Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1.1 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 Interlanguage Theory

1.1.1.1 Early Developments

The behavioristic and structural principles of language learning were severely criticized by Chomsky (1959). Chomsky argued that the rapidity with which all children learn language could not be explained in terms of mechanical principles of behaviorism. He felt that child’s capacity to generalize, hypothesize and to develop his own strategies to communicate confidently has its own pedagogical relevance.

The Saussurian dictum of *La langue* and *La Parole* is partially analogous to the notion of *Competence* and *Performance* put forward by Chomsky. In recent years, there has been increasing focus on *learner’s performance* or *La Parole* of the learner’s at different stages of learning at its
own right. With the appearance of three articles in the last three decades, second
and foreign language research geared their direction towards learner-based
learning. Corder (1976) in his article ‘The Significance of Learners’ Errors’
introduced the Transitional Competence; in 1971, Nemser introduced
Approximative Systems in his article ‘Approximative Systems of Foreign
Language Learners’. Later in 1972, Selinker’s term Interlanguage was
introduced to the field in an article carrying the same term as its title.

Different researchers started to investigate the plausibility of the fact that
the language of second-language learner is a distinct system. The results ratified
that this system is in some sense autonomous and distinct both from native
language and target language.

Before the introduction of the notion of interlanguage, the proponents of
contrastive analysis asserted that the second-language learner’s language was
shaped solely by transfer from the native language (NL), therefore a good
contrastive analysis of the NL and the target language (TL) could accurately
predict all the difficulties which the learner would face in attempt to learn the
TL. These claims were not backed up by data obtained from the systematic study
of learner language itself, but usually only by utterances which analysts
happened to have noticed and remembered. Unfortunately, due to natural
tendency, analysts happen to notice only the data their theories predict and not
the data which do not fit their theories. For example, utterances which were
clear evidence of transfer were noticed and quoted, but the utterances which did
not provide evidence of transfer apparently went unnoticed or were classified as
residue. Thus, Tarone (1994) says in the 1950s and the 1960s, there were virtually no systematic attempts to observe learner language and to document scientifically the way in which learner language developed, or to independently and objectively verify the strong claims of the contrastive analysis hypothesis that language transfer was the sole process shaping learner language.

Error Analysis emerged as an attempt to validate the predictions of contrastive analysis by systematically gathering and analyzing the speech and writing of second-language learners. For the first time, the focus was on what scientific study could reveal about problems of second language learners. The early results showed an increasingly large 'residue' of errors that did not, in fact, seem to be caused by transfer as contrastive analysts had predicted. These errors became an increasing major source of difficulty for the contrastive analysis hypothesis, a hypothesis, which could not satisfactorily answer the question of what shapes learners language. But error analysts' too much preoccupation with learner errors put the error analysis in jeopardy of neglecting the correct utterances, communication, and comprehension. One of the major shortcomings of error analysis was its failure to account for the strategy of avoidance. A learner can, for a number of reasons, avoid the use of particular word structure or discourse category, and still be considered as having no difficulty and regarded as fluent (Brown, 1987). Negligence of universal aspects of language was another weak point of error analysis (Gass, 1984). The interlanguage system, as Gass suggests, may have elements that neither reflect the L1 nor L2, but rather distinct universal features which go unnoticed by the error analysis. Finally, one
can argue against error analysis voicing the fact that the production errors are only a subset of the overall performance of the learner, the main data which error analysts depend on. In short, Varadi (1983) quotes Nemser’s statements about the shortcomings of the error analysis as: (1) preoccupation with overt as opposed to covert errors, (2) an almost exclusive concern with learning inhibition and consequent neglect of facilitation, (3) an exclusively normative approach to errors precluding analysis in sui generis terms, and (4) a neglect of a simple gap or hiatus- in the learner’s knowledge of the target language as a source of errors along with structural disparities between the base language and the target language.

Larry Selinker (1972) was the first to introduce the term Interlanguage to refer to the second language distinct linguistic system, which is manifested, when a learner tries to express meanings in the language being learned. In other words, interlanguage refers “to the systematic linguistic behavior of learners of a second or other language” (Smith, 1994). The primary goal of interlanguage research is to provide explanation to the difference between the psycholinguistic processes involved in the acquisition and learning a native language and mainly a second language. It set out to explain the fossilization or cessation, and failure of an interlanguage speaker to attain a native-like status in the course of target language learning.

Analyzing the term interlanguage will leave us with the immediate constitutes of inter which is the reminder of some phenomenon located between the two things, and language which can be taken as some separate autonomous
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linguistic system which is between the native language and a target language but is linked to both. This distinct linguistic system includes all aspects of a language such as phonology, morphology, syntax, and other levels as pragmatics and discourse. It is not a hybrid product of the morphological system of first language (L1) and the syntactic system of target language (L2). Neither is it the language when a native speaker of language tries to communicate the same meanings. It is systematically different from both. To understand the nature of this system, Chomsky (1965) says that a research studying the second language development should view it as similar to first language development, that is, we should study the development of underlying linguistic competence. In either case rule creation is involved where these rules are products of hypothesization.

The notion of interlanguage gained more ground as error analysis suffered gloom. By interlanguage, Selinker meant the linguistic system evidenced when a second language learner attempts to express meanings in the language being learned (Tarone, 1994). Corder (1987) argues that Selinker coined the term with the impression that the learner’s language was a kind of hybrid between L1 and L2. Selinker’s position was supported by errors of transfer. Later on, the researches on second language in informal setting and language learning by children revealed that errors happened with most of the learners at some stage of development and were independent of the nature their L1. Thus, clearly interlanguage could not be regarded as a hybrid (Corder, 1987). The systematic errors were regarded as the by-product of the attempt of the learner to communicate his meaning.
If the learner’s errors are in some sense systematic and not random, then we can conclude that this target language must be based on some systematic knowledge or personal ‘competence’ to put it in Chomsky’s term. In other words, the learner’s errors are based more or less on well-defined personal grammar. If we accept this fact then we can regard his performance as being rule-governed in the same way as any native speaker’s performance is. In as much as the learner’s verbal performance in the second language is structurally systematic, we can assume that at any particular point in his learning carrier, he possesses a language. These learner’s versions of target language were given the collective name *interlanguage* by Selinker. The learner is supposed to have ‘intuition’ about the grammaticality of his language. But when we talk about errors made by the learners we are clearly applying to their language the intuition of grammaticality possessed by speakers of the target language. This is regarded as a flaw in this approach. Because we should compare the utterance of the learners against the amount of input and the amount of intake, not the utterances against the native speakers’ competence.

Later in 1981, Corder for the first time persuasively proposed another approach for the study of learners’ language. He argued that second language learners do not start learning the second language by their first language, rather they follow a sequence of development which itself is the result of sequence imposed on them from outside. He called this system a universal *built-in syllabus* which help them to develop systematically a linguistic system which he named *transitional competence*. For Corder, this system is a system distinct
from L1 and L2, and it follows its own course and rules of development, probably following the Universal Grammar (UG). The errors elicited in the language of second language learners are evidences of an idiosyncratic linguistic system, which is in the process of shaping and development. On the other hand, Canale and Swain (1980) talk about communicative competence which is referred to the underlying systems of knowledge and skill required for communication (e.g. knowledge of vocabulary and skill in using the sociolinguistic conventions for a given language). Actual communication is the realization of such knowledge and skill under limiting psychological and environmental conditions such as memory, perceptual constraints, and fatigue nervousness. This distinction between communicative competence and actual communication tallies with the Chomsky’s distinction between competence and performance. For Canale and Swain (1980), communication is the exchange and negotiation of information between at least two individuals, through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols, written/visual modes, and production and comprehension processes. Canale and Swain (1980) outline four major components for this communicative competence:

1. Grammatical Competence: it includes the knowledge of vocabulary, rules of word and sentence formation, semantics, pronunciation and spelling.

2. Sociolinguistics Competence: it includes rules of appropriateness of both meaning and grammatical forms in different sociolinguistic contexts.

3. Discourse Competence: it includes the knowledge required to combine forms and meanings to achieve unified spoken or written texts.
4. Strategic Competence: It includes the knowledge of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called upon to compensate for limitations in one or more of the areas of communicative competence.

The act of communication itself is characterized by Candlin (1981), and Widdowson (1979) having the following features: a) it is a form of social interaction, and is, therefore, normally acquired and used in social interaction, b) it involves a high degree of unpredictability and creativity in form and message, c) it takes place in discourse and sociocultural contexts which forces some constraint on proper language use, d) it is carried out under limiting psychological and other conditions such as memory constraints, fatigue and distractions, e) it always has purpose (for example), to establish social relations, to persuade, or to promise), f) it involves authentic, as opposed to textbook-contrived language; and g) it is judged as successful or otherwise on the basis of actual outcomes.

The term Strategies of Communication was first invoked by Selinker (1972) to account for certain classes of errors made by learners of second language learner. The errors were regarded as the by-product of the attempts of the learner with an inadequate grasp of the target language system to express his meaning in spontaneous speech. He hypothesized that there are five psychological and cognitive processes which shape interlanguage as follows:

a. Native language transfer

b. Overgeneralization of target language rules

c. Transfer of training
He tried to stimulate systematic research into the development of language produced by adult second language learners. Selinker et al. (1975) argued that an analysis of children’s oral performance revealed the systematic nature of interlanguage. This systematicity could not be predicted by grammatical rules, which is to be evidenced by recognizable strategy. By strategy, he meant a cognitive activity at the conscious or unconscious level that involved the processing of second language data in an attempt to express meaning.

Communication strategies are regarded as the source of learner error, which include both the interlingual and intralingual transfer and the context of learning as the learner tries to get a message across to another learner or reader. At the time of communication, due to some reason, certain linguistic forms may not be available to the learner (speaker), so the learner consciously tries to employ different processes, verbal or non-verbal mechanisms, to compensate for the lack of his linguistic means.

Apart from discussing the central issue of fossilization, Selinker proposed five processes which shape interlanguage. Communication Strategies (CSs) are seen as the one of the processes used by the learner to cope with communicative problems when the interlanguage system is not equipped with the sufficient L2 linguistic items. In such a situation, a learner may attempt different ways to convey the message. These attempts are called Communication Strategies (CSs).
"The linguistic forms and patterns used in such attempts may become more or less permanent parts of the learner’s interlanguage" (Tarone, 1994).

1.1.1.2 Later Developments

Since the introduction of the interlanguage theory there has been several responses to the conceptualization of it, among them three main trends have been adopted by Selinker et al. (1975), Adjémian (1976), and Tarone (1979). Selinker considers the interlanguage as a separate, systematic, prone-to-fossilization linguistic system which develops as a result of learner’s attempts to learn a language which is normally done through five cognitive processes, which he considers to be involved in second language learning (SLL). For Selinker, the process of children’s language learning is different from adults’, in that the adult’s second language learning involves fossilization, transfer and lack of access for Universal Grammar. Because of the extension of the interlanguage studies to the children’s communication by Selinker et al. (1975), the phenomenon of ‘systematicity’ became the main concern of the researchers. This systematicity could only be accounted for by the study of potentially cognitive activities that are evidenced in the strategic behavior of the learners, i.e. strategies. However, the lack of consensus over the nature of L1 and L2 learning has led to the emergence of another approach in the interlanguage studies inspired from the Universal Grammar of Chomsky (1990).

The availability of UG in the adult second language learning is the kernel of the approach gained the favor of some researchers among them Adjémian.
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( Ibid.). The systematicity which Selinker talked about, is explored by Adjémian in the framework of linguistically ruled-governed behavior, which mainly derived from the principle and parameter model of Chomsky (1980). Interlanguage like any other natural language is susceptible to universal constraints and internal consistency. This system could be linguistically idealized by observing the regularities in the data. In this regard McLaughlin (1988) notes:

Interlanguage systems are thought to be by their nature incomplete and in a state of flux...the individual’s first-language system is seen to relatively stable, but the interlanguage is not. The structures of the interlanguage may be invaded by the first language....

In certain contexts, when the learners fall short of the L2 linguistic means, they resort to communication strategies. The context of use of strategies opened another avenue for researchers.

A set of stylistic variations ensuing from different contexts of use consolidates the nature of interlanguage. Proposing this idea, Tarone (1979) continues “learner utterances are systematically variable in at least two senses: (1) linguistic context may have a variable effect on the learner’s use of related phonological and systematic structures, and (2) the task used for the elicitation of data from learners may have a variable effect on the learner’s production of related phonological and syntactic structures.” According to Tarone (1979) context and task play important roles in the interlanguage communication.
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Interlanguage is considered as a natural language which shows systematic variability according to context, an idea which has its roots in sociolinguistic studies of Labov (1970). For Tarone, interlanguage is not a mono-dimensional system, rather a set of styles which keep on changing according to the social context, and pragmatic constraints. So she suggests, for the better understanding of the interlanguage system, we should always construct a variety of elicitation tasks.

In general, the development, and the revisions made to the interlanguage theory since 1972, some of which we have discussed above, could be summarized in the following paragraphs.

1. The interlanguage theory was initially intended to account for the adults second language learning processes, but the recent evidences from the research of the children’s language immersion programs have shown the shaping of interlanguage in the children’ mind, since there has been evidential proofs of the fossilized linguistic items and traces of transfer from their native language. This might have been caused by the sociolinguistic factors in such a way that there has been less exposure and rare opportunity for the meaningful application of interlanguage outside the classroom, so no comprehensible output has been produced by these children. Now the question is whether these children use their language acquisition device (LAD) in these contexts to internalize the L2, or they employ those five psycholinguistic processes proposed by Selinker, assumed to be characteristics of the adult’s second language. The new researches are directed to find answers to this dilemma.
2. The influence of UG on shaping and development of natural languages has been widely pressed upon in the recent literature. Two opinions are there in this regard. Selinker believes that interlanguage is not a natural language, emphasizing the idea that natural languages are developed based on LAD, and that UG is connected to the nature of construct of LAD, whereas interlanguage does not follow UG, and that interlanguage is the product of cognitive processes not LAD. The second opinion is held by Adjemian (1976) who believes that interlanguage learning, like L1 learning, is the product of the LAD; and fossilization, too, occurs because the parameters are already set for one language are now being used for another language which requires its own parameter setting. Adjemian’s view suggests the availability of UG even after the completion of the lateralization of the mind which is known as a critical point of learning. On the contrary, Selinker denies the involvement of UG in shaping the interlanguage after the teens. Whatever the credibility of these claims, the assumption that interlanguage is a natural language is matter of dispute among the researchers.

3. Recent findings in interlanguage studies depict the involvement of context factor in the SLL. Researcher have empirically proved that in some sociolinguistic contexts, as compared to others, learners are capable of producing a language which does not deviates from the native speakers’ in respect of grammaticality and fluency. Assuming that the learners do vary in respect of context, time, or sociolinguistic backgrounds raises doubt about the credibility of extension of linguistic notions, set for a monolingual society now being applied
to bilingual or interlanguage contexts. Finally, it suggests the engagement of enormous data elicited through a wide range of contexts, for making invulnerable and sturdy generalizations.

4. Inevitability of fossilization of language or cessation of learning has been the much-disputed notion in the field of SLL. Here, Selinker is of the opinion that no second language could hope to speak a target language in a way that he may not be distinguished from the native speakers of that language. Further it is has been argued that phonological system is controlled neurolinguistically, hence it is concluded that after puberty, it is almost next to impossible to articulate the foreign sounds accurately. Others, apparently not rejecting this argument in totality, yet differ assuming that a native-identical language competence is very much possible in respect of morphology, syntax, and grammar. The sociolinguistic pressures such as the need for identification with the native language rather than the need to be identified with the target language have been believed to be the causes of phonological distancing or approximation. If the need for identification with the target language is intense enough, the learner is already potentially equipped to make the phonological assimilation a reality.
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The challenge of how to observe the constructions such as balloon, ball, air ball, special toy for children, for better understanding of the second language learning and use has become twofold since the publication of *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* by Færch and Kasper in 1983. The validity of the answers to the questions such as how to conduct research and how to see the various forms produced by the L2 learners has been challenged in the recent years.

There have been mainly two opinions on the study of CSs. One is the opinion of the advocates of maintaining and expanding of the taxonomies led by Tarone, and the other belongs to those who deny the validity of the existing taxonomies and favor reduction in the number of categories of analysis (Poulisse et al., 1984,1987), (Poulisse, 1987,1994). This divergence of opinions in the approaches toward the study of CSs has even affected the findings of the researches. In other words, the advocates of the expansion of categories which we will refer to as Expansionists believe in the active teaching of CSs whereas the followers of the approach who favor reduction of categories, who we will refer to as Reductionists, strongly have opposed the teaching of CSs (Kellerman, 1991).

Here, we will look at the analytic perspectives of the two main groups or schools. The issue of the number of the strategies is the main obvious difference. In the typical taxonomy of the Expansionists, there are two main categories, achievement strategies, and reduction strategies. Achievement
strategies are further divided into word coinage, approximation, circumlocution, paraphrase, language transfer, etc. Reduction strategies, also, are subdivided into avoidance, change of plan, or communicative avoidance. In the taxonomy proposed by the Reductionists only the achievement strategies (compensatory strategies) have been emphasized and reported in detail. However, in the present research, the reduction strategies have also been explored. In the typical Reductionists' taxonomy, compensatory strategies have been subdivided into conceptual and code (linguistic) strategies. Conceptual strategies are further subdivided into analytic and holistic strategies. Holistic strategy refers to the substitution of a word related to the intended concept, and analytic strategy refers to the listing of the criterial properties of the intended concept.

The differences in the approach is initiated from the difference in analytical perspectives, which these two groups assume. Expansionists mainly depend on the interactive and the observed L2 forms for the categorization, and only implicitly refer to the psychological processes in the production of CSs, whereas the Reductionists focus on the psychological (psycholinguistic) processes, cognitive decisions employed by the L2 learners, and then they make implicit remarks on the observed different linguistic forms that are elicited in performance. That is, Expansionists study performance to account for the competence whereas Reductionists study competence in order to account for the performance data (Yule and Tarone, 1997).

The interactional aspect of L2 communication is another point of dissimilarity between the Expansionists and the Reductionists' approach. The
negotiational aspect of the CSs (L2 learner and native communication) is the core of the study in Yule and Tarone's (1997) view, whereas in the eyes of the Reductionists, this aspect is peripheral and a secondary objective, because they view the communication as the process through which one conveys certain meanings to the listener. For the Reductionists, the relevant L1 is the learner’s L1 whereas for the Expansionists “the relevant L1 ... is not that of the learner, but that of the target language (TL) speakers.” Therefore, Expansionists find it useful to compare performance of the language learner with performance of the native speaker. Nevertheless, the Reductionists perceive that the sole study of underlying L2 competence and comparison of this competence with the learner’s L1 performance proves to be more revealing and essential. The two different surface realizations of the same underlying psychological and cognitive processes cannot be the base for assigning these realizations into two different strategies, as these surface forms are the base for the taxonomic classification by the Expansionists. However, for Tarone, these surface linguistic differences are more radiant and more meaningful (Poulisse et al., 1984).

1.2.1 Definitions of Communication strategies

The following definitions have been proposed for the communication strategies. In spite of the fact that every researcher has given a distinct definition for the communication strategies, the definitions seem to be defined mainly based on the criteria of problematic-orientedness, consciousness, and intentionality of the strategies.
1. A systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his meaning when faced with some difficulty.  
   (Corder, 1981)

2. A mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures are not shared.  
   (Tarone, 1980)

3. Potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal.  
   (Færch & Kasper, 1983)

4. Technique of coping with difficulties in communicating in an imperfectly known second language.  
   (Stern, 1987)

5. Every potentially intentional attempt to cope with any language-related problem of which the speaker is aware during the course of communication.  
   (Dörnei and Scott, 1997)

### 1.2.2 Methodological Differences between the Approaches

There are methodological differences between these approaches, which are discussed below and summarized in table 1.1 as follows:

In the Reductionists’ approach, the learners are used as their own control group and their L2 is compared with their L1, whereas Expansionists compare the L2 forms of the learners with those of the native speakers’.
Reductionists’ main aim is to understand the internal cognitive processes whether in L1 or L2, whereas Expansionists primary goal is explanation of the realized forms and their comparison with those of the native speaker when they involve the same test.

The different elicitation prompts used in these two approaches are another point of dissimilarity though this dissimilarity has not been taken seriously in the Expansionists’ approach. Up to now only abstract shapes (nouns) have been used for the data elicitation, Poulisse and the Nijmegen Group (1984,1990,1994), and the concrete nouns have not been put into trial, whereas the Expansionists have only used concrete nouns, with the exception of Chen (1990), Paribakht (1985). It is assumed that in the case of abstract nouns, analogous explanation, and in the case of concrete nouns, functional aspect of the items will be used in the explanations of the L2 learners. The synthesis of the both these concrete and abstract concepts have been made in this project in order to shed light to this aspect of use of CSs.

The involvement of an interlocutor in the process of data elicitation is another point of methodological discrepancy. Due to the fundamental interest of the Reductionists in study of cognitive processes, there is no need for the presence of a listener in the context, especially when, as in Yule and Tarone’s (1997) experiment, the listener is not allowed to verbalize anything and response is permitted only in the form of gestures. Still, for the Expansionists the presence of an addressee is seen to have “profound influence on the cognitive processes underlying (that) performance.”
The diversity of the subjects used for the research study is another point of difference. A study of homogeneous subjects (geographically, linguistically, socio-culturally) will make L1 data elicitation feasible, but as claimed by some researchers the use of subject who come from same linguistic background will weaken the power of the generalization of the results to other speech communities. This argument has not yet been validated. To avoid this problem,

Table 1.1
Summary of Differences between the Approaches*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Expansionists</th>
<th>Reductionists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Profligate, liberal expansion of categories</td>
<td>Conservative, parsimonious reduction of categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Taxonomic description of observed forms in output, External and interactive</td>
<td>Description of underlying psychological process, Internal and cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>L2 learner performance compared to TL native speaker’s performance; many differences found</td>
<td>L2 learner performance compared to their own L1 performance: many similarities found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elicitation prompts are real-world objects</td>
<td>Elicitation prompts are abstract shapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Listening partner, with a purpose, present</td>
<td>No listening partner present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>L2 learner with different L1s; L1s mostly dissimilar to TL</td>
<td>L2 learners with same L1; L1 very similar to TL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Communication strategies should be actively taught</td>
<td>Communication strategies should not be actively taught</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted with the courtesy of Dr. Tarone with certain modifications.

Tarone and Yule (1987) have used cross-cultural groups. This approach has increased the potentiality of making generalizations, but with the same token it
has weakened the reliability of the findings. That is, the learners knowing that the interlocutor does not belong to the same linguistic group will not attempt the use of L1-based strategies. Hence, the data is prejudiced. In general the differences discussed above are summarized in the table 1.1.

1.2.3 Approaches to the Study of Communication Strategies

Tarone (1980) made a fine observation on the approaches adopted by different researchers studying the CSs, and proposed a distinction between three notions involved in the studies: 1) the **observational phenomenon**, 2) the **conceptual framework** used to think about that phenomenon, (3) and the **terminology used** to talk about the framework. “There are certain observable phenomena that occur in interlanguage IL communication, but researchers put them into different conceptual frameworks according to approach.” Different researchers emphasize linguistic forms or other function of the language according to an understanding of their importance. In the study of communication strategies, one has to determine whether the researchers are (1) “observing different phenomena” (2) “observing the same phenomenon but placing what they observe into different conceptual frameworks” or (3) “observing the same phenomenon, using the same conceptual framework but simply using different terms for the same concepts.” Having this observation in mind, we shall review some of the main views and approaches in the study of
CSs. An overview of the taxonomies available in the literature is shown in Table 1.2.

1.2.3.1 Tarone's Interactional Approach

Tarone (1977) viewed the CSs as the forms of verbal or non-verbal behavior in situations where the learner's linguistic knowledge does not satisfy the needs of communication. She defines communication strategies as:

Systematic attempts by the learner to express or decode meaning in the target language, in situations where the appropriate systematic target language rule have not been formed.

She has recognized the following categories of the CSs:

A. Avoidance

There are two subtypes of this strategy, a) Topic avoidance i.e. when the learner does not have the TL vocabulary for specific concept, he may not talk at all about the concept, b) Message abandonment, i.e. "when the learner begins to talk about a concept but is unable to continue and begins a new sentence" (Tarone, 1977).

B. Paraphrase

"The rewording of the message in an alternate acceptable language construction, in situations where the appropriate form or construction is not
known or not yet stable” (Tarone, 1977). There are three subtypes of paraphrase:

1. **Approximation**: the use of substitute term that shares some of the semantic features of the original word.

2. **Word Coinage**: creation of a new word to communicate a desired concept is called *word coinage*.

3. **Circumlocution**: description of the characteristics or elements of the object or an action instead of using the appropriate target language structure.

C. **Conscious Transfer**

It refers to the involvement of the L1 linguistic knowledge in the production of L2 language by the second/foreign language learners. There are two types of transfer: a) *literal translation*: word by word translation is done, e.g. ‘he invites him for drink’ instead of using the term ‘toast’, b) *language switch*: use of the exact L1 term in place of L2 term.

D. **Appeal for assistance**

It occurs when the learner asks the experimenter for the supply of word, approval, confirmation of what he talks about, and consultation of the dictionary for some word.

E. **Mime**: it refers to the use of non-verbal CSs.
Tarone (1980), in her attempt to broaden the concept of CS introduced the *interactional perspective* of the communication, and expanded her approach in such a way that the interactional and meaning negotiation in the act of communication became the core aspect of the approach. She redefined the CS as, “mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on meaning in situations where request meaning structures do not seem to be shared.”

Tarone sees the CSs as tools used in a joint negotiation of meaning where both interlocutors attempt to agree as to a communicative goal. Here, the CSs are considered as bilateral enterprises in which both the speaker and the addressee sometimes feel that they do not understand each other so they resort to the groups of strategies which are described in Tarone (1977). Although the above definition allows the inclusion of “repair mechanisms and meaning negotiation” which are different from L2 “problem-management efforts”, but there are some difficulties with this definition as well. For example, a) this approach cannot be applied to (as it doesn’t care of) monologue (e.g. writing), b) the use of CS may not be necessarily manifested in interaction, rather they may remain hidden at the planning stage without surface realization of the fact. This ignorance makes the explanatory power of the approach seem less strong.

1.2.3.2 Færch and Kasper’s Psychological Approach

The psychological approach of Færch and Kasper (1983) views the CSs in terms of the learner’s mental response to problems, rather than as a mutual effort of the two interlocutors. This approach tries to explore the communication
strategies exclusively in terms of psychological processes which become operational in L2 production. Færch and Kasper make a distinction between strategies and plans. This distinction is made, based on a speech production model. Their speech model consists of two phases, a) planning phase, and b) execution phase. These distinct phases involve separate steps. The result of the planning phase is the formation of a ‘plan’ to achieve a specific communicative goal, and the result of the execution phase is execution of the plan which is realized by speech. In their model, CSs are placed only in the planning phase. Their speech production model is presented in a diagram as follows:

A. The Planning Process

The planning process develops a plan, which its execution, will result in an action, which generates an actional goal. In the planning phase, user selects rules and items that he considers most suitable for establishing a plan, the
execution of which results in verbal behavior which is expected to satisfy the original goal. The product of the planning phase is a plan which controls the execution phase.

B. The Execution Phase

The execution phase consists of neurological or physiological processes, which result in the articulation of speech sounds, writing, use of nonlinguistic gestures, signs, etc. This model gives a better understanding of mental problems of learners in using communication strategies. Faerch and Kasper (1983a) locate the CSs within the planning phase, or more precisely, within the area of planning process and the resulting plan. They define communication strategies as “potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual present itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal” Faerch and Kasper (1983a).

Here, two main criteria have been taken into account, a) problem-orientedness and b) potential consciousness. The criterion of problem-orientedness maintains a distinction between the goals, which the learner faces no difficulty in reaching, and the goals which the learners encounter as problem in achieving. Here, in this definition “only the goals which present themselves as problems are considered as strategies” Faerch and Kasper (1983b). In general, this criterion says that the L2 users often experience situations in which their communicative goals cannot be realized by the existing and accessible linguistic knowledge. On the other hand, potential consciousness criterion further delimits
the subset of problem-solving plans. This excludes the cognitive operations which are often completely automatic and are not subjected to conscious control, e.g. neural and motor processes in articulation Færch and Kasper (1983b).

Problems may arise in both phases. “The problems within the planning phase may occur either because of the linguistic knowledge is felt to be insufficient by the language, user, as relative to a given goal, or because the user predicts that he will have problems in executing a plan” whereas “the problems in within the execution phase have to do with retrieving the items or rules which are contained in the plan” (1983b).

Based on the above argument, Færch and Kasper identify two broad groups of communication strategies, which are established according to two fundamental different types of behavior that the learner may take up. The learners may adopt avoidance behavior, i.e. drop a part of original communicative goal, or may rely on achievement behavior, i.e. try to overcome the problem by attempting alternative plans. These two types of approaches or behaviors correspond to two major communicative strategies. Avoidance behavior manifests itself in reduction strategies, and achievement behavior manifests itself in achievement strategies.

The communication strategies recognized by Færch and Kasper are summarized in the figure 1.2. The main strategies identified by them are, a) functional reduction strategy which is regarded as a technique by which the learner avoids the problematic goal by reducing the communicative goal in the form of topic avoidance, message abandonment, or meaning replacement, b)
formal reduction strategy which is thought of as the production of a reduced language in order to avoid the incorrect and uncertain forms, and c) achievement strategy, i.e. a technique by which the learner expands his communicative goals, such as transfer, to achieve conveying the intended concept.

Figure 1.2. Communication Strategies Proposed by Færch and Kasper (1983)

1.2.3.2.1. Strategies Proposed

The strategies proposed by Færch and Kasper are discussed in detail as follows:
A. Reduction (Avoidance) Strategies

Reduction strategies are further sub-classified into formal and functional reduction. In formal reduction the speaker/user decides to communicate by means of reduced system, i.e. he uses readily accessible rules or items. Here, the problem may be initiated either by the correctness or the fluency which are considered the justifiable criteria. In the case of functional reduction, any component of a communicative goal may be affected, i.e. its actional, prepositional or modal aspect. In actional functional reduction, the learner avoids performing certain speech acts or discourse functions, e.g. initiate acts. The strategies as topic avoidance, message abandonment, and meaning replacement are classified in prepositional functional reduction. Modal function reduction refers to the learner’s decision not to make speech acts for relational (politeness) and expressive function. Functional reduction strategies are employed when the learner has insufficient linguistic resources (in planning phase) or if has retrieval problems (in execution phase), in case the behavior is a reduction one.

B. Achievement Strategies

By employing the achievement strategies, the learner attempts to solve the problems of communication by expanding his communication resources, instead of reducing the communication goal, (functional reduction). Most of the literature in the field is related to achievement strategies. Faerch and Kasper (1983) refer to achievement strategies, aimed at solving problems in the planning phase, which results from insufficient linguistic
resources, as *compensatory strategies*, and they concentrate on investigation of these aspects of CSs.

A common characteristic of the compensatory strategies is that the original communicative goal is maintained, but the learner resorts to creative use of existing resources. He may resort either to *non-cooperative strategies*, self-reliantly expressing the communicative goal in an alternate way, or attempt *Cooperative strategies* to solve the problem by the help of other party, e.g. interlocutor’s assistance.

The authors classify the non-cooperative strategies into three subclasses of communicative resources used to compensate for the unavailability of linguistic forms:

a. A different code, such as L1 or another foreign language L3 (L1, L3-based strategies)

b. The learner’s IL (IL-based strategies)

c. Non-linguistic means (Non-linguistic strategies).

As mentioned above, the compensatory strategies are sub-classified according to the resources the learner draw on in solving his planning problem, which are presented below.

30
Introduction and Review of Literature

A. Compensatory Strategies

1. Code Switching

Code Switching is referred to as a situation in which the speaker starts speaking (writing) in one language (L2) and then changes to another language, e.g. L1, in the middle of his speech or writing.

2. Interlingual Transfer

Strategies of interlingual transfer result in combination of linguistic features from the IL and the L1. If the non-IL element is adopted to the IL system, phonologically or morphologically, the strategy is termed as foreignizing, whereas the verbatim selection of combination of IL lexical items on the basis of L1/L3 has been called literal translations. Both foreignizing and literal translation are traditionally located under interlingual transfer.

3. Inter/Intralingual Transfer

When the learner assumes that the L2 is formally similar to his L1, these strategies are applied. “The result of the strategy is a generalization of IL rules ... but the generalization is influenced by the properties of the corresponding L1 structures, (Færch and Kasper 1983, pp. 20-60), e.g., generalization of -ed suffix to irregular verbs, e.g. 'swim'→ 'swimmed'.”

4. Interlanguage-based Strategies

It comprises various ways of problem-solving procedures of the learner’s IL knowledge which he may use.
4.1 Generalization

Through generalization the problem is solved in the planning phase by substituting the intended term which appears in the learner’s plan with an IL items which the learner would not normally use in the given context. By this filling of the gap, he assumes the intended meaning would be conveyed, e.g. referring to ‘giraffe’ as ‘animal’.

4.2 Paraphrase

In an attempt to solve the problem in the planning phase, the learner tries to fill the information gap with a construction, which is well formed according to his IL system. Description and exemplification are instances of paraphrasing of an unavailable lexical item. For example:

- ‘a cykel there is a motor’ for ‘a bicycle-with a motor’.

4.3 Word Coinage

It involves the creative construction of a new IL word. This strategy is called word coinage, e.g. ‘rounding of stadion’ for ‘curve of stadium’.

4.4 Restructuring

Restructuring is employed whenever the learners realize that they cannot complete a plan which is already being executed, and decide to develop an alternative local plan which enables
them to reach their original communicative goal, e.g. 'I have two-er-I have one sister and one brother'.

5. **Cooperative Strategies**

Cooperative strategies involve a joint problem-solving effort by two interlocutors. Such cooperative problems solving activity is initiated by a *direct* or *indirect appeal* performed by one of the interlocutors. Tarone (1977) accounts for this strategy by defining communication strategies in *interactional terms*. However, Færch and Kasper do not restrict their definition to this aspect. For Færch and Kasper, it is up to the learner to decide whether to attempt a resolution by himself, e.g. by using a psychologically achievement strategy, or to send SOS signals about his problem to his interlocutor and thereby attempt to solve the problem in cooperative manner.

6. **Non-Linguistic Strategies**

Færch and Kasper talk about the use of *nonlinguistic strategies* such as mime, gesture, and sound initiation as the substitutes or support for other strategies.

B. **Retrieval Strategies**

Besides all these compensatory strategies, Færch and Kasper indicate *Retrieval strategies* as subtype of achievement strategies. They believe “in executing a plan, learner may have difficulties in retrieving specific IL items and may adopted achievement strategies in order to get at a problematic item” (Færch and Kasper, 1983).
Lastly, Faerch and Kasper try to relate the use of CSs to their potential language learning. For them, L2 learning is a process of gradual development of IL system by the processes of hypothesis formation and hypothesis testing in which hypothetical rules either are rejected or incorporated to IL system through the feedback obtained. Besides these cognitive processes, the L2 is learned by the process of **automatization**, the increase of IL rules by the use of them in formal exercise or in communication.

It is concluded that only those communication strategies which aim at solving problem in the planning phase can lead to L2 learning with respect to hypothesis formation. The communication strategies in connection with the execution phase will be associated with automatization only. In a foreign language situation, the communication strategies are regarded as devices which enable the learner to bridge the gap between the formal classroom interaction to the more realistic outside communication. Hence, they improve the learners **communicative competence** in IL communication.

### 1.2.3.3 Dörnyei’s Extended Approach

Dörnyei (1995) introduced the term **stalling strategies** (lexicalized pauses-fillers and hesitation gambits) arguing that these strategies are mediatory factors in the problem solving/management process, through which the learner organizes thought as the communication channel is kept open via the use of strategies. Dörnyei argued that these strategies prevent the breakdown of the communication, as they are used to buy time or think. But Tarone does not
regard these strategies as communicative, rather for her they are production strategies, because they are not primarily used for negotiation of meaning. Færch and Kasper (1983) too consider stalling strategies as temporal variables rather than strategic devices.

1.2.3.4 Dörnyei and Scott’s Extended Approach

Dörnyei and Scott (1997) in an attempt to integrate all types of communication problem-management mechanisms discussed in the L2 literature came up with a new definition and finally proposed an extension of the definition of CS “to include every potentially intentional attempt to cope with any language-related problem of which the speaker is aware during the course of communication.” This definition embraces all the conscious problem-management mechanisms in L2 communication.

1.2.3.5 Canale’s Extended Approach

As Dörnyei puts it “Canale (1983) proposed the broadest extension of the concept of communication strategies.” In Canale’s approach, any attempt which enhances the effectiveness of communication is included in the category of CS, e.g. deliberate speech simplification. Generally speaking, “communication strategy is a plan of action to accomplish a communicative goal; the enhancement of communication effect is certainly such a goal” (Dörnyei and Scott, 1997).
1.2.3.6. Psychological Approach of Bialystok

Researchers such as Bialystok (1990), Poulisse and Schils (1989), and Færch and Kasper (1983) suggested a turn towards the study of cognitive processes underlying the use of strategies. Their argument is based on the fact that a study or classification which is merely dependent on the surface realization of the underlying psychological processes would be misleading. Bialystok proposed that we should initially understand the cognitive and psycholinguistic dimensions of CS use. It is further suggested that the attentions to be shifted from the product-oriented researches into process-oriented researches, in which the main focus is on the cognitive, and deep structure of strategic language behavior. Bialystok, then, argued that there are two inherent classification problems in the existing classifications:

A. Problem of Level and Embeddedness

Bialystok (1990) says in all previous classification the "strategic options are unique choices" whereas for the speaker it is not so, because communication is stream for the speaker, and use of specific structure or approach may entail another CS, so culminating all these strategies in one category is not logical. Bialystok tries to question the previous approaches, and proposes another framework for categorization of strategies. She argues that if we classify the utterances based on some fine proportion as circumlocution or approximation then we are going by what she calls the very linguistic product. Embeddedness of some strategies in some other is another problem. To solve this problem
Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), have made a distinction between the main strategies and embedded strategies, the distinction adopted later on by Poulisse.

B. Adequacy of the Definitions

The definitions, according to Bialystok, suffer form lack of explicitness. She criticizes the classifications in detail as follows:

1. Message Abandonment: Tarone (1977) defined the message abandonment as the “learner begins to talk about a concept but is unable to continue and begins a new sentence” whereas for Færch and Kasper (1983) “the first problem is the decision about whether or not any abandonment has really occurred.” For, restructuring of equivalent strategy is considered as subset of an interlanguage-based achievement strategy, or paraphrase in Tarone’s term. Thus for Færch and Kasper the presence of linguistic false starts and stumbles are not the evidences of abandoning the overall effort to achieve” (Bialystok, 1990). As Bialystok concludes, in Færch and Kasper’s view, nothing has been abandoned by the learner, rather another attempt has started to achieve the goal. The adequacy of these two interpretations for deciding on a criterion based on which we can assign the strategies, has not been conventionalized. So, the classification depends partly on the listener’s response and partly on the speaker’s willingness to convey more. Sometimes even unnecessary information is supplied by the speaker.

Another problem is the criterion based on which we attribute the characteristic of abandonment of a message. The idea is that the speaker doesn’t
finish a sentence, or replaces it with another before the completion of the first. Rather the “unfinished sentences that consign an utterance to the category of message abandonment usually fails at a point which that speaker requires another unknown lexical item,” e.g. in the sentence ‘the water comes out of it... it is attached to ...’ the speaker tries to convey the concept ‘garden hose’, but he discovers that he does not have the lexical item for ‘tap’ and this limitation compels him to start a new sentence. So, we cannot conclude that the speaker has abandoned the original goal, rather we should conclude that the speaker has encountered a new secondary problem and the attempt to solve this needs some modification or manipulation of the form of the expression.

2. **Paraphrase:** Bialystok (1990) comments on Tarone’s definition of the paraphrase. She says that the definition proposed by Tarone for paraphrase contains ambiguous terms of *alternate acceptable* target language construction where the *appropriate form or construction is not known* or not yet stable. The problem is that the criterion of acceptability is not defined as she says: a) “to what extent the utterance should comply with the target language structure for communication to be successful”, b) “what constitutes the appropriate target language form”. Talking about the target language forms implies that there may be only one way to refer to the same thing deviations from which result departures from the norm. Here, we are led to accept that there is one optimal form for referential communication. But in the case of stylistic differences or deliberate speech with a highly expert person of the field the selection of words may differ from the time when we talk to an inexpert where we may not use the
actual word to refer to something. But in both cases the selection of the words seems to be appropriate according to the context, c) “there are precarious assumptions about what is known for the learner, and what cannot be retrieved under some conditions.” There are different reasons for the unavailability of certain form for the learner, one of which may be that the form has not been learned, yet. Bialystok and Kellerman (1987) further call the word coinage category of Tarone as slippery, because it depends on the morphological/syntactic judgment, “a category such as word coinage allocates excessive attention to a trivial features of surface structures.” They support their idea with the example of a speaker of German language who, with the help of highly productive morphological systems of German, would produce utterances which would be more like a word than a phrase.

3. **Circumlocution**: Circumlocutions seems to be a category to encompass all the explanations, descriptions and the illustrations. Classification based on physical properties and contextual information of the utterances (Bialystok and Fröhlich, 1980), (Paribakht, 1985) leads to arbitrary boundaries. She goes ahead argues that the choice of descriptions depends on the characteristic feature of the object and “they reflect the conceptual differences among objects more reliably than do linguistic ones among speaker” (Bialystok, 1990).

4. **Conscious Transfer**: Bialystok believes the definitions provided by Tarone to be limited. In this regard, she quotes the corpus of the data from the children whose grammar is weak, and the errors committed are traceable even in the English structure. She says “it is doubtful, though, that such structures are
motivated by communicative intentions...the inferences made from its [conscious transfer] use is equally uncertain” (Bialystok, 1990).

5. Appeal for Assistance: The utterances classified as *appeal for assistance* in the Tarone’s taxonomy (1977,1980) do not exemplify the category. In conversation, sometimes the listener cannot provide the right word or structure but still the communication continues. For further details refer to Bialystok (1990).

Rejecting the validity of the previous taxonomies, and following her cognitive theory of language processing, Bialystok (1990) proposed two main classes of CSs:

**A. Analysis-based Strategies**

They relate to the attempts “to convey the structure of the intended concept making explicit the relational defining features” (Bialystok, 1990, p.133). That is, the learner tries to convey the message by describing the distinctive features of the intended concept, such as giving definition.

**B. Control-based Strategies**

They involve “choosing a representational system that is possible to convey and that makes explicit information relevant to the identity of the intended concept” (ibid.). In simpler words, the learner preserves original content but alters the means of reference, for example, he may try mime or use L1 to convey the intended idea.
1.2.3.7 Nijmegen Approach

The Nijmegen Project on the communication strategies is believed to be the most comprehensive in the CSs studies. It has been reported by several authors such as Poulisse and Schils (1989). Poulisse et al. (1984) in another report argued that the study of communication strategies should go beyond the simple prediction and explanation of the case. They criticized the previous studies for concentrating on the linguistic rather than on the process that leads to different strategies. Taking the underlying process as the base Poulisse (1987) argues that CSs should psychologically be plausible, a characteristic which is attributed to the Nijmegen’s approach. They have related the project to a psycholinguistic model of speech production which involves a cognitive component called conceptualiser which produces preverbal messages; “these are passed to a linguistic component called the formulator which encodes them grammatically and phonologically, and has access to a lexicon which gives them lexical forms; there is, then, a clear separation between conceptual and linguistic levels of production” (Cook, 1993). If L2 production breaks down because of lack of appropriate forms in the mental lexicon, the learner makes up either by conceptual strategies or by alternative linguistic formulations (linguistic strategies).

As said above, several authors during its development have reported the Nijmegen Project. In one of the early publications, Poulisse (1987) while paving the ground for her successors says that L1 communication being usually automatic is different form foreign language (FL) communication. Very often,
the FL learners lack the right word in their competence. In these situations, the learners have the following options:

1. They can abandon or revise the original sentence or plan which most of the time involves complete reiteration of speech plan. These strategies are traditionally called *avoidance*.

2. They can directly or indirectly appeal to the other party for the correct form. These strategies are called *interactional strategies*, which involve the dialogue between two interlocutors. This aspect has mainly been emphasized in Tarone's approach.

3. They can attempt the compensatory strategies to execute their original plan. Poulisse suggests two strategies. One, is to operate on the concept for which they do not know the appropriate word, and the second is to exploit their linguistic knowledge.

These are called *conceptual* and *linguistic* strategies respectively.

**A. Conceptual Strategies**

In the case of conceptual strategies, the conceptual knowledge is used to convey the concept. The concept is decomposed into its defining and/or characteristic features, or a word sharing a number of semantic features with the original concept substituted. The conceptual strategies are divided into *analytic* and *holistic* strategies.
1. **Analytic Strategies**

In the case of analytic strategies, the speaker lists some of the criterial features of the intended concept to make up for the gap. For example:

- ‘it is green, and you usually eat it with potatoes’ for ‘spinach’; or,
- ‘a talk bird’ or ‘a bird that can talk’ for ‘parrot’.

Here, the linguistic form of the utterance is considered irrelevant for its classification.

2. **Holistic Strategies**

They involve the selection of a different concept which is sufficiently similar to the original one to convey the speaker’s intended meaning.

For instance:

- ‘vegetable’ which is a more general term is used for ‘pea’; or,
- ‘hammer’ for ‘tools’; or, ‘table’ for ‘desks’.

B. **Linguistic Strategies**

“The speaker who uses a linguistic strategy manipulates his linguistic knowledge.” This includes the syntactic, morphological, and phonological rules that are used in L1, some knowledge of these rules and L2 (and possibly L3s), and knowledge of similarities and dissimilarities between the L1 and L2 (and L3) (Poulisse, 1987). The linguistic strategies are further divided into two groups, *morphological creativity*, and *transfer* strategies.
1. Morphological Creativity

By manipulation of the L2 morphological derivations, the learner creates a new word, a word which he thinks is a comprehensible L2 word. For instance, ‘ironize’ for ‘iron’; ‘appliance’ for ‘letters of application’.

2. Transfer

Transfer involves the similarities, which exist between languages (Kellerman, 1977). The words or phrases from two close languages may be transferred into each other. For example, ‘middle’ for ‘waist’ based on Dutch ‘middel’. “Utterances resulting from this strategy may or not be morphologically and/or phonologically adapted” (Poulisse and Schils, 1989, pp. 15-48).

The compensatory strategies proposed by Poulisse and Schils (1989) are shown in the following figure.

Figure 1.3 Compensatory Strategies, Poulisse and Schils (1989).

The Nijmegen Project was launched to investigate the proficiency in strategy selection, the relationship between CS use in L1 and L2, and the effectiveness of various CS types with a parsimonious approach based on the
cognitive and underlying psychological processes. In this study, only compensatory strategies were studied.

The results of this study point out that in general the language proficiency has minor effect on the strategy selection. It is claimed that the task-related factors played more decisive role than the proficiency factor. Furthermore, there is inverse relationship between the number of strategies employed and the language proficiency. That is to say, as the language proficiency improves the lesser number of strategies are employed and vise versa. However, less proficient speakers used most transfer strategies. In referring to photographs, there was no transfer strategy whereas in conversation all speakers used it. Proficiency-related differences were elicited in story telling. It was also found in case of holistic strategies that the proficient learners in telling stories and conversation used them more often, but not in referring to photographs. However, they could not justify the lack of substantial proficiency-related differences, and they expressed the need for further research with the subjects of lower proficiency.

The above results comply with the previous studies in that CS use is task-related. More specifically, the University of Nijmegen Project claims that the kind of CS a learner will use depends on the demands imposed by the task/situation.

1.2.3.8 Poulisse’s Speech Production Model

In 1993, Poulisse revised some aspects of the earlier approach and proposed a modified process-oriented cognitive taxonomy based on a speech
production model, introducing new terms and proposing the categories of substitution strategies, substitution plus strategies, reconceptualization. Poulisse (1993) argued that her previous attempt, and Nijmegen Group were not sufficiently in accordance with the Levelt's (1989) speech production theory. So, she proposed a revision of the categories and suggested the followings as the replacement:

A. **Substitution Strategies**

They involve omission or changing one or more features of a lexical chunk in search of a new lexical item.

B. **Substitution-plus Strategies**

“Substitution-plus strategies accompanied by the out-of-the-ordinary application of L1 or L2 morphological and/or phonological ending procedures” (e.g. foreignizing).

C. **Reconceptualization strategies**

They relate to the change in the preverbal message involving more than one chunk (e.g. circumlocution). However, Kellerman and Bialystok (in press) have criticized and raised concern over this type of categorization. They comment that there is no distinction between substitution and reconceptualization strategies. They believe that the new approach suffers form ambiguity of the most common phenomenon of exemplification, whereas the previous categorization is immune to this problem. A summary of categorizations follows.
### Table 1.2: Summary of the Taxonomies of the Communication Strategies Available in the Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Avoidance</strong></td>
<td>I. Formal Reduction</td>
<td>I. L1-Based Strategies</td>
<td>I. Message Adjustment Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Topic Avoidance</td>
<td>A. phonological</td>
<td>A. Language Switch</td>
<td>A. Topic Avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Message Abandonment</td>
<td>B. Morphological</td>
<td>B. Foreignizing</td>
<td>B. Semantic Avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Paraphrase</strong></td>
<td>C. Syntax</td>
<td>C. Transliteration</td>
<td>C. Message Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Approximation</td>
<td>D. Lexical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Word Coinage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Circumlocution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Conscious Transfer</strong></td>
<td>II. Functional Reduction</td>
<td>II. L2 Based Strategies</td>
<td>II. Resource Expansion Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Literal Translation</td>
<td>A. Actional</td>
<td>A. Semantic Contiguity</td>
<td>A. Borrowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Language Switch</td>
<td>B. Modal</td>
<td>B. Description</td>
<td>B. Paraphrasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Achievement Strategies</strong></td>
<td>C. Reduction of Prepositional Content</td>
<td>C. Word Coinage</td>
<td>C. Paralinguistic Devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Topic Avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Massage Abandonment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Meaning Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Appeal for Assistance</strong></td>
<td>III. Non-linguistic Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Mime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Linguistic Approach</strong></td>
<td><strong>I. Contextual Approach</strong></td>
<td><strong>I. Conceptual Strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Semantic Contiguity</strong></td>
<td><strong>A. Linguistic context</strong></td>
<td><strong>A. Analytic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Superordinate</td>
<td>B. Use of L1 Idioms &amp; Proverbs</td>
<td>B. Holistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comparison</td>
<td>C. Transliteration of L1 Idioms and Proverbs</td>
<td>II. Linguistic/Code Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Positive</td>
<td>D. Idiomatic Transfer</td>
<td>A. Morphological Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Analogy</td>
<td><strong>II. Control-Based Strategies</strong></td>
<td>B. Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Synonymy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Contrast and Opposite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Antinomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Circumlocution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Physical Description</td>
<td><strong>III. Conceptual Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Size</td>
<td>A. Demonstration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Shape</td>
<td>B. Exemplification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Color</td>
<td>C. Metonymy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Constituent Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Elaborated Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Locational Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Historical Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Functional Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Metalinguistic Clues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IV. Mime</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Replacing Verbal Output</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Accompanying Verbal Output</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continued from the previous page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Substitution Strategies</td>
<td>I. Direct Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Substitution Plus Strategies</td>
<td>A. Resource Deficit-related Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Reconceptualization Strategies</td>
<td>1. Message Abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Message Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Circumlocution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Approximation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Use of All-Purpose Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Word Coinage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Restructuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Literal Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Foreignizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Code Switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Use of Similar Sounding Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Mumbling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Omission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Retrieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Mime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Own-performance Problem-Oriented Strategies</td>
<td>C. Other-Performance Problem-Related Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-Rephrasing</td>
<td>1. Other-Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-Repair</td>
<td>II. Interactional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Resource Deficit-Related Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Appeals for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Own-performance Problem-Related Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Comprehension Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Own-Accuracy Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Other-Performance Problem-Related Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Asking for Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Asking for Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Asking for Confirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Guessing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Expressing Non-Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Interpretive Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Indirect Strategies</td>
<td>C. Other-Performance Other-Related Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Feigning Understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.4 Criteria for Defining Communication Strategies

Reportedly there have been several criteria which have been set by different researchers for the evaluation and defining the communication strategies. Beside Tarone’s observation, which were mentioned before, two other defining criteria have been crucial in the literature, a) problem-orientedness, and b) consciousness. Although the proposed definitions claim to capture the essence of strategic language behavior, yet sometimes their lack of explicitness has partly caused the diversity in CS research (Dörnyei and Scott, 1997). Bialystok and Kellerman (qtd. in Bialystok, 1990) believe that an adequate taxonomy should “reach beyond description to prediction and explanation”, and meet the following conditions:

A. Parsimoniousness

As the goal of linguists is to provide a theory which could account for the whole of a language with minimum rules, the best conception, here, is that the smallest number of strategies which could provide the best description of the learners’ interlanguage, would be the ideal inventory.

B. Psychological Plausibility

The division and classification of strategies should be constituted and linked to description of cognitive language processing system.
C. Generalizability

It simply means that the same strategies established in one context could be applicable to different data as well, i.e. the findings which have made in various researches, irrespective of differences in tasks and differences in L1 and L2 background, could be generalized to other contexts. This condition of the authors may also be traced back to the aims of linguistic theory set by Chomsky (1957).

Looking back to the wide range of communication strategies research spectrum, we may observe traces of compliance of the above mentioned conditions in the definitions and taxonomies which have been proposed. Under the umbrella-type conditions, several researchers have discussed about some defining criteria, which in one way or another, can be incorporated to the above conditions. We will review some of these criteria, which shed light to our understanding of the above arch-criteria.

1.2.4.1 Problem-Orientedness

It refers to the fact that the CSs are used when there is a mismatch between the means and the ends and when the learner is deficient in conveying his meaning. Almost, in most of the definitions given for the communication strategies the concepts of problemacity or problem-orientedness have been involved. For example, this definition of CS which says that CSs are some strategic devices employed when the learner experiences a problem in
communicating the concept using his deficient linguistic resources, has used the criterion of problemacity as a defining criterion. Similarly this aspect has undoubtedly been one of the core features of strategic language behavior. But it is felt that the problem-orientedness has not been defined explicitly, though originally it was used to refer to resource deficits. But this restriction has been reflected in the definition of CSs, and it has led to freehanded extension and stretch of the problemacity to the extent that it may include several researchers’ conception of the fact. Bialystok (1984,1990) has used the term problemacity to refer to the same phenomenon. But Dörnyei and Scott (1997) believe that problem-orientedness is not specific enough, that is why “it leaves undefined the exact types of the problem an area where various approaches show divergence” by extending the concept to include the following aspects:

1.2.4.2 Own-Performance Problems

It refers to a situation in which the learner realizes that he had something incorrect in his speech. This may be followed by some mechanisms such as self-repair, self-paraphrasing, self-editing.

1.2.4.3 Other Performance Problems

Sometimes, the learner thinks that what the interlocutor says is incorrect. Or the learner may not fully understand what the other party tries to convey. These are ended in the meaning negotiation procedures.
1.2.4.4 Processing Time Pressure

Generally, the L2 speakers need more time for processing and planning in the L2 speech than in natural language communication. It is associated with strategies such as fillers, hesitation devices, and self-repetitions.

1.2.4.5 Consciousness

In most researches, the consciousness aspect of the CS has been referred to quite frequently. Consciousness has several connotations in literature. The problem arises when the CSs are defined in terms of 'consciously used devices'. With such a definition, the areas of consciousness can be completely diverse. These may be conscious of a language problem, conscious of solving this problem, achieving an alternative, conscious of the execution of a plan, and so on. In literature, four basic senses of consciousness have been suggested which are intentionality, attention, awareness, and control. But Dörnyei and Scott (1995) have suggested the relevance of the following senses.

1.2.4.6 Consciousness as Awareness of the Problem

"Only those instances of problem-related language use which are related to language processing problems that the speaker consciously recognizes as such should be termed CSs in order to distinguish mistakes and CSs...that may have a similar erroneous form" (Dörnyei and Scott, 1995). For example, one cannot be quite sure that the forms like ‘ironize’ is an incorrectly learned word or as an
example a conscious attempt in the word coinage derived from the word ‘iron’. But, how we can strictly distinguish these two is an unresolved problem yet.

1.2.4.7 Consciousness as Intentionality

"The speaker's intentional use of the CS separates CSs from verbal behaviors that are systematically related to the problems of which the speaker is aware but that are not done intentionally (e.g., non-lexicalised filled pauses, humming and erring...)" (Dörnyei and Scott, 1995). These fillers are not used intentionally whereas the fact that one has encountered a linguistic problem may be conscious.

1.2.4.8 Consciousness as Awareness of Strategic Language Use

"The speaker realizes that he/she is using a less-than-perfect stopgap device or doing a problem-related detour on the way to mutual understanding" Dörnyei and Scott (1997, pp. 172-210). However, they agree that still the role of consciousness is not clear because some other factors such as frequent atomization of certain elements/sub-processes in language processing have significant role in this regard. In general, they believe that for defining CS we should only take the above mentioned senses of the consciousness.

Yet, further expansion of the definition of the CSs by Canale and Swain, (1984) to include the factor of enhancement of effectiveness of communication as another criterion in the use of CSs, and also, the consequent emphasis on the similarity in the use of CSs in L1 and L2, has added an extra quandary, or
created a ‘puzzling situation’ (Yule and Tarone, 1997) in the study of interlanguage communication strategies used by the second/foreign language learners.

Kellerman et al. (1990) have reported overwhelming similarity between strategies used in Dutch (L1) and English (L2). They argued through illustration that if the learners already know how to use various strategies to explain some unknown concrete or abstract concept term in Dutch, why cannot they do the same in L2. Yule and Tarone (1997) say “the observable linguistic differences ... between the actual forms used to encode the act of reference in the L1 versus the L2 are not considered significant in the ... [Reductionists’ approach, author].” It is based on this argument and perspective that Reductionists do not advise the teaching of strategic competence. However, such differences are considered extremely interesting and significant for the Expansionists.

1.2.5 Empirical Researches

The empirical studies of the communication strategies have widely been influenced by the theoretical frameworks, methodology applied for the data collection, data analysis procedures, and the type of subjects and their L1 background.

In a pioneering empirical study, Varadi (1980) established an IL production model comprising two types of strategies, i.e. *meaning adjustment strategies*, and *meaning replacement strategies*. Varadi used adult Hungarian
learners of English at the intermediate level, and the results were in favor of the hypothetical model of meaning adjustment strategies.

Later Bialystok (1983) in another study investigated the four Wh-questions. That is, Who uses Which strategy When and to What effect? In her experiment, she used a reconstruction of picture model to investigate the hiatus observed and experienced by the learners in regard to vocabulary, with a situation in which no linguistic response was allowed. Bialystok concluded that the efficiency of IL-based strategies, and those strategies which correspond to some of the semantic features of the intended concept is higher. She also showed that the best strategy users are those who could easily combine their linguistic knowledge with flexibility in strategy selection.

A further study by Blum-Kulka and Levenston (1983) examined the two hypotheses of a) “lexical simplification operates according to universal principles”, and b) “their universality derives from language user’s semantic competence in their L1”. The results of the study confirmed their hypothesis of universality of lexical simplification.

In another research by Haastrup and Phillipson (1983) on eight adolescent Danish school learners of English in the face of linguistic intercourse with native speakers, approved that L1-based strategies have the least effectiveness whereas the IL-based strategies are easily understood by the natives.

Among the various empirical researches, Chen (1990) investigated the relationship between learner’s L2 proficiency and their strategic competence in case of Chinese EFL learners. The results showed that the frequency, type, and
effectiveness of CSs employed by her subjects vary according to their proficiency level. The language distance also proved to affect their choice of CS. She suggested that the learners' communicative competence could probably increase by development of their strategic competence.

In another research Tanaka (1993) investigated the real time CSs of Japanese learners of English whose exposure to language has been through formal instruction. The study proved the use of CS facilitates their communication with the native speakers. He also studied the relationship between strategy use and nature of communicative task, English classroom achievement, and individual's social-cognitive styles. The findings suggested that success of learners depended on strategy use, and subjects' strategy use in turn depended on (a) the nature of task, (b) their perceived distance between the two languages, and (c) their perceived communicative goal, and (d) their attitudes towards the task. The findings also proved that the difference between learners in performing the communicative task was related more to their social and cognitive style characteristics than their classroom achievements. Successful learners shared personal communicative skill characteristics whereas the unsuccessful ones did not.

Sionis (1995) in a study of CSs in the scientific articles of French scientists investigated "those communication strategies that may be attributable to two functionally different attitudes towards foreign language learning, using the language precisely as tool to meet the requirements of a specific task only (a) sort of 'use-and-forget attitude', or taking advantage of all possible situations to
try to expand one's overall performance in the use of language.” The results of the study showed that the subjects of the study had tendency to curtail their messages and preferred the avoidance strategies. “The post-mortem of the articles also illustrated the fact that error-free communication was often achieved at the expense of abandoning the researchers’ [subjects of the study] optimal meaning.”

The next study was done by Yarmohammadi (1995) to a) study the employment of CSs by the learners, b) find out which CSs are more favored under a given condition, c) find a link between task type and use of specific CSs. Following the framework of Færch and Kasper (1983b), Yarmohammadi studied the communication strategies of fifty, intermediate level, Iranian subjects attending General English classes at Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran, in three different tasks of writing composition, translation, and narration of story. His hypothesis, i.e. “IL users if faced with a communication problem will first resort to achievement strategies rather than reduction” correspond with his conclusion which says, less advanced students exploit a variety of reduction and achievements, but when faced with fundamental issues they opt for achievement strategies rather than reduction strategies. The use of achievement strategies is independent of the task type (equal usage of achievement strategies in both oral and written tasks). The learners depended much on IL-based strategies rather than depending on L1-based ones. Finally, he confirmed the existence of the strategic competence.
1.2.6 Limitations of the Previous Studies

Whatever the theoretical base of the discussed approach, it will be unfair to disregard the clarity which they have brought to the study of CSs which, in turn has broadened our knowledge about the second language learning and production. However, the review of the literature showed that the researches till date have been subjected to limitations such as the following:

1. The researchers preoccupation with the linguistic realizations of the utterances rather than the cognitive study of speech production procedure has obstructed the establishment of taxonomy transpiring general consensus. The new approaches should consider the learners’ utterances as the result of strategies rather than one of the processes that leads to it. The review of the empirical researches reveals that the attempts to provide insight in to the cognitive processes underlying the communication strategies use have not been allegedly significant. As the researchers like Chen (1990), Paribakht (1985), Tarone (1977, 1997) have proposed taxonomies which are based on the linguistically realized forms rather than process.

2. They are insufficiently related to the theories of the language use or development, Poulisse (1994). Though this idea has not been elaborated by Poulisse, yet we may connect the real intention of the interlanguage theory which is the stimulation of systematic research in second language learning based on the psycholinguistic processes, evidenced in the form of troubled pieces of language, it may be
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possible to deduce that the projects which follow this approach can account for the learners’ linguistic system which is evidenced by the CSs use.

3. Being parsimonious in classification of CSs has not been the aim of a portion of the researchers as they have not followed the much desired goal of the linguistic theory which attempts attainment of such a grammar, and categorization of data by means of small set of rules (here strategies). This criterion again refers to the nature of the traditional approaches which have made classification based on the minute structural details or difference. So, they have come up with a long list of strategies in which sometimes the examples given for them could be incorporated into more than one strategies, (see Scholfield’s criticism of the Paribakht’s classification, 1987).

4. Small-scale nature of the projects and empirical studies is another observation worth consideration. Of course, the nature of CSs is such that a comprehensive investigation that may cover most of the contexts needs to be carried out in a big projects. However, what is observed is the recent projects’ less inclusion of several tasks. As it has been noticed by Poulisse and Scott (1987), Chen (1990), and Paribakht (1985) have worked on the picture or concept description, only. It seems for making stronger generalizations we shall try to include more tasks (contexts).
5. Major researches have found the achievement strategies (compensatory) more interesting for investigation, whereas the reduction strategies have not been looked upon as such. For example, the reports of the Nijmegen Project, which is claimed to be the most comprehensive study, has talked about and reported the compensatory strategies only, (see Poulisse and Scott, 1989; Kellerman, 1991).

6. Writing as a task in which learner responds differently, in regard to CSs, has been dealt with rarely. Among the very few that we may mention are Yarmohammadi (1995), and Sionis (1995).

7. Up-to-now, according to our knowledge, no comprehensive work on the learners who specialize in ELT, has been reported. This may be the first study, as such, with a reference to Iranian learners.

8. Reviewing the theoretical bases of the approaches discussed above, reveals some weaknesses in the previous studies, discussed in the review of the literature, such as the preoccupation of the previous researches with the linguistic realizations. These linguistic realizations are themselves the result of different strategies, rather than one of the processes that leads to them. Such studies are insufficiently related to the theories of language use or development, and the narrow-scale nature of the projects does not enable the researcher to make valid generalizations.
1.2.7 Pedagogical Aspects of the Communication Strategies

The pedagogic relevance of the CSs has been an uncompromising issue in the researches related to CSs. The ability to solve the communicative problems through CSs is considered a part of the learner’s communicative or strategic competence. But the issue whether this strategic competence should be taught and developed through formal L2 teaching in the same way as other competencies such as syntactic or grammatical competencies, are taught, is not agreed upon by the researchers. Whether CSs should be taught is an unresolved issue between the two camps, i.e. Expansionists and Reductionists, or Pro and Cons in Tarone’s terms (1997). From the Reductionists’ theoretical stand point it is understood that the strategies used by the second language learners are considered as cognitive processes, and any attempt to teach them is equal to an attempt to teach cognitive processing. As a matter of fact, “for adult learners that cognitive processing is believed to have already matured through their L1 experience and hence need not be taught” (Tarone, 1997). On the contrary, the Expansionists assume that “performance creates competence”. By involving the students in situations which foster the production of different types of CSs, the Expansionists believe that there will be less inhibitions, more purposeful language practice, and a greater awareness in the learners. The pedagogic relevance of CSs such as to whether strategies should be taught or not will be discussed in Chapter Four.
1.2.8 Objectives of the Study

1.2.8.1 Primary Objectives

On the basis of the discussion above we will attempt to achieve the following objectives:

1. To establish a comprehensive categorization of CSs employed by Iranian English foreign language learners.
2. To discover the relationship between frequency of CSs and foreign language proficiency.
3. To illustrate the relationship between language proficiency and selection of different CS types.
4. To explore the effect of the tasks/situations, i.e. conversation, story telling, narration, translation, or writing, on the selection of strategy type.
5. To find out the relationship between strategy types.
6. To examine the role of language distance and selection of CSs.

1.2.8.2 Secondary Objectives

In the light of the hypotheses mentioned, we would attempt to answer the following issues which mainly concentrate on the pedagogical aspects of the CSs.

1. A description of conditions which serves to make learners more likely to adopt certain strategies.
2. Why does a speaker adopt a particular CS? Is it true that the speaker follows a certain selection order and that he first considers those strategies which require least effort, and resorts to more demanding types only if the former turn out incomprehensible?

3. Strong strategic competence leads to high communicative competence.

4. Are problems solved differently in writing where there is no interlocutor involved?

1.8.9 Hypotheses

The objectives of the study are examined against the following hypotheses:

1. High proficiency learners are expected to use more CSs than the low proficiency learners in view of more avoidance strategies by the low proficiency learners.

2. CSs use is task bound.

3. Low proficiency learners depend more on linguistic knowledge, strategies and use more L1 based strategies; whereas high proficiency learners rely more on Holistic strategies, and use more L2 based strategies.

4. Those learners whose experience have been limited to formal classroom language learning are most likely to rely upon avoidance strategy and employ fewer types of CSs.
5. Low proficiency learners employ more avoidance and reduction strategies than the high proficiency learners.

6. Low proficiency learners employ more retrieval strategies as compared to high proficiency learners.

7. The strategies of communication are interrelated and there is a correlation between them.