# Communication Strategies: Implications for EFL University Students

Şaziye YAMAN[1], Pelin IRGIN[2] & Mehtap KAVASOĞLU[3]

## ABSTRACT

Oral communication is an interactive process in which an individual alternately takes the roles of speaker and listener. Thus, rather than focusing on each skill separately, these skills should be considered integratedly. In order for students to overcome the burdens in listening and speaking skills, they need to develop communicative competence, especially strategic competence. With reference to speaking, strategic competence points out the ability to know how to keep a conversation going, how to terminate the conversation, and how to clear up communication breakdowns and comprehension problems (Shumin, 1994). Therefore, the aim of this quantitative study is to investigate both speaking and listening strategies (so called "communication strategies") used by EFL students to cope with problems during communication so they can be integrated into language teaching in order to develop students' strategic competence. Two hundred ninety-one Turkish EFL university students participated in this study. Researchers used the "Communication Strategy Inventory", a 5 point Likert-type scale developed by Yaman, Irgin and Kavasoglu (2011). The findings of this study revealed that EFL students used *negotiation for meaning*, *compensatory*, and *getting the gist strategies* in communication. It also found that female students used communication strategies more than males and advanced level students.

*Key Words:* Communication, Strategy, EFL learner

[1] Asst. Prof. Dr. - Mersin University, Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching Department - syaman33@gmail.com
[2] Instructor Pelin Irgin, M.A, Hacettepe University ELT PhD student - pelinirgin@yahoo.com
[3] Instructor, Mehtap Kavasoğlu, M.A Mersin University, Faculty of Education - mehtapkavasoglu@gmail.com

## INTRODUCTION

Over the past three decades there has been a growing body of research on communication strategies. However, these studies have defined communication strategies in various ways, creating the concept of problematicity in the field of linguistics and language learning (Kasper & Kellerman, 1997). For many people, communication is accepted as the main goal of learning a foreign language. It is thought that people send and receive messages and negotiate meaning via communication (Rubin&Thompson, 1994). Also, it is believed that learners' communicative skills can be improved by developing strategies for communication. Cohen, Weaver and Li (1998) claimed the use of strategies in communication raises learners' language awareness and solves the interlocutors' potential communication problems. Also, Dörnyei (1995) asserted that communication strategies develop learners' oral proficiency.

Considerable studies have been done on communication strategies, most of which search for the conceptualization of communication strategies (Bialystok, 1990) and outline the classification of communication strategies (Brown, 2000). For McDonough (1995) and Oxford (1996), language learners need to use communication strategies because the use of specific communication strategies plays a great role in learning the target language. Language learners need to use communication strategies to overcome difficulties in communication. According to Bialystok (1990), "the familiar ease and fluency learners sail from one idea to the next in the first language is shattered by some gap in the knowledge of a second language" (p. 1). Learners need to overcome these gaps—words, structure, phrases, tense markers, and idioms (Wenden & Rubin, 1987).

In addition, Dörnyei and Scott (1997) said oral communication is an interactive process in which an individual alternately takes the roles of speaker and listener. In order for students to overcome the burdens in listening and speaking skills, they need to develop communicative competence, especially strategic competence. With reference to speaking, strategic competence is defined as the ability to know how to keep a conversation going, terminate a conversation, and clear up communication breakdowns and comprehension problems (Shumin, 1994). Thus, this study aims to integrate listening and speaking skills rather than focusing on each skill separately.

### Taxonomies of Communication Strategies

Bialystok (1990) defined communication strategies as a systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his/her meaning when faced with some difficulty. For Tarone (1980), it is a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures are not shared. Also, communication strategies are potentially conscious plans for solving problems in reaching a particular communicative goal (Faerch & Kasper, 1983). They are the techniques of coping with difficulties in communicating in an imperfectly known second or foreign language (Stern, 1983).

Communication strategies negotiate meaning where either linguistic structures or sociolinguistic rules are not shared between a foreign language learner and a speaker of the target language (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). They facilitate learners' communicative competence in a foreign language and focus on interaction and interlocutors' negotiation behavior for coping with communication breakdowns. Furthermore, communication strategies enhance the effectiveness of communication (Canale, 1983). They involve both listening and speaking which contribute to the foreign language learners. Communication strategies are used to negotiate meaning and to maintain the conversation (Tarone, 1980). Faerch and Kasper (1983) said communication strategies handle difficulties or

communication breakdowns. Dörnyei and Scott (1997) found the existence of a mismatch between L2 speaker's linguistic knowledge and communicative intentions caused a crucial need for communication strategies to help L2 learners in their efforts to speak English as a target language.

There are two approaches to investigating communication strategies: the interactional view and the psycholinguistic view. The interactional view of communication strategies is based on the interaction process between language learners and their interlocutors and the negotiation of meaning (Tarone, 1980). Communication strategies were defined as "tools used in negotiation of meaning where both interlocutors are attempting to agree as to a communicative goal and a shared enterprise in which both the speaker and the hearer are involved rather than being only the responsibility of the speaker" (Tarone, 1980, 140). The psycholinguistic view sees communication strategies as the speaker's cognitive process with a focus on comprehension and production (Nakatani, 2005). Faerch and Kasper (1983) define communication strategies in terms of the individual's mental response to a problem rather than a joint response by two people. Therefore, the psycholinguistic view of communication strategies has been associated mainly with strategies for overcoming limitations in lexical knowledge.

From the perspective of the interactional view, Tarone (1977) identified several communication strategies: approximation, word coinage, circumlocution, literal translation, language switch, appeal for assistance, mime, and avoidance. From a psycholinguistic view, Faerch and Kasper (1983) adopted the criteria of process or plan, conscious or unconscious, problem-oriented or problem-free. They proposed two possible strategies for solving a communication problem: avoidance and achievement strategies. While avoidance strategies include formal reduction strategies—using reduced systems to avoid producing non-fluent or incorrect utterances—and reduction strategies—avoiding a specific topic or giving up sending a message—achievement strategies consist of compensatory strategies and retrieval strategies. The former consist of code switching, transfer, inter-language based strategies, cooperative strategies, and nonlinguistic strategies in which learners find an alternative solution for reaching the original goal by means of whatever sources are available. The latter are used when learners have difficulties retrieving specific items. Also, Dörnyei (1995) classified communication strategies into two groups: reduction and achievement strategies. In addition, he offered stalling or time-gaining strategies that help a speaker gain time to keep the communication channel open if they face a problem. In this study, we adopted the interactional view since we plan to integrate speaking and listening skills that require the interaction process between interlocutors to negotiate for meaning.

## METHOD

The aim of this survey method study is to investigate both speaking and listening strategies (communication strategies) used by EFL students to cope with problems during communication so they can be integrated into language teaching in order to develop students' strategic competence. The following research questions guided the present study:

1. What are the communication strategies of the EFL university students at the department of English Language Teaching at Mersin University in Turkey?
2. Do the communication strategies used by the EFL university students differ in terms of gender?
3. Do the communication strategies used by the EFL university students differ in terms of proficiency levels?

## Participants

Two hundred ninety-one (215F/76M) Turkish EFL preparatory, freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior students of Department of English Language Teaching at Mersin University during the 2010-2011 academic year participated in this study. Their ages ranged from 18 to 27. They were informed about how to complete the inventory and were required to answer each item. Also, they were asked to identify themselves with their nicknames in the inventory and to write their gender and classes. The participants were a homogenous group in terms of their educational and socio-cultural backgrounds. The participants' proficiency level in the English language was determined as intermediate (independent user, B1 & B2) and advanced (proficient user, C1 & C2) based on the proficiency levels in Common European Framework (CEF). The participants in preparatory grade were independent users while freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior participants were classified as proficient users.

## Data Collection Tools

Researchers used the Communication Strategy Inventory (CSI), a 5-point Likert-type scale developed by Yaman, Irgin and Kavasoglu (2011). Participants were asked to respond on the five frequency uses of each item, ranging from "Never true of me" to "Always true of me". The 21 items on the CSI were classified into five groups: Factor 1, negotiation for meaning while using listening strategies (items 5, 11, 16, 19, 20, 21); Factor 2, getting the gist strategies (items 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17); Factor 3, scanning strategies (items 1, 6, 12, 18); Factor 4, nonverbal strategies (items 2, 7, 13); and Factor 5, word-oriented strategies (3, 4).The 21 items in CSI were put in random order without considering the factors to which they belong. The inventory showed highly acceptable internal consistency as shown: Factor 1, negotiation for meaning while using listening strategies, .82; Factor 2, getting the gist strategies .76; Factor 3, scanning strategies, .67; Factor 4, nonverbal strategies, .61; and Factor 5, word-oriented strategies, .74. According to the results of the reliability analysis, all the items are internally consistent with each other because Cronbach's Alpha value was .84. The researcher administered the inventory in the classrooms and the entire procedure lasted approximately 10 minutes.

## Data Analysis

Researchers used correlation analysis, descriptive statistics and independent samples t-test as data analysis methods. The correlation analysis was implemented to determine the relationship between listening strategies and speaking strategies in the Communication Strategy Inventory. The independent samples t-test was used to see whether communication strategy use differs according to the participant's gender and to compare the participants' proficiency level and their strategy use.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The results will be presented in order of research question and discussed in relation to current literature.

**What are the communication strategies of the EFL university students in the Department of English Language Teaching at Mersin University in Turkey?**

Descriptive statistics were applied to determine the rank order of any statement in the Communication Strategy Inventory from the most preferred to the least preferred. Table 1 presents the results of the descriptive statistics.

Table 1. *Descriptive statistics (n=291)*

| Factors | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Compensatorystrategies | 9.00 | 30.00 | 22.43 | 4.32 |
| Negotiation for meaning while listening and speaking strategies | 14.00 | 30.00 | 24.12 | 3.20 |
| Getting the gist strategies | 8.00 | 20.00 | 15.15 | 2.57 |

Table 1 shows that negotiation for meaning while using listening and speaking strategies (M=24.12) is the most preferred factor among the study participants. Compensatory strategies (M=22.43) is the second according to the means of the descriptive statistics results. Then, getting the gist strategies (M=15.15) rank third in the order in the frequent use of strategies.

Negotiation for meaning while using listening and speaking strategies is characterized by negotiating behavior in listening and speaking when students have problems during interaction. They are used to maintain the conversational goal with speakers (Nakatani, 2006). The inventory developed by Yaman, Irgin and Kavasoglu (2011) found that Turkish EFL students prefer to use communication strategies. While Turkish students listen, they ask for repetition when they do not understand what the speaker has said. They use gestures when they have difficulty understanding. The listener clarifies what they could not understand. Also, Turkish students pay attention to their rhythm and intonation during communication. They know they use expressions that fit a rule they have learned and they give examples if the listener does not understand what they are saying.

Compensatory strategies are one of the strategy categorizations that Turkish EFL students use in communication. Compensatory strategies are accepted as achievement strategies that solve problems in the planning phase due to insufficient linguistics resources (Yang & Gai, 2010). Compensatory strategies (CS) are subcategorized into code switching, inter-lingual transfer/L1-based CS, inter-intralingual transfer/L2-based CS, and interlanguage based strategies (Faerch & Kasper, 1983). Turkish EFL students use an alternative word that expresses the meaning as closely as possible when they cannot think of the word they want to say. They reduce the message and use simple expressions if they cannot express themselves. When they feel incapable of executing their original intent, they try to express themselves in a different way. Additionally, getting the gist strategies help a listener get the basic idea of a speaker's utterance. Learners pay attention to general information contained in speech rather than specific utterances. They consider the context and the speaker's previous sentences to guess the overall meaning (Nakatani, 2006). It is difficult for EFL learners to follow every single detail; therefore the gist strategies could be useful for understanding what the interlocutor is saying by activating their schemata of background information (Dörnyei & Scott, 1997). Turkish EFL students use getting the gist strategies but not frequently. They try to understand every single detail while listening, which is used mostly by less active students in listening instead of paying attention to catch the speaker's main idea. However, students can help understanding if they prepare their mind to what

they will hear before listening. They can use their prior knowledge to understand the main idea. Anticipating what the speaker is going to say based on the context is another tactic of good listeners.

**Do the communication strategies used by the EFL university students differ in terms of gender?**

Table 2 presents the results of the indipendent samples t-test in terms of gender.

Table 2. *Independent samples t-test in terms of gender (n=291)*

| Factors | Gender | n | X | S | sd | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Negotiation for meaning while listening and speaking strategies | Female | 215 | 22.82 | 4.28 | 291 | .716 | .01* |
| | Male | 76 | 21.30 | 4.33 | | | |
| Compensation strategies | Female | 215 | 15.37 | 2.50 | 291 | .032 | .03* |
| | Male | 76 | 14.57 | 2.73 | | | |
| Getting the gist strategies | Female | 215 | 24.22 | 3.12 | 291 | .840 | .00* |
| | Male | 76 | 23.86 | 3.48 | | | |

*p<.05

According to the results of the independent samples t-test, there is a significant difference between female and male EFL learners in terms of communication strategy use named "negotiation for meaning strategies" ($t_{(291)}$=.716, p<.05), "getting the gist strategies" ($t_{(291)}$=.840, p<.05), and "compensation strategies" ($t_{(291)}$=.032, p<.05). Both female and male students use getting the gist strategies more frequently than compensation strategies. Moreover, the use of strategy in terms of gender shows a change in different studies applied to different cultures.

Studies indicate that females show more interest in social activities than males and they are more cooperative than males. A number of researchers continue to assume female superiority in language development (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Oxford, 1993; Ellis, 1994). The results of the study by Ehrman and Oxford (1989) indicate that females use cognitive, compensation and metacognitive strategies more frequently than males (Macaro, 2006). Li's study (2010) found that female university students in Taiwan apply CS more often than male students. However, some findings reveal that males employ more learning strategies than females (Wharton, 2010). Such findings are important because they show us that there might be differences in the way females and males learn a language. In contrast, the results of Lai's study (2010) show that Chinese male and female learners use strategies in the same way. Lai (2010) claimed this may be because both male and female Chinese learners learn English in the same language context.

**Do the communication strategies used by the EFL university students differ in terms of proficiency levels?**

Table 3 shows the results of the independent samples t-test in terms of prociency level.

Table 3. *Independent samples t-test in terms of proficiency level (n=291)*

| Factors | Proficiency level | n | X | S | sd | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Negotiation for meaning while listening and speaking strategies | Intermediate | 90 | 23.47 | 4.64 | 291 | .782 | .02* |
| | Advanced | 201 | 22.14 | 4.14 | | | |
| Compensation strategies | Intermediate | 90 | 23.06 | 3.46 | 291 | .023 | .04* |
| | Advanced | 201 | 24.43 | 3.03 | | | |
| Getting the gist strategies | Intermediate | 90 | 14.54 | 2.53 | 291 | .860 | .02* |
| | Advanced | 201 | 15.87 | 2.58 | | | |

*p<.05

The results of the independent samples t-test show a significant difference between intermediate and advanced EFL learners in terms of the use of communication strategies named "negotiation for meaning strategies" ($t_{(291)}$=.782, p<.05),"getting the gist strategies" ($t_{(291)}$=.023, p<.05), and "compensation strategies" ($t_{(291)}$=.860, p<.05).

The results of the independent samples t-test to understand whether communication strategies used by EFL university students differ in terms of proficiency levels show a significant difference between intermediate and advanced level EFL learners in terms of communication strategy use. Advanced level learners use "getting the gist strategies" while intermediate level learners use "negotiation for meaning strategies more frequently."

Furthermore, various studies dealing with the relationship between the use of oral communication strategies and English language proficiency level show differences, making it difficult to define the relationship. One study of English proficiency level and the use of communication strategies was carried out by Chen (1990), who conducted an experiment to identify the communication strategies used by EFL learners from on different levels. The study's results showed the frequency, type and effectiveness of communication strategy use varied in relation to proficiency levels. Chen (2009) also conducted a study using Nakatani's Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (2006).

Gökgöz (2008) also investigated whether there is a correlation between reported use of strategies for coping with speaking problems and the students' speaking grade levels. She found a difference between low and high proficiency groups. The high oral proficiency group reported more use of social affective strategies, fluency-oriented strategies and negotiation for meaning strategies. The students from low speaking grade levels also scored low in reporting use of strategies for coping with speaking problems.

In contrast to the results of the studies that show that learners with low linguistic proficiency use fewer communication strategies, Paribakht (1985) found that learners with low linguistic proficiency use communication strategies more frequently than learners with high linguistic proficiency because learners with high linguistic proficiency confront fewer communication problems. Si-Qing (1990) supported the findings that communication strategy use decreases when linguistic proficiency increases. Wharton (2000) reported that learners with low linguistic proficiency appeal to communication strategies more often because of communication problems due to their limited command of L2. Learners with high linguistic proficiency, on the other hand, resort to fewer communication strategies because they are better equipped.

Similarly, Gümüş (2007) investigated the communication strategy use of EFL students of a Turkish Anatolian High School and the impact of language proficiency on the use of communication strategies. She found that low-level learners used modification devices more often than high level students. The analysis of the qualitative data of the same study revealed

that non-preparatory (low level) learners employ communication strategies more frequently than preparatory (high level) learners. Research into communication strategy use revealed controversies in terms of the relationship between proficiency level and use of communication strategies.

## CONCLUSIONS

Communication strategies (both listening and speaking) have a direct influence on communication and play a constructive role in foreign language learning. EFL learners are expected to use communication strategies in a meaningful way. They also are expected t to be highly motivated for initiating oral communication, to increase participation during interactions as well as solve their communication problem so as to achieve communicative goals, and to be able to send the right messages. It is important to motivate foreign language learners to take risks in communication and use communication strategies. Clearly, learners should be instructed to use strategy in their listening and speaking activities. They should use available resources without being afraid of making mistakes in communication; however, they should be aware of communication strategies used by the proficient students such as social affective strategies, fluency oriented strategies and nonverbal strategies while speaking. Turkish EFL learners should pay attention when using strategy in both speaking and listening to gain competence in communication.

This study shows significant differences in the use of communication strategies in terms of gender and proficiency level. It implies that gender variables are determining factors in the preference of communication strategies, but they should not be perceived on their own because there are controversies in the use of communication strategies by females and males, even in the same cultures. Also, other variables such as individual differences, background knowledge and motivation should be considered in identifying communication strategies used by students.

Finally, recent studies on communication strategies have witnessed encouragement in the use of communication strategy. However, there is still a lack of investigation in issues such as raising EFL learners' awareness of the communicative potential of communication strategies, understanding how EFL learners use communication strategies in interactive listening and speaking activities, and drawing EFL teachers' attention to strategy instruction to broaden learners' repertoires. Further research should study the issues stated above to improve the viewpoints on communication strategy.

## REFERENCES

Anderson, N. (2005). L2 learning strategies. *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. (Edt: E. Hinkel). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. pp. 757-771.

Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication strategies: A psychological analysis of second language use.* London: Blackwell.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* 4th Edition. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Canale, M. (1983). *On some dimensions of language proficiency*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics,* 1, 1-47.

Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in language learning strategy research and training. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching,* 1, 14-26.

Chen, H. W. (2009). Oral communication strategies used by English major college students in Taiwan. *Unpublished Master's Thesis*. Chaoyang University of Technology, Taichung, Taiwan.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cohen, A. D., Weaver, S. J. & Li, T.Y. (1998). The impact of strategies-based instruction on speaking a foreign language. *Strategies in learning and using a second language.*(Edt. A.D.Cohen). Essex, England: Longman. pp. 107-156.

Cohen, A. D. &Chi, J. C. (2002). Language strategy use inventory and index. *Maximizing study abroad*. (Eds: R. M. Paige, A. D. Cohen, B. Kappler, J. C. Chi, & J. P. Lassegard). Minneapolis: Center for Advanced Research for Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota. pp. 16-28.

Dörnyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly,* 29, 55-85.

Dörnyei, Z. & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning,* 47, 173-210.

Ehrman, M. E. & Oxford, R. L. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 1-13.

Ehrman, M. & Oxford, R. L. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *Modern Language Journal*, 74, 311-327.

Ehrman, M., Leaver, B. & Oxford, R. L. (2003). A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning. *System,* 31, 313-330.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman.

Gökgöz, B. (2008). An investigation of learner autonomy and strategies for coping with speaking problems in relation to success in English speaking class. *Unpublished Master's Thesis*. Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Gümüş, P. (2007). A study into the impact of language proficiency on the use of communication strategies by high school students. *Unpublished Master's Thesis*. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings.* (Eds: J. Pride & J. Holmes). Harmondsworth: Penguin. pp. 269-293.

Lai, H. (2010). Gender effect on the use of CSs. *English Language Teaching,* 3, 28-32.

Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: revising the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal,* 90, 0-337.

MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R. C. (1989). Anxiety and second language learning: Towards a theoretical clarification. *Language Learning,* 39, 251-275.

MacIntyre, P. D. (1999). Language anxiety: A review of the research for language teachers. *Affect in foreign language and second language learning: A practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere. (*Edt: D. J. Young). Boston: McGraw-Hill. pp. 24-45.

McDonough, S. H. (1995). *Strategy and skill in learning a foreign language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Nakatani, Y. (2005). The effects of awareness-raising on oral communication strategy use. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 75-90.

Nakatani, Y. (2006). Developing an oral communication strategy ınventory. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 151-168.

O'Malley, J. & Chamot, A. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. L. (1993). Gender differences in styles and strategies for language learning: What do they mean? Should we pay attention? *Strategic interactionand language acquisition: Theory, practice, and research.* (Edt: J. E. Alatis). Washington, DC: Georgetown   University Press. pp. 541–557.

Oxford, R. L. (1996). *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspective.* Honololulu, HI: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Paribakht, T. (1985). Strategic competence and language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics,* 6, 132-146.

Rubin, J. & Thompson, I. (1994). *How to be a more successful language learner*. New York: Heinle & Heinle.

Shumin, K. (1997). Factors to consider: Developing adult EFL students' speaking abilities. *English Teaching Forum,* 25 (3), 204-211.

Si-Qing, C. (1990). A study of communication strategies in interlanguage productionby Chinese EFL learners. *Language Learning,* 40, 155-187.

Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report. *TESOL*. (Eds: H. D. Brown, C. A. Yorio & R. C. Crymes). Washington: TESOL. pp. 194-203.

Tarone, E. (1980). On the variability of interlanguage systems. *Applied Linguistics,* 4, 143-163.

Yaman, S., Irgin, P. & Kavasoglu, M. (2011). Communication Strategy Inventory. The Development of Oral Communication Strategy Inventory & Listening Strategy Inventory. *Published Master's Thesis* supervised by Yaman, S., Mersin University, Mersin.

Yang, D. & Gai, F. (2010). Chienese learners' communication strategies. *Cross-cultural Communication,* 6, 56-81.

Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning.* London: Prentice Hall International.

Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning,* 50, 203-243.

# İletişim Stratejileri: İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Üniversite Öğrencilerine Yönelik Çıkarımlar

Şaziye YAMAN[4], Pelin IRGIN[5] & Mehtap KAVASOĞLU[6]

## Giriş

Son yıllarda iletişim stratejileri üzerine yapılan çalışmaların sayısında kayda değer ölçüde bir artış olmuştur. Kasper ve Kellerman'in (1997) belirttiği gibi iletişim stratejilerinin dilbilim ve dil öğretiminde kavramsallaştırılmasında değişiklikler vardır ve bu değişiklikler halen devam etmektedir. Pek çok araştırmacı için iletişim, yabancı dil öğrenmenin esas amacı olarak kabul edilmektedir. İletişim aracılığı ile insanların etkili bir şekilde mesaj alıp verdikleri ve anlam çıkardıkları düşünülmektedir (Rubin & Thompson, 1994). Aynı zamanda, dil öğrenenlerin iletişim becerilerinin iletişime yönelik strateji geliştirerek ilerleyebileceğine inanılmaktadır. Cohen, Weaver ve Li (1998) iletişimde strateji kullanımının öğrencilerin dil farkındalığını arttıracağını ve iletişim kuran kişilerin karşılaştıkları olası iletişim problemlerini çözebileceğini ileri sürmüştür. Bunun yanında Dörnyei (1995), iletişim stratejilerinin öğrencilerin sözlü iletişim yeterliliklerini geliştirdiğini iddia etmiştir. Belirtilen çalışmaların ardından, Brown (2000) iletişim stratejilerinin de kendi içerisinde sınıflandırılması gerektiğini öne sürmüştür. Yabancı dili öğrenmek için öğrecilerin belli başlı stratejilerin kullanımına yönelmesi ve özellikle de iletişim stratejilerinin kullanımına ihtiyaç duyması; iletişim stratejilerinin kavramsallaştırılmasıve stratejilerde sınıflandırılmaya gidilmesinde önemli bir adımdır. Ayrıca, alan yazında gösterildiği gibi dil öğrenenler, iletişimdeki zorlukların üstesinden gelmek için iletişim stratejisi kullanmaya ihtiyaç duymaktadır. Bialystok'e göre (1990) ana dilde ileri düzeyde bir hâkimiyet göstererek bir fikirden başka bir fikre hiç dili yapısal açıdan düşünmeden konuşabilen kişiler, ikinci dil öğrenimi aşamasında bazı ifadeleri oluştururken belli başlı zorluklarla karşılaşmaktadırlar. Wenden ve Rubin'in de (1987) belirttiği gibi dil öğrenenler, iletişim sırasında kurdukları cümlelerdeki kelime, yapı, kısa ya da uzun ifade, dilbilgisi kuralı ve deyim kullanımı gibi zorlukların üstesinden gelmeye etkili bir iletişim kurmak için ihtiyaç duyarlar. Aynı zamanda bireyler iletişim sırasında hem dinleyici hem de konuşmacı olarak iletişimde aktif bir şekilde rol alırlar, bu dönüşümlü süreç sözel iletişim olarak adlandırılmaktadır. Bu yüzden sözel iletişimde her bir beceriye ayrı ayrı odaklanmak yerine beceriler bütünleştirilmiş düşünülmelidir. Dinleme ve konuşma becerilerinde öğrenciler üzerilerinde olan yükün üstesinden gelmek için iletişim yeterliklerini özellikle de stratejik yeterliklerini geliştirmeye ihtiyaç duyarlar. Konuşma ve dinleme becerilerinde stratejik yeterlik; iletişime nasıl geçmeyi, iletişimi nasıl sürdürüp sonlandırmayı ve anlama problemleri yanı sıra iletişim sırasında oluşan kopuklukları nasıl gidermeyi bilme yeteneğini vurgulamaktadır (Shumin, 1994).

## Yöntem

Tarama modelindeki bu çalışmanın amacı, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrenciler tarafından iletişim sırasında karşılaştıkları problemlerin üstesinden gelmek için kullanılan hem konuşma hem de dinleme stratejilerini (sözde iletişim stratejileri)

[4] Yrd. Doç. Dr. - Mersin Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi - syaman33@gmail.com

[5] Okutman, M.A. - Hacettepe Üniversitesi Doktora Öğrencisi - pelinirgin@yahoo.com

[6] Okutman, M.A. -Mersin Üniversitesi, , Eğitim Fakültesi - mehtapkavasoglu@gmail.com

araştırmaktır. Bu çalışmaya, İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen 291 (215K/76E) Türk üniversite öğrencisi katılmıştır. Katılımcılar, 2010-2011 akademik yılında Mersin Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği programında eğitim görenhazırlık, birinci, ikinci, üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerinden oluşmaktadır. Yaşları 18 ile 27 arasında değişenkatılımcılar, eğitim durumları ve kültürel birikimleri açısından homojen bir gruptur. Katılımcıların İngilizce'deki yeterlik seviyeleri Ortak Avrupa Çerçeve Programıyeterlik seviyelerine göre orta (dili bağımsız kullananlar, B1 & B2) ve ileri seviye (dili ileri düzeyde kullananlar, C1 & C2) olarak belirlenmiştir. Hazırlık sınıfında yer alan öğrenciler yabancı dili bağımsız olarak kullanan öğrencilerden oluşurken birden dördüncü sınıfa kadar olan öğrenciler dili ileri düzeyde kullanan öğrenciler arasında bulunmaktadır.

Bu çalışmada, Yaman, Irgin ve Kavasoglu (2011) tarafından geliştirilen ve 5'li Likert tipi cevap ölçeği olan İletişim Strateji Envanteri kullanılmıştır. İletişim Strateji Envanteri21 maddeden oluşmaktadır ve 5 faktörle sınıflandırılmıştır. Faktör 1: Dinlerken anlam çıkarma stratejileri (*madde 5, 11, 16, 19, 20, 21*), Faktör 2: Ana fikri çıkarma stratejileri (*madde 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17*), Faktör 3: Tarama stratejileri (*madde 1, 6, 12, 18*), Faktör 4: Sözel olmayan stratejiler (*madde 2, 7, 13*), Faktör 5: Kelime temelli stratejiler (*madde 3, 4*). İletişim Strateji Envanteri'nde yer alan 21 madde, ait oldukları faktörleri göz önünde bulundurmadan ölçekte rastgele sıralanmıştır. Ayrıca, ölçeğin geçerlik ve güvenirlik katsayısı .84'dür ve bu değer çalışmada kullanılan veri toplama aracının güvenilir bir ölçme aracı olduğunu göstermektedir.

Bu çalışmada, korelasyon analizi, betimsel istatistik analizi ve bağımsız gruplar için t-testi, veri analizi yöntemleri olarak kullanılmıştır. Çalışmada uygulanan korelasyon analizi İletişim Strateji Envanteri'nde yer alan dinleme ve konuşma stratejileri arasındaki ilişkiyi görmek için yapılmıştır. Betimsel istatistik analizi ile İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak kullanan Türk öğrencilerinin kullandıkları iletişim stratejilerine açıklık getirilmiştir. Bağımsız gruplar için yapılan t-testi veri analizi, iletişim strateji kullanımının çalışmaya katılanların cinsiyetlerine göre değişip değişmediğini görmek ve yabancı dil seviyeleri ile strateji kullanımını karşılaştırmak için yapılmıştır.

## Bulgular ve Yorum

Çalışmanın bulguları, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin iletişimde anlam çıkarma, telafi etme ve ana fikri çıkarma stratejilerini kullandığını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bu çalışmada geliştirilen envanterdeki maddelerden, yabancı dili İngilizce olarak öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin iletişim stratejileri öğrenmeyi tercih ettikleri sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Türk öğrenciler iletişim esnasında anlayamadıkları yerleri konuşmacıya sözel olarak ya da vücut dilini kullanarak göstermektedirler. Konuşmacı dinleyicinin anlayamadığı yerlerde konuşmasına örneklendirme yaparak netlik kazandırmaktadır. Aynı zamanda, Türk öğrenciler iletişim sırasında konuşmacınıntonlamasına ve vurgusuna dikkat etmektedirler. Öğrenciler konuşmacının ne söylediğini anlamaya çalışırlarken bir taraftan da konuşmacının kullandığı cümlelerdeki yapıların öğrendikleri kurallara uygun olup olmadıklarınaözen göstermektedirler. Türk kültüründe, telafi stratejileri iletişim sırasında İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin en çok kullandığı stratejilerden bir tanesidir. Telafi stratejileri, yetersiz dilbilgisine bağlı olarak konuşmanın planlanma aşamasında problem çözmenin amaçlandığı baş etme stratejileri olarak kabul edilmektedir (Yang & Gai, 2010). Telafi stratejilerialt gruplara ayrılmaktadır: Dil değiştirme, anadile bağlı iletişim stratejileri, yabancı dile bağlı iletişim stratejileri, dillerarası kullanılan stratejiler(Faerch & Kasper, 1983). İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak konuşan Türk öğrenciler, tam olarak ifade etmek istedikleri uygun kelimeyi bulamadıklarında o ifadeyi veren olabildiğince yakın anlamdaki başka bir

kelimeyi kullanmaktadırlar. Kendilerini ifade etmekte yetersiz hissettiklerinde daha basit açıklamalarla ya da yakın anlamlı ifadeler kullanarak vermek istedikleri mesajı aktarırlar. Buna ek olarak, ana fikri çıkarma stratejileri konuşmacının söylediklerinin özünü anlamak için kullanılan stratejilerdir. Dil öğrenenler konuşmada yer alan belirli ifadelerden daha çok konuşmanın içeriğindeki genel bilgilere dikkat ederler. Bağlamı ve konuşmacının bir önceki cümlesini göz önünde bulundurarak genel anlama ulaşmaya çalışmaktadırlar (Nakatani, 2006). İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin iletişim sırasında her detayı takip etmesi zor olacağı için ana fikri çıkarma stratejileri öğrencilerin var olan bilgilerini aktif hale getirerek konuşmacının ne söylediğini anlamak için faydalı olabilir (Dörnyei & Scott, 1997).

Bayan öğrencilerinerkek öğrencilerden daha çok iletişim stratejisi kullandığı bulunmuştur. Dahası, cinsiyete bağlı strateji kullanımı farklı kültürlere de uygulandığındabenzer sonuçlar göstermektedir. Çalışmalarda bayanların erkeklerden sosyal aktivilerde daha ilgili olduğu ve erkeklerden daha işbirlikçi olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Pek çok araştırmacı dil gelişiminde bayanların üstünlüğüne inanmayı sürdürmektedir (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Oxford, 1993; Ellis, 1994; Li, 2010). Bayanlar bilişsel, telafi etme ve bilişüstü stratejileri erkeklerden daha sık kullanmaktadır (Macaro, 2006). Ayrıca, bağımsız gruplar için yapılan t-testi sonucunda iletişim stratejisi kullanımı açısından orta ve ileri düzeydeki öğrenciler arasında anlamlı bir fark olduğu bulunmaktadır. İngilizce'de ileri düzeyde olan öğrenciler, iletişim stratejilerini en çok kullanan öğrencilerdir. Orta seviyedeki öğrenciler sıklıkla anlam çıkarma stratejilerini kullanırken, ileri düzeydeki öğrenciler ana fikri çıkarma stratejilerini kullanmaktadırlar.

**Tartışma**

Konuşma ve dinlemeyi kapsayan iletişim stratejilerinin iletişim üzerinde direk bir etkisi vardır ve yabancı dil öğreniminde yapılandırıcı bir rol oynamaktadır. İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenleriyabancı dil öğrenimini anlamlı ve etkili kılmak, sözel iletişimde yüksek oranda motivasyonu sağlamak, karşılıklı konuşma esnasında konuşmaya katılımı artırmak ve doğru mesajı göndermek için iletişim stratejilerini kullanmaları beklenmektedir. Özetle, cinsiyet ve dil yeterliliği açısından iletişim stratejilerinin kullanımında önemli farklılıklar vardır. Cinsiyet değişkeni iletişim stratejileri seçiminde belirleyici bir faktör olarak vurgulanabilir fakat aynı kültürdeki bayan ve erkekler tarafından kullanılan iletişim stratejilerindeki farklılıklardan dolayı cinsiyet tek başına değerlendirilmemelidir. Aynı zamanda, cinsiyet ve dil yeterliliği dışındaki bireysel farklılıklar, bireylerin bilgi birikimleri ve motivasyon gibi diğer değişkenler öğrenciler tarafından kullanılan iletişim stratejilerini belirlemede göz önünde bulundurulmalıdır. Alanyazında hala, iletişim stratejilerinin potansiyel olarak İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak kullanan öğrencilerin iletişimdeki farkındalığını arttırma, öğrencilerin karşılıklı dinleme ve konuşma aktivitelerinde iletişim stratejilerini nasıl kullandığını anlamave öğrencilerin strateji dağarcıklarını geliştirmek için yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin dikkatini strateji öğretimine çekme gibi konularda eksiklikler bulunmaktadır. Gelecekte, belirtilen bu konular üzerine çalışmalar yapmak iletişim stratejilerinin kullanımı açısından yabancı dil öğrenenlere ve öğretenlere katkı sağlayacaktır.

*Anahtar Sözcükler:* İletişim, Strateji, İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenenler

**Atıf için / Please cite as:**

Yaman, Ş., Irgın, P. & Kavasoğlu, M. (2013). Communication strategies: Implications for EFL university students [İletişim stratejileri: İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen üniversite öğrencilerine yönelik çıkarımlar]. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi - Journal of Educational Sciences Research*, 3 (2), 255–268. http://ebad-jesr.com/