

The Impact of Gender Difference on Effective Communication Between Learners of English Language and Native Speakers of English

Cinsiyet Farkının İngilizce Öğrenen Öğrenciler İle Anadili İngilizce Olan Kişiler Arasındaki İletişime Etkisi*

Zeynep Koçoğlu**

ÖZ: Bu çalışma, cinsiyet farkının İngilizce öğrenenlerin anadili İngilizce olan kişiler ile konuşurken kullandığı iletişim stratejilerine etkisini araştırmaktadır. 10 Türk öğrenci 10 anadili İngilizce olan kişiler ile eşleştirilmiş ve 10 dakikalık konuşmalar yapmışlardır. Veri toplama teknikleri olarak özgeçmiş anketi, gözlem, deney sonrası anket ve görüşmeler kullanılmıştır. Veri analizinde ise Faerch ve Kasper'ın (1983) geliştirdiği iletişim stratejileri kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen bulgulara göre konuşulan kişinin cinsiyeti Türk öğrencilerinin kullandığı iletişim stratejilerini etkilemiştir. Bir başka deyişle, öğrencinin cinsiyetinden ziyade konuşulan yabancı cinsiyeti iletişim stratejilerinin kullanımında etkili olmuştur. Bunun yanı sıra, Türk erkek ve Türk kız öğrencilerin kullandığı iletişim stratejileri benzerlik göstermiştir

Anahtar sözcükler: Cinsiyet, iletişim stratejileri, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi.

ABSTRACT: This study investigated the influence of gender on English learners' production of communication strategies while interacting with native speakers of English. Ten Turkish EFL students were paired with 10 native speakers of English, producing a total of 20 (10-minute long) conversations. Data collection procedures consisted of a background questionnaire, observation, a post-session questionnaire and an interview. A modified version of Faerch and Kasper's (1983) framework of communication strategies was used in data analysis to identify communication strategies employed by Turkish EFL students when conversing with native speakers of English. The findings revealed that the gender of the native speaker of English, rather than the gender of the students had an important impact on the Turkish EFL students' communication strategy use. Furthermore, more similarities rather than differences between male and female Turkish EFL students in the communication strategies used was seen when the interlocutor was not taken into consideration.

Keywords: Gender, Communication Strategies, English Language Teaching

1. INTRODUCTION

In the early 1970s, the concept of communicative competence became a leading model in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and English as a Foreign Language Teaching (EFL). Dell Hymes (1972) applied the notion of communicative competence to the knowledge of vocabulary and skill in using the sociolinguistic conventions of a given language appropriately in a given situation. Since then, a vast number of studies were done on communicative competence consisting of four components (Canale and Swain, 1980) such as grammatical competence (mastery of language code); sociolinguistic competence (mastery of sociocultural rules of use); discourse competence (mastery of how to combine grammatical forms and meanings to achieve coherence in form and in meaning); and strategic competence (mastery of verbal and nonverbal skills). Of these components, strategic competence, which is related to the speaker's ability to convey messages successfully in a communicative situation, has been selected as the focus of the present study because Turkish students as non-native speakers of English have problems in communicating in English, nor do they know how to cope with problems while speaking English due to the limited opportunity to use the target language outside of the classroom context.

* Bu makale, yazarın tez çalışmasının bir kısmıdır.

** Yard. Doç. Dr., Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İstanbul-Türkiye, e-posta: zbkocoglu@yeditepe.edu.tr

The term strategic competence has been defined by Canale and Swain (1980:29) as “the mastery of communication strategies that may be called into action either to enhance the effectiveness of communication or to compensate for breakdowns in communication.” Speakers use communication strategies (henceforth CSs) to “resolve difficulties they encounter in expressing an intended meaning” (Tarone, 2005:488). The speaker decides whether to avoid communication totally or to find alternatives by using the shared meaning structures between the speaker and the listener in order to continue with the communication especially in listening and speaking (Goh, 2000; Piolat, 2008).

CSs have been defined in various ways in the fields of second language acquisition, but most definitions are based on the issue of “problematicity” (Kasper & Kellerman, 1997:2). For example, Tarone defined CSs as “conscious communication strategies that are used by an individual to overcome the crisis which occurs when language structures are inadequate to convey the individual’s thought” (1983:72). Faerch and Kasper (1983:36) defined CSs as “potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal.” This issue of problematicity leads to problem-solving strategies, namely CSs that the speaker uses when (s)he encounters any problems in conveying the intended message to the interlocutor in the conversation, especially in conversations involving native/non-native speakers. Clearly, with the aid of CSs, the speaker has “alternative means of expression when linguistic shortcomings make it impossible for them to communicate their intended meaning in the preferred manner” in the target language (henceforth TL) (Poullisse, 1990:192-193). Among these various definitions of CSs, Faerch and Kasper’s categorization of CSs was chosen for the present study because other categorization of CSs such as Tarone’s and Poullisse’s claimed that communication strategies were cooperative in nature. In other words, this claim supported that the interlocutors were aware of the problem they encounter and try to cooperate to solve the communication problem. But Faerch and Kasper argued that in real-life conversations between language learners and native speakers, cooperation does not always take place. That is to say, native speakers may not help learners because learners may feel linguistically inferior and shy, so a face-threatening act of correcting someone may be avoided. Therefore, Faerch and Kasper (1983) categorized the CSs according to the behavior that language users may choose when they face a communication problem. They may either choose avoidance behavior (avoiding the difficulty); or select achievement behavior (trying to solve the problem). Therefore, two types of CSs are defined based on these two types of behavior: reduction strategies related to avoidance behavior and achievement strategies related to achievement behavior

1.1. Communication Strategies: Research Findings

The studies conducted on CSs have investigated the relationship between CS use and learner characteristics such as personality and learning style (Haastrup & Phillipson, 1983; Lujan-Ortega & Clark, 2000; Littlemore, 2001), L1 (first language) background (Palmberg, 1979; Rossiter, 2003; Si-Quing, 1990), proficiency level (Bialystok, 1983; Fernandez Dobao, 2007; Jourdain, 2000; Paribakht, 1985; Poullisse et al. 1990) and teachability of CSs (Dörnyei, 1995; Faucette, 2001; Gallagher Brett, 2001; Maleki, 2007; Nakatani, 2005). However, in most of these studies, some variables such as gender have not received enough attention. Only one study (Wang, 1993) addressed the possible influence of gender on 16 Korean ESL learners’ interaction with 16 native speakers of English, and on the use of CSs. Analysis of 32 audiotaped conversations regarding the university orientation program revealed that the learners used more CSs with a female than with a male native speaker interlocutor. Thus, the gender of the native speaker interlocutor, not the gender of the learner, appears to have an impact on the CSs use. Wang study was conducted in the USA where English was the native language; whereas in the present study, the native language is Turkish. Unlike Wang’s Korean students, Turkish students

living in Turkey have no exposure to English contexts. They hardly have a chance to practice English with native speakers of English or foreigners. Therefore, this study was designed to investigate how Turkish students use CSs while interacting with native speakers of English, and how gender has an impact on foreign language (L2) learners' production of CSs. başlıklar küçük harfle, koyu ve yukarıdaki formata uygun yazılmalıdır. Burada olduğu gibi alt bölümlerde bu formata dikkat edilmelidir.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. The Sample

Two groups of subjects (total 19) participated in the study. The first group (non-native speakers, henceforth NNSs) consisted of 10 Turkish EFL students (5 male and 5 female; age range 19-21) who were currently enrolled in the first year of a four-year teacher training program at a Turkish University. The NNSs exhibited similarities in terms of exposure to, and proficiency in English and other languages. These Turkish subjects had been exposed to English for at least seven years. They were all graduates of various Anadolu Teacher Trainer high schools, attended University's Preparatory School, and passed the proficiency exam, which is said to be equivalent to the Michigan Test of English (Hughes, 1988). Two subjects had been abroad for a period of one or two months, one to Germany and one to England.

The second group (native speakers, henceforth NSs) consisted of 9 native (4 male and 5 female; age range 20-25) speakers of English who were visiting Turkey at the time of the study. All NS subjects were from the U.S.A. They all had a university education and were currently working in various professions (e.g., engineering, architecture, and sociology). None of the NS subjects had met the NNS subjects before, and none of them were English language teachers. Only three of NNSs knew foreign languages, two spoke French and one German. However, they did not consider themselves proficient in these languages

2.2. The Task

The present study used an authentic task to examine real communicative behavior of the interlocutors rather than a controlled task, which could not document the complex aspects of language. It was assumed here that the features of natural conversation such as "face-to-face interaction, unplannedness, unpredictability of sequence and outcome, potentially equal distribution of rights and duties in the talk, and the manifestation of features of reactive and mutual contingency" (Van Lier 1989:495) would be more likely to elicit real-life strategy use in communicative situations. Considering all these points, the researcher first asked to the participants as to on what topic they would talk about and two topics (money and advertising) which did not demand any expertise or field-specific knowledge, culturally neutral and which were related to the subjects' daily life were chosen, and randomly assigned to dyads for discussion.

2.3. Data Collection

In line with the objectives of the study, the subjects in Group NNSs were paired with the subjects in Group NSs to form same-sex and opposite-sex dyads. In other words, a female NNS was paired first with a female NS as the first pair to have the first conversation, and a male NNS and a male NS were paired as the second group to have the first conversation (Session I) on one topic (money). After the 10-minute long Session I, the interlocutors were exchanged and paired

for the second conversations (Session II). One female NNS was paired with male NS; and one male NNS was paired with female NS, and discussed the other topic (advertisement). At the end of Session II, a post-session questionnaire, which was adapted from Wang (1993) was administered. Each subject filled out two post-session questionnaires; one related to the same-sex interlocutor, and the other to the opposite-sex interlocutor. The five-point Likert-scale questionnaire, written in English, consisted of 12 questions. The aim of the questionnaire was to find out who had provided assistance more in conversation and how the subjects' feelings and/or attitudes to each other affected their conversation. All questions on the post-session questionnaire were the same for all subjects.

After the subjects filled out the post-session questionnaire, they were interviewed by the researcher to find out whether they had faced any communication problems during the interaction; and if so, the reasons for these and how they solved the problem in order to facilitate the interaction. The interviews were tape-recorded.

2.4. Data Analysis

The data analysis was done in three tiers: transcribing the interviews, locating problem areas by using problem indicators (e.g., hesitation marks, stops) and coding/classifying CSs. Firstly, at the end of the data collection, the researcher listened to all the recorded interviews to get a sense of what went on during the conversations and interviews. Then all the conversations and interviews were transcribed verbatim.

The second step in data analysis was locating the problem areas. Learners use strategies when there is a gap between their intended message and their ability to produce it, so communication breakdowns needed to be located before strategies could be identified. Accordingly, Faerch and Kasper's problem indicators were taken as a framework for the initial classification; thus, explicit signals of uncertainty (e.g. *well, I mean, you know*) and implicit signals of uncertainty variables (e.g. pauses, rate of articulation, repeats and intonation) were applied to identify problematic areas in which the interlocutors seemed to have problems in communication.

After locating the problem areas, the next step was coding and classifying CSs. After reviewing existing taxonomies of CSs, the researcher decided to adopt and modify Faerch and Kasper's (1983) framework for two reasons. Firstly, they operationalized their definitions of CSs clearly in their framework, so coding and quantifying CSs were easily done in data analysis. Secondly, most studies on CSs have made use of this framework, so it was expected that this study could be compared to other studies. Consequently, in this study seven categories of Faerch and Kasper's CSs (transfer, generalization, paraphrase, word coinage, restructuring, topic avoidance, message abandonment) (See Appendix 1 for definitions) used by male and female subjects with the same- and opposite-sex interlocutors were evaluated according to their frequencies. The frequency of each strategy was counted in order to find the frequency of the main categories of CSs.

3. RESULTS

First, the findings related to the study's first question "What type(s) of CSs do male and female Turkish EFL students use when they interact with male and female native speakers of English?" will be discussed. Then, the findings related to the study's second question, "Are there any similarities and/or differences between male and female Turkish EFL students in the use of

CSs regardless of the gender of the NS interlocutors?" will be explained. Finally, subjects' feelings about the dyadic interactions will be reported.

3.1. Communication Strategy Use in Sex-Based Dyads

The focus of this research was the non-native speakers' strategic action while interacting with native speakers of English; therefore, the results were discussed from EFL learners' perspective. As can be seen in Table 1, the total number of CSs employed by male Turkish EFL students was more with the opposite-sex interlocutors (57) than with the same-sex interlocutors (34). Furthermore, male Turkish EFL students used very few transfer and word coinage strategies. However, they used topic avoidance, generalization, paraphrase, restructuring and message abandonment more with the opposite-sex interlocutors than with the same sex-interlocutors.

Table 1: Frequency of Types of CSs used by Male NNSs

STRATEGIES	with male NSs		With female NSs		z-value
	n	%	n	%	
Topic avoidance	5	15	9	16	1.83*
Transfer	1	3	1	2	.00
Generalization	4	12	8	14	1.35
Paraphrase	9	26	11	19	.40
Word coinage	2	5	2	4	.53
Restructuring	5	15	12	21	1.62
Message abandonment	8	24	14	25	1.60*
Total	34		57		1.46

*p<.05

As is shown in Table 2, the total number of CSs employed by female Turkish EFL students was more with the same-sex interlocutors (47) than with the opposite-sex interlocutors (41). Furthermore, female Turkish EFL students used four CS categories out of seven, and more with the same-sex interlocutors than with the opposite-sex interlocutors: generalization, paraphrase, word coinage and restructuring. They only used one category more with male NS than with female NS interlocutors, while they used one category, (transfer: 3) only with male NSs. Also, they used an equal number of message abandonment strategies with male NSs and female NSs. Buraya yorum/tartışma kısmı eklenmeli ve yukarıda verilen önerilere dikkat edilmelidir.

Table 2: Frequency of Types of CSs used by Female NNSs

STRATEGIES	with male NSs		With female NSs		z-value
	n	%	n	%	
Topic avoidance	8	19	4	9	.91
Transfer	3	7	0	0	1.34
Generalization	8	19	12	26	1.60*
Paraphrase	7	21	8	17	1.00
Word coinage	1	2	2	4	.53
Restructuring	5	12	12	26	1.82*
Message abandonment	9	21	9	19	.00
Total	41		47		.73

*p<.05

A comparison of CS use indicated that female NNSs used two CSs, (generalization and restructuring), significantly more with female NSs than with male NSs. Regarding generalization, three of five female NNSs used more generalization with female NS interlocutors than with male NS interlocutors. Two of five female NNSs used an equal number of generalization strategies with both sexes.

NNSf: The topic was advertisement.

NS: *Oh yeah?*

NNSf: *Advertisement, TV or newspaper?*

NS: *Commercial*

NNSf: *Yes, commercial something like that.*

Regarding the restructuring strategy, four of five female NNSs used more restructuring with female NS than male NS interlocutors. One subject did not use restructuring with male NS interlocutors at all.

NNSf: *Is your major political science?*

NS: *uh uh?*

NNSf: *Oh! My my sister grad uh her major was political science.*

As Table 3 displays, another difference was that the total number of CSs that male Turkish EFL students used with female native speakers was more than female Turkish EFL students (57 vs. 47). On the other hand, the total number of CSs that female Turkish EFL students used with male NSs was more than male Turkish EFL students (41 vs. 34).

Table 3: Total number of CSs used by male and female NNSs to their same- and opposite-sex interlocutors.

	To male NSs	To female NSs	z-value
Male NNSs	34	57	1.46
Female NNSs	41	47	.73
z-value	.68	.43	

In summary, there were more similarities than differences between male and female Turkish EFL students' selection of communication strategy while interacting with male and female native speakers of English. The total number of CSs that male and female Turkish EFL students used was more with the female native speakers of English than with males. However, differences arose in the type of CSs categories used; male Turkish EFL students used topic avoidance and message abandonment strategies while female Turkish EFL students used generalization and restructuring. Another difference was that male NNSs used more CSs with female NSs than female NNSs. Female NNSs, on the other hand, applied more CSs with male NSs than male NNSs did.

3.2. Communication Strategy Use and Gender

As Table 4 shows, male NNSs used more CSs (91) overall than female NNSs (88) regardless of the gender of the NS interlocutor significant. Male NNSs used four categories of CSs more than female NNSs: topic avoidance, paraphrase, word coinage and message abandonment. Female NNSs, on the other hand, employed two categories of CSs more than male NNSs; transfer and generalization. Both male and female NNSs applied only one category of CSs equally; restructuring. Although male and female NNSs had different preferences in relation to the type of CS and the frequency with which they used each category, the differences in the frequency of each CS used was not more except in the case of generalization. Below is the comparison of each CS in relation to the gender of Turkish EFL students, which is given in order of the frequency counts of CS use.

Table 4: Overall CSs used by Male and Female NNSs

STRATEGIES	male NNSs	female NNSs	TOTAL	z-value
Topic avoidance	14	12	26	1.22
Transfer	2	3	5	.24
Generalization	12	20	32	2.40*

Paraphrase	20	15	35	1.06**
Word coinage	4	3	7	.00
Restructuring	17	17	34	.11
Message abandonment	22	18	40	.64**
total	91	88	178	.32

* $p < .05$

**close-to-significant

Regarding generalization, female NNSs used this strategy more frequently (20) than male NNSs did (12). The maximum frequency with which female NNSs used this strategy was five, whereas for male NNSs it was three. The minimum frequency with which female NNS subjects used generalization was three while male NNS subjects used one generalization.

NNSm: Did you see the places they make the commercials?

NS: Yeah?

NNSm: I mean the scene, the place that they make a commercial?

Testing of performance on paraphrase showed that male NNSs used paraphrase more frequently (20) than female NNSs (15). The maximum number of paraphrases male NNSs employed was five, while for female NNSs this was four. The minimum number of paraphrases used by male NNSs was three while it was two for female NNSs.

NNSm: And it started at that time, and they have working for two years and didn't well they haven't removed the machine you get pictures with the little thing you get pictures of your family your friends.

NSf: ahh you mean cameras?

Male NNSs used message abandonment strategy more than female NNSs (22 vs. 18). The maximum frequency with which this strategy was employed by both sexes was equal (6). The minimum frequency with which male NNSs used a message abandonment strategy was three, while the figure was two for female NNSs.

NSf: That is done in every department store and you still shop there didn't you?

NNSm: Yeah but there I can can't can't. . .

NS: do anything about it? Yes, here you can't do anything.

Both male and female Turkish EFL students used an equal number of restructuring strategies. The maximum number of restructuring strategies that were used by both sexes was the same (5). The minimum frequency for male NNSs was one whereas for female NNSs it was two.

NNSf: you have money more you have respect. The way people use money the way people use money is changing they use it for different several different purposes.

With regard to topic avoidance, the maximum frequency with which this strategy was used by both male and female NNSs was three. The minimum frequency with which this strategy was applied was two for both sexes.

The two strategies that were used the least by both sexes were transfer and word coinage. Regarding transfer, three of five male and also three of five female NNSs did not use transfer. The maximum frequency with which this strategy was used was one for male NNSs and two for female NNSs. Only one female NNS used two transfer strategies.

NNSf: One of my friend hold many money to go to America to study.

Regarding word coinage, four of five male NNSs and three of five female NNSs used a word coinage strategy once. One male NNS and two female NNSs did not use this strategy at all.

To sum up, male and female Turkish EFL students' CS use exhibited similarities in terms of the total number of CSs used without taking gender of the NS interlocutor into consideration. The total number of CSs used by both sexes was almost equal. Gender difference became clear in terms of the type of strategy choice, but not so much the frequency overall.

3.3. Communication Strategy Use and Gender

The observation, post-session questionnaire and interviews revealed that both male and female Turkish EFL students exhibited similar behaviors during the interactions and had similar feelings about the interactions with their NS interlocutors. In the gender-based dyads, the interactions were always initiated by the native speaker interlocutors regardless of the gender of the NNS and NS interlocutors.

Based on the interview and general observations, the researcher drew conclusions as to why male and female native speakers acted as the initiators. The reasons appeared to be that both male and female Turkish EFL students were shy in starting the conversations, and perhaps were intimidated by the presence of the NS interlocutors.

NSf: Both students had definite views on the topics we discussed. Therefore, it was easy to develop a conversation. However, I was the one who initiated the topics and who changed them because they were very shy at the beginning.

When NS interlocutors started the interaction by asking personal questions to the NNS, it appeared to change the mood of the NNSs and made them more relaxed and more comfortable. Additionally, not only at the beginning, but also throughout the entire interaction, NS interlocutors had more active roles in native/non-native interactions.

NNSf: When I first thought this, I was afraid of being with foreign people and felt myself being here. But I want to say now that I enjoyed being here and talking with them. But I must say that both of them are very friendly and want me to talk, ask me questions about myself and they always want me to talk.

Although male and female NS interlocutors seemed to exhibit similar behaviors, there were differences in terms of the support that they provided to their NNS interlocutors. Female NSs were more patient and more encouraging in terms of getting the NNSs interlocutors to engage in the conversation. The instances of female NSs support were much more common than male NSs during the native/non-native interactions. This might explain why both male and female NNSs used more CSs with female NS interlocutors than with male NSs, and cross-validate the quantitative part of this study. The examples were common in the data:

NNSm: So I felt for me hmmm there is a man to man, or women to women very good system.

NSf: To match, to match people (providing the word to match)

NNSm: Yes, to match the people or several persons match.

Both male and female Turkish EFL students faced difficulties while interacting with NS interlocutors of both sexes due to their limited proficiency in English. They felt that experiencing language problems resulted from being exposed to English only at school, but not outside the school. Part of the difficulties stemmed from not having a large vocabulary. Language learners who were talkative and outgoing seemed to deal better with the problems related to proficiency in the target language better.

NSm: The boy had a problem with pronunciation and the flow of the conversation. He very often stopped while talking. The girl was more extrovert and talkative, but she needs to enlarge her vocabulary.

In summary, both male and female Turkish EFL students had positive feelings about the interactions with both male and female native speakers of English. Even though they felt uneasy at the beginning of the conversations, NS interlocutors made them comfortable and encouraged them to continue to conversations by being more cooperative. The female NS interlocutors seemed to give more encouragement to the NNSs. Both NNSs and NSs pointed out that NNS subjects had fluency and vocabulary problems due to the lack of opportunity to practice English outside the school environment. This was particularly so for NNSs who were more introverted.

4. CONCLUSION and IMPLICATIONS

The finding related to the study's first research question revealed that the gender of the native speaker interlocutor played a role in native/non-native interactions. The results indicated that both male and female Turkish EFL students used more strategies overall with the female NS interlocutors than with male NS interlocutors although the frequency with which each individual category of CS was used varied. Perhaps the reason why both male and female NNS subjects used CSs more with the female NS than male NS interlocutors is that the female NSs were more collaborative, encouraging and responsive in the interactions, for instance, providing appropriate words or correct expressions to the NNS interlocutors when necessary. This finding supports Wang's (1993) study on Korean ESL learners, which showed that female speakers played a greater role than male speakers in native/non-native and non-native/non-native interactions. Similarly, the female NS interlocutors of this study were more active in the interactions and took more responsibility for the flow of the interaction.

The present study's second finding revealed that male and female EFL learners did not differ in terms of the total number of CSs used and individual categories of CSs as had been found in Wang's study (1993). In the present study, the proficiency level of the learner might have been of greater importance than the gender of the learner. Gender differences between the two groups might have been more explicit and this is worthy of more in-depth investigation.

Another finding was that the success of the communication depended a lot on the native speakers' response or cooperation. Since the Turkish EFL learners and the native speakers of English were not equal in terms of their linguistic ability, NS interlocutors' initiating the conversation, trying to keep the conversation flowing and supporting NNS interlocutors where necessary, made the communication more effective. The outcomes of this study suggested that success in communication depends on pairing, and particularly in native-nonnative interaction on the cooperation of the native speakers and the native speaker's responses. That is, cooperation and NS feedback led to successful communication in the NS-NNS interaction.

This study aimed to contribute to second language acquisition research in general, and communication strategy studies in particular. The present study, specifically, examined the types of communication strategy male and female Turkish EFL students used when they interacted with the male and female native speakers of English. It also examined whether there were any similarities and/or differences between male and female Turkish EFL students in the use of CSs regardless of the gender of the NS interlocutor. The findings overall revealed that the gender of the NS interlocutor in both same- and opposite-sex dyads had an impact on the use of CSs. All Turkish EFL students used more CSs with female rather than male native speakers of English and the post-session interviews suggested that this might be because the former were perceived as more cooperative than the latter.

Although the richness and the variety of the findings in this study can be a springboard for other studies, they should be interpreted within the study's limitations. Similar to other studies on foreign language production which reported their findings on a small number of subjects

(Crookes, 1991), this study was also based on a small sample size. However, if the sample size were increased, patterns of CSs use would be more clear-cut. Therefore, studies with large number of subjects are necessary to make the findings of this study more generalizable.

Also, studies focusing on language learners' behavioral patterns such as mime and gesture should be investigated by using a more advanced technology such as video cameras. Videotaping the interaction of the language learners in gender-based dyads can provide a better and a more holistic picture of the use of CSs in relation to the gender of the native speaker.

Additionally, studies that examine a variety of ethnic groups are essential for cross-communication research examinations. Studies which focus on groups of subjects with different ethnic backgrounds and compare each ethnic group's CS use will be invaluable to SLA research. Although this study was conducted only with one ethnic group, extensive overlap was found between the use of CSs by Turkish EFL students and those of Wang's (1993) Korean ESL learners.

Some methodological considerations should also be noted for further studies. This study did not describe the use of communication strategies as having occurred in shared conversation than as being used by only one of the interlocutors, namely English learners. Therefore, this raises the question of whether it is the female native speakers who are more likely to use CSs than male native speakers; and which interlocutor first used these strategies to overcome communication problems. Further research needs to include these questions.

Since the scope of interest was the students' conversation, the data analysis was based solely on linguistic products or output, ignoring the actual process of producing the output. The language learners' psychological state during the process of using communication strategies is equally important. Consequently, studies can take this point into consideration as well by using an introspection method (e.g., think-aloud protocols) and/or a retrospection method (e.g., stimulated recall) to collect data. This technique would supply data that would provide a more comprehensive and deeper understanding of strategy choice. For further research, discussion of categories involving introversion/extroversion as suggested above in relation to psychological research tools.

The findings of the study have several implications for second/foreign language teaching and learning. Teachers should design activities to develop their students' fluency and vocabulary in the classroom and assign tasks, which will make the language learners devote time to using English outside the classroom, such as having pen-pals, interviewing a foreigner, and looking for specific information on news channels (e.g., CNN or BBC).

Pairing of language learners who exhibit different interactive styles due to their proficiency in the language classroom should be done with care. The data from this study suggests that when teachers involve learners in group or activities, language learners with limited second/foreign language proficiency can be paired with the ones who are at a higher level of proficiency so that the latter will provide more comprehensive input to the former. As this study shows, the conversational dominance by one of the pair members does not necessarily lead to failure in communication, on the contrary, it can facilitate interaction. The feedback given by the NSs and the cooperation they provided showed that learners with higher proficiency in the classroom activities would act in a similarly supportive way as the native speaker interlocutors of the present study.

5. REFERENCES

- Bialystok, E. (1983). Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies. In Faerch, C. and G. Kasper (Eds.). *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 100-118). New York: Longman.

- Canale, M. and M. Swain. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1(1), 1-47.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 55-85.
- Faerch, C. and G. Kasper. (1983). *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. New York: Longman.
- Faucette, P. (2001). A pedagogical perspective on communication strategies: benefits of training and analysis of English language teaching Materials. *Second Language Studies*, 19(2), 1-40.
- Fernandez Dobao, A. and Martinez, I. P. (2007). Negotiating meaning in interaction between English and Spanish speakers via communicative strategies. *Atlantis*, 29(1), 87-105.
- Goh, C. C. M. (2000). A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension problems. *System*, 28, 55-75. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251x\(99\)00060-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251x(99)00060-3)
- Haastrop, K. and Phillipson, R. (1983). Achievement strategies in learner/native speaker interaction. In Faerch and Kasper, (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 134-153). London, Longman.
- Hughes, A. (1988). Introducing a needs-based test of English language proficiency into an English-medium university in Turkey. In Hughes, A. (Ed.), *Testing English for University Study* (pp. 112-123). Hong Kong: Modern English Publications and the British Council.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In Pride, J.B. and J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings* (pp. 269-293). Baltimore: Penguin.
- Jourdain, S. (2000). A native-like ability to circumlocute. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(2), 185-195.
- Littlemore, J. (2001). An empirical study of the relationship between cognitive style and the use of communication strategy. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(2), 241-265.
- Lujan-Ortega, V. and Clark-Carter, D. (2000). Individual differences, strategic performance and achievement in second language learners of Spanish. *Studia Linguistica*, 54(2), 280-287.
- Kasper, G. and Kellerman, E. (1997). *Advances in Communication Strategy Research*. London: Longman.
- Maleki, A. (2007). Teachability of communication strategies: An Iranian experience. *System*, 35:583-594.
- Nakatani, Y. (2005). The effects of awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89, 76-91.
- Palmberg, R. (1979). Investigating communication strategies. In Palmberg, R. (Ed.), *Perception and Production of English: Papers in Interlanguage* (pp. 33-75). Abo: Abo Akademi.
- Paribakht, T. (1985). Strategic competence and language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics* 6(2), 132-146.
- Piolat, A. (2008). Fluency and Cognitive Effort During First- and Second-Language Notetaking and Writing by Undergraduate Students. *European Psychologist*. 13(2), ISSN1016-9040. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.13.2.114>
- Poulisse, N., Bongaerts, T. and Kellerman, E. (1990). *The use of compensatory strategies by Dutch Learners of English*. Enschede: Sneldruk.
- Rossiter, M. (2003). "It is like chicken but bigger": Effects of communication strategy in ESL classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 60(2), 105-121.
- Si-Qing, C. (1990). A study of communication strategies in interlanguage production by Chinese EFL learners. *Language Learning*, 40(2), 155-187.
- Tarone, E. (1983). Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategies. In Faerch, C. and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 61-74). N.Y.: Longman.
- Tarone, E. (2005). English for specific purposes and interlanguage pragmatics. In Kathleen Bardovi Harlig and Beverly Hartford (Eds.), *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Exploring Institutional Talk* (pp. 157-176). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- Van Lier, V. (1989) Reeling, writing, drawing, stretching, and fainting in coils: Oral proficiency interview as conversation. *TESOL Quarterly* 23(3), 46-57.
- Wang, H.S. (1993). *The role of gender in interactional learner communication strategies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Yule, G. and Tarone, E. (1991). The other side of the page: Integrating the study of communication strategies and negotiated input in SLA. In R. Philipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, and M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second Language Pedagogy Research* (pp. 56-73). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Geniřletilmiř Özet

1970'lerin bařında iletiřim becerisi, 2. dil ediniminde ve yabancı dil eđitiminde öne çıkan bir kavram haline gelmiř ve iletiřimin etkisini artırmak ya da iletiřimdeki aksaklıkları telafi etmek için kullanılan iletiřim stratejilerine kullanabilmek de geliřtirilmesi gereken bir beceri olarak kabul edilmiřtir (Faerch ve Kasper, 1983; Tarone, 2005). Bir dizi çalıřma, iletiřim stratejisi kullanımı ve öđrenici özellikleri arasındaki iliřkiyi incelemiřtir; örneđin, kiřilik ve öđrenme stili ((Haastrup ve Phillipson, 1983; Lujan-Ortega ve Clark, 2000; Littlemore, 2001), dil yeterlilik seviyesi (Bialystok, 1983; Fernandez Dobao, 2007; Jourdain, 2000; Paribakht, 1985; Poulisse et al. 1990), ve iletiřim stratejilerinin öđretilebilirliđi (Dörnyei, 1995; Faucette, 2001; Gallagher Brett, 2001; Maleki, 2007; Nakatani, 2005). Ancak, bu çalıřmaların çođunda cinsiyet gibi bazı deđiřkenlere yeteri kadar önem verilmemiřtir. Sadece bir çalıřma (Wang, 1993) 16 Koreli İngilizce öđrencisinin 16 İngilizce anadil konuřuru ile etkileřimi ve iletiřim stratejilerinin kullanımı üzerinde cinsiyetin muhtemel etkilerini ele almıřtır. Wang'ın bu çalıřması anadili İngilizce olan öđrenciler ile yapılmıřtı; oysa bu arařtırmada anadil Türkçedir. Wang'ın Koreli öđrencilerinin aksine, Türkiye'de yařayan Türk öđrenciler İngilizce konuřulan ortamlarda bulunmamaktadır. Türk öđrenciler, çok nadiren anadili İngilizce olan kiřilerle ya da yabancılarla İngilizce konuřabilme fırsatı bulabilmektedir. Bu nedenle, bu çalıřma Türk öđrencilerin İngilizce anadil konuřurlarıyla iletiřim kurarken, iletiřim stratejilerini nasıl kullandıklarını ve cinsiyetin yabancı dil öđreniminde öđrencilerin iletiřim stratejisi kullanımlarını nasıl etkilediđini arařtırmak için düzenlenmiřtir.

Bu çalıřma, cinsiyet farkının İngilizce öđrenenlerin anadili İngilizce olan kiřiler ile konuřurken kullandıđı iletiřim stratejilerine etkisini arařtırmaktadır. 10 Türk öđrenci 10 anadili İngilizce olan kiřiler ile eřleřtirilmiř ve 10 dakikalık konuřmalar yapmıřlardır. Veri toplama teknikleri olarak özgeçmiř anketi, gözlem, deney sonrası anket ve görüřmeler kullanılmıřtır. Veri analizinde ise Faerch ve Kasper'in (1983) geliřtirdiđi iletiřim stratejileri kullanılmıřtır.

Arařtırmanın amaçlarına uygun olarak, anadili İngilizce olmayanlarla olanlar arasında, aynı ve farklı cinsiyetlerden oluřmuř iki kiřilik gruplar oluřturuldu. Bir bařka deyiřle, birinci seansta anadili İngilizce olmayan bir kız öđrenci anadili İngilizce olan bařka bir kız öđrenci ile, anadili İngilizce olmayan bir erkek öđrenci anadili İngilizce olan bir erkek öđrenci ile, 'para' konulu ilk konuřmalarını gerçekleřtirmek üzere ikili gruplara ayrıldılar. 10 dakika süren ilk seansın ardından, konuřmacılar yer deđiřtirdi ve ikinci konuřma için yeniden ikili gruplar oluřturuldu (2. seans). Anadili İngilizce olmayan bir bayan anadili İngilizce olan bir erkekle, anadili İngilizce olmayan bir erkek anadili İngilizce olan bir bayanla eřleřti ve bařka bir konu olan 'reklam' kavramını tartıřtılar. 2. seansın sonunda, öđrencilere Wang (1993)'ten alınıp düzenlenen bir seans sonrası anket uygulandı. Her katılımcı bu seanslar sonrasında, bir tane kendi cinsiyeti ile aynı olan konuřmacıya - bir tane de karřı cinsiyetteki konuřmacıya iliřkin olmak üzere iki tane anket doldurdu. Beř puanlı olan Likert ölçeđi İngilizce yazılmıřtı ve 12 tane soru içeriyordu. Anketin amaçı konuřma esnasında kimin daha çok kolaylık sađladığını, ve katılımcıların duyguları ya da birbirlerine olan tutumlarının konuřmayı nasıl etkilediđini ortaya çıkarmaktı. Bu ankette her katılımcıya aynı sorular soruldu.

Anket doldurulduktan sonra, katılımcılar bir de arařtırmacı tarafından, konuřmaları esnasında iletiřim problemi yařayıp yařamadıklarını, eđer yařadırsa bunun sebeplerini ve konuřmanın sürekliliđini sađlamak adına bu sorunu nasıl ařtıklarını ortaya çıkarmak için birebir mülakata alındı. Bu konuřmalar kayda alındı.

Elde edilen data üç Őekilde analiz edildi: arařtırmacı ile yapılan birebir konuřmaları yazıya dökme, katılımcıların seans konuřmalarına dayanarak sorun alanlarını belirleme (örnek: tereddüt etme, duraklama vs.), iletiřim stratejilerini kodlama/sınıflandırma.

Bu arařtırmanın üstünde durduđu nokta, anadili İngilizce olmayan konuřmacıların anadili İngilizce olan konuřmacılarla iletiřim kurarken kullandıkları stratejilerdi, bu nedenle arařtırmanın sonuçları İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öđrenenlerin pespektifinden ele alınmıřtır. İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öđrenen erkek konuřmacıların kullandıđı toplam iletiřim stratejisi sayısı karřı cinsiyetteki konuřmacılarla (57) aynı cinsiyetteki konuřmacılarla (34) olduđundan daha fazlaydı.

İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen kız öğrencilerin kullandıkları toplam iletişim stratejisi sayısı bayanlarla, erkeklerle kullandıklarından daha fazlaydı. Ayrıca kız öğrenciler erkek öğrencilerden ziyade aynı cinsleriyle bu stratejileri kullanırken, yedi iletişim stratejisinden dördünü kullanmışlardır: genelleme (12'ye karşı 8), açıklama (8'e karşı 7), kelime uydurma (2'ye karşı 1), ve yeniden yapılandırma (12'ye karşı 5). Bayanlar, sadece bir strateji kategorisini (bazı konulardan kaçınma: 8'e karşı 4) anadili İngilizce olan bayanlardan çok erkeklerle kullanmışlardır; öte yandan yine sadece bir kategori (dil transferi: 3) sadece anadili İngilizce olan erkeklerle kullanmışlardır. Dahası, anadili İngilizce olan erkek ve bayanlarla aynı sayıda "söyleyeceğinden vazgeçme" stratejisi kullanmışlardır (9'a karşı 9).

Bir diğer farklılık da İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen erkek Türk öğrencilerin, ana dili İngilizce olan bayanlarla konuşurken kullandıkları iletişim stratejisi sayısı bayan Türk öğrencilerle olduğundan daha fazlaydı (57'ye 47). Öte yandan, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen bayan Türk öğrencilerin, ana dili İngilizce olan erkeklerle konuşurken kullandıkları iletişim stratejisi sayısı bayan Türk öğrencilerle olduğundan daha fazlaydı (41'e 34).

Ana dili İngilizce olan konuşurların cinsiyeti gözardı edildiğinde, erkek ve bayan Türk öğrencilerin iletişim stratejisi kullanımları, toplam iletişim stratejisi sayıları bakımından benzerlik göstermiştir. Kullanılan toplam iletişim stratejisi sayısı her iki cinsiyette de neredeyse aynı olduğu gözlenmiştir. Cinsiyetin, iletişim stratejisi kullanma sıklığı konusunda değil, kullanılan stratejinin türü üzerinde belirleyici bir etken olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır.

Hem erkek hem bayan Türk öğrenciler, anadili İngilizce olan hem erkek hem de bayanlarla yaptıkları konuşmaları olumlu olarak değerlendirdiler. Öğrenciler konuşmanın başlarında huzursuz hissetselerde, İngilizce anadil konuşurları onları rahatlatmaya çalıştı ve destekçi davranarak konuşmanın devamı için cesaretlendirdiler. İngilizce anadil konuşuru bayanların öğrencilere daha fazla destek verdiği gözlemlendi. Hem İngilizce anadil konuğu olanlar hem de olmayanlar, Türk öğrencilerin akıcı konuşmalarının ve kelime bilgisi yetersizliklerinin sebebinin İngilizceyi okuldan başka bir ortamda konuşmadıkları olduğunu belirttiler.

Araştırmanın bulguları ikinci/yabancı dil öğretiminde birçok gerekliliği ortaya koymaktadır. Öğretmenler, öğrencilerin sınıfta akıcı konuşma ve kelime bilgileri için aktiviteler dizayn etmeliler ve projeler vermeliler. Yabancı dillerindeki yeterlik seviyelerinden dolayı farklı iletişim stillerine sahip öğrencilerin ortak çalışması konusunda titiz davranılmalıdır. Bu araştırmanın sonuçları, dil açısından sınırlı bir seviyede olan öğrencilerin daha iyi seviyede olan öğrencilerle ortak çalışmasının faydalı olabileceğini göstermiştir, çünkü böylece iyi seviyedeki öğrenci diğer öğrenciye kapsamlı bilgi sağlayabilecek ve gelişmesine yardımcı olacaktır. Araştırmanın gösterdiğine göre, ikili çalışan öğrencilerden birinin konuşma sırasında baskın olması iletişimde aksaklığa sebep olmaz, aksine iletişimi kolaylaştırabilir. Bu araştırmadaki İngilizce anadil konuşmacılarının geri bildirimleri ve destekçi tavırları, iyi seviyedeki öğrencilerin de ikili sınıf aktivitelerinde benzer bir rol üstlenebileceklerini ve destekçi bir tavır izleyebileceklerini göstermiştir.

Appendix 1

The definitions of strategies used in the present study

Topic avoidance	The speaker avoids the topic due to lack of structure or vocabulary.
Transfer	The speaker uses an L1 item modified in accordance with the target language or with no modification.
Message abandonment	The speaker leaves the message unfinished because of language difficulties.
Paraphrase	The speaker produces the same meaning using different linguistic forms. "It is like lemon but not yellow" for orange
Word coinage	The speaker makes up a new word following the target language rules e.g., vegetarianist for vegetarian.
Restructuring	The speaker develops an alternative plan to communicate his/her intended meaning.
Generalization	The speaker uses an alternative term which is assumed to share same semantic feature e.g., animal for horse

Citation Information:

Koçođlu, Z. (2013) The impact of gender difference on effective communication between learners of English language and native speakers of English. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eđitim Fakóltesi Dergisi [Hacettepe University Journal of Education]*, 28(2), 279-292.