

Oral Communication Strategies Used by Turkish Students Learning English as a Foreign Language

Şaziye Yaman and Mehtap Özcan

Abstract The study aims to identify the oral communication strategies used by the students learning English as a foreign language in Turkey, using a reliable and valid measurement tool. Thus, the *Strategy Inventory of Oral Communication* (SIOC), developed by the present authors specifically for the Turkish culture, was used. The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the whole inventory, including five factors: negotiation for meaning strategies, message abandonment strategies, organizing/planning strategies, affective strategies, and compensatory strategies, amounted to 0.79. The inventory was administered to 294 EFL students at the English Language Teaching Department of Mersin University. The study aimed to investigate the differences in the use of oral communication strategies in terms of language proficiency level and gender. It was found that negotiation for meaning and compensatory strategies are the most frequently used, with no statistically significant differences in terms language proficiency. Message abandonment and planning strategies, on the other hand, were the least frequently used strategies, favored mostly by intermediate level students. Moreover, there were significant differences in the use of oral communication strategies in terms of gender. While female students used message abandonment strategies more frequently than males, males used affective strategies more frequently than females.

1 Introduction

Learning a language is learning to communicate, so speaking can be considered as one of the most important components of learning a foreign language. However, acquiring speaking ability can be seen as much more difficult for some students than other skills because there are many factors affecting speaking such as age, motivation or the context in which language is learned (i.e. a second language context or

Ş. Yaman · M. Özcan (✉)

Tarsus Vocational School, Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
e-mail: mehtapkavasoglu@gmail.com

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2015

M. Pawlak and E. Waniek-Klimczak (eds.), *Issues in Teaching, Learning and Testing Speaking in a Second Language*, Second Language Learning and Teaching,

DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-38339-7_9

foreign language context). Developing speaking competence also involves a variety of processes. First of all, there is a need for sufficient linguistic knowledge to maintain the conversation in various contexts. However, apart from the ability to use language correctly (i.e. linguistic competence), students should have other competences, that is, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competences, which are components of communicative competence (Savignon 1983, p. 130). It is believed that learners can develop communicative proficiency by developing the ability to use communication strategies which enable them to compensate for deficiencies in their knowledge of the target language (Bialystok 1990, p. 5). So, it is obvious that students need to be able to use communication strategies to develop speaking skills.

Researchers have studied communication strategies (henceforth CSs) from two perspectives: the *interactional view* and *psycholinguistic view*. Whereas researchers (e.g. Tarone 1980; Canale 1983; Nakatani 2005) who support the interactional view consider CSs as a mutual attempt by participants in a communicative situation to maintain communication, Faerch and Kasper (1983) define CSs in terms of the individual's mental response to a problem rather than as a joint response by two people. Because of the differences in theoretical viewpoints, the taxonomies also vary considerably in different studies. Tarone (1980), adopting the interactional view, divides CSs into *approximation*, *word coinage*, *circumlocution*, *literal translation*, *language switch*, *appeal for assistance*, *mime* and *avoidance*. On the other hand, embracing a psycholinguistic view, Faerch and Kasper (1983) propose two strategies in general for solving a communication problem: *avoidance strategies* and *achievement strategies*. *Avoidance strategies* include *formal reduction strategies* and *functional reduction strategies*. *Achievement strategies*, on the other hand, comprise *compensatory strategies* and *retrieval strategies*. The compensatory strategies of Faerch and Kasper (i.e. code switching, transfer, interlanguage-based strategies, cooperative strategies, and nonlinguistic strategies) show some similarities to some of the devices in Tarone's taxonomy although they are classified from a different perspective. Thus, rather than adhering only to the psycholinguistic or interactional view, two approaches were adopted in the current study. It was assumed that if a person uses non-linguistic strategies, he or she not only tries to overcome limitations in his or her target language knowledge (i.e. psycholinguistic view) but also negotiates for meaning (i.e. interactional view).

Moreover, a number of instruments have been designed in order to identify and categorize the CSs used by students learning English as a second language (ESL). However, the number of the instruments developed for students learning English as a foreign language (EFL) is limited. Although the most commonly used measurement tools are strategy inventories, most of the speaking strategy inventories, such as *Speaking Strategy Checklist* (Cohen et al. 1996) or *Language Strategy Use Survey* (Cohen et al. 2002), suffer from problems connected with the lack of reliability and validity studies. Another problem with speaking strategy inventories is that they represent strategies that the learner could use throughout the language learning process and they are not directly relevant to the skill of speaking. Furthermore, most studies (e.g. Kılıç 2003; Gümüş 2007) focusing on speaking strategies conducted in Turkey are based on inventories used in western countries

and developed for learners learning English as a second language, with no consideration being given to their compatibility with the Turkish culture. The review of the literature concerning the classification of communication strategies also reveals that although they are employed in all languages and cultures, “the particular types of strategy preferred for use in certain situations may be culture specific or language specific” (Tarone 1980, p. 422). As a result, it can be implied that the lack of valid and reliable measurement tools developed for students learning English as a foreign language and the lack of an appropriate classification system for this context cause uncertainty about the results obtained from the available studies.

2 Research on Communication Strategies

Over the last two decades a considerable number of descriptive and empirical studies have been carried out on communication strategies. In order to provide a clear picture of communication strategy research, studies related to the purposes of the current empirical investigation will be presented in the following sections.

2.1 The Relationship Between the Use of Oral Communication Strategies and the Level of Proficiency

The findings of studies dealing with the relationship between oral communication strategy use and English language proficiency vary, making it difficult to draw definitive conclusions. Chen (1990), for example, conducted research aimed to identify the communication strategies used by EFL learners representing different levels and found that the frequency, type and effectiveness of CS use depended upon proficiency. Chen (2009) also conducted a study using the *Oral Communication Strategy Inventory* developed by Nakatani (2006). The results revealed that there were five significant relationships between speaking proficiency and strategy use. On the one hand, positive relationships were found between speaking proficiency and the use of *social affective strategies, fluency-oriented strategies, and negotiation for meaning while speaking strategies*. On the other hand, negative correlations were found between speaking proficiency and the use of *message reduction and alteration strategies and message abandonment strategies*. The results indicated that *social affective strategies, fluency oriented strategies and nonverbal strategies while speaking* were commonly employed by high proficient speakers while low proficient speakers were inclined to use *message reduction and alteration strategies, message abandonment strategies and nonverbal strategies* more frequently. Thus, the findings imply that speaking proficiency is related to the use of oral communication strategies at a certain level. Gökgöz (2008) also investigated whether there is a correlation between reported use of strategies for coping with speaking problems and the speaking grade levels of the students.

She found a difference between high and low proficiency groups. The high oral proficiency group reported more use of *social affective strategies*, *fluency oriented strategies* and *negotiation for meaning strategies*.

2.2 Gender Differences in Strategy Use

Gender differences have been found in many areas of social and cognitive development. Research findings indicate that females show more interest in social activities than males and they are more cooperative. A number of researchers continue to assume female superiority in language learning (e.g. Ehrman and Oxford 1989; Ellis 1994). The results of the study by Ehrman and Oxford (1989, cited in Macaro 2006, p. 321) indicate that females seem to use *cognitive*, *compensation* and *metacognitive strategies* more frequently than males. In Li's study (Li 2010), female university students in Taiwan were reported to apply communication strategies more often than male students. However, some findings reveal that males employ more learning strategies than females (e.g. Wharton 2000). Such findings are important because they show that there might be some differences in the ways females and males learn a foreign language.

In contrast, the results of the study undertaken by Lai (2010) show that Chinese male and female learners tend to use strategies in the same way. Lai claims that this may be because Chinese learners, both males and females, learn English in the same language context. This assumption is supported by Freed (1996, cited in Lai 2010, p. 29), who points out that "if females and males are set in a similar context to fulfill the same communicative task, much similarity will be found in the use of language". Because of the different viewpoints on gender differences, more research in different language contexts is needed to determine whether there exists a difference between male and female students in the use of CSS.

3 Methodology

The present study aims to investigate the use of oral communication strategies by EFL students studying at the English Language Teaching Department of Mersin University with the help of a reliable and valid speaking strategy tool developed for Turkish culture. More specifically, the study seeks to find answers to the following research questions:

1. What are the most common oral communication strategies used by the ELT Department students studying at Mersin University?
2. What are the differences in the use of oral communication strategies in terms of the students' level of proficiency, i.e. intermediate versus advanced?
3. What are the differences in the use of oral communication strategies between male and female students?

3.1 Participants

The study involved 294 (217 female and 77 male) participants, students at the English Language Teaching Department of Mersin University, Turkey. The English language level of the participants was determined as intermediate (independent users) and advanced (proficient users), based on the proficiency levels included in the *Common European framework of reference* (CEFR). In Turkey, students starting to study at the English Language Teaching Department are required to take a placement test including four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). Using the criteria included in the *CEFR*, the students who pass this exam are regarded as proficient users while the students who fail are classified as independent users who are required to study at preparatory class until they become proficient users. For this reason, the participants attending preparatory class were classified as independent users while the participants in freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior years were classified as proficient users.

3.2 Data Collection Tools

After a review of the strategy inventories related to speaking skills, it was concluded that in comparison to other measurement instruments, the *Oral Communication Strategy Inventory* (OCSI) developed by Nakatani (2006) had a clear factor structure and it seemed the least problematic. Thus, the OCSI was trialed in the Turkish context to investigate whether the oral communication strategies it included would also measure Turkish EFL students' speaking strategy use (Yaman and Kavasoğlu 2013a). It was found that changes were required in some of the items that represent each factor. For example, the items classified as *nonverbal strategies* in the original inventory (Nakatani 2006) gave loadings to *negotiation for meaning strategies*, which implied that strategies should be investigated in accordance with the culture they are used in. Therefore, in another study, in order to identify the oral communication strategies used by the students learning English as a foreign language (EFL) in Turkey, the *Strategy Inventory of Oral Communication* (SIOC) was developed by Yaman and Kavasoğlu (2013b). The items included in the inventory were mostly based on the factors obtained in the adapted version of OCSI (2013a). 557 students studying at the English Language Teaching Department of Mersin University participated in the development study. In the analysis of the data, the researchers performed an exploratory factor analysis for all the participants in order to determine the number of strategy factors. Various methods of factor analysis and rotation techniques such as varimax or direct oblimin were employed to obtain the most meaningful interpretation. Besides, in order to ensure the internal consistency of the inventory, reliability analysis was performed. As a result of the study, a valid and reliable 23-itemed self-report strategy inventory was developed. It consists of five factors, that is *negotiation of meaning strategies*, *message abandonment strategies*,

organizing/planning strategies, affective strategies and achievement/compensatory strategies. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient amounted to 0.79, which indicates that the inventory has the requisite psychometric characteristics and can be employed to measure the use of oral communication strategies by EFL learners (see Appendix A).

Since some items in the inventory may at first glance seem to be unrelated to the category they belong to, it is instructive to mention those cases. For example, *negotiation for meaning strategies*, which are related to learners' attempts to maintain their interaction and avoid communication breakdown, include items such as "I notice myself using an expression which fits a rule that I have learnt". Although the item seems to be representative of *accuracy-oriented strategies*, as Nakatani (2006) suggests, it gave loadings to *negotiation for meaning strategies*. The reason why students use grammar structures they are familiar with may be the fact that they want to be understood easily in order to maintain the conversation. Furthermore, *message abandonment strategies* include the item "When I don't know the English word for something, I say the Turkish equivalent of the word", which seems to be unrelated to *message abandonment strategies*. However, it is not surprising that this item gave loadings to *message abandonment strategies* because students may think that they give up their message when they use the first language equivalent of the target word. In previous classifications of CSs, there were different views on the direct use of a first language equivalent, or code-switching. While some taxonomies regarded code-switching as an achievement strategy (e.g. Faerch and Kasper 1983; Dörnyei 1995), Nakatani (2005) included it in the category of reduction strategies (see Appendix B for all the items in each category of the SIOC).

3.3 Data Analysis Methods

In the current study, various data analysis methods were applied with the help of SPSS 11.5 for Windows. In order to determine the most frequently and the least frequently used oral communication strategies, *descriptive statistics* was used. An *independent samples t-test* was conducted in order to compare communication strategy use between intermediate and advanced level students as well as male and female students. When the variances were not equal, the *Mann-Whitney U test*, which is used as a non-parametric equivalent to the independent samples *t-test* was conducted. Besides, in order to find out the differences between different levels in the program (i.e. freshman, sophomore, junior and senior), one-way ANOVA tests were carried out.

3.4 Procedure

First, the participants were guided to respond to each of the strategy descriptions based on a 5-point Likert scale which asked students to report the frequency with which they used particular strategies in speaking in a foreign language. The participants were

expected to respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never or almost never true of me*) to 5 (*always or almost always true of me*). The criteria used for evaluating the degree of strategy use frequency were: low frequency use (1.0–2.49), medium frequency use (2.5–3.49), and high frequency use (3.5–5.0) (see Oxford and Burry-Socky 1995, p. 2).

4 Results and Discussion

The findings will be presented in the order of the research questions and discussed in relation to current literature.

4.1 What Are the Most Common Oral Communication Strategies Used by the ELT Department Students Studying at Mersin University?

In order to identify the oral communication strategies employed by the participants, the means were calculated. This allowed the researchers to determine the most and the least frequent oral communication strategies used by the participants.

As shown in Table 1, *negotiation for meaning* and *compensatory strategies* were those with the highest mean ($M = 4.1$), whereas *message abandonment strategies* manifested the lowest mean ($M = 2.5$). This indicates that the participants display medium to high frequency of use of each of the five categories of communication strategies, with the means ranging between 2.5 and 4.1.

The findings of the current study are consistent with those reported by Chen (2009) because he also found that *message abandonment strategies* are the least frequently used. The study conducted by Mei and Nathalang (2010), which investigated the use of communication strategies by Chinese EFL learners, also supports the finding that *compensation strategies* and *negotiation for meaning* are the most frequently used strategies.

Table 1 Descriptive statistics for oral communication strategy use

Strategy categories	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	S
C1. Negotiation for meaning	294	2.57	5.00	4.1	0.52591
C2. Message abandonment	294	1.00	4.50	2.5	0.78785
C3. Planning/organizing	294	1.20	5.00	3.5	0.69824
C4. Affective	294	1.33	5.00	3.8	0.77000
C5. Compensatory	294	1.50	5.00	4.1	0.54448

1.0–2.4 = low strategy use; 2.5–3.4 = medium strategy use; 3.5–5.0 = high strategy use, see Oxford and Berry-Sock (1995, p. 2)

4.2 What Are the Differences in the Use of Oral Communication Strategies in Terms of the Students' Level of Proficiency?

Since the results of Levene's Test showed that the variances were not equal, the *Mann-Whitney U test* was conducted in order to examine the differences in the use of oral communication strategy use between intermediate and advanced students. The results of the Mann-Whitney *U*-test (see Table 2) indicate that there is a significant difference between intermediate and advanced students in the use of *message abandonment* and *planning/organizing* strategy categories: intermediate level students use *message abandonment* and *planning/organizing* strategies more frequently than advanced level students ($p = 0.000$). However, the analysis also revealed that irrespective of their proficiency, the participants tended to use *compensatory*, *negotiation for meaning* and *affective* strategy category; that is, there is no significant difference between intermediate and advanced level students in the use of these strategies.

The participants of the study were ELT department students who are expected to be teachers of English. Even in preparatory classes, they have intrinsic motivation to speak English when compared to other departments. Therefore, their use of affective strategies is always high. Furthermore, all of the participants have previous experience in using English, so both intermediate and advanced level students know how to compensate for gaps in their lexical knowledge by means of whatever resources are available in order to maintain the conversation. That is why, there are no differences between the two levels in the use of *compensatory strategies* or *affective strategies*.

In contrast to the present study, Nakatani (2006) found that the high oral proficiency group reported more use of *social-affective*, *fluency oriented* and *negotiation for meaning* strategies, which may be related to the fact that the participants of Nakatani's (2006) study were engineering, law and literature students having both low oral proficiency and high oral proficiency. However, the majority of the studies (Nakatani 2006; Chen 2009; Mei and Nathalang 2010) produce similar results

Table 2 The results of the Mann Whitney *U*-test conducted to examine the differences in the use of oral communication strategies between intermediate and advanced level students

Strategy categories	Proficiency group	N	M	S	Z	p
C1. Negotiation meaning	Intermediate	93	4.0358	0.58810	-0.625	0.532
	Advanced	201	4.0980	0.49484		
C2. Message abandonment	Intermediate	93	2.7158	0.88774	-3.931	0.000 ^a
	Advanced	201	2.3338	0.70740		
C3. Planning/organizing	Intermediate	93	3.7379	0.72061	-4.328	0.000 ^a
	Advanced	201	3.3694	0.65743		
C4. Affective	Intermediate	93	3.6667	0.91551	-1.679	0.093
	Advanced	201	3.8656	0.68591		
C5. Compensatory	Intermediate	93	4.0920	0.62416	-0.891	0.373
	Advanced	201	4.0558	0.50467		

^a correlation is significant at $p < 0.05$ level

indicating that low proficiency participants tend to use *message abandonment* strategies more often than high proficient ones. Mei and Nathalang (2010) found that low proficiency participants resorted to *language switch*, which is one of the items in the *message abandonment* strategy category in the current study.

The Mann Whitney *U*-test identified differences in the use of *message abandonment* and *planning/organizing strategies*, but did not allow the researchers to pinpoint the nature of these differences. Thus, in order to find out if there existed differences between years of study (i.e. freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior), one-way ANOVA tests were also carried out. They revealed no significant differences among the classes in terms of *negotiation for meaning* ($p = 0.288$) and *compensatory* strategy use ($p = 0.841$). However, there was a significant difference in the use of *message abandonment* ($p = 0.000$), *planning/organizing* ($p = 0.000$) and *affective strategy* use ($p = 0.047$). Then, posthoc tests (LSD) were carried out for those categories of strategies (i.e. *message abandonment*, *planning/organizing* and *affective strategies*) showing significant differences.

As shown in Table 3, with respect to *message abandonment*, when compared to senior students, preparatory class students use these strategies more frequently than freshman and senior students, with the differences being significant at the 0.002 and 0.000 level. With regard to *planning/organizing*, LSD results revealed no significant difference between preparatory class and freshman students. However, it was found that preparatory classes use *planning/organizing* strategies more frequently when compared to sophomore, junior, and senior students ($p = 0.017$; $p = 0.002$ and $p = 0.000$). As regards *affective strategy* use, when the preparatory class was compared to other classes, there was a significant difference only in the case of senior students ($p = 0.005$) since these students used *affective strategies* more frequently than preparatory class participants.

Table 3 The results of posthoc tests (LSD) used to examine the differences in the use of oral communication strategies between classes

Strategies	(I) Class	(J) Class	Mean difference	S	P
Message abandonment strategies	Preparatory class	Freshman	0.4103 ^a	0.13037	0.002
		Sophomore	0.2066	0.13114	0.116
		Junior	0.2805	0.14285	0.050
		Senior	0.6073 ^a	0.13114	0.000
Planning/organizing strategies	Preparatory class	Freshman	0.1935	0.11418	0.091
		Sophomore	0.2769 ^a	0.11486	0.017
		Junior	0.3916 ^a	0.12511	0.002
		Senior	0.6207 ^a	0.11486	0.000
Affective strategies	Preparatory class	Freshman	-0.2469	0.13046	0.059
		Sophomore	-0.0629	0.13123	0.632
		Junior	-0.0889	0.14294	0.535
		Senior	-0.3711 ^a	0.13123	0.005

^a statistical significance at the 0.001 and 0.005 level

These results imply that after completing the freshman year, students reach an advanced level and they do not need to plan their speech in advance or abandon their messages, which may testify to the fact that the students have expanded their communicative resources. Moreover, the finding that the senior students use *affective strategies* more frequently than preparatory class students may result from the fact that by the time the participants come to the 4th year, they will have had a lot of opportunities for language production and the classes they attend over this time may affect their attitudes towards speaking in English positively. In addition, it may be concluded that although students in preparatory classes may bring negative attitudes related to their previous experiences, they overcome these negative feelings and gain self-confidence in the process of their language education.

4.3 What Are the Differences in the Use of Oral Communication Strategies in Terms of Gender?

In order to explore the differences in oral communication strategy use between female and male students, the researchers used an independent samples *t*-test. The results included in Table 4 show that there is a significant difference between male and female students in the use of *message abandonment strategies* and *affective strategies*. Females use *message abandonment* strategies more frequently than males ($p = 0.023$), whereas males use *affective strategies* more frequently than females ($p = 0.029$).

Such findings stand in contrast to those of most of the studies undertaken to investigate differences in the use of language learning strategies between male and females students. For example, Tercanlioglu (2004) found male superiority for all strategies except for the affective domain in which case there is female superiority. Aslan (2009) also found that males resorted to *affective strategies* less than females,

Table 4 Results of independent samples *t*-tests used to examine the differences in the use of oral communication strategies between males and females

Strategy categories	Gender	N	M	S	t	p
C1. Negotiation for meaning	Female	217	4.0927	0.51391	0.716	0.475
	Male	77	4.0427	0.56173		
C2. Message abandonment	Female	216	2.5192	0.76026	2.280	0.023 ^a
	Male	77	2.2825	0.84229		
C3. Planning/organizing	Female	216	3.5307	0.66641	1.745	0.082
	Male	77	3.3695	0.77307		
C4. Affective	Female	216	3.7468	0.80564	-2.206	0.029 ^a
	Male	77	3.9481	0.63996		
C5. Compensatory	Female	216	4.0673	0.54090	0.032	0.974
	Male	77	4.0649	0.56108		

^a statistical significance at the 0.05 level

but the difference was not significant. Furthermore, while Aydın (2003) found no significant differences between males and females in terms of language learning strategy use, other studies showed significant female superiority in the use of all language learning strategies (Ehrman and Oxford 1989; Ellis 1994). The results indicate that even in the same culture there may be gender differences, which may result from the fact that one's social context and culture shape gender identity, a process that is accompanied by unique individual experiences (cf. Davis and Skilton-Sylvester 2004).

5 Conclusions

The results imply that *negotiation for meaning strategies*, *compensatory strategies* and *affective strategies* can be regarded as effective oral communication strategies which help students overcome communication problems, whereas *message abandonment strategies* and *planning/organizing strategies* can be considered as less useful in dealing with communication difficulties. Thus, in order for students to cope with communication breakdowns and achieve their communicative goals, they should be trained in the use of *negotiation for meaning strategies*, *compensatory strategies* and *affective strategies*.

The differences between intermediate and advanced level EFL students in the use of oral communication strategies indicate that proficiency level is important in the case of *message abandonment strategies* and *planning/organizing strategies*, but it is not so crucial when it comes to *compensatory strategies*, *negotiation for meaning strategies* and *affective strategies*. However, the results cannot be generalized to all EFL students because in the literature there are contradicting results regarding the use of *compensatory strategies*, *negotiation for meaning strategies* and *affective strategies*. The participants of the current study include ELT department students who are expected to have background knowledge and intrinsic motivation to speak. Thus, it can be assumed that this motivation may be related in intricate ways to the proficiency level.

The differences in the use of oral communication strategies by female and male students may indicate that gender is a determining factor in this respect. However, it should not be perceived on its own because there are divergences in the preferences for oral communication strategies by females and males even in the same cultures, which may result from individual differences or the social context. To sum up, the results of the study suggest that apart from proficiency level and gender differences, other variables such as culture, individual differences, background knowledge and motivation should be taken into account in the identification of oral communication strategies.

The study was conducted at the English Language Teaching Department of Mersin University. A follow-up study can be carried out with students who learn English in other settings for different purposes so that comparisons can be made with respect to their motivation. The factors investigated in this study should be

reinvestigated with participants from different settings, bearing in mind other possible factors, with different research methods, so as to be able to better understand the effect of gender and proficiency on the use of communication strategies. Cohen (1998) claims that each investigation method has a unique set of advantages and disadvantages. For example, the findings of the current study are restricted to the perceptions of the students, but strategy use can also change according to the speaking tasks in which students are engaged. For this reason, in future research, specific tasks could be assigned and students' speech could be recorded in order to identify oral communication strategies.

Appendix A

Strategy Inventory of Oral Communication (SIOC)

Items	Never true of me	Generally not true of me	Somewhat true of me	Generally true of me	Always true of me
1. I think of what I want to say in my native language and then construct the english sentence					
2. I leave a message unfinished because of some language difficulty					
3. When I don't know the english word for something, I say the Turkish equivalent of the word					
4. I plan how words will come together in advance					
5. When I can't think of a word that I want to say, I use an alternative word expressing the meaning as closely as possible					
6. I try to remember the words related to the speech topic and context in advance					
7. I pay attention to my rhythm and intonation					
8. I use gestures and facial expressions if I can't communicate how to express myself					

(continued)

(continued)

Items	Never true of me	Generally not true of me	Somewhat true of me	Generally true of me	Always true of me
9. I change the structure of Turkish word or expression in accordance with english structure					
10. I repeat what I want to say until the listener understands					
11. I try to relax when I feel anxious					
12. I try to speak clearly and loudly to make myself heard					
13. I give examples if the listener doesn't understand what I am saying					
14. I don't mind taking risks even though I might make mistakes					
15. I give up when I can't make myself understood					
16. I pay attention to the conversational flow					
17. I actively encourage myself to express what I want to say					
18. I notice myself using an expression which fits a rule that I have learned					
19. I think first of a sentence I already know in english and then try to change it to fit the situation					
20. When I feel incapable of executing my original intent, I try to express myself in a different way					
21. I ask other people to help when I can't communicate well					

(continued)

(continued)

Items	Never true of me	Generally not true of me	Somewhat true of me	Generally true of me	Always true of me
22. I reduce the message and use simple expressions if I feel incapable of expressing myself					
23. While speaking, I pay attention to the listener's reaction to my speech					

Appendix B

The Items of Strategy Categories in SIOC (the Inventory Developed)

C 1: Negotiation for Meaning Strategies

7. I pay attention to my rhythm and intonation.
10. I repeat what I want to say until the listener understands.
12. I try to speak clearly and loudly to make myself heard.
13. I give examples if the listener doesn't understand what I am saying.
16. I pay attention to the conversational flow.
18. I notice myself using an expression which fits a rule that I have learned.
23. While speaking, I pay attention to the listener's reaction to my speech.

C 2: Message Abandonment Strategies

2. I leave a message unfinished because of some language difficulty.
3. When I don't know the English word for something, I say the Turkish equivalent of the word.
15. I give up when I can't make myself understood.
21. I ask other people to help when I can't communicate well.

C 3: Planning/Organizing Strategies

1. I think of what I want to say in my native language and then construct the English sentence.
4. I plan how words will come together in advance.
6. I try to remember the words related to the speech topic and context in advance.
9. I change the structure of Turkish word or expression in accordance with English structure.
19. I think first of a sentence I already know in English and then try to change it to fit the situation.

C 4: Affective Strategies

11. I try to relax when I feel anxious.
14. I don't mind taking risks even though I might make mistakes.
17. I actively encourage myself to express what I want to say.

C 5: Compensatory Strategies

5. When I can't think of a word that I want to say, I use an alternative word which expresses the meaning as closely as possible.
8. I use gestures and facial expressions if I can't communicate how to express myself.
20. When I feel incapable of executing my original intent, I try to express myself in a different way.
22. I reduce the message and use simple expressions if I feel incapable of expressing myself.

References

- Aydın, T. 2003. Language learning strategies used by Turkish high school students learning English. MA thesis, University of İstanbul, İstanbul.
- Aslan, O. 2009. The role of gender and language learning strategies in learning English. MA thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Bialystok, E. 1990. *Communication strategies: Psychological analysis of second language use*. New York: Blackwell.
- Canale, M. 1983. From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In *Language and communication*, eds. J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt, 2–27. Harlow: Longman.
- Chen, S. 1990. A study of communication strategies in interlanguage production by Chinese EFL learners. *Language Learning* 40: 155–187.
- Chen, H. W. 2009. Oral communication strategies used by English major college students in Taiwan. MA thesis, Chaoyang University of Technology, Taichung, Taiwan.
- Cohen, A. D., S. J. Weaver and T. Y. Li. 1996. The impact of strategies-based instruction on speaking a foreign language. *CARLA Working Paper Series* 4. Minneapolis: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Cohen, A. D. 1998. *Strategies in language learning and using a second language*. Essex, England: Longman.
- Cohen, A. D., R. Oxford and J. C. Chi. 2002. *Language Strategy Use Survey*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Davis, K. A. and E. Skilton-Sylvester. 2004. Looking back, taking stock, moving forward: Investigating gender in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly* 38: 381–404.
- Dörnyei, Z. 1995. On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly* 29: 55–85.
- Ehrman, M. E. and R. L. Oxford. 1989. Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *Modern Language Journal* 73: 1–13.
- Ellis, R. 1994. *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Faerch, C. and G. Kasper. 1983. On identifying communication strategies in interlanguage production. In *Strategies in interlanguage communication*, eds. C. Faerch and G. Kasper, 210–238. 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. MA thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Li, R. L. 2010. The relationship between speaking anxiety and speaking strategies among university students in Taiwan. MA thesis, National Ping Tong University of Education, Ping Tong, Taiwan.
- 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. *Modern Language Journal* 90: 320–337.
- Mei, A. and S. Nathalang. 2010. Use of communication strategies by Chinese EFL learners. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics* 33: 110–125.
- Nakatani, Y. 2005. The effects of awareness-raising on oral communication strategy use. *Modern Language Journal* 89: 75–90.
- Nakatani, Y. 2006. Developing oral communication strategy inventory. *Modern Language Journal* 90: 151–168.
- Oxford, R. L. and J. A. Burry-Stock. 1995. Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL). *System* 23: 1–23.
- Savignon, S. J. 1983. *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom competence*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Tarone, E. 1980. Communication strategies, a foreigner talk and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning* 30: 417–431.
- Tercanlioğlu, L. 2004. Exploring gender effect on adult foreign language learning strategies. *Issues in Educational Research* 14: 181–193.
- Yaman, Ş. and M. Kavasoglu. 2013a. The adaptation study of Oral Communication Strategy Inventory into Turkish culture. *International Journal of Human Sciences* 20: 400–419.
- Yaman, Ş. and M. Kavasoglu. 2013b. The development of Strategy Inventory of Oral Communication for Turkish culture. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Wharton, G. 2000. Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning* 50: 203–243.