

121312-10

**A STUDY ON COMPARISON OF
COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES OF
TURKISH EFL LEARNERS AT
DIFFERENT PROFICIENCY LEVELS**

Rengin Özarı
(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)
Eskişehir, 1997

ANADOLU ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MEZUNİYET BÜYÜKLERİ

**A STUDY ON COMPARISON OF COMMUNICATION
STRATEGIES OF TURKISH EFL LEARNERS AT
DIFFERENT PROFICIENCY LEVELS**

**İNGİLİZCE'Yİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK
ÖĞRENEN FARKLI DİL DÜZEYİNDEKİ TÜRK
ÖĞRENCİLERİN İLETİŞİM STRATEJİLERİNİN
KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI**

Rengin Özarı

A Thesis

**Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts
in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language
Advisor: Assoc. Prof. F. Hülya Özcan**

**Eskişehir
Anadolu University
Social Sciences Institute
January 1997**

**ANADOLU ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MERKEZ KÜTÜPHANESİ**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Hülya Özcan for her valuable suggestions and devoting her time to the completion of this thesis.

I would like to thank to Prof. Zülal Balpınar for her suggestions.

I would also offer my special thanks to Assoc. Prof. Handan Kopkallı Yavuz for her suggestions and for assisting me when I needed help.

I would like to thank to Dr. Embiya Ağaoğlu for his suggestions for the statistical analysis for the research.

I would like to thank to my colleague Özlem Ersöz who helped me with the interviews with the students.

I also thank to my friends for their patience and help and to my students who devoted their time and effort during the data collection.

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on the investigation of communication strategies of foreign language learners and particularly on how the types and frequency of communication strategies employed vary according to the level of foreign language proficiency. The study is limited to the comparison of communication strategies at lexical level in oral production.

The study was conducted with 30 subjects; 10 in the elementary, 10 in the pre-intermediate group, and 10 in the upper-intermediate group. 10 abstract and 10 concrete lexical items were selected for the study, and they were included in two different tasks. First task was structured questions and the second task was interview.

The results indicated that learners' communication strategies do not vary in terms of total use. But, when we look at the types of strategies in detail, elementary learners use L1-based strategies more than higher proficiency learners and they use L2-based strategies less than higher proficiency learners. It was also indicated by the results that learners used more L1-based strategies for abstract lexical items and used more L2-based strategies for concrete lexical items and also that the interview task led elementary learners to use more L1-based strategies and higher level learners to use more L2-based strategies than structured questions task.

It was concluded that proficiency level, task types and the nature of the lexical items motivate learners to appeal to different communication strategies.

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, İngilizce öğrenen, başlangıç, ortanın altı ve ortanın üstü olmak üzere farklı dil düzeylerindeki Türk öğrencilerin sözcük bazında sözlü dilde kullandıkları iletişim stratejilerinin, dil düzeyine bağlı olarak, tür ve kullanım sıklığı açısından nasıl farklılıklar gösterdiğini incelemektedir. Çalışma, dil düzeyinin yanısıra, çalışmada kullanılan araçlar ile sözcüklerin soyut-somut olmasının strateji kullanımına etkilerini de ele almaktadır. Bu amaçla, birinci dile ve ikinci dile dayalı stratejiler olmak üzere iki grup iletişim stratejisi seçilmiştir.

Bu çalışmaya, Anadolu Üniversitesi İletişim Bilimleri Hazırlık Bölümü ve birinci sınıfta öğrenim gören toplam 30 öğrenci katılmış, bu öğrencilerden dil düzeylerine göre 10'ar kişilik gruplar oluşturulmuştur.

Çalışmanın yürütülmesi için, 10 soyut, 10 somut, toplam 20 İngilizce sözcük seçilmiş, ve bu sözcükleri kapsayan iki farklı araç hazırlanmıştır. Birincisi, ana dilde hazırlanmış bir metin üzerine, İngilizce yanıtlanması gereken İngilizce sorular, ikincisi ise, deneklerle birebir yapılan İngilizce mülakattır.

Araştırmanın sonucunda, gruplar arasında, toplam strateji kullanımı açısından bir fark ortaya çıkmamıştır. Ancak, sonuçlar, başlangıç düzeyindeki öğrencilerin, birinci dile dayalı stratejileri, üst düzeydeki öğrencilerden daha sık, ikinci dile dayalı stratejileri ise daha az kullandıklarını göstermiştir. Sonuçlar, dil düzeyinin yanısıra, sözcüğün niteliğinin ve araçların da strateji kullanım sıklığı ile strateji türü seçiminde özellikle düşük dil düzeyinde etkili olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır.

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 2.1. A Typology of Communication Strategies	16
Table 2.2. Communication Strategies for Lexical Simplification	17
Table 3.1. Communication Strategy Categories	38
Table 4.1. The Numbers and Percentages of L ₁ -based and L ₂ -based Strategies for All Proficiency Levels	40
Table 4.2. The Numbers and Percentages of L ₁ -based Strategies for All Proficiency Levels	42
Table 4.3. The Numbers and Percentages of L ₂ -based Strategies for All Proficiency Levels	44
Table 4.4. The Numbers and Percentages of L ₁ -based and L ₂ -based Strategies for Abstract and Concrete Lexical Items for All Proficiency Groups	47
Table 4.5. The Numbers and Percentages of L ₁ -based and L ₂ -based Strategies in Task 1 and Task 2 for All Proficiency Groups	55
Table 4.6. The Numbers and Percentages of L ₁ -based and L ₂ -based Strategies for Abstract and Concrete Lexical Items in Task 1 and Task 2 for All Proficiency Groups	63

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	i
ÖZET	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iii
CHAPTER I	
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Purpose and the Scope of the Study	7
1.2. Definition of the Terms	8
CHAPTER II	
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	10
2.1. Definition of Communication Strategies	10
2.2. A Typology of Communication Strategies	16
2.3. The Role of Communication Strategies in Foreign Language Learning	18
2.4. Affective Factors on the Selection of Communication Strategies	22
2.5. Empirical Research on the Relationship between Use of Communication Strategies and Learners' Proficiency Level	23

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER III	
THE METHOD	32
3.1. Subjects	32
3.2. Research Design	33
3.2.1. General Procedures	33
3.2.2. Data Collection	35
3.3. Data Analysis	37
CHAPTER IV	
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	39
4.1. Comparison of Overall Use of Communication	
Strategies	40
4.2. Comparison of L ₁ -based Communication	
Strategies	42
4.3. Comparison of L ₂ -based Communication	
Strategies	43
4.4. Comparison of L ₁ -based and L ₂ -based	
Communication Strategies for Abstract and	
Concrete Lexical Items	45
4.4.1. Comparison of L ₁ -based Communication	
Strategies for Abstract Lexical Items	45
4.4.2. Comparison of L ₁ -based Communication	
Strategies for Concrete Lexical Items	48
4.4.3. Comparison of L ₂ -based Communication	
Strategies for Abstract Lexical Items	50
4.4.4. Comparison of L ₂ -based Communication	
Strategies for Concrete Lexical Items	51

	<u>Page</u>
4.5. Comparison of L ₁ -based and L ₂ -based Communication Strategies in Terms of Different Tasks	53
4.5.1. Comparison of L ₁ -based Communication Strategies in Task 1	53
4.5.2. Comparison of L ₁ -based Communication Strategies in Task 2	56
4.5.3. Comparison of L ₂ -based Communication Strategies in Task 1	57
4.5.4. Comparison of L ₂ -based Communication Strategies in Task 2	59
4.6. Summary	60
4.7. Discussion	64
 CHAPTER V	
CONCLUSION	75
5.1. Conclusion	75
5.2. Suggestions for Further Research	79
 REFERENCES	81
 APPENDICES	86
Appendix A. Story and questions used in the study to elicit abstract lexical items	86
Appendix B. Story and questions used in the study to elicit concrete lexical items	88

Page

Appendix C. A sample transcript of the interview task ...	89
Appendix D. Tables of Scheffe F-tests Showing the Difference across All Proficiency Groups	97

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The developments since the 1960s in terms of knowledge and theories in issues related to the nature of language and language learning have brought a different perception in language teaching in many aspects. It has been recognized that many issues in language teaching can not be understood and evaluated without a clearer understanding of the nature of second and foreign language learning. It has also been recognized that studies in the field of language learning contribute to language teaching (Richards, 1991).

These new perspectives have given a way to new fields of study. With the introduction of cognitive learning theory, error analysis and interlanguage studies have become prominent fields of study as alternatives to Contrastive Analysis, which was a discipline linked to behaviorist learning theory (Corder, 1978; Varadi, 1983; Ellis, 1991b). Error Analysis and Interlanguage studies have primarily focused on how learners' internal processing mechanisms led to particular types of output (Ellis, 1988). In the 1970s, these two fields of study have broadened their scope to include not only the nature and development of linguistic systems of second language, but also the interactional and communicative dynamics of second and foreign language performance (Ellis, 1988; Richards, 1991). That is, learner performance in terms of the

cognitive processes learners employ in reorganizing and/or using the input they have received from the target language has been emphasized. As one of the results of this shift of emphasis on learning processes, language learning and acquisition studies have focused on communicative competence and how competence is developed (Ellis, 1991b).

The concept of communicative competence was introduced by Hymes in the 1960s. Hymes described communicative competence as "what a speaker needs to know to communicate effectively in culturally significant settings" (Rivers, 1983:14). The term communicative competence has evolved as a shift of emphasis, moving away from the language rules; grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation towards the ability to use language (Faerch, Haastrup and Phillipson, 1984). According to Saville and Troike (1982; cited in Wartella and Reeves, 1989):

"Communicative competence involves not only the language code, but also what to say to whom, and how to say it appropriately in any given situation. It deals with the social and cultural knowledge speakers are presumed to have enable them to use and interpret linguistic forms." (Saville-Troike, 1982; cited in Wartella and Reeves, 1989:625)

Gumperz (1984; cited in Ellis and Roberts, 1987) suggests that communicative competence should not be defined in terms of the rules that speakers must use. Instead, it is about developing conditions that enable shared information. Canale and Swain (1980; cited in Canale, 1987) regard communicative competence as the underlying systems of knowledge and skill required for

communication and it refers to both knowledge and skill in using this knowledge when interacting in actual communication. They, therefore, explain the communicative competence as a whole in terms of three types of competence -grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic. In addition to these three types of competence, Canale's framework (1987) for communicative competence includes another competence: discourse competence. Therefore, there are four areas of knowledge and skill to explain communicative competence.

Grammatical competence is related to the knowledge of linguistic structures, i.e., the form of the language (Tarone and Yule, 1989). That is, it is concerned with mastery of the language code (verbal or non-verbal) itself. It concentrates on the knowledge and skill necessary to understand and express the literal meaning of utterances in speech and writing accurately (Canale, 1987).

Discourse competence concerns the mastery of how to combine grammatical forms and meanings to accomplish a unified spoken or written text in different types. Unity of a text is reached through 'cohesion' in form and 'coherence' in meaning (Canale, 1987). Therefore, discourse competence is utilized when to form cohesive and coherent texts is needed (Ellis and Roberts, 1987).

Sociolinguistic competence, which is made up of sociocultural rules, addresses the extent to which utterances are produced and understood 'appropriately' in different sociolinguistic contexts depending on contextual factors such as status of participants.

purposes of interaction, and norms of interaction (Canale, 1987). That is, it allows the language user to choose which form of utterance is considered appropriate within a language community on a particular interactive occasion (Tarone and Yule, 1989).

Strategic competence is mainly related to the ability for an effective use of language (Tarone and Yule, 1989). Strategic competence, which is activated when communication strategies are required, refers to the ability to put one's meaning across to communication partners through strategies when communication problems occur (Faerch, et. al., 1984). Canale (1987: 10ff) maintains that strategic competence is related to the mastery of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action mainly for two reasons:

a. to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to limited conditions in actual communication (e.g. momentary inability to recall an idea or grammatical form) or to insufficient competence in one or more of the other areas of communicative competence,

b. to enhance the effectiveness of communication (e.g. deliberately slow and soft speech for rhetorical effect).

As it is stated by Faerch and et. al. (1984), strategic competence is compensatory relative to the other types of competence. Having strategic competence means that the speaker has a repertoire of communication strategies to compensate when a breakdown in communication exists (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991). Therefore, the learners use strategic competence to resolve not only grammatical and lexical problems, but also problems of

sociolinguistic and discourse nature, thus it compensates for breakdowns or problems in other competencies (Canale, 1980).

Thus the investigation of strategic competence is closely tied to the use of communication strategies. Communication strategies are defined as the mechanisms for compensating for a lack of a linguistic form; vocabulary or grammatical knowledge in communication (Oxford, 1990). Consequently, communication strategies allow language users to organize their utterances as effectively as possible in order to get their messages across to particular listeners (Tarone and Yule, 1989).

Besides, strategic competence is relevant to both native and target languages since communication problems may arise and must be overcome both in the first and second languages (Dörnyei and Thurrell, 1991). Terrel (1977; cited in Canale, 1987) argues that communication strategies and thus strategic competence are universal and picked up in mastering the first language. Although communication strategies are described within a framework of interlanguage, this does not mean that they are used only by learners. There are many situations in which native speakers use communication strategies when a breakdown in communication occurs (Faerch and Kasper, 1984). Similarly, foreign and second language learners employ communication strategies when they experience a problem in communication (Ellis, 1991a). Therefore, strategic competence and communication strategies have a universal aspect and constitute a universal solution to lexical and grammatical problems (Kellerman, Bongaerts, and Poulisse, 1987).

The available research on communicative competence indicate that the study of communication strategies reveals not only learners' psychological processes of the target language during the developmental stages of interlanguage but also their strategic and, thus, communicative competence (Bialystok, 1983; Corrales and Call, 1989). These learner processes refer to both the conscious and the unconscious cognitive behaviors that learners engage in as they learn or acquire a second or foreign language (Richards, 1991). Furthermore, the study of communication strategies leads to the extent to which learners' utterances in the target language are influenced by the native language. Also, the study of communication strategies presents how and how far the target language is simplified and which procedures are used for simplification of the structures and words in the target language (Bialystok, 1983). As a result, investigation of learners' strategies has had a central place in foreign and second language learning since it emphasizes the relationship between the input and the internal processing to reveal how each affects the other (Ellis, 1991b).

Thus, a study on the effect of target language proficiency level on the use of university level students' communication strategies of lexical meaning in oral production would contribute significant results not only to the actual use of communication strategies, but also to the strategic competence of foreign language learners.

1.1. Purpose and the Scope of the Study

In this study, the effect of proficiency level on the type and frequency of the communication strategies will be examined. The aim of this study is to reveal whether proficiency levels of the learners affect the selection of communication strategies at lexical level in oral production, in other words, this study aims to reveal whether there is a relationship between communication strategies and the learners' proficiency level.

In the study, communication strategies which Turkish learners of English at elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate proficiency level use to express lexical meaning in spoken language will be compared.

In order to be able to compare communication strategies of the learners, it is necessary to identify the strategies that they use. As a result, in the study, the question to be answered first is:

1. What type of communication strategies will elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners use?

After each learner group's communication strategies in spoken language will be identified, in order to compare their communication strategies in terms of frequency, following question will be answered in the study:

2. Is there a difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in terms of quantity of communication strategies?

In order to achieve the other purpose of this study, to compare the learners' communication strategies in terms of types of communication strategies, following questions will be answered in the study:

3. Is there a difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in terms of the quantity of communication strategies that are based on the learners' native language (henceforth, L₁-based strategies)?

4. Is there a difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in terms of the quantity of communication strategies that are based on the learners' foreign language (henceforth, L₂-based strategies)?

Communication strategies of the learners will also be identified in terms of the two tasks (structured question task and interview task) that will be used in the study and in terms of the nature of the lexical items (abstract and concrete lexical items) that will be used in the study.

1.2. Definition of the Terms

Communication Strategies: Mechanisms used to solve grammatical or lexical problems and to compensate gaps in the planning or the realization of speech production.

Interlanguage: The system that the learner constructs using the linguistic input to which he has been exposed during the period of learning a foreign or second language.

Communication Strategies Based on the Native Language (L1-based Strategies): Types of communication strategies which are affected by the learner's native language.

Communication Strategies Based on the Foreign Language (L2-based Strategies): Types of communication strategies which are affected by the learner's foreign language.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, communication strategies are defined and the characteristics and nature of communication strategies, are explained. This chapter also reviews the research literature on how proficiency level of the foreign language learners affects their use of communication strategies.

2.1. Definition of Communication Strategies

With the effect of the recent approach to study communication strategies (CS), several definitions to define CS have been offered. For instance, Brown (1987) defines communication strategies as the verbal or non-verbal mechanisms for communicating a meaning when particular linguistic forms are not available to the learner at that point of communication. Oxford (1990) suggests that they are the mechanisms employed to compensate for a lack of vocabulary or of grammatical knowledge. In other words, according to Oxford (1990), they are the strategies that allow learners to use language both in spoken and written expression although they have gaps in their knowledge. Ellis (1991a:179) defines communication strategies as the strategies "used to solve problems which the learner experiences in the planning and execution of speech as a result of inadequate resources."

However, Faerch and Kasper (1984) maintain the idea that communication strategies should not be defined in such a simple way. They indicate that there has been two different ways to define them: psycholinguistic and interactional ways. Faerch and Kasper (1984) define communication strategies in the psycholinguistic way. By 'psycholinguistic', they mean that CS originate in a communication problem as experienced by a language user and form the procedures to solve this problem although the preferred strategy does not need in itself to be psycholinguistic in the strict sense of the term. Faerch and Kasper (1980) explain that learners may attempt to solve problems in foreign language learning through psycholinguistic strategies (adopted when the problem is in hypothesis formation) or behavioral learning strategies (when the problem is in hypothesis testing or in increasing automatization) and CS are the strategies that are used to solve problems in the planning or the realization of speech production. Therefore, they locate CS within underlying cognitive structures. Bialystok and Smith (1985:113) claim that

"The way in which we search for or select words in speech production is determined by certain cognitive structures. If a problem presents itself during that search, then it may be that the process is slowed down, and that additional means for search (strategies) are added, but these must still fit in with our view of how the system operates normally."

Ellis (1991a) adds that CS are components of production procedures that consist of the various strategies used by learners in both planning and monitoring their output. Thus Ellis (1991a)

agrees that CS are handled to solve problems which the learner experiences in the planning and execution of speech as a result of inadequate resources. Faerch and Kasper (1983:212) define communication strategies as "potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal."

This definition reveals the two major criteria of CS that help distinguishing them from other verbal plans; *problem-orientedness* and *potential consciousness*. The first criterion, problem-orientedness, implies that language users confront situations in which they cannot recognize their communication goals through their existing accessible and applicable linguistic repertoire; for example, an appropriate item or rule may not be a part of learner's linguistic knowledge, or it may be difficult to retrieve at that point. In these cases, the learner faces with a communication problem and the solution requires a particular strategic plan (Faerch and Kasper, 1984).

The second criterion, potential consciousness excludes the subset of problem-solving plans to such that can be consciously employed. Existence of consciousness depends on individual and social variables and on the linguistic material and the psychological procedures involved, thus consciousness is not a permanent state. As a result, foreign language learners develop a higher metalingual awareness than those who acquire language as their second language without a formal instruction. The linguistic material also influences the level of consciousness, for instance, lexical items are chosen more consciously than syntactic and

morphological rules. As a result, for these features of consciousness, Faerch and Kasper (1984) hold that CS are 'potentially' conscious.

Faerch and Kasper (1983; 1984) regard CS as a subclass of verbal plans and they suggest that regarding communication strategies as potentially conscious plans allows to account for the characteristics of consciousness. Also, psycholinguistic definition allows one to specify the conditions for an interlanguage item to be a result of a communication strategy: (1) the learner experiences a problem when he desires to communicate a meaning with his available linguistic resources; (2) the learner attempts to solve the problem by setting up a strategic plan that may be conscious or not; (3) he produces the data basing on the plan.

Second definition -interactional- has been offered by Tarone (1980). She defines CS as "mutual attempts of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared" (Tarone, 1980: 419). The meaning structures comprise of both linguistic and sociolinguistic structures. Tarone and Yule (1989:104) list the necessary criteria for CS as follows:

1. A speaker desires to communicate a meaning x to a listener.
2. The speaker believes the linguistic or sociolinguistic structure desired to communicate meaning x is unavailable or is not shared with the listener.
3. The speaker chooses:
 - a. not to attempt to communicate meaning x or

- b. to attempt to alternate means to communicate meaning x.
The speaker stops trying alternatives when it seems clear to the speaker that there is shared meaning.

Tarone (1980) suggests that the criteria above are necessary to define the use of a communication strategy; if any of the criteria does not exist, that would not be a communication strategy. She regards CS as tools that are used in a joint negotiation of the meaning, in situations where both interlocutors attempt to agree on the communicative goal.

When the two definitions; psycholinguistic and interactional, are compared, it could be noticed that 'interactional' definition sees CS as cooperative; i.e., the interlocutors' linguistic codes need a negotiation of the message as intended by one and perceived by the other participant. This means that the learner and his interlocutor are aware of the presence of a communication problem and that they have to solve it cooperatively (Faerch and Kasper, 1983). Furthermore, according to this definition, the central function of CS is the negotiation meaning, hence CS are to bridge the gap between the second language learner's and his interlocutor's linguistic knowledge in communication process (Faerch and Kasper, 1984).

Additionally, Faerch and Kasper (1983; 1984) argue that there are some insufficient aspects of Tarone's definition. First of all, it is difficult to apply to monologue, as in writing, when there is no interlocutor for the second language learners, however, communication problems may appear in monologue as well as in

dialogue. So this definition excludes strategic behavior in other types of communication (e.g. in writing) (Faerch and Kasper, 1984).

Second, the learner may notice before the execution of the plan that his production plan will not operate, then he can construct an alternative plan and this may happen without a signal except a pause. Nevertheless, Tarone's definition considers merely the CS that are marked in performance ignoring covertly marked strategies (Faerch and Kasper, 1984; Ellis, 1991b).

On the other hand, 'psycholinguistic' definition considers that CS are related to the learner and his problems both in speech perception and in the planning and execution of speech production since problems may crop up both in the planning and the execution of speech. According to this definition, the strategy may or may not be cooperative. The learner may have a communication problem and employ a communication strategy without signalling to his interlocutor (Faerch and Kasper, 1983).

As a result, psycholinguistic definition suggests that CS are related to the experience of communicative problems and the solutions they pursue. However, in interactional definition, the negotiation of meaning as a joint effort between the interlocutors is represented as the central function of CS. Hence, these dissimilar definitions have brought forward different typologies of CS (Faerch and Kasper, 1984).

2.2. A Typology of Communication Strategies

Table 2.1 A Typology of Communication Strategies

A. REDUCTION STRATEGIES: Learner attempts to do away the problem; he gives up his original communication goal.

1. Formal reduction strategies
2. Functional reduction strategies

B. ACHIEVEMENT STRATEGIES: They are activated when the learner decides to keep the original communication goal, but he compensates for insufficient means or makes the effort to retrieve the required items.

1. Compensatory Strategies

a. Non-cooperative strategies: These do not call for the assistance of the interlocutor.

i) L1/L3-based strategies

- *code-switching
- *foreignizing
- *literal translation

ii) L2-based strategies

- *substitution
- *paraphrase
- *word coinage
- *restructuring

iii) Non linguistic strategies

b. Co-operative strategies: They involve a joint problem-solving effort by the learner and the interlocutor.

- i) Direct appeal
- ii) Indirect appeal

2. Retrieval strategies: They are used when the learner has a problem locating the required item but decides to preserve rather than use a compensatory strategy.

- a. Waiting
- b. Using semantic field
- c. Using other languages

Ellis (1984, 1991) argues that there are various lists of communication strategies that have been put forward basing on the specific research area. However, the classification above, suggested by Faerch and Kasper (1984), seems to be preferable since it is detailed. Table 2.1 includes all the communication strategies that have been identified. However, as the specific strategies to be investigated in the study are the strategies used for the lexical items, it will be better to limit the general typology of communication strategies. Faerch, et. al., (1984) propose a typology solely for the communication strategies for the lexical items.

Table 2.2 Communication Strategies for Lexical Simplification

A. CS based on the first language (L₁-based strategies): Communication strategies which make use of the learners' native language
1. L₁ Switch: Learner borrows one or more words from his native language and he is aware that it/they are not English.
2. Literal Translation: Learner makes a word for word translation from his native language
3. Foreignizing: Learner tries to make a word in his native language sound a word in the foreign language and thinks now it may be a word in the foreign language
B. CS based on the foreign language (L₂-based strategies): Communication strategies which a learner uses to reach a solution by making creative use of his foreign language knowledge
1. Circumlocution: Learner attempts to describe or define the characteristics or functions of the target lexical item by means of other words in the target language
2. Approximation: Learner uses a target language word which shares semantic features with the target word
3. Word Coinage: Learner creates a new target language word or phrase

2.3. The Role of Communication Strategies in Foreign Language Learning

There are two major points in terms of the relationship between use of communication strategies and foreign language learning. First point is related to the linguistic aspects of language; CS might be considered as intended merely to compensate lexical gaps. However, Oxford (1990) states that CS have a function of making up for an inadequate repertoire of vocabulary as well as grammar. For example, if learners do not know how to express subjunctive form of a verb, they might use a different form to get the message across. Additionally, CS are not the strategies that are employed solely during speech production; they allow learners to produce not only spoken, but also written language (Faerch and Kasper, 1984; Oxford, 1990).

The second point is attached to the debate that whether communication strategies are a subclass of learning strategies and how and how far they contribute to learning. Oxford (1990) regards communication strategies as a subclass of direct learning strategies. However, Bialystok (1983) emphasizes that learning strategies and communication strategies are not the same even though the distinction between the two is uncertain. A characteristic of the learner may result in a learning strategy (i.e. the learner may be heavily using his or her memory), on the other hand, a characteristic of the language may result in a communication strategy (the learner may have to use a communication strategy when he or she is in the need of using a target word unknown to him or her). Learning strategies are the

activities in which the learner may engage for improving target language competence and they are revealed by the learner. However, communication strategies are revealed through linguistic analyses of the learner's interlanguage.

Learning strategies are also the attempts to develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language, thus, for a learning strategy, a purpose is not necessary for the speaker since the motivation of a learning strategy is not to communicate, but to learn a meaning structure of the target language (Tarone, 1980; Tarone and Yule, 1989). Ellis (1991b) states that learning strategies are the means by which the learner processes the second language input to develop his linguistic knowledge. He also adds that the problem which arises as a result of attempts to perform in the second language leads to communication strategies and they are required to meet a strong communicative need. CS are the short-term answer to the problem, but learning strategies provide long-term solutions to the problem. As a result, the distinction between the two can be summarized in the way that "learning strategies used to *expand* the speakers' competence, and communication strategies used to *exploit* it" (Paribakht, 1985:142).

However, both learning strategies and communication strategies have the common characteristic of being problem-oriented (Ellis, 1991b). Furthermore, both are the strategies that result in the application of linguistic rules in a linguistic and/or conversational context where they normally would not apply in the same way (Adjemian, 1976). Also, both strategies may be

accompanied by varying degree of learner control (Bialystok, 1983).

The research on CS has divulged that when learners confront with a communication problem, they may either attempt to solve it by avoiding the problem, or develop a solution by activating their communicative competence (Corrales and Call, 1989). The first choice is defined as the risk-avoiding strategy, 'message adjustment', and the latter is called as the risk-taking strategy, 'resource-expansion' by Corder (1978).

Message adjustment strategies involve measuring one's resources and adjusting the message to his available resource. The learner either refuses further interaction or side-steps certain topics, or opts out in various degrees. That is, these strategies involve either a slight alteration, or reduction of the message along the idea that language learners should say not what they want to, but what they can. Message adjustment strategies hardly result in an enhancement in learning and using them leads learners to feel that what they say sounds simplistic or vague (Corder, 1978; Dörnyei and Thurrell, 1991). However, Tarone (1980), taking the interactional aspect of CS, claims that *all* -even mime or message abandonment- strategies are often to get the interlocutor to help the speaker to find the appropriate structure to say what he wants to say. Therefore, according to Tarone (1980), *in use, all* communication strategies may have a function of promoting learning. It has been stated that although these strategies are of use rather than learning, they can contribute to learning indirectly

by helping the learner to obtain more input and therefore, more practice (Oxford, 1990; Ellis, 1991b).

On the other hand, with the resource-expansion (or achievement) strategies, the learner risks failure and tries to keep the communication, expressing his messages by compensating for his deficiencies (Dörnyei and Thurrell, 1991). They often lead to learning and to develop the learner's interlanguage, for instance, when the learner's strategy of approximation is accepted by his interlocutor, the form is added into the learner's target language repertoire. Thus, these strategies may lead learners to gain more information about what is permissible and appropriate in the new language and those that fail will present an idea about where the limits of target language end (Corder, 1978; Oxford, 1990). Furthermore, in communication, the major aim is to convey the message. Hence, despite the fact that first language based strategies may be less effective as a learning device than second language based strategies, they are still effective in conveying the message (Faerch and Kasper, 1980; 1984).

Risk-taking strategies may result in unacceptable utterances, however, this underlines the principle that one's interlanguage is developed by risk-taking (Corder, 1978). Also, as Holley and King (1975; cited in Corder, 1978) indicate, producing ungrammatical utterances in terms of full native competence will allow the learner to progress like a child by forming hypotheses about the language.

Therefore, CS, particularly risk-taking strategies help learners to keep on using the language and obtaining more practice. In

addition, these strategies enable learners to become more fluent in what they already know. Furthermore, learners who are skilled in such strategies may communicate better than learners who have a larger repertoire of target language words and structures (Oxford, 1990).

2.3. Affective Factors on the Selection of Communication Strategies

Another important point about communication strategies is the selection of the CS. The results of the available research provide evidence for that there are different variables that affect the use of communication strategies. These variables can be summarized as follows:

1. Personality: It is suggested (Tarone, 1977; cited in Ellis 1991) that personality factors may correlate with strategy preference. Corder (1978) supports this by emphasizing that personal preference is a factor determining the strategy type. Brown (1987), for example, states that extrovert and introvert learners might employ different strategies in the learning process. Additionally, Saville-Troike (1988) agrees that different types of learners favor different approaches and that even an individual in one group of a certain type of learner can employ different communication strategies than others.

2. Problem Source: Ellis (1991b) suggests that existing of close cognates in the two languages can affect the choice. Selinker (1992) points that language distance plays a role in the selection of CS. For example, borrowing of a linguistic item may be determined

by the learners' perception of the linguistic distance between his native language and target language. Kellerman, et. al. (1987) suggest that transfer strategy is discouraged if the first and foreign languages are distant typologically. Corder (1978) explains this by stating that if the target language is only distantly related structurally to the native language (e.g., Chinese-English), the learner may choose a recreative strategy, while if the target language is closely related to the native language (e.g., Danish-English), he may prefer a restructuring strategy.

3. Learning Situation: Learners may use different strategies when they are in the classroom environment than they are in a natural environment. Also, different task requirements in the classroom environment can shape the type of the strategies to be selected (Oxford, 1990; Ellis, 1991b).

4. Proficiency Level: Learners' proficiency level seems to be a relevant factor in determining the strategies. Learners prefer different types of strategies at different proficiency levels (Kellerman, et. al., 1987). It is also stated by Corder (1978) that speakers' choice of CS might be related to their target language proficiency.

2.5. Empirical Research on the Relationship between Use of Communication Strategies and Learners' Proficiency Level

The study of communication strategies used by foreign language learners goes back to the works of Selinker (1972; cited in Selinker, 1983). He observed that second language learners produce different speech from the speech of native speakers. These

data were examined for the evidence of strategies that occur during language learning process in an attempt to develop a more comprehensive theory of foreign language learning (Richards, 1991). Basing on the observable output resulting from a learner's production of a target language form, Selinker (1983) hypothesized a separate linguistic system which he calls 'interlanguage'. Interlanguage is the system that the learner constructs using the linguistic input to which he has been exposed (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991). He also reports that there are five cognitive processes which are central to second language learning: (1) language transfer; (2) overgeneralization of target rules; (3) transfer of training; (4) strategies of second language communication. Consequently, CS are one of the processes operating in interlanguage. The term communication strategy is used to refer to an identifiable approach to communicate with a limited target language system. These processes, including communication strategies, form the ways for the learner to internalize the second language system. They are the means through which the learner tries to lessen the learning burden to a manageable degree. Selinker (1972) also states that they can be considered under the general 'simplification' process.

Therefore, the first data for the research on communication strategies came from language learners' utterances in the target language (Adjemian, 1976). Selinker's (1972) work on interlanguage has led to interesting studies of interlanguage strategies from a psycholinguistic perspective (Ellis and Roberts,

1987). After Selinker's studies, empirical research on this field was initiated by Varadi (1973; cited in Ellis, 1991b).

The available research suggests that the focus on the field of communication strategies has shifted from a concern with the definition and description of strategies (see for example, Faerch and Kasper, 1984; Tarone, 1980; Oxford, 1990) to the particular types of strategies that learners adopt to convey meaning in specific contexts (see for example, Corder, 1978; Paribakht, 1985; Poulisse and Schils, 1989; Tarone and Yule, 1989). However, Kellerman, Bongaerts, and Poulisse (1987) suggest that it is important to examine not only the types of strategies used by speakers, but also what it is that motivates their selection of a particular strategy.

Although available research on the use of CS could reveal some significant results, the number of experimental studies that could lead researchers to more substantial conclusions concerning CS use has been small and theoretical aspects of CS have had a greater interest among researchers (Ellis, 1991b). Furthermore, there are some points that have not been dealt with in the studies that concentrated on the actual use of CS by foreign language learners.

Corrales and Call (1989) designed a study to investigate the communication strategies used by two groups -intermediate and advanced- of Spanish-speaking students of an intensive English course to express lexical meaning. The intermediate group consisted of five learners, however, there were twelve learners in the advanced group. The study focused on the variation in use of

communication strategies to express lexical meaning as a function of the learners' target language proficiency level at Time₁, of the type of communication required, and of the learners' target language proficiency level at Time₂. In the study, two types of tasks were used. The first task was a reading passage written in English and 40 of the lexical items that occurred in the text were taken and asked to the subjects. The other task was a simulated conversation and this task included eight different lexical items.

The results of the study showed that the pattern of strategy types used by subjects from Time₁ to Time₂ changed in a straight forward manner. The percentage of transfer strategies decreased overall from Time₁ to Time₂, while the percentage of overgeneralization strategies remained constant. The percentage of task-influenced strategies increased in the intermediate group and decreased in the advanced group, suggesting an interaction between time as an indicator of increased proficiency and baseline proficiency level.

The proportion of instances of overgeneralization strategies used by both proficiency levels was very similar at both Time₁ and Time₂ and across both tasks. Also, results indicated that the mean proportion of task-influenced strategies is higher at Time₂ for the intermediate subjects, but that the reverse is true for the advanced group. This implies an interaction between the level of baseline proficiency and the level of proficiency that resulted from five weeks of intensive ESL study. The interaction of increased proficiency level and baseline proficiency level on the proportion of instances of task-influenced strategies partially confirmed the

prediction that the intermediate group used a greater proportion of task-influenced strategies at Time2 than at Time1 where the reverse was true for the advanced group.

Second, Poulisse and Schils (1989) set up a study to investigate the effect of foreign language learners' proficiency level on compensatory strategies used by the learners to solve lexical problems. The study involved three groups of Dutch learners of English; subjects formed three groups as advanced, intermediate and beginning. However, while the advanced group included university students, other groups included secondary school pupils. That is, there was a difference between subject groups in age.

The subjects were tested individually on three tasks; first task was picture description. In this task, there were 40 pictures of objects. 20 of these lexical items were known to the subjects and 20 of them were unknown. Subjects were shown the pictures and asked to tell the objects. In the second task, subjects listened to five ten-line stories in Dutch and they were asked to retell them in English. Finally, subjects were interviewed on everyday topics such as school, holidays, cooking, and sports. However, the route of the interview was not controlled, therefore, subjects were free to control the topic and this caused the subjects to avoid communication problems. In addition, since there were no particularly selected lexical items for this task, it resulted in difficulties with identification of CS of subjects.

The comparison of intermediate students (Group 1) and beginning students (Groups 2 and 3) in general confirmed the prediction of an inverse relationship between the absolute number of CS used by the subjects and their proficiency level. The advanced students produced fewer superordinate CS than lower level students did.

The results of this study revealed that task effects are much larger than proficiency level effects on the choice of CS. However, the less-proficient subjects produced a higher number of CS than those who were more proficient did. Because the command of foreign language of low level subjects was limited, they had to resort to the L1 more often.

Paribakht (1985) examined the types and frequency of CS used by different proficiency level learners. The subjects in two lower proficiency groups were students at various language schools, colleges and universities. She compared these two groups to the native speaker group that included graduate and undergraduate native speakers of English.

In the study, there were ten abstract and ten concrete lexical items. Concrete items were written on cards in the native language and abstract items were written both in the native and the target language without any context; that is the task was not communicative. Then the subjects were asked to convey these lexical items without using the exact word.

After collecting the data, Paribakht (1985) developed a taxonomy basing on the results. Therefore, conclusions were drawn

upon the CS that were only used by the subjects and other strategies were not analyzed.

The results indicated that there were some qualitative and quantitative differences among the three groups at different proficiency levels. The results of Paribakht's study affirmed that learners use more L2-based strategies than L1-based strategies as their level of proficiency progresses. Besides, the relative frequency of use of strategies differed depending on the proficiency level. She reached the conclusion that learners seem to abandon or adopt certain CS and also change their proportional use of certain strategies as they approach to the target language.

Another study was designed by Si-Qing (1990) to explore the relationship between learners' language proficiency and their strategic competence. The study challenged the hypothesis that high-proficiency learners preferred L2-based communication strategies more than low-proficiency level learners. The study also hypothesized that high-proficiency learners employ fewer CS than do low-proficiency learners; high-proficiency learners are more efficient in the use of CS than are low-proficiency learners.

The study by Si-Qing (1990) was conducted with only twelve subjects who were students of a foreign language course. Subjects were grouped as low and high-proficiency learners, however, their proficiency levels were not clear in fact, i.e. their certain proficiency levels were not determined for the study.

There were twelve concrete and twelve abstract lexical items in the study, and these items were written on cards both in the

native and target languages. The task required each subject to read the items on the cards and to try to convey only four of the items without using the exact word itself.

The results of the study by Si-Qing (1990) indicated that CS employed by the low-proficiency learners greatly outnumber the CS employed by the high-proficiency learners. Additionally, a significant difference between the high-proficiency group and low-proficiency group in their relative frequency of the use of CS appeared. Linguistic-based CS are used more often employed by the high-proficiency learners whereas the knowledge-based CS and repetition CS are used more frequently by the low-proficiency learners.

The study by Bialystok (1983) showed that proficiency level is a quite effective factor on selection of certain strategy. She found that advanced learners used less L1-based strategies than low-proficiency learners even though there was no significant difference between the groups in terms of the quantity of the strategies used.

Faerch, et. al. (1984), basing on Bialystok and Fröhlich's (1980) study, summarize the ways in which strategies are used by learners at different levels of proficiency in the target language:

At lower proficiency levels, learners use more L1 based strategies than L2 based strategies. Additionally, they generally substitute non-linguistic strategies for linguistic strategies.

At intermediate levels, learners make use of a larger repertoire of strategy types. However, they are divided into the categories of 'achievers' and 'reducers' and their selection may be affected by their personality and their experience in the second language classroom.

For the advanced learners, Faerch and et. al. (1984) suggest that it may be expected that they use few strategies, however, it is difficult to find strategies that are clearly marked by strategy markers. This might be because that learners become like native speakers at this level at anticipating problems and at solving them during the normal planning of speech.

The results of the empirical research on the proficiency level factor that affect the selection of CS indicate that there are differences between the CS employed by the learners at different proficiency levels. Low-proficiency learners tend to adopt different strategies (more L1-based CS) than high-proficiency learners do (more L2-based CS). Also, low-proficiency learners seem to use more strategies than high-proficiency learners in terms of quantity. Si-Qing (1990) attempts to explain this by asserting that high-proficiency learners are equipped with more knowledge of the target language and have a richer repertoire, and thus, they appeal less to CS. On the other hand, others have limited resources and, therefore, need to compensate more. Secondly, high-proficiency learners are more able to estimate the limitations of their target language and able to solve communication problems in the planning process and hence use more appropriate and effective CS than low-proficiency learners do.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Subjects

The study aimed to compare the communication strategies in oral production at lexical level used by university students of three different English proficiency levels: elementary, pre-intermediate, and upper-intermediate. Therefore, there were three groups of ten adult subjects in the study. First group (Group 1) included university students at elementary level, who have had an instruction of English as a foreign language in the elementary class of the Preparatory Program. Second group (Group '2) consisted of pre-intermediate level university students. The subjects in the second group were selected among the students in the pre-intermediate class of the Preparatory Program. The subjects in Group 1 and Group 2 were given English Placement Test at the beginning of the first semester and according to their scores on the Placement Test, they were assigned to elementary and pre-intermediate classes of the Preparatory Program. The third group (Group 3) comprised of upper-intermediate university students who had completed the Preparatory Program and who had been attending their first year and taking courses of English as a foreign language at upper-intermediate level. To ensure that subjects in the third group were at upper-intermediate level, they were given Michigan Proficiency Test and the ones who achieved between 55-

70 on the test were considered to be at upper-intermediate level. Hence, the subjects in the first and the second group were selected randomly among the students of Preparation Program of Faculty of Communication, Anadolu University. The subjects in the third group were selected randomly among the first year students of Faculty of Communication, Anadolu University.

Subjects in the elementary group were taking 6 hours of grammar, 4 hours of listening, 5 hours of grammar, 3 hours of speaking, and 2 hours of fun (a course on vocabulary development) in a week during the period this study was carried. Subjects in the pre-intermediate group were taking the same courses as the elementary learners except that they had 5 hours of grammar. Subjects in the upper-intermediate group had completed the Preparatory Program and were first year students. Their exposure to English in their first year program was limited to 2 hours a week.

All of the subjects were monolingual native speakers of Turkish. In all of the groups, there were both female and male students. The average age was 20 for the whole sample.

3.2. Research Design

3.2.1. General Procedures

The study focused on the communication strategies of second language learners of different proficiency levels to express lexical meaning in oral production related to everyday communication. Therefore, in order to elicit these strategies, 20 lexical items, which were likely unknown to the subjects, were used. In order to lower the possibility that subjects might know the lexical items selected

for the study throughout their instruction until the time when the study was conducted, syllabus of each course was checked. There were 10 concrete and 10 abstract concepts which were checked by English native speakers and Turkish professors to make sure that they are universal concepts and that they have the same semantic meanings both in Turkish and in English. Also, all concepts were selected among the words that are directly related to everyday life and communication. Concrete concepts -occupations- would help to obtain information about how they communicate and compensate nouns in English. Beside concrete concepts, abstract concepts -adjectives to describe personality- were included in the experiment to observe better how foreign language learners communicate abstract concepts. Moreover, since abstract concepts have a lack of visual support, they are expected to create linguistic problems during the communication process. Therefore, inclusion of abstract topic would reveal the difference among the communication strategies for lexical meaning in oral production of elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners.

There were two sets of ten lexical items used in the study:

ABSTRACT CONCEPTS

1. unstable
2. cheerful
3. talkative
4. generous
5. truthful
6. conservative
7. stubborn

CONCRETE CONCEPTS

1. vet
2. interior decorator
3. shepherd
4. shop assistant
5. surgeon
6. referee
7. carpenter

- | | |
|-------------|--------------------------|
| 8. greedy | 8. switch-board operator |
| 9. fragile | 9. plumber |
| 10. curious | 10. cook |

In order to ensure that the tasks to be used in the experiment would elicit the target items, a pilot study was conducted. The procedure in the pilot study was almost the same as in the experiment except that a lesser number of lexical items were used and lesser subject participated in the study. The pilot study revealed that there were some lexical items that would create problems with the identification of the strategies since they had similar pronunciation both in the native and target language such as ballerina, guardian. Thus some of the lexical items were changed for the main study. Pilot study also revealed that both two types of tasks were effective in eliciting the target items and communication strategies.

3.3. Data Collection

In order to elicit the lexical items above, two different kinds of tasks for each lexical item categories were used. That is, for abstract and concrete lexical items, totally four tasks were used. The first task was structured questions. In this task, there were two reading passages to be given to the subjects. One of the passages included the target abstract items (cf. Appendix A) and in the other passage, there were target concrete items (cf. Appendix B). Consequently, this task was used for both concrete and abstract items. Each passage was written in Turkish to ensure that the subjects would comprehend the text. Each passage was followed

by questions in English about the content. These questions were designed in a way that the presumed lexical items were able to be elicited (cf. Appendix A and B). That is, the answers of the questions included the selected items. Each subject was asked to read the passage with abstract lexical items first. Then they were asked the questions about the passage they read and required to answer them in English. Second, subjects were given the text including concrete items and asked questions related to the passage. The questions about the texts were asked to the subjects in the same order. During the performance of this task, neither help and nor feedback was provided to the subjects. However, when the subjects had any difficulty about comprehending a question, the question was clarified in English. In addition, the subjects were allowed to go back to the passage when they could not recall the answer.

This task might appear to be related to reading skill and comprehension; not to oral production, however, the texts were written in Turkish not to interfere with comprehension and the subjects had to give the answers orally. Additionally, this task was used in the pilot study beforehand and it was an effective instrument to elicit the students' strategies. Another reason for using a reading passage is to contextualize the lexical items. That is to say, without a text, lexical items would have been presented to the subjects in an isolated way and presenting the lexical items without any context would not have been a communicative task. As a result, this task was used since it was effective both in eliciting the strategies and in making the task communicative.

The second task was an interview. This was an average of 20-minute interview (cf. Appendix C). In this task, each subject was interviewed and during interviews, everyday topics were discussed and these topics focused on both abstract and concrete concepts. These topics were selected in such a way that first abstract, then concrete concepts were involved in the discussion. When the topic is directed to another by the subject, the interviewer controlled the topic and led the discussion to the topic.

As the purpose of the study was to examine communication strategies of second language learners in oral production for daily communication, making use of an interview would be appropriate to the purpose. Besides, this task simulated a real communication exchange since the topics discussed were directly related to daily communication.

Each of the sessions conducted during the application of the tasks was recorded on the tape only and they were not told that they were being recorded; they were not recorded on video since a natural communication atmosphere was targeted and the recording on video might prevent subjects from being natural and using the style they use in everyday communication.

3.3. Data Analysis

First, the tapes were transcribed orthographically. Then the responses of the subjects that were identified as communication strategies were categorized according to the taxonomy shown on Table 3.1 and these categorized strategies were analyzed. Then, using the data, strategies of each group were analyzed and

compared in terms of type and frequency. Communication strategies employed by each group were also compared in terms of abstract and concrete lexical items and tasks. Since there were three groups of learners and one factor at a time in the study, the strategies of each group were analyzed and compared using one-way ANOVA tests.

Table 3.1 Communication Strategy Categories

A. L₁-BASED STRATEGIES	B. L₂-BASED STRATEGIES
1. L ₁ Switch	1. Circumlocution
2. Literal Translation	2. Approximation
3. Foreignizing	3. Word Coinage

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The general aim of this study was to compare the use of communication strategies across different language proficiency levels; namely elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners. In order to achieve this aim, two types of tasks were employed to elicit the communication strategies of the learners. Then learners' strategies were identified and mainly grouped as L1-based strategies (1.L1 switch -in which the learners borrow word(s) from their native language-, 2.Literal Translation -in which learners make a word for word translation from their native language-, 3.Foreignizing -in which learners apply target language phonology to a native language word) and L2-based strategies (1.Circumlocution -in which learners describe or define the characteristics or functions of the target word, 2.Approximation -in which learners use a synonym or a target language word sharing the semantic features with the target word, 3.Word Coinage -in which learners create a new target language word or phrase). To see if there is any difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups, the data were analyzed statistically using one-way Analysis of Variance test (ANOVA). When there was a difference, Scheffe F-test was used to reveal at what level the difference takes place (see Appendix D). For all statistical analysis, 95% significance level was used.

4.1. Comparison of Overall Use of Communication Strategies

In order to investigate the difference between communication strategies of three learner groups, learners' strategies were grouped as L1-based and L2-based strategies first.

The distribution of L1-based and L2-based communication strategies of elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups is summarized in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 The Numbers and Percentages of L1-based and L2-based Communication Strategies for All proficiency Levels

	Group 1 Elementary (n=10)		Group 2 Pre-intermediate (n=10)		Group 3 Upper- intermediate (n=10)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
L1-based strategies	120	26.55	39	8.98	18	4.41
L2-based strategies	332	73.45	395	91.02	390	95.59
Total	452	100.00	434	100.00	421	100.00

As presented in Table 4.1, elementary group learners use 452 communication strategies, pre-intermediate learners use 434 strategies, and upper-intermediate learners use 421 strategies in the tasks. The total use of communication strategies displays a slight decrease as the proficiency level of the groups becomes higher. That is, lower proficiency level learners use more strategies than higher proficiency level learners. In other words, the total number of the communication strategies of elementary group is higher than the other two groups and similarly the total number of pre-

intermediate group's strategies is higher than upper-intermediate group's. However, statistical analysis indicated that the difference between three groups in total use of communication strategies is not significant ($F=1.846$, $p=.177$). As a result, total use of strategies does not vary significantly depending on the proficiency level of the groups.

When we look at the distribution of use of L1-based and L2-based strategies (Table 4.1), we see that the percentages of L1-based strategies show a change between groups. Elementary learners use more L1-based strategies than pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups. The percentage is 26.55% for elementary group, 8.98% for pre-intermediate group, and 4.41% for upper-intermediate group. These percentages show a decrease with the increasing proficiency level. Statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant difference between the three groups' L1-based strategies ($F=20.742$, $p=.001$). And this significant difference takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate levels. After this level, the proficiency level does not affect the use of L1-based strategies.

Unlike L1-based strategies, L2-based strategies show an increase as the proficiency level of the groups becomes higher. Elementary level learners use L2-based strategies 73.45% of the time and this percentage is 91.02% for pre-intermediate learners and 95.59% for upper-intermediate learners. Statistical analysis indicated that there is a significant difference across three groups in terms of use of L2-based strategies ($F=3.926$, $p=.031$). Yet the difference takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate

learner groups, and after this level, learners' proficiency level does not influence the use of L2-based strategies.

4.2. Comparison of L₁-based Communication Strategies

The distribution of the L₁-based communication strategies of elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners is summarized in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 The Numbers and Percentages of L₁-based Strategies for All Proficiency Levels

	Group 1 Elementary (n=10)		Group 2 Pre-intermediate (n=10)		Group 3 Upper- intermediate (n=10)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
L ₁ Switch	103	85.83	16	41.03	8	44.44
Literal Translation	14	11.67	20	51.28	10	55.56
Foreignizing	3	2.50	3	7.69	0	00.00
Total	120	100.00	39	100.00	18	100.00

When the frequency of L₁ switch strategy is compared between three groups, it is clear that elementary group uses more L₁ switch strategy than the other two groups. Yet the percentages of L₁ switch strategy for pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups are close. The percentage is 85.83 for elementary group, 41.03% for pre-intermediate group, and 44.44% for upper-intermediate group. Statistical analysis on the difference across three proficiency learner groups in terms of frequency of L₁ switch

strategy confirmed that there is a significant difference ($F=20.933$, $p=.001$). And this difference takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate groups.

The frequency of Literal Translation strategy is 11.67% for elementary group, and elementary group uses Literal Translation strategy less than pre-intermediate group (51.28%) and upper-intermediate group (55.56%). When we look at whether there is a significant difference among these three proficiency level groups in terms of Literal Translation strategy, we see that the difference between three groups is not statistically significant ($F=1.439$, $p=.254$). As a result, elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learner groups do not show any difference in terms use of Literal Translation strategy.

The percentages of Foreignizing strategy used' by elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learner groups indicate that it is the least preferred strategy and it is not used by upper-intermediate group at all (2.50% for elementary, 7.69% for pre-intermediate and 00.00% for upper-intermediate group). When the results of Foreignizing strategy were analyzed statistically, it was seen that there is no significant difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learner groups in terms of use of Foreignizing strategy ($F=1.105$, $p=.345$).

4.3. Comparison of L2-based Communication Strategies

The distribution of L2-based communication strategies of elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups is summarized in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 The Numbers and Percentages of L2-based Strategies for All Proficiency Levels

	Group 1 Elementary (n=10)		Group 2 Pre-intermediate (n=10)		Group 3 Upper- intermediate (n=10)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Circumlocution	158	47.59	221	55.95	231	59.23
Approximation	93	27.71	91	23.04	79	20.26
Word Coinage	82	24.70	83	21.01	80	20.51
Total	332	100.00	395	100.00	390	100.00

When we compare the types of L2-based strategies, we see that (Table 4.3) the percentage of Circumlocution strategy shows an increase with the increasing proficiency level and this type of strategy is the most frequently used strategy type in all three proficiency level groups; percentages are 47.59% for elementary, 55.95% for pre-intermediate, and 59.23% for upper-intermediate group. Use of this strategy by elementary group is less frequent than pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups. Statistical analysis indicated that there is a significant difference across groups ($F=3.449$, $p=.046$). And this difference takes place between elementary and upper-intermediate groups.

Approximation strategy is the second most frequently used strategy for elementary and pre-intermediate groups (27.71% and 23.04% respectively) and the least frequently used strategy by upper-intermediate group (20.26%). The percentages of Approximation strategy do not present a great variation by the

proficiency level of the groups. As it was confirmed by statistical analysis, there is no significant difference across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in terms of frequency of Approximation strategy ($F=.485, p=.621$).

The frequency of Word Coinage strategy is almost the same across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learner groups (24.70% for elementary group, 21.01% for pre-intermediate and 20.51% for upper-intermediate group). That is, the frequency of this type of strategy, like Approximation strategy, does not vary as the proficiency level of the groups changes. Statistical analysis revealed that the difference across three groups is not significant ($F=.026, p=.973$).

4.4. Comparison of L1-based and L2-based Communication Strategies for Abstract and Concrete Lexical Items

In this section, we look at the distribution of L1-based and L2-based communication strategies across proficiency levels in terms of abstract and concrete lexical items.

4.4.1. Comparison of L1-based Communication Strategies for Abstract Lexical Items

The percentages of L1-based communication strategies used to express abstract lexical items vary among three learner groups; (Table 4.4). The percentages for three groups increase by proficiency level (54.15% for elementary, 56.41% for pre-intermediate and 66.66% for upper-intermediate group). Statistical analysis indicated that there is a significant difference across three

groups in terms of L1-based communication strategies employed to express abstract lexical items ($F=12.653$, $p=.001$). And this difference takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate groups; that is, learners do not show any difference after pre-intermediate level.

Elementary level learners mostly use L1 switch strategy among L1-based communication strategies to express abstract lexical items (Table 4.4). The percentage of L1 switch strategy of elementary group, which is 44.16%, is higher than pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups; 25.64% for pre-intermediate and 27.78% for upper-intermediate group. When we compare the use of L1 switch strategy by different proficiency levels statistically, we see that there is a significant difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learner groups. ($F=11.854$, $p=.002$). This difference takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate learners and after this level, proficiency level of the learners does not affect the use of L1 switch strategy.

The percentages of Literal Translation strategy differ across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups; 8.33% for elementary, 25.64% for pre-intermediate, and 38.88% for upper-intermediate group. These percentages show an increase with the increasing proficiency level. Statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in terms of use of Literal Translation strategy for abstract lexical items ($F=.474$, $p=.627$). Thus use of this strategy is not affected by proficiency level.

Table 4.4 The Numbers and Percentages of L1-based and L2-based Strategies for Abstract and Concrete Lexical Items for All Proficiency Groups

	GROUP 1 (ELEMENTARY)			GROUP 2 (PRE-INTERMEDIATE)			GROUP 3 (UPPER-INTERMEDIATE)											
	CS Used for		Total	CS Used for		Total	CS Used for		Total									
	Abstract Items	Concrete Items		Abstract Items	Concrete Items		Abstract Items	Concrete Items										
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%								
L1-based Strategies	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%								
L1-Switch	53	44.16	50	41.68	103	85.84	10	25.64	6	15.39	16	41.03	5	27.78	3	16.67	8	44.45
Literal Translation	10	8.33	4	3.34	14	11.67	10	25.64	10	25.64	20	51.28	7	38.88	3	16.67	10	55.55
Foreignizing	2	1.66	1	0.83	3	2.49	2	5.13	1	2.56	3	7.69	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00
TOTAL	65	54.15	55	45.85	120	100.00	22	56.41	17	43.59	39	100.00	12	66.66	6	33.34	18	100.00
L2-based Strategies																		
Circumlocution	75	22.59	83	25.00	158	47.59	132	33.42	89	22.53	221	55.95	121	31.02	110	28.21	231	59.23
Approximation	53	15.96	39	11.75	92	27.71	62	15.70	29	7.34	91	23.04	51	13.08	28	7.18	79	20.26
Word Coinage	26	7.83	56	16.87	82	24.70	11	2.78	72	18.23	84	21.01	24	6.15	56	14.36	80	20.51
TOTAL	154	46.38	178	53.62	332	100.00	206	51.90	190	48.10	395	100.00	196	50.25	194	49.75	390	100.00

Foreignizing strategy is the least preferred strategy type among L1-based strategies across three proficiency groups (1.66%, 5.13%, and 00.00% respectively). Furthermore, upper-intermediate learners do not use any Foreignizing strategy for abstract lexical items. Statistical analysis indicated that there is no significant difference among elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learner groups ($F=1.125$, $p=.339$). Hence proficiency level does not influence the use of this strategy.

4.4.2. Comparison of L1-based Communication Strategies for Concrete Lexical Items

As it is presented on Table 4.4, the percentage of L1-based communication strategies used for concrete lexical items of each learner group shows a decrease by the rate of proficiency level (45.85%, 43.59%, and 33.34% respectively). Statistical analysis also indicated that there is a significant difference across three groups in use of L1-based communication strategies employed to express concrete lexical items ($F=12.653$; $p=.001$). And this difference takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate levels.

As presented on Table 4.4, L1 switch strategy is the most frequently used strategy in elementary group. It is used 41.68% of the time. The preference of this strategy changes according to the proficiency levels of the learners. Pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners use L1-based strategies less than the elementary group. The frequency of this type of strategy is 15.39% for pre-intermediate and 16.67% for upper-intermediate group.

These percentages show a decrease in the use of L1-based strategies from elementary to pre-intermediate levels. Upper-intermediate group uses this type of strategy slightly more than pre-intermediate group. The change is statistically significant ($F=25.091, p=.001$). The difference takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate groups and after this level, use of this strategy type is not affected by proficiency level.

The percentage of Literal Translation strategy presents a difference across the groups. Yet this difference is not consistent in relation to the proficiency level. Elementary group uses this strategy only 3.34% of the time. This ratio increases up to 25.64% for intermediate group and with the increasing proficiency level, it decreases again down to 16.67% for upper-intermediate group. It was revealed by statistical analysis that there is not any significant difference across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in terms of employing Literal Translation strategy for conveying concrete lexical items ($F=2.345, p=.115$).

Frequency of Foreignizing strategy, which is the least used L1-based strategy type by three groups, does not show a noteworthy difference between three groups and upper-intermediate learners do not prefer it at all. It is used 0.83% of the time by elementary group, 2.56% by pre-intermediate group and 00.00% by upper-intermediate group. Therefore, there is no statistically significant difference across three learner groups in terms of the frequency of Foreignizing strategy for communicating concrete lexical items ($F=1.08, p=.353$).

4.4.3. Comparison of L2-based Communication Strategies for Abstract Lexical Items

As it is illustrated on Table 4.4, the total use of L2-based strategies displays a change between groups. Elementary learners use L2-based strategies less than the other two groups; 46.38% of the time by elementary, 51.90% by pre-intermediate, and 50.25% by upper-intermediate group. Moreover, the percentage of L2-based strategies is the highest in the pre-intermediate group. Across three groups, there is a significant difference and this difference takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate groups in the use of L1-based strategies to express abstract lexical items ($F=6.572, p=.004$).

In terms of L2-based strategies for abstract lexical items, all the groups show the same tendency. That is, the most frequent L2-based strategy type is Circumlocution strategy for all groups (22.59%, 33.42%, and 31.02% respectively). These percentages show an increase in the use of Circumlocution strategy with the increasing proficiency level up to pre-intermediate level and once again the percentage of this strategy, although slightly, decreases with the upper-intermediate level. Statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant difference across three groups ($F=6.126, p=.006$). And this difference takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate group and after pre-intermediate level, proficiency level does not affect the use of Circumlocution strategy .

Frequency of Approximation strategy does not vary notably by proficiency level of the groups. Elementary learners use

Approximation strategy 15.96%, pre-intermediate learners 15.70%, and upper-intermediate learners 13.08% of the time. Elementary and pre-intermediate groups use this strategy at the same level and this ratio shows a slight decrease with the upper-intermediate learners. The use of this strategy type does not change according to the proficiency level. Statistically, there is no difference across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups ($F=.481, p=.623$).

When we look at the use of Word Coinage strategy, we see that it is the least frequently used L2-based strategy type by all the three groups. The frequency of this strategy is 7.83% for elementary, 2.78% for pre-intermediate, and 6.15% for upper-intermediate group. These percentages show a decrease with the pre-intermediate group and an increase with upper-intermediate group. And there is no statistically significant difference across elementary pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups ($F=.1911, p=.167$).

4.4.4. Comparison of L2-based Communication Strategies for Concrete Lexical Items

As it is illustrated on Table 4.4, the percentage of L2-based communication strategies used for concrete lexical items is 53.62% for elementary group, 48.10% for pre-intermediate group, and 49.75% for upper-intermediate group. Statistical analysis showed that there is no significant difference across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in terms of use of L2-based strategies ($F=.731, p=.490$).

Circumlocution strategy is the mostly preferred type of L2-based strategy in all groups. It is used 25.00% of the time by elementary group, 22.53% of the time by pre-intermediate group, and 28.21% of the time by upper-intermediate group. Although the preference of this strategy changes by the rate of proficiency level, this change is not consistent with the increasing proficiency level. This change is not statistically significant across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups ($F=1.36$, $p=.273$).

Approximation strategy is used 11.75% of the time by elementary group. This percentage shows a decrease with the increasing proficiency level; pre-intermediate learners use Approximation strategy 7.34% of the time and upper-intermediate learners use 7.18% of the time. But the difference across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups is not statistically significant ($F=.881$, $p=.426$).

Word Coinage strategy is used 16.87% of the time by elementary group, 18.23% of the time by pre-intermediate group and 14.36% of the time by upper-intermediate group. These percentages show a slight increase at pre-intermediate level, but decreases with the upper-intermediate proficiency level. Statistical analysis indicated that there is no significant difference across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in terms of use of Word Coinage strategy to convey concrete lexical items ($F=.975$, $p=.390$).

4.5. Comparison of L1-based and L2-based Communication Strategies in Terms of Different Tasks

In this section, we look at the distribution of L1-based and L2-based communication strategies of elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in Task 1 and Task 2. The distribution of L1-based and L2-based strategies in tasks is summarized in Table 4.5.

4.5.1. Comparison of L1-based Communication Strategies in Task 1

As it is presented on Table 4.5, the percentage of L1-based communication strategies used in Task 1 -which was structured questions; answering questions related to a text- shows a slight increase with the increasing proficiency level. Elementary learners use L1-based strategies 45.83% of the time, pre-intermediate learners use 46.15% of the time and upper-intermediate learners use 55.56% of the time. Statistical analysis indicated that there is a significant difference across three groups. This difference takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate groups ($F=16.71$, $p=.001$). After pre-intermediate level, there is no change in the use of L1 switch strategy.

The distribution of each L1-based strategy type for elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in Task 1 is illustrated on Table 4.5. L1 switch strategy is used most frequently by elementary group (39.17%). Pre-intermediate group uses this strategy 17.95%, and upper intermediate group 27.78% of

the time. The statistically significant difference takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate groups and the use of L1 switch strategy is not influenced by proficiency level after pre-intermediate level ($F=15.55$, $p=.001$)

The frequency of Literal Translation strategy shows a variation between three groups (5.00% for elementary group, 23.07% for pre-intermediate and 27.78% for upper-intermediate group). There is a considerable increase in terms of percentages of this strategy between the elementary and the higher proficiency levels. Statistical analysis indicated that the difference between three groups is not significant ($F=1.37$, $p=.271$). That is to say, there is no significant difference across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in terms of use of Literal Translation strategy .

Frequency of Foreignizing strategy, which is the least preferred strategy type among all strategy types, shows neither a decrease nor an increase by the rate of proficiency level (1.66% for elementary group, 2.53% for pre-intermediate group, and 00.00% for upper-intermediate group). Therefore, there is no significant difference across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in terms of the use of Foreignizing strategy ($F=.692$, $p=.509$).

Table 4.5 The Numbers and Percentages of L1-based and L2-based Strategies in Task 1 and Task 2 for All Proficiency Groups

	GROUP 1 (ELEMENTARY)						GROUP 2 (PRE-INTERMEDIATE)						GROUP 3 (UPPER-INTERMEDIATE)					
	Task 1		Task 2		Total		Task 1		Task 2		Total		Task 1		Task 2		Total	
L1-based Strategies	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
L1-Switch	47	39.17	56	46.67	103	85.84	7	17.95	9	23.08 ^F	16	41.03	5	27.78	3	16.66	8	44.44
Literal Translation	6	5.00	8	6.67	14	11.67	9	23.07	11	28.21	20	51.28	5	27.78	5	27.78	10	55.56
Foreignizing	2	1.66	1	0.83	3	2.49	2	5.13	1	2.56	3	7.69	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00
TOTAL	55	45.83	65	54.17	120	100.00	18	46.15	21	53.85	39	100.00	10	55.56	8	44.44	18	100.00
L2-based Strategies																		
Circumlocution	83	25.00	75	22.59	158	47.59	120	30.38	101	25.57	221	55.95	120	30.77	111	28.46	231	59.23
Approximation	45	13.55	47	14.16	92	27.71	36	9.11	55	13.92	91	23.04	38	9.74	41	10.52	79	20.26
Word Coinage	38	11.45	44	13.25	82	24.70	33	8.36	50	12.66	83	21.01	38	9.74	42	10.77	80	20.51
TOTAL	166	50.00	166	50.00	332	100.00	189	47.85	206	52.15	395	100.00	196	50.25	194	49.75	390	100.00

4.5.2. Comparison of L1-based Communication Strategies in Task 2

Table 4.5 summarizes the distribution of L1-based strategies on Task 2 in which learners were interviewed for about 20 minutes- for elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups.

We first compare the distribution of L1-based communication strategies across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners. Elementary learners use L1-based strategies 54.17% of the time, pre-intermediate learners use 53.85% of the time and upper-intermediate learners use 44.44% of the time. These percentages of L1-based strategies in Task 2 decrease by proficiency level as they do in Task 1. This change is also statistically significant ($F= 12.485$, $p=.001$). But this difference takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate group and after pre-intermediate level, there is no change in the use of L1-based strategies in Task 2.

L1 switch strategy is mostly used by elementary group in Task 2 (46.67%). Use of this strategy changes according to the proficiency level of the learner groups; pre intermediate and upper-intermediate learners use less L1 switch strategy than elementary learners (23.08% and 16.66% respectively). Thus the frequency of this strategy shows a decrease by proficiency level. This change is statistically significant ($F=12.008$, $p=.002$). Yet this difference takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate groups, and proficiency level is not effective after pre-intermediate level.

The percentage for Literal Translation strategy shows an increase as the proficiency level becomes higher: 6.67% for elementary group, 28.21% for pre-intermediate group and 27.78% for upper-intermediate group. However, in use of Literal Translation strategy in Task 2, there is no statistically significant difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups ($F=1.279, p=.294$).

The percentage for Foreignizing strategy, the least preferred L1-based strategy type, does not differ among elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learner groups and additionally, upper-intermediate group makes no use of Foreignizing strategy at all. The percentages for three groups are 0.83%, 2.56%, and 00.00% respectively. The difference across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups is not statistically significant ($F=1, p=.381$).

4.5.3. Comparison of L2-based Communication Strategies in Task 1

The distribution of L2-based strategies in Task 1 is summarized on Table 4.5. The percentage of L2-based strategies of elementary learners is 50.00%. The percentage does not show a considerable change with the increasing proficiency level; pre-intermediate learners use L2-based strategies 47.85% of the time and upper-intermediate learners use 50.25% of the time. The difference across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups is not statistically significant ($F=2.012, p=.153$).

The frequency of the most frequent L2-based strategy type, Circumlocution, changes across three groups. Elementary learners use this type of strategy 25.00% of the time. Pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners prefer Circumlocution strategy more than elementary learners do (30.38% for pre-intermediate learners, and 30.77% for upper-intermediate learners). These percentages show an increase in the use of Circumlocution strategy by the rate of proficiency level. Statistically, there is a significant difference across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups ($F=4.966$, $p=.014$). And the difference takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate groups.

The frequency of Approximation strategy is 13.55% for elementary group. This frequency shows a decrease as the proficiency level of the learners increases. The frequency of use of this strategy is the same for pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups (9.11% and 9.74% respectively). However, statistical analysis indicated that there is no significant difference across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups ($F=.812$, $p=.454$).

When we look at the frequency of Word Coinage strategy, we see that there is a slight decrease in terms of percentages at pre-intermediate level and then a slight increase with the upper-intermediate level. The frequency of this type of strategy is 11.45% for elementary group, 8.36% for pre-intermediate group and 9.74% for upper-intermediate group. However, this change is not statistically significant, that is, there is no significant difference

across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in terms of use of Word Coinage strategy ($F=.545$, $p=.586$).

4.5.4. Comparison of L2-based Communication Strategies in Task 2

Table 4.5. illustrates the distribution of L2-based communication strategies for elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in Task 2. The percentage is 50.00% for elementary group, 52.15% for pre-intermediate group and 49.75% for upper-intermediate group, and these percentages do not show a change with the increasing proficiency level. However, statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant difference across three groups ($F=4.994$, $p=.014$). But this change only takes place between elementary and pre-intermediate groups.

The frequency of Circumlocution strategy is 22.59% for elementary learners, 25.57% for pre-intermediate learners, and 28.46% for upper-intermediate learners. These percentages show a decrease by the proficiency level of the learners. But statistical analysis indicated that there is no significant difference across elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups ($F=1.711$, $p=.199$).

As illustrated on Table 4.5, the frequency of Approximation strategy decreases according to the proficiency level of the groups. The percentage is 14.16% for elementary group, 13.92% for pre-intermediate group, and 10.52% for upper-intermediate group. But the comparison of these results did not indicate a statistically

The interview task (Task 2) shows a similar variation: more strategies are used in the interview task for abstract lexical items than in the interview task for concrete lexical items. For elementary group, total amount of L2-based strategy use for abstract items is the same on both tasks, although when the structured questions (Task 1) and interview tasks (Task 2) are compared individually on each type of strategy, there are slight differences between structured question task (Task 1) and interview task (Task 2). The total numbers and percentages for concrete items do not differ between the structured questions and interview tasks. However, as it is for abstract items, the use of types of L2-based strategies in the structured question task and in the interview task shows a slight difference. In addition, as it is presented in Table 4.6 elementary group prefers more L2-based strategies for concrete lexical items than for abstract lexical items both in the structured questions and interview tasks.

Pre-intermediate group uses more L1-based strategies in the interview task (Task 2) than in the structured questions task (Task 1) not only for abstract items, but also for concrete lexical items. However, this difference is not considerable. When the tasks are compared across types of lexical items, it is clear that L1-based strategy use in the structured questions task (Task 1) for abstract lexical items is more than for concrete lexical items and likewise strategy use in the interview task (Task 2) for abstract items is more than for concrete items.

For abstract lexical items, pre-intermediate group employs more L2-based strategies in the interview task (Task 2) than in the

structured questions task (Task 1) and this is because that pre-intermediate learners use more Approximation strategy. For concrete lexical items, this difference is smaller. Comparison of the structured questions task (Task 1) across lexical item categories, namely abstract and concrete, shows that the difference is slight. On the other hand, strategy use on the interview task (Task 2) differs; L2-based strategy use in the interview task for abstract items is more frequent than for concrete items.

As it is illustrated on Table 4.6, upper-intermediate group employs a small number of L1-based strategies. This group uses more strategies in the structured questions task (Task 1) than in the interview task (Task 2) for abstract items, but they use L1-based strategies for concrete lexical items at the same frequency on both tasks. Upper-intermediate learners, although they use different amount of types of L2-based strategies for abstract items, use strategies in the structured questions (Task 1) and interview tasks (Task 2) at the similar quantity similar in total, except a very slight difference. For concrete items, they employ slightly more strategies in the structured questions task than in the interview task. Moreover, they use more L2-based strategies for concrete items than for abstract items in the structured questions task (Task 1), but in the interview task (Task 2), they use L2-based strategies more for abstract items than for concrete items.

Table 4.6 The Numbers and Percentages of L₁-based and L₂-based Strategies for Abstract and Concrete Lexical Items in Task 1 and Task 2 for All Proficiency Groups

	GROUP 1 (ELEMENTARY)				GROUP 2 (PRE-INTERMEDIATE)				GROUP 3 (UPPER-INTERMEDIATE)															
	CS used for Abstract Items		CS used for Concrete Items		CS used for Abstract Items		CS used for Concrete Items		CS used for Abstract Items		CS used for Concrete Items													
	Task 1	Task 2	Task 1	Task 2	Task 1	Task 2	Task 1	Task 2	Task 1	Task 2	Task 1	Task 2												
L1-based Strategies	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%										
L1 Switch	25	20.83	28	23.33	22	18.34	28	23.33	4	10.26	6	15.39	3	7.69	3	7.69	3	16.67	2	11.11	2	11.11	5	5.56
Literal Translation	4	3.34	6	5.00	2	1.67	2	1.67	5	12.82	5	12.82	4	10.25	6	15.39	4	22.22	3	16.65	1	5.56	2	11.11
Foreignizing	1	0.83	1	0.83	1	0.83	0	00.00	1	2.57	1	2.57	1	2.57	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00
TOTAL	30	25.00	35	29.16	25	20.84	30	25.00	10	25.65	12	30.77	8	20.51	9	23.07	7	38.89	5	27.77	3	16.67	3	16.67
L2-based Strategies																								
Circumlocution	37	11.15	38	11.45	46	13.86	37	11.15	67	16.96	65	16.45	53	13.42	36	9.11	64	16.41	57	14.61	56	14.35	54	13.85
Approximation	29	8.73	24	7.22	16	4.82	23	6.93	23	5.82	39	9.87	13	3.29	16	4.05	20	5.13	31	7.95	18	4.62	10	2.56
Word Coinage	11	3.31	15	4.52	27	8.13	29	8.73	3	0.76	8	2.03	30	7.60	42	10.63	13	3.34	11	2.82	25	6.41	31	7.95
TOTAL	77	23.19	77	23.19	89	26.81	89	26.81	93	23.54	112	28.36	96	24.31	94	23.79	97	24.88	99	25.38	99	25.38	95	24.36

4.7. Discussion

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between proficiency level and use of communication strategies for conveying lexical meaning in oral production.

Comparison of the total use of communication strategies of elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups indicated that the quantity of communication strategies of the learners at three different proficiency levels does not vary (cf. Table 4.1). This means that to compensate lexical gaps, elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups adopted the same amount of communication strategies in their oral production. This did not provide support for the prediction that instances of communication strategies -L1-based and L2-based strategies together- would demonstrate a decrease from low to high proficiency level. Still these results are in the same route that was reached in the study by Bialystok (1983); she found that low-level and advanced learners adopted communication strategies at the same frequency.

The results related to the total use of L1-based communication strategies revealed that elementary learners employed more L1-based strategies than both pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners. However, the quantity of L1-based strategies did not vary between pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners (cf. Table 4.1). The result that elementary learners adopted more L1-based strategies verified the prediction of a reverse relationship between the frequency of L1-based

strategies and the learners' proficiency level. This could be tied to that low-level learners have a limited target language repertoire and they are more likely to appeal to the communication strategies based on the first language (Bialystok, 1983; Faerch, et. al., 1984; Paribakht, 1985; Si-Qing, 1990). On the other hand, the result that there is no difference between pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners does not confirm the prediction stated above. This could be interpreted to indicate that L1-based strategy use may decrease as learners become more proficient in the target language and then this decrease may slow down or stop (Corrales and Call, 1989).

Comparison of elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners' L2-based communication strategies revealed that elementary learners used L2-based strategies less than pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners. This result might be attributed to that as the learners progress in the target language, they tend to abandon L1-based strategies and prefer L2-based strategies instead (Paribakht, 1985). Results also revealed that pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners are L2-based strategy users at the same level of frequency. This might imply that learners appeal more to L2-based strategies, as they progress in the target language, however their use of L2-based strategies ceases or slows down as the learners approach to the target language (Paribakht, 1985). This also may be explained by that there may be a period when learners' use of L2-based strategies remain constant at the same frequency and afterwards -when they become advanced learners- the learners may start to appeal L2-based communication

strategies. Since we have not included advanced learners in this study, we are not in a position to provide our results in relation to this claim.

The results about the comparison of the use of individual types of L1-based communication strategies by elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners indicated that L1 switch strategy type differed by proficiency level of the learners. Elementary learners adopted more L1 switch strategies than pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners did. On the contrary, pre-intermediate learners did not use more L1 switch strategies than upper-intermediate learners did. That elementary learners utilized more L1 switch strategy could be linked to the hypothesis that along the stages of interlanguage, learners rely on their prior knowledge to facilitate their progress and for the elementary learners, their prior knowledge is only embodied by their first language (Bialystok and Fröchlich, 1980; cited in Si-Qing, 1990). Accordingly, as learners approach to the target language, they obtain more prior language in the target language and they do not appeal to L1 switch strategy; they rely more upon their prior knowledge target language to compensate their gaps.

In the use of Literal Translation and Foreignizing strategies, the results did not indicate a significant difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners, additionally, these strategies were used quite less than L1 switch strategy by all learners. This result seems to be related to that Literal Translation and Foreignizing strategies are the best examples of transfer of knowledge of the native language to the

target language. However, this transfer is more likely to be done only if the native and the target languages are typologically similar to each other, thus distance between languages may prevent learners from using Literal Translation and Foreignizing strategies (Selinker, 1992; Kellerman, et. al., 1987; Si-Qing; 1990; Corder, 1978; Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991). In this case, learners' native language Turkish, and target language, English, are distant languages; Turkish is a member of Uralic- Altaic language family, whereas English is a member of Indo-European language family. Therefore, Turkish learners of English may be aware that English is almost completely distant from Turkish and that they will not be able to convey the target meaning and communicate basing on their knowledge of native language. As a result, when the learners are not able to construct an L2-based strategy and when they feel obliged to use an L1-based strategy, they prefer switching directly to their native language more than translation of a word or applying target language phonology to a native language word.

The results of comparison of types of L2-based communication strategies indicated that Circumlocution strategy was employed by elementary learners less than upper-intermediate learners and not than pre-intermediate learners; but no significant difference between elementary and pre-intermediate and pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners in terms of instances of Circumlocution strategy was observed. The reason for that Circumlocution strategy use does not differ significantly between all groups could be that all learners have been encouraged by their instructors and course materials, especially in the classroom

environment, to utilize their available knowledge in their target knowledge to solve communication problems arising at both grammatical and lexical levels.

Results did not indicate any difference in terms of use of Approximation and Word Coinage strategies between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners. However, incidents of use of these strategies are quite frequent for all learner groups. This may be related to that learners in all groups have been stimulated to use their existing target language as much as possible and when they have had problems in communicating a meaning, they have often been encouraged to appeal to their target language instead of their native language in their program. As a result, all learners participated in the study had been familiar with using words that have a meaning similar to that of the target words and creating a new word or phrase to communicate the target meaning.

In terms of total use of L1-based communication strategies, there was a difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners. Elementary learners used more L1-based strategies than pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners, but between pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners, there was no difference. These results were the same for total L1-based strategies used to convey abstract and concrete lexical items. Thus the nature of the lexical items -being either abstract or concrete- does not affect the quantity of L1-based strategies in terms of total use.

In use of L₁ switch strategy, as it was in total use of it, there was a difference between elementary and pre-intermediate and between elementary and upper-intermediate learners and there was no difference revealed between pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners both for abstract and concrete lexical items. This implies that selection of L₁ switch strategy does not depend on the nature of the target word.

While there was no difference between three groups of learners in terms of total use of Literal Translation strategy, a difference between learner groups in communication of abstract lexical items revealed. That is, to express abstract vocabulary, elementary learners utilized more Literal Translation strategy than pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners. On the contrary, in conveying concrete vocabulary, no difference between groups was observed. These results may lead to that nature of the target word -being abstract or concrete- could be effective in the selection of Literal Translation strategy. Furthermore, abstract items seem to make the learners, particularly elementary learners, appeal to Literal Translation strategy. This could be explained by that especially for elementary learners, it is not always easy to use a synonym or an explanation for an abstract word since a synonym or an explanation would again require use of abstract words or phrases.

Foreignizing strategy varies between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners for neither abstract nor concrete concepts. This may indicate that learners are aware of the fact that they could not solve their lexical problems by

applying their foreign language phonology to the words in their native language due to that English and Turkish are distant languages and there is no similarity between the phonology of English and Turkish. As a result, the nature of the target words -abstract or concrete- does not determine the use of Foreignizing strategy, but the distance between languages does (Si-Qing, 1990, Corder, 1978).

The results of comparison of L2-based communication strategies adopted for abstract concepts indicated that pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners employed more L2-based strategies than elementary group, but there was no difference between pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners. This is in the same direction with results of the total L2-based strategy use. On the other hand, no difference between learner groups to express concrete concepts was found. These results together indicate that abstract concepts may activate especially pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners' strategic competence in order to use L2-based communication strategies more than concrete concepts may.

The results revealed that Circumlocution strategy differed between three learner groups to convey abstract lexical items as it did in total use. This difference was in the way that pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners adopted more Circumlocution strategy than elementary learners did, but no difference was observed between pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate group. The results also revealed that the difference between three groups was not significant in conveying concrete

lexical items. The fact that Circumlocution strategy use differed between groups not for concrete, but for abstract concepts may be interpreted to suggest that abstract concepts are more likely to activate particularly pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners' strategic competence than concrete concepts. Another explanation may be that learners might need to compensate for abstract concepts through Circumlocution strategy than they do for concrete concepts.

The results for Approximation and Word Coinage strategies employed for abstract and concrete lexical items indicated no difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners. This is also consistent with the results obtained by comparison of these two strategy types in terms of total quantity. As a result, this could be tied to that selection of Approximation and Word Coinage strategies may not strongly be influenced by the nature of the lexical items.

The results for frequency of L1-based communication strategies in Task 1 and Task 2 were the same with the results for total use of L1-based strategies. That is to say, elementary learners made a greater use of L1-based strategies than pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners in total and in Task 1 and Task 2. However, there was no difference between pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners. These results do not suggest any task effect on the selection and frequency of L1-based communication strategies.

Comparison of both total use of L1-based strategies and each L1-based communication strategy in Task 1 and Task 2 did not reveal different results from those of total use. That is, in total use of L1-based strategies and L1 switch strategy, elementary learners used a greater amount than pre-intermediate and upper intermediate learners in Task 1 and Task 2 and no difference between pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners appeared. Similar to the results in total, no significant difference was observed between learner groups in use of Literal Translation and Foreignizing strategies. These findings might be explained by that type of tasks -answering questions on a text orally and interview- is not a determining factor on the use of L1-based strategies.

Contrary to the results related to use of L1-based strategies, use of L2-based strategies varies in terms of tasks. First, total use of L2-based strategies in Task 1 had a different pattern than Task 2. Moreover, patterns of L2-based strategy use in Task 1 and Task 2 were different from the pattern of total L2-based strategy use. While in total use, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners employed more L2-based strategies than elementary learners and there was no difference between pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners, total use of L2-based strategies of each group did not vary significantly on Task 1. Furthermore, on Task 2, the difference took place only between elementary and pre-intermediate learners. This variation might be attributed to the effect of types of tasks. In spite of the fact that tasks did not seem to influence utilization of L1-based strategies, different types of

tasks seem to be a factor affecting the use of L2-based strategies. Oxford (1990) and Corrales and Call (1989) state that tasks can require different demands from the learners, thus tasks can sometimes be influential on strategy use.

In Task 1 -answering questions on a text orally- elementary learners used less Circumlocution strategy than pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners did. On the other hand, frequency of pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners did not show a difference. These results were the same when the total Circumlocution strategy use was compared between groups. The results related to Approximation and Word Coinage strategies did not indicate any difference between groups. These findings may lead us to suggest that although task types may be an affective factor, Task 1 does not seem to motivate any change on individual types of L2-based strategies.

On the other hand, L2-based strategy use on Task 2 -interview- did not follow the same route with that of total use of L2-based strategies and of Task 1. In Task 2, there is no difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners in terms of Circumlocution, Approximation and Word Coinage strategies. As a result, Task 2 may influence L2-based communication strategy use pattern.

To summarize, learners at elementary pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate proficiency levels adopted communication strategies at the similar frequency. However, elementary learners utilized more L1-based and less L2-based communication strategies

than pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners and these findings partially verified the predictions.

Nature of concepts, abstract and concrete, seemed to partly influence the selection of communication strategies. Also, tasks, due to their different requirements from the learners, seemed to affect the selection of strategy types.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.1. Conclusion

This study aimed to compare the frequency and the types of communication strategies of Turkish learners of English as a foreign language at elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate proficiency levels.

To achieve this aim, first communication strategies of each learner group were identified and grouped. After the identification and classification of strategies, following question was studied: "Is there a difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in terms of quantity of communication strategies?". Comparison of CS of each learners groups showed that there is no difference between three groups in terms of elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups. In other words, learners at elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups use the same amounts of communication strategies. This result indicate that proficiency level of the learners does not affect or determine the quantity of communication strategies.

The next question in the study was "Is there a difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in terms of the quantity of communication strategies that

are based on the learners' native language?". The results confirmed that elementary learners use L1-based strategies more frequently than pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners. However, unlike our prediction, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners' strategies do not differ. Consequently, the results partly confirmed our prediction. And proficiency level does not influence the use of L1-based strategies after learners reach pre-intermediate level.

Other purpose of this study was to answer the question "Is there a difference between elementary, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups in terms of the quantity of communication strategies that are based on the learners' foreign language?". The results showed that elementary learners use L2-based strategies less than higher proficiency level learners but pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners do not differ in use of L2-based strategies. These results lead us to conclude that proficiency level is not an effective factor on the use of L2-based communication strategies when learners reach upper-intermediate proficiency level.

This study also aimed to reveal whether the nature of the tasks affects the selection of communication strategies. The results showed that different task types affect the selection of communication strategies, especially L2-based strategies and also that interview task (Task 2) is more effective in encouraging the learners to use strategies than structured questions task (Task 1). It can be concluded that different communication situations -tasks-

require learners to appeal to different types of communication strategies.

The results related to the nature of lexical items -being abstract and concrete- showed that nature of the lexical items affects the selection of communication strategies. It could be concluded that abstract lexical items motivate learners to use communication strategies more than concrete lexical items.

To summarize, proficiency level affects the selection of communication strategies of elementary level learners. Task type is a factor that partly affects the selection of communication strategies. Another factor, nature of the lexical items, -abstract or concrete- also influences the choice of communication strategies. However, the most effective factor is still proficiency level. As a result, these findings indicate that proficiency level is closely tied to the learners' strategic competence and learners' communicative competence could be developed by activating and developing their strategic competence.

These findings could be tied to some implications for classroom procedures in foreign language teaching. As Dörnyei and Thurrel (1991) state, strategic competence is the most neglected component of communicative competence by course books and teachers. Furthermore, the course materials are not sufficient to teach learners how to use communication strategies when they have problems in communication (Tarone and Yule, 1989). These materials keep communication problems away from the learners; for example, they generally explain the vocabulary in advance (Si-

Qing, 1990). Consequently, development of strategic competence and use of communication strategies are often ignored by course books and materials. But Terrel (1977; cited in Canale, 1987) argues that communication strategies are important in the development of communicative competence, especially at the beginning stages of language learning. Hence, syllabuses, especially for speaking courses, designed to include training of communication strategies would activate and help with developing the learners' strategic competence and communicative competence. Furthermore, due to that training of communication strategies -particularly of L2-based strategies- would provide the learners -even the learners at the beginning proficiency levels- opportunity to use their existing knowledge of their target language, activities in such a syllabus, as Dörnyei and Thurrel (1991) state, would, therefore, provide the learner a sense of security and facilitate spontaneous improvisation skills and linguistic creativity. Since proficiency level and strategic competence are related, implementation and training of communication strategies would lead the learners to achieve a better speaking performance. Moreover, many speaking teachers complain about that most of the students are silent and prefer not to speak unless they are told to, so through activities on the implementation of communication strategies, the learners would not remain silent during classes.

Inclusion of communication strategies by syllabuses must cover two points; the first point is that learners must be taught what communication strategies are and how to use them. Second, syllabuses must include activities to encourage learners to use such

strategies. In addition, that abstract lexical items were found to be more powerful than concrete lexical items in motivating elementary learners to appeal to L1-based communication strategies should be taken into consideration. Thus, to enable learners, particularly elementary learners, to employ more L2-based strategies, activities should comprise of concrete vocabulary more than abstract vocabulary.

Considering that the interview task in the study resulted in more communication strategy use than structured questions task, situations and tasks where learners can talk about themselves and their ideas like an interview with the learners without a testing purpose can make the learners use communication strategies and thus, communicate. On the other hand, a reading-based type of task may prevent learners from activating their use of communication strategies, and since learners face more problems in oral language than they do in reading, reading-based tasks may not be successful enough to encourage learners to use communication strategies in classroom environment.

5.2. Suggestions for Further Research

The results of this study can be used as a startpoint for additional research. The scope of this study can be directed to other areas related to the actual use of communication strategies. A possible research focusing on CS in oral production can be conducted on a long term schedule. Observing communication strategies of learners at different proficiency levels to convey lexical meaning through a long term study would reveal more

substantial conclusions about foreign language learners' development of strategic competence.

Another study can be carried out with learners from all proficiency levels including advanced learners. Investigating strategies of different learners whose proficiency levels are not close to each other can reveal better insights about how use of communication strategies vary depending on the proficiency level.

Since personality type is considered to influence the selection of communication strategies, a study to investigate the effects of personality type on the use of communication strategies could be designed.

Another possible study can be conducted with learners from different learner groups to investigate learners' use of communication strategies for compensating their grammatical gaps. Additionally, since employing communication strategies is not merely restricted to spoken language, the scope of this study can compare learners' use of strategies to convey grammatical meaning in written language.

REFERENCES

- Adjemian, C. (1976). 'On the nature of interlanguage systems', Language Learning. Vol:26(2).
- Bialystok, E. (1983). 'Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies' in C. Faerch and G. Kasper, (eds.) Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. London: Longman.
- Bialystok, E. and M. S. Smith (1985). 'Interlanguage is not a state of mind: an evaluation of the construct for second language acquisition', Applied Linguistics: Vol:6(2).
- Blum-Kulka, S. and E.A. Levenston. (1983). 'Universals of lexical simplification', in C. Faerch and G. Kasper, (eds.) Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. London: Longman.
- Brown, H.D. (1987). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Canale, M. (1987). 'From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy', in J.C. Richards and Richard W. Schmidt, (eds.) Language and Communication. New York: Longman.

Corder, S.P. (1978). 'Language-learner language', in J.C. Richards, (ed.) Understanding Second and Foreign Language Learning. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Corrales, O and M.E. Call. (1989). 'At a loss for words: The use of communication strategies to convey lexical meaning', Foreign Language Annals. Vol:22(3).

Dörnyei, Z. and Y. Thurrell. (1991). 'Strategic competence and how to teach it', ELT Journal, Vol:45(1).

Ellis, R. (1984). 'Communication strategies and the evaluation of communicative performance', ELT Journal. Vol:38(1).

_____. (1988). Classroom Second Language Development U.K: Prentice Hall.

_____. (1991a). Instructed Second Language Acquisition. U.K.: Blackwell Publishers.

_____. (1991b). Understanding Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. and C. Roberts (1987). 'Two approaches for investigating second language acquisition', in R. Ellis, (ed). Second Language Acquisition in Context. Cambridge: Prentice Hall.

Faerch, C. and G. Kasper. (1980). 'Processes and strategies in foreign language learning and communication', Interlanguage Studies Bulletin-Utrecht. Vol:5(1).

_____. and _____. (eds.). (1983). Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. London: Longman.

_____. and _____. (1984). 'Two ways of defining communication strategies', Language Learning. Vol:34(1).

Faerch, C., K. Haastrup and R. Phillipson. (1984). Learner Language and Language Learning. Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Kellerman, E., T. Bongaerts and N. Poulisse. (1987). 'Strategy and System in L2 Referential Communication'. in R. Ellis, (ed.) Second Language Acquisition in Context. New York: Prentice Hall.

Larsen-Freeman, D. and M. L. Long. (1992). An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research. New York: Longman.

Oxford, R. (1990). Language Learning Strategies. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Paribakht, T. (1985). 'Strategic competence and language proficiency', Applied Linguistics. Vol:6(2).

Poulisse, N and E. Schils. (1989). 'The influence of task- and proficiency-related factors on the use of compensatory strategies: A quantitative analysis', Language Learning. Vol:39(1).

Richards, J. C. (1991). The Context of Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, W.M. (1983). Communicating Naturally in a Second Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saville-Troike, M. (1988). 'From context to communication: Paths to second language acquisition', in Deborah Tannen, (ed.) Linguistics in Context: Connecting Observation and Understanding. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing.

Selinker, L. (1983). 'Interlanguage', in Betty Wallace and Jacquelyn Schachter, (eds.) Second Language Learning. U.S.A: University of Michigan Press.

_____. (1992). Rediscovering Interlanguage. New York: Longman.

Si-Qing, C. (1990). 'A study of communication strategies in interlanguage production by Chinese EFL learners', Language Learning. Vol:40(2).

Tarone, E. (1980). 'Communication strategies; foreigner talk and repair in interlanguage', Language Learning. Vol:30(2).

Tarone, E. and G. Yule. (1989). Focus on the Language Learner. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Varadi, T. (1983). 'Strategies of target language learner communication: Message adjustment', in C. Faerch and G. Kasper, (eds.) Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. London: Longman.

Wartella, E. and B. Reeves. (1989). 'Communication and Children', in C. R. Berger and S. H. Chaffe (eds.) Handbook of Communication Science. California: Sage Publications.

APPENDIX A

Story and questions used in the study to elicit abstract lexical items

O yaşı adamı, bundan iki yıl önce tanımıştık ilk kez. Yanımızdaki büyük, bahçeli eve taşınmıştı. Taşındığı ilk günlerde, kimi zaman komşu çocuklarıyla şakalaşıyor, kimi zaman ise, onların yüzüne bile bakmıyordu. Bu yüzden ilk günlerde, onun dengesiz biri olduğunu düşünmüştü herkes.

O evde daha önce, yaşlı bir teyze otururdu, belki de buranın en sevilen insanıydı. Tekbaşına yaşardı o kocaman evde. Kimsesi var mıydı bilmezdik. Adını bile bilmezdik; Melek Teyze derdik. Herkesin bildiği özelliği, neşeli ve konuşkan olmasıydı. Kimi insanlar, O'nu kullanmaya çalışırdı; çok cömertti çünkü. Yine de küsmezdi onlara Melek Teyze.

Bir gün Melek Teyze'yi ziyarete gittiğimizde, O'na 'Bu renk elbise seni yaşlı göstermiş.' demiş, sonra da utanmışım. Oysa O bana, 'Doğru sözlü bir insansın, ne güzel.' demişti.

Çok severdi insanları. Tutucu insanlardan hoşlanmazdı sadece. 'İnsan yeniliklere hoşgeldin diyebilmeli', derdi. Bir de bahçedeki çiçeklerini çok severdi. Saatlerce otururdu bahçede. Çiçeklerde yitirdiği birşeyleri arardı sanki. O'nu en son gördüğümüzde, hastaydı. Yakalandığı hastalığa karşı inatçıydı. İnatla yaşamak istercesine gülümsüyordu. Ve, veda etti bize.

Melek Teyze'den sonra, o evde bir başkasının yaşadığını kabullenmek çok zor geliyordu. Belki de bu nedenle o yaşlı adama ısınmamıştık başlarda. Aramızdaki bahçe duvarı alçaktı. O'nu rahatça görebiliyorduk. Teyzenin ölümünden sonra çöle dönen

APPENDIX A
Continued

bahçeyle uğraşiyor, çiçekler dikiyordu. Bahçe konusunda, çok hırslıydı. O'nu ilk tanıdığımızdan farklı biri olduğunu anlamaya başlamıştık. Konuşurken, birisi Melek Teyze'den bahsedecek olsa, adam birden kırılğan biri olup çıkıyordu. Meraklı komşular, neden Melek Teyze'den bahsedildiğinde adamın bu kadar hassaslaştığını öğrenmek istiyor, sorular soruyorlardı O'na. Ama tek kelime çıkmıyordu adamın ağzından. O'nu tanıdığını bile söylemiyordu kimseye. Oysa hissederdik ki, Melek Teyze O'nun bir zamanlar yitirdiği çiçeğiydi.

Questions

1. What did people think about the old man at the beginning?
2. How did everybody know Melek Teyze?
3. Why did some people try to use her?
4. What did Melek Teyze say when the writer said 'The dress of this color makes you seem older'?
5. What kind of people didn't she like?
6. How was she against her illness?
7. How was the old man about the garden?
8. How was the man when people talked about Melek Teyze?
9. What kind of people did ask questions to the old man about Melek Teyze?

APPENDIX B

Story and questions used in the study to elicit
concrete lexical items

Çoğu insan, ailem hakkında sordukları sorulara aldıkları cevaplar karşısında, şaşırıyor. Onları şaşırtan, "bizim ailedeki mesleklerin çokluğu. Babam, veteriner ve aynı zamanda bir iç mimar. Çocukluğunda, köyde çobanlık yapmış. Annem ise, liseyi bitirince, bir mağazada tezgâhtar olarak çalışmış. İki yıl sonra, tıp fakültesine girmiş, ve şimdi bir cerrah; insanları kesip biçiyor. Ağabeyimin küçüklüğünden beri tutkusu, futboldu. İyi bir futbol oyuncusu olamadı, ama, şimdi hakemlik yapıyor. Kalan zamanında ise evde 'marangozluk yapıyor hobi olarak. Ablam, postanede çalışıyor; santral memuru. İşini çok 'seviyor. Bir de küçük erkek kardeşim var. Henüz bir mesleği olacak yaşta değil, ama evdeki musluklarla, su borularıyla uğraşmayı çok seviyor. Annem, 'Bu çocuk sıhhi tesisatçı olacak' diyor. Bence O, bir aşçı olmalı; yemekleri çok seviyor.

Questions

1. What is her father's job?
2. What was her father when he was a child?
3. What did her mother do after she finished the high school?
4. What is her mother's job now?
5. What is her older brother's job?
6. What does her brother do as a hobby?
7. What is her sister's job?
8. What does her mother think about her younger brother?
9. What does she think about her younger brother?

APPENDIX C

A sample transcript of the interview task
(Interview with a subject from pre-intermediate group)

Interviewer (I): Now Lale, what can you tell me about your personality? What kind of a person are you?

Learner (L) : First, I'm a sensitive person. For example, I cry easily, I become sorry easily. (target word:fragile; strategy: circumlocution) I... I'm... And I'm friendly. I love people and my friends and... And I love helping to my friends.

I : How do you help them? What do you do to help them?

L : For example, I share my time... I can give money, I share my money with them. (target word: generous; strategy: circumlocution)

I : So, you like spending your time and money with others... Then, you are...

L : Yes, I'm... I'm open-handed. (target word:generous; strategy: literal translation)

I :What else can you say about yourself?

L : Mmm... I'm... I like working hard. If I decide to do something, I must do it. I do everything to do it; I'm ambitious. I always want to be successful. (target word: greedy; strategy: circumlocution)

I : You mean your decisions are important for you... Then, for example, your friends call you and ask you to go out with them, but you don't want to go out because you planned to stay home that night. What would you do? Would you go out with them or stay at home?

APPENDIX C

Continued

L : I think... I stay at home. If I say 'No', I don't change my decision. I'm very.... mmm...inatçı. (target word: stubborn; strategies: circumlocution and L1-switch)

I : Now let's talk about the people you don't like.

L : People I don't like... You know, some people are your friends, but... They spend their time with you, but they talk about you after... And I don't like changing people...

I : Changing people?

L : Yes, changing people... mmm... You can't trust them; they change everyday, unbalanced people. (target word: unstable; strategies: circumlocution and approximation). And I don't like people with complex... And... I don't like liars...

I : You don't like liars, so you like... Whom?

L : I like people tell the real things... I mean... Honest, right people and people always telling right. (target word: truthful; strategies: circumlocution and approximation)

I : All right. Now can you tell me about your best friend or one your best friends? I don't want you to give any name. I just want you to tell me the things that you like and you don't like about him or her.

L : My best friends. One of them is here, we're in the same class... First of all, she knows my secrets and she doesn't tell them to people... We live in the same house... I.. like her because she's open... She's helpful. She always smiles and joyful, lovely (target word: cheerful; strategies:

APPENDIX C

Continued

- circumlocution and approximation). She's kind to everybody. Sometimes she's like me... But she's not tidy very much at home. She loves animals... Like me...
- I : You like animals, don't you?
- L : Very much. I have a cat in İzmir. I had a bird when I was child.
- I : Do you have any interesting memory about your animals? With your cat or with your bird?
- L : Mmm... I must think... Oh, yes... Two years ago, we forgot our cat in the... mmm... What does balkon mean?
- I : Balcony.
- L : We forgot her in the balcony. We went outside and we came back three hours after. It had rained. I saw my cat in the balcony. It had stayed under the rain three hours. It was... It was wet. It was ill.
- I : Was it ill?
- L : Yes.
- I : What did you do?
- L : We took our cat to the animal doctor (target word: vet; strategy: word coinage). He said 'Give aspirin to it'. We gave aspirin and it became healthy again.
- I : You told me that you share a house with a friend.
- L : Yes, I have a friend at home.
- I : Do you both like your home?
- L : Yes, I love my home. I do things in my home.

APPENDIX C

Continued

- I : What kind of things do you do?
- L : Mm... Like decoration.
- I : Do you decorate your home?
- L : Yes.
- I : Do you know who designs and decorates inside parts of the houses professionally?
- L : Err. Decorationer, I think... (target word: interior decorator; strategy: word coinage)
- I : Some people like having a lot of furniture at home and some of them like having simple and not a lot of furniture. Which one do you prefer?
- L : I prefer simple furnitures. For example...mmm... minder... I like using it. And I don't like classic furnitures. I like different and... simple things. My mother, too, for example. She don't like those things and my mother and father... They... They make them a man... I mean... You know, there are people, they don't sell furnitures, they make the furnitures from trees. He can make different furnitures (target word: carpenter; strategy: circumlocution) .
- I :What about houseworks around your home. Do you like doing houseworks?
- L : I like some of them, but for example, I don't like... I don't like ironing. I like cleaning and cooking. I'm... I'm a... good cooker. My friend's a good cooker, too. (target word: cook; strategy: word coinage)

APPENDIX C

Continued

- I : What do you do when you have a problem about things at home that you can't solve by yourselves? For example, you may have problems with electricity, cables, or with water pipes, taps, etc. What do you do then?
- L : When we can't do, we call people.
- I : Whom do you call for example?
- L : Mm. For example, last month, four... sigorta broke, an electrician came and made it... And when we rent house, mm... taps in kitchen and... şofben was broken, we called a... mechanic of water and pipe system... I mean... sıhhi tesisatçı. He made them (target word: plumber; strategies: word coinage and L1-switch).
- I : It seems that you've got used to live away from your family in a short time.
- L : Yes... Before this, I lived alone, too.
- I : When?
- L : Two years ago, in summer, I was working in Alanya. There I lived alone.
- I : Where did you work? At a hotel?
- L : No, in jewellery shop... I was... I was the... salesman. I was selling jewellery to the tourists. (target word: shop assistant; strategy: approximation)
- I : How long did you work?
- L : Two months.

APPENDIX C

Continued

I : Good, you had some job experience... Do you have any brothers or sisters Lale?

L : Yes, My sister is older. And I have a brother, he's young.

I : What do they do? Do they attend a school like you?

L : My sister finished... Ankara Medical Faculty and she's a doctor. She married in Ankara. My brother goes to secondary school.

I : You said your sister is a doctor. What's her branch?

L : Her branch...Err... about skin problems.

I : I see. Does she do any medical operations?

L : No. Because she's only a doctor, not an... an operator.

(target word: surgeon; strategy: literal translation) She only looks and gives medicine.

I : And... Your brother?

L : He is in high-school... College. Yatılı okul in İstanbul.

I : Can you often see him?

L : Now, I can't see him. My family is in İzmit. They go sometimes to İstanbul. But generally we talk on the telephone.

I : Does he call you or do you call him?

L : Generally he calls us. Because we can call him only in the evenings. It is difficult... First, we have to call the central, you know. Then the central officer connects us. (target word: switch-board operator; strategy: literal translation). But it is difficult. Because telephones aren't... empty.

APPENDIX C

Continued

- I : Is he happy with his school and being in İstanbul?
- L : Yes... I mean mostly. But he's a bit a lazy. In holidays, he's always in outside. He plays basketball, football.
- I : Do you like basketball and/or football?
- L : I like basketball and sometimes football... But football is silly I think.
- I : Imagine that you have to play football one day... Let's say for the faculty team. Which position would you prefer to be in? Would you like to be a defense player, or the coach, etc.?
- L : Err. I wouldn't play. But maybe I would be coach or... the football match director... (target word: referee; strategy: word coinage)
- I : Director?
- L : Yes... You know, the man... with black uniform... He doesn't play, he runs, shows cards... green, yellow... And he directs the match. (target word: referee; strategies: circumlocution)
- I : Does this mean that you like directing or leading people?
- L : Sometimes... Yes.
- I : Would you like to have a sort of leadership position in the future?
- L : Leadership?
- I : Yes...Would you like to be the leader of a group, of a party?
- L : Mm... Maybe... of a party. But not in these parties. I mean... I wouldn't be like today's leaders.
- I : Do you mean you'd be different?

APPENDIX C

Continued

L : Yes, I wouldn't do like them. I would live to give people best education in Türkiye. I wouldn't be a liar like them. I... And it is difficult to be a leader in Türkiye... I wouldn't be like a leader of sheeps. (target word: shepherd; strategy: word coinage) I wouldn't call people from my back like sheep leader. (target word: shepherd; strategy: word coinage). I would teach to walk by themselves.

I : It seems difficult to be a leader... It's nice to have a conversation with you. You like talking.

L : I'm a talking person. (target word: talkative; strategy: word coinage) And... I like practising English. Also I like reading English books.

I : Is that because you want to improve your English or you like reading in general?

L : I like reading. And... I don't like not reading people. Because they can't know other worlds. They can't know themselves and new things. And... So they don't like new things. They believe old ideas. They stay same and they don't say 'yes' to new things. (target word: conservative; strategy: circumlocution) And they don't have any... they don't have any wish for learning. They aren't wondering persons (target word: curious; strategy: word coinage)

I : Do you think that university students read enough?

L : No. Never enough.

.....

APPENDIX D

Tables of Scheffe F-Tests Showing the Difference across All Proficiency Groups(*)

The Results of Scheffe F-Test Showing the Difference in Total Use of L1-based Strategies

Groups(*)	Mean Difference	Scheffe F-test
Group 1 vs. Group 2	8.1	.11.563*
Group 1 vs. Group 3	10.3	18.697*
Group 2 vs. Group 3	2.2	.853

The Results of Scheffe F-Test Showing the Difference in Use of L1 Switch Strategy

Groups	Mean Difference	Scheffe F-test
Group 1 vs. Group 2	8.7	14.267*
Group 1 vs. Group 3	9.5	17.012*
Group 2 vs. Group 3	.8	.121

The Results of Scheffe F-Test Showing the Difference in Total Use of L1-based Strategies for Abstract Lexical Items

Groups	Mean Difference	Scheffe F-test
Group 1 vs. Group 2	4.5	7.847*
Group 1 vs. Group 3	5.3	10.884*
Group 2 vs. Group 3	.8	.248

* The mark (*) in the tables shows at what level(s) the significant difference takes place.

* **Group 1:** Elementary group

Group 2: Pre-intermediate group

Group 3: Upper-intermediate group

APPENDIX D

Continued

The Results of Sheffe F-Test Showing the Difference in Use of L₁ switch Strategy for Abstract Lexical Items

Groups	Mean Difference	Scheffe F-test
Group 1 vs. Group 2	4.3	7.869*
Group 1 vs. Group 3	4.8	9.806*
Group 2 vs. Group 3	.5	.106

The Results of Sheffe F-Test Showing the Difference in Total Use of L₁-based Strategies for Concrete Lexical Items

Groups	Mean Difference	Scheffe F-test
Group 1 vs. Group 2	3.8	11.203*
Group 1 vs. Group 3	4.9	18.628*
Group 2 vs. Group 3	1.1	.939

The Results of Sheffe F-Test Showing the Difference in Use of L₁ switch Strategy for Concrete Lexical Items

Groups	Mean Difference	Scheffe F-test
Group 1 vs. Group 2	4.4	17.541*
Group 1 vs. Group 3	4.7	20.014*
Group 2 vs. Group 3	.3	.082

APPENDIX D

Continued

The Results of Sheffe F-Test Showing the Difference in Total Use of L₂-based Strategies for Abstract Lexical Items

Groups	Mean Difference	Scheffe F-test
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-5.1	6.011*
Group 1 vs. Group 3	-3.9	3.515*
Group 2 vs. Group 3	1.2	.333

The Results of Sheffe F-Test Showing the Difference in Use of Circumlocution Strategy for Abstract Lexical Items

Groups	Mean Difference	Scheffe F-test
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-5.7	5.442*
Group 1 vs. Group 3	-4.6	3.544*
Group 2 vs. Group 3	1.1	.203

The Results of Sheffe F-Test Showing the Difference in Total Use of L₁-based Strategies in Task 1

Groups	Mean Difference	Scheffe F-test
Group 1 vs. Group 2	3.6	8.61*
Group 1 vs. Group 3	4.6	14.058*
Group 2 vs. Group 3	1	.664

APPENDIX D

Continued

The Results of Sheffe F-Test Showing the Difference in Use of L₁ switch Strategy in Task 1

Groups	Mean Difference	Scheffe F-test
Group 1 vs. Group 2	4	11.907*
Group 1 vs. Group 3	4.2	13.1128*
Group 2 vs. Group 3	.2	.03

The Results of Sheffe F-Test Showing the Difference in Total Use of L₁-based Strategies in Task 2

Groups	Mean Difference	Scheffe F-test
Group 1 vs. Group 2	4.4	6.951*
Group 1 vs. Group 3	5.6	11.26*
Group 2 vs. Group 3	1.2	.517

The Results of Sheffe F-Test Showing the Difference in Use of L₁ switch Strategy in Task 2

Groups	Mean Difference	Scheffe F-test
Group 1 vs. Group 2	4.7	7.873*
Group 1 vs. Group 3	5.3	10.011*
Group 2 vs. Group 3	.6	.128

APPENDIX D

Continued

The Results of Sheffe F-Test Showing the Difference in Use of Circumlocution Strategy in Task 1

Groups	Mean Difference	Scheffe F-test
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-3.7	3.725*
Group 1 vs. Group 3	-3.7	3.725*
Group 2 vs. Group 3	0	0

The Results of Sheffe F-Test Showing the Difference in Total Use of L2-based Strategies in Task 2

Groups	Mean Difference	Scheffe F-test
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-4.5	4.859*
Group 1 vs. Group 3	-2.9	2.018*
Group 2 vs. Group 3	1.6	.614