This extensive article examines trends in second language communication strategies (CSs) to date. It aims to present a historical overview of CS research, definitions of CSs offered and the various taxonomies proposed in the literature so far. Data elicitation methods and data analysis procedures are also discussed. Then it presents the author’s taxonomy of communication strategy, which is based on the pilot study he conducted. Furthermore, it highlights the major problems of existing taxonomies and their classification of CSs into different categories. Teachability of communication strategies, which is a controversial issue, is also discussed. Finally, it concludes with the implications of communication strategies.

A BRIEF HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Selinker (1972), in his paper "Interlanguage", suggested the term 'strategies of second language communication' to refer to the strategies used by foreign or second language learners to deal with the difficulties they encounter during the course of communication. He considered these strategies as one of the five processes central to second language learning (1972: 229). However, he did not go into detail about the nature of these strategies. Savignon (1972) also published a research report in which he highlighted the importance of 'coping strategies', i.e., communication strategies, in communicative language teaching and testing. A year later, Varadi (1973/1980) gave addressed a small European conference. This discourse was considered to be the first systematic analysis of strategic language behaviour, dealing with message adjustment in particular. By message adjustment, Varadi meant that second language learners either reduce or replace the optimal meaning-actual meaning. When they encounter a difficulty. This article only came into print in 1980.

In order to investigate the adjustment phenomenon, Varadi (ibid.) carried out a small-scale experiment with 18 Hungarian English language learners. The results of this pilot study suggested the general validity of the theoretical presuppositions concerning the concept of message adjustment.

Empirical studies were subsequently carried out, the first one being that of Tarone (1977). She based her definition of CSs and her typology on data elicited from nine sub-
jects. Her taxonomy is still seen as the most important in the field since most of the follow-
ing taxonomies relied on it.

Since 1980, the real study of communication strategies has become the concern of ma-
ny researchers. Canale/Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) included them in their model of 
communicative competence. They thereby showed one of the constituents of the sub-
competencies-strategic competence. In Canale/Swain (1980: 30) strategic competence con-
ists of "verbal and non-verbal CSs that may be called into action to compensate for break-
down in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence".

In 1983, Faerch/Kasper published the first edited volume, Strategies in Interlanguage 
Communication, which put together the most important papers in one collection. These 
publications increased the various areas of interest of many research studies, focusing pri-
marily on identifying and classifying CSs and on the teachability of CSs.

Nijmegen University became the dominant centre of CS studies in which a group of re-
searchers carried out various studies whose results highlighted the main aspects of CS use, 
challenged the prevalent taxonomies and proposed a new taxonomy (e. g., Poulisse 1987, 
1990; Poulisse/Schils 1989; Kellerman/Ammerlaan/Bongaerts/Poulisse 1990). In 1997, 
Kasper and Kellerman published the second edited volume, Communication Strategies: 
Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives, which included many important articles 
and empirical studies about communication strategies.

In the following sections, these areas will be discussed in detail: data collection meth-
odology, approaches to communication strategies, taxonomies, classification problems and 
the teachability issue.

DEFINING COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

Faerch/Kasper (1983a) defined communication strategies by placing them in their model of 
speech production, in which their function may be characterised through the relationships 
between 'processes' and 'plans'. Faerch/Kasper found that in the planning phase, language 
learners retrieve items from the relevant linguistic system. The product of the planning proc-
ess is a plan that controls the execution phase. The execution phase comprises neurologi-
cal/psychological processes. When non-native speakers of a target language encounter a prob-
lem during the course of communication, due to the lack of linguistic knowledge at either the 
planning or the execution phase of speech production, they produce a plan to overcome the 
problem. For them, communication strategies can be placed "within the planning phase ... 
within the area of the planning process and the resulting plan" (Faerch/Kasper 1983a: 30).

Following Faerch/Kasper, Ellis (1985) placed communication strategies in a hierarchy 
of types of L2 knowledge. He divided such knowledge into declarative (knowing that) and
procedural (knowing how) knowledge. Procedural knowledge is divided into social processes and strategies and cognitive strategies and processes. The latter is then subdivided into learning and using L2. Lastly, the use of L2 component is subdivided into production reception processes and strategies and communication strategies. These types of L2 knowledge are shown in Figure (1) below.

A distinction should be drawn here between learning strategies and communication strategies. Learning strategies are attempts that language learners make to improve their communicative competence. Oxford (1992) provides a definition for LS as "techniques that students (often intentionally) use to improve their progress in developing L2 skills ... strategies are tools for the self-directed involvement necessary for developing communicative ability" (18). In contrast, communication strategies refer to language use.

![Figure 1: Types of L2 knowledge (adapted from Ellis 1985: 165)](image)

Though not many writers offer a definition of communication strategies, they usually refer to them by using different terms. Varadi (1983) calls them communicational strategies, whereas Corder (1983) refers to them as communicative strategies. Harding (1983) prefers the term compensation strategies, whereas Poulisse (1990) uses compensatory strategies.

Both native and non-native speakers, and listeners use communication strategies. Wagner and Firth (1997) claim that "CS is a very prominent element in speech production and therefore an important element in natural discourse" (Firth 1997: 342). Dornyei/Scott
Gh. Rabab'ah (1997) conceive communication strategies to be "the key units in a general description of problem-management in L2 communication" (1997: 179).

As a result of their limited resources, L2 learners use CSs more frequently than native speakers. Corder (1983: 15), in his article "Strategies of communication", acknowledges this fact, when he writes "it is now fairly clear that all language users adopt strategies to convey their meaning... but we are only able more or less readily to perceive these when the speaker is not a native speaker".

It is difficult to find a rigorous definition of communication strategies on which CS researchers have reached an agreement. There have been many definitions proposed for the communication strategies of second language learners. The following definitions will provide us with an insight into the nature of communication strategies.

"conscious communication strategies are used by an individual to overcome the crisis which occurs when language structures are inadequate to convey the individual's thought" (Tarone 1977: 195)

"a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared" (Tarone 1980: 420)

"they are a systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his meaning when faced with some difficulty" (Corder 1981: 103, 1983: 16)

"Learners' attempt to bridge the gap between their linguistic competence in the target language and that of the target language interlocutors" (Tarone 1981: 288)

"CSs are potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal" (Faerch/Kasper 1983a: 36)

"Communication strategies predetermine the verbal planning, they serve the function of adjusting the plan to the situation, i.e. each individual utterance is to be seen as strategic. What is specific for IL users is that plans of action cannot be directly converted into verbal plans, because of gaps in the speaker's (and hearer's) linguistic repertoire. The primary function of communication strategies in the speech of IL users is to compensate for this deficit" (Wagner 1983: 167)

"Communication strategies, i.e., techniques of coping with difficulties in communicating in an imperfectly known second language" (Stern 1983: 411)

"The domain of compensation strategies must be precisely defined. It is the domain of attempts made by non-native speakers of a language to remedy the disparity that exists between their communicative needs and the linguistic tools at their disposal" (Harding 1983: 1)

"... all attempts to manipulate a limited linguistic system in order to promote communication. Should learning result from the exercise, the strategy has also functioned as a learning strategy, but there is no inherent feature of the strategy itself which can determine which of these roles it will serve" (Bialystok 1983: 102f.)

"Compensatory strategies are strategies which a language user employs in order to achieve his intended meaning on becoming aware of problems arising during the planning phase of an utterance due to his own linguistic shortcomings" (Poulisse et al. 1984: 72; Poulisse 1990: 88)

"Communication strategies (CS) have generally been defined as means that speakers use to solve their communicative problems" (Paribakht 1985: 132)

"the means used by a speaker to overcome a difficulty encountered whilst attempting to communicate in the foreign language" (Towell 1987: 97)
The key defining criteria for CSs are 'problematicity' and 'consciousness'. All the previously mentioned definitions support the claim that CSs are employed when L2 learners encounter a problem in communication. Tarone's (1977), Faerch/Kasper's (1983a) definitions emphasise the idea that CSs may be used consciously. Faerch/Kasper (1983a) see problem orientation and potential consciousness as the defining criteria of communication strategies. This is very clear in their definition of CSs as "potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal" (Faerch/Kasper 1983a: 36). The ultimate aim after using communication strategies is to achieve a communicative goal.

Faerch/Kasper conceive these plans as being of three types:

"1. plans which are always consciously employed; 2. plans which are never consciously employed; 3. plans which to some language users and/or in some situations may be consciously used and which to other language users and/or in other situations are used unconsciously." (Faerch/Kasper 1983a: 35)

Bialystok (1990), however, claims that consciousness is implicit in all the proposed definitions. She excludes the criterion of consciousness as a defining criterion for communication strategies because she does not find evidence that speakers are indeed aware that their utterances constitute a strategic behaviour. Speakers have a choice when they communicate. For example, they may choose lorry or truck to refer to the same thing. This choice is due to a strategic purpose to make themselves understood by the listeners. "This choice, however, may be made entirely without conscious consideration of the speaker (Bialystok, 1990: 4). She goes on to describe a third criterion 'intentionality', which presupposes consciousness. It refers to the learner's control over a repertoire of strategies. From this repertoire the speaker can choose a particular one from certain options, in order to achieve certain effects. But she concludes: "the intentionality of communication strategies is questionable" (1990:5).

I am in favour of Faerch/Kasper's (1983a: 36) definition which defines CSs as "potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal". It associates communication strategies with the solutions to the problems encountered by language users. In order for them to achieve their communicative goals when language users encounter a problem, they resort to communication strategies. In their definition, Faerch/Kasper neither restrict communication strategies to the interaction that takes place between the speaker and the listener, nor do they restrict their use to non-native speakers as Harding (1983) and Stern (1983) did.

**DATA ELICITATION METHODOLOGY**

CS researchers have used different methods to elicit data needed to study communication strategies. Some researchers have used tasks which are purposefully designed to elicit
communication strategies; some have used communicative tasks. But their methods of elicitation are different. The elicitation methods include picture description (Bialystok/Frohlich 1980), picture reconstruction (Bialystok 1983), video-taped conversation (Haastrup/Phillipson 1983), narration (Dechert 1983; Raupach 1983), instruction (Wagner 1983) and interview (Raupach 1983). These different methods affect the speaker's selection of a certain strategy.

Often language learners are asked to describe uncommon or unfamiliar objects, e.g. Hammock (Paribakht 1985), Abacus (Poulisse 1990). The pictures were sometimes abstract shapes for which there is no name (e.g. Bongaerts/Poulisse 1989) as in Figure (2).

![Figure 2: Bongaerts/Poulisse's picture description task (1989: 259)](image_url)

The learners' task in Bialystok (1983) was to describe the pictures so that the listener could pick out the matching pictures. Green (1995: 56) believes that "restrictions may be imposed on both the listener and the speaker". For example, "... the reconstructor refrained from speaking as much as possible" (Bialystok 1983: 105), "The listener was not allowed to ask the speaker for any clarification ..." (Yule/Tarone 1990: 186). Restrictions may also be imposed on the speakers "who were asked to try to convey the items to their interlocutors without using the exact target word" (Paribakht 1985: 134). Bialystok (1990: 59f.) divided the subjects into pairs: "director" and "matcher". She describes her task as "game-like" where "The director had to describe her board to the matcher so that she could reproduce the ordering that was on the director's board".

Description of a related series of drawings is used by some researchers to elicit narrative-like speech (e.g., Dechert 1983; Green 1995; Varadi 1983; Lotfalla/Sharzad 1992), or learners are asked to retell a story that they have already heard in L1 (e.g., Bongaerts/Poulisse 1989).
Another common task used to elicit communication strategies is when learners are given a series of instructions for making something, e.g. constructing a house or a clay pot from Lego blocks (Wagner 1983), or assembling a Christmas tree stand (Yule/Tarone 1990). Blum-Kulka/Levenston (1983), in their study "Universals of lexical simplification", which aimed to investigate CSs of lexical simplification, used isolated sentences with single blanks for single missing words (Cloze test).

Role-play is another type of task used for eliciting CSs, e.g. telephoning a plumber to ask for help (Corrales/Emily 1989), or a customer and waiter role-play (Khanji 1996), and interviews with native speakers, (e.g. Poulisse 1990; Klosek 1982; Corrales/Emily 1989; Liskin-Gasparro 1996). Sometimes telephone conversation tasks are used (Green 1995).

Despite the fact that all the tasks cited above are successful in eliciting strategic behaviour, many of them may seem remote from real-life communication. Maybe for that reason, some researchers have tried to elicit their data by video-taping conversations with native speakers, e.g. face-to-face conversation between Danish learners at various educational levels and native speakers of English conversing about everyday topics (Faerch/Kasper 1983a), conversation with native speakers (Haastrup/Phillipson 1983), conversations about incidental matters between native speakers of the Cantonese dialect of Chinese (Klosek 1982).

It is difficult to say that these conversations represent real-life communication. Even if the subjects feel relaxed, they will still have the feeling of being tested. Their performance or oral production might thus be affected. If researchers are interested in carrying out their research in a natural setting, it will be:

"... difficult to control and the results are often problematic to interpret. If a particular phenomenon is the object of study, such as the use of strategies for referential communication, one may have to wait days for any spontaneous emission of relevant data. Further, natural data are the product of a myriad of factors over most of which the researcher has no control and many of which the researcher is unaware."

(Bialystok 1990: 161)

**Taxonomies of CSs**

The terminology used to describe strategic behaviour varies a great deal, but the corresponding parts of most of the existing strategies show many similarities. In this section, I will discuss the various taxonomies offered in the literature so far.

**Varadi's Taxonomy:** Varadi (1973/1980) envisaged a variety of communicational strategies which were of two basic types: *reduction* and *replacement* of an optimal meaning resulting in a message adjustment. See Figure (3).
Varadi drew a distinction between *intensional* and *extensional reduction* which fall under reduction strategies. *Intensional reduction* was defined as "relaxation of precision caused by the selection of forms whose meaning, though related to it, falls short of the optimal meaning (salesman > man)". This could be realised through generalisation or approximation. *Extensional reduction* was referred to as the elimination of part of the meaning and is manifested in the omission of particular forms (a young man of 50 with a Chaplin-style moustache > man). Varadie also adds that "all intentional reductions necessarily involve extensional reductions as well". Strategies of replacement of meaning include paraphrase or circumlocution (Varadi 1980: 92).

**Tarone's (1977) Taxonomy:** The first taxonomy to describe CSs was that of Tarone (1977). In her study, Tarone analysed the performance of nine subjects, who were at an intermediate level, in describing two simple drawings and a complex illustration in both LI and L2 English and came up with a taxonomy of CSs. See Table (1), where these strategies are defined explicitly and illustrated with examples. *The Compensatory Strategies of Faerch/Kasper (1983)* are convergent with the major strategies proposed by Tarone (1977): approximation, coinage, literal translation, paraphrase, avoidance strategies and appeal for help. See table 1 and figure 5 below.

Tarone (1977: 198) defines *paraphrase* as "the rewording of the message in an alternate, acceptable target language construction, in situations where the appropriate form or construction is not known or not yet stable". She identifies three types of paraphrase strategy: approximation, word coinage and circumlocution. According to Faerch/Kasper (1983a), *paraphrase* is used to refer to description, exemplification and circumlocution, whereas *generalisation* is used to mean approximation in other taxonomies.
PARAPHRASE
Approximation — use of a single target language vocabulary item or structure, which the learner knows is not correct, but which shares enough semantic features in common with the desired item to satisfy the speaker (e.g. pipe for waterpipe)

Word coinage — the learner makes up a new word in order to communicate a desired concept (e.g. airball for balloon)

Circumlocution — the learner describes the characteristics or elements of the object or action instead of using the appropriate target language (TL) item or structure ('She is, uh, smoking something. I don't know what's its name. That's, uh, Persian, and we use in Turkey, a lot of. ')

CONSCIOUS TRANSFER

Literal translation — the learner translates word for word from the native language (e.g., He invites him to drink, for They toast one another.)

Language switch — the learner uses the native language (NL) term without bothering to translate (e.g. balon for balloon, tirtil for caterpillar)

Appeal for assistance — the learner asks for the correct term (e.g., 'What is this? What called?')

Mime — the learner uses non-verbal strategies in place of a lexical item or action (e.g., clapping one's hands to illustrate applause)

AVOIDANCE

Topic avoidance — the learner simply tries not to talk about concepts for which the TL item or structure is not known

Message abandonment — the learner begins to talk about a concept but is unable to continue and stops in mid-utterance

Table 1: Tarone's (1977) Taxonomy of Communication Strategies (cited in Tarone 1983: 62f.)

BIALYSTOK’S (1980) TAXONOMY: Bialystok/Frohlich (1980) and Bialystok (1983) proposed a new taxonomy based on the type of information used by the learners. See Figure (4). They classified CSs into three main categories: L1-based strategies, L2-based strategies and paralinguistic strategies, based on the source of information used to solve the communication problem. L1-based strategies include switching, foreignising and literal translation. Language switch is the "insertion of a word or a phrase in a language other than the target language, usually the learner's native language", whereas foreignising is the creation of non-existent or inappropriate target language items "by applying L2 morphology and/or phonology to L1 lexical items", for example pronouncing an English word with a French accent (Bialystok/Frohlich 1980: 10).
Following their model of speech production, Faerch/Kasper (1983a) suggested that there are two phases included in speech production: the planning phase and the execution phase. A plan results from the planning phase and is then followed in the execution phase in order to achieve the intended communicative goal. The speaker "selects the rules and items which he considers most appropriate for establishing a plan, the execution of which will lead to verbal behaviour which is expected to satisfy the original goal" (ibid.: 25). Communication strategies are considered to be a constituent of the planning phase. When second language learners face any problem, they resort either to avoidance behaviour (adopting avoidance strategies), or to achievement behaviour (adopting achievement strategies). See figure (5) below.

Faerch/Kasper (1983a) divided reduction strategies (avoidance strategies) into two sub-categories: formal reduction strategies and functional reduction strategies. Formal reduction is defined thus: "learners... communicate by means of a 'reduced' system in order to avoid producing non-fluent or incorrect utterances" and this may occur at the level of phonology, morphology, syntax or lexis (ibid.: 38). Functional reduction strategies are used when learners experience problems in the planning phase or in the execution phase, and the learner then 'reduces' his communicative goal. It occurs either at the planning phase or the execution phase and it includes topic avoidance, message abandonment and message replacement.

Faerch/Kasper (1983a) also divided achievement strategies into two sub-categories (i) compensatory strategies and (ii) retrieval strategies which learners adopt at the execution phase. Compensatory strategies and retrieval strategies are achievement strategies which
learners use in an attempt to solve their communication problems by expanding their communicative resources.

*Code switching* involves a switch from L2 to L1 or to any other foreign language, whereas *interlingual transfer* refers to strategies that result in a combination of the linguistic features of L1 and L2. *Inter/intralanguage transfer* involves making generalisations which are influenced by L1 structures. *IL-based strategies* refer to "coping with communicative problems by using his IL system: he may (i) generalize; (ii) paraphrase; (iii) coin new words....(iv) restructuring" (Faerch/Kasper 1983a: 47).

![Figure 5: Faerch/Kasper's taxonomy of CSs (adapted from Faerch/Kasper 1983a: 36-56)](image-url)
**Co-operative strategies** include *appeal for help* to the interlocutor, which could be a direct or indirect appeal. **Non-linguistic strategies** refer to mime, gesture and sound imitation and they are used to support verbal strategies and to facilitate communication. **Retrieval strategies** appear when "learners may have difficulties in retrieving specific IL items and may adopt achievement strategies in order to get at the problematic item" (Faerch/Kasper 1983a: 52).

**Generalisation** is used when learners find a solution to their communication problems in the planning phase by "filling in the 'gaps' in their plans with IL items which they would not normally use in such contexts" (Faerch/Kasper 1983a: 47). **Paraphrase** involves solving a problem in the planning phase by "filling the 'gap' in his plan with a construction which is well – formed according to his IL system" (Faerch/Kasper 1983a: 49).

**Word coinage** "involves the learner in a creative construction of a new IL word (cf. Varadi (1973/1980) 'airball' for 'balloon'). **Restructuring** is used "whenever the learner realizes that he cannot complete a local plan which he has already begun to use and switches to an alternative local plan which enables him to communicate his intended message without reduction" (Faerch/Kasper 1983a:50).

**CORDER'S (1983) TAXONOMY:** According to Corder (1983), strategies of communication are related to *means* and *ends* which are in balance in a native speaker, but not in a language learner. When language learners are faced with a problem during the course of interaction, they have two options: either they tailor their message (ends) to their linguistic resources (means) by using 'message adjustment strategies or risk avoidance strategies' that could be *topic avoidance, message abandonment or semantic avoidance*, or they increase their linguistic resources to achieve their communicative goals by *resource expansion strategies*. See Figure (6) below.

---

**Figure 6: Corder's taxonomy of CSs**

(Corder 1983 regards the *message adjustment strategies* hierarchically ordered from least extreme (message reduction) to most extreme (topic avoidance).
THE NIJMEGEN GROUP TAXONOMY: The most comprehensive project on communication strategies was that conducted at the University of Nijmegen (Netherlands) by Kellerman, Bongaerts, and Poulisse in the 1980s. They argued that "the study of communication strategies should reach beyond description to prediction and explanation" (Kellerman et al. 1990: 164). They criticised the early taxonomies for concentrating on the linguistic form that results from a strategy, rather than on the process that leads to the use of such strategies.

The Nijmegen group's aim was to produce a process-based taxonomy of CSs that was characterised by being parsimonious (fewer categories), generalisable (independent of variations across speakers, tasks, languages and levels of proficiency) and psychologically plausible (the most important) that would replace existing taxonomies (Kellerman/Bialystok 1997).

The Nijmegen group also argued that CSs are mental procedures. They believed that CS research should investigate the cognitive processes that underlie strategic language use. They claimed that concentrating only on the surface structures of strategic language behaviour would lead to taxonomies of 'doubtful validity'. Therefore, Bialystok and the Nijmegen group maintained that CS research should adopt an analytic perspective by focusing on the cognitive 'deep structure' of strategic language.

Their alternative approach followed a process-oriented classification of CSs which divided them into conceptual strategies and linguistic strategies. This classification was based on Bongaerts/Poulisse's (1989) study of 45 Dutch learners of English (30 secondary school pupils and 15 university students), who were tested at three proficiency levels according to the number of years they had studied English: advanced (university level), intermediate (high secondary school), and low (low secondary). Four tasks were used in their project: describing photographs of unusual objects like a fly-swatter, describing abstract geometrical drawings in LI and L2; retelling four one-minute long scripted stories; and a fifteen-minute interview. Compensatory strategies were classified into conceptual (analytic and holistic) and linguistic (morphological and transfer). See Figure (7) below. The results showed that the more advanced the learner, the fewer compensatory strategies he/she employed. The results also showed that L1 and L2 speakers handle their referential problems in a similar way.

Conceptual strategies refer to the learner's use of his conceptual knowledge to compensate for a missing word. In a conceptual strategy "the speaker analyses the concept semantically, by decomposing it into its defining and characteristic features" (Poulisse 1990: 80). According to Kellerman/Bialystok (1997), it includes two sub-types: holistic and analytic. When a language user adopts a holistic strategy, he uses a referent which is similar to the target referent, for example chair for stool, rose for flower. In traditional taxonomies, these are referred to as 'approximation'. The use of 'bird' for 'sparrow' and 'vegetables' for 'peas' are examples of a holistic conceptual strategy. The use of such a strategy is preceded by expressions like "It looks like a.....", "It's a sort of.....".
An analytic strategy involves "a conceptual analysis of the originally intended concept", such as "a talk uh bird" for "parrot", or "he lives in the mountain" for "hermit" (Poulisse 1990: 61). Bongaerts/Poulisse (1989: 255) also claim that holistic and analytic strategies are sometimes combined, as in "a bird which is small and has a red breast", for robin.

Linguistic strategies are used when the language user "exploits his or her knowledge of the rule systems of the native language, the target language, or any other language he or she happens to know. He/she uses his/her insights into the correspondences between these rule systems" (Bongaerts/Poulisse 1989: 255).

Bongaerts/Poulisse (1989) distinguish between two sub-types of linguistic strategy. Morphological creativity refers to the use of the target language's morphological rules to create new words (e. g., 'appliances' for letters of application, 'representator' for representative and 'shamely' for shameful). The second sub-type is the strategy of transfer, which includes transferring things from L1 or L3. It can be referred to as 'literal translation', 'foreignizing' and 'borrowing'.

Kellerman (1991) presented a two-strategy taxonomy which was based on the Nijmegen project (e. g., Poulisse 1987). It includes conceptual and code strategies. Conceptual strategies involve talking about the properties of the concept, including part-whole relationships, attributes and functions. Code strategy refers to the use of a word form via languages other than L2 or via the derivation of rules within L2.

In Kellerman's (1991) taxonomy, non-verbal strategies such as mime are considered to be manifestations of a conceptual strategy when depicting semantic properties, whereas in previous taxonomies they are classified as a separate category.

Poulisse (1997) tried to conceptualise CSs within a coherent model of speech production which allowed for a detailed psycholinguistic analysis of strategic behaviour. When L2 learners find it difficult to communicate their intended message, they adopt a certain stra-
egy. Following Levelt's (1989) model of language production, Poulisse (1997) summarises what happens in the course of communication:

“At Step 1, speakers conceptualise a message adhering to general principles of communication and taking into account the situation, the preceding discourse, the knowledge they share with their interlocutor(s) and so on. At Step 2, they start the encoding of this message, but run into problems... They then have the choice between giving up (i.e. using an avoidance strategy), or encoding their message in an alternative way (i.e. using a compensatory strategy). The latter solution will presumably involve replanning the original message at the level of conceptualisation: it will either require a complete organization of the original plan in the case of analytic conceptual strategy, or the substitution of some meaning or language elements to allow for the selection of an alternative lexical item in the case of holistic conceptual strategy or transfer strategies. It seems likely, then, that while planning the use of a CpS, the speaker will again follow general principles of communication and will take the situation, the preceding discourse and shared knowledge into account. In other words, CpS use is probably subject to the same principles and constraints that affect the production of any other utterance.” (Poulisse 1997: 50)

Despite the fact that the Nijmegen group taxonomy seems applicable and convergent with other taxonomies, it is difficult to apply geometrical, partitive and linear analysis to data other than the abstract geometrical shapes which formed the central task in their research (cf. Bongaerts/Kellerman/Bentalage 1987; Bongaerts/Poulisse 1989; Poulisse 1990).

Dornyei/Scott's Taxonomy: Dornyei/Scott's (1997) review article on CSs cited their taxonomy of CSs (Dornyei/Scott 1995a, 1995b). Their taxonomy is considered to be a summary of all the taxonomies available in CS research, but some new strategies such as use of similar-sounding words, use of all-purpose words, mumbling, as a part of their main category direct strategies are added to their taxonomy. Feigning understanding is another added strategy. See table (2) below.

Dornyei (1995) suggested an extension to the definition of communication strategies to include stalling or time-gaining strategies (e.g. the use of pause fillers and hesitation gambits). According to Dornyei/Scott, these strategies are not used as a result of language deficiency, but rather to help speakers gain time to keep the communication channel open when they encounter a problem. In his suggestion, he agrees with several other researchers (e.g., Canale 1983; Savignon 1983; Rubin 1987; Rost 1994).

In discussing comprehensible input, Kasper/Kellerman (1997) suggest that interactional modifications, or adjustments such as confirmation checks, comprehension checks and clarification requests,

"... operate on input which is too far ahead of the learner's current interlanguage competence and size it down to what the learner can manage. Since 'negotiation of meaning' is a joint enterprise between the learner and her interlocutor(s), the learner exerts a fair amount of control over just how much modification of the original input is needed to comprehend the interlocutor's contribution.”

(Kasper/Kellerman 1997: 5f.)
This suggestion supports Dornyei/Scott's (1995a, 1995b) taxonomy which regards confirmation checks, comprehension checks and clarification requests as communication strategies. They labelled these strategies "interactional strategies".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Direct Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. RESOURCE DEFICIT—RELATED STRATEGIES INCLUDE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message abandonment, Message reduction, Message replacement, Circumlocution, Approximation, Use of all-purpose words, Word coinage, Restructuring, Literal translation, Foreignizing, Code switching, Use of similar-sounding words, Mumbling Omission, Retrieval, and Mime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. OWN-PERFORMANCE PROBLEM-RELATED STRATEGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Self-rephrasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Self-repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. OTHER-PERFORMANCE-RELATED STRATEGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Other-repair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Interactional Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. RESOURCE DEFICIT-RELATED STRATEGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Appeal for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. OWN-PERFORMANCE PROBLEM-RELATED STRATEGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Comprehension check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Own-accuracy check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. OTHER-PERFORMANCE PROBLEM-RELATED STRATEGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Asking for repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Asking for clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Asking for confirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Guessing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Expressing non understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Interpretive summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Indirect Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. PROCESSING TIME PRESSURE-RELATED STRATEGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Use of fillers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Repetitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. OWN-PERFORMANCE PROBLEM-RELATED STRATEGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Verbal strategy markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. OTHER-PERFORMANCE PROBLEM-RELATED STRATEGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Feigning understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Dornyei/Scott's taxonomy of CSs (1995a, 1995b) (adapted from Dornyei/Scott, 1997:189ff.)

RABAB’AH’S TAXONOMY (2001): Our Taxonomy (Rabab’ah 2001) is different from all the existing taxonomies because it was based on the pilot study, which was conducted to assess the suitability of tasks for eliciting the strategic behaviour and the quality of the data collection procedures. New sub-categories were added to the taxonomy, which were classified under language switch strategy. They were classified according to the factors causing
under *language switch* strategy. They were classified according to the factors causing this switch. These sub-categories are *L1 appeal for help*, *L1 optimal meaning*, *L1 ignorance acknowledgement strategy* and *L1 retrieval strategies*. They are "language switch" strategies and each one was used for a particular reason. Another L2–based strategy is added which is called *ignorance acknowledgement*. This strategy is used when the learner admits his ignorance and does not try any other strategy to describe the language item needed. For examples, see the taxonomy below.

The basis of the taxonomy is a consideration of the source of the information on which the strategy is used. This information may derive from the learner's native language which is referred to as an L1-based strategy, or the information may originate from the target language, and in this case it is referred to as an L2-based strategy. When we say here L1-based strategies, we mean Arabic–based strategies. The reason for this is that there is no language used by Jordanians other than their native language, Arabic, in both formal and informal communication. The examples given in the adopted taxonomy below are taken from the data of the author's study (Rabab'ah 2001: 213ff.).

Rabab’ah’s Taxonomy (taken from Rabab’ah 2001: 213ff.)

**A. L1-BASED STRATEGIES**

1. **Literal translation**: translating literally a lexical item.
   e.g. "It is electrical stairs" for "Escalator".

2. **Language switch**: This refers to the use of a word or a phrase from L1 to represent the target language item. This category may be divided into sub-categories according to the reasons for switching.
   a. **L1 slips and immediate insertion**: Learners insert a word unintentionally - a slip of the tongue. Learners also insert words to complete the intended meaning.
      e.g. *Nasi* (tr: I forgot) ............., skin scan e:r *qiyas* (tr: measure) e:r ((unintelligible)) em temperature degree?
   b. **L1 appeal for help**: This refers to when learners use Arabic to appeal for help. The following example is taken from the story-telling task.
      e.g. e:r yesterday e:m ...., the guy? *ghalat?* (tr: wrong?) drive er .........., er drive the [baisklet]
      The subject here uses the Arabic word *ghalat?* (tr: wrong?) with a rising intonation looking for confirmation from the researcher.
c. **LI-optimal meaning strategy.** Learners use L1-intended meaning (exact Arabic word) to refer to the object as in the following example: the use of the word *ascenseur* which was originally French, but has become part of everyday language, is also used by the learners. *ascenseur* (tr: lift) ((the researcher asked "In English?") the subject insisted *hia ascenseur* (tr: It's a lift)

The use of the Arabic word *masaad* is another example of LI-optimal meaning: *hatha masaad* (tr: This is a lift.)

d. **LI-retrieval strategies:** Learners may realise at a certain time that the item they want to use is there, but they have to retrieve it in some way, so they wait for the term to appear, in the meantime, they use Arabic all the while trying to recall what items they have. The following is a clear example of LI-retrieval strategy.

*e.g.* *Hathi bisamouha* (tr: this is called), to light the room, to light the room.

e. **LI ignorance acknowledgement strategy:** This is used when learners express their ignorance of the target language item required.

*e.g.* *er mush aarefhcii* (tr: I don't know this).

B. **L2 – BASED STRATEGIES**

1. **AVOIDANCE STRATEGIES:**

a. **Message abandonment:** This refers to leaving a message unfinished because of some language difficulty.

*e.g.* The driver didn't do anything to em to prevent er em or to ... he didn't do anything.

b. **Topic Avoidance:** This refers to reducing the message by avoiding certain language structures or topics considered problematic language-wise, or by leaving out some intended elements as a result of lacking the necessary linguistic resources. In this study, this was assessed in terms of whether the key events in the story-telling task, or the speech acts in the role-play task were attempted or not. For the picture identification/naming task, avoidance was not possible because of the nature of the task. The subjects were asked to identify the object shown to them by the researcher. All the pictures were attempted.

2. **WORD COINAGE:** This refers to the creation of a non-existent L2 word by applying a supposed L2 rule.

*e.g.* "unmove" to mean "broke down" in the following utterance.

he found this the man who dr who hit them er find him his car is er is ,..., ..., it's un-move
3. **Circumlocution**: This refers to exemplifying, illustrating, or describing the properties of the target object or action.
   e. g. "We use it to make the baby walking in the house easily" to refer to 'baby walker’

4. **Self-correction/Restructuring**: This refers to attempts to correct oneself by trying to restructure the utterance to reach the optimal meaning.
   e. g. the car was broke ...broken.

5. **Approximation**: Using an alternative lexical item that shares certain semantic features with the target item, or using a generalised target language item.
   The use of 'quicker' in the following example to mean 'faster'
   The boys em be because they because he is er ,……., very,……., er quicker,……., in speed er very speed in driving.

6. **Mumbling**: Swallowing or muttering inaudibly a word (or part of a word) whose correct form the speaker is uncertain about.
   e. g. he go er or er ((muttering)) on his bicycle

7. **L2 Appeal for Help**: This refers to asking for help directly or indirectly. Though the author did not intend to give any help, some subjects appealed for help.
   e. g. er ..........., I don’t know. Electric er (13 sec) electric,........, ladder? Electric ladder? Electric steps? Step? I don't know.

8. **Self-repetition**: The learner repeats a word or a string of words immediately after they have been said.
   e. g. he was very happy because he didn’t ca(re) he didn’t care for him when he fell.

9. **Use of Similar-sounding words**: This strategy is used to replace a lexical item whose form the speaker is unsure of with an existing or non-existent word which sounds like the target item.
   e. g. "this is {ekstenture}" for "fire extinguisher"

10. **Use of All-purpose words**: This refers to the use of words like "stuff", "thing", "things" "do" or "make".
    e. g. the man was trying to fix it (the car). he looked at it and he did the same thing

11. **Ignorance Acknowledgement**: This refers to the learner's admission of his lack of the required knowledge or vocabulary when he says that he does not know.
    e. g. e:r em I don't know, tell me.
So far no consensus has been reached on a definitive taxonomy of communication strategies. In the following section, I will discuss the problems related to these taxonomies and the problems encountered in classifying utterances into different CS categories.

**Problems with taxonomies of CSs**

The taxonomies provided by researchers are organised according to certain criteria: the choice of the learner as to whether to reduce or achieve his goal, to consult different sources of information – L1 or L2 – or to use his conceptual or linguistic knowledge. Though researchers have produced apparently different taxonomies with different structures, the underlying structure of these taxonomies is often the same. What is referred to as circumlocution by one taxonomy is classified as description or exemplification in other taxonomies. For example, Bongaerts/Poulisse (1989) distinguish between two sub-types of linguistic strategy: *morphological creativity* and *strategy of transfer*. *Strategy of transfer* consists of transferring items from L1 or L3. It may be referred to as 'literal translation', 'foreignizing' and 'borrowing'. In Tarone's (1977) taxonomy, these strategies are referred to as strategies of *conscious transfer* and later (Tarone 1983) as *borrowing*.

Poulisse (1993) reconsidered some aspects of her work with the Nijmegen group and came up with a modified cognitive taxonomy made up of three categories: *substitution*, *reconceptualization* and *substitution plus*. Substituting one lexical item for another is substitution, whereas feature listing is reconceptualization. *Substitution plus* refers to the adaptation to the target language via morphological and phonological accommodation.

Kellerman/Bialystok argue that Poulisse's new classification has its own problems. For example, "stuff to kill flies" (for 'fly spray'), according to Poulisse is an example of "reconceptualization", or "substitution and reconceptualization" (1997: 42). Another problem concerns lists of category members (e.g., tables, beds and chairs for 'furniture'). Should these be treated as substitution or as reconceptualization? One lexical item may be treated as substitution, but all these category members are considered to be "reconceptualization on the grounds of requiring more processing effort" (Kellerman/Bialystok 1997: 42f.). What about when the learner produces 'apples and things' for 'fruit', or 'tables, etc.' for 'furniture'. How are these classified? Poulisse's (1993) distinction between substitution and reconceptualization seems to be based on whether it is a single lexical item representing another. Kellerman/Bialystok (1997: 43) claim that, "Since exemplification is a fairly common compensatory lexical device, its ambiguous status is a challenge to Poulisse's typology".

In the original Nijmegen taxonomy, exemplification would always be classified as an example of conceptual strategy, whether by mentioning one or more category members (e.g., tables, beds and cupboards), or whether it is followed by *etc.* or *and things*. 
According to Bialystok, "To return to zoological taxonomies, classifying animals according to their ability to fly or their possession of feathers will lead to essentially the same classification of events, even though the criteria for classifying the events appear to be different" (1990: 47).

The taxonomies of Tarone (1977), Faerch/Kasper (1983), Bialystok (1983) and Paribakht (1985), show many similarities. Thus, Bialystok (1990) remarked:

"... the variety of taxonomies proposed in the literature differ primarily in terminology and overall categorizing principle rather than in the substance of the specific strategies. If we ignore, then, differences in the structure of the taxonomies by abolishing the various overall categories, then a core group of specific strategies that appear consistently across the taxonomies clearly emerges.... Differences in the definitions and illustrations for these core strategies across the various studies are trivial." (Bialystok 1990: 61)

However, Yule/Tarone (1997: 17) summarise the approaches taken by CS researchers. The "Pros" whose purpose has been to "propose additional categories, maintaining and expanding existing taxonomies (e. g., Tarone/Yule 1987)", and the "Cons" who denied the value of existing taxonomies and proposed a substantial reduction in the number of categories (e. g. Bongaerts et al. 1987).

In terms of methodology, the Pros and Cons are different. The Pros use a comparison between L1 and L2 performance. According to Yule/Tarone (1997), the Cons failed to elicit L1 performance so they compare the learners' L2 performance with that of native speakers of the target language. The Cons focus on the cognitive processes involved in communicating a message, whereas the Pros are interested in describing the forms used by language learners. With abstract shapes, learners resort to conceptual strategies by using analogies and by describing the parts of the shape, but with real world objects, learners start by naming and describing their function and use. (In this study when the subjects do not know the target language item or a substitute for it, they describe its use and function). The presence or the absence of the listener is another difference between the Pros and the Cons. For the Cons, the presence of a listener seems to be unnecessary in a shape identification task. Tarone/Yule (1989) are of the opinion that the interlocutor/listener has an important and powerful influence on the speaker's performance, and may have a great effect on the cognitive processes underlying that performance.

Another difference is that the Cons draw their subjects from only one background (Dutch L1 learners). This might have affected the type of strategies revealed in the data. For example, Chen (1990) found that there were no L1-based (code) strategies used by her Chinese subjects. The Pros, on the other hand, included learners from a variety of L1 backgrounds.

To conclude, there is no consensus among researchers over a taxonomy of communication strategies. It is very clear in the literature that a single utterance may be labelled under two different categories. Cook argues that "if the lists were standardised, at least, there..."
would be an agreement about such categories" (1993: 133). Researchers develop and propose new taxonomies of communication strategies from time to time. In the end, research into communication strategies will probably include a standardised taxonomy.

PROBLEMS WITH THE CLASSIFICATION OF CSs

CS research has suffered from problems related to the classification of communication strategies. According to Bialystok (1990: 69) "each utterance betrays the presence of several strategies. This combination of approaches used by speakers in a single utterance leads to problems of classification".

Duff (1997: 195) claims that overlap exists across the communication strategies: "the same utterances may manifest or have embedded within them more than one strategy". To illustrate this, Rabab’ah (2001), in his study, found out that some utterances included two or more communication strategies. To identify an escalator, one subject produced "these machine used to carry people from one floor to another floor, floor er like in,...,..., airport or in any... (unintelligible word)"

Repetition strategy in the above example was used when the subject repeated the word 'floor'. Circumlocution strategy was also manifested when the subject described the use or the function of the object "used to carry people... like in airport". Mumbling was a third strategy used.

Another example of the students' oral production, which manifests more than one strategy in an utterance, is given by Rabab’ah (2001).

e:r ,,,......, you can count er the e:r ..., the distance of e:r found it in the car e:m this o'clock can e:r e:r put in shu? (tr: what?) er in the car to: er to: limit the: the speed (This full description is just to identify a speedometer).

In the above utterance five strategies were used. An example of approximation strategy is the use of the word 'count' to mean 'measure'. The learner extends the meaning of 'count' to mean 'measure'. This could be as a result of literal translation from the native language/Arabic. The word 'clock' is used as an approximation of the target word 'speedometer', which could be also due to the influence of the native language since people in Jordan use the word 'clock' translated literally to refer to the speedometer. Language switch and appeal for help were clearly manifested when the learner asked 'shu?' in Arabic (tr: what?). But the most apparent strategy is circumlocution: "found it in the car e:m .... er in the car to: er to: limit the: the speed"

Many researchers have disagreed with each other over the classification of a certain type of strategic behaviour in terms of which category it belongs to, but they almost always refer to the same thing. In Tarone (1977) one learner referred to 'a hairdresser' as 'a person
who cuts hair', while another person called it 'a haircutter'. For Bongaerts/Poulisse (1989), using Tarone's (1977) taxonomy, the first utterance should be classified as a "circumlocution" and the second as a 'word coinage'. This classification focuses on the differences in the linguistic form between the two utterances. But Bongaerts/Poulisse (1989: 254) claim that "the two utterances are similar in terms of their semantic content....Thus, it ignores the fact that the underlying referential processes are similar. In both cases the learners communicate the intended concept by mentioning some of its most distinctive attributes". For the Nijmegen group, when the expressions refer to the characteristics of the item, they are all categorised as "circumlocution".

Traditional taxonomies (e.g., Tarone 1977, Faerch/Kasper 1983a) would categorise "something to kill flies with" for 'a fly-swat' as a description of function, "an animal in the form of a star" for 'a starfish' as a description of shape, and the "small orange ones" to distinguish large fish from small ones, as a description of size followed by colour. Bongaerts/Poulisse (1989: 254) claim that the problem with such a classification is that:

"these distinctions merely reflect differences in referents and differences in the contexts in which the referents are presented. Consequently, taxonomies that contain such distinctions fail to capture an important generalization with respect to referential behaviour: the strategy learners adopt is to mention those attributes of a referent which uniquely identify it in a given context."

Kellerman (1991: 146), in criticising the taxonomies proposed so far, points out that referring to 'an art gallery' as 'a picture place' or as 'a place where you look at pictures' obviously reflects the same underlying cognitive process. Thus to code them as 'word coinage' and 'circumlocution', according to Tarone's taxonomy, is misleading.

Bialystok (1990: 75) summarises the main problems that CS research suffers from:

"the criteria for assigning an utterance to a specific strategy are sometimes vague, sometimes arbitrary, and sometimes irrelevant. If concepts such as 'sharing semantic features' or 'single words' are interpreted differently, the same utterance would be assigned to a different category. These vagaries of classification directly challenge the reliability of the taxonomies and limit their potential for forming the basis for explanation of communication strategies."

In supporting Bialystok’s view (1990), in the data collected by Rabab’ah (2001), one learner produced "hand e:r ..........., cleaning hand Mukinseh, Nasi Esimha Bililingilizi ( tr: broom, I forgot its name in English)". Cleaning hand can be classified both as word coinage and as literal translation. Such examples were considered to be literal translation from Arabic because in daily life situation in Jordan 'broom' is referred to as something close to the words produced by the learner. Another example is "telephone public" produced by another learner. The wrong word order is an indication of literal translation, because in Arabic word order is different from English, the noun comes before the adjective (Rabab’ah 2001).
In the following example which was produced by another subject, electrical lamps could be classified as either word coinage or literal translation, but I think it is considered word coinage strategy, which again resulted from literal translation: 'er electrical lamps or e:r or er electrical lamps I guess'.

The subject in the utterance quoted below used 'travelling cheques' for traveller's cheque. Such utterances have been classified in Rabab'ah's study as word coinage. It is probable that the learner applied a number of morphological and syntactical rules in order to arrive at this form, intending to create a new word.

e:r I have some travelling cheques and em I wonder where I can find a bank or what time the banks open or close?

"Electricity machine" was produced by another learner to refer to a vacuum cleaner. It could be classified by another researcher as literal translation, but in our opinion is word coinage. The subject tried to express the optimal meaning, but due to his limited linguistic resources, he was forced to join two words together to pass on his message.

It has become obvious that it is sometimes difficult to assign a particular utterance to a particular strategy since the same utterance may include more than one strategy, and also be classified differently by researchers. However, in order to standardise the classification process, the CS cases should be identified as to strategic behaviour, then highlighted and classified within their context. Moreover, the use of independent judges could help in maximising the reliability of the classification plus of the coding system.

TEACHABILITY OF COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

A major issue that has been investigated by many researchers is whether L2 learners need to be taught communication strategies or not. Some researchers have been enthusiastic about the idea of teaching CSs and claim that it is both possible and desirable (e.g., Oxford 1990; Tarone/Yule 1989; Rost 1994). Others have opposed teaching CSs (e.g., Terrell 1977; Bialystok 1990; Labarca/Khanji 1986; Cook 1991; Kellerman 1991).

Canale/Swain (1980) believe that communication strategies are most likely to be acquired in real-life situations and not in the classroom. Bialystok (1990) also argues that communication strategies are reflections of underlying psychological processes, so focusing on the surface structure will not enhance communication strategy use. She proposes that we should seek to develop learner's CSs by "training aimed at mastering of analysis and control over the target language" (Bialystok 1990: 145). She also adds that "What one must teach students of a language is not strategy, but language", because the more the learners know, the better they will be at meeting their demands (ibid.: 147). Kellerman also holds the same point of view. He
(1991: 158) proposes that "there is no justification for training in compensatory strategies in the classroom... Teach the learners more language and let strategies look after themselves".

These researchers' conclusions are not based on any experimental research that has proved that teaching CSs does have a beneficial effect on learners' performances in the target language. As a result, empirical studies have been conducted to investigate the effect of teaching CSs on the learners' performance (For details see section 5.6).

On the other hand, many other researchers maintain that strategy training is possible and desirable (e.g., Faerch/Kasper 1983a; Chen 1990; Haastrup/Phillipson 1983; Rost 1994; Savignon 1972, 1983; Tarone/Yule 1989; Dornyei/Thurrell 1991).

Faerch/Kasper, for example, argue that "if by teaching we mean passing on new information only, there is probably no need to teach communication strategies" because language users have that knowledge and make use of it in their LI. They (1983a: 55) suggest that if teaching means making learners conscious of their behaviour, then "it is obvious that we should teach them about strategies".

Oxford (1990) and O'Malley/Chamot (1990) also argue that conscious raising of the use of CSs is important. They suggest that training students in the use of communication strategies and learning strategies helps them become better language users.

Tarone/Yule (1989: 114) support Faerch/Kasper's (1983) view of teaching communication strategies when they admit, "We differ in our approach from other researchers, who argue that communication strategies cannot be explicitly taught".

Controversies among researchers might be due to the different interpretations of the notion of teaching communication strategies, which may be summarised thus:

1. Raising the learners' awareness of the nature of CSs. Faerch/Kasper emphasized the importance of increasing 'metacommunicative awareness' (1986: 187).
2. Encouraging learners to be risk takers and use CSs. Learners should not be afraid of making errors (Faerch/Kasper 1986).
3. Providing L2 models of the use of certain CSs through demonstrations, listening materials and videos and getting learners to categorise and evaluate strategies used by native speakers or other L2 speakers. Faerch/Kasper's (1986) procedure when they video-taped the learners' performance was for them to view their own recordings, and the students analysed their own use of strategy.
4. Teaching CSs directly by providing learners with linguistic devices. For example, Tarone/Yule (1989) point out that circumlocution requires certain basic core vocabulary and sentence structure in order to be able to use terms such as bowl-shaped, triangular, on the rim circular. Dornyei/Thurrell (1991) consider basic structures to be given to the learners like a kind of, the thing you use for, it is something you do/say when... .
5. Providing opportunities for practice in strategy use rather than direct teaching. Keller-man (1991: 160) acknowledges the possible usefulness of situational classroom practice of strategies in order to help learners overcome difficulties: "such exercises would be designed to help learners perform their competence rather than build it up".

By teaching communication strategies, I think we mean all of the above: raising the learners' awareness of CSs, encouraging them to take risks and use CSs, providing L2 models of the use of certain CSs, teaching CSs directly by providing learners with linguistic devices and finally providing opportunities for practice in use of strategies. The effective use of CSs will probably help enormously in achieving the speakers' communicative goals.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Research into communication strategies has made an important contribution to L2 acquisition. This research has made much progress during the last three decades since Selinker (1972) introduced the term 'Strategies of Second Language Communication'. CS researchers began their research by defining, identifying and classifying communication strategies. Empirical research into CSs, which was conducted subsequently, has given way to the analysis of the mental processes underlying CS use. The Nijmegen Group and Poulisse (1993) attempted to relate strategy use to models of language processing and language production, but this was limited to lexical compensatory strategies. Another important direction for CS research was that of Kellerman/Bialystok (1997), which was concerned with the psycholinguistic approach to cover other types of strategies, such as reduction strategies and appeal for help.

Previous CS research conducted so far has almost exclusively focused upon the second or foreign language speakers, particularly learners in communicating with native speakers of the language. But in real life situations, native speakers also encounter problems during the course of communication. Therefore, they resort to strategies to solve their problems. Rabab'ah (2001) investigated the use of CSs by English majors at Jordanian universities in both languages Arabic and English, and he found out that Arabic native speakers also encounter communication problems; therefore they resort to a good number of communication strategies.

To conclude, there has been little research that investigated the use of CSs by native speakers when they try to communicate with non-native speakers, except some studies conducted on 'Foreigner Talk'. Therefore, research into communication strategies on strategies that are used by native speakers should be given more attention.
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