Compensatory Communication Strategies Employed

by Syarifuddin Syarifuddin

Compensatory Communication Strategies Employed
by EFL Students in Taking Turns Talking of a Speaking Class

Syarifudin

Universitas Islam Negeri Mataram

Bio-Profile:

Syarifudin is an associate professor at Education and Teacher Training Faculty, Mataram State Islamic University. His Master and Doctor in English Language Education field. His interests are in TEFL, Research Methods in ELT, and sociolinguistics. Affiliation Address: Jl. Gajah Mada No. 100 Jempong-Mataram, Indonesia, FTK-UIN Mataram. Email: syarif@uinmataram.ac.id.

Abstract

The present study explored verbal and nonverbal compensatory communication strategies (CCSs) employed by EFL students both in encoding of message (speakers) and in decoding of message (listeners) to surmount communication problems in taking turns talking of an English speaking class. Taking turns talking is one way of practicing and learning of speaking in order to habituate and familiarize students on spoken English. Students circulate the message in process of spoken communication are both as message productive and message receptive who convey and receive the message in taking turns talking.

This study was carried out by employing a qualitative approach with an ethnography of communication design in a limited setting. Thirty students taking Speaking for Everyday Communication Course at English Language Education Program of Mataram State Islamic University were selected as subjects of research by using a purposeful technique. Techniques used to collect data were non-participant observation, video recording, and interview.

The research findings showed that there were ten verbal CCSs employed by speakers, including approximation, word coinage, circumlocution, language switch, appeal for assistance, paraphrase, self-correction, comprehension check, and self-repetition. Meanwhile, nonverbal CCSs employed by speakers consisted of six strategies comprising smiling, head nodding, head shaking, hand moving, thumb up, and drawing something. Furthermore, on

students' strategies to deal with communication problems encountered by listeners were found seven verbal CCSs, including language switch, appeal for assistance, asking the speaker for clarification, asking the speaker for repetition, asking the speaker to add language, guessing the speaker's message, and specifying the speaker's message. Seven nonverbal strategies were found, consisting of smiling, gazing towards the speaker, head nodding, head shaking, hand moving, forward position.

Key Words: communication strategy, strategy competence, speaking strategy, speaking class

Introduction

On the strength of EFL students' assumption that speaking proficiency is very imperative of learning English, and the success of it is measured by the ability to use English in spoken communication. Many EFL students consider that speaking ability is one of their primary purposes of studying a language, they assume that it would derive some personal satisfaction from being able to speak English and it would be useful in pursuing a job and other activities (Hadley, 1993). However, to gain speaking proficiency is not easy for EFL students because it needs mastery of some components of communicative competence, including grammatical competence as a linguistic system comprising phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexical (vocabulary) as well as other English competencies like discourse, sociolinguistic, and strategic underlying speaking proficiency. Shumin (2002) stated that "speaking language is especially difficult for foreign language learners because effective oral communication requires the ability to use the language appropriately in social interaction". It may indicate that EFL students encounter problems in using TL in spoken communication if they lack of TL communicative competence underpinning spoken language.

Speaking requires the ability to utilize the appropriate, acceptable and comprehensible spoken language through communication in many kinds of opportunities. Opportunities are available for students who want to communicate in spoken English both inside and outside the classroom activities, but in fact that some of students are sometimes reluctant and inhibited to participate in spoken English. In a speaking class, students are encouraged to communicate both monologue and dialogue speaking activities in order to habituate and familiarize them on spoken communication in the target language. However, a speaking class is one way of learning and practicing of speaking, but multitudes of opportunities for using spoken communication exist in context in which English is used.

Taking turns talking in a speaking class promotes students to engage in interaction activity leading them to enhance spoken language. Grice (1975) as cited by Arellano-Tamayo (2018) argued that "conversational turn-taking helps the classroom becomes interactive, this is composed of two utterances by two speakers, one after the other." Furthermore, he stated that "this is the set of signals used by the speakers to introduce and manipulate different referents in a communicative event." This statement indicates that students' engagement in interaction is absolute needed in teaching speaking. Nevertheless, some of students still have problems in interaction leading them to use of communication strategies. Their problems consist of problem both as speakers in encoding of message and problem as listeners in decoding of message, then they try to face down the problems during communication by employing compensatory communication strategies either verbal or nonverbal.

With reference to the setting of English-speaking course instruction at English language education program of Mataram State Islamic University, where this study took place, it is essential to document some of perceived problems by students and their strategies to surmount problems when they are engaging in taking turns talking. Because of the independency between the background of knowledge and personal ability of English communicative competence making students faced different problems, as well as different strategies in facing down those problems. Those problems encountered leading students use communication strategies in order their spoken communication is reached. In accordance with the context of the study, the present study addresses the major discussion focus on compensatory communication strategies both verbal and nonverbal employed by students as speakers and as listeners in taking turns talking of a speaking-class.

Review of Literature

Compensatory communication strategy is a conscious attempt of both speaker in encoding of message and listener in decoding of message to agree on a meaning employing to cope with communication problem that they encounter to achieve communication goal. This coincides with Tarone's (1980) statement on CCs that a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structured are not shared. Tarone's perspective of communication strategies may be seen as attempts to bridge the gap between the linguistic knowledge of speaker and listener to TL in real communication situation. By using a compensatory strategy, speakers and listeners attempt to overcome communication problem by "expanding their communicative resource, rather than by reducing their communicative goal" (Corder, 1980). Communication problems to be overcome by means of CCS may occur at all

linguistic levels, but mostly problems concentrated on problems face by students at lexical level. Most of Problems in communication occur in the planning phase and some to retrieval problems in the execution phase. Similar to Tarone (1980), Corder, (1980), Bialystok (1983) defined communication strategies as "all attempts to manipulate a limited linguistic system in order to promote communication." This coincides with Luoz & Weil (2014) who stated that "Compensation strategies are actions taken by a learner to overcome limitations in his/her L2 knowledge, e.g., in the vocabulary or grammar necessary for comprehending or communicating". Bialystok's perspective about communication strategies may be seen as demeanors for those cases in which communication is disrupted because of an inadequate linguistic knowledge and an impasse in minds of what they are talking in TL of both speakers and listeners.

Theoretical bases from some concepts which are adopted as the theoretical underpinning in this research are compensatory communication strategies from interactional and psycholinguistic perspectives. Those theoretical bases are mainly based on a model of the popular studies on compensatory communication strategies are proposed by Tarone (1983) acknowledged as an interactional approach, and Faerch and Kasper (1983) acknowledged as a psycholinguistic approach. Those theoretical bases of compensatory communication strategies proposed are going to be delineated more detail in the further explanation.

Tarone's (1983) research is in the form of analyzing transcripts of the students' attempts to refer to a number of objects and events depicted. The students' productions are interactional, which reflect student's attempts to make themselves understood by their interlocutors. By focusing on interactions, Tarone regards compensatory communication strategies as any attempts at avoiding disruptions of communication. Tarone (1983) further categorized the existence of compensatory communication strategies that happen in students' speaking-interaction into seven categories.

1. Approximation: student uses of a single TL term which speaker knows is not correct, but which shares enough semantic features in common with the desired term to satisfy the listener.
2. Word coinage: student makes up a new word in order to communicate a desired concept.
3. Circumlocution: student describes the characteristics or elements of the object or action instead of using the appropriate TL term.
4. Literal translation: student translates word for word from the native language.
5. Language switch: student uses the native language term without bothering to translate.
6. Appeal for assistance: student asks for the correct term or structure to any capable peers.

7. Mime: student uses nonverbal strategies in place of a lexical item or action.

Faerch and Kasper (1983) adopted psycholinguistic approach in analysis compensatory communication strategies in which they locate communication strategies within a general model of speech production. Somewhat similar with Tarone (1983), Faerch and Kasper (1983) developed compensatory communication strategies into ten categories, as follows.

1. Code switching: Student uses a form in the non-TL language.
2. Interlingual transfer: Student makes use of other than the TL.
3. Intralingual transfer: Student makes use of alternative TL forms.
4. Generalization: Student replaces one TL form with another.
5. Paraphrase: Student replaces a TL item by describing or exemplifying it.
6. Word coinage: Student replaces a TL item with an item made up from TL forms.
7. Restructuring: Student develops an alternative constituent plan.
8. Cooperative strategies: These involve a joint problem-solving effort by the student and his interlocutor.
9. Non-linguistic strategies: Student compensates, using non-linguistic means such as mime, gesture, and sound-imitation.
10. Retrieval strategies: Student attempts to retrieve in some ways from achievement strategies in order to get at the problematic item. These strategies comprising of waiting for the term to appear, appealing to formal similarity, retrieval via semantic fields, searching via other languages, retrieval from learning situations, and sensory procedures.

Knowing that both compensatory communication strategies proposed by Tarone (1983), and Faerch and Kasper (1983) have similarity and dissimilarity. The similarity is in which some of those strategies seem not only to exist explicitly in each of category, but also to exist into each other, such as word coinage, language switch, and non-linguistic strategies. Furthermore, classifying the differences of both categories are focused on the strategy's perspectives and strategies types.

The differences come from the fact that Tarone (1983) views communication strategies from a discourse analytical perspective through interactional approach, which is believed that students' speaking in interaction of real communication context is the one way to know the interaction process between speakers and their interlocutors, what strategies which are students employed to cope with the problems in communication. Faerch and Kasper (1983) esteemed communication strategies verbal plan within a speech production through psycholinguistic

approach, which is considered that mental processes of students underlying their language behavior when dealing with problems of communication in speaking acts.

Research Method

The present study employed a qualitative approach with an ethnography of communication design in a limited setting to students of English Language Education Program, Mataram State Islamic University as accessible subjects. It aims at fulfilling data of research focus on students' compensatory communication strategies in taking turns talking both as message sender (speaker) and as message receiver (listener) to cope with their problems in spoken communication. Thirty students taking Speaking for Everyday Communication Course in one class at the program were taken as subjects by employing purposeful technique.

Techniques used to collect data consisted of non-participant observation: observing the students' utterances and acts when taking turns talking; and video recording: recording the students' performances in taking turns speaking. To know the students' problems leading to use CCSs, they were asked to speak in a pair based on given topics at the course meetings.

In analyzing field notes and videos recorded, the following steps were done:
1. Making two lists of students' utterances/verbal and acts/nonverbal showing the attempts to cope with problems as the way of using compensatory communication strategies in taking turns talking.
2. Grouping the speakers' utterances/verbal and acts/nonverbal employed by the speakers as attempts to cope with problems, considering the similarities of a part of utterances and acts being made. It was found that the attempts which made to achieve a particular purpose in their speaking (compensatory strategies).
3. Grouping the listeners' utterances/verbal and acts/nonverbal employed by the listeners. In this case, it might be found the particular attempts to understand the message (compensatory strategies).
4. Classifying the initial reported verbal and nonverbal strategies into communication strategies types of the speakers.
5. Classifying the initial reported verbal and nonverbal strategies into communication strategies types of the listeners.
6. To establish the credibility of the research, the researcher applied two techniques, including persistent observation and triangulation techniques. Persistent observation was done by observing and video recording of spoken communication among the subjects.

114

During observations, field notes and reflective descriptions were considered to identify relevant data that supported research focuses. Then, this research applied three types of triangulation comprising sources, methodological, and theoretical triangulations. Sources triangulation was conducted by including verbal and nonverbal CCSs among the students. Methodological triangulation was done by employing three different data collection modes (observation, video recording, and interview) on both the same and different occasions. Furthermore, theoretical triangulation was theories which were relevant to the research foci were selected.

Data Display

The data display presented in two sections, including description about types of verbal and nonverbal compensatory communication strategies employed by speakers and types of verbal and nonverbal compensatory communication strategies employed by listeners.

Compensatory Communication Strategies Employed by Speakers in Conveying Messages

Verbal Compensatory Communication Strategies

Data display emphasizes on verbal CCSs employed by speakers, including approximation, word coinage, circumlocution, literal translation, language switch, appealing for assistance, foreignizing, paraphrase, self-correction, comprehension check, and self-repetition.

'**Approximation**' is the first compensatory strategy used twenty times by speakers of sixteen different pairs in dialogue. Even though the alternative words that students used sound inappropriate, they seemed successful help interlocutor to catch the general meaning of what the speaker said, *[e.g. S: I think may general tourists /./ I think they feel good beach to visit]*.

'**Word coinage**' is the second compensatory strategy utilized ten times by eight different pairs. The example of this strategy: *[S: Many politic people and so many leader officeworker do corruption]*.

The third compensatory strategy is '**circumlocution**' which considered as one of good solutions to cope with students' problem in spoken English. It used nine times by nine different pairs in dialogue. The example of this strategy is [S: *I don't know in English but like this when people marry, there is a man and a woman who married]*.

The fourth compensatory strategy is **'literal translation'** employed ten times by ten different pairs in dialogue. Example of this strategy: *[S: "It so many tourists there, and do you know in Selebrana beach there many villas, bungalos*, oleh-oleh /em./ handicraft restaurant too many"].

'**Language switch'** is the fifth CCS. Speakers of twenty-five pairs substituted sixty times their utterances to NL words because they did not know TL words when articulating their utterances. Its sample: *[S:May be is very good/./because UIN Mataram is second perguruan tinggi negeri in NTB]*.

'Appeal for assistance' is the sixth compensatory category, which employed ten times by ten different pairs as speakers. Its Sample: *[S: What is the small ship running to Gili Trawangan]*.

'Foreignizing' appertainned as the seventh compensatory category only employed twice by one pair. Its sample: *[S: Senggigi beach is the most famous place. There many villas, gilis, barugas like Gili Trawangan, Gili Meno, and Gili Air.]*

The eighth CCS in this study is **'Paraphrase'**. It appeared six times of six different pairs in dialogue. Its sample: [S: '…*gili air is a small island; I said small island because in small island there are not many people, there are not many villas, but there are many tourists.]*

The ninth compensatory strategy in this study was **'self-correction'**. It employed seventeen times by sixteen different pairs. Its sample: *[S: I am new comer here, I want ask about what is good place /./ I mean the interesting place there.]*

'Comprehension check' appertainned the tenth CCS was used   eight times by seven different pairs in dialogue. Example of this strategy: *[S: ...I know many places, may be one of beautiful beach is Kuta beach. Do you know Kuta beach?]*.

'Self-Repetition' was utilized nineteen times by seventeen speakers of different pairs, and it is included in the twelfth CCS. For example *[S: You may visit there, you can visit there location is far but very good to visit, white sand, beautiful panorama]*.

Nonverbal Compensatory Communication Strategies

Nonverbal CCSs appearing in spoken communication took place through facial expression (smiling), gestures (head nodding, head shaking, hand raising, hand moving, pushing hands down, thumb up, and drawing something).

'Smiling' is the first nonverbal CCS employed by speakers in this study. It occurred five times of five different pairs in dialogue. Its sample: *[S: ...Lots tourist enjoy Kuta /em./*

{smiling}in Kuta beach]. The speaker smiled when saying "… *Lots tourists enjoy Kuta /em./ {smiling} in Kuta beach].*

'Head nodding' which employed five times by five speakers of different pairs was categorized as the third nonverbal CCS. An example of it: *[S: ...very good panorama because /eh.../{head nodding} so/--- //.../].* By nodding of his head, it indicated that speaker has a message through nonverbal.

'Head shaking' which appeared four times by four speakers of different pairs was categorized as the fourth nonverbal CCS. Speaker's utterance *[S: 'I think nyongkolan like /em.../I do not know* while *head shaking}],* was an example of this strategy.

'Hand raising' which appeared five times of five different speakers was the fifth nonverbal CCSs. The speaker said */Eh.../ in Lombok, there are traditional houses. The first is in Central Lombok Sade village while {raising of right index hand}* is an example of this strategy.

'Hand-moving' which categorized as the sixth nonverbal strategy was employed seventeen times by seventeen different speakers. Its sample: *[S:In Lombok there are many mosques, for example you can visit Islamic Center because there is /eh.../ you may/---/*], while {moving of both spread hands forwards body}.

In spite of its appearance only three times by three speakers of different pairs in dialogue, '**thumb up**' is categorized as the seventh nonverbal strategy in this study. Its sample: [S: Okay, I am from CNA. I am/---/ a journalist {thumb up}].

'Drawing something' is the ninth nonverbal strategy in this study. It used five times by five speakers of different pairs in dialogue. Its sample: *[S:Ya, ujian nasional /.../ may be test in the end of school use /---/ test and /---/ test].*

After displaying all findings of CCSs employed by speakers, researcher needs to reveal the frequency and percentage (%) of CCSs used across all fifteen pairs of two parts of dialogue extracts in this study. The following are summary of CCSs covering all dialogue extracts parts: 1 (tourism) and 2 (education) through pairs one to thirty.

Distribution of CCSs Employed by Speakers

No	Types of Verbal Compensatory Communication Strategies	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Approximation	20	11.69
2	Word coinage	10	5.84

No		Frequency	Percentage (%)
3	Circumlocution	9	5.26
4	Literal translation	10	5.84
5	Language switch	60	35.08
6	Appeal for assistance	10	5.84
7	Foreignizing	2	1.16
8	Paraphrase	6	3.50
9	Self-correction	17	9.94
10	Comprehension check	8	4.67
11	Self-repetition	19	11.11
	Total	**171**	**100**
No	**Types of Nonverbal Compensatory Communication Strategies**	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
	Face Expression		
1	Smiling	5	11.36
	Gestures		
2	Head nodding	5	11.36
3	Head shaking	4	9.09
4	Hand raising	5	11.36
5	Hand moving	17	38.63
6	Thumb up	3	6.81
7	Drawing something	5	11.36
	Total	**44**	**100**

Compensatory Communication Strategies Employed by Listeners in Receiving Messages

Verbal Compensatory Communication Strategies

In coping with the communication problems in taking turns talking, listeners used eight verbal CCSs, including language switch, appeal for assistance, asking the speaker for clarification, asking the speaker for repetition, asking the speaker to add message, guessing the speaker's message, and specifying the speaker's message.

The first CCS employed by listeners in taking turns speaking is **'language switch'**. Listeners used it seven times of seven different pairs. Its example: [*L: Coba diulangi lagi!*].

The second CCS was **'Appeal for assistance',** employed three times of three pairs as listeners. The listeners employed this strategy because they still need more messages from the speakers. Its sample: *[L: Help me! What you say!]*.

'**Asking the Speaker for Clarification'** was the third verbal CCS for listeners. It appeared fifteen times of fifteen pairs in dialogue. Its sample: *[L: As you say, the excellent higher education is what aspect?]*.

'**Asking the speaker for repetition'** is categorized the fourth compensatory strategy for listeners. Six listeners of different pairs used six times this strategy. Its sample: *[L: .../am./ /am.../ question again, do you mean tourism place/eh.../!]*.

The fifth compensatory strategy used by listeners was 'a**sking the speaker to add message'**. It employed seven times by seven listeners of different pairs in dialogue. Its sample: *[L: So, how about tourism place?]*.

The sixth CCS used by listeners was **'guessing the speakers' messages**. It used nine times of nine different pairs. Its example: *[S: Do you know...? Do you know... some...! L: tourism place...!]*.

'**Specifying the Speaker's Message'** was categorized as the seventh strategy for listeners. It appeared four times by four different pairs. Its sample: *[S: Where is wonderful place makes you happy? L: Tourism place...!]*.

Nonverbal Compensatory Communication Strategies

There were nine nonverbal CCSs employed by listeners in this study, including facial expression (smiling), eye contact (gazing towards the speaker), gestures (head nodding, head shaking, hand raising, and hand moving), and posture (forward position).

Facial expression in forms of **'smiling'** was the first nonverbal CCS employed by listeners. It used twenty-five times of nineteen different pairs. Its sample: *[S:...location is very good to white sand, beautiful panorama. L: Very good to visit...! {smiling}]*.

'Gazing towards the speaker' was categorized as the second nonverbal CCS for listeners in this study. It employed four times by four different pairs in dialogue. Its sample: *[S: What make Gili Trawangan beautiful? L: Wow...beautiful...!{gazing towards the speaker}]*.

Gestures that appeared in forms of head nodding, head shaking, hand raising, and hand moving were nonverbal CCSs. **'Head nodding'** which employed twenty times by twenty different pairs was categorized as the third CCS. Its sample*: [S: I am very-very happy /./ /ah./ because the beach /eh.../L: why/---/ {head nodding}]*. Next, **'head shaking'** employed ten

119

times of ten pairs was the fourth CCS. Its sample*: [S: /Ah.../ what do you think/---/ knowledge of student in our university? [L: {head shaking} Can question repeat again?].* Furthermore, **'hand raising'** appeared twice of two different pairs was categorized as the fifth CCS. Its sample: *[S: /-/ May be from Mataram /.../ , [L: Find what?{raising the right flat hand}].* In addition, **'hand moving'** was categorized as the sixth nonverbal CCS. It employed six times by six different pairs. Its sample: *[S: Character village is your village /-/ Cool /em.../, [L: What next! {moving the right flat hand}].*

Posture occurred in form of **'forward position'** which employed three times by three listeners of different pairs was categorized as the seventh nonverbal CCS. A finding sample: *[S: I am new in your place, I want/.../ I want/.../, [L: Want what/---/ {forward position}]* depicted listener's posture when hearing the speaker's utterance *".... I want /.../ I want /.../"*

To facilitate in understanding of these compensatory communication strategies employed by listeners, frequency and percentage presented in the following table.

Distribution of CCSs Employed by Listeners

No	Types of Verbal CCSs	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Language switch	7	13.72
2	Appeal for assistance	3	5.88
3	Asking the speaker for clarification	15	29.41
4	Asking the speaker for repetition	6	11.53
5	Asking the speaker to add message	7	13.72
6	Guessing the speaker's message	9	17.64
7	Specifying the speaker's message	4	7.84
	Total	51	100
No	Types of Nonverbal CCSs	Frequency	Percentage (%)
	Facial Expression		
1	Smiling	25	35.71
	Eye contact		
2	Gazing towards the speaker	4	5.71
	Gestures		
3	Head nodding	20	28.57
4	Head shaking	10	14.28
5	Hand raising	2	2.85

6	Hand moving	6	8.57
	Posture		
7	Forward position	3	4.28
	Total	70	100

Discussion

The discussion emphasizes on verbal and nonverbal CCSs employed by speakers in encoding messages and listener in decoding messages in taking turns talking of a speaking class supported by the relevant theoretical bases and the previous studies.

Compensatory Communication Strategies Employed by Speakers in Conveying Messages

Verbal Compensatory Communication Strategies

Verbal CCSs discussion comprises of approximation, word coinage, circumlocution, literal translation, language switch, appealing for assistance, foreignizing, paraphrase, self-correction, comprehension check, and self-repetition.

'**Approximation**' was a strategy which speakers used as an effort in encoding of messages to listeners by rewording their message. This strategy used twenty times (11.69%) of sixteen different pairs in dialogue. It was employed to surmount of lexical meaning transmission problems by using terms or structures that shared semantic features with the intended terms instead. Finding on speaker's utterance '*feel good beach*; in which speaker in conveying the message used terms '*feel good*' to replace a term '*wonderful*'. The use of approximation strategy revealed that the terms '*feel good*' instead of using a term '*wonderful*' when it could not be elicited in his mind when talking at the time. For all that alternative terms which speakers used sound inappropriate, they seemed successfully help listeners to catch the general meaning of what speakers said. In this case, speakers selected terms that provided an approximate translation of an unknown terms by referring to a similar but known terms.

'**Word coinage**' was a strategy that speakers used as an attempt in encoding of messages through creating new terms. It appeared ten times (5.84%) of eight different pairs in dialogue. It was employed to face down the difficulty in encoding messages of particular term by making up a new term to engender the intended meaning. Finding on speaker's utterance '*politicpeople*' and '*officeworker*' showed that speaker created terms '*politicpeople*', '*officeworker*' to replace terms '*politician*' '*office employee*'. These new terms sound like the appropriate terms in this context, but they were inappropriate in English terms.

'Circumlocution' was considered as one of good solutions to cope with speakers' problem in spoken English. It used nine times (5.26%) by nine different pairs in dialogue. Circumlocution strategy used by speakers who unable to elicit the desired terms but want to express the message, so they described the characters of the objects instead of using the appropriate English terms. Looking at finding '*I don't know in English but like this when people marry, there is a man and a woman who married*' that inspired to comment that this was an unique strategy because speakers could not recall the intended terms, however, they could make a sequence of sentence to express the message. Of data indicated that speaker has a problem to recall English words '*bride*' and '*bride groom*' when he was talking about marriage in Lombok. Speaker used this strategy to explain the description of words that he wanted to convey to listener.

'Literal translation' which appeared ten times (5.84%) of ten speakers of different pairs in this study was a part of interlingual transfer. Literal translation-interlingual transfer may involve the transfer of phonological, morphological, syntactic or lexical features of the IL, and may also occur at the pragmatic and discourse level. If it occurs in lexical lever of IL system (e.g. translating compounds or idiomatic expressions from native language verbatim into TL) described as 'literal translation'.

Discussing of this strategy, finding was delineated by speaker '... *you know in Selebrana beach there many villas, oleh-oleh /emↃ/ handicraft, restaurant too many*' indicated that speaker used interlingual transfer at lexical level or literal translation by combining of linguistic features from codes of English and Indonesian as such '*many villas, oleh-oleh /emↃ/ handicraft*''. Speaker translated Indonesian word '*oleh-oleh*' with '*handicraft*', but it is not properly used. However, listener as the interlocutor understood of what speaker said by uttering "*May be I am … I want to go there 'may be you can…*'". Using literal translation sometimes makes interlocutor easier to comprehend the message, it may be because the listeners in each opportunity can speak their native language of Indonesian, however, it used to avoid communication breakdown.

'Language switch' deals with switching the TL into NL or vice versa. Speakers of twenty-five pairs substituted sixty times (35.08) their utterances to Indonesian words because they did not know the English words when articulating their utterances. They exerted their own language to face down English words deficiencies and to keep their communication running well in a properly manner. Finding such '… *UIN Mataram is second perguruan tinggi negeri in NTB*' showed that speakers began dialogue by using English, then switching the message into Indonesian when uttering '*perguruan tinggi negeri*' because he was unable to elicit English

words for *'perguruan tinggi negeri'*. Speakers sometimes uttered the sequence of message by using both English and Indonesian in conveying of message to listeners. They switched the messages into Indonesian because of their English words limited.

'Appeal for assistance' which employed ten times (95.84%) by ten speakers of different pairs was speakers' effort to ask assistant from interlocutors to face down the difficulties in encoding messages. Speakers asked for correct words as well as the continuum of message before ending of talking by using both English and Indonesian. Finding on appealing for assistance *'What is the small ship running to Gili Trawangan'* showed that speaker has difficulty in recall term *'boat'* in English, so he appealed assistance to his interlocutor.

'Foreignizing' which only appeared twice (1.16%) of one pair of subjects in this study was a part of interlingual transfer. The speaker adjusted English plural item like's' to interlingual plural (Indonesian). The finding revealed this strategy *'... There many villas, gilis, barugas like Gili Trawangan, Gili Meno, and Gili Air'*. The finding showed that a speaker employed a foreignizing strategy by utilizing the English inflectional morpheme *'s'* to Indonesian words *'gili'* and *'baruga'* became *'gilis'* and *'barugas'*. Whereas, *'gili'* and *'baruga'* were not English, but they were Indonesian words. Even though both words were pronounced like English plurals, the listener understood of what speaker conveyed, he only nodded his head and smiled, but he was unable to correct of this was misused of Indonesian plural.

This strategy indicated that the speaker employed foreignizing strategy to face down his lexical deficiency of the TL. Speaker included the utterances of TL plural when uttering L1 word in an equivalent stretch of sentence because of not knowing about unfamiliar L1 terms when articulating his utterances. The speakers sometimes uttered their own language as foreignizing if they encountered difficulty to elicit TL items in dialogue.

'Paraphrase' referred to the rewording of messages in an alternative TL construction in order to avoid unknown TL terms. It appeared six times (3.50%) of six different pairs in dialogue. Finding on: *'…gili air is a small island; I said small island because in small island there are not many people, there are not many villas, but there are many tourists'*. Finding indicated that speaker has a problem when describing the content of talking, so he paraphrased some English terms. Speaker used this strategy because of his limited knowledge of English and lack of idea about the speaking content, so he repeated several words while thinking for next words for being used to facilitate the interlocutor understood the message was being delivered.

'**Self-correction**' was employed seventeen times (9.94%) by sixteen different pairs. Speakers performed self-correction during communicating by revising their own inappropriate English terms in the way of speakers used them. Finding on *'I want ask about what is good place /./ I mean the interesting place there'* showed that the speaker corrected his utterance by uttering *'I mean the interesting place there'.* In this case, speaker just realized that the use of term '*good*' was inappropriate to be used in the context because they were talking about tourism, so it necessitated him to specify his message. Accordingly, he revised his diction by uttering the appropriate language '*I mean the interesting place*' as a self-correction strategy.

'**Comprehension check**' appeared eight times (4.67%) by seven different pairs in this study. It referred to check question of speaker to interlocutor whether the interlocutor has a prior knowledge of speaking context or speaker exerted comprehension check to know that interlocutor understood of what speaker uttered. Finding on '… *I know many places, may be one of beautiful beach is Kuta beach. Do you know Kuta beach?'* showed that there was a question employed by speaker, *'Do you know Kuta beach?*' as a comprehension check. Speaker used this strategy to obtain the listener's understanding that messages have been understood by the listener.

'**Self-Repetition**' was utilized nineteen times (11.11%) by seventeen different pairs in dialogue. By using repetition, speakers repeated a part or the whole of the utterance and they could eliminate long filled pauses, symbol used /em…/ and long unfilled pauses, symbol used /…/ while thinking for recalling the next words to be utilized in delivery messages. Speakers produced long utterances automatically and sound more fluent in their spoken English. Finding on *'you may visit there /…/, you can visit there /…/ location is far but very good to visit, white sand, beautiful panorama'* indicated that the speaker repeated a part of his utterances such as 'you may visit there /…/ you can visit there /.../ to compensate his communication problem in dialogue. This happened because the speakers lack of TL terms and sometimes making them talked while thinking the sequence of next terms.

Nonverbal Compensatory Communication Strategies

Nonverbal CCSs appearing of spoken communication in forms of facial expression-smiling and gestures (head nodding, head shaking, hand raising, hand moving, pushing hands down, thumb up, and drawing something).

'**Smiling**' was a form of facial expressions occurred five times (11.36%) of five different pairs as speakers. It was a simple way of using when dialogue to engender meaning of emphasizing the verbal message or delivering of independent meaning instead of utilizing

verbal words to enhance the speaking effectiveness. Finding on *'... lots tourist enjoy Kuta /em./ {smiling}in Kuta beach',* in which speaker smiled when uttering *'... lots tourist enjoy Kuta /em./ {smiling}in Kuta beach,* indicated that the place seemed interesting which made tourists enjoy to visit Kuta beach, but the speaker could not describe the characteristic of that place. Smile here referred on feeling interesting place of Kuta beach.

'Head nodding' was a form of gesture that used five times (11.36%) by five different pairs as speakers in dialogue. Finding on '*...tourism place in Lombok/./ very good panorama because /eh.../{head nodding} so/---//.../].* By nodding of his head, it indicated that speaker faced difficulty in recalling new terms to illustrate the place, so nodding his head to listener indicating that asked the listener to complete the messages was being uttered. The speaker was unable to utilize a manner of verbal expression, so head nodding is a good way of expressing the message meaning.

'Head shaking' that appeared four times (9.09) by four speakers of different pairs was a part of gesture. Speakers employed this strategy indicating there were somethings happened with their messages while shaking head. Finding of speaker's utterance *'I think nyongkolan like /em.../ I do not know* while *head shaking}'* indicated that speaker did not know the needed words to use for next message. Speaker employed head shaking strategy when uttering *"I don't understand.* It was done by speaker to indicate that he has a message which he delivered through nonverbal message.

'Hand raising' was appeared five times (51.36%) of five speakers of different pairs. Speakers used it when either uttering message concurrently with raising their hands to emphasize the verbal terms or only raising hands without uttering anything in conveying the meaning of message. Finding on '*Eh.../ ...there are traditional houses. The first is in Central Lombok Sade village while {raising of right index hand}'* indicated that speakers often were unaware of what came out of their utterance and what they communicated through their nonverbal language were two acts which supported to each other. However, commonly nonverbal act was used to accompany or emphasize the verbal message.

'Hand-moving' was employed seventeen times (38.63%) by seventeen different pairs. Speaker's utterance '*... for example you can visit Islamic Center because there is /eh.../you may/---/, while {moving of both spread hands forwards body}'*showed that the difficulty of speaker in recalling of English terms, so he exerted long filled pause /eh.../ you may/---/ and moving of both spread hands forwards body while thinking the needed terms.

'Thumb up' which used three times (6.81) by three subjects' pairs in this study was a gesture. It either can substitute a verbal word without uttering it, but has the same meaning or

supports a verbal word concurrently with thumb up when uttering a verbal word in expressing the message meaning. Finding on '*I am/---/ a journalist {thumb up}*' indicated that speaker wanted to convince the interlocutor that he was a good journalist. In spite of using lengthening of syllables 'I am/---/' before said 'a journalist', he could utilize a nonverbal CCS while thinking the next terms 'a journalist'

'Drawing something' was used five times (11.36) by five pairs in dialogue. Speaker used it in delivering something to substitute the verbal massage in expressing of meaning. Finding on '*/.../ may be test in the end of school use /---/ test and /---/ test*' showed that speaker used lengthening of syllables '*use*' /---/' and '*and*' /---/ while drawing something indicated that he has a problem of English lexicals. Speaker drew something such as writing on paper by pen with right hand to illustrate written test at school. Speaker was not able to recall the needed terms to deliver verbal message.

Compensatory Communication Strategies Employed by Listeners in Receiving Messages

Verbal Compensatory Communication Strategies

On verbal CCSs, the discussion consists of language switch, appeal for assistance, asking the speakers for clarification, asking the speakers for repetition, asking the speakers to add message, guessing the speakers' message, and specifying the speakers' messages.

'Language switch' was used seven times (13.72) by listeners of seven different pairs. They switched their utterances into Indonesian terms because they did not know English terms. Majority of listeners used this strategy in responding spontaneously of what speakers said, such as asking for clarification, appeal for assistance, and asking the speakers to add message. Finding on listener' utterance '*coba diulangi lagi!*' indicated that listener asked for repetition to the speaker by switching his language into Indonesian. Listeners exerted Indonesian to surmount English terms deficiencies when dialogue.

'**Appeal for assistance'** which employed three times (5.88%) of listeners was one of students' efforts to come up with their limited knowledge on English. The listeners employed this strategy because they still need more messages from the speakers. Finding on '*Help me! What you say!*' showed that listeners used it because they needed more information from speakers that made them requested assistance to speakers in dissolving of difficulties in expressing of messages when their turns.

'Asking the Speaker for Clarification' was used fifteen times (29.41%) by listeners of fifteen pairs in dialogue. When listeners could not directly understand of what speaker said, they could clarify by means of asking for clarification, that was, an expression designed to

recall clarification of speakers' previous message. Finding on '…*the excellent higher education is what aspect!'* indicated that listener asked the speaker to clarify the message because he needed further explanation from speaker's message, so he asked the speaker to clarify his message.

'**Asking the speaker for repetition'** was employed six times (11.53) by six listeners of different pairs. It is the simple strategy because listeners only ask the speakers to repeat what they spoken in the first time if listeners could not understand of the message. Finding on '*question again, do you mean tourism place /eh…/!* showed that a listener asked the speaker for repitition because of missing main point of what speaker's utterance or because of listener was unable to understand speaker's messages. Listener used long filled pause /eh…/ while thinking words for responding the speaker's question, unfortunately the listener was unable to recall them.

'**Asking the speaker to add message'** that employed seven times (13.72%) by seven listeners of different subjects' pairs was similar with asking the speaker to repeat speaking. Listeners used this strategy because they needed more messages from speakers to facilitate in comprehending of speaking content. Finding on listener's utterance '*So, how about tourism place?'*, indicated that listener needed more explanation on speaking content, so he requested speaker to add his message in order to know more about description of speaking content.

'**Guessing the speakers' messages'** was used by listeners nine times (17.64) of nine different pairs. Listeners guessed messages from speakers because they more understanding about speaking contents of what being uttered by speakers. Finding on '*Do you know… some…! L: tourism place…!'*, showed that listener polished up the speaker's message by guessing the phrase '*tourism place'* to complete the speaker's utterance. Speaker sometimes was unable to recall English terms needed in delivering complete messages making listeners guessed needed terms directly when taking turns talking.

'**Specifying the Speaker's Message'** employed four times (7.84) by four different pairs was important in detecting the speaking behavior of listeners in spoken English. The listener as soon as possible to specify the message in order to facilitate in eliciting a sequence of responses. Finding on '*Tourism place…!'* to specify of speaker's question '*Where is wonderful place makes you happy?* This question was still considered in general, so the listener specified the speaker's question into the particular place by uttering '*tourism place…!'*. Listener specified the speaker's question in order to facilitate in recalling a sequence of response.

127

Nonverbal Compensatory Communication Strategies

The discussion of nonverbal CCSs employed by listeners, including facial expression-smiling, eye contact (gazing towards the speaker), gestures (head nodding, head shaking, hand raising, and hand moving), and posture (forward position).

Facial expression in forms of **'smiling'** was appeared twenty-five times (35.71) of nineteen different pairs in dialogue. Listeners smiled because of their happiness/agreement or not understanding/disagreement of message from their interlocutors. Finding on '*Very good to visit…! {smiling}*' reflected listener's feeling agreement of message from speaker '*S: …very good to white sand, beautiful panorama*'. Listener seemed to be interested when hearing things on beautiful panorama of Kuta beach. Smiling was a simple nonverbal strategy which usually employed in spoken communication because of its effectiveness in engendering of both supporting verbal terms and delivering independent meaning instead of utilizing verbal terms to enhance spoken communication goal.

'Gazing towards the speaker' employed four times (5.71) by four listeners of different pairs was one of eye contact forms. Eye contact was visual sense as a way of delivering message that engendered of meaning in spoken communication. Finding on '*S: What make Gili Trawangan beautiful? L: Wow…beautiful…!{gazing towards the speaker}*'. Listener performed an act such as '*Wow… beautiful…!{gazing towards the speaker}*' to ask the speaker to repeat what had uttered in the first time and asking for repetition. It was done because listener less understanding of speaker's question making him could not answer the question directly.

Gestures appeared in forms of head nodding, head shaking, hand raising, and hand moving were nonverbal CCSs. **'Head nodding'** was employed twenty times (28.57%) by twenty different pairs as listeners. Listeners nodded of head because of either their understanding or not understanding about message from speakers. Finding on speaker' utterance '*I am very-very happy /./ /ah./ because the beach /eh…/*' made the listener responded '*why/---/ {head nodding}*'. It indicated that listener could not understand of message that has delivered by the speaker, so he nodded her head to ask the speaker to add the message. She employed head nodding nonverbal strategy to ask the speaker to continue speaking or add his message. Next, **'head shaking'** was employed ten times (14.28) by ten subjects' pairs as listener. Finding on speaker's utterance '*Ah…/ what do you think/---/ knowledge of student in our university?*' made listener shook of head while uttering '*Can question repeat again?*'. Listener employed head shaking strategy as a response of not knowing on the speaker's query, so he should ask the speaker to repeat the query. Furthermore, **'hand raising'** was used twice

(2.85) by listeners of two different pairs. Finding on speaker' utterance *'/-/... may be from Mataram /.../'* made the listener said *'Find what?{raising the right flat hand}'* It showed that in which listener raised her right flat hand when listening the speaker's utterance *'/-/...may be from Mataram /.../'* because of not comprehending of what speaker's just uttered. In his utterance, the speaker exerted long unfilled pause /.../ in the end of her message because of limited English terms that made listener raised the right flat hand to indicate that he needed more explanation from the speaker of her question. In addition, **'hand moving'** was employed six times (8.57) by listeners of six different pairs. Listeners used this strategy when listening of incomplete speakers' utterances indicating that listeners needed complete messages from speakers. Finding on speaker and listener's utterances *'S: Character village is your village /-/ Cool /em.../, L: What next then!{moving the right flat hand}'* showed the speaker faced difficulty in eliciting the TL terms, so he exerted long filled pause /em.../. In responding to the utterance, listener uttered *'what next!'* while moving his right flat hand asked the speaker to continue speaking.

Posture as nonverbal CCSs occurred in forms of **'forward position'** in this study. It employed three times (4.28%) by listeners of three different pairs. Data on *'S: I want/.../ I want/.../,* and *'L: Want what/---/ {forward position}'* depicted that listener's posture when hearing the speaker's utterance *'.... I want /.../ I want /.../'* could not comprehend the message from speaker. In his utterance the speaker exerted long unfilled pause /.../ twice and smiled. The utterances made the listener was impatient to wait his message, so he uttered *"want what/---/"* while going forward position. This act was meant asked the speaker for repeating his utterance to facilitate in engendering the meaningful message.

Conclusion

Concerning those various kinds of CCSs employed by students in taking turns talking of this study, most of them coincided with achievement/compensatory strategies proposed by Tarone (1983) and Faerch and Kasper (1983). Students may employ those strategies in an attempt to deal with problems in communication directly by using alternative in order to get the message across. CCSs enable the students "work on an alternative plan for reaching their original goal by means of whatever resources are available, these strategies are regarded as good students' behaviors" (Nakatani, 2006). There are some CCSs in which students may employ to cope with spoken communication problems, including word coinage, language switch, paraphrase, circumlocution, approximation, self-repetition. asking the speaker for clarification, asking the speaker for

repetition, asking the speaker to add language, cooperative strategies, non-linguistic strategies, and retrieval strategies.

Pedagogical Implication

This research has pedagogical implication for the English language education department policy of the university, in which to enhance students' speaking proficient should be included communication strategies materials in teaching speaking. It facilitates the students to use spoken communication by elaborating many ways of delivering and receiving the messages from and to interlocutors.

Recommendations

Several recommendations are made for speaking course lecturers at Mataram State Islamic University. It is recommended that speaking lecturer should know that CCSs do play important role in spoken communication for both lecturers and students. This can help lecturers to enhance their teaching strategies and students to improve their speaking competence. Speaking course needs to include communication strategy as a part of strategy in spoken communication. They should teach students how to increase their speaking proficiency through practicing how to memorize, connect, and use TL lexical, morphological, syntactic, and phonological aspects in a series of utterances to form a meaningful whole in a proper way in taking turns speaking.

References

Arellano-Tamayo, R. (2018). Spoken Discourse Analysis on Language Use Along Turn
    Taking and Topic Management in English as Second Language (ESL) Classrooms.
    Asian EFL Journal, 20(12.3), 8-24.

Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication Strategies: A Psychological Analysis of Second
    Language Use*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.

Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983). On Identifying Communication Strategies In Interlanguage
    Production. In Claus Faerch & Gabriele Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage
    Communication* (pp. 210-238). New York: Longman Inc.

Hadley, A. O. (1993). *Teaching Language in Context*. Bostom: Heinle & Heile Publishers.

Luo, J. & Weil, N. (2014). Language Learning Strategy Use in an American IEP:
    Implications for EFL. *Asian EFL Journal, 16*(3), 96-115.

Nakatani, Y. (2006). Developing an Oral Communication Strategy Inventory. *The Modern Language Journal, 90* (2), 151-168. Retrieved from http://www.docjax.com.

Shumin, K. (2002). Factors to Consider: Developing Adult EFL Students' Speaking Abilities. In Jack C. Richards and Willy A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice* (pp. 204-211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tarone, E. (1983). Some Thoughts on the Notion of Communication Strategy. In Clause Faerch & Gabriele Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 61-74). New York: Longman Inc.

Compensatory Communication Strategies Employed