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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

1.1. THE CONTEXT OF STUDY

Communication strategies appear to be among the important factors affecting the success in second language acquisition. There are a variety of studies on communication strategies published, and research in this phenomenon reached its peak in 1980s. The definition of communication strategies is defined in a variety of previous studies in different ways. According to Faerch and Kasper (1983b), “communication strategies are potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal” (p.36). Tarone (1977) supported this view by her definition that “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” (p.195). It is believed that CSs have an important impact on the development of strategic competence, one of the components of communicative competence; therefore, the issues of CS have still been significant in second language acquisition.

There is a variety of research in CSs in term of second language acquisition; however, a limited number of CS research focuses on the subjects of refugees and immigrants. A refugee is "someone who has fled across a national border from his or her home country, or who is unable to return to it because of a well-founded fear that he or she will be persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, political opinion or for being a member of a particular social group"
According to Casciani (2014), the immigration rate to UK has increased recently and among immigrants and refugees coming to UK, Vietnamese accounts for a huge number. As refugees and immigrants, Vietnamese faces certain challenges. Kleinmann (1982) highlighted that the biggest challenge for refugees is language which is related to prevocational, occupational, and survival. Seufert (1999) shows that refugees and immigrants face a lot of difficulties in learning English as a second language because of three reasons including limited time to study, previous experience with education and psychological needs. He suggested ESOL for refugees should have less emphasis on formal language rules. Thus, CS is believed to have massive impact on learning English as second language by refugees and immigrants. However, in the literature of CS research, studies focusing specifically on refugees’ experiences of ESOL are sparse. This current research is undertaken as a case study of two specific cases in Manchester. Results from research might not be generalisable for the refugee and immigrant community. Nevertheless, a case study provides an in-depth and detailed picture for CSs’ use. The research is conducted with the aim of investigating how Vietnamese refugees and immigrants use CSs in the Manchester context. Findings might contribute the better understanding of CSs’ use by refugees and immigrants, which enhances the effectiveness of communication.

1.2. THE STRUCTURE OF STUDY

In the following chapter, the author reviews the literature pertaining to the current investigation in order to review the knowledge of communication strategies. Firstly, the chapter introduces the definition of communicative competence which is the base of communication strategies to
emerge. Significant models of communicative competence are also discussed in this section. Secondly, it describes the notion of communication strategies from different perspectives. In this section, the characteristics of communication strategies including problematicity and consciousness are summarized. Additionally, in order to define the taxonomy for research, the taxonomies which have been proposed before are elucidated, focusing on Dörnyei and Scott (1995a, 1995b)’s taxonomy and Paribakht (1985) and Nijmegen Group’s taxonomies which are introduced base on the different views. Thirdly, the literature review looks at the empirical studies of communication strategies with the emphasis on the subject of learners of English and specifically Vietnamese refugees and immigrants.

The third chapter describes the methodology considered and used in the current research. The chapter starts with research goals, and followed by the section of methodological issues and considerations. Continually, the research indicates possible ethical issues, and subjects of the investigation which the description of sampling procedures and participants. Finally, the section of research instruments with audio-recordings and interview method are discussed about data collection and data analysis. The next chapter is about findings and discussion of data collected. This chapter will be divided into three main sections with introduction at the beginning, and two remaining sections in the attempt to answer two research questions. The research is concluded by the final chapter. This chapter summarizes the results of discussion in chapter IV, and indicates the significance of the research. Furthermore, limitation of study is also considered, followed by the sections of implication for teaching and further research.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter reviews the literature pertaining to the current investigation. Research into communication strategies has a long story. The review of literature has been divided into subsections which frame the debate about communicative competence, and communication strategies, and thus relate to various aspects of the study. The chapter starts with the discussion about communicative competence which is considered to be the beginning of the communication strategies which emerged.

2.2. COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

2.2.1. Definition of communicative competence

Different theories exist in the literature regarding the term of “communicative competence”. The notion of communicative competence was firstly defined in detail by Hymes (1972). Before Hymes, the key term “competence” has been discussed as one of the most controversial terms in the area of applied linguistics. Within the communicative view of linguistics, Chomsky (1965) made a fundamental distinction between “competence” and “performance”. Accordingly, he defined “competence” as the speaker-hearer's knowledge of his language and “performance” as the actual use of language in concrete situations” (Chomsky, 1965, p4). It seems to be that things which are related to non-grammatical items belong to the field of linguistic “performance”. It is
also argued that Hymes (1972) introduced a broader notion of communicative competence, whereby Wagner (2005) believed that Hymes brought the sociolinguistic perspective into Chomsky’s view of linguistic competence. Additionally, Hymes (1974) argued that:

“a child from whom any and all the grammatical sentences of a language might come with equal likelihood would be a social monster. Within the social matrix in which it acquires a system of grammar, a child acquires also a system of its use” (p.75)

Conversely, Chomsky’ supporters indicated that communicative competence could be flexible, because the capacity for acquiring linguistic competence is natural (Johnstone and Marcellino, 2010).

In contrast, other studies such as Savignon (1972), Bagarie and Djigunovie (2007) support Hymes’s concept of competence because they found that the notion introduced by Hymes was more realistic than Chomsky’s view. According to a definition provided by Hymes (1971), he not only focused on possibility (“whether an instance conforms to the rules of grammar and pronunciation”) but also three others of feasibility (“whether an instance can be processed by the speakers of the language”), appropriateness (“ whether the language or behavior is acceptable in the given context”), and attestedness ( “ whether.. something is done”) ( Hymes, 1971, p.18-24). It is true that “meaning and form are closely interrelated” (Nunan, 1989, p.10). Furthermore, according to Zhang and Yang (2010), drawing a hard and fast distinction between communicative and non-communicative is challenging. As such, Hymes’s concept of communicative competence explored three more aspects besides traditional grammaticality.
However, more emphasis was placed on a better understanding of how language is used rather than of how language is structured (Howatt, 1984). This is because “there are rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless” (Hymes, 1971, p.15).

The term of “communicative competence”, which was firstly used by Campbell and Wales (1970), can be argued as ambiguous in its meaning. Therefore, Bagarie and Djigunovie (2007) considered Hymes as the father of the notion of “communicative competence” which is defined more fully and explicitly.

After Hymes, in attempt of clarifying the concept of “communicative competence”, research has been carried out in the field of applied linguistics. Canale and Swan (1980) and Canale (1983) use the term “communicative competence” to refer to the combination of two components which underlies the system of knowledge and skill acquired for communication. Under this definition, Bagarie and Djigunovie (2007) indicated three kinds of knowledge underlying grammatical principles, including how to combine communicative function and utterance, and how to use language in the social context. While skills needed for communication reflect on how to use these types of knowledge in the real communication.

In other research, Widdowson (1983) made a classic distinction between competence and capacity to define the term “communicative competence”. He described communicative competence in term of knowledge of sociolinguistic and linguistic convention. Furthermore, he indicated that it was the ability of how to use knowledge. However, he paid more attention to performance in the relationship with competence. In contrast, Savignon (1972) used the term “competence” to refer to an underlying ability and “performance” to an open manifestation of competence (Bagarie and Djigunovie, 2007). According to her, “communicative competence is
the ability to function in a truly communicative setting – that is, in a dynamic exchange in which linguistic competence must adapt itself to total informational input, both linguistic and paralinguistic, of one or more interlocutors” (Savignon, 1972, p.8). Being inherited by other first research of communicative competence, Bachman (1990) defined the term “communicative language ability” as the synthesis of competence and the use of the knowledge in the appropriate context in order to gain achievement in communication goals. This is the roof/ base of strategic competence, and to a greater extent, communication strategies.

2.2.2. Models of communicative competence

A number of authors have considered the components of communicative competence because of its importance in language acquisition, especially during 1970s and 1980s. The current literature reviews on the models of Canale and Swan (1980), and Murcia and Dörnyei (1995). The reason why these models are chosen is because they explore important effect on the theory of communicative competence. In addition, they detail on strategic competence, one of the components of the communicative competence which remains the center of current research.

Model of Canale and Swan (1980)

One of the first models of communicative competence is proposed by Canale and Swan (1983). According to Canale and Swan (1980), the model comprises of three components including grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence (or communication strategies). Regarding grammatical competence, the authors refer to the
knowledge of lexical items and of the rules of syntax, pronunciation, morphology and sentence-grammar semantic. Conversely, sociolinguistic competence is composed of socio-cultural and discourse rules of use. Later in 1983, Canale isolated the discourse competence from sociolinguistic competence to become one of the four components of the model. The last component is strategic competence which is made up “verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that maybe called in action to compensate for breakdown in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence” (Canale and Swan, 1980, p.30). It is believed that strategic competence has an impact on other components. Communication strategies are used to paraphrase the grammatical rules which one has not mastered. Additionally, it relates to sociolinguistic competence by “various role-playing strategies, how to address the strangers when unsure of their social status” (Canale and Swan, 1980, p.31).

**Murcia and Dörnyei (1995)**

In 1995, Murcia and Dörnyei introduced the model of communicative competence being made up of five components. Compared to Canale and Swan’s model, the authors used the term “linguistic competence” instead of “grammatical competence” so as to highlight unambiguously that it comprises of the rules of lexis, pronunciation, morphonogy and syntax. Another minor difference in the comparison of Canale and Swan’s model is the use of the term “socio-cultural competence” rather than “sociolinguistic competence”, which emphasizes that socio-cultural competence is essential for “the appropriate deployment of resources in other components” (Murcia and Dörnyei, 1995, p.11). Besides these above components and discourse one, Murcia and Dörnyei (1995) proposed the term “actional competence” as the competence “in conveying
and understanding communicative intent, that is, matching actional intent with linguistic form” (p.17). It is believed that this competence is typical to the written communication rather than oral communication.

Lastly, the strategic competence is conceptualized as the knowledge of communication strategies. In this model, Murcia and Dörnyei (1995) have contributed the theory of communication strategies. The concept of communication strategies is proposed in more details with three functions of strategies use from different perspectives: psycholinguistic perspective, interactional perspective and communication maintenance perspective.

Figure 1: Schematic Representation of Communicative Competence

(Murcia and Dörnyei, 1995, p.10)
The figure is represented as Murcia and Dörnyei’s model of communicative competence. The circle surrounding the pyramid of discourse competence is strategic competence. It is easy to realize that it’s potentially usable inventory of skills which the users “negotiate message…resolve problems or to compensate for deficiencies in any of the other underlying competencies” (Murcia and Dörnyei, 1995, p.9). The authors also suggested the further research focusing on communication strategies and offered to teach communication strategies in second language teaching in the future. This once again highlights the importance of communication strategies in literature in term of applied linguistics, especially in second language learning and teaching.

The description of these models of communicative competence could highlight the importance of the strategic competence, which also refers to communication strategies. It should not be denied that communication strategies are the means to enhance the effectiveness of communication.

2.3. COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

An amount of research of communicative competence has been published, especially during 1980s. This showed the importance of communicative competence in the literature of applied linguistics. Accordingly, the strategic language use has been promoted to discover in the field of linguistic, because strategic competence is believed to help second language speakers to handle the difficulties and breakdown communication (Canale and Swan, 1990). Moreover, with the recognition of the mismatch between second language speakers’ linguistic resources and communication target, “communication strategies” has become the dominant phenomena of
research among other fields of linguistics (Dörnyei and Scott, 1997). Among the other aspects of communication strategies such as the elements affecting to communication strategies, the role of communication strategies, etc, the review of literature only put the emphasis on the notion and the taxonomies of communication strategies. It is easy to understand, because these two aspects could be considered to be the capital influential as the central of “communication strategies” research. Therefore, understanding these aspects seems to mostly illuminate others related to the field of communication strategies.

2.3.1. Notion of communication strategies

Different perspective for conceptualization

The term of “communication strategies” was firstly used by Selinker (1972) in his published paper entitled “Interlanguage” when defining five central processes in second language learning; however, the author didn’t indicate the nature of communication strategies in details. In the early literature, other research uses different terms for communication strategies such as “coping strategies” (Savignon, 1972), “strategic language behavior” (Varadi, 1973). In 1977, Tarone (1977) proposed the full and clear definition of communication strategies and also provided the taxonomy. The researchers have attempted to conceptualize “communication strategies” from different perspective. These followings have apparently become the influential approach in conceptualization literature.

The traditional perspective could be the first one to consider the concept of communication strategies. This view reflects that communication strategies are considered as the verbal and non-
verbal devices in order to overcome the gap occurring in communication and reach the communication goals (Dörnyei and Scott, 1997). According to Faerch and Kasper (1983b), “communication strategies are potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal” (p.36). Tarone (1977) supported this view by her definition that “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 (p.195). Under this conceptualization, communication strategies are involved in problem-management efforts and language production problems which happen at the planning stage, which indicates that communication strategies are different from other problem-solving devices. Namely, communication strategies, repair-mechanism, and negotiation of meaning in communication are completely independent in research literature (Yule and Tarone, 1991).

**Interactional perspective for conceptualization**

This perspective highlights the role of meaning rather than linguistic structure in defining communication strategies (Canale, 1983; Dörnyei and Scott, 1995, 1995b). Tarone (1980) defined “communication strategies are seen as tools used in a joint negotiation of meaning where both interlocutors are attempting to agree as to a communicative goal” (p.420). Compared to her earlier definition in 1977, this conceptualization seems to be broader by extending the actual purpose of communication strategies which she believed to “clarify intended meaning rather than simply correct linguistic form” (Tarone, 1980, p.422). Due to the impact of the interactional perspective, a variety of author such as Canale, 1983; Dörnyei and Scott, 1995, 1995b; Savignon,
1983 and Willems, 1987 provided the taxonomies with interactional mechanisms. However, it should be noted that Tarone did not extended interactional strategies in her taxonomy; rather, she chose to offer the well-known conceptualization of communication strategies from interactional view.

**Psychological perspective for conceptualization**

Within the literature of defining communication strategies, a considerable amount of researchers has developed from a completely different perspective, associated with the psychological approach. Bialystok (1990) argued that communication strategies should be regarded in the cognitive processes underlying the strategic language use, because he believed that communication strategies are mental procedures. Following up this perspective, Kellerman (1991), Poulisse(1990), Bongaerts and Bentlage (1987) claimed that “not understanding the cognitive psychological and psycholinguistic dimensions of communication strategy use, and focusing only on the surface verbalizations of underlying psychological processes, would lead to taxonomies of doubtful validity” (Dörnyei and Scott, 1997, p.180). Later in 1993, Poulisse developed this conceptualization under psychological perspective through her speech-production model which is inherited by the model of Levelt (1989). As such, she examined the psycholinguistic analysis of strategic language behavior with a more refined modified process-oriented cognitive taxonomy than Faerch and Kasper (1983b) did before.

**2.3.2. Characteristics of communication strategies**
In furtherance of a greater understanding of the notion of communication strategies, the current literature review attempts to analyze the components of communication strategies. According to Bialystok (1990),

“communication strategies are undeniable event of language use, their existence is a reliably documented aspects of communication, and their role in second language communication seems particularly salient” (p.116).

It is true that there is a variety of different approaches conceptualizing the term of “communication strategies”; however, most researchers seem to ultimately conclude that two main components of communication strategies are problematicity and consciousness.

**Problematicity**

As defined above, communication strategies are considered as language tools used to handle the communication problem which can lead to interrupted communication (Dörnyei and Scott, 1997). This is because “the original insight into communication strategies was based on a mismatch between communicative intention and linguistic resources” (Varadi, 1992, p.437). The term “problematicity” was used by Bialystok (1984, 1990), additionally, “problem-orientedness” by Dörnyei and Scott (1997), referred to the fact that when second language speakers recognize the potential problem which could lead the interrupt of communication, then communication strategies are used to overcome this. It can be acknowledged that this criteria has become significant in most research in the field of communication strategies. However, Dörnyei and Scott (1995a, 1995b) also argued that the consideration of which communication problems under the term “problematicity” should be taken into account for communication strategies.
Accordingly, not all problems in communication could be handled by communication strategies, and not only “resource deficits” (Dörnyei and Scott, 1997, p.183), one kind of problems was believed to be solved by communication strategies. In a long discussion, it was determined that resource deficits could be seen as the “gaps in speaker knowledge preventing them from verbalizing messages” (Dörnyei and Scott, 1997, p.183). As such, communication strategies are believed to be used to handle resource deficits. However, if so, this does not reflect the term “communication strategies” which is named for a various communication problems rather than just one set of problems. Therefore, researchers extended the term by defining exactly these following communication problems.

Consequently, researchers introduce the own- performance problems. This type of problems is when a speaker realizes that what has been said is incorrect or partly correct (Dorney & Scott, 1995a, 1995b; Savignon, 1983; Tarone & Yule, 1987; Willems, 1987). Communication strategies which are involved in are restructure, self-rephrasing, self-repair, comprehension check, and verbal strategy maker mechanisms. Secondly, other performance problems are highlighted within communication strategies. Other-performance problems refer to something realized from the interlocutor’s speech as problematic. It could be due to the lack of understanding the message. Communication strategies related to this are other-repair, pretend understanding, asking for repetition, clarification, confirmation, expressing non-understanding, guessing (Canale, 1983; Dörnyei&Scott, 1995a, 1995b; Rost & Ross, 1991, Rubin, 1987, Willems, 1987). The final type is processing time pressure. It is recognized that second language speakers need more time to plan and process second language speech than it is naturally normal. Under time pressure, there are communication strategies such as using of fillers and repetition
Consciousness

According to Dörnyei and Scott (1997), consciousness has become the second component of defining communication strategies. Nevertheless, there is general dispute as to the validity of this conclusion. Drawing on the previous work of researchers, these following problems related to consciousness seem to be mostly significant in defining as the criteria of communication strategies.

Firstly, there are a variety of different connotations under the term “consciousness”. Schmidt (1994) indicated that there are four major aspects of consciousness in this context, including attention, awareness, intentionality, and control. However, Dörnyei and Scott (1995a, 1995b) argued that the idea of considering consciousness as a control is not really essential. The authors additionally expressed that “the automatized strategy” could be considered. The importance of considering consciousness as awareness was also shown in their research through trying to distinguish consciousness as awareness of problem and awareness of strategic language use. Namely, awareness of problem is when second language speakers realize the problems-related language use in processing (for example, word coinage strategy). In contrast, consciousness as awareness of strategic language use is about speaker’s realization in doing “a problem related detour on the way to mutual understanding” (Dörnyei and Scott, 1997, p.185).
argument, Bialystok (1990) highlighted that intentionality should be separated from consciousness to achieve the certain effects.

Secondly, it may be controversial for researchers when discussing the automated elements related to consciousness to define communication strategies. According to Faerch and Kasper (1983b, p.35), “consciousness is perhaps more a matter of degree than either-or”. It could be argued that second language speakers are only conscious when selecting some certain elements which Gass and Selinker (1994) believed to be automatically high- frequent used. In agreeing with this view, Bialystok (1990) pointed out that second language learners might use strategies where there has been no problematicity in communication, and thus automatically (or routinely) rather than consciously selecting a certain strategy. Interestingly, according to Dörnyei (1995), one of the purposes of communication strategies training is to enhance the automatization. Therefore, it suggested that some strategies are “over-learned and seem to drop from consciousness” (Wiemann and Daly, 1994, p.ix). Moreover, according to Dörnyei and Scott (1997),

“What was originally an intentional strategy may become in certain situation and/or with certain individuals a highly automatized or fossilized – hence not fully conscious – device” (p.184).

This phenomenon explains why the term “potentially conscious” was used in Fearch and Kasper (1983b)’s definition of communication strategies.
Distinguish between communication strategies and learning strategies

In the literature, there is a considerable amount of research analyzing the relationship between communication strategies and learning strategies. It may be somewhat problematic to decide if a communication strategy could be also deemed as a learning strategy. In an attempt to clarify this issue, the review looks at the widely-held definition of learning strategies. Namely, learning strategies are seen as “an attempt to develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language” (Tarone, 1977, p.67). By researching the purpose of strategies, it can be determined that communication strategies and learning strategies are completely different. Accordingly, communication strategies focus on an attempt to communicate, while learning strategies are related to the effort to learn the target language. This view could be illustrated by the following example. One of strategies mentioned here is repetition. In the case of the fact that listeners try to repeat the term which has been said by speakers in order to remember and learn the term, that is to say, learning strategies. On the other hand, repetition will be considered as communication strategy if one repeat what has been said or what is repaired by the interlocutor in order to gain time to keep the conversation going on or just as a self-repair mechanism. However, the problem that remains here is how the purpose is exactly identified in cases. Therefore, depending on the purpose of strategy that is used, the type of strategy could be identified. In some certain situations, it is believed that there is an overlap between communication strategies and learning strategies.

In conclusion, it should not be denied that there are different approaches defining communication strategies. Drawing on the work of researchers mentioned above, the current research look at communication strategies as the strategic language devices consciously or automatically used to
not only overcome the breakdown in communication, but also “enhance the effectiveness of communication” (Savignon, 1983, p.11).

2.3.3. Taxonomies of communication strategies

As mentioned above, Tarone (1977) may be viewed as one of the first author providing the taxonomy of communication strategies. Subsequently, a variety of taxonomies were offered by other researchers in an attempt to define and clarify communication strategies. There are different perspectives attempting to conceptualize the term “communication strategies” as discussed above, which leads the differences of defining taxonomies. However, in spite of this, similarities could be found among different terminology in taxonomies. As Byalystok (1990) pointed out that

“the variety of taxonomies proposed in the literature differ primarily in terminology and overall categorizing principle rather than in the substance of the taxonomies by abolishing the various overall categories, then a core group of specific strategies that appear consistently across the taxonomies clearly emerge” (p.61).

The current review is based on Dörnyei and Scott (1997)’s review which looks at taxonomies by Bialystok (1983); Dörnyei & Scott (1995a, 1995b); Faerch & Kasper, 1983b; Paribakht (1985); Tarone (1977); and Willems (1987) and additionally taxonomies by Corder (1981).
Similarities

Fearch and Kasper (1983b) defined communication strategies under the first category “reduction strategies” which is divided into two sections including formal reduction and functional reduction. The term of “reduction strategies” is also used by Willems (1987) in his taxonomy while Tarone (1977) offered “avoidance”, instead of and Corder (1981) labeled it as “risk-avoidance strategies”. The second option used in most taxonomies is “achievement strategies”. Both Fearch and Kasper (1983b) and Willems (1987) termed communication strategies under this label as the second major. In Dörnyei and Scott (1995a, 1995b)’s taxonomy, this term is expended to the achievement reduction duality rather than just achievement strategies. Base on the review by Dörnyei and Scott (1997), taxonomies by Fearch and Kasper (1983b); Tarone (1977) and Willems (1987) share a basic duality in common. Namely, communication strategies are used to “a, to tailor one’s message to one’s resources by altering, reducing, r completely abandoning the original content; or b, to try and convey the intended message in spite of the linguistic deficiencies by extending or manipulating the available language system” (Dörnyei& Scott, 1991, p.195).

Difference

Difference in defining taxonomies in the literature is inevitable because of different approaches to access as discussed above. This literature review only put the emphasis on Dörnyei and Scott (1995a, 1995b)’s taxonomy which is believed to be one of the most influential in the literature
history and Paribakht (1985) and Nijmegen Group (i.e., Bongaerts, Kellerman, and Poulisse)’s
taxonomies under the psychological perspective.

**Dörnyei and Scott (1995a, 1995b)’s taxonomy**

Dörnyei and Scott (1995a, 1995b) defined communication strategies according to “the manner of
problem management; that is, how communication strategies contribute to resolving conflicts
and achieving mutual understanding” (Dörnyei & Scott, 1997, p.198). Under this principle, there
are three sections for classifying communication strategies. Firstly, “direct strategies” are seen as
the manageable, self-contained and alternative devices of getting meaning, directly contribute to
solve the problem by compensating. While “indirect strategies seem to “create the conditions
for achieving mutual understanding” (Dörnyei & Scott, 1997, p.198) by using of fillers, strategy
markers, or pretending understanding. The purpose of this type of communication strategies is to
prevent the communication from the interrupt and keep the communication going on. The third
type of communication strategies is interactional strategies. In order to have mutual
understanding between two interlocutors, communicators try to handle the problems
cooperatively by asking for repetition, help, confirmation and explanation, etc.

**Paribakht (1985) and Nijmegen Group’s taxonomies**

From the psychological perspective, these authors developed their taxonomies in a different way
compared to the rest of other taxonomies. Nijmegen Group and Paribakht (1985) classified into
two main sections which are “conceptual strategies” and “linguistic strategies”. Paribakht (1985)
added one more category, that is, “contextual strategies”. Conceptual strategies falling into two kinds, analytic and holistic, “manipulate the concept so that it becomes expressible through their available linguistic resources” (Kellerman, 1991, p.149). Linguistic strategies, on the other hand, are to “manipulate the speaker’s linguistic knowledge through either morphological creativity or transfer” (Dörnyei & Scott, 1997, p.200).

2.4. **EMPIRICAL STUDIES ON COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES**

The research of “communication strategies” reached at the peak in 1990s; however, it has fallen down in these recent years while the other phenomenon such as technology’s use in second language learning and teaching has developed significantly. In spite of the decrease of attention in the research history in the field of linguistics, communication strategy research has played an important role in contributing to second language learning and teaching. Therefore, a significant amount of study has been carried out on communication strategies. This review only focuses on those employed by learners of English.

2.4.1. **Research on communication strategies employed by learners of English.**

Empirical studies emphasis on investigating the role of communication strategies in the second language instruction and practice. Some have examined on the frequency or popularity of which type of communication as second language speakers. Others have focused on how second
language learners communicate by using communication strategies and its effectiveness in communication. A little amount of research has been undertaken to compare the use of communication strategies of native and non-native speakers. The following are findings which have came out from other research in this case so far.

Firstly, communication strategy’s role has been considered in the empirical studies in term of communication strategies. Communication strategies are essential and effective devices used to not only overcome the communication problems because of linguistic deficiency or other resources, but also enhance the effectiveness of communication (Dobao & Martínez, 2007; Savignon, 1983; Somsai & Intaraprasert, 2011). The latter role also reflects the findings that communication strategies contribute to their fluency with what they already process. As "other strategies - such as paraphrase or adjusting the message (self-repair) may not help the learners to expand their repertoire, but help them to become fluent with what they already possess". (Littlewood, 1984, p.87). Besides negotiating meaning, keeping communication channel open is one of the completely crucial roles of communication strategy’s use (Dobao & Martínez, 2007). According to Hatch (1972), the most important one is to encourage second language learners not to give up.

Second of all, researchers have focused on communication strategy’s fluency when conducting studies related to this term. “The lower the competence in target language, the greater the dependence on communication strategies” (Dobao & Martínez, 2007, p.295; Terrell, 1977). Additionally, reduction strategies have been used more frequently than achievement strategies (Dobao & Martínez, 2007; Littlemore, 2003; & Moattarian, 2012). However, Littlemore (2003)
extended that the most likely effective strategies are literal mechanisms. The last significant aspect of communication strategy research is communication strategy’s context. Namely, the context whereby learners’ knowledge and ability in communication in the first language will affect their ability in using communication strategies in second language. It’s also related to learners’ communicative ability. (Dobao & Martínez, 2007; Bou-Franch, 1994, & Moattarian, 2012).

2.4.2. Review of research on Vietnamese refugees and immigrants in the field of communication strategies in United Kingdom

Look back the literature, there is a barely amount of communication strategies of Vietnamese learners of English so far in spite of its long history. However, the research only focuses on teaching communication strategies in academic environment, and that, participants are Vietnamese learners as English major students who have a good background of English (Bui & Intaraprasert, 2013 & Le, 2006). In this case, the finding came out that teaching communication strategies might improve and enhance learners’ fluency in language use (Le, 2006). The research has been done so far in Vietnam while it seems to be hard to find any study of Vietnamese refugees and immigrants in Britain, especially in Vietnam. Even research on refugees and immigrants in general undertaken in Britain is not a significant number. It is true that language is one of the challenges and forced element to learn for refugees and immigrants because of inevitably important role. However, studies on language learning for refugees and immigrants
focus on other aspects of language such as how to teach them effectively, what challenges they might face rather than communication strategies as Tully (2006).

Through reviewing the literature review so far, as awareness of the role of communication strategies in the theory of applied linguistics, the importance of language on communication in the Vietnamese refugees and immigrants in Britain, as well as, the lack of research on this aspect on Vietnamese refugees and immigrants. It is added that this research is conducted as a case study of two cases in personal contexts. Therefore, it might not be clear to how universal the results are for other refugees and immigrants who have different backgrounds and educational experiences. Therefore, the research will be undertaken in order to answer theses following research questions:

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. How do Vietnamese refugees and immigrants in the Manchester context use communication strategies?

2. What differences are there in the use of communication strategies between effective and less-effective second language speakers in the Vietnamese refugee and immigrant community?
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

3.1. RESEARCH GOALS

The current investigation has two main goals. Firstly, the research aims to determine how Vietnamese refugees and immigrants use the communication strategies by examining participants’ frequency of using communication strategies. Secondly, this study investigates the difference of communication strategies’ use between the apparently effective communicator and the less effective one.

3.2. METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS

3.2.1. Case study

It should not be denied that qualitative research conducted in education, especially in applied linguistics, has increased in recent years. According to Duff (2008), qualitative research emphasizes the importance of interpreting phenomenon in context. These contexts tend to be naturally occurring ones, or being arranged for research purposes. In comparison with quantitative research, qualitative research involves a small number of participants, which may be hard to generalize the findings. However, Denzin and Lincoln (2005) indicated that qualitative research offers a better understanding of the subject matter, allowing conducting detailed and in-
depth investigation of single cases. Qualitative research approach commonly used is case study. A case study is described as

“the in-depth study of instances of a phenomenon in its natural context and from the perspective of the participants involved in the phenomenon” (Gall, 2003, p.436).

In an attempt to define the term “case study”, Duff (2008) expressed that a case study is designed to explore and describe phenomenon; building theory, illustrating, and explaining theoretical insights. In term of applied linguistics, case study offers a wide range of learners, and generates detailed accounts of the process, factors associated with language learning, and language use. Issues addressed could be pragmatics, attitudes and motivation, anxiety, learning strategies Duff (2008). Case study is conducted to investigate a variety of issues in applied linguistics, because it provides “a high degree of completeness, depth of analysis, and readability” (Duff, 2008, p.43). Therefore, in an attempt to explore how refugees and immigrants as language learners of English use communication strategies effectively or less effectively, case study of two specific cases could be the appropriate method which is believed to provide the more detailed and in-depth results. However, the consideration should be mentioned here is that the case study is conducted in personal contexts which might not be generalisable for other Vietnamese refugees and immigrants’ situations.

3.2.2. The study

The current research which was decided to be undertaken as a case study because most studies on communication strategies have been conducted with large groups of learners such as surveys
conducted by Dobao & Martínez (2007), Le (2006), and Sato (2005). A case study of two selected participants provides a thorough picture of individual experiences. Research carried out in personal contexts might not be generalisable. Nevertheless, it allows accessing the issue more in-depth, which might be hard to be discovered by questionnaire surveys. The case study was also intended to provide detailed insights into communication strategies’ use by refugees and immigrants. The majority of research focuses on learners of English in schools or universities such as Bui & Intaraprasert (2013), Le (2006), and Tully (2013). Therefore, the researcher decided to conduct the study on refugees and immigrants who use English for the wider communication purposes rather than academic goals, which enables to researcher to have a panoramic view of communication strategies’ use on various subjects.

The taxonomy used in the research

The taxonomy used in the research is mainly based on Dörnyei and Scott (1995a, 1995b)’s taxonomy. By classifying communication strategies into three main sections as mentioned above, the taxonomy seems to be suitable for the research’s aim to investigate how Vietnamese refugees and immigrants use communication to directly or indirectly solve the language problems. However, there are some difference between the original taxonomy and the current one. First of all, not all of categories are used in this taxonomy. Some of them are believed to be similar; therefore, just one term is used (for example, restructure and self-repair). Secondly, topic avoidance is separated from message reduction. The reason of this separation is the reflection of message reduction is to leave out intended key words because of some language difficulties while topic avoidance is believed to be avoiding topic or changing the topic when non-
understanding occurs in communication. Thirdly, three strategies are added which are over – emphasis, over-using interrogative fragment and keep going the conversation. The table below shows the taxonomy used in the study with analysis codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DS/MA</td>
<td>Message abandonment</td>
<td>Leaving a target message unfinished because of language difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS/ MR</td>
<td>Message Reduction</td>
<td>Leaving out intended key words because of some language difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS/ MRP</td>
<td>Message Replacement</td>
<td>Substituting the intended message of the new one because of a lack of linguistic resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS/ PP</td>
<td>Paraphrasing</td>
<td>Describing the intended message or the target object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS/ TA</td>
<td>Topic avoidance</td>
<td>Avoiding topic or changing the topic when non-understanding occurs in communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS/ LT</td>
<td>Literal translation</td>
<td>Translating literally a compound/ structure from L1 to L2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS/ IT</td>
<td>Interlingual Transfer</td>
<td>Using a L2 word/ phrase with L1 pronunciation or morphology or vice versa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS/ UoL1</td>
<td>Use of L1 words</td>
<td>Using L1 words to fill the gap where a message is incomplete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS/ UoP</td>
<td>Use of all purpose words</td>
<td>Using “thing, stuff, make, do, what – do- you – call – it “ where specific items are lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS/ RT</td>
<td>Retrieval</td>
<td>Saying a series of incomplete or wrong forms or structures until reaching the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
optimal form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DS/ SR</td>
<td>Self repair</td>
<td>Making self-initiated corrections in their speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS/OR</td>
<td>Other repair</td>
<td>Correcting the items which are corrected by interlocutor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS/OE</td>
<td>Over-emphasis</td>
<td>Over-emphasis of language feature for clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS/OIF</td>
<td>Over-using Interrogative fragment</td>
<td>Over- using the interrogative fragment like “tag”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDIRECT STRATEGIES: IDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDS/ UoF</td>
<td>Using of fillers</td>
<td>Use of gambits to fill the pauses in order to gain time, carry on the conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS/RP</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>Repeating a word or a string of words immediately after they were said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS/ ORP</td>
<td>Other repetition</td>
<td>Repeating something the interlocutor said to gain time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS/PU</td>
<td>Pretend understanding</td>
<td>Pretending understand to carry on the conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS/KG</td>
<td>Keep going the conversation.</td>
<td>Carrying on the topic until reaching the target object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERACTIONAL STRATEGIES: IRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRS/ AfH</td>
<td>Appeal for Help</td>
<td>Trying to elicit help from the interlocutor either verbally or nonverbally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS/ AfR</td>
<td>Asking for Repetition</td>
<td>Requesting repetition when not hearing or understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS/ AfC</td>
<td>Asking for Confirmation</td>
<td>Requesting confirmation that one heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS/ AfE</td>
<td>Asking for explanation</td>
<td>Requesting explanation of the word or structure not understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Taxonomy based on Dörnyei and Scott (1995a, 1995b)

### 3.3. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

As the investigation described in this paper focuses on two participants, this section gives rise to ethical issues. First of all, the ethical considerations with anonymity, informed consent and confidentiality and data store are considered. Therefore, those participants were provided full information in order to have good comprehension of what the project was and what the project’s purpose before they agreed to take part in. A consent form was necessary to be signed in case study research. It was translated into Vietnamese in order to make sure they understand all the agreements in the form.

Another ethical challenge is that considerable details and contextualization about participants might be difficult to protect or participants might want to hide some information related to privacy; therefore, the researcher might change or withhold data which could compromise the confidentiality of the study. The audio records of conversation were stored safely after the research if having permission from participants; otherwise, they were destroyed after the research.
One of the ethical issues could be considered in this research is about the relationship between the researchers and participants. They might accept to participate in the research just because of the friendship with the researcher which might lead them to find out that they are not as good at English as they thought. However, both of participants in this research had a willingness to learn English and really want to participate in the research which findings might help them to improve their English. In spite of this, the informed consent forms would stress the ability to leave the study anytime.

3.4. SUBJECT OF THE INVESTIGATION

3.4.1. Sampling procedures

In order to select participants for the research, two sampling strategies were used, including “criterion sampling” and “convenience sampling”. First of all, participants who were selected met “specific predetermined criteria” (Dörnyei, 2007, p.128) (reference). Firstly, the participants had to be Vietnamese refugees or immigrants who do not have much experience with high education before coming to England. As refugees and immigrants who are students or high-skilled workers have better background in English rather than the others (Seufert, 1999). Secondly, two participants had to meet the requirement of the stay length in England approximately. Thirdly, participants taking part in the current research had to be tested in order to identify if they are effective or less-effective in communication. The term “successful or
“Success is thought to be based on such factors as checking one’s performance in a language, being willing to guess and to ‘take risks’ with both comprehension and production, seeking out opportunities to practice, developing efficient memorizing strategies, and many others” (p.56).

The researcher can consider if the participant is effectively or less-effectively communicated by daily observation based on experience of working with each participant as a teacher. Second of all, the “convenience sampling” was used to select the participants for the study. The potential participants were selected because both of them met the criteria such as availability at a certain time, easy accessibility and willingness to attend.

3.4.2. The participants

The current study investigated the use of communication strategies on two participants. Firstly, the first participant (P1) is a 35 years old female. She works as a nail technician in Manchester for 10 years. Although she can not make a speech in a good grammar after having lived in England for such long time, she can communicate and express her ideas with native speakers fluently and express. Therefore, I believe she might be considered as a successful situation in using communication strategies.

The second participant (P2) is the 32 year old male, working as the nail technician in Manchester for 7 years. He lives with his Vietnamese wife and two children. He used to attend
English class with other refugees three days a week. However, his English hasn’t been improved much. He can only speak the speech which he has prepared before and finds it difficult to communicate with native speakers in daily life.

3.5. RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

3.5.1. Audio-recording

Data collection

The purpose of the study is to investigate the communication strategies’ use in actual life. Thus, the main data collected in this investigation is audio-recordings of actual conversations with the help of follow up interviews. The investigation started with video-recording for P1. However, because P2 changed his mind during the procedure of collecting data, the study had to change to audio-recordings instead of video-recordings which were decided to use before. Audio-recordings were collected in interpersonal and transactional contexts. It is true that one of language learners’ important aims is to communicate for interpersonal and transactional purposes. According to Nunan (1992), interactional talk is communicating with someone for social purpose in order to establish and maintain social interaction. Topics in interpersonal talk are non-controversial such as weekend, school, work, weather, and holiday. In this case, the interpersonal context is in nail salons. As discussed above, another essential communication skill is the ability of using English to accomplish different kinds of transactions such as check in into
a hotel, ordering food, buying something in a store. This type of talk involves communicating to get something done rather than maintaining social relationship. Both types of speech were investigated in the current research, because learners have to speak English in both interpersonal and transactional contexts in daily communication.

First of all, the researcher recorded five conversations between the participants and customers in their nail salon for the interpersonal talk purpose. Customer’s permission was given before recording. Secondly, in order to investigate the communication strategies’ use in the transactional context. Two participants were told to do two communication tasks and audio-recording was taken during the process. The first task is that the participants had to find out how to get to the target place, a French restaurant by asking for direction on street. Both participants began at the same start and destination. The researcher took audio recording while the participants were asking for directions.

Another task is to record the conversation between the participants and native speaker in the transactional context. One place had to be chosen among these potential places including museum, travel agent, accommodation agent and council. However, travel and accommodation agents were believed that the participants might not have chance to keep the conversation open because they might be introduced information by leaflets while it was hard to get permission to record in council. Therefore, the researcher decided to choose Manchester central museum for the task. Namely, the researcher introduced seven galleries in museum and gave P2 a choice of one of them which he was interested in with the aim of motivating the less effective participant to involve in speaking English. His decision is money gallery. P2 was told to speak with gallery
guider to find out information about money. The conversation between him and the staff in
gallery was recorded. It was undertaken the same with P2. However, it was considered that if P1
should be given choice of any gallery in museum like P2. However, focusing on the aim of
research, the researcher decided to give P1 equal context in term of engagement of speaking
English. Thus, P1 had to do task in the same gallery, money gallery. Because the purpose of the
study is to investigate how the effective and less effective participants use communication
strategies; therefore, if it is conducted in the same situation, it would enable the researcher to
analyze data in comparison the results.

Data analysis

The audio recordings were transcribed (see table X for transcription features) and then analyzed.
Analysis codes were introduced in the taxonomy above. During transcription procedure, three
codes were added to describe the communication strategies which hadn’t been in the taxonomy
before. The coding used on the transcriptions appears in the order in which features are seen in
each line. For example, in this line, “Um oh (…) where they in the church (yeh)?”, The code is
analyzed in order “INDIRECT STRATEGY/UoF for “ah oh oh”, and DIRECT STRATEGY/ PP
for “where they in the church?”. From the recording data, the frequency of the use of
communication strategies was calculated by times of being used and percentage of total use.
After analyzing data collected from audio- recordings, the follow- up interview was conducted to
find out more details, focusing on the specific issues discovered from the analysis of the task
recordings.
3.5.2. Interview

Data collection

According to Duff (2008), interview plays an important role in research in applied linguistics; therefore, it is commonly used in case study. A research interview is defined as a construction or joint production by interviewee and interviewer (Coughlan & Duff, 1994; & Mishler, 1986). In order to find out more details about specific issues from the analysis of task recordings, follow-up interview was undertaken to each participant. The current research attempts to investigate how P1 and P2 use CSs and what differences there are. The analysis from task recordings provides different use of CSs by each participant; therefore, interview questions are different, which is based on specific issues. Both participants were individually interviewed by mobile phone and audio-recorded. According to Duff (2008), qualitative research interviews could be conducted face to face or telephone if it is hard to arrange meeting times and places. Interviews were taken in Vietnamese, because it is easier for them to express their ideas in the first language. The interview questions below were used to explore issue which emerged from task recordings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P1 – Interview questions</th>
<th>P2- Interview questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking about the use of literal translation strategy:</td>
<td>Talking about the use of interlingual transfer strategy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do you often literally translate when speaking English?</td>
<td>- Do you have any difficulties in pronouncing English?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have you known the structure of “have/get something done” in English before? How is it used?

- Do you know you have to use prep “to” with “speak”, instead of “speak with”?

- Which one do you focus on when you speak English? Between accuracy or fluency?

Talking about over-emphasis strategy

- Why did you emphasize the sound /s/ in your speech?

- Could you give me an example of that?

Talking about over-using interrogative fragment strategy

- When do you use “ISN’T IT” in your speech?

- Did you use it to ask for information in that situation? If not, could you say something more about this?

How do you think if you are taught to pronounce English sounds properly?

- How would you react if listener doesn’t understand what you have said?

Talking about the use of using all-purpose words

- How often do you use this word “thing” when you speak English?

- If you want to express an action which you don’t know proper verb to express, how would you say?
Data analysis

Because the interview was taken in order to find out more detailed and in-depth explanation associated with issues which were discovered from analysis of task recordings, interviews were translated from Vietnamese into English after being transcribed without coding.

### 3.6. PILOTING THE RESEARCH

According to Dörnyei (2007), it is essential to pilot research instruments and procedures before they are actually used in practice, which contributes the high quality of the outcomes. In this
case, task-recordings and interviews are recorded by an audio-recorder. The quality of recorder was carefully checked before it was used. Additionally, a friend of the researcher volunteered to take part in the pilot study. To be more specific, a volunteer had to go to museum and did direction task with the researcher before conducting the study.

3.7. RELIABILITY

In order to increase reliability of the study, task-recordings’ transcriptions were coded by researcher’s lecturer in university in Vietnam by email. Codes were agreed 90%. The lecturer suggested one new strategy. However, the frequency of the use of this strategy is a small number, the researcher decided not to use this in the current research. Additionally, some codes were suggested to change. It is noted that the use of CSs is somewhat ambiguous in some situations; therefore, some codes were decided to change or not, depending the follow-up interview data.

The findings and results were also checked with both participants.

3.8. CONCLUSION

The above chapter presented the aim of the research, described the sampling procedures employed to select participants for the research and portray the selected participants. Moreover, this chapter also mentioned the possible ethical issues and detailed the methodology instruments
and procedure used in the current study. The data analysis with taxonomy and analysis code was presented. The following chapter shows about the findings and discussion of communication strategies’ use.
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the findings and the discussion of the communication strategies’ use employed by participants in the current research. The structure of this chapter will be divided into two main sections based on finding out the answer for the research questions. Each of the sections details data gathered with the help of the instruments used in the investigation. Therefore, there might be an overlap among discussions of each section.

In the first part, the data collected from audio-recordings of participant’s completion of tasks are analyzed from different angles. The main way to deal with data in this research is frequency number by comparing usage’s times and percentage of total use. There are three uses of percentage in this analysis. Firstly, it is percentage of the total of each group’s use. As mentioned above, there are three groups including direct strategies, indirect strategies, and interactional strategies. The second one is the percentage of the total of overall CSs’ use, and the third one is the total of use in context. Consider the example below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of DIRECT STRATEGY (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of CS (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECT STRATEGY/MA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table shows that the strategy of message abandonment (DIRECT STRATEGY/MA) is used 4 times, taking the proportion of 3,01% of the total of direct strategies’ use; 0,97% of the total of overall communication strategies’ use, and 1,13 % of the total of use in conversation.

Results start with the overall level of CSs’ use, which allows us to have a general view of the difference. After that, it will be made a discussion between the different groups of strategies, as well as different frequency levels within each group. The researcher is going to discuss the significant numbers of the strategies’ usage by both participants by analyzing excerpts selected from the audio-recordings transcriptions with the help of the follow-up interview data. Examples of using strategies will be in bold in excerpts.

4.2. How do Vietnamese refugees and immigrants in the Manchester context use communication strategies?

In an attempt to answer this research question, the researcher provides a general view of CSs’ use by each participant, and details some of significant CSs to analyze how P1 and P2 use in specific contexts.

4.2.1. The effective learner – P1
General view

The tables 2 and 3 provide the summary statistics for learner’s frequency of each group of communication strategies in the context of interpersonal and transactional talk, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of strategies (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECT STRATEGY</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td>37.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT STRATEGY</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>52.30</td>
<td>44.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTIONAL STRATEGY</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Frequency of CS’s use in interpersonal talk by effective learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Percentage/Total of strategies (%)</th>
<th>Percentage/Total of use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECT STRATEGY</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33.11</td>
<td>24.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT STRATEGY</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55.86</td>
<td>40.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTIONAL STRATEGY</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Frequency of CS’s use in transactional talk by effective learner

It can be seen from the data in the table 2 that the DIRECT STRATEGY group and INDIRECT STRATEGY group reported approximately with the number of 44.63% and 37.57% of total of use, respectively. While this number of the other group, interactional strategy, is only 4.80%. In comparison with the table 3 which shows the frequency of communication strategy’s use in
transactional conversation, although indirect strategy group is approximately double compared to
direct strategy group, both these groups still take the significant proportion of total with 40.91% and 24.24% respectively. The proportion of interactional strategy group in the transactional talk increases with 8.08%. As mentioned above, these tables are an overview of the data. In order to
discuss these numbers further, looking at the significant aspects of the details from data is
necessary before turning to these statistics.

**Literal translation**

In the context of interpersonal conversation, one of the most striking results to emerge from the
data is the dominant number of a strategy of literal translation with 40 times of being used.
Literal translation strategy takes the second largest proportion of 12.99% of total of strategies used in interpersonal context. The results of the correlation analysis are presented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of DSs (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of CSs (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Message abandonment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Reduction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Replacement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrasing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic avoidance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal translation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.08</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlingual Transfer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of L1 words</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This strategy was frequently used in P1’s interpersonal data, which could be illustrated by excerpt below:

**Excerpt 1:**

Line 1: P1: I think yeah (. ) “oh” Now yeah. your natural nailS: a bit longer. (1.0) but I thinking
Line 2: they will be (1) will SLIP ((action of nails being taken off)) easy. Because I feeling they
Line 3: really SOFT in here ((pointed at the nails)). So I think now I do like this. >I< cut all your
Line 4: reo /reo/ ((Vietnamese pronunciation)) real nail off.

Line 5: CUS: yeah yeah.

Line 6: P1: And I put clear tip. And after that I paint the color like my. “And” in [three week later]

Line 7: CUS: Right.

Line 8: P1: “Three week later”, **you infill. When they come the gap** ((pointed at the gap between

Line 9: customer’s real nails and fake nails) like before. (. ) **You infill** and then painting the

Line 10: colour. It’s that better and save your money as well.
This excerpt of conversation is a good illustration for using literal translation from the participant’s first language. P1 used this strategy again in line 8 by “you infill” and even “when they come the gap”. It is apparent that there is not the structure “have something done” with the meaning something’s done for the speaker by someone else in Vietnamese. The verb used by the first person or the second person could be understood as having the same meaning. Looking at this strategy in this line could illustrate this view. Firstly, in Vietnamese, it’s said that “you infill” rather than “you have it infilled”.

Consider also excerpt 2.

Excerpt 2:

Line 1: P1: You want to do nails?
Line 2: Cus: Yeah. Would you be able to do my nails?
Line 3: P1: yeah of course.

The participant used the utterance “You want to do nails?” instead of “You want to have your nails done ?”. Conversely, if the latter is said in this situation, it will sound strange in Vietnamese. It could be noted that literally, P1 and customers use different structures which should be understood differently; however, it does not interrupt the conversation, and the target communication is still conveyed effectively.

A third useful illustration of this use is the following excerpt 3.

Excerpt 3:
Line 1: CUS: We should have translator over here, well free really should not they?

Line 2: P1: yeah I can. But like (2.0) sometimes I do not understand what they say. BUT

Line 3: sometimes I can learn **mouth to mouth** ((move hand)), like “oh” when I speak **with**

Line4: you, I can learn from you.

“Mouth to mouth” is translated literally. P1 meant this by learning by communication, which is “BẰNG MIỆNG” in Vietnamese. Additionally, the participant used “speak with” instead of “speak to” because “with” can be used with all verbs in Vietnamese in order to express the action happening with someone. Taking about this issue, the interviewee said:

“If I think it’s easy for me to express my ideas, I will try to speak accurately. Sometimes, I forgot it, I meant when I speak fluently. But I think I have problem now, because I thought these words could be used in this situation. It’s really hard to pay attention on grammar when you talk.” (P1- Interview – Translated from Vietnamese)

There are two reasons which could be explained for this issue according to data analysis above. Firstly, it depends on the situation whereby conversation occurs and the intention of using CSs. If the situation seems to be easy with the linguistic resources needed, the participant will be consciously aware of accuracy in her speech in an attempt to improve her English. However, the more confident the participant is, the more fluently she speaks English, and the more frequently the literal translation is used. This finding supports Nilsson (2012) that when learners have to keep in mind the accuracy aspect, it could break fluency in communication. In this case, the usage of literal translation strategy indicates that although P1 tries to focus on accuracy at the beginning, she tends to change focus on fluency in order to keep communication channel open.
According to Karjalainen (2008), the use of communication strategies and learning strategies depends on the learners’ intention to communicate a meaning or focus on development of language skills. He suggested that learners tend to use CSs to promote the interaction between partners, because focus on literacy might cause a break in fluency. In this case, it is considered that P1 uses the literal translation strategy to promote fluency in communication, and it is supposed that she might use different CS if she focused on accuracy in this situation. As Littlewood (1984) pointed out that "communication strategies may not help the learners to expand their repertoire, but help them to become fluent with what they already possess" (p.87). It comes to conclusion that the intention of using CSs is influenced by a focus on accuracy or fluency in communication.

Considering this issue from different view found out from interview data, P1 is not aware of the fact that she is using literal translation strategy because of the first language’s influence. Thus, she unconsciously uses this strategy rather than deciding to use it on purpose. This again supports Gass and Selinker (1994) that CSs are also believed to be automatically used rather than used in control according to Schmidt (1994).

**The strategies of over-emphasis and over-using interrogative fragment**

Two of three additional strategies are over-emphasis and over-using interrogative fragment such as question tag. These types of strategies play an important role in considering how the participants communicate by using it. As can be seen from table 4 above, both strategies have the high percentage of usage, after literal translation in total of direct strategies, which is over-emphasis with 11.28% and over-using interrogative fragment with 14.29%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of DSs (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of CSs (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Message abandonment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Reduction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrasing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic avoidance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal translation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlingual Transfer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of L1 words</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of all purpose words</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self repair</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other repair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over - emphasis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-using Interrogative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Frequency of DIRECT STRATEGY’s use in transactional talk by effective learner

Data from the table 4 can be compared with data from table 5 which shows the frequency of DIRECT STRATEGY’s use in transactional talk by P1. In table 5, the number of the strategy’s use of over-emphasis is quite significant with the largest number, 20.83% of total of DIRECT STRATEGY. The analysis discusses each of these two strategies in detail below.
Interestingly, the data collected from P1 shows the issue of over-emphasis of the final consonant in her speech. The consonant mostly over-emphasized is /s/. The participant demonstrated that:

“The final sound is really important in English. When I learned English in Vietnam, it wasn’t mentioned in any lesson of pronunciation. We just focused on how to pronounce the main sounds with the omission of the final consonants. When I came here, I found it really difficult to make the local understand what I said. It took me a long time to realize that I had to pronounce the final sound. There are two final consonants which are the most popular ones in English and those are emphasized most clearly by native speakers, which are /s/ and /k/. For example: Mil/k/, wee/k/, friend/S/, I think.” (P1- Interview- Translated from Vietnamese)

The following examples are illustrated to investigate how P1 over-emphasized as discussed above. Consider the excerpt 4.

Excerpt 4:

Line 1: P1: It (will be) nice. Your friend live over there ? Live in Philippines ?

Line 2: CUS: No she lives here, her family are still over here.

Line 3: P1: “Oh” she’s Philippine lady ? Like my. Vietnamese lady ?

Line 4: CUS: Yeah yeah.

Line 5: P1. “oh yeah” so now she just **comes** /s/ here,
Line 6: P1: [[ and fu (. ) future she goes /s/ over there.

Line 7: CUS: [[ She married an English man and she’s been over here for about 20 years.

This example is really interesting, because as can be seen, P1 over-emphasized the consonants /s/ in both words “comes” in line 5 and “goes” in line 6. However, it’s right in the case of “comes”. The latter word “goes” should be pronounced /ɡəʊz/ rather than /ɡəʊs/. P2’s view about the final sounds could be considered accurate in term of pronunciation; however, it’s somewhat unsuccessful. Since not all words ending with consonant “s” is pronounced /s/. Namely, the ending is pronounced /s/ after a voiceless sound, /z/ after a voiced sound, and /iz/ after a sibilant sound. Therefore, her insufficient knowledge about this phenomenon causes her to use over-emphasize strategy. However, to be fair, it is true that Vietnamese does not contain words ending with consonants, which makes learners confused with the final consonants. Therefore, naturally, they tend to omit most of them. Compare with the excerpt below.

Excerpt 5:

Line 1: P1: Your family wedding or some friends /S/ ?

Line 2: CUS: This summer. (The customer might misunderstand participant’s question)

Line 3: P1. Ah oh oh (2.0) where they start ?

Line 4: CUS: Pardon?

Line 5: P1: Um oh (…) where they in the church (yeh) ?

Line 6: CUS: Ah Albion Church, in Stamford.

Line 7: P1: Yeah (..) so how many dresses (/s/) you change ?
In this example, P1 pronounced /s/ in “friends” instead of the proper sound /z/ in line 1. And it is the same with “dresses” in line 7 when she pronounced /s/ instead of /iz/. In this case, the participant is aware of the importance of the final sound when pronouncing and tries to speak English properly as she said in the interview:

“Whenever the words contain the letter ‘s’, it means that it must be pronounced this sound /s/ clearly, especially, the plural form of nouns and the verb’s form with /s/. This is one of things I have to remember, and I try to remember before I speak anything with these words, because I want to speak English properly.” (P1-Interview- Translated from Vietnamese)

This again supports the finding above that P1 starts using CSs in an attempt to focus on accuracy in communication. However, she did not realize that she over-used it because of her insufficient knowledge of linguistics items. The phrase “the letter/s/” in her interview is emphasized, because this shows what P1 is based on to pronounce a word. It could be seen that P1 pronounces /s/ by looking at the letter “s” rather than connecting it with other sounds in the words. As P1 said, not only the final sound ending with “s”, but also its presence in the middle of words, it has to be pronounced clearly. This could be illustrated by looking at the following example.

Excerpt 6: (From transactional talk. CP: Conversation partner)

Line 1: P1: Some people tell me find **to Deangate** (without /S/).

Line 2: CP: Deansgate ?

Line 3: P1: Yeah yeah. **Dean/S/gate.** ((Laugh))
Excerpt 7:

Line 1: P1: My friend said near Deangate ((without /s/) (1.0). Dean...(1.0) Dean/S:/ (.) gate.
Line 2: Something like that.
Line 3: CP: Are you looking for Deansgate?
Line 4: P1: Yeah yeah. Where about Dea:n/S/gate? Do you know?

It is true that one of the significantly common errors committed by Vietnamese learners of English is omitting some sounds occurring in the middle of words, because such occurrence is an unfamiliar phonetic phenomenon. To be more specific, Vietnamese is described as syllable-timed language (Nguyen, 1970) whereas English is stress-timed language. According to Tran (1980), it is a challenge for speakers of syllable-timed languages to “get the hang of stress timing, so this feature will persist, strengthening the staccato rhythm of Vietnamese English” (p.427). In this case, because of P1’s attempt to speak English properly and have good communication, she tries to emphasize it; however, it’s over-emphasis because of the lack of proper knowledge of linguistic resources.

**Over-using interrogative fragment**

Question tags are commonly used in spoken English by native speakers. In communication, a question tag could be used to request information politely, confirm what has been said, or just a way to start a conversation and/ or keep it moving. The rule is that the sentence is finished with a negative tag after a positive statement, and vice versa, using the main verb (if there is no auxiliary) or the first auxiliary verb (if there is an auxiliary). However, the participant in this case
study seems to over-use by emphasizing the only form of “IS IT” for every situation with question tag. Looking at this following example, it shows the way how P1 use the question tag in order to maintain good communication.

Excerpt 8:

Line 1: P1: “Ah.” How many do you have?
Line 2: CUS: six all together
Line 3: P1: WOW! ((Laughing)) It’s fun, IS IT?
Line 4: CUS: Yeah. But they like to fight to each other.
Line 5: P1: Yeah. Are you take them (.) go anywhere?
Line 6: CUS: No.
Line 7: P1: Yeah. Just spend time together, IS IT?
Line 8: CUS: Well. They’ve got little friends around us
Line 9: P1: But they younger, it’s easy. (.) But when they teenager/S:/ so you can NOT control
Line 10: on them. Yeah. All the time – they go what (1.0.) they go, where they go and they do
Line 11: what they want, IS IT?

It can be seen that P1 used “IS IT” for most situations improperly. For example, it should be “ISN’T IT” rather than “IS IT” in line 3, and it occurs similarly in other cases, such as the proper form should be “DOESN’T IT” in line 7, and “DON’T THEY” in line 11 as well. Continuingly, in the excerpt 9 below, P1 used “IS IT” in line 1 instead of the right form “ISN’T IT”, and “DON’T YOU” in line 6.
Excerpt 9:

Line 1: CUS: We’ve been friends now for 18 years

Line 2: P1: Eighteen? WOW! It’s that long, IS IT?

Line 3: CUS: We have those things yeah, we share to each other.

Line 4: P1: So now like sister, sister.

Line 5: P1: Sometimes yeah, same (plus) but hard for them to make friends together. And when

Line 6: you see someone else different (plus), but you get on very well, IS IT?

Line 7: CUS: Yeah. Sometimes I can tell what she is about to say.

Talking about this issue with the participant, the reason given for this use is similar to the use of over-emphasis strategy discussed above. That is because her knowledge of this language item is not sufficient rather than saying that she misunderstands it. The comment below illustrates this view.

“Actually I never heard of this structure (question tag) when I learned English in secondary school in Vietnam long time ago. When I first came here, speaking to native speakers, I thought they used this after each statement when they wanted to change from statement to question. I started to try using it in communication after that, and I thought it worked, that is, they understood what I said better. I use it to make listener understand more, and when I want to have attention from them. ((laugh)).” (P1- Interview – Translated from Vietnamese).

It could be said that P1 intends to use this strategy in order to enable communication and especially to “have attention from listener”, which motivates her to speak English and become an effective communicator.
In sum, it could be considered that the strategies of literal translation, over-emphasis and over-using interrogative fragment are used more frequently than remaining ones. Though the participant used to learn English in school in Vietnamese and even spent time on joining English classes when she came to Britain, she learnt English through daily communication rather than in formal class. The rule of linguistics came out by subjective awareness of problems occurring in actual communication, which leads insufficient awareness of linguistic items. It is true that P1 made mistake when speaking English as discussed above; however, in term of communication, she used them with the aim of keeping the conversation channel open. The problem is just because she didn’t realize her mistake and tried to emphasize it in an attempt to speak English properly, which makes a good communication at least. Considering English as a lingua franca (ELF)/ English as International language (EIL), ‘failing’ to use correct forms in tag questions (e.g., isn’t it?/ Is it?) as P2 does here is a feature of this language (Cogo & Dewey 2006). However, while according to Breiteneder (2005), ELF/ EIL is typically used between NNS and NNS, she uses with native speakers for the same sort of reason to enable communication. It is assumed that it’s the best thing for her to speak a native speaker model of English rather than an ELF/English as international language model.

In conclusion, it could be noted that P1 consciously used DIRECT STRATEGIES in order to not only fill the gap occurring in communication, but also enhance the effectiveness of communication in spite of improper CSs’ use because of the lack of knowledge of linguistic items. The result confirms to role of CSs’ use as essential and effective devices used to not only overcome the communication problems because of linguistic deficiency or other resources (Dobao & Martínez, 2007; Savignon, 1983; Somsai & Intaraprasert, 2011).
4.2.2. The less effective learner

General view of CSs’ use

An overview of communication strategy’s use of P2 considered is shown in these tables below. As can be seen in the tables, the frequency of the indirect strategy is the most significant one, followed by direct strategy as the second highest percentage and interactional strategies in the last. Namely, in interpersonal talk, the numbers demonstrate the disparity between indirect strategy group and direct strategy group with 75.07% in total of strategies used and 21.66%, respectively while this number of interactional strategy is just 3.27%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of CSs (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECT STRATEGY</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>27.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT STRATEGY</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>75.07</td>
<td>90.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTIONAL STRATEGY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Frequency of CS’s use in interpersonal talk by the less effective learner

In transactional talk, the difference among groups is similar to the data in interpersonal talk. However, the difference between indirect and direct strategies is lower with 54.60% of total of strategies for indirect strategy and 34.97% for direct strategies. This number of interactional strategy is higher with 10.43%.
### Table 7: Frequency of CS’s use in transactional talk by less effective learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of CSs (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECT STRATEGY</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34.97</td>
<td>33.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT STRATEGY</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>54.60</td>
<td>52.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTIONAL STRATEGY</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>10.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interlingual transfer strategy**

The analysis will go in details in dominant numbers in following tables. One of the most significant numbers in the use of direct strategies is interlingual transfer’s use in both interpersonal and transactional contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of DSs (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of CSs (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of Use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Message abandonment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Reduction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Replacement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrasing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic avoidance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal translation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlingual Transfer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.14</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of L1 words</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of all purpose words</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retrieval  |  7  |  9.59  |  2.08  |  2.65  
Self repair | 3  |  4.11  |  0.89  |  1.14  
Other repair | 4  |  5.48  |  1.19  |  1.89  
Over - emphasis | 1  |  1.37  |  0.30  |  0.38  
Over-using Interrogative fragment | 3  |  4.11  |  0.89  |  1.14  

Table 8: Frequency of DIRECT STRATEGY’s use in interpersonal talk by less effective learner

From the table 8 above, we can see that the significant number of the strategy of interlingual transfer with 30.14% of total of DIRECT STRATEGYs’ use and 6.53% of total of CSs’ use in general. This number in the transactional context is 35.09% and 12.27%, respectively. The following examples show how P2 uses this strategy in communication.

Excerpt 10:

…

Line 1: Cus: How about you?

Line 2: P2: No. “oh” “I” just one time “a” year come back Vietnam, my country. “oh” “oh” I Line 3: visit my country /kʌn tə ri/ (Vietnamese pronunciation)

Line 4: Cus: Oh yeah. So when are you going?

Line 5: P2: No. No. “oh” I think in Fe “oh” Fe.. Februa..”oh” February /Fe bə rə ry/ ((Vietnamese pronunciation))

Line 6: Cus. February.

Excerpt 11:
Line 1: Cus: ((Laugh)) yeah. How long does it take?

Line 2: P2: Thirteen /ˈθɜːrti:n/ ((Vietnamese pronunciation)) hour.”oh” HourS /S/.


Line 4: P2: Yeah. And in here different weather. She like the summer, BUT the winter “oh” she

Line 5: do not like. Very cold. “oh” in my country it’s very hot.

Line 6: Cus: Exactly. Not like here. ((laugh)).

Line 7: P2: yeah. This “oh” time thirty nine or forty DEGREE /ˈde ɡə riː/ ((Vietnamese pronunciation))

Excerpt 12:

Line 1: P2: Balance /ˈbæ ləns/ ((Vietnamese pronunciation)).

Line 2: NS: Sorry?

Line 3: P2: Ba... balance? I do not know in English. ((Move hands))

Line 4: NS: Yeah. It number 14, brass sovereign balance. A balance to make sure that the weight of gold Line 5: was the same on either side.

In these examples of interpersonal talk, the words of “Country”, “Thirteen”, “February”, and “Degree” were pronounced by the effect of Vietnamese pronunciation. As explained in the interview, it was hard for P2 to pronounce the sounds containing the consonant cluster such as /br/ in “February” or /gr/ in “Degree”. As mentioned above, the phonetic phenomenon of consonant cluster is unfamiliar to the Vietnamese. Thus, participants tend to adjust their mother tongue to the target language phonologically or morphologically (Dörnyei 1995). This is explained for P2’s choice of Interlingual transfer strategy in communication. Looking at another
example in the excerpt 12 of transactional conversation, we can see P2 tried to pronounce “Balance” many times by using the strategy of interlingual transfer. However, the reason of this usage is because he didn’t know how to pronounce it at all. While in above examples, he knew the pronunciation, but he could not deal with it or might not try to properly pronounce. In sum, the strategy of interlingual transfer seems to be used because of pronunciation problems affected by the first language and/ or the lack of vocabularies which should be learnt with the meaning, spell and pronunciation. Therefore, it could be said that the context might not an important influential in this case. Notwithstanding, it can be added that motivation might be the element which should be considered in using the strategy of interlingual transfer. As the participant said:

“I think it’s not a big problem, because my customers still understand. Actually, if I try, I can pronounce some words properly, but I do not. If they understand what I say, that’s enough”. (P2- Interview translated from Vietnamese).

To be more specific, it could be noted that P2 use CSs with the intention of achievement of fluency rather than accuracy in communication, which causes the fact that he seems not to be motivated to speak English properly by using different CSs. This result confirms Guhlemann’s findings (2011) about the possible correlation between motivation and strategy use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of DSs (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of CSs (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Message abandonment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Reduction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrasing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic avoidance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal translation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlingual Transfer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.09</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>11.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of L1 words</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of all purpose words</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self repair</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other repair</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over - emphasis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-using Interrogative fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Frequency of DIRECT STRATEGY’s use in transactional talk by less effective learner

The strategy of the use of all-purpose words

The table 8 shows that one of the significant numbers is the strategy of using all-purpose words. It takes the proportion of 10.96% of total of DIRECT STRATEGYs’ use as the second highest strategy used in communication. Consider excerpt 13.

Excerpt 13:

Line 1: P2: oh yeah. That color. (2.0) You live in Ashton?

Line 2: Cus: No. I live in Oldham.

Line 3: P2: How far from here ?

Line 4: Cus: About fifteen minutes. Not far.

Line 6: Cus: Oh yeah. That’s good. It’s a bit quite in the morning, is not it ?

Line 7: P2: Yeah. Nor (.) nor (.) normally weekend very busy. (2.0) “oh” but the middle month

Line 8: “oh” is not busy than “oh” “oh” the end of the month.

Line 9: Cus: Urm ?

Line 10: P2: “oh” Customer “oh” have to pay. They do money. “oh” I meant they have

Line 11: money. “ah” They do for someone. And someone pay for them.

Line 12: Cus: oh yeah.

The participant used “my do” instead of “my job” in line 5 in the excerpt above, and “they do money” instead of “they earn money” in line 11. It could be argued that the strategy used might be the use of word coinage and/ or literal translation rather than using of purpose words. However, if we look at the taxonomy of the current research, that is to say, the strategy of using of all-purpose words is separated and is defined as a mean of using the common purpose words of “thing” for unknown nouns, and “make, do” for unknown verbs”, this situation will be classified as the strategy of using purpose words. The reason why these words are quite popular and used a lot could be found out by looking at the data collected from the follow up interview.

In an question about how often P2 use the word “thing in English”, he demonstrated that

“Actually a lot.((laugh)). If I do not know how to express a noun, I use “something” or “thing”. At least listener could understand I am mentioning something, not action.” (P2- Interview translated from Vietnamese)

While being questioned about what word P2 normally prefer using to express his ideas if he does not know main verb, P2 indicated that:
“Do. I use “do” to explain whatever I want to meant by action. Actually, I also use “make”, but I can not distinguish the use of “make” and “do” in each situation. It sounds to me that they have same meaning and we can use them as an alternative.” (P2- Interview- Translated from Vietnamese)

Interestingly, using of all-purpose words as a communication strategy is also described as a feature of ELF. Cogo & Dewey (2006) presented one of ELF’ features is overusing certain verbs of high semantic generality such as do, make, have. As discussed above about the use of over-using question tags by P1, P2 also uses here with native speakers. However, P2 tends to use it in both interpersonal and transactional contexts while this strategy is used in transactional talk by P1. Consider excerpt below.

Excerpt 14:
P1: Oh Chinese coin. (( Point at the other coin)). I remember when I YOUNGER (1.0) “oh” “oh” when I can not “oh” sleeping, like sleeping. And about midnight I wake up ....”oh” (( Action)). And I remember my grand >grand grand<mother, she use “the” hole like this and go through with the “oh” thing, what it call, but long and you can do “oh” (2.0) and put in “my” part. (( Point at the neck)).

P1 seems to use the strategy of using purpose words less frequently in interpersonal context than transactional context. In the excerpt 14, she used “the thing” and “do” as the purpose words. According to Cheng (2007) in a survey of Taiwanese university students, the CSs’ use is dependent on the context rather than previous learning and experiences. Compared with the findings above, the research provides some evidence that both participants, especially P1, tend to
strategy of using of all-purpose words in the contexts which is difficult to deal with. Therefore, it could be said that the choice of CSs might be affected by specific contexts.

4.3. What differences are there in the use of communication strategies between effective and less-effective second language speakers in the Vietnamese refugee and immigrant community?

With respect to the second research question, it is true that differences in the use of communication strategies by the effective and less effective participants are also found based on the answer of the first research question. The findings above partly give an insight about the differences. However, the other interesting and significant data which emerges from the analysis could be considered to provide a more detailed and in-depth explanation.

4.3.1. Asking for confirmation strategy.

As discussed above, the use of INTERACTIONAL STRATEGY takes the smallest proportion of total strategies for both participants in not only interpersonal but also transactional conversation. Among interactional strategies, the strategy of asking for confirmation is commonly frequent used compared to others. Nevertheless, this number by P1 is more dominant than P2. To be more specific, it is 4.24% of total of use by P1 and P2 with 2.65% in interpersonal context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of IRS (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of CSs (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asking for Help</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for Repetition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for confirmation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88.24</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for explanation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Frequency of INTERACTIONAL STRATEGY’s use in interpersonal talk by the effective learner

And table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of IRS (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of CSs (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeal for Help</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for repetition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for Confirmation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for explanation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Frequency of INTERACTIONAL STRATEGY’s use in interpersonal talk by the less effective learner

The choice of using the strategy found from data analysis is different by both participants. The strategy of asking for confirmation is used by P1 to confirm what she has listened and/ or to express the feeling of being surprised. While P2 uses it when he is not sure what has been said by the interlocutor. Consider excerpts below.
Excerpt 15:
Line 1: CUS: (...)I sorted all of my wardrobe out a few weeks ago and I sent all me clothes out to the Line 2: Philippines.
Line 3: P1: “Um” Philippines?

Excerpt 16:
Line 1: P1: It (will be) nice. Your friend live over there? Live in Philippines?
Line 2: CUS: No she lives here, her family are still over here.
Line 3: P1: “Oh” she’s Philippine lady? Like my. Vietnamese lady?
Line 4: CUS: Yeah yeah
Line 5: CUS: Yeah yeah she’s been over here for about 20 years.
Line 6: P1: WOW! Twenty years? That’s long enough, IS IT ?

Compare with the use of this strategy by P2 in the excerpt below.

Excerpt 17: P2
Line 3: P2: Nine ? “And” work until 5 yeah ?
Line 5: 9pm.
Line 6: P2: “oh” so from half past nine to nine pm?
Line 7: CUS: No no. Normally just from half past nine until five. But tomorrow I am working
Line 8: from nine am to nine pm.

The information collected in interview data about these conversations shows that P1 knew the
information such as “Philippines” in line 3 in excerpt 15, “she’s Philippine lady” in line 3, and
“Twenty years” in line 6 in excerpt 16 before asking for confirmation. While P2 in an interview
said:

“I didn’t hear clearly nine or half past nine. I know she explained again, but I still
didn’t get it”. (P2-Interview translated from Vietnamese)

As P2 said, he wasn’t sure about the information provided by the customer. After twice times of
asking for confirmation, he pretended understanding. The strategy seems to be used to enhance
the effectiveness of the communication in the case of P1 while P2 uses it for the force situations
such as in direction rather than keeping conversation opening until reaching the target language.
In another interview, P2 expressed his ideas that:

“I do not want to ask for confirmation because If I do not understand what they
said, It means I do not know the words been said. So even they still explain for
me, I think I can not get it.” (P2-Interview translated from Vietnamese)
It is apparent that motivation again has an impact on the use of the strategy of asking for confirmation. In an attempt to speak English more fluently and properly, the effective learner seems to be more active in communication, trying to use the strategies in order to solve the communication problem in an active way, which contributes to keep communication open and make the conversation become actively. However, the less effective learner tends to solve the communication problem in an opposite way which allows him to prevent the challenges in communication by avoiding it. Therefore, the solutions offered by these both participants are different, which will be discussed in the next section.

4.3.2. Topic avoidance (TA) and Keep going strategies (KG)

Two divergent results emerged from the interview data that the participants tend to handle the communication problems of non-understanding differently. P1 seems to use the strategy of keeping conversation going until reaching the target communication while the strategy of topic avoidance is frequently used to handle the communication problem by P2. The analysis of each situation will be discussed respectively.

Strategy of keep going conversation

Firstly, as can be seen in the table 3a, the use of KG is the third highest one in total of interactional strategies with 12 times of being used, and takes 3.39% of total of use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of IDS (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of CSs (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of Use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using of fillers</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>72.73</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>31.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other repetition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretend understanding</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep going conversation.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 12: Frequency of INDIRECT STRATEGY’s use in interpersonal talk by effective learner

Consider the following excerpt.

Excerpt 18:

Line 1: P1: Do you where is this restaurant?

Line 2: CP1: No idea.

Line 3: P1: My friend, she said it is somewhere near Dean (.) DeanS:gate.

Line 4: CP2: Is it near central church…central church?(( Fast))

Line 5: P1: “oh” “oh” “yeah”. It is near Deangate.

Line 6: CP1: On deansgate?

Line 7: CP2: It is possible that it is base Brasenose street?

Line 8: P1: What ? what street ?

Line 9: CP2: Brasenose street?

Line 10: P1: I just want to go to this restaurant. I do not understand.

Line 11: CP2: I’m just not sure about it, but “um” on Brasenose street, there is the church.
Line 12: P1: “Oh” ok. I try to walk.

(( They check Google Map))

Line 13: P1: **Someone tells me yeah. I walk to Debenham. But I do not get where to go next.**

Line 14: CP2: yeah

Line 15: P1: **So could you help me ?**

Line 16: CP2: ah I just think that it might be on Brasenose Street. I’m not sure about it.

Line 17: CP1: ok so carry on walk. If it is on Deansgate, it’s like…. um you just keep walking, on Line 18: the right side you will see “um” a Marks Spencer shop, and then it should be on the left Line 19: side there should be like…um

As described in the taxonomy of the current research, KG is keeping the same conversation going until reaching the target communication when facing a non-understanding communication problem or does not get any cooperation in communication with the interlocutor. It means that the learners try to achieve the intended communication by any way. In the excerpt, though the conversation partner didn’t provide any information, P1 kept the conversation by adding more information that **“My friend, she said it is somewhere near Dean (.) DeanS:gate.”** in line 3. It is apparent that it worked because at least the interlocutor turned back the conversation and asked P2 more about the place. However, P2 didn’t get the message, and she kept going by repeating the information **“It is near Deangate.”** in line 5. When being asked more details about the place, she kept continuing to say **“I just want to go to this restaurant”** in line 10 though she didn’t understand what they asked her before. It had been continuing like this way until she got the message of how to get to the restaurant. It is true that her choice of using the strategy of KG
works in this case. Just imagine that if the conversation still goes on if she stopped at the first sentences. As she said in an interview:

“Sometimes I do not understand what they are talking about, which makes me feel bad. It’s hard to say what this feeling is. The only thing I can do is to keep talking about this until I understand or get the answer.” (P1- Interview- Translated from Vietnamese)

Considering another case of the less effective learner, P2 tends to handle the problem in a different way by using the strategy of “topic avoidance” when non-understanding occurs in communication. The table 7 shows that the strategy of topic avoidance is also frequently used by the less effective learner. It is 14,04% of total of DIRECT STRATEGY group, just after the highest number of the interlingual transfer strategy; and 4.73% of total of use. To be added that, topic avoidance in this taxonomy used in the current research is about when learners decide to change to another topic in order to avoid the topic which they find it difficult to deal with. Consider this excerpt below.

Excerpt 19:

Line 1: NS: But this is, they used this to, when the ancestors died to burn the money, as an
Line 2: offering I think. That’s what it says; it says Chinese hell money. And that’s how
Line 3: much…is that 5 million or 50 million? Or 800 million and 200 thousands…such
Line 4: invitation money is ceremonially transfer money from the human world to ones ancestors
Line 5: in the spiritual world.
Line 6: P2: yeah. “just” (sell) it?
Line 7: NS: ???

Line 8: P2: **You know – You know (1.0) which year?** (( Point at another coin ? ))

Line 9: NS: I do not know. Does it say?

Line 10: P2: No it does NOT.

In this example, after the explanation, P2 didn’t get the whole message and guessed “hell money” in line 2 to “sell money” according to the follow up interview data. Therefore, he used the strategy of asking for confirmation in attempt to say something related to the given message by the question “Just sell it?” in line 6. However, when P2 didn’t get the information back, he changed to use the strategy of topic avoidance by pointing at another coin in money gallery and asked **“You know – You know (1.0) which year?”** in line. This could be considered that P2 might be easier to give up the communication and use the strategy of topic avoidance as a way to handle the communication rather than keeping the conversation going in the same topic until reaching the communication target. The finding of using topic avoidance strategy by P2 confirms what Guhlemann (2011) pointed out that participants who face with language difficulties try to avoid talking about a specific topic by topic avoidance strategy or completely abandon intended messages. Similarly, in a survey of investigating Swedish students’ overall use of CSs, Guhlemann (2011) found out that topic avoidance strategy was among the most frequently used strategies.
4.3.3. Strategy of using of fillers

The most striking number in data analysis is the use of strategy of using of fillers. This number is the highest one in not only interpersonal talk but also transactional ones for both participants. In interpersonal context, P1’s use takes the proportion of 31.64% of total of utterances while this number for P2 is 60.60% based on the data from the table 3a and 7a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of IDS (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of CSs (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total of Use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using of fillers</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>63.24</td>
<td>47.48</td>
<td>60.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28.06</td>
<td>21.07</td>
<td>26.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other repetition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretend understanding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep going conversation.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 13: Frequency of INDIRECT STRATEGY’s use in interpersonal talk by the less-effective learner

In transactional context, there is slight decrease in the percentage of frequency of the strategy’s using of fillers. Namely, it is 25.25% of total of utterances for P1 and 25.44% for P2. However, these numbers stills stand in the highest one compared to the remaining strategies.
There are two issues considered in this section. From the data collected and analyzed, it is found that there is difference between two participants when using of fillers as a communication strategy. To be more specific, the differences are the position of filler in speech and type of fillers used.
Position of fillers in speech.

Firstly, a comparison of the two results reveals that P1 tends to use the fillers in the beginning or the end of the speech while it is in the middle for the less effective one. Consider these following excerpts.

Excerpt 20:

Line 1: P1- In interpersonal talk

Line 2: CUS: Yeah like the Philippines is a poor country, nice but poor

Line 3: P1: Yeah. It’s nice. “And” when you go to Vietnam yeah, it’s REALLY cheap. A lot of

Line 4: history (. ..and a few villages, really nice. (1.0) Oh yeah. People in there , they’re really

Line 5: beautiful and sweet.

Line 6: P1: When you go there, you do not worry you get lost. Yeah. EVEN, even you can NOT

Line 7: speak Vietnamese, language yeah. BUT they’re always side by side for help if you need

Line 8: their help.

Excerpt 21:

Line 1: P1: It’s language really important. Yeah. BECAUSE if you know a few languages,


Line 3: CUS: We should have translator over here, well free really should not they?

Line 4: P1: Yeah I can. But like (2.0) sometimes I do not understand what they say. BUT

Line 5: sometimes I can learn mouth to mouth (( move hands)), like “oh” when I Line 6: speak

with you, I can learn from you.
Line 7: P1: **Yeah, yeah.** “Like” our culture (1.0), our language **yeah**, when I say Vietnam, BUT Line 8: you say Vietnamese: (not /z/) **yeah?**. The problem (1.0) any word just “tik tik tik” (( Line 9: ...)) like this, but English like (.) up and down (( move hands)) and /S:/ like that. Like Line 10: Please. “Like” I say PLEASE, I just say PLEASE ((without sound /z/)) **yeah**, but “oh” Line 11: “oh” if I say popular English correct, I have to say PLEASE: ( /S:/). **Yeah? Yeah.** But Line 12: sometimes I forgot. (( laugh)).

As can be seen from the excerpt, P1 tends to use most of fillers in two positions one of which is the end of speech, for example, “BUT you say Vietnamese: (not /z/) **yeah?**” in line 8 (excerpt 21) or “And” when you go to Vietnam **yeah**” in line 3 (excerpt 20). And another one is the beginning of the speech. Looking at these examples: **Yeah.** It’s nice” in line 3 (excerpt 20), **Yeah, yeah.** “Like” our culture (1.0)” in line 7 (excerpt 21), P2 tends to use most of fillers at the beginning of the sentence. Talking about this issue, P1 said in an interview that she didn’t mean to use it at the beginning and the end. She automatically uses the filler when she wants to gain time to change to next sentence. According to her, using of fillers is better than repetition of the word which has been said before in order to gain time. In a survey of Malaysian students in universities, Raed, Nur and Mohamad (2013) indicated that the Malaysian ESL students used fillers strategy more often than others among the indirect CSs; however, the authors did not describe how learners tended to use these strategies.
Considering the use of fillers by P2, the position is mostly common used in the middle of time. According to the data collected from interview, P2 didn’t know what word he would choose to say; therefore, he used fillers a lot in the middle of speech.

Excerpt 22:
Line 1: Cus: Oh yeah. So when are you going?
Line 2: P2: No. No. “oh” I think in Fe “oh” Fe. Febru..”oh” February ((Vietnamese pronunciation))
Line 3: Cus: February.
Line 5: I get married already. “oh” Before I’m “oh” I’m alone. SO I just go “back” to “oh” to
Line 6: “oh” visit my mom all the time. But “this” year, “oh” not decide yet. “oh” Not say no
Line 7: now, still thinking.
Line 8: Cus: haha yeah. You’re right. Did you get married here?
Line 9: P2: My wife ((Point at his wife)).
Line 10: Cus: Oh your wife?
Line 11: P2: Yeah. My wife is over here. Over there. ((laugh))
Line 12: Cus: Alright.
Line 13: P2: “oh” sometime “oh” two years. “oh” Just one time “oh” for two “oh” years. Two
Line 14: years. “oh” Because she is lazy. She do not want “long” time on flight.
Line 15: CUS: Because when you get to Singapore, you stay over there and then you have to
Line 16: wait for the next plane…very long flight
Line 17: P2: Oh my God. Yeah really long flight.

**Type of fillers**

The second issue could be considered here is the type of fillers used by both participants. Turning back to above excerpts, it could be said that P1 seems to use “yeah” rather than “um” or “oh” while P2 is vice versa. According to Spielmann (2007), the fillers of “yeah” are multi-functional such as back-channeling, agreeing with alters’ moves and structuring discourse. House (2013) pointed out that the frequency of using “yeah” is to make its use “communicatively effective”. Therefore, it could come to conclusion that the use of what type of fillers could show how effective the communication is.
CHAPPER V: CONCLUSION

5.1. SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

In conclusion, the current research attempted to answer two questions. Firstly, the investigation aimed to determine how Vietnamese refugees and immigrants use communication strategies to manage to communicate. Secondly, this study investigated the differences of using communication strategies between the effective and less effective communicators. Two research questions were answered by analyzing audio-recordings of conversations between participants and native speakers in the specific contexts and the follow-up interview data.

First of all, the investigation found out how participants use communication strategies in both interpersonal and transactional context by looking at each situation. P1 tends to use both direct strategies and indirect strategies with the approximately similar frequency. Dörnyei and Scott (1995a, 1995b) defined communication strategies according to “the manner of problem management; that is, how communication strategies contribute to resolving conflicts and achieving mutual understanding”. Thus, it could be said that the effective participant tends to use communication strategies both directly and indirectly in order to solve communication problems and with a similar frequency level.

Another finding is that P1 tends to choose CSs in an attempt to focus on accuracy in communication at the beginning; however, different CSs are used during conversation in order not to break fluency in communication. P1 unconsciously uses CSs to enable communication.
Additionally, limitations in the learning English through communication is highlighted by the high frequency of use of over-emphasis and over-using interrogative fragment strategies by P1 such as using non-changing form of question tags (isn’t it/ is it?). Learning English through communication might lead to the misunderstanding and insufficiency of knowledge. However, in the attempt to speak English properly by using these strategies, motivation should be considered as an element for communication strategy’s use. In term of ELF/EIL, both participants are believed to use some CSs (over-using all purpose words, non-changing question tags’ use) as the features of this language for the same sort of reason to enable communication. The findings found out on the less-effective shows that the participant seems to indirectly create conditions to solve communication problems rather than directly contribute to handle by compensating. Challenges in pronunciation affected by the first language are also considered. However, the reason of using interlingual transfer as discussed in the chapter IV presents that the participant is not motivated to use communication strategy effectively.

With respect to the second research question, it is true that differences in the use using communication strategies by the effective and less effective participants are also found based on the answer of the first research question. The findings above partly give an insight about the differences. However, the other interesting and significant data emerged from the analysis could be considered to provide a more detailed and in-depth explanation. Firstly, as discussed above, the use of interactional strategy is small number compared to others for both participants. However, the reasons found out are different in each situation. Namely, the effective participant tends to use interactional strategies in order to enhance the effectiveness of communication while the less effective one seems not to be motivated to use these because of the thought that they are
useless strategies for him. Because of this, participants tend to handle situations differently when communication problem of non-understanding occurs in the communication. To be more specific, in order to solve problems, the effective one tends to use the strategy of enable communication while topic avoidance is used more frequently by the less effective one. Finally, the focus on position and type of fillers in term of using of fillers as a strategy shows that the effective participant uses the fillers mostly in the beginning and end of speech while the less effective one uses it in the middle more frequently. “Yeah” appears to be used more effectively in communication by the effective participant.

5.2. SIGNIFICANCE

It is important to note that the current research provides the detailed insights into the use of communication strategies by the effective and less effective learners. The results of the investigation provide the evidence that communication strategies are used not only to fill the gap occurring in communication but also to enhance the effectiveness of communication. Furthermore, in attempt to find out the differences of communication strategies’ use between the effective and less- effective learners, the research shows the possible relationship between motivation and communication strategies’ use as Guhlemann (2011) presented, which wasn’t expected before research. The study also supports the idea of first language’s influences on communication strategies’ use. The position and type of filler used as a strategy could also be considered as important findings in this research.
5.3. LIMITATION

As a case study research, there are some possible limitations which are considered in this context. Firstly, according to Duff (2008), generalizability is one of the most pronounced disadvantages in case study. The research investigated two cases, and consequently, it is unclear how universal the findings are to reflect the general phenomenon for other Vietnamese refugees and immigrants with different backgrounds and educational experiences. However, Stake (2005, p.448) notes that “even intrinsic case study can be seen as a small step toward grand generalization”. A great example is the case study of Wes, a Japanese artist who hasn’t improved his English after a long time living in Hawaii by Schmidt (1983). This case study could be a small step for following research carried out on the field of communicative competence of the subjects who are immigrants to English-spoken country. This communication strategy was used as a key part of argument about need for conscious attention to grammar in SLL.

Secondly, because of one of two participants’ change in using audio-record instead of video-record, non-verbal communication strategies such as gestures, body language, eye-contact are not conducted in this investigation. Also, the period of research time limits how much data which was analyzed. Namely, only two conversations among five in nail salons were discussed for each participants.

Finally, a case study should be carried out as a longitudinal research which provides a more feasible chance to examine change through the case chosen (Duff, 2008). This present project has a limited time for three months. Therefore, the aim of the case study was to discover how
participants use communication strategies instead of examining if teaching communication strategies improve their language acquisition.

5.4. IMPLICATION FOR TEACHING

With regard to communication strategies in the language classroom, it is controversial that these strategies should be taught or not in classroom. Bialystok (1990) claimed that “The more the learner knows, the more possibilities exist for the system to be flexible and to adjust itself to meet the demands of the learner. What one must teach students of a language is not strategy, but the language” (p.146). According to Sato (2005) and Le (2006), teaching of communication strategies is not sufficient for learners to use communication strategies in actual life in spite of its certain influences. Conversely, other researchers such as Oxford (1990) and Dörnyei (1995) argued that teaching CSs is necessary in second language acquisition in order to help learners to be aware of strategy use and employ appropriate strategies in certain situations. As discussed in the chapter IV, the participants seem to use indirect strategies unconsciously while the direct strategies are consciously used. This suggests that teaching of direct strategies might be useful to raise learners’ awareness and improve their strategic competence (Sato, 2005). Therefore, this investigation offers the following implications. Namely, learners need to be encouraged and motivated to use communication strategies. Furthermore, explicit communication strategy teaching has a certain impact on raising learners’ awareness. The practice of direct strategies such as paraphrasing, using of all-purpose words might be useful for learners in order to use
these in real communication. Raising learners’ awareness of differences between first language and second language’s pronunciation is also important in classroom.

5.5. FURTHER RESEARCH

It is significant to note that in order to increase the validity of the results and compare individual cases, it would be interesting to undertake an investigation similar but with multiple cases. Survey research of wider population based on self-report data could be conducted in order to confirm findings of the current research. Furthermore, this study is conducted in specific contexts. Thus further research is needed to investigate CSs’ use in different context such as EFL context, with different subjects and different role of participants. Also both participants in this research have lived in England for at least 7 years, which might affect the results. Therefore, the use of CSs on different participants with shorter or longer length of time in England might lead to different results, which awaits further research.

5.6. FINAL WORDS

One of challenges for refugees and immigrants is language. It is really hard for them to communicate in daily life and find a job because of difficulties in second language. The government actually supports these subjects by English courses in colleges. Some organizations also provide English classes for refugees and immigrants in public places, which encourages them to learn English. My experience was of little understanding among teachers of the general
and specific experiences of refugees. However, through my experiences during undertaking the current research, I became interested in investigating communication strategies’ use by refugees and immigrants in order to help them improve their English skills. Teaching English as lingua franca or a native speaker model bringing more benefits for refugees and immigrants is still needed to investigate in further research. As a part of Vietnamese community in UK, I have chances to talk to refugees and immigrants, who are the majority in this community. Some told me their stories of learning English in UK and difficulties which they face in learning process. They have been taught and tested in English class by fulfill the grammar tasks such as writing an email, reading paragraph rather than communicative tasks. Through my experiences with refugees and immigrants, communication strategies’ use plays an important role in second language acquisition. More research on this phenomenon is needed to contribute methods to enhance effectiveness of learning English for refugees and immigrants, because “there are rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless” (Hymes, 1971, p.15).
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APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Project: A Case study of the use of ESL communication strategies by Vietnamese refugees and immigrants in the Manchester context

Introduction

You are being asked to participate in a research study. The research is to examine and explain what communication strategies learners use to manage to communicate meaning and discover how to help learners to improve their language skill by using communication strategies. This form will describe the purpose of the study and your rights as a participant in the study. The decision is yours to participate or not. If you decide to participate, please sign and date the last line of the form.

There are some certain participants in the current study. All of information and data will be collected only for the research and will be destroyed after that. Therefore, there isn’t possible risk of saving data of the research. Personal information is not collected in this research. There isn’t also any cost to you in this research. Your participation in this research is voluntary, and you will not be penalized or lose any benefits you refuse participate or decide to stop.

Any time you have questions about the research, you may contact:

Name: Nguyen Thi Phuong Thao

Email: T.P.T.Nguyen@........

Phone number: 07799776365
Signing this document means that the research study, including the above information, has been described to you orally, and that you voluntarily agree to participate.

...............................................................  ...................
Signature of participant                                   date

(Adapted from Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 323)
**APPENDIX B**

**Taxonomies of Communication Strategies 1 (Dornyei and Scott, 1997, p.196)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVOIDANCE</td>
<td>FORMAL REDUCTION</td>
<td>LI-BASED STRATEGIES</td>
<td>LINGUISTIC APPROACH</td>
<td>REDUCTION STRATEGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic avoidance</td>
<td>Phonological</td>
<td>Language switch</td>
<td>Semantic contiguity</td>
<td>Formall reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message</td>
<td>Morphological</td>
<td>Foreignizing</td>
<td>-Superordinate</td>
<td>-Phonological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandonment</td>
<td>Syntactic</td>
<td>Transliteration</td>
<td>-Comparison</td>
<td>-Morphological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARAPHRASE</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>L2-BASED STRATEGIES</td>
<td>*Positive comparison</td>
<td>-Syntactic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximation</td>
<td>FUNCTIONAL REDUCTION</td>
<td>Semantic contiguity</td>
<td>Analogy</td>
<td>-Lexical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word coinage</td>
<td>Actional red.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Synonymy</td>
<td>Functional reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
<td>Modal red.</td>
<td>Word coinage</td>
<td>*Negative comparison</td>
<td>-Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSCIOUS</td>
<td>Reduction of propositional content</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contrast &amp; opposite</td>
<td>abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER</td>
<td>-Topic avoidance</td>
<td>NON-LINGUISTIC STRATEGIES</td>
<td>Antonymy</td>
<td>-Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal translation</td>
<td>-Message</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
<td>replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language switch</td>
<td>abandonment</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Physical description</td>
<td>-Topic avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPEAL FOR</td>
<td>-Meaning replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>ACHIEVEMENT STRATEGIES</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Shape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIME</td>
<td>Compensatory strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Color</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Code switching</td>
<td>CONCEPTUAL APPROACH</td>
<td>*Material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interlingual transfer</td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>-Constituent features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Inter-/intralingual</td>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td>*Features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transfer</td>
<td>MIME</td>
<td>*Elaborated features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-II based strategies</td>
<td>Replacing verbal output</td>
<td>-Features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Generalization</td>
<td>Accompanying verbal output</td>
<td>-Locational property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Paraphrase</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Historical property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Word coinage</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Other features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Restructuring</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Functional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cooperative strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Non-linguistic strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Metalinguistic clues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retrieval strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTEXTUAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contextual clues:*
- Description
- Circumlocution
- Exemplification
- Smurfing
- Self-repair
- Appeals for assistance
- Explicit
- Implicit
- Checking questions
- Initiating repair
APPENDIX C

Taxonomies of Communication Strategies 2 (Dornyei and Scott, 1997, p.196)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS BASED STRATEGIES</td>
<td>CONCEPTUAL STRATEGIES</td>
<td>SUBSTITUTION STRATEGIES</td>
<td>DIRECT STRATEGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL BASED STRATEGIES</td>
<td>Analytic</td>
<td>Holistic</td>
<td>Resource deficit-related strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC/ CODE STRATEGIES</td>
<td>Morphological creativity</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>*Message abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Message reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Message replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Circumlocution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Approximation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Use of all-purpose words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Word-coinage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Restructuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Literal translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Foreignizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Code switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Use of similar sounding words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Mumbling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Omission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Retrieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Mime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Own-performance problem-related strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Self-rephrasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Self-repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other-performance problem-related strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERACTIONAL STRATEGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource deficit-related strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own-performance problem-related strategies</td>
<td>Other-performance problem-related strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Appeals for help</em></td>
<td><em>Asking for repetition</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Comprehension check</em></td>
<td><em>Asking for clarification</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Own-accuracy check</em></td>
<td><em>Asking for confirmation</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Guessing</em></td>
<td><em>Guessing</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Expressing nonunderstanding</em></td>
<td><em>Interpretive summary</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Responses</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIRECT STRATEGIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Processing time pressure-related strategies</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Use of fillers</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Repetitions</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Verbal strategy markers</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Feigning understanding</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

EXAMPLE OF CODED DATA

Conversation 1: At museum – Money Gallery

NS: Native speaker

P1: Participant 2

P2: “Could” “I” ask something about coins?

NS: Yeah. Sure thing.

P2: Why? “oh” I can (1.0) “Could” I ask something “oh”, question, one question about this?

NS: Yeah.

P2: Why? “ah” Why not? Why “ah” is Chinese money in here?

NS: Oh yeah. Because there’s money are from all over the world.

P2: WOW. Yeah.

NS: yeah this is Chinese hell money, and that’s how much such invitation money is burned in the ceremony for transferring money from the human world to ones ancestors in the spirit world.

P2: “Oh” “Um”.

NS: Have you heard of this before?


NS: The Chinese were the first to invent paper money. But they actually they used mulberry...you know where the silkworm lives? The mulberry tree?

P2. Oh yeah. “The” mull...mull?

NS: Mulberry tree.

P2: Oh yeah. I know.

NS: yeah. Where the silk, you know the cloth silk? They were the first paper monies ever in the world.

P2: oh yeah.