THESIS

THE EFFECTS OF TEACHING THE COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES ON LEARNERS' SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

FITRININGSIH

P0600209016

ENGLISH LANGUAGE STUDIES
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM
HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY
MAKASSAR
2012

THE EFFECTS OF TEACHING THE COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES ON LEARNERS' SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

PENGARUH PENGAJARAN STRATEGI KOMUNIKASI TERHADAP KEMAMPUAN BERBICARA PEBELAJAR

FITRININGSIH

P0600209016

ENGLISH LANGUAGE STUDIES
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM
HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY
MAKASSAR
2012

THE EFFECTS OF TEACHING THE COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES ON LEARNERS' SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

A THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Magister in English Language Studies

FITRININGSIH

P0600209016

ENGLISH LANGUAGE STUDIES
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM
HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY
MAKASSAR
2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Alhamdulillahirrobil'alamin. I would like to convey my deepest gratitude to the Lord of Universe, Almighty Allah SWT, for all the Grace, Providence, Mercy and Guidance. I would not be able to accomplish my thesis without His Blessing.

I wish to express my gratefulness to my advisors, Prof. Dr. Abd. Hakim Yassi, M.A and Prof. Dr. H. Hamzah A. Machmoed, M.A., for their worthwhile guidance in completing this thesis. My special thanks to Prof. Dr. M.L. Manda, M.A., M.Phil, Prof. Dr. Noerjihad Saleh, M.A., and Dra. Hj. Etty Bazergan, M.Ed., Ph.D as my board examiners, who provided insightful comments and suggestions to improve this thesis. I also extend my gratefulness to all lectures of English Language Studies (ELS) program who have shared priceless knowledge and counsel during her study.

Additionally, this thesis could not be completed without the invaluable help of students at State University of Makassar, especially who were involved in my research. My thankfulness is also express to all my friends in ELS 2009.

Lastly and most importantly, I wish to thank my dear parents, Drs.Suardi and Rukiyah, S.Pd. They raised me, taught me, supported me and loved me. To them I dedicate this thesis. I also thank to my beloved sister, Magfirah, thanks for everything. In addition, I wish to thank my entire family for providing love, care, encouragement and understanding. Without their support, I would not have been able to finish my thesis.

Makassar,   January 2012

Fitriningsih

ABSTRAK

FITRININGSIH. *Pengaruh Pengajaran Strategi Komunikasi terhadap Kemampuan Berbicara Pebelajar* (dibimbing oleh Abdul Hakim Yassi dan Hamzah A. Machmoed).

Penelitian ini bertujuan menganalisa efek dari pengajaran strategi komunikasi terhadap kemampuan berbicara pebelajar.

Penelitian ini dirancang sebagai studi intervensionis yang dilakukan terhadap sekelompok mahasiswa. Data kualitatif maupun kuantitatif dikumpulkan dalam penelitian ini. Sebanyak 35 mahasiswa jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris di Universitas Negeri Makassar berpartisipasi dalam penelitian ini. Seluruhnya menerima pengajaran strategi komunikasi berbasis instruksi selama 12 minggu. Selain itu, mereka menyelesaikan empat jenis tugas berbicara dan kuesioner laporan diri pada awal dan akhir pengajaran. Data dikumpulkan melalui (1) nilai empat jenis tugas berbicara , (2) kuesioner laporan diri dan (3) kuesioner sikap.

Hasil dari tugas berbicara dan kuesioner laporan diri menunjukkan bahwa pengajaran strategi komunikasi secara eksplisit meningkatkan kesadaran pebelajar untuk menggunakan strategi dalam meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara mereka serta mempromosikan penggunaan strategi komunikasi yang diajarkan. Selain itu, hasil positif dari pengajaran beberapa strategi komunikasi didukung pula oleh hasil dari kuesioner sikap pebelajar terhadap pengajaran strategi komunikasi. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa para pebelajar merasakan manfaat dari pengajaran strategi komunikasi berbasis instruksi terhadap kemampuan berbicara. Mereka juga menunjukkan sikap positif terhadap pengajaran strategi komunikasi.

ABSTRACT

FITRININGSIH. *The Effects of Teaching the Communication Strategies on Learners' Speaking Performance* (supervised by Abdul Hakim Yassi and Hamzah A. Machmoed, M.A).

The research aimed to investigate the effects of teaching the communication strategies on learners' speaking performance.

The research was designed as an interventionist study carried out on a group of students. Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected in the research. 35 students of English Education Department at State University of Makassar (UNM) participated in the research. All of them received an instruction based teaching of the communication strategies for 12 weeks, and they were also asked to accomplish four types of speaking tasks and a self-report questionnaire before and after the teaching of communication strategies. Data were collected through (1) the scores of four types of speaking tasks, (2) the self-report questionnaire, and (3) the attitudinal questionnaire.

The results of the speaking tasks and the self-report questionnaire indicate that the teaching of communication strategies explicitly improves the learners' awareness to use the strategies in improving their speaking performance, and promoting the use of the communication strategies taught. Moreover, the positive outcomes of the teaching of several communication strategies are supported by the results of the learners' attitudinal questionnaire on teaching the communication strategies. The findings indicate that the learners find the utility of the instruction based teaching of the communication strategies on their speaking performance. The learners also express their positive feelings and attitudes on teaching the communication strategies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background

One can hardly deny that English plays a very important role in the major aspects of life in this globalized era. In that respect, an increasing public recognition of the global position of English., with more than 300 million speaking it as the first language, more than 200 million people speaking it as a second language, and more than one billion people speaking it as a foreign language (Crystal, 1997: 76). Its influence is increasing with the advancement of information technology, which has evidently accelerated the explosion of knowledge, increased the speed of communication for various purposes, and gradually created a global culture.

In the Indonesian context, a good mastery of English will indeed help accelerate the development of the country for two major reasons. First, the development should be supported by the mastery of science and technology. Second, English is one of the international languages used for various international communication purposes; trading, diplomacy, politics and education. So a good mastery of English can be said to be a prerequisite for the success of developing this country.

Nowadays, along with the strengthening position of English as a language for international communication, the teaching of speaking skill is also important due to the large number of learners who want to study English in order to be able to use English for communicative purposes. This is apparent in Richards and Renandya's (2002:201) publication where they stated, "A large percentage of the world's

language learners study English in order to develop proficiency in speaking".
Moreover, learners of second/foreign language education programs are considered
successful if they can communicate effectively in the language (Riggenback &
Lazaraton, 1991:126). The new parameter used to determine success in
second/foreign language education programs appears to revise the previously-held
conviction that learners' success or lack of success in ESL/EFL was judged by the
accuracy of the language they produced. Thus, the great number of learners wanting
to develop English speaking proficiency and the shift of criteria of learning success
from accuracy to fluency and communicative effectiveness signify the teaching of
ESL/EFL speaking.

Unfortunately, the teaching of English in Indonesia has so far been unable to
achieve its declared goals despite the many efforts made to improve its quality. In
particular, speaking English among Indonesian university learners, although they
had completed at least 6 years of English language studies before entering the
university but they still got difficulties in speaking English. Several studies revealed
(Nur, 2004; Renandya, 2004) that English instruction is a failure in this country.
One of the reasons for the failure is that there has been no unified national system of
English education (Huda, 1997:281) and, therefore, improvements of English
communicative ability are painstakingly made. The main challenge for this country
thus is to develop an educational system resulting in human quality competitive at
international level. This is relevant to the significant change that took place in the
real needs for English in Indonesia (Huda, 1997:282). Accordingly, efforts need to
be continuously made concerning quality improvements of English instruction in

Indonesia. More particularly, curriculum of English education that can be effective to produce graduates who are able to communicate at international level is needed.

In the last quarter of the century, the teaching of EFL speaking in Indonesia has been closely connected to the concept of communicative competence which is emphasized within the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. As approach that values interaction among learners in the process of language learning, classroom activities have a central role in enabling the learners interact and thus improve their speaking proficiency. According to the widely accepted theory of Canale and Swain (1980), communicative competence as a whole can be explained in terms of three component competencies, grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence. *Grammatical competence* involves knowledge of the language code (grammar rules, vocabulary, pronunciation, spelling, etc.). Language teaching has traditionally been aimed at developing this competence above all others. *Sociolinguistic competence* is made up of two sets of rules—sociocultural rules and rules of discourse.' Sociocultural rules specify ways of using language appropriately in a given situation: they are concerned with style, register, degree of politeness, and so on. Rules of discourse concern the combining of language structures to produce unified texts in different modes—for example: a political speech, an academic paper, a cookery recipe, etc. The focus here is on certain cohesion devices (grammatical links) and coherence rules (appropriate combination of communicative functions) to organize the forms and meanings. Then, the component of communicative competence most neglected by language course books and teachers, however, is *strategic competence.* This is defined by

Canale and Swain (1980: 30) as 'verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence'. In other words, strategic competence refers to the ability to get one's meaning across successfully to communicative partners, especially when problems arise in the communication process. In short, our educational system does not place the strategic competence in the same proportion as the other two components (grammatical and sociolinguistics competence) that composed the communicative competence.

Due some facts, that some Indonesians are very poor in speaking English; it is because the goal of English teaching in secondary school in Indonesia is the acquisition of communicative competence with an emphasis on reading skill, and not speaking (Huda, 1999 in Fauziati 2002). Study by Sembiring (2003) found that Indonesian learners have communicative problems in using their English. Some particular issues on Indonesian learners speaking problems namely, Mukminatien (1999) found that learners of English departments have a great number of errors when speaking and problem in interactive communication (i.e., difficulties in getting the meaning across or keeping the conversation going) or concern in their lack of strategic competence. Learners need to have communicative competence. According to Widiati and Cahyono (2006:279) the speaking problems of Indonesian learners can be relate not only to their linguistic factor (e.g. lack of grammatical knowledge and/or vocabulary limitations) and the personality factor (e.g. lack of self confidence in using English), but also the types of teaching approach/instructions and classroom task provided by the teachers. Moreover, the initial point of view is

also supported by the current study researcher' informal interview with English department learners of Makassar State University during the preliminary observation in March 2011. The learners revealed that they sometimes lacked sufficient linguistic and strategic knowledge to maintain conversation. They found difficulties to face communication breakdowns with their interlocutor. When they did not know the vocabulary or structure to use, they left the message unfinished and avoided talking about the topic. In addition, they were too shy to speak English and lacked confidence to use English although they had studied English for long time. They also stated that sometimes they felt nervous and forgot what they wanted to say in English. They seemed lacked of self-awareness in speaking and using communication strategies. Harmer (2000:14) communicative competence involves not just language competence (grammar, vocabulary, etc) but also knowledge of how language is used appropriately and how language is organized as discourse. Spoken language production, learning to talk in the foreign language, is often considered to be one of the most difficult aspects of language learning for the teacher to help the learners with (Brown and Jule, 1983: 25).

This current research is attended to draw attention to a crucial, and yet rather neglected, aspect of communicative language skills namely *strategic competence,* which concerns the ability to express oneself in the face of difficulties or limited language knowledge. The lack of fluency or conversational skills that is learners often complain about, to a considerable extent, due to the underdevelopment of strategic competence. Moreover based on the situational analysis of English learners in Indonesia mostly still have problems in their English speaking ability despite

several years of learning English. When learners are engaged in communication, they often have communicative intentions that they find difficulty in expressing, because of their limited knowledge in strategic competence of foreign language. In many spoken encounters, such as in-class activities or everyday situations, English language learners in Indonesia often encounter unfamiliar words and phrases that block their language knowledge. Likewise, learners also experience situations where limits to their English prevent from expressing themselves effectively. Therefore, learners should try to find a way to avoid confusion in the message due to imperfect pronunciation, grammar, or vocabulary and how to use strategies for managing communication breakdowns, such as they will prefer to abandon their intended message or tend to avoid certain kinds of topics during communicating with others either in formal and informal situations. Learners realized that their knowledge of grammar and enough vocabulary that they had could not help them much to express their intentions (Dewi, 2002:iv). In addition, Dornyei and Thurrell (1991:17) in their study noted that a lack of strategic competence may account for situations when learners with a firm knowledge of grammar and a wide range of vocabulary get stuck and are unable to carry out their communicative intent. At oral language exams such learners may even fail, and their teachers often cannot comprehend how that could happen to their 'best learners'. On the other hand, there are learners who can communicate successfully with only one hundred words—they rely almost entirely on their strategic competence. Therefore, the researcher in this current study assumed that it is important to include strategy teaching in a communicative syllabus that use in our English speaking class in Indonesia.

In response to the situation described above, it is important to find out the effectiveness of communication strategies teaching on learners speaking performance especially in Indonesian education setting. It is not enough to encourage speaking activities in class; teacher must also explicitly emphasize communication strategies. Teaching and equipping learners with particular communication strategies are beneficial since they may enable learners to know how to compensate for their lack of language knowledge during the communication process. Finally, communication strategies may help learners boost their confidence and take risks while speaking English. Therefore, the current study is based on the view that teaching the communication strategies to learners can be beneficial. This view is also supported by Kebir (1994), Dornyei (1995), Lam (2004), Wen (2004), Nakatani (2005), Le (2006) and Kongsom (2009), detail description about their study reviewed in Chapter II. In this present study the researcher implemented an alternative way of English speaking instruction for the university level learners.

This study is justified on the following grounds. First, some studies in the research literature suggested that further studies should investigate the teachability of communication strategies. Dornyei (1995) for example, proposed that future extensions and elaborations of the training program may be expected to achieve even more marked result. In addition, Nakatani (2005) supported the view that the further investigation regarding the impact of strategy training on the forms of utterances should be conducted. Similarly, Manchon (2000) concluded if we want to move forward there is a need to carry out empirical studies at least to test whether in fact training learners in the use of communication strategies does make a difference.

Therefore, this present study aims to offer some more understanding of the relationship between teaching communication strategy, their task performance (effective or not) and also their attitudes towards the teaching the communication strategies.

Second, based on the researcher knowledge, several studies in the field of applied linguistics especially communication strategies in Indonesia merely focus on the investigations on learners' use of communication strategies (e.g., Nur, H.A, 1994; Dewi, 2002; Irmawati, A.S, 2004) and there seems to be no information about study on the implementation and effects of teaching the communication strategies to the learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) in Indonesia. Therefore it is worth to investigate the effects of teaching the communication strategies to Indonesian learners of English to provide a contribution to research in the similar field.

B. Statement of Problem

English learners in Indonesia mostly still have communicative problems in their speaking performance despite several years of learning English. Moreover, the lack of conversational skills that is learners often complains about, to a considerable extent, due to the underdevelopment of strategic competence.

C. Research Questions

Based on the statement of problem above, the present study addresses three major research questions as follows:

1. What are the effects of teaching the communication strategies on learners' speaking performance?

2. To what extent teaching the communication strategies alter learners' perception on the use and usefulness of communication strategies?

3. What are learners' attitudes toward the teaching of communication strategies?

D. Objectives of the Research

In line with the problem formulation mentioned above, the objectives of this study are:

1. To justify and describe the effects of teaching the communication strategies on learners' speaking performance.

2. To observe whether teaching the communication strategies alter learners' perception on the use and usefulness of communication strategies.

3. To find out the learners' attitudes towards teaching the communication strategies.

E. Significance of the Research

In terms of pedagogical implications as practical benefit, this study provides an alternative way of teaching speaking to Indonesian learners. The results of this study can be also applied to other similar group of learners. In addition they can be useful for other organizations and people involved in the field of English language teaching and learning especially to the pedagogy of English language teaching in Indonesia. The teachers can use the examples from this study as guidelines in teaching the

communication strategies or use the materials to train their learners. Finally, the finding of this study can be used to raise both teachers' and learners' awareness of how important communication strategies are for development of their speaking ability and performance. The effects of teaching the communication strategies might be also promoted the autonomous learning within learners.

From theoretical perspective as theoretical benefit, this study provides additional evidence for the research areas of L2 speaking and communication strategy use, specifically on the strategy-based instruction and teachability of communication strategies. The validity and usefulness of teaching the communication strategies for improving communicative competence have been widely argued in the field of language teaching and learning.

F. **Scope of the Research**

The writer limited the scope of this research to the effects of teaching of some specific communication strategies on learners' speaking performance.

G. **Definitions of Terms**

In this section, the definitions of key terms employed in this study are provided below:

1. Interlanguage: the type of language produced by nonnative speakers in the process of learning a second language or foreign language.

2. Appeal for help: the learners ask for aid from the interlocutor either directly (e.g. what do you call…?) or indirectly (e.g. rising intonation, pause, eye contact, puzzled expression).

3. Approximation: the learners use a single target language vocabulary item or structure, which is not correct, but which shares enough semantic features with the desired item to satisfy the speaker.

4. Circumlocution: the learners describe the characteristics or elements of the object or action instead of using the appropriate target language item or structure.

5. Clarification request: the learners request the explanation of an unfamiliar meaning structure (e.g. again, please! Or pardon?)

6. Code switching: the learners use an L1 word with L1 pronunciation while speaking L2

7. Communication strategies: devices a learner uses while communicating in English to solve oral communication problems and to reach the communicative goals.

8. Comprehension check: the learners ask the questions to check whether the interlocutor understands what they say or not.

9. Confirmation check: the learners repeat the words that the interlocutor has said to confirm what they heard is correct or not.

10. Foreignizing: the learners use an L1 word by adjusting it to L2 phonology (i.e, with L2 pronunciation) and/or morphology (e.g., adding to it an L2 suffix).

11. Learning strategies: "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations" (oxford, 1990).

12. Literal translation: the learners translate literally a lexical item, idiom, compound word, or structure from L1 to L2.

13. Message abandonment: the learners begin to talk about a concept but are unable to continue and stop in mid-utterance.

14. Non-linguistic strategy: the learners use mime, gesture, facial expression, or sound imitation.

15. Pause fillers and hesitation devices: the learners use fillers or hesitation devices to fill pauses and to gain time to think (e.g., well, now let's see, uh.., as a matter of fact).

16. Self-repair: the learners make self-initiated corrections in their own speech.

17. Topic avoidance: the learners avoid talking about particular topics because they may require vocabulary or structures which they do not know.

18. Use of all-purpose words: the learners extend general, empty lexical item to contexts where specific words are lacking (e.g., the overuses of thing or stuff).

19. Word coinage: the learners create a non-existing L2 word based on a supposed rule (e.g., vegetarianist for vegetarian).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Previous Related Studies

Role of CSs was widely acknowledged in the field of second language learning due to the seminal works of Canale and Swain (1980) and Faerch and Kasper (1983). According to Canale and Swains's (1980) well-known framework of communicative competence, strategic competence involves the ability to use problem-solving devices to overcome communication problems derived from the lack of knowledge in any of other sub-competencies. These problem-solving devices they mentioned are CSs. In addition, they suggested teaching CSs in classroom and providing students the change to use these strategies Moreover, other researchers also make pedagogical recommendations and support the idea that CS training is possible and desirable to develop learner's strategic competence. Faerch and Kasper (1983), for instance, suggest that it is possible to teach CSs in the foreign language classroom. They view that whether to teach CSs or not depends on the purposes of teaching. If teaching for passing on new information only, it is probably unnecessary to teach CSs. Foreign language learners already have implicit knowledge regarding CSs and apply this knowledge. However, if teaching is to make learners conscious about aspects of their already existing strategies, it is necessary to teach them about strategies, particularly how to use communication strategies appropriately. They also argue that "by learning how to use communication strategies appropriately, learners will be more able to bridge the gap between formal and informal learning situations, between pedagogic and non-pedagogic communication situations.

The instruction of CSs is also supported by Willems (1987). He proposed that two ideas should be paid more attention when teaching CSs in the language lessons. First, it is necessary to spend more time on instruction about CSs because CSs in the L1 are mostly used automatically and the learners are not always aware of their own preferences or limitations. Second, more time should be devoted to practicing the use of CSs for raising conscious awareness of a variety of possible CSs. Another important work in the field of CSs is the book Strategies in Interlanguage Communication edited by Faerch and Kasper (1983). In this book, many studies and papers on CS are collected and divided into three main parts: CSs defined, empirical studies of CSs and problems in analyzing CSs. This collection therefore, provides a valuable contribution to the research in CSs.

The researchers in the 1990s investigated CS application in relation to different proficiency level (e.g., Chen, 1990; Kebir, 1994) and teaching pedagogy of CSs (e.g., Dornyei & Thurrell, 1991; Yule & Tarone, 1991; Dornyei, 1995). Their works have shed light on CSs studies and provided theoretical contributions to the field of CSs. Since then, the issue of CS instruction has received increasing attention from a variety of researchers. Despite the controversy about CS instruction many researchers have defined CSs, promoted CS application and supported CS instruction (e.g., Lam, 2004; Wen, 2004; Nakatani, 2005; Kongsom, 2009). Lam (2004) argued that it is possible and desirable to teach and raise learners' awareness of using CSs in oral communication.

Wen (2004) conducted empirical studies to investigate the effects of strategy instruction on learners' use of communication strategies. The participants of his study were six Chinese learners of English at university level. The results of his study

suggested some potential benefits in the direct teaching of CSs. Nakatani (2005) also supports the idea that language learners should be made aware of how to use CSs in their communication. He conducted the study on 62 Japanese learners of English at a private schooling Japan, and then the result of his study showed the participants in strategy training group improved their oral proficiency test scores while the improvements in the control group were not significant. Then Kongsom (2009) she involved 62 students majoring in Engineering at King Mongkut's University of technology North Bangkok in her study and the result showed that the explicit CSs instruction raised students' awareness of strategy use.

Despite widespread disagreement in the research literature about the exact nature of CSs, problem orientedness has been identified as a primary defining criterion for identifying CSs (Bialystok, 1990). Speakers use CSs to "resolve difficulties they encounter in expressing an intended meaning" (Tarone, 2005, p. 488).

As shown, the researchers in the field of CSs have recently paid more attention on the teachability issue of CSs as well as promoted strategy instruction. They have attempted to explore the effects of CS teaching instruction on learners' strategic behavior and competence. Based on the review and arguments in favor of teachability of CSs, The current study is attempted to address this issue to provide new knowledge for this research area.

B. Related Concepts & Theories

1. Definitions of communication strategies

In the course of learning a second/foreign language, learners will frequently encounter communication problems caused by a lack of linguistic resources.

Communication strategies are strategies that learners use to overcome these problems in order to convey their intended meaning. Strategies used may include paraphrasing, substitution, coining new words, switching to the first language, and asking for clarification. These strategies, with the exception of switching languages, are also used by native speakers. The term *communication strategy* was introduced by Selinker in 1972.

The following definitions have been proposed for Communication strategies (CS):

a. 'a systematic attempt by the learner to *express* or *decode* meaning in the *target language*, in situations where the appropriate systematic target language rules have not been formed' (Tarone, et al, 1983);

b. 'a systematic technique employed by a speaker to *express* his meaning when faced with some *difficulty*.' (Corder, 1983);

c. 'a *mutual* attempt of two *interlocutors* to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures are not shared.' (Tarone, 1983);

d. 'potentially *conscious* plans for solving what to an *individual* presents itself as a *problem* in reaching a particular communicative goal' (Faerch and Kasper, 1983);

e. 'the dynamic interaction of the components of language processing that balance each other in their level of involvement to meet task demands' (Bialystok, 1990);

f. 'strategies which a language user employs in order to achieve his intended meaning on becoming *aware* of *problems* arising during the planning phase of an utterance due to his own linguistic shortcomings' (Poulisse, 1990).

2. Definition of communication strategies for the current study

In the current study, communication strategies are defined as "Devices a learner uses while communicating in English to solve oral communication problems and to reach the communicative goals". This definition provides specific and precise descriptions of CSs, which refer to techniques employed when speakers face problems in expressing themselves. It also associates CSs with the solutions to the communication problems that language learners may encounter.

3. The identification of communication strategies

Unlike other researchers (see the above definitions), Bialystok, however, (1990) doubts whether the **first** criterion of *problematicity*, consciousness and intentionality are critical to the definition of CS. Restricting CS to instances of difficulty or *problematicity*, she argues, implies that a distinction of another form of language use which is not problematic, and hence non-strategic, must be made. Yet it is not clear how this distinction can be applied in real communication, nor is there any certainty about the status of language use that is 'not normally perceived problematic but which none the less may be strategic'. To illustrate her argument, she gives the following example: *'You take this street to the place where there is a round park in the centre and many roads come together'*. This very utterance could be used by an L2 learner who does not know the word '*roundabou*t', as well as by a native speaker (NS) in an attempt to describe the concept to a North American visitor who has never

driven on one. In other words, to claim that *problematicity* is characteristic to CS is to say that the above utterance is strategically used in one case and non-strategically used in the other, which, she argues, undermines the credibility or the psychological plausibility of such a claim.

Similarly, Bialystok is skeptical about the role of **second** criterion, consciousness in distinguishing between CS and other constructs of language use. The claim that CS is conscious events of language use, according to her, implies that the speaker is aware of using them. This would imply, in her view, that only those speakers who are conscious of their strategic behavior employ CS. Young children, for whom a lack of conscious monitoring of their cognitive processing is claimed (cf., Piaget's study on children in their 'pre-operational' cognitive stage), will, therefore, be excluded from the group of speakers using CS. Bialystok rejects this reasoning by conducting a number of studies, Among others, Bialystok which also show that children's use of CS to overcome lexical shortages is approximately the same as it is the case with adults. Moreover, Bialystok also the one who clearly show that children's strategic use in cognitive domains in general and linguistic domain in particular does not differ significantly from adults' strategic use above are the arguments from Bialystok in supporting her side in the field of CSs.

The **third** criterion that is implied in the definitions listed above is *intentionality*. Intentionality, in Bialystok's view, presupposes systematic manipulation and selection of the strategies according to some factors, such as the learner's proficiency level, the nature of the tasks being used, the conditions under which real communication takes place, and so on. Yet there is little evidence that such

a link exists. There seems to be, however, some relations between the learners' proficiency level and the use of the L2-based or L1-based strategies (the L2-based strategies are presumably preferred by more advanced learners), but this does not determine the exact strategy or strategy type that will be used (Bialystok, 1983, 1990; Poulisse, 1990).

4. Strategy versus Process

The claim that 'problematicity' and the related 'consciousness' and 'intentionality' are indicative of L2 strategic behavior leads to the assumption that another non-strategic type of behavior must be determined. The question that is likely to arise is how it should be determined when exactly strategies have been or have not been used. The answer to this question is a matter of disagreement between researchers.

Selinker (1972), for example, considers strategies as a subclass of *processes*. The other processes involve 'language transfer', 'transfer-of-training' and 'overgeneralization'. As an example the use of a superordinate term like 'flower' instead of 'rose' to overcome the absence of the word in the learner's utterance, for instance, is a strategy of communication. However, the repeated occurrence of the same word in the same context over time indicates that a process has taken place. In this sense, a strategy that is used to solve an immediate problem may become a process if it occurs on more than one occasion.

Bialystok (1990), on the other hand, proposes *optionality* as a criterion to distinguish between the two categories. Processes, according to her, are obligatory (i.e., autonomous) and strategies are optional (i.e., additional) mental activities of the language system. Strategies are thus defined as 'optional means for exploiting

available information to improve competence in a second language'. Strategies, then, are the range of options available for the speaker at the moment of communication, whose selection and subsequent implementation change the autonomous course of the language processing, and hence, lead to a different form of output than would be expected under normal communicative conditions (i.e., according to TL-norms). Consider the following conversation, for instance:

> A: He's suffering from paranoia.
>
> B: What do you mean by 'paranoia'?
>
> A: Paranoia is erm... a mental disorder which is characterized by er, what's it called, er... erm…
>
> B: insanity?
>
> A: No, uh… uh… delusions about the intentions of others.

As is clear from this example, the language used in this conversation is correct according to the TL-norms. Equating CS with speech errors would imply that the above utterance is not strategically employed. Yet a closer examination is likely to reveal that some type of a paraphrase strategy (namely, circumlocution) is being used. The same is true for the following definition for 'donkey' elicited in child's L2-speech:

> 'Well, it's a sort of horse, a very small horse, which is very lazy, and if not really pulled can just sit there and not do anything'

Compared to the target norm, this definition is not erroneous in any way. Yet it is difficult to exclude from strategic use.

5. Strategy versus Plan

Another attempt to discriminate strategies from processes and other components of language use is postulated by Faerch and Kasper (1983). In their view, the real

opposition to *process* is *product* rather than strategy. *Process*, therefore, must be used in a general sense to mean 'a continuing development involving a number of changes' (Brown, 1976) and 'a dynamic sequence of different stages of an object or system' (Klaus and Buhr, 1976; cited in Faerch and Kasper, 1983). Hence, plans rather than processes are comparable to strategies. *Strategies,* then, are *a subclass of plans* that are developed during the planning phase, the execution of which leads to speech production. Two criteria are attributed to strategic use: 'problem-orientedness' (i.e., problematicity) and 'consciousness'.

According to Faerch & Kasper (1983), the existence of strategies can be inferred through special *performance features,* like temporal variables (e.g., rate of articulation, pauses, drawls and repeats), self-repairs (e.g., false starts and new starts, speech errors or slips of the tongue) and the like. In their view, these performance features occur not only in the *interlanguage* (IL) but in the L1 performance as well.

6. Classification of Communication Strategies

Over the years, various typologies of CSs have been developed and proposed by many researchers in the field of CSs. According to Yule and Tarone (1997), they conclude the duality of approaches taken by researchers: the "Pros" following the traditional approach (e.g. Tarone, 1977; Faerch & Kasper, 1983) and the "Cons" taking a primarily psychological stance (e.g., Bialystok, 1990). The Pros emphasize the descriptions of the language produced by L2 learners, i.e., the external and interactive aspects; however, the Cons focus o the internal and cognitive aspects.

Based on the above arguments of Yule and Tarone, there have been two perspectives in the classification of CSs: the traditional approach (product-oriented

approach) and the process-oriented approach. The taxonomies of CSs proposed by Tarone (1983) and Faerch and Kasper (1983) are based on the traditional approach while the taxonomy of CSs proposed by Bialystok (1990) represents the process-oriented approach. Apart from these two perspectives of CS classification, Dornyei (19950 and Dornyei and Scott (1997) also added some new view points to the CSs classification of CSs in the field. Consequently, the taxonomies of CSs vary considerably in different studies. In the following sections, the CS taxonomies that have been used as a starting point for the taxonomy of the current study are discussed.

a. **Tarone's taxonomy**

From an interactional view or social strategies, Tarone (1983) provides five main categories of CSs: paraphrase, borrowing, appeal for assistance, mime and avoidance. The taxonomy and examples of CSs proposed by Tarone (1983) are shown in Table 1

Table 1. Tarone's taxonomy of CSs

Tarone's taxonomy of CSs	
Paraphrase:	
Approximation:	-use of a single target language vocabulary item or structure, which the learner know s is not correct, but which shares enough semantic features in common with the desired item to satisfy the speaker (e.g., pipe for waterpipe)
Word coinage:	-the learner makes up a new word in order to communicate a desired concept (e.g., air ball for balloon)
Circumlocution:	-the learners describes the characteristics or elements of the object or action instead of using the appropriate target language (TL) item or structure (e.g., "She is, uh, smoking something, I don't know what's its name. That's, uh, Persian, and we use in Turkey, a lot of."
Borrowing:	
Literal translation:	-the learner translates word for word from the native language (e.g., "He invites him to drink." For "They toast one another."
Language switch:	-the learner uses the native language (NL) term without bothering to translate (e.g., balon for balloon)
Appeal for Assistance:	-the learner asks for the correct term (e.g., "What is this?", "What called?")
Mime:	-the learners uses nonverbal strategies in place of a lexical item or action (e.g., clapping one's hands to illustrate applause)
Avoidance:	
Topic avoidance:	-the learner simply tries not to talk about concepts for which the TL item or structure is not known.
Message abandonment:	-the learner begins to talk about a concept but is unable to continue and stps in mid-utterance.

Communication strategies by Tarone, 1983

In summary, this taxonomy is significant in the field because it covers most of CSs investigated in later studies. In addition, the definitions and examples of the CSs provided by Tarone are clear and illustrative. Based on such reasons, this current study adopted Tarone's (1983) five main categories of CSs as starting point for coding and classifying CSs. Full details of justifications for Tarone's taxonomy adopted in the current study are presented in chapter III.

b.   Faerch and Kasper's taxonomy

The second significant classification of CS was proposed by Faerch and Kasper (1983), as seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Faerch and Kasper's taxonomy of CSs

Faerch and Kasper's taxonomy of CSs
(1) Avoidance
(1.1)   Formal reduction:
1.1.1   Phonological
1.1.2   Morphological
1.1.3   Grammar
(1.2)   Functional reduction:
1.2.1   Actional
1.2.2   Propositional
1.2.3   Modal
(2) Achievement
(2.1)   Non-cooperative:
2.1.1 Code switching
2.1.2 Foreignizing
(2.2)   Interlanguage strategies:
2.2.1 Substitution
2.2.2 Generalization
i.   Exemplification
ii. Word-coining
iii. Restructuring
iv. Description
(2.3)   Non-linguistic strategies:
2.3.1 Mime
2.3.2 Imitation
(2.4) Cooperative:
2.4.1   Appeals

Communication strategies by Faerch and Kasper, 1983

Faerch and Kasper's taxonomy of CSs is more complicated than Tarone's taxonomy since it consists of more subtypes. However, there are some problems in the organization of their taxonomy. According to Bialstok (1990:43), the distinction between two types of reduction (formal reduction and functional reduction) is not clear because the use of formal reduction may result in the use of functional reduction. For example, if the learner uses lexical formal reduction because he/she does not have the target word like "mushroom", he/she may employ functional reduction to avoid discussing "eatable fungi". This lack of distinction becomes a problem for the current study. In addition, some subtypes of Faech and Kasper's taxonomy are similar to those Tarone's taxonomy but their definitions and examples are not clear. Consequently, the current study includes only some achievement strategies (e.g., code switching, foreignizing, word-coining, non-linguistics strategies and appeals).

In summary, the product-oriented taxonomies of Tarone (1983) and Faerch and Kasper (1983) have been criticized by several later researchers (e.g. Poulisse, 1987; Bialystok, 1990) for the failure to generalize the taxonomies of CSs. That' is, the product-oriented taxonomies emphasize descriptions of superficial difference in strategy types and ignore the cognitive process underlying strategy use of the learner. The next section presents the process-oriented taxonomies proposed by Bialystok's taxonomy.

c. Bialystok's taxonomy

Bialystok (1990) conceptualizes two principal classes of CSs in the process-oriented approach: analysis-based and control-based strategies, as seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Bialystok's taxonomy of CSs

Bialystok's taxonomy of CSs	
Analysis-based strategies	-conveying the structure of the intended concept by making explicit the relational defining features.
(a) Circumlocution	
(b) Paraphrase	
(c) Transliteration	
(d) Word coinage	
(e) Mime	
Control-based strategies	-switching from the linguistic system being used and focusing instead on some other symbolic reference system that can achieve the same communication function.
(a) Language switch	
(b) Ostensive definition	(i.e., pointing to real objects)
(c) Appeal for help	
(d) Mime	

Communication strategies by Bialystok, 1990:132-134

According to Bialystok (1990:133), the analysis-based strategies involve "an attempt to convey the structure of the intended concept by making explicit the relational defining features. The strategies from the descriptive taxonomies that are included in the analysis-based strategies are circumlocution, paraphrase, transliteration, and word coinage where the attempt is to convey important properties. The control-based strategies involve "choosing a representational system that is possible to convey and that makes explicit information relevant to the identity of the intended concept (Bialystok, 1990: 134). That is, the speaker keeps the original intention with the utterance and turns to different means of reference outside the L2. This taxonomy of

CSs proposed by Bialystok 1990), therefore, is based on a framework of language processing. It should be noted that the definitions and exemplifications of Bialystok's taxonomy of CSs are clear and some strategies (e.g., circumlocution, word coinage and mime) are similar to Tarone's taxonomy of CSs. These strategies are included in the list of CSs that will be investigated in the current study.

d. Dornyei's taxonomy

Dornyei (1995) further collects a list and descriptions of the CSs that are most common and important in this core group, based on Varadi (1973), Tarone (1983), Faerch and Kasper (1983) and Bialystok (1990), as seen in Table 4.

Table 4. Dornyei's taxonomy of CSs

Dornyei's taxonomy of CSs
Avoidance of Reduction Strategies
1. Message abandonment
2. Topic avoidance
Achievement or Compensatory Strategies
3. Circumlocution
4. Approximation
5. Use of all-purpose words
6. Word coinage
7. Use of non-linguistic means
8. Literal translation
9. Foreignizing
10. Code switching
11. Appeal for help
Stalling or Time-gaining strategies
12. Use of fillers/hesitation devices

Dornyei, 1995:58

According to Dornyei (1995:57), the first two strategies are usually referred to *avoidance* or *reduction strategies* as they involve an alteration, a reduction, or complete abandonment of the intended meaning. Strategies 3-11 are grouped as *achievement* or *compensatory strategies* as they offer alternative plans for the

speakers to carry out their original communicative goal by manipulating available language. Strategy 12 is an example of *stalling* or *time-gaining strategies*. These strategies are different from other strategies mentioned earlier because they are used to gain time and to keep the communication channel open at times of difficulty.

It should be noted that this taxonomy of Dornyei (1995) provides the inclusion of stalling for time-gaining strategies to the existing taxonomies in the field. These strategies are not employed to compensate for vocabulary deficiency but rather to help learners gain more time to think and maintain their conversation with their interlocutor. Based on this reason, the researcher of the present study decided to include stalling and time gaining strategies as one of target strategies that will explore in this study.

e. Dornyei and Scott's taxonomy

In the extended taxonomy of problem-solving strategies, Dornyei and Scoot classified the CS according to the manner of problem-management; that is, how CSs contribute to resolving conflicts and achieving mutual understanding (Dornyei and Scott, 1997:198). They separated three basic categories: direct, indirect and interactional categories, as seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Dornyei and Scott' taxonomy of CSs

Dornyei and Scott' taxonomy of CSs

Direct Strategies

Resource deficit-related strategies
 1) Message abandonment
 2) Message reduction
 3) Message replacement
 4) Circumlocution
 5) Approximation
 6) Use of all-purpose words
 7) Word-coinage
 8) Restructuring
 9) Literal translation
 10) Foreignizing
 11) Code switching
 12) Use of similar sounding words
 13) Mumbling
 14) Omission
 15) Retrieval

Own-performance problem-related strategies
 16) Self-rephrasing
 17) Self-repair

Other-performance problem-related strategies
 18) Other-repair

Interactional Strategies

Resource deficit-related strategies
 19) Appeals for help

Own-performance problem-related strategies
 20) Comprehension check
 21) Own-accuracy check

Other-performance problem-related strategies
 22) Asking for repetition
 23) Asking for clarification
 24) Asking for confirmation
 25) Guessing
 26) Expressing non-understanding
 27) Interpretive summary
 28) Responses

Indirect Strategies

Processing time pressure-related strategies
 29) Use of filers
 30) Repetitions

Own-performance problem-related strategies
 31) Verbal strategy markers

Other-performance problem-related strategies
 32) Feigning understanding

(Dornyei and Scott, 1997:197)

According to Dornyei and Scott (1997:198), direct strategies contain "an alternative, manageable, and self-contained means of getting the meaning across, like circumlocution compensating for the lack of a word. Indirect strategies are not strictly problem-solving devices. They facilitate the conveyance of meaning indirectly by establishing the conditions for achieving mutual understanding, preventing breakdowns and keeping the communication channel open or indicating less-than perfect forms that require extra effort to understand. Interactional strategies involve a third approach, by means of which the participants perform trouble-shooting exchanges cooperatively (e.g., appeal for and grant help, or request for and provide clarification), and therefore mutual understanding is a function of the successful execution of both pair parts of the exchange (Dornyei and Scott, 1995:198-199).

The above taxonomy of CSs proposed by Dornyei and Scott (1995) is not only based on the summary of all taxonomies in the field of CSs, but it also provides new CSs such as use of similar-sounding words, mumbling, omission, feigning understanding and asking for repetition. In addition, they include use of fillers as part of "indirect strategies". Based on their explanation, these fillers are used to prevent breakdowns and keep the communication channel open. The current study included four strategies of Dornyei and Scott's interactional strategies, namely: appeal for help, confirmation check, and comprehension check and clarification request) as target strategies. In addition, use of all-purpose words and self-repair strategies are also included in this study.

f.   The Current study CS taxonomy

In the present study, rather than rely on one classification schema, the selection of target strategies is derived from several main taxonomies in the CS field. The target strategies has adopted from CSs taxonomies proposed by Tarone (1977), Faerch and Kasper (1983), Bialystok (1990), Dornyei (1995) and Dornyei and Scott (1997). The reason for adopting the strategies based on such taxonomies is that these researchers' classification of CSs is well organized and clearly defined. In addition, the results of previous research (Chen, 1990; Lam, 2004; Wen, 2004; Pornpibul, 2005; Kongsom, 2009). Therefore, the proposed CSs that will investigate in self-report strategy questionnaire of this study are classified into 16 types and 9 of these 16 strategies are going to introduce and teach to the students/participants. Table 6 shows the framework of types of CSs use in the current study.

Table 6. Taxonomy of CSs adopted in the current study

Taxonomy of CSs adopted in the current study
1. Topic avoidance
2. Message abandonment
3. Circumlocution
4. Approximation
5. Word coinage
6. Use of all-purpose words
7. Appeal for help
8. Literal translation
9. Code switching
10. Foreignizing
11. Non-linguistic strategy
12. Self-repair
13. Confirmation check
14. Comprehension check
15. Clarification request
16. Pause fillers and hesitation devices

Full details of justifications for selecting CSs that will investigate in the current study will be discussed in Chapter III. Research Methodology.

7. The arguments on teaching the communication strategies to second/foreign language learners

The teachability of CSs for promoting learners' communicative competence has been widely discussed in terms of its validity and usefulness. More recently, researchers have turned their attention to the relationship between CSs and pedagogical issues (Kaper & Kellerman, 1997).

a. The arguments in favor of teaching the communication strategies

Many researchers make pedagogical recommendations and support the idea that CS training is possible and desirable to develop the learner's strategic competence. Faerch and Kasper (1983:55), for instance, suggest that it is possible to teach CSs in the foreign language classroom. They view that whether to teach CSs or not depends on the purposes of teaching. If teaching for passing on new information only, it is probably unnecessary to teach CSs. Foreign language learners already have implicit knowledge regarding CSs and can apply this knowledge. However, if teaching is to make learners conscious about aspects of their already existing strategies, it is necessary to teach them about strategies, particularly how to use CSs most appropriately.

The instruction of CSs is also supported by Willems (1987). He proposed that two ideas should be paid more attention when teaching CSs in the language lessons. First, it is necessary to spend some time on instruction about CSs because CSs in the

L1 are mostly used automatically and the learners are not always aware of their own preferences or limitations. Second, more time should be devoted to practicing the use of CSs for raising conscious awareness of a variety of possible CSs (Willems, 1987:356).

Tarone and Yule (1989:114) further maintain that CSs can be taught through more focused and explicit approaches. They conclude that the language teacher should provide actual instruction in the use of CSs, and opportunities for practice in strategy use. Another researcher advocating teaching and training language use strategies is Dornyei (1995:61), supports CS training by discussing three possible reasons for the controversy surrounding the teachability of CSs: (1) most of the arguments on both sides are based on indirect or inconclusive evidence, (2) there is variation within CSs with regard to their teachability, and (3) the notion of teaching allows for a variety of interpretations. He further suggests that learners' use of CSs should be developed through focused instruction. He proposed a direct approach to teaching CSs and included awareness-raising in this approach.

b. The arguments against teaching the communication strategies

Researchers such as Paribakht (1985), Bongaerts& Poulisse, 1989, and Kellerman, 1991 agree that strategic competence develops in speaker's L1 and is freely transferable to target language. As Kellerman (1991) concludes:

> There is no justification for providing in compensatory strategies in the classroom. All things being equal,if learners seem to be poor strategy users in L2 (worse than they are in L1), it will be because they do not process the linguistics means to use strategies properly. The answer seems simple enough. Teach the learners more language and let the strategies look after themselves (1991:158)

Moreover, Bialystok (1990:145) argues that since CSs are reflections of underlying psychological processes, it is unlikely that focusing on surface structures will enhance strategy use or the ability to communicate. In her view, strategic competence is the ability to use language effectively for communication through analysis and control-based strategies. Therefore, teaching the strategies is to equip the learner with the resources essential for the high-level functioning of analysis and control. She concludes that the student must be taught language structure rather than strategies.

In summary, the major argument posed by the arguments against teaching CSs is that the strategies will automatically transfer from L1 to L2. This means that most L2 learners already have developed level f this strategic competence. Thus, it is not necessary to teach this competence to the learners. What L2 teachers should do is teach the learners language and, as Kellerman (1991:158) suggests, "let the strategies look after themselves."

However, in researcher's point of view the fact that strategic competence has developed in the speaker's first language and can transfer into his/her second language learning is undeniable, nonetheless, as suggested by Alderson and Bachman (2004:ix), to speak in a foreign language is very difficult and competence in speaking takes a long time to develop. Indonesian students still need to have strategic competence or communication strategies to handle possible English language interaction which may arise in their communication. Since English as a foreign language in Indonesia, Indonesian students do not have many opportunities to practice using communication strategies either inside or outside classrooms. Thus, teaching and practice of CSs may

be useful since the learners may make use of these strategies when facing communication problems.

8. Overview of postpositivism and interventionist study adopted in the current study

Educational and psychological research has been influenced and guided by postpositivism for several decades (Mertens, 1998:70 in Kongsom). According to Guba and Lincoln (1998:205), postpositivism is based on the concept of "critical multiplism" (a refurbished version of triangulation) as a method to falsify hypotheses. Researchers working in a postpositivist approach try to find out knowledge through various research methods and tools. They argue that postpositivism encourages researchers to find out knowledge by modified experimental methods, critical multiplism, and falsification of hypotheses and include qualitative methods. That is, qualitative methods can be used within this paradigm. As claimed by Mertens in Kongsom (2009:70), researchers in postpositivism can use quantitative methods, interventionist studies and decontextualized methods as approaches to systematic inquiry or methodology. On the basis of the aforementioned information, postpositivism enables the researcher in the current study to find out basic research evidence from quantitative data as well as to focus in depth on qualitative data of Indonesian students' use of CS.

Since the purpose of this study is to develop an understanding about the effect of teaching some specific CSs on students' speaking performance and attitudes, an interventionist study will adopt as the research design of the study. In contrast to descriptive research which aims to describe and interpret specific aspects of classroom life, interventionist research incorporates deliberate, systematic attempts on the part of

the research team to change existing practice. Brumfit and Mitchell (1990) describe studies as follows:

> Interventionist studies are those in which some aspect of teaching or learning is deliberately changed, so that the effects can be monitored. Thus new materials may be introduced, new types of learning activity may be devised or used in an environment where they were not previously used, or teachers may be asked to smile more, use the target language exclusively, or participate in small group discussion. The setting is the normal one for teaching and learning, but the research monitors the effects of changes which have been deliberately introduced (Brumfit & Mitchell, 1990).

In other words, interventionist research involves some deliberate change in a particular process or situation so that the effects can be monitored and evaluated. This type of research tends to have less control over variables than experimental studies. According to Brumfit and Mitchell, at the same point interventionist studies are similar to experimental studies but the latter usually involves a much more formal control of variables.

9. Overview of strategy-based instruction (SBI) adopted in the current study

According to Cohen (1998:81), strategy-based instruction (SBI) is "a learner centered approach to teaching that extends classroom strategy training to include both explicit and implicit integration of strategies into the course content".

He further explains that a typical SBI classroom, the teachers:

a. describe, model, and give examples of potentially useful strategies;

b. elicit additional examples from the students based on the students' own learning experiences;

c. lead small-group/whole-class discussions about strategies (e.g. reflecting on the rationale behind strategy use, planning an approach to a specific activity, evaluating the effectiveness of chosen strategies);

d. encourage their students to experiment with a board range of strategies; and

e. Integrate strategies into everyday class materials, explicitly and implicitly embedding them into the language tasks to provide for contextualized strategy practice.

(Cohen, 1998:81)

To conduct SBI, teachers have three options: "(1) starts with the established course materials and then determine which strategies to insert and where; (2) start with a set of strategies that they wish to focus on and design activities around them; and (3) insert strategies spontaneously into the lessons whenever it seems appropriate e.g. to help students overcome problem with difficult materials or to speed up the lesson (Cohen, 1998:82).