CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to presents the results. An attempt is made to answer the research questions which are restated here:

RQ 1: What are the strategies used by postgraduate Middle Eastern students in the University of Malaya to overcome communication problems with staff (in the service encounters in the Institute of Postgraduate Studies)?

RQ 2: Which are the types of communicative strategies most frequently used by them?

This study focuses on lexical choice in communication; it does not deal with range of language problems such as grammar, pronunciation and intonation. (see section 1.2)

The results of data analysis are presented in two sections. The first section provides a description of the taxonomy of communication strategies developed from the collected data, which serve as the basis for subsequent data analysis. The second section provides the frequency distribution of communication strategies employed by each group.
4.2 Unstructured interview Questionnaire results

4.2.1 Background to the Study of English – The number of years spent studying the language

The participants spent years to study the English Language in their home county before they enrolled with the University of Malaya. The number of years spent studying the language is different. Out of 90 participants, 61(67.8%) studied English above 10 years, 19(21%) participants studied English for 8-10 years, 5(6.7%) participants studied English for 5-8 years and 3 (3.3%) studied English for 2-5 years. There are only 3(1.2%) participants who studied English below 2 years. (See Table 4.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of English language learning</th>
<th>No of participants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above 10 years</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 2 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of participants started learning English in primary or middle school (except Saudi students who started learning English in Grade 7) therefore, it is not surprising that nearly 70% of the students had studied English for more than 10 years.
4.2.2 The Place and the medium of instruction in the Previous University/College

The majority of the participants completed their first degree in their home country. For 95% of the medium of instruction was Arabic while only 5% reported that their medium of instruction was English.

Arabic is designated as the official language in Middle-Eastern countries and it functions as the primary language of education although English is taught as a school subject. In the Middle East, the medium of the instruction in formal education is Arabic, except for some subjects such as Science, Medical, and Engineering which are taught in English. Some universities conduct training in English, particularly in fields like science, engineering, and medicine (Charise, 2007).

There are only a few Universities where the medium of instruction is English, such as King Fahad University in Saudi Arabia (founded in 1975), and The Higher Colleges of Technology (founded in 1988) are almost exclusively taught in English by non-Arab (Charise, 2007).

4.2.3 First language

As the participants were all from the Middle Eastern region, the English language was a foreign language to them. Two thirds (69%) of the participants’ first language was Arabic, the official language of most Middle Eastern countries. About a third (31%) of the participants’ first language was Farsi. All of them had studied English as a second language in their schools.
4.2.4 Self Evaluation of Proficiency in English

Approximately a fifth or 23.5% of participants thought that their English proficiency was satisfactory while about half or 56% of the participants thought that their English proficiency was moderate. None of the participants considered their English proficiency as excellent while a small percentage (12.5%) of participants considered themselves as good in English. Only 8% of participants considered their English proficiency as weak.

The findings show that a very small percentage of participants believed that they were weak in English (8%). The higher percentage (56%) of participants believed that their proficiency was moderate and thus is probably due to the very Basic English language requirement to enter postgraduate programs at University Malaya. (See section 1.3.1)

4.3 Classification and Identification of Strategy Type

The Communication strategies were classified according to the taxonomy developed for this study as given in Chapter two (see section 2.4.3). Based on this taxonomy, CSs from the corpus were identified and tabulated into a main chart by frequency of occurrences.

4.3.1 Frequency of Occurrences

The frequencies of occurrences for each CS were identified as Modification, Compensatory, Avoidance and Interactional Strategies. The total frequency of occurrences for each CS was calculated.
The most frequently used communication strategy by international students at service encounters in IPS was the use of ‘modification devices’. The other strategies used in order of frequency were ‘interactional strategies’ (see section 2.4.1), ‘compensatory strategies’, (see section 2.4.3.1) ‘avoidance strategies’ (see section 2.4.2).

### 4.3.2 Frequency of Communication Strategies

Table 3 shows the overall frequency distribution of the actual use of communication strategies by the participants. Modification Strategy (see figure 3) was the most frequently used communication strategy and there were 236 cases (49%) of strategies employed by the subjects in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Strategies</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modification Devices</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Strategies</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensatory Strategies</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance Strategies</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-based strategies</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, two commonly employed communication strategies were interactional strategies and
compensatory communication strategies; they were distributed in this study as there were 87 cases (18%) for interactional strategies and 85 cases (17.5%) for compensatory strategies. Avoidance strategies among the participants were 59 cases (13%). L2-based strategies were not that much employed by the participants as there were only 17 cases (3.5%).

4.3.2.1 Modification devices

Modification devices are sub-categorized into 6 strategies: clarification requests, pauses, confirmation check, self-repairs, comprehension check, backchannel cues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Communication strategies</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pauses</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation check</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification Requests</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backchannels</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-repair</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension check</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows the overall frequency distribution of the actual use of Modification communication strategies by the participants. Pauses (see E1) were the most frequently used
communication strategies and there were 74 cases (31.5%) in this study. Others were confirmation check (see E2, E3) 70 cases (30%), clarification requests (see E4, E5) 32 cases (13.5%), backchannels (see E6) 31 cases (13%), and fillers (see E7) 13 cases (5.5%), self-repair (see E8, E9) 12 cases (5%) and comprehension check 4 cases (1.5%)

4.3.2.1.1 Pause

Pausing is the communication strategy that was most commonly employed by the participants in this study. By using pausing, participants tried to keep the conversation going and tried to tell the interlocutor that they were thinking, because they needed time to think about what to say next.

Pausing was found in all participants by using pausing fillers such as “eh…..” “Umm…….” as they tried to keep the conversations going, instead of giving up the conversation by using the strategy of message avoidance. The following are some examples of pausing:

**Example of pause strategy**

1:

F4: Science? I am not sure, hold on.

D32: **You don't have eh__ (0.2) This um__ (gesture) Science**

F4: For the science we have these (show him)

D32: For um__ about nutrition?

F4: Nutrition? maybe you can check website you can see what field Of research
D32: Can we get eh_ (0.3) (gesture) The program we can eh_ (0.5) //

F4: We oh, only this electronic, manufacture, this one for new program

D32: The__ the_____ program um__they have it eh__for__ (0.5) next year?

2:

F2: You let them know because of this situation want to get offer early, if they sent it to meeting~~

D6: >eh< (0.3) (nod the head)

F2: [If they accepted then we will give your offer letter].

D6: you mean ask the faculty? (gesture)

F2: You no need to ask faculty because still processing it

D6: >eh<(0.5) (gazing at staff)

F2: Maybe next week Monday like that, you check with them.

From the example above it is clear that the participants (D32, D6) had a communication problem, but both of them wanted to get the information across and therefore tried to keep the conversation going, instead of giving up. Fillers were used: “eh…..” as he tried to find the correct lexical items in that particular context while at the same time sending a signal to his interlocutor that he needed time to think what to say next.

4.3.2.1.2. Confirmation Check

Confirmation check is another type of modification strategy. It is used in order to check
interlocutors’ understanding. There were times where the interlocutors did not understand clearly what the participants had said, and participants checked out their interlocutors’ understanding by using phrases such as “Right? Okay? You know?” 70 confirmation checks were employed by participants. The examples are provided.

**Examples of Confirmation Check**

3:

D52: (Standing) excuse me I want to check my English class, um___

What is the day?

F7: Next one will be on 28th.

D52: On March?

F7: So two weeks before you go to notice board before registration come to register your name.

D52: **Two weeks before the March** (look at staff)?

F7: Yes

D52: **Before the March?**

F7: The 1st of March or 2nd of March you can come

4:

D54: I went to check for my friend the application of master.

F6: Starting July
D54: July?

F6: But start apply in January, first of January, the advertisement will be out 3rd of January.

D54: So application submit by~~~/

F6: One month before.

D54: **One month before?**

F6: Yeh

From the examples above, the participant (D52) tried to use confirmation check strategy by repeating the interlocutor’s statement with a rising intonation to check her own understanding of the date of the new intake. The participant (D54) used confirmation check strategy to check the date of the submission forms.

### 4.3.2. 1.3 Clarification Requests

Clarification is one of the subtypes of modification strategies. Clarification requests imply a lower level of understanding on the part of the addressee, who is asking for an explanation of the words or expressions that have not been understood. They therefore tend to require more collaborative effort than confirmation checks. It is a request made by the language learners for repetitive explanations during the process of conversation by using phrases such as saying: "Pardon", “Please say it again”, “What do you mean ？ ” or by using rising intonation.

There were 32 (13.5%) cases of clarification requests strategy found in this study.
**Examples of Clarification Request**

5:

F7: So you register the master?

D75: Yeh, I got module two, because the offer letter~~~//

F7: [Oh, you are G to G program is it?]

D75: **What?(get closer to staff and look at her)**

F7: You are government to government?

D75: Not yet until now, my, um__my__ I pay~~~/

6:

D78: I registered last month and they said that I have to register for research methodology and I went to my faculty~~~

F7: **[Eh]?**

D78: And they said I have to come back to here and make payment to check that Research Methodology is exclusive or not.

F7: Ok, this one you must check with finance

D78: **Eh?(look at staff)**

F7: Finance section

D78: Final section?

F7: Finance section.
D78: Finance up there (gesture point up)

From the example above, it is clear that when the participants did not grasp the intended meaning of their interlocutor they requested the interlocutor to repeat or explain in greater detail. In example 5 participants (D75) used “what?” Instead of using “Please say it again” to ask his interlocutor to repeat the question. And in the example 6, the participant (D78) used “eh?” with the rising tone to request the interlocutor to provide more information.

They rarely used phrases such as saying “Pardon”, “Please say it again”, and “what do you mean?” When they failed to understand information or did not understand what they interlocutor said, they used ‘eh’ with a rising tone to request further explanation or a repetition. This sometimes caused misunderstanding with their interlocutors. The interlocutors waited the participant to continue their conversation. So, the participants did not realize that they should be using expressions for clarification, such as "Excuse me?" “Pardon?”, “Again please?”, “Please says it again.”

### 4.3.2.1.4 Backchannel Cues

Sending backchannels while listening is a tool to show that that second language learners are listening and/or understanding the message. It is feedback for the interlocutors that the conversation can continue. In other words, they included backchannel cues in their conversation to indicate their participation in the conversation. However, it was observed that not all participants made use of backchannels. There were only about 31 cases (13 %) of the participants used backchannel cues. In most cases, participants remained silent instead of using a backchannel cues. This was a cause of misunderstanding for interlocutors, as they were not sure whether their interlocutor understood or not.
Example of Backchannel Cues

7:

F7: This is translation, what you do to make photocopy and go to

you embassy to certify it.

D72: It's not my document, his document; they ask for it, this is stamp for this.

F7: Ok, this from original, once you copy no more consider

original you just stamp on the copies, you still got time.

D72: Stamp on it, ok?

F7: Or you can ask lecture~~~

D72: [This is from lecture] (show the paper)

From the example 7, it can be seen that the participant (D72) used backchannels to show his understanding and also showed that he was a participant in the conversation.

4.3.2.1.5 Fillers

The use of fillers; that is using of words, pauses or pause fillers such as “well”, ”fine”, ”emmm”, etc, to allow time to think in order to keep the conversation going smoothly was also in evidence in the data collected. The researcher found that when faced with communication problems, subjects needed some time to think about what to say next because they did not want any silence to interrupt the communication

The examples below demonstrate filler strategies being used by the respondents which prompted
his/her interlocutor to indicate that they understood what was said.

Example of Fillers

8:

D31: **Because I__I__ want to__eh__ get for my embassy(gesture), because**

my embassy um__/(0.2) need it say that I study__um__ I am student__um__/ 

F4: [(Writing) Ok.]

D31: But this is two semester__um__ or three semester ?(gesture)

F4: That one faculty maximal 10 semesters 5 years

D31: eh, eh__/ (0.2 gazing at staff ) This is not fair for me .no~~

F4: Ok, I cancel.

D31: Can you write two__two__ three years or four years (shake head), because

our country for~~~/ (gesture)

F4: [We put two semesters to ten semesters.] 

D31: Um__ ok, ok put, put (gesture) ____sorry.

F4: You can try tomorrow.

D31: Can you write Thursday? $

F4: Yes.

4.3. 2.1.6 Self Repair

Self-repair is the strategy when the second/foreign language learners are able to correct the mistakes made by them. In the conversation, the participants tended to make some mistakes while
they used a wrong expression, such as missing vocabulary items. They would then immediately correct the words because they did not want to cause misunderstanding.

**Examples of Self Repair**

9:  

F4: For the next year?  

D32: For next year, which program they have the vacancy um capacity (gesture) for this semester?  

F4: Capacity? What do you mean?  

D32: We can um empty(gesture), eh empty um Capacity (put hand on forehead) eh I mean it can accept this(gesture) semester

10:  

D6: Morning, I am from medical department, they could not register for me, because they told me I need to submit~~~ Photocopy of this (gesture of stamp on the paper) (pass a printed paper to staff) I came to last Friday~~~ (gesture to point at back)  

F2: [Um?]  

D6: I want to know copy of this (point at the paper) is acceptable?  

F2: It just this one? But you still need to get certify one.  

D6: >yeh<, this~~~  

F2: You get copy, I know you already copy it.
D6: They (gesture point at back)did not certify, they don't certify because they need translation of English

F2: You should certify it.

Research indicates that second language learners with high oral proficiency are able to correct their own mistakes because they know the language better than those whose oral skills are poor (Wannaruk, 2002). In this study, it was observed that only rarely respondents were able to correct the mistakes they had made. The majority of them even did not realize that they had made a mistake. They usually tried to continue the conversation to obtain the information that they needed. In some cases, even though the interlocutor tried to correct the mistakes they made the participants did not realize this and continued using the wrong expressions. In this study, the finding supports the psycholinguistic approach. According to Faerch and kasper (1983a), when learners face “problems” in their communication they try to solve them in their own way.

4.3.2.2 Interactional Strategies

Table 3 shows the frequency distribution of interactional strategies employed by participants. Among the three subtypes of interactional strategies, avoidance strategy is the most commonly employed by the participants. There were 59 cases (69%) who used avoidance, followed by paraphrases strategy which numbered 17 cases (20%) while mime strategies were 11 cases (11%).
Table 4.4: The Frequency Distribution of Interactional Strategies employed by Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Interactional Communication Strategies</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Message Avoidance</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mime</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal for help</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under avoidance strategy, topic avoidance was not observed, because data collected was based on the natural conversations which took place at the service counter. Under the paraphrase strategy, there were only two subtypes of paraphrase that were observed in this study namely Approximation and Circumlocution. (See section 2.4.1)

4.3.2.2.1 Message Avoidance

Avoidance strategies are employed by the learner when faced with a potential communicative problem, a message is reduced by avoiding certain language structures or topic considered problematic or by leaving out some intended elements because lack of linguistic resources. In these contexts of interaction, the need to avoid a lexical void or unknown concept calls for strategies such as a change of topics or complete silence. These patterns are described by Tarone,
Frauenfelder and Selinker, (1976), Tarone (1977), Corder (found in Faerch and Kasper 1983), Tarone, Cohen and Dumas (found in Faerch and Kasper 1983) and Bialystok (1990).

Message avoidance was observed among the participants. All participants behaved similarly to show the interlocutor that they could not continue that message which they were trying to pass on, they simply stopped their utterance. They did not have the correct strategy to communicate to their interlocutor directly that they could not continue with the message that they were trying to communicate.

**Examples of Message Avoidance**

11:

F6: Fees? how__? (Check computer) it's helped.

D61: **Ye, but the timetable given it is not um.... I take my~~~/**

  (gesture point at herself)

F6: [Oh?]

D61: It's not my course, XX for whole um__( gesture draw circle in air) science ,

  But I could not find, // (0.5) it's ok.

12:

F4: Yes this one(show a paper) for temporary

D28: For one month?
F4: For one month?

D28: $ after four weeks (gesture for 'four' ) eh I // (stop talking)

F4: You can come here, so you can get you matric card

D28: Temporary?( show the paper to staff)

F4: Yes.

From the example above, it can be seen that participants (D61, D28) intended to continue their conversations with their interlocutors, but because they lacked the appropriate vocabulary they gave up by just gazing at the staff or use hand gestures.

4.3.2.2 Paraphrase

The subtype of paraphrase strategies are: Approximation, word coinage, Circumlocution. In this study only approximation and circumlocution strategies were observed.

4.3.2.2.1 Circumlocution

In the conversation below, it was very common to find that the participants could not find the appropriate term in the target language, and so in order to keep the conversation going they tried to get their interlocutor to understand their intended meaning. In order to do so they tried to describe characteristics or elements of the objects or actions instead of using the appropriate word. The common request that participants made at the service counters was a “confirmation letter” from the counter staff. See the following examples:
Examples of Circumlocution

13:

D31: Because I__ I___ want to__ eh___ get for my embassy(gesture) ,because my

embassy um)/(0.2) need it say that I study ___um___ I am student

__um_)/(Confirmation letter)

F4: [(Writing) Ok.]

D31: But this is two semester __um___ or three semester ?(gesture)

F4: That one faculty maximal 10 semesters 5 years

D31: eh, eh__/ (gazing at staff)(0.2 ) This is not fair for me .no~~

14:

D30: (shake head) thank you it's ok, eh one more thing( sat down ) I asked about~~

F4: [sorry?] 

D30: I want a letter shows that we are students here and we are taking course for myself and

my friend (confirmation letter)

F4: together?

D30: yes, but I need 4(gesture show four fingers ) sets

From the examples above, it is clear that the participants (D30, D31) did not know the term for

“confirmation letter”. Therefore the tried to explain what the letter was by saying“letter to show
my embassy that I am studying here.” (in example 13) and “the letter to show that we are
students here…” (in example 14). These strategies were successful as they were understood by
their interlocutor.
4.3.2.2.2 Approximation

Tarone (1977, p.198 in Bialystok, 1990, p.40) defines approximation as “the use of single target language vocabulary item or structure, which the learner knows is not correct, but which shares enough semantic features in common with the desired item to satisfy the learner”.

When the learners could not find the appropriate word(s) in the target language in the process of communication, he/she tries substitute with a word which shares common semantic features.

Examples of Approximation

15:

D: We submit all the **papers(document)** with this form to your right

F: Yes but you need all certify it

D: Where to certify

F: From you embassy in Malaysia

D: Oh, yes, yes, so USD50 pay to bank account

F: Yeh.

16:

F4: This is your original?

D34: Yes.

F4: No, we need the certified true copy.

D34: (Nod the head) this is just for register, because after this we
**will supply (submit) this one( show original)**

F4: This is original, we need certified one.

D34: I already register I am student here, I already register~~~

The participants used Approximation strategy to produce the words where, in conversation, they know there is more accurate term but they could not find the appropriate word for the particular context.

In Example 15 above, instead of using the word ‘document’ for what they needed to submit, the participant used “papers”. In order to keep the conversation going, he used another word which has a similar meaning. In example 16, the word “supply” has a similar meaning to “submit” as both mean “to pass to”, or “to hand in”.

**4.3.2.2.3 Mime**

Mime refers to the learner use of gesture as well as non-verbal output to convey meaning. Mime is a separated category which is explained as “all nonverbal accompaniments” (Tarone, 1977 cited in Bialystok, 1990, P.42). Mimes were used when the participants were not certain of the words they were using, or they could not find the appropriate word to indicate or transform their intended message, mimes were quite useful to help comprehension. In this study, there was not much mime employed. Participants used mime when they thought that their interlocutor could not understand
what they had said. By using mimes the interlocutor found it easy to understand their intended meaning.

**Examples of Mime**

17:  

D34: You, you just want to two copies from this (point at the paper)?

What else do you want?

F4: This one for two, this one for one

D34: It's just similar (gesture)?

F4: This one we need certified copy

D34: Certify? (gesture stamp on paper)

F4: Yes.

D34: *It's already certified, you need stamp on this? (gesture stamp)*

18:  

D15: Yes, I have sent already (gesture)

F1: oh, you already sent (check computer)

D15: *Maybe it's already in faculty, this before two month (gesture 'v')*

F1: Oh, I check with this.

4.3.2.2.4 Self-Repetition

Self repetition was utilized by participants. Self repetition strategy enabled participants to maintain the communication. When a communication gap occurred in the conversation because of a loss of
idea due to limited linguistic knowledge or while learners were thinking of the next word they should use, they repeated immediately what they had already said. A possible reason for using self-repetition was when learners could not think of the next appropriate word or expression, they needed time to think and repeating the last word or expression might help them to do this. Moreover, self-repetition saved learners from being embarrassed when communication difficulties occurred. Instead of resorting to silence, they repeated themselves so that they could maintain the conversation.

**Example of Self-Repetition**

19:

---

D35: *For example, example um* one program is only course work and dissertation, Another is only by research, can not?

F4: Finish one then you can apply another.

D35: Another program ok, thank you very much. finish all my question( gesture)

20:

F3: What program? By research or by course?

D24: No, course work

F3: You r asking about July intake or?

D24: No, no, it's already it's already~~~(gesture)

F3: [You already got offer letter?]
4.3.2.2.2.5. Appeal

The participants used interactional strategies when they wanted some assistance from their interlocutors. When a breakdown in communication happened while they were talking due to, perhaps, a lack of vocabulary item which might interrupt the flow in speaking, the subjects tried to overcome this problem by directly asking some help from the interlocutor or from others. The study indicated that the participants did not seek assistance from their interlocutor when they had communication problems. However, an interesting finding in this study showed that participants sought help from their friends when they did not understand what their interlocutor had said rather than appeal to the interlocutor. This meant that sometimes it took some time for the participant to respond to the interlocutor.

Example of Appeal

21:

D58: Yes, oh__ three__ three weeks~~ (gesture for three)

F6: It's not here; the only document we have is PHD in economics.

D58: (Turns to ask friend something) he applied new application(gesture put two hands together) by (through) our(gesture put hand on chest) friends he is now in our country, he ask us to__he applied our friend, he applied three weeks again~~~

F6: You submitted your application here or~~~?
D58: Yes, yes, application eh__in IPS~~~ (point at)

F6: Computer science?

D58: Yes, yes, computer science we want to sure eh__ all applied___new

(show a paper) we go to eh____~/

Although the participants use the different strategies in their conversation, these strategies are useful to help the participants solve the communications problems. The most frequent interactional communication strategy employed by the participants was the avoidance strategy. When the participants did not know how to answer the specific topic they maintained silence and this is not helpful way to learn.

4.3.2.3 Compensatory Strategies

Table 4.5 shows the frequency distribution of compensatory strategies employed by the participants of the study. Compensatory strategies are sub-categorized into 11 strategies. Only 6 subtypes of compensatory strategies were employed by the participants in this study. These 6 subtypes are: Use of all purpose words, Non-linguistic signals, stalling or time-gaining, approximation, circumlocution, and guessing. Among these 6 subtypes of compensatory strategies, approximation and circumlocution strategies were employed by participants in interactional strategies. Stalling or time gaining strategies are similar with pausing strategies which was mentioned under the Modification strategy.
Table 4.5: the Frequency Distribution of Compensatory Strategies employed by Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Communication Strategies</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of all purpose words</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonlinguistic signals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalling or time gaining</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guessing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the 6 subtypes of compensatory strategies used by participants, among these 6 the use of all purpose words is the most common strategies were employed by the participants of which there were 29 cases (33%), followed by non-linguistic signals strategy which numbered 26 cases (30%) and stalling strategies were 13 cases (15%). Others like approximation strategy and 10 cases (11%), circumlocution strategy 7 cases (8%) and guessing strategy 3 cases (3%)  

4.3.2.3.1 Use of All Purpose Words

Example of Use of All Purpose Words

F1: You want to check your program?
D2: yes, I want to change to master um~~~

F1: [Your are master in biology technology?]

D2: Yes, can I register of **something**?

F1: Ok, (make phone call) hold down (few minutes latter) ok, you can see my officers inside

D2: Ok, (walk away)

---

**23:**

D3: Total payment? (rising tone)

F1: Yes, you can go here you will know your total payment(point the place)

D3: Not here?(gesture)

F1: yes

D3: Eh, (take out a form from bag) I didn't not **submit this, do I need to**

Submit this (Point at the orange card?)

F1: It's ok(take it)

D3: It's ok?(rising intonation)

F1: Yes

From the examples above, it can be seen that when participants could not find the appropriate word for a particular item they over used “this one” or ‘something” with mime strategy together to keep conversation going smoothly.

4.3.2.3.2 Guessing

Guessing strategy is a technique a few participants chose when they attempted to indicate an uncertain word to the interlocutor. This was rarely used by participants in this study. There were
only 3 (3 %) cases instances of guessing found in this study. When participants did not understand a word that the interlocutor used, they tried to guess the meaning of the word from the clue or the context of conversation.

**Example of Guessing**

**24:**

D66: I want to get my student's card.

F6: You already registered?

D66: Eh? (nod head)

F6: Have you registered as a student here?

D66: **They(point at another office) ask me to come to here( gesture point at counter)**

F6: You want your student's card right?

D66: **Student card (get closer to staff) eh it's my second semester.**

F6: This is your second semester, it's means you already have your matric card

D66: Yeh( shake head)

From the example above it can be seen that the participant did not understand the utterance used by his interlocutor, instead of using an appeal strategy to ask his interlocutor to repeat the utterance, he tried to guess the meaning by attempting answer what he thought was the question.
4.3.2.4 Non-Verbal Communication Strategies

Non-verbal cues are use of mimes, guessers, facial expressions or body movement when there was some sort of linguistic limitation to explain the target vocabulary or sentences used by the speakers. Research have shown that nonverbal communication is a ‘major force’ in our lives, according to Birdwhistell (1955 cited by Burgoon and Buller, 1996) and it has been estimated that nearly two-thirds of the meaning in any social situation is derived from nonverbal cues. In other words, people rely heavily on nonverbal cues to express themselves and to interpret the communicative activities of others (Burgoon and Buller 1996).

Table 4.6 shows the overall frequency distribution of the actual use of non-verbal strategies especially gestures by the participants. It indicates that gestures for substitution were the most frequently used communication strategies in this study as there were 126 cases (33.5 %) found. Others that followed in order of importance and usage: complementation 103 cases (28.5 %), redundancy 69 cases (19.5 %), and the last gesture for emphasis had 68 cases (18.5 %)

Table 4.6: Frequency Distribution of Non-Verbal Communication Strategies employed by participants based on the different functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of gesture</th>
<th>No. of gestures used</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Substitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-understand</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Complementation</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Redundancy</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Contradiction</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emphasis</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3.2.4.1 Redundancy**

Redundancy is repeating what is said verbally, such as nodding one’s head while saying yes or shaking one’s head (hand) while saying no are examples of repetition. Typically, much of what people do nonverbally is somewhat redundant with the verbal message, in that way, accuracy of communication is improved.

**Example of Redundancy**

**25:**

F2: (Pointed at the paper) this is old one and this is new one

D5: (Nod the head)

F2: New one correct or not?

D5: *(Nod the head) yes, yes*

F2: I prepared already, but is not there (asked others)

**26:**

D25: Ok, last semester, I applied for leave, (gesture) last I canceled (gesture) it~~~

F3: You applied leave, eh?

D25: (Gesture) I cancelled late, late~~~

F3: Eh?

D25: I attended lectures the end of this semester, I check in examination section, (gesture
pointing at above) **there is no result. (wave his hand)**

F3: They don't have your result?

D25: The result check from here, no result.

F3: Your name?

D25: Abdullah

F3: Give your matric card.

D25: (pass it to staff)

From the examples above, it can be seen that the participants nod their head (D24) or shake their hand (D25) to repeat when they say something. By using this type of gesture they sent the message that they understood what their interlocutor had said.

### 4.3.2.4.2 Substitution

Visual symbols sometimes replace words. A simple smile may replace the need to say yes. Gazing at the listener’s eyes may replace the need to say “yes”. In some cases instead of saying "pardon", "place repeat it” participants who did not understand the interlocutor used their facial expression to show a lack of understanding by just staring at their interlocutors.

Cultural differences often influence the use of eye contact, the frequency of gazing and the focus of listener’s eyes. Arabs generally engage in more eye contact than do North Americans (Nesjirwan 1978; Wston and Graves 1966, cited by Burgoon and Buller, 1996, p.222).
Example of Substitution:

27:

D4: No I want to graduate~~~(gesture and smiling)

F2: Meaning that you must register all the semesters?

D4: (Nod the head)

F2: This you must wait, once they are ready, they will sent you the graduation Letter.

D4: (Gazing at staff) (5 second) veh?

F2: Whether you graduate or not so you should wait for graduation, semester one

Form the example above, it can be seen that the participant (D4) did not understand what his interlocutor had said. Instead of asking the interlocutor to repeat, he just gazed at the interlocutor about 5 second to indicate non-comprehension.

4.3.2.4.3 Complementation

Non-verbal cues may elaborate the meaning expressed by words. This was frequently found in the study. The participant sent the message to their interlocutor to clarify their verbal words through nonverbal cues. Showing a “v” sign using fingers is one of the examples of complementation. The rationale for using these gestures was to get the attention from their interlocutors and also to add to the meaning expressed by words. The following are some of the examples found.
Examples of Complementation strategy:

28:

D63: Five minutes?( gesture to show five)another thing ( stand up) if we want to postpone (gesture) our fees can or can not?

F7: Postpone? That one you need to talk to finance.

D63: **Finance? Second floor( gesture to show "v")**

F7: Second floor. Why not you give me the paper in case we get it before you come back From second floor?

D63: (Shake head)ok

From the example it can be seen that the participant used a gesture to clarify the words uttered.

29:

D14: I want to check about the course I need to take the research methodology and Bahasa Malayu.

F1: New student or~~?

D14: New student.

F1: Your offer letter?

D14: **I didn't bring it , but I registered last week (points to the back)**

F1: Last week? The requirement you have to pass you language and research methodology

D14: It's essential for everybody? It’s necessary?
F1: Ye, you have attend all the requirement before your start, by course work or research

From the example above, the participant gestured to point to the back to indicate something had passed, to add to the expressed meaning for “last Friday.”

4.3.2.3.4 Contradiction

This produces a mixed or ambiguous message in some cases, sarcasm or irony in others.

There is no participant used this strategy in this study.

4.3.2.3.5 Emphasis

Highlighting what is said verbally such as pointing, pounding a table, and yelling are examples of ways to emphasis what is being said. By pointing while the participants talked gives emphasis to what the participants said. This was a very common strategy used by the participants in this study.

Example of Emphasis:

30:

D65: My friend applied the master in faculty of engineering, I come to here to check why she didn't get offer

F6: Your talk to Mr. Ali

D65: Ali? there? (gesture point at another office)

F6: Yes, you wait for him a while there
D65:    Ok, thank

31:

D25: Ok, last semester, I applied for leave. (gesture) last I canceled (gesture) it~~~

F3:    [You applied leave, eh?]

D25: (Gesture) I cancelled late, late~~~

F3:    Eh?

D25: I attended lectures the end of this semester, I check in examination

section, (gesture pointing at above) **there is no result.** (gesture for 'no')

F3:    They don't have your result?

D25: The result check from here, no result

From the two examples above it was found that the participants tried to underscore what he had
said verbally by pointing as he talked. By doing this he was able to get the attention of their
interlocutor.

4.3.2.3.5    Prompting

Prompting is used as a strategy to get an interlocutor to continue the conversation using phrases
such as “and then”, “next” or “that’s all” “so”. Although this strategy was not much observed,
some of the participants used this strategy to keep the conversation going.
**Example of promoting strategy:**

32:

F7: You want to apply~~~/

D72: Yes for my friend, and I have his document,(gesture point at back) is the right time now?

F7: By course or by research?

D72: Oh…. Both (gesture for two)

F7: Actually it's close now, but if you want to submit you form can, is you certified everything?

D72: (Look at staff) um...I am not sure, last time I came you told me that it's not right time

F7: Yes, advertisement out in 27th of January

D72: Now (checking his bag) please check it's completed or not, **so you need~~~/**

( gesture)

F7: Here not complete yet, you must write masters of what program in which faculty?

D72: (Look at paper) oh? What about this?

F7: You want to master or PHD

D72: >Oh< .so~~~/

F7: Is this original?

D72: (Looking at paper) eh__ Translation __eh__ Not this one.
F1: Ok, requirement, you must have bachelor degree, you must have your transcript your bachelor degree honours? Your master degree for same field? Your master in research or…?

D9: Research by course work?

F1: by research eh~~~

D9: [Master? By course?]?

F1: By course ok, you have to submit your certificate and transcript

D9: Then?

F1: You have to submit your proposal, your can check for your supervisor in faulty of science.

D9: Ok. What about process, how long we have to wait eh…../?

F1: Ok for process, your process for PHD program maybe about 2-3- month.

From the examples above, it can be seen that the participants used fillers such as “so” and “then” to keep the conversation running smoothly, by using this type of strategy the participant prompted the interlocutor to continue the conversation.

4.4 Summary

All the participants employed CSs strategies as they tried to keep the conversation running smoothly so as to achieve their communication goals. As the participants’ goals to maintain the conversation, they had to make effort in collaborating with the staff despite not being proficient in
English language.

Modification strategies were employed more frequently as they tried to solve their communication problems. Besides interactional strategies, compensatory strategies, L2-based strategies and non-verbal communication strategies were also employed.

The results of this present study show that compensatory strategies were more frequently used by the participants than interactional strategies. The findings of this study support Clennel’s statement.

The finding supports Wenden’s (1991:41) statement that ‘the good language learner is willing to take risks’. These students were willing to take risks in order to communicate, using any meaning at their disposal to convey meaning. This often involves the use of circumlocution, paraphrases, gestures, and may sometimes involve the creation of new words by analogy with familiar forms.

In Chapter five, the researcher will present the summary of findings, limitation of this study and some suggestions also application in language learning and teaching will be given for further studies.