

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

2.0 Introduction

The English Language Syllabus for Secondary School states that the teaching of English is to enable all school leavers to use English in certain everyday situations and work situations. One of the extra curricular activities used to promote the use of the language is debate.

The format of debate introduced in Malaysian schools is known as Parliamentary Style Debate (PSD). PSD demands that the speaker be able to evaluate a statement made on the floor and respond immediately by synthesizing whatever background knowledge one may have on the topic.

Debating in an ESL environment may prove to be challenging since debating demands that one arrives at a reasoned judgment and responds off the cuff. Faucette (2001) stated that both non-native and native speakers of any given language sometimes struggle to find the appropriate expression or grammatical construction when attempting to communicate their meaning. The ways in which an individual speaker manages to compensate for this gap between what the speaker wishes to communicate and his immediate available linguistic resources is known as Communication Strategies (CS).

2.1 Communication Strategies

There are two categories of communication strategies being looked at for this study. The first, communication strategies, or strategic considerations, needed to win a particular debate or argument and second, communication strategies employed in an ESL situation to articulate arguments and maintain communication. Due to identical terminology, for the purpose of this study, this researcher uses the term **Strategic Considerations (SC)** to mean the communication strategies needed to win a particular debate. The term **Communication Strategies (CS)** used to identify communication strategies employed in an ESL situation to articulate arguments and maintain communication.

This chapter provides an outline of what both these categories of strategies are and their use by the debaters during PSD. It also provides a theoretical framework and the theories that have allowed the analysis of both categories of strategies from various perspectives.

2.2 Strategic Considerations (SC) in Parliamentary Style Debates (PSD)

According to Ziegelmueller & Dause (1975, p. 184), Communication Strategies (Strategic Considerations - SC) are broad plans which determine how an advocate will adapt the presentation of his analysis to the constraints and opportunities of a particular communication

situation; their aim is to heighten the persuasive impact of the analysis through alternations in perception or emphasis. Based on their definition, there are five primary elements to the concept.

The first element is SC are broad plans. This concerns how the overall case is dealt with and how the main issue is developed. In PSD this would mean determining how the team is going to argue its case based on the sides.

The second element is SC determine how an advocate will adapt the presentation of his analysis. This element concerns itself with how the debaters will build a case around their stand on the motion. In short, come up with three arguments to support their case line or stand.

In the third element, SC call for adaptation to the constraints and opportunities of a particular communication situation. This means that the debaters should attempt to utilize the time allotted to the maximum to highlight the crux of their case line. Other than that, debaters should also be alert to highlight to the audience any contradictions in the opposing case line via POIs or during rebuttals.

The fourth element states that the aim of SC is to heighten the persuasive impact of the analysis. Debate is goal directed communication (Cragan et al., 2004, p. 70) and debaters should strategize to increase their chances of achieving their goals in that particular situation. They should explain their case line to the target audience in a manner that would

increase the acceptance of their reasons and sway the adjudicators in their favour.

The fifth and final element is SC seek to achieve their objectives through alterations in perception and / or emphasis. This means that the debaters would have to be able to persuade the audience to look at the motion from a very different yet plausible perspective.

Ziegelmueller & Dause (1975, p. 185) sum up SC as broad schemes utilizing the limitations of a communication situation for the advantage of the advocate, or in this case, the debater.

2.2.1 Four Classes of Strategic Considerations (SC).

According to Ziegelmueller & Dause (1975), the four classes of SC listed below can be used to gain a persuasive advantage with no fundamental changes in the speaker's ideological position. They are:-

1) Altering Perception of the Analysis (SC1)

If the audience or listeners have prejudged or have preconceived ideas about the motion, it is now the duty of the debaters to change the perception of the listeners. The debaters would need to begin their presentation at an unusual but particularly appropriate point, with the aim of widening the audiences' limited world view on the entire controversy

by relating it to a set of larger and more apparent problems. Debaters can do this through the a) adoption of antagonistic values, b) universalization of the problem, c) reordering arguments and by d) focusing on unexpected aspects on an issue.

In short, it boils down to manipulation of matter or substance to change the perception of the audience, specifically the adjudicators.

2) Altering Perception of the Advocate (SC2)

SC2 is based on non verbal aspects. It has to do with stature and image buffing – a psychological smokescreen to get the crowd on their side. In PSD at school level, teams from established or elite schools are known to play this card.

Mannerism, as in confident smiles, eye contact with the crowd, the right tone of voice; when appealing, cajoling or emphasizing, minimal use of cue cards and the placement of school insignia on their outfits are all strategies to maximize marks under the category of style.

3) Emphasis through Formal Procedure (SC3)

PSD, or academic debates, place major constraints upon each debater as speaking order, or turn, is pre-determined and there are rigid time limits for each speaker's turn. Therefore it is pertinent that each

debater is able to prevent main arguments from getting obscured in the overall flow of words.

SC3 concerns itself with selecting, ordering and timing arguments for maximum impact. The utilization of well-timed formal interjections or POIs are also emphasized.

This SC also focuses on team and individual strategy. By playing their individual roles in the team, arguments and counter-argument overlaps as well as time loss can be avoided. The first two debaters should focus on building their case whereas the duty of the third debater is to rebut all the arguments brought up by the opposing side.

4) Emphasis through Informal Codes (SC4)

SC4 involves informal codes of conduct. A debate session is a very regulated or rule governed form of discourse or communication. This would mean doing something informal to gain support of the crowd. It might entail changing the style of dressing; from formal wear to street casual, or breaking out in song part way through an argument to emphasize a certain point.

This SC is rare in PSD due to the formality of procedure and place where the tournament is held, usually in a school. This researcher has seen this kind of SC used and also borne witness to the team being chastised

during the adjudicators' comments rounds for using or resorting to what they consider to be 'distracting' or 'frivolous' tricks.

2.2.2 The Role of SC in PSD

Ziegelmüller & Dause (1975), in their book, *Argumentation. Inquiry and Advocacy*, stipulated that to win a debate, teams have to utilise the following four classes of SC:-

- a) altering the perception of major aspects of analysis (SC1)
- b) altering the perceptions of the advocates (SC2)
- c) gaining emphasis through adaptation to formal procedures (SC3)
- d) gaining emphasis through adaptation to informal codes of conduct. (SC4)

The prerequisites of winning a PSD are embodied in the SC highlighted by Ziegelmüller & Dause (1975). Therefore the researcher will analyse qualitatively to see if the teams involved in this study have utilised any, or all four, of the SC as proposed by Ziegelmüller & Dause (1975) (**RQ1**). The researcher will also study the implications of using the SC during the debate (**RQ2**).

2.3 The Communication Process

Colin Cherry (1990, p. 3) defined communication as “essentially a social affair and that man has evolved a host of different systems of communication to make social life possible”. The most prominent of these systems would be human speech and language. Whilst animal noises may communicate emotional states, human speech which is complex, is able to convey information about external factors, using a grammatical structure which is acquired. In short, man is able to use speech and language to describe events and ideas that do not necessarily have to cater to his basic needs of survival.

According to Dean and Bryson (1953, p. 10), the communication process begins with the controlling purpose of a speaker and ending in the response of the audience. There are two principles for effective communication. Firstly, it has to be known exactly what is being tried to accomplish in writing, speaking and listening. Second is to remember the audience and what must be communicated to them in order to accomplish the purpose.

Dean and Byrson (1953, p. 23) go on to say that communication has to be more than the study of language itself because communication is more than just about language. Communication can be considered a two way social process in which each individual has to function effectively.

Adler, Rossenfeld and Towne (1995, p. 2) state that communication is the largest single factor determining what kinds of relationship the speaker makes with others and what happens to him in the world about him. How this person survives is largely dependent on his communication skills. The goal of the speaker would be to attain communicative competence and even more so if the language that he is using is not his own.

2.4 Communicative Competence

Communicative competence, first coined by Dell Hymes (1967, 1972), is the ability to include knowledge of social and cultural norms and rules of speaking that underlies language use and an individual's ability to realize it in actual speech (as cited in Yo, 2006, p. 350). In other words, what a speaker needs to know in order to be communicatively competent in a speech community.

Henry Widdowson (1978) states that communicative competence is not a compilation of items in memory but a set of strategies or creative procedures for realizing the value of linguistic elements in contexts use, an ability to make sense as a participant in discourse, whether spoken or written, by the skillful deployment of shared knowledge of code resources and rules of language rules (as cited in Brown, 2000, p. 248).

Savignon (1983) notes that communicative competence is relative, not absolute, and depends on the cooperation of all the participants involved (as cited in Brown 2000, p. 227). Savignon (1983) also goes on to say that communicative competence is important for it is the ability to function in a truly communicative setting, which is a spontaneous transaction involving one or more persons (Savignon, 1983, p. 9).

2.4.1 Communicative Competence – Four Components

Canale and Swain's (1980) , and later in Canale (1983), definition of communicative competence is made up of four different components; two components reflect the use of the linguistic system – grammatical competence and discourse competence; and the other two define the functional aspects of communication – sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence.

2.4.1.1 Grammatical Competence

Grammatical competence is that aspect of communicative competence that covers “knowledge of lexical items and rules of morphology, syntax, sentence – grammar semantics and phonology” (Canale & Swain 1980, p. 29). Færch, Haasttrup and Philipson (1984, p. 168) stress that grammatical competence, or linguistic competence as they

termed it, in no way represents an alternative or counterpart to communicative competence as it is impossible to conceive of a person being communicatively competent without being grammatically, or linguistically competent.

2.4.1.2 Discourse Competence

“Discourse competence is the complement of grammatical competence in many ways” (Brown, 2000, p. 228). Discourse competence is the ability to connect sentences in stretches of discourse and to form a meaningful whole out of a series of utterances. It is the link between language competence and actual language use in specific situations. It accounts for the speaker’s capacity to act by means of language in ways which are appropriate to their communication intentions, to the context in which they communicate, both written and verbal, and to the discourse into which their verbal contributions fit (Færch et al, 1984, p. 168).

2.4.1.3 Sociolinguistic Competence

This component is the mastery of the socio-cultural code of language use as in an appropriate use of vocabulary, register, politeness and style in a given situation. According to Savignon (1983, p. 37), this competence requires an understanding of the social context in which

language is used: the role of the participants, the information they share, and the function of the interaction.

2.4.1.4 Strategic Competence

Canale and Swain (1980, p. 30) describe strategic competence as the “verbal and non-verbal communication that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or due to insufficient competence”. Savignon (1983, p. 40) states that strategic competence is strategies that one uses to compensate for imperfect knowledge of rules – or limiting factors in their application such as fatigue, distractions and inattention. In other words, it is the competence underlying one’s ability to make repairs, to cope with imperfect knowledge, and to sustain communication through “paraphrase, circumlocution, repetition, hesitation, avoidance and guessing, as well as shifts in register and style” (Brown, 2000, p. 228).

Swain (1984) amended the earlier notion of strategic competence to include “communication strategies that may be called into action, either to enhance the effectiveness of communication or to compensate for breakdowns”. Similarly, Yule and Taron (1990) refer to strategic competence as “an ability to select an effective means of performing a communicative act that enables the listener or reader to identify the intended referent” (as cited in Brown, 2000, p. 228). In short, according to

Brown (2000, p. 228), strategic competence is the way we manipulate language in order to meet communicative goals.

However, though strategies are largely compensatory, Lyle Bachman (1990) broadened the theoretical model for viewing strategic competence to include non-compensatory behaviours (as cited in Cohen, 1996). In Bachman's model, there is an assessment component where the speakers set communication goals; a planning component, where they retrieve the relevant items from their competence and plan their use; and an execution component where they implement the plan. After the activity, the speaker may perform an assessment to evaluate the extent the communication goal was achieved.

Cohen (1996) states that non-native speakers may make different use of the components in Bachman's model, which includes meta-cognitive strategies for assessing language needed to perform the given tasks; cognitive strategies for selecting appropriate language structures; strategies for executing the plan; and finally post-task assessment strategies; when performing specific communication tasks to avoid violating any socio-cultural conventions.

Since communication may be regarded as a combination of acts, a series of elements with purpose and intent, careful consideration of the purpose is a necessary step in preparation of any communication. A debating team's motive is to sway the audience, especially the

adjudicators, in their favour, so they need to ensure that the audience is favourable towards their arguments.

Real time interaction, as in debating, is a cognitively and linguistically demanding task. Participants have to deal with multiple things during the process of coding and decoding messages (Koprowski, 2004, p. 6). To offset this ‘handicap’, debaters who have to debate in a language that is not their own may tap into their linguistic competence to employ any number of communication strategies to achieve their communicative goals.

2.5 Communication Strategies (CS)

CS are not exclusive to non-native speakers of a language as native speakers sometimes struggle to find the appropriate expression or grammatical construction when attempting to communicate their meaning (Dörnyei, 1995; Faucette, 2001).

When learners cannot find the word or expression needed, the choices open to them are to give up completely, to reduce the original communicative intention, or to try and solve the problem by making creative use of communication resources available (Færch et al., 1984, p. 154). If they choose the third option, then the learners may make use of CS.

Ever since Selinker (1972) coined the term CS to explain the process responsible for interlanguage, there has been no universally accepted definition of CS. The following are several attempts at defining CS.

“A systematic attempt by the learner to express or decode meaning in the target language (TL), in situations where the appropriate systematic TL rules have not been formed” (Tarone, Frauenfelder and Selinker, 1976; Tarone, Cohen & Dumas, 1976)*

“A conscious attempt to communicate the learner’s thought when the interlanguage structures are inadequate to convey that thought” (Varadi, 1980; Tarone, 1977; Galven & Campbell, 1979)*

“A working definition of communication strategies is that they are a systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his meaning when faced with some difficulty. Difficulty in this definition is taken to refer uniquely to the speakers inadequate command of the language used in the interaction” (Corder, S.P., 1978)*

“Communication strategies are potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in

reaching a particular communicative goal” (Færch & Kasper, 1980)*

“Communication Strategy (CS) – a mutual attempt by two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared. Meaning structures include both linguistic and sociolinguistic structures” (Tarone, E, 1981)*

(* as cited in Færch, C. & Kasper, G. 1983. *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. New York: Longman)

Kasper and Kellerman (1997) summarized all the definitions for CS as being based on the concept of ‘problemacy’. This concept has led to the problem solving strategies that a speaker uses when lacking morphological, lexical or syntactic knowledge. They also noted that CS research has primarily focused on lexical deficiencies within the speaker’s knowledge, since lexical CS are easy to identify (as cited in Wongsawang, 2001, p. 111).

Since this research focuses on communication problems faced by debaters in a debating tournament, the working definition for CS will be the one offered by Corder (1981) – “a systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his [or her] meaning when faced with difficulty” (as cited in Dörnyei, 1995, p. 56).

Along with the definitions, various taxonomies have been proposed by Varadi (1973), Tarone , Cohen and Dumas (1976), Corder (1978), Færch and Kasper (1980), Kellerman, Bongaerts and Poullisse (1987), and Dörnyei (1995). Tarone's Interactional Approach, Færch and Kasper's Psycholinguist Approach, Kellermen et al's Archistrategic Approach and Dörnyei's, as well as Celce-Murcia et al's, Compilation Taxonomy will be reviewed.

2.5.1 Tarone's Interactional Approach

Tarone (1981) defined CS as attempts to bridge a gap between the linguistic knowledge of the second language learner, and the linguistic knowledge of the target language interlocutor in real communication situations (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 65). She considers CS as mutual attempts to solve L2 communication problems by participants. When there is communication breakdown, both participants are said to be in a state, or process, of devising a communication strategy to overcome the problem. Since it is a 'joint negotiation of an agreement on meaning' (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 64), it is said to be an interactional effort required to solve a communication problem: hence the 'interactional approach' (APPENDIX C).

Tarone (1981) has divided CS into 3 types: Paraphrase, Borrowing and Avoidance.

2.5.1.1 Paraphrase

According to Tarone et al (1976), paraphrase refers to the rewording of the message in an alternate, acceptable target language construction, in order to avoid a more difficult form or construction (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 10). According to Corder (1978), paraphrasing is the art of getting round one's problem with the knowledge that one has, though inelegant, may be successful (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 19).

Tarone (1981) subdivides paraphrase into 3 subsets – approximation, word coinage and circumlocution.

- i) Approximation is a strategy of using another word that means approximately the same, example the term 'new moon' for 'crescent moon'. Both words share enough semantic features with the desired item to satisfy the speaker and the listener will be able to identify what is being meant from the context of the conversation.
- ii) Word coinage occurs when the speaker creatively conjures a word or term to substitute the unknown word or term. For example, one might say 'kung fu bug' to describe the 'praying mantis'.
- iii) Circumlocution is describing the desired word or phrase by using other words to describe the characteristics or elements of the object or action. For example, 'the thing you wear to keep your fingers

and hand warm during winter' for 'gloves' or 'when you argue with the seller for the best price' for 'bargain'.

2.5.1.2 Borrowing

Tarone (1981) subdivides borrowing into 4 strategies – literal translation, language switch, appeal for assistance and mime.

- i) Literal translation occurs when the speaker translates word for word from the native language. For example, 'I story to him about her' for 'I told him about her'. Tarone et al (1976), referred to it as negative transfer from native language because not only is it inappropriate, it is also incorrect. It is a case of thinking in one language and saying it in another via direct translation.
- ii) Language switch takes place when the speaker uses a native word or phrase without bothering to translate. In Malaysia, 'Let's go for *makan*' is commonly used instead of 'Let's go for a meal'. According to Tarone et al (1976), (as cited in Færch & Kasper 1983, p. 11), the reason for language switch could either be linguistic (an attempt to avoid a difficult target language form or one that has not been learned) or social (such as one's desire to fit in with one's peers).
- iii) Appeal for assistance is a direct and explicit request and invitation to the listener to help prevent communication breakdown. The

speaker will ask someone else to supply a word or to check if the term used is correct. Questions like, 'What do you call it?' or 'Is it correct to say...?'

- iv) Mime is the non-verbal version of appeal for assistance. The speaker may use gestures or act out a situation like clutching one's throat and coughing to illustrate choking.

2.5.1.3 Avoidance

Tarone (1981) categorized avoidance under 2 specific strategies: topic avoidance and message abandonment.

- i) Topic avoidance occurs when the speaker tries to talk about concepts for which the target item or structure is not known (Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 63). Tarone et al (1976) elaborate that topic avoidance may take the form of either a change of topic or no verbal response at all. For example, the speaker may avoid discussing or describing what happened the previous day because it calls for past tense inflections (Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 10). In short, the speaker makes a conscious choice not to talk on the subject.
- ii) Message abandonment happens when the speaker gives up in mid utterance. For example, a speaker begins to describe the art of basket weaving but gives up half way when he runs out of words to

describe the process. The speaker does not appeal for assistance. This strategy differs from topic avoidance because the speaker tries but makes no attempt to overcome any communication problems that may come up and just gives up.

2.5.1.4 Feedback on the Interactional Approach

Færch and Kasper (1983, p. 212-213) raised a few issues with regards to Tarone's Interactional Approach.

First, Tarone's definition implies that the speaker and listener are aware simultaneously of a communication problem which they then solve on a cooperative basis.

Tarone unfortunately failed to take into consideration situations involving monologues, as in a debate, where there is no interlocutor and no overt negotiation of meaning.

Secondly, the speaker may make use of communication strategies to solve a communication problem without signaling to his interlocutor, without the cooperative assistance of the interlocutor. An example is when the interactional model is flouted as the speaker just gives up midway through a sentence or conversation.

Third, from the research perspective, Tarone's Interactional Approach implies that the communication problems and the strategies that are used to overcome them are explicit and easily identified by the

researcher. However, it is difficult, for instance, to detect evidence of topic avoidance accurately unless it is in a controlled experiment.

Having raised these issues, Færch and Kasper (1983) offer another taxonomy classified as the Psycholinguistic Approach (APPENDIX D)

2.5.2 The Psycholinguistic Approach

When a speaker wants to express something through a second language but encounters a problem, he resorts to communication strategies. Færch and Kasper (1980) focus on the psychological dimension of what is in the speaker's mind. For Færch and Kasper, when the speaker has a problem, he makes a conscious effort to overcome it. Keeping this in mind, they came up with the following definition.

“As a primary defining criterion of communication strategies, we adopt problem orientedness, and as a secondary criterion, we adopt consciousness”

(Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 31)

Færch and Kasper (1980) realised that there were various problems in defining CS as consciously employed plans because consciousness is perhaps more a matter of degree than of either – or, as is apparent from Tarone, Frauenfelder and Selinker (1976), who distinguished between ‘more’ ‘conscious’ and ‘more’ ‘unconscious’ strategies. Furthermore,

consciousness is clearly not a constant holding for specific types of plans (or parts of plans) across all individuals (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 35). Taking into consideration that speakers may not always be aware of their use of CS, Færch and Kasper (1980) redefined CS as ‘potentially conscious plans to solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communication goal’ (Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 36)

The goal of any speech production is a communication goal. Færch and Kasper (1980) believe that in order to achieve the communication goal, planning and execution are prudent (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 24).

The planning process, the objective of which is to develop a plan which can control the execution phase, is primarily sensitive to the following 3 variables: the communication goal, the communicative resource available to the individual and the assessment of the communication situation (Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 27). It is when the communication resource is insufficient to meet the needs to achieve the communication goal, the speaker may resort to CS.

Individuals will behave in two fundamentally different ways when faced with problems in communication. They will either avoid it or tackle it. If they adopt the avoidance behaviour, they will try to do away with the problem, normally by changing the communication goal. If they choose to

tackle the problem directly by developing an alternative plan, they are said to have adopted the achievement behaviour.

Færch and Kasper (1980) drew a distinction between 2 major types of strategies; reduction strategies governed by avoidance behaviour and achievement strategies, governed by achievement behaviour. According to them, the choice of strategy is not only sensitive to the underlying behaviour (avoidance/achievement) but also to the problem to be solved (Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 36-37).

2.5.2.1 Reduction Strategies

Færch and Kasper (1980) further divided reduction strategies into Formal Reduction Strategies (FRS) and Functional Reduction Strategies (Func. RS)

2.5.2.1.1 Formal Reduction Strategies (FRS)

Learners adopt FRS because they want to avoid making errors and/or they want to increase their fluency (Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 40). The learner may decide to communicate by means of a 'reduced' system, focusing on stable rules and items which have become reasonably well automatized. It is parallel to native speakers who may use a simpler

version of the L1 system when speaking with learners who may have limited linguistic resources (Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 38-39).

The speaker may avoid any linguistic form, whether at the phonological level, the morphological level or at the lexical level. FRS is motivated by the speaker's desire to use the language correctly. According to Blum and Levenstone (1978), FRS at the lexical level may be in the form of topic avoidance or paraphrasing as certain words may be difficult to pronounce (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 42).

2.5.2.1.2 Functional Reduction Strategies (Func. RS)

Func. RS are used if learners experience problems in the planning phase (due to insufficient linguistic resources) or in the execution phase (retrieval problems). By adopting a Func. RS, the learner 'reduces' his communication goal in order to avoid the problem (Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 43).

Færch and Kasper (1983) go on to state that Func RS may affect any of the three elements of a communication goal – actional, modal and propositional. The speaker may avoid certain speech acts, abandon or replace topics and avoid modality markers when unable to perform communicative tasks (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 43).

Func. RS for actional features of communication goals occurs when the speaker experiences the inability to perform communication

tasks which demand other types of speech acts, such as argumentative or directive functions. When the speaker experiences problems in performing a specific speech act as in making his utterances appropriate for politeness, he would adapt modal Func RS. According to Harder (1980) if the ill equipped speaker chooses to attempt the communicative act, he may convey a distorted picture of his personality (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 43-44).

Func. RS of the propositional content comprises strategies such as 'topic avoidance', 'message abandonment' and meaning replacement. According to Færch and Kasper (1980), topic abandonment occurs exclusively in the planning phase as opposed to message abandonment that occurs in the execution phase (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 44).

2.5.2.2 Achievement Strategies

According to Færch and Kasper (1980), by using an achievement strategy, the learner attempts to solve problems in communication by expanding his communicative resources rather than by reducing his communicative goal (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 45).

Færch and Kasper (1980) subdivided achievement strategies into two subtypes – compensatory and retrieval strategies.

2.5.2.2.1 Compensatory Strategies

Færch and Kasper (1980) further subdivide compensatory into 5 subclasses they believe the learner will draw on in trying to solve his planning problem:-

- a) a different code (code switching and interlanguage transfer)
- b) a different code and the IL code simultaneously
(inter/intra transfer)
- c) the IL code exclusively (generalization, paraphrase, word coinage and restructuring)
- d) discourse phenomena (appeal for assistance)
- e) non linguistic devices (mime, gestures)

- a) i) Code switching

Code switching (or ‘language switch’, Tarone, 1977; Corder, 1978; Tarone, et al., 1976) may involve varying stretches of discourse from single words up to complete turns. Corder (1978) stated that when code switching affects single words only, the strategy is sometimes referred to as borrowing (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 46).

- ii) Interlingual transfer

According to Ickenroth (1975), the strategy of interlingual transfer is sometimes referred to as foreignizing whereas Tarone

(1977) describes it as literal translation (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 47)

b) Inter/Intralingual transfer

This strategy occurs when the learner considers the L2 similar to his L1. As Kellerman (1977,1978) and Jordens (1977) discovered, this generalization is influenced by the properties of the corresponding L1 structures. They deduced that Danish learners of English might generalize the regular –ed suffix to irregular verb on the basis of the way verbs in Danish are distributed between the regular and irregular declensional classes.

For example :-

Danish svømme – svømmede (past tense)

English swim – swam

(as cited in Færch & Kasper,1983, p. 47)

c) i) Generalization

By generalization, learners solve problems in the planning phase by filling the ‘gaps’ in their plan with IL items which they would not normally use in such contexts. For example, the learner may use a lexical item to fill a gap in his vocabulary and believes that the substitute will convey his intended meaning (as cited in Færch & Kasper,1983, p. 47 – 48).

ii) Paraphrase

Færch and Kasper (1980) equate paraphrase to description or circumlocution as Tarone (1977) and Varadi (1980) did where the learner focuses on characteristic properties or functions of the intended referent. Færch and Kasper (1980) go on to describe paraphrase as exemplification where the learner uses a hyponymic expression instead of the missing superordinate term (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 49). Example of

a) paraphrasing or circumlocution – ‘face wiping paper ’ for ‘tissue’

b) of exemplification - ‘Kleenex’ for ‘tissue’

iii) Word Coinage

Word coinage strategy involves the learner in a creative construction of a new IL word.

Example , Varadi’s (1980) ‘airball’ for ‘balloon’.

iv) Restructuring

A restructuring strategy is used when the learner realizes halfway through that he cannot complete his intended message and has to start all over. The learner will restructure his plan to try and communicate meaning.

For example, to convey that he has a headache,

“I need to lie down. I have a ... My head is painful. I need to lie down.”

d) Cooperative Strategy

Færch and Kasper (1980) state that if the learner decides to signal his interlocutor that he is experiencing a communicative problem and that he needs assistance, he will make use of the cooperative communication strategy of ‘appealing’.

According to Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977), appeals, which can be categorized as ‘self initiated repairs’, can be either direct or indirect (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 51). In short, when the speaker faces a communication problem, he makes an appeal for assistance and the interlocutor or listener helps to keep the conversation going.

e) Non linguistic strategies

As pointed out by Tarone (1977) and Corder (1978), in face to face communication, learners frequently resort to non linguistic strategies such as mime, gestures and sound imitation (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 52). For example, to describe a train, one might utter ‘choo – choo’.

2.5.2.2.2 Retrieval Strategies

In executing a plan, learners may have difficulties in retrieving specific IL items and may adopt achievement strategies in order to get the problematic item. This phenomenon has been studied by Glahn (as cited in Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 52), who concluded that the learners who participated in the task immediately realized whether they did or did not possess a term in French. In some cases they knew that the term was there, and they had to retrieve it in some way. The following are six retrieval strategies that were identified in the experiment:-

- i) waiting for the term to appear
- ii) appeal for formal similarity
- iii) retrieval via semantic fields
- iv) searching via other languages
- v) retrieval from learning situations , and
- vi) sensory procedures.

2.5.2.3 Feedback on the Psycholinguistic Approach

Færch and Kasper (1980) presented a typology on communication strategies within a framework of speech production. Their typology suggests that the learner experiences a problem because his Interlanguage

(IL) system lacks the appropriate item (planning phase) or there is a retrieval of fluency problem (execution phase).

When Færch and Kasper (1983) established that a speaker may resort to CS in a monologue, as opposed to Tarone's Interactional Approach, others like Dörnyei (1995) and Celce-Murcia et al (1995) have gone on to include stalling strategies (use of filler and hesitation devices) and self monitoring strategies (self initiated repair, self rephrasing) in their taxonomies.

Dörnyei (1995) justifies the inclusions based on the premise that Færch and Kasper's (1983) criteria of CS are 'problem oriented' and 'conscious'. Therefore 'filled pauses' which Færch and Kasper (1983) had initially labeled as 'temporal variables' are instead CS as they may function to help the speaker consciously solve a communication problem, both in the planning and execution phase.

However, before going on to discuss further on other product oriented typologies, the following typology is one that focuses on the cognitive processes used by L2 learners in selecting a CS. The typology conceptualized by the Nijmegen University Group in 1987 offers an insight into the area.

2.5.3 The Archstrategic Approach

Kellerman et al (1984) in a survey of literature on L2 communication strategies found that much effort had gone into constructions of descriptive taxonomies of the means which L2 users resort to in their attempts to overcome their lexical problems. They argued that the taxonomies that were based on Tarone (1977) or Færch and Kasper (1980) were rather long confusing lists of strategies that needed to be simplified. Furthermore, they noticed that the focus of the existing taxonomies were preoccupied with surface features of learners' utterances, as in being product oriented, rather than with processes leading to such utterances (as cited in Bongeaerts and Poullisse, 1989, p. 254).

Kellerman et al (1987) proposed as an alternative a two strategy taxonomy which reflected differences in the process of referential communication. The two strategies were the conceptual strategy and the linguistic strategy.

The conceptual strategy entails analysis and manipulation of the concept. With the conceptual strategy, two subtypes can be distinguished: holistic and analytic. When the language user adopts a holistic strategy, he or she names a referent, which is similar to or reminiscent of the target referent, example 'chair' for 'stool' (Bongeaerts and Poullisse, 1989, p. 255). In Tarone (1977), the holistic strategy would be similar to

approximation whereas in Færch and Kasper (1980) it would be exemplification (as cited in Færch & Kasper,1983).

The analytic strategy, which entails specifying characteristic features of the concept is similar to that of Tarone's (1977) circumlocution (as cited in Dörnyei, 1995, p. 58).

The second strategy available to the speaker is the linguistic strategy where the speaker exploits or manipulates his or her knowledge of the native language, the target language or any other language and his or her insights into the correspondences between these rule systems (Bongearts and Poulisse, 1989, p. 255).

This strategy is divided into 2 subtypes – morphology creativity and transfer. Dörnyei (1995) equates morphology creativity to grammatical word coinage (Dörnyei, 1995:58). As for transfer, it has been termed as literal translation and borrowing by Tarone (1977) (as cited in Færch & Kasper,1983, p. 62).

Despite being promoted as a process oriented taxonomy, the Archistrategies Approach (APPENDIX E) by the Nijmegen Group, contains certain similarities and overlaps with the Interactional Approach as pointed out above.

Based on the performance data of this research, the researcher will go on to examine Dörnyei's CS Compilation based on Traditional Conceptualizations to study if it may be used as a basic guideline to examine and identify CS used in the debates.

2.5.4. Dörnyei's CS Compilation following Traditional Conceptualizations

In the *TESOL Quarterly* (1995), Zoltan Dörnyei published a CS taxonomy based on the traditional conceptualizations (APPENDIX F) established by Varadi (1973), Tarone (1977), Færch and Kasper (1983) and Bialystok (1990) in an article called '*On the Teachability of Communication Strategies*'.

Dörnyei chose Corder's (1981) definition of CS that is 'a systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his [or her] meaning when faced with some difficulty' as it was in accordance with Canale and Swain's (1980) as well as Færch and Kasper's (1983) conceptualization which posits problem orientedness and systematicness or consciousness as central features of CS (Dörnyei, 1995, p. 56). Dörnyei limited the scope of communication strategies (CS) as devices speakers use when they have difficulties in verbalizing a mental plan for lack of linguistic resources (Dörnyei, 1995, p. 57).

Dörnyei (1995) listed 12 strategies which he subdivided into 3 categories:-

1. Avoidance or Reduction Strategies
2. Achievement or Compensatory Strategies
3. Stalling or Time Gaining Strategies.

2.5.4.1 Avoidance or Reduction Strategies

Under this category, Dörnyei listed message abandonment and topic avoidance. These two strategies involved either an alteration, a reduction or total abandonment of the intended message.

- i) Message abandonment – leaving a message unfinished because of language difficulty.
- ii) Topic Avoidance – avoiding topic area or concepts which pose language difficulties.

2.5.4.2 Achievement or Compensatory Strategies

According to Dörnyei, the listed achievement or compensatory strategies offer alternative plans for speakers to carry out their original communication goal by manipulating available language, thus compensating some how for their language deficiencies. Even strategies suggested by the Nijmegen Group – Kellerman et al (1984), fall under this category.

- a) Circumlocution (similar to analytic strategies, a subdivision of conceptual strategies by Kellerman et al, 1984) – describing or exemplifying the target object or action. Example, ‘paper used to wipe face’ for ‘tissue’.

- b) Approximation (similar to holistic strategies, a subdivision of conceptual strategies by Kellerman et al, 1984) – using an alternative term which expresses the meaning of the target lexical item as closely as possible. Example, ‘boat’ to describe ‘yacht’.
- c) Word coinage – creating non-existing L2 word based on a supposed rule. Example, ‘vegetarianist’ for vegetarian.
- d) Literal translation – translating literally a lexical item, an idiom, a compound word or structure from L1 to L2. Example, ‘I want to story about her’ from ‘*Saya nak cerita tentang dia*’.
- e) Foreignizing – using L1 word by adjusting in to L2 phonologically and/or morphologically. Example, ‘I am *lepaking*’ for ‘I am loitering’.
- f) Code switching- using a L1 word with L1 pronunciation or a L3 word with L3 pronunciation in L2. Example, ‘Let’s *makan*’ for ‘Let’s eat’.
- g) Appeal for help – turning to the conversation partner for help, either directly (e.g. ‘What do you call...?’) or indirectly (e.g. rising intonation, pause, eye contact, puzzled expression).
- h) Use of non linguistic means – mime, gesture, facial expression or sound imitation.
- i) Use of all purpose words - extending a general, empty lexical item to context where specific words are lacking. Examples, the overuse of lexical items like ‘stuff’, ‘thingy’ or phrases like ‘you know’.

This strategy is similar to overgeneralization (Tarone, 1977) and Dörnyei has focused on the lexical manifestation of this strategy.

2.5.4.3 Stalling or Time Gaining Strategies

According to Dörnyei, these strategies do not actually compensate for any linguistic deficiencies but rather to gain time and to keep the communication channels open at times of difficulty.

Strategies like the use of fillers (words or gambits used to fill pauses), hesitation devices (to gain time to think) are, according to Hatch (1978), used to show the native speaker that they are really trying (as cited in Dörnyei, 1995, p. 159). Dörnyei included hesitation devices and fillers as they are conscious means to sustain communication in the face of difficulty.

Færch and Kasper (1980, p. 214) considered filled pauses and hesitation pauses as temporal variables of speech performances rather than CS. However, using Færch and Kasper's definition where 'problem orientedness' and 'consciousness' are criteria for CS, Dörnyei was able to justify that hesitation devices and fillers were CS. Both are used consciously and by the speaker to rectify a communication problem.

2.5.5 Communication Strategies according to Celce-Murcia et al (1995)

More strategies were introduced when Dörnyei, along with Celce Murcia, M. and Thurrel, S. published *Communicative Competence: A Pedagogical Motivated Model with Content Specifications* in 'Issues in Applied Linguistics' Vol 6, No2: 5 – 35 in 1995 (Inozuka, 2001, p. 7).

Celce-Murcia et al (1995) went on to include the following categories:- (Only the new terms are listed as the rest overlap with the components of Tarone's (1977) taxonomy and Dörnyei's (1995) compilation) (APPENDIX G).

- a) Avoidance and Reduction Strategies
 - i) Message replacement (when speaker changes the topic and picks up another line of conversation in which they are more interested).
- b) Achievement or Compensatory Strategies
 - i) Restructuring (e.g. The bus was very...there were a lot of people in it.)
 - ii) Retrieval (e.g. bro...bron...bronze)
- c) Stalling /Time Gaining Strategies
 - i) Repetition of self.
 - ii) Repetition of others.

- d) Self Monitoring Strategies
 - i) Self initiated repair (e.g. I mean...)
 - ii) Self rephrasing (e.g. This is for students...pupils...when you're at school).
- e) Interactional Strategies
 - i) Requests
 - a) Repetition request – (e.g. Pardon? Could you say that again, please?)
 - b) Clarification Request – (e.g. What do you mean by...)
 - c) Confirmation Request – (e.g. Did you say...)
 - ii) Expressions of non-understanding
 - a) Verbal (e.g. Sorry, I'm not sure I understand)
 - b) Non – verbal (raised eyebrows, blank look)
 - iii) Interpretive Summary

Example, 'You mean.../So what you're saying is....
 - iv) Responses

Repetition, rephrasing, expansion, reduction, confirmation, rejection and repair.
 - v) Comprehension checks
 - a) Whether the interlocutor can follow you (e.g. Am I making sense?)

- b) Whether what you said was correct or grammatical
(e.g. Can I/you say that ?)
- c) Whether the interlocutor is listening (e.g. on the phone, ‘Are you still there?’)
- d) Whether the interlocutor can hear you.

(as cited in Inozuka, 2001, p. 7 – 9)

2.5.5.1 Feedback on the Compilation following Traditional Conceptualizations

As Bialystok (1990) remarked, when the differences in terminology are stripped away, a core group of specific strategies that appear consistently across taxonomies clearly emerges (as cited in Dörnyei, 1995, p. 57).

The list compiled by Dörnyei is made up of CS from Varadi (1973), Tarone (1977), Færch and Kasper (1983) and Bialystok (1990). When looking at the taxonomies, there are clear overlaps. For example, Tarone (1977) used the term *Avoidance Strategies* whereas Færch and Kasper (1983) used *Functional Reduction Strategies*. Both have listed message abandonment and topic avoidance as subgroups.

All inclusions in the list proposed by Celce-Murcia et al (1995) mimicked the rationale that Dörnyei used, as in strategies used were conscious efforts to solve a communicative problem.

2.5.6 Significance to the Study

When debaters have to use a language that is not their own to articulate their ideas, they are bound to face difficulties expressing themselves. As Varadi (1980) stated, the user will resort to certain devices as he, or she, tries to communicate in the target language. In this case, these devices are CS.

The five taxonomies reviewed in the chapter will be analysed and used to structure a taxonomy for this study (please refer to Chapter 3, Section 3.3) as done by Inozuka (2001), Scattergood (2003) and Faucette (2001) for their respective studies.

This taxonomy will then be used to tabulate the frequency and identify the functions of each type of CS used during the debate (RQ3). Qualitatively, this researcher will work to establish the relationship between the frequency of CS employed and the outcome of the debates in this case study (RQ4)

2.6 Conclusion

This research attempts to understand the role of SC in winning a debate as well as to identify the various CS used by debaters to get their arguments across and win the debate.

The following chapter will discuss the method and instruments used in the data collection process as well as the taxonomy of choice for the current research.