
A REVIEW OF COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES EMPLOYED BY ASIAN ENGLISH SPEAKERS

Bakhtawar Halepoto

Independent Researcher & English Language Teacher,
School Education and Literacy Department, Government of Sindh,
Sindh, Pakistan
Email: bhalepoto9@gmail.com

Sadaf Fatima

MS Applied Linguistics,
Lecturer, Department of English, Federal Urdu University of Arts, Sciences & Technology,
Sindh, Pakistan
Email: sadaffatimaa1@gmail.com

Sana Bint-e-Javaid

Lecturer English,
Department of Business Administration, Salim Habib University,
Sindh, Pakistan.
Email: sanabintejavaid29@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper covers the far-reaching view of research and development in communication strategies (CSs) over the years and confines to the Asian region. For this review, the empirical and non-empirical research papers from 1970-2022 were reviewed to identify the CSs employed by Asian English speakers and the frequency of use of these CSs. The review shows that Asian English speakers use strategies such as paraphrasing, compensation, avoidance strategies and others. Hence, avoidance strategies are found to be the most frequent. Studies from English as a second language (ESL) and foreign language countries have been reviewed considering the Asian context. Moreover, the review revealed that CSs used by Asian English speakers are similar to native speakers. However, ESL speakers use more strategies than native English speakers. Another perspective identified is that using CSs is unconscious among novice English language learners. Furthermore, the review indicates that English language learners naturally use various CSs, but they are unaware of how to use them effectively. Hence, it is suggested to incorporate the teaching of CSs in English language pedagogy to inform English language learners about the correct use of CSs.

KEYWORDS

Communication strategies, Globalization, English language teaching, Asian English speakers

INTRODUCTION

Globalization has dramatically impacted the number of non-native speakers in the world in the last few decades, and today, non-native speakers have outnumbered native speakers (Smokotin, Alekseyenko & Petrova, 2014). Moreover, intelligibility is vital in communication between speakers of different first languages (L1). However, learners employ various CSs unconsciously to communicate effectively. Many researchers perceived CSs as an individual and mental process. Moreover, at the beginning of the prior work, the CSs were significantly identified in the second language domain, generally more than English as a second language (Bjorkman, 2014). Hence, with the advancement in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) study and the development of non-native English language corpora, various lexical and syntactical patterns of English language use in a non-native context have been identified. Research showed that these features should not be comprehended as incompetency of language but should be seen as the innovations of the new varieties (Jenkins, Cogo, & Dewey, 2011). The view of English language standardization has also been changed, and now the focus is shifted to English as Foreign (EFL) and Second Language (ESL) (Kachru, 1985).

Communication strategies, as defined by Dornyei & Scott (1997), are “A plan of action to accomplish a communication goal; the enhancement of communication effect is certainly such a goal” (p. 179). According to Canale (1983), CSs are any endeavour to develop an effective communication platform. In a study done on the students of Indonesia analysing the CSs used by these students, the results showed that the most frequent strategies used were “time-gaining” and “repetition” (Kalisa, 2019). Kalisa (2019) also informed that using certain CSs depends on the kind of tasks students are engaged in. Moreover, it was identified that the speaker needs to achieve ‘strategic competence’ to benefit from specific communication strategies. It is related to a speaker's competence to use these strategies effectively. On the other hand, Tarone (1981) examined the difficulty in identifying the role of consciousness in using communication strategies. Further, it is encapsulated that if there was any role of consciousness, then it would be difficult for previous definitions to justify the concept of communicative strategies. Therefore, it is necessarily suitable to avoid dealing with a degree of consciousness in the use of communication strategies. Tarone (1981) has also quoted a personal account of understanding communicative strategies, indicating the issue for learners to understand the method of utilizing these strategies with the limited knowledge they have of a particular context. He also divulged a contrasting concept that communicative strategies are not a constituent of learners’ knowledge of

the target language; rather, it is the description of how they use these strategies (Tarone, 1981). Selinker coined the term Communication Strategies. Initially, the function of CSs was to help second language learners to communicate and accommodate their weaknesses (Ellis, 2008). However, the CSs researchers indicated CS to be one solution to the many difficulties in second language communication (Jamshidnejad, 2011). Some linguists defined communication from two perspectives: *transactional and interactional*. The transactional perspective is related to the meaning, and the interactional perspective is related to maintaining social relations (Brown & Yule, 1983; Yule, 1997). The former approach was proposed by Tarone (1980), identifying communicative strategies as the tool to negotiate meaning among speakers who appear to achieve a communicative goal.

In contrast, the latter approach links to the second language speakers who use communicative strategies as a tool to meet communicative needs and compensate for overcoming difficulties in communication (Jamshidnejad, 2011). Dornyei (1995) proposed a relatively similar concept to the interactional approach, and he indicated that Communicative strategies are a tool to process communication. In addition, speakers use stalling strategies while a pause to continue the communication channel. Dornyei & Scott (1995) further described the concept as the use of CSs while attending to any difficulty related to language use, and also exclaims as the key phenomenon that covers all second language-related problem-management aspects of communications (Dornyei & Scott, 1997).

Including this, the paradigm shift in the English language standardization and variation after Kachru's Concentric Model led to the development of traditional English Language teaching theories, and the focus shifted to the cultural identities of second language learners (Chan, 2021). Nevertheless, the use of English became more specific to respective contexts. The English language is now viewed as more than a contact language, and the use of English has increased in many domains of world communication which also impacts the purpose of utilizing various CSs. Hence, most of the studies have investigated CSs either at ESL or EFL level but not specifically as Asian English speakers. Therefore, this paper allows researchers to gain a comprehensive overview of the basic concept of communication strategies used in the Asian region including ESL/EFL countries, and develop an overarching understanding concerning the research questions of the paper.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Taxonomy of Communication Strategies

The literature has significantly shown a difference between language devices and taxonomies of communication strategies. Since the focus of this paper is based on communications strategies, therefore, only some of the taxonomies of CSs are

discussed. The early characterization of Willems (1987) is based on Achievement/Compensatory strategies and Reduction strategies that rely on productive and receptive processes. He proposed the possibility that the speakers' CSs might be based on their L1. Moreover, the CSs may include the paralinguistic aspect of communication, performing different explicit or implicit functions such as help or request (Willems, 1987). Likewise, Kellerman (1991) believed that the psychological aspect should be counted while studying communication strategies, therefore, suggested three conditions be incorporated when developing taxonomies of communication strategies: *psychological* - learners should be familiar with the cognitive and problem-solving aspects of language production, *parsimony* - the learners should be provided with a simplified framework of communication strategies, and *generalizable* - the strategies should not be based on certain tasks; they should have a generalized approach towards all languages, linguistics features, and items. In addition to this, there should not be any formal or informal contextual differences, and strategies should not depend on whether the learning takes place inside or outside the classroom.

In Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy, firstly, they classified the CSs on a "problem-management process" that focuses on how speakers would solve the interactional difficulties to enhance mutual understanding. In the extended version of their taxonomy, three categories have been identified: *interactional* - involves the approach to carry out tasks collectively with mutual understanding, participants employ strategies to ask for help or assistance, *indirect* - does not primarily involve a problem-solving approach and convey meaning indirectly through attaining understanding with a peer, and *direct strategies* - involve compensating and manageable approach of conveying meaning with alternative, circumlocution or modifying the word (Dornyei & Scott, 1997). In addition to this, Poulisse (1993) proposed that Bialystok's (1990) taxonomy does not sufficiently incorporate the aspects of speech processing followed by the adaptation process model of L2 (Levelt, 1989 as cited in Dornyei & Scott, 1997). However, Poulisse's extended taxonomy includes three categories of communication strategies: *substitution strategy* - incorporates the omission method or changing the forms of the lexical item to form a new one and also includes code-switching method, *substitution plus strategies* - foreignizing the structures by employing unusual morphological and phonological production of L1 and L2, and *reconceptualization* - use of periphrasis in a message to change its structure (Poulisse, 1993). Later on, Bjorkman (2014) presented a framework consisting of two broad categories: *self-initiated CSs and other-initiated CSs*. Self-initiated CSs are where speakers initiate the use of CSs, whereas, Other-initiated CSs are where another speaker shares the need for communicative clarity.

Chamot (1987) and Oxford (1990) stated that further differentiation of language learning and use of strategies could be done based on *Affective* - strategies that help

regulate emotions, motivation, and a positive attitude, *Social* - require learners to socialize, and ask native speakers questions to increase communication, *Cognitive* - Identification, storage, retention, or restoring the words and different factors of the second language, and *Metacognitive* - requires preplanning and pre-assessment, making plans and assessment associated with language learning and language use events. These techniques permit beginners to have a whole command of self-cognition via ways of coordinating the mastering procedure through preparation, organization, and evaluation.

Effectiveness and Theoretical Approach of Communication Strategies

The term “Communication Strategies” was incorporated primarily into the second language learning domain to enhance the effectiveness of second language teaching and was considered one of the processes fundamental to second language learning (Selinker, 1972). The notion of CSs began to rise in the 1970s with the increasing problems of communication in the second language that resulted from inadequate resources among second-language speakers and their communicative needs (Dornyei & Scott, 1997). Hence, the studies under CSs mainly focus on the solutions to communication hindrances (Mursyid, Kafryawan & Rahmawansyah, 2021). A study based on CSs’ training shows students perform better when trained to use the CS while oral communication (Rachmawaty et. al, 2021). However, the analysis of the second language (L2) communication discourse of learners showed the great importance of communicative strategies in second language communication (Gass & Varonis, 1991, as cited in Dornyei & Scott, 1997). As CSs are an ongoing research topic and further developments have taken place in recent decades, the area also possesses various controversies that have led to the emergence of distinct definitions of CSs (Dornyei & Scott, 1997). The first published definition was given by Tarone (1977). Later on, he also identified the taxonomy that inculcates the fundamentals of communicative strategies (Tarone, 1977, as cited in Dornyei & Scott, 1997). Furthermore, Selinker (1972) states the concept of “Interlanguage,” where he introduced the notion of communication strategies. His study incorporates “Interlanguage” as a form of language that is developed when the speaker is not aware of certain features of the target language and has difficulty communicating effectively. If presented in his words, could be the difference in linguistic phenomenon between the native speaker of a language and its target learner (Selinker, 1972). In addition to this, his study then shifted to the concept of ‘strategy’ and depicted its importance in second language learning by pointing out the dependence of strategies on its culture (Seliniker, 1972). Moreover, Tarone (1981) identifies that CSs are used between dialects where there is a gap between the listener’s and speaker’s semantic and linguistic system. On the contrary, among native speakers, the use of CSs will be different. It will mainly be comprised of lexical items and for pronouns’ clarification. However, in interlanguage, the strategies are mainly comprised of the morphological, syntactic, and phonological

aspects (Tarone, 1981) which indicates that communications strategies used by native speakers will be different from CS used by ESL/EFL speakers. Moreover, he also talked about two other strategies: *Production strategies* (Language use but lack the focus on meaning) and *Learning strategies* (developing the competence of the social and linguistic system of one's language) (Tarone, 1981).

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To explore the CSs employed by Asian English speakers.
2. To identify the frequently used CSs employed by Asian English speakers.
3. To investigate the factors affecting the choice of CSs.
4. To analyse the importance of CSs in English language teaching in the globalized world.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What are the CSs employed by Asian English speakers?
2. What are the frequently used CSs employed by Asian English speakers?
3. What are the factors affecting the choice of CSs?
4. What is the importance of CSs in English language teaching in the globalized world?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This article is a systematic review paper. For this review, empirical and non-empirical papers were identified through various electronic databases, including Taylors and Francis, Elsevier, and Summon Discovery 2.0. Moreover, book chapters were reviewed under Longman, Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, and John Benjamin's publication. Most of the research papers identified ~~are~~ originated from Malaysia, Philippines, China, Iran, Japan, Indonesia, and other Asian countries - other than pioneer studies. Then, themes were generated based on various foci of empirical studies. Furthermore, the sampling of the paper was confined to the pioneer studies in the field of CSs and studies carried out in the Asian context. Total of 56 papers were reviewed including research papers, reviews, and book chapters. However, half of them are categorized under various themes generated via research questions as follows:

Table 1. Theme-based Categorization of the Articles Reviewed

Theme	Author/Title
	Aziz, A. A. (2017). Agreement Strategies Among Malaysian Chinese Speakers of English.
	Björkman, B. (2014). An analysis of polyadic English as a lingua franca (ELF) speech: A communicative strategies framework

**CSs Employed by
Asian English
speakers**

Dornyei, Zoltan. (1995). On the Teachability of Communication Strategies.

Jamshidnejad, A. (2011). Functional approach to communication strategies: An analysis of language learners' performance in interactional discourse.

Lee, J. S. (1970, January 1). A conversation analysis of self-repair in Asian englishes: Semantic scholar. Undefined.

Tarone, E. (1981). Some Thoughts on the Notion of Communication Strategy.

Valentine, T. M. (1994). Agreeing and disagreeing in Indian English discourse: Implications for language teaching.

Williams, Jessica, Inscoc, Rebecca, Tasker, Thomas, (1997). CSs in an interactional context: the mutual achievement of comprehension

Franceschi, V. (2019). *Enhancing explicitness in BELF interactions: Self-initiated CSs in the Workplace*.

Syafryadin, S., Martina, F., & Salniwati, S. (2020). *Compensation strategies in speaking activities for non-English ... Compensation strategies in speaking activities for non-English department students: Poor and competent speakers*

Hajhashemi, K. (2017). *Compensation still matters: Language learning strategies ... Compensation Still Matters: Language Learning Strategies in Third Millennium ESL Learners*.

Bialystok, E. (1983). Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies

Corrales, O. & Call, M. (2008). At a Loss for Words: The Use of CSs to Convey Lexical Meaning.

Faerch, Claus & Kasper, G. (1984). Two ways of defining communication strategies.

Transfer as a Communication Strategy	Palmberg, R. (1979). Investigating Communication Strategies. PARIBAKHT, T. (1985). Strategic Competence and Language Proficiency. Poulisse, N & Schils, E. (1989). The influence of task- and proficiency-related factors on the use of compensatory strategies: A quantitative analysis. Tarone, E. (1983). Teaching Strategic Competence in the Foreign Language Classroom. Yarmohammadi, L. & Seif, S. (1992). More on Communication Strategies: Classification, Resources, Frequency and Underlying Processes.
Importance of CSs in Teaching English in the Globalized World	Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy Chan, J. Y. H. (2021). Bridging the gap between ELF and L2 learners' use of communication strategies: Rethinking current L2 assessment and teaching practices. KAUR, J. (2010). Achieving mutual understanding in world Englishes. Kellerman, E. (1991). Compensatory strategies in second language research: A critique, a revision, and some implications for the classroom Richards, Jack C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (2nd ed.). Maleki, A. (2007). Teachability of communication strategies: An Iranian experience. Thi, N. & Thu, K. (2016). Oral English CSs among Vietnamese Non-majors of English at Intermediate Level Aljohani, N. J. & Hanna, B. E. (2021) 'I do not know what's that word in English, but I will

	tell you about my cousin': EFL learners' CSs in online oral discussion tasks Su, Ya-Chen. (2021). College Students' Oral Communication Strategy Use, Self-perceived English Proficiency and Confidence, and Communication Anxiety in Taiwan's EFL Learning. Chan (2021) Bridging the gap between ELF and L2 learners' use of communication strategies: Rethinking current L2 assessment and teaching practices Behroozian, Ghafoori and Ahangari (2021), EFL Teachers' and Students' Perceptions about CSs Teachability
Taxonomy of CSs	Chamot, A. U. (1987). The learning strategies of ESL students. Oxford, R. L. (1990). Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know. Dörnyei, Zoltan, Scott, Mary Lee, 1997. CSs in a second language: definitions and taxonomies Poulisse, Nanda. (1993). A Theoretical Account of Lexical Communication Strategies Willems, G. M. (1987). CSs and their significance in foreign language teaching
Factors Affecting the Use of CSs	Fernández Dobao, A. M. (2002). The Effect of Language Proficiency on Communication [Communication] Strategy Use: A Case Study of Galician Learners of English. Paramasivam, S. (2009). Language Transfer as a Communication Strategy and a Language Learning Strategy in a Malaysian ESL Classroom. Muhtarom & Masykuriyah, (2019) Speaking Strategies Used by the Junior High School Students with Different Level of Speaking Ability Chan, Jim. Y. H. (2021). Bridging the gap between ELF and L2 learners' use of

	communication strategies: Rethinking current L2 assessment and teaching practices.
Frequency of Use of CSs and Factors Affecting the Choice of CSs	Lin, W. (2011). Communicative Strategies in Second Language Acquisition A Study of Chinese English Learners' Attitude and Reported Frequency of Communicative Strategies.
	Lewandowska, E. (2019) English as a lingua franca: an overview of communicative strategies
	Thảo, P. & Huang, C.-P. (2010). Exploring Factors Affecting the Use of Oral Communication Strategies
	Kim Hua, Mohd Nor, Jaradat (2012) CSs Among EFL Students - An Examination Of Frequency Of Use And Types Of Strategies Used
	Putri (2013) CSs in English as a Second Language (ESL) Context
Effectiveness and Theoretical Approach of CSs	Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage.
	Mursyid, Kafryawan and Rahmawansyah (2021) CSs Used by Papuan EFL Students
	Rachmawaty et. al (2021) Oral CSs Training: The Case of Pre-Service English Teachers in Indonesia

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

1-Communication strategies employed by Asian English speakers

The following list of communication strategies does not depict the final categorization of all existing CSs. However, it indicates the strategies used by Asian English speakers.

Table 2: CSs Employed by Asian English Speakers

Types		Definition
Paraphrase	Approximation	It uses vocabulary words so simple that they are not quite correct, but their meaning is nearly close to that of the target word (Franceschi, 2019). Competent, as well as poor speakers, use such strategies to bridge the

		communication gap while speaking (Syafryadin et al., 2020)
Word Coinage		It is the creation of a new term which occasionally needs the reorganization of the word's grammatical context, as in <i>increasive</i> for <i>increase</i> . Newly coined verbs may also improve intelligibility because they are both based on common words that the other participant may be more familiar with (Franceschi, 2019).
Circumlocution		It refers to the use of words indirectly rather than coming to the actual point (Lewandowska, 2019). In this aspect, the learner describes objects with characterized features and qualities without using Target Language (TL) Tarone, E. (1981). Speakers help to improve clarity and facilitate comprehension by using the marker to direct the listener's attention to the upcoming information and by changing or adding information (Franceschi, 2019).
Borrowing	Literal translation	The speaker gives out a literal translation of a sentence from his native tongue.
	Language switch	The speaker doesn't feel the need to translate and uses the word as it is in his native language.
	Appeal for Assistance	The speaker seeks help using the right word.
	Mime	The speaker uses the support of actions to describe a verbal or action word.
Avoidance and reduction	Topic avoidance	The speaker avoids talking about the concepts for which the TL item or structure is not known.
	Message abandonment	The speaker cannot complete the whole concept and get confused and leave it abandoned in the middle of the concept (Tarone, 1981).

Self-initiated repair	The self-initiated repair is focused on two objectives: One is to acquire more time to plan their next words and to emphasize a particular subject. The time-gaining objective was more frequent according to the data investigated by Franceschi (2019). There is an explicit preference for self-repair among Asian English people (Lee, 1970).
Other Initiated Repair	The source speaker completes a repair with the help of the repair initiator. Here, the repair initiator is often the listener who asks for clarification through certain linguistic aspects (Lee, 1970).
Agreement Strategies	An agreement can be stated overtly or covertly. It can also be expressed in the term minimal based on the reputation of the previous speaker. An Addressee agrees when he or she chooses to believe some Proposition is true and reacts with a statement that includes the propositional content of the Proposition's support. (Aziz, 2017).
Building upon the previous	According to Valentine (1994), to find a common medium and show support for the previous speaker's statement, the current speaker would include extra points, reasoning, and details when building on the previous speaker's turn (Aziz, 2017).
Repeating Previous Person	Repetition shows that the speaker agrees with the other speaker and actively participates in the conversation (Valentine 1994). They would repeat a portion of what the other person before him had said. They use this strategy to be more involved in the conversation. Moreover, Repetition seems to be frequent in ELF as is used by speakers for different objectives. However, the repetition of the words said by the same

	or other speaker is not limited to ELF. It was shown that native speakers also use this strategy in their daily unplanned conversations (Franceschi, 2019).
Positive feedback	Speakers use positive feedback such as 'Yupp,' 'Yeah,' 'Uuh Yes', 'Uhuh' and 'Hmm' to express several functions to agree, encourage the speaker, or indicate the listener's attentiveness (Aziz, 2017).
Clarification	Clarification requests are different from verification checks that are used by the speakers. They request clarification or additional explanation on points or sections that are unclear to them (Dörnyei and Scott, 1997). A repeat of a question includes repeating a particular word or small segment to ask a question. Williams et al. (1997) observed that to respond to a clarification request, the respondent must perform significantly more "interactional work".
Signaling importance	Signalling type is quite common. However, there are instances of such usage in the group work discussions investigated, where other speakers mark the value of an object by clearly making it a part of the discussion (Björkman, 2014).
Simplification	The second strategy used for the creation of extra explicitness is to simplify the terms and concepts or lexicogrammar-related items (Björkman, 2014). It included self-rephrasing a sentence or a phrase to clarify the other person and avoid any confusion (Franceschi, 2019).
Stalling or time gaining	Stalling and time-gaining tactics are the last types of communicative strategies. It comprises pauses or random filler words so that one can put some time to think before saying what one wants (Lewandowska, 2019).

Overt question	The current category talks about cases where speakers are confused about the previous words, so they ask questions to clarify their doubts. (Björkman, 2014)
Comprehension check	According to Jamshidnejad (2011), Comprehension checks include the speaker generally asking questions to make sure his partner can catch up to his words. The questions may include short words, like "Understood?" (Williams et al., 1997, p. 313)
Compensation strategies	Oxford (1990) investigated the compensation strategies used by non-native English speakers by using hand gestures or using their minds to understand a word by relating it to the situation or context. Hajhashemi (2017) noticed that this strategy is used when the exact meaning of a word or a sentence is not understood. The learners use this strategy to compensate for their language limitations (Hajhashemi, 2017). Both advance and poor English speakers use these compensating strategies to make the language communicable and understandable, bridging the gap efficiently (Syafryadin, Martina & Salniwati, 2020).

Transfer as a communication strategy

Transfer as a communications strategy is referred to as a process where speakers use certain features of their first language to make the second language communication effective (Paramasivam, 2009). However, Tarone (1983) determines this process as "borrowing," which depicts the learner who either translates the idea from his/her mother tongue or uses L1 to convey the message. Furthermore, a similar strategy is referred to as "L1/L3 strategies" (Faerch & Kasper, 1984) Paramasivam (2009) explained it as the stimulation through the "language switch," in which the speaker either thoroughly translates the meaning into the target language or uses the terms from L1 to express the meaning. However, the term possesses various definitions in literature but refers to the same concept (Paramasivam, 2009). The transfer as a communication strategy is inquired under various variables including speakers' L1

(Palmberg, 1979), L2 level (Bialystok, 1983; Paribakht, 1985; Fernandez Dobao, 2002), characters of the communication activity (Corrales, 1989; Poullisse & Schils, 1989; Yarmohammedi & Seif, 1992), and kind of received instructions (Tarone 1983; Dornyei, 1995). Hence, the concept is rather studied as a constituent of communicative strategies and scarcely scrutinized isolated (Paramasivam, 2009). Bialystok (1983) studied French language speakers and found that advanced learners of the language use L2-based strategies whereas other learners were dependent on L1-based communicative strategies. Another study inquired similar results that Galician speakers of English with low proficiency use more transfer and avoidance strategies than advanced-level students (Fernandez Dobao, 2002).

2-Frequently used communication strategies employed by Asian English speakers

A study conducted by Kim Hua, Mohd Nor & Jaradat (2012) explored how and when the CSs are used by Malaysian students in group discussions at a university. The results showed that low-proficiency students use code-switching strategies more, and students with high proficiency use self-repair and topic avoidance strategies more frequently than other CSs. Lewandowska (2019) investigates the CSs used by ELF users and their frequency through a case study where the author defines the reason for ELF nature being fluid and variant. It was hypothesized that ELF users are inclined towards using various types of strategies that contain language manipulation, for instance, circumlocution, approximation, and neologism, and some of them are dependent on the users' attitudes. The study also suggests that if the interlocutors are familiar with the environment, there are more chances of using fewer avoidance strategies. However, the results showed that users employ manipulation strategies less frequently and avoidance strategies more frequently in their communication (Lewandowska, 2019).

3-Factors affecting the choice of communication strategies

Research studies that analysed the correlation between the level of language speaking and the use of communicative strategies found rather different results. An investigation identified that learners having good language skills use different strategies than those having a low level of language (Muhtarom & Masykuriyah, 2019; Fernandez Dobao, 2002). Moreover, it also indicated that learners with a low level of speaking ability use fewer strategies than learners with a high level of speaking ability. Low-speaking ability learners tend to use gestures, time-gaining, pause filler, code-switching/code-mixing, and repetition strategies. On the other hand, high-speaking ability learners were inclined towards using advanced strategies; using synonyms, explaining, code-switching/code-mixing, using phrases, using fillers, time-gaining, using gestures, and asking if the listener understood what they said. Muhtarom and Maskyuriyah (2019) further appended another aspect that the use of strategies depends on the context of the language speaker and their anxiety level. Another study by Putri (2013) discussing the factors affecting the choice of CSs in Indonesia identified that the users' attitudes, the

proficiency level of learners, the situation of language learning, the context of communication, and the personality of the learner are also some of the major factors affecting the choice of CSs (Putri, 2013). In addition, language motivation can also impact the use of CSs (Thao & Haung, 2010). Moreover, Lin Wei (2011) identified the same factors determined by Putri (2013); the context of communication, the context of learning, and the learner himself.

In addition to this, Chan's (2021) study on Hong Kong's secondary schools yet has confirmed the influence of academic attainment of the use of CSs in the EFL context. Similarly, Mursyid, Kafryawan and Rahmawansyah (2021) carried out a study in Papua, Indonesia on EFL students. The findings validate the use of CSs as a result of anxiety, lack of confidence and hesitation among EFL students. Another study analysed Malaysian English language students to identify the strategies they encompass in their communication while performing an oral task. The analysis found that "transfer" as a communication strategy is useful for L2 communication (Paramasivam, 2009).

4-Importance of communication strategies in English language teaching in the globalized world

There has been a debate on whether the use of communicative strategies should be taught in academia. Canale (1983) indicates that learners should be taught such frameworks to make effective use of the strategies in second-language communication. In contrast, Kellerman (1991) proposed a conflicting remark that learners transfer the communicative strategies from their first language naturally and they do not require the teaching of it. Whereas, Thi Thu and Kieu Thu (2016) investigated CSs employed by Vietnamese students with an intermediate level of language proficiency and identified that students used useless CSs and suggested incorporating instructions informing the use of CSs in their curriculum. Another study identified the same results that teaching CSs can be effectively incorporated into teaching pedagogy (Maleki, 2007). However, when ELF is discussed, one can scrutinize how a Lingua Franca is intelligible for speakers of various English varieties and different L1 users. Kaur (2010) carried out a study based on intelligibility among ELF speakers; the results found that due to the various CSs (*paraphrasing, repetition, confirmation*) employed by the ELF users, the language has become intelligible to both speaker and listener. Since these strategies are equally employed by all non-native English speakers without their dependence on speakers' L1 and are perceived as a natural process, it will be difficult to identify which strategies are specific to Asian-English speakers. As the Asian context includes both outer and expanding circle countries, CSs employed by speakers of these countries are not classified as separate categories. Hence, some strategies are more common in the ELF context (Chan, 2021). Moreover, the approaches to language teaching are mainly based on the needs of the students and the

knowledge that is required for learning the target language (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). With the global spread of English, its needs have also changed. Therefore, ELF in the global arena should be taught following the changes taking place in the global marketplace (Lewandowska, 2019). Moreover, the traditional English language teaching practices and theories are under consideration due to the previous native-speakers language teaching model, which is now expected to be changed according to the cultural identities of second-language learners (Chan, 2021). Although the CSs are similar in both ESL/EFL contexts, the teaching of these strategies shall be different in ESL and EFL contexts. Moreover, the field of CSs is still open to more research and should focus on implementation as well (Bjorkman, 2014). In addition, Aljohani and Hanna (2021) observed that learners acquire CSs effortlessly when instructed through the implicit method. Moreover, Behroozian, Ghafoori and Ahangari (2021) revealed that teaching of CSs develops a positive attitude among EFL students and teachers in Iran. Further, awareness of CSs can increase self-confidence to speak a foreign language and practice them to identify strategies that are helpful (Su, 2021). Hence, inducing a positive attitude towards non-native English varieties by providing awareness of language diversity among native and non-native students can help in cross-cultural communication (Subtirelu, et al., 2022).

DISCUSSION

CSs were studied under the process of communicating in a second language in general; English was not specified by then (Bjorkman, 2014). With the development of Englishes and globalization, the use of communicative devices increased. Later, with the development of Kachru's (1985) concentric model, the English varieties gained their identity, and strategic communication started growing to make non-native interaction effective. The use of CSs was set up for further studies in various contexts, and several strategies were identified. However, the specificity of the use of communication strategy according to a region is not differentiated yet, and most of the research has focused on CSs in ESL and EFL contexts instead of the Asian context. Although, the frequency of use of CSs could vary in different contexts and it will be difficult to identify the use of CSs specifically in Asia because firstly, these papers include strategies used in other parts of the world, such as Europe, and secondly Asia includes various ESL and EFL countries that possess similar communicative needs. However, one can contemplate through the literature that CSs in the Asian context are identified as similar to the CSs used by other non-native speakers of most ESL and ELF countries inside and outside the Asian region. Moreover, as identified in this review, the major element of communication is to communicate effectively and resolve the comprehension difficulties that render the message from conveying. Therefore, CSs are categorized as language devices as other language-related tools and devices. In addition, it has been identified that the choice of CSs depends on the learner, attitude, motivation, context of communication, and context of learning which also

affects the frequency of use of CSs. Previously, the researchers focused on the development of a suitable framework (Tarone, 1977; Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Bialystok, 1983; Paribakht, 1985; Willems, 1987; Poullisse, 1993; Dornyei & Scott, 1995). Some scholars believe that CSs can be based on L1 and L2 (Bialystok, 1983). However, it is identified that learners can use L1 as a communication strategy to communicate as well, but the concept of CSs is not merely based on first language competence. Rather includes various factors that control the use of communication strategies. Moreover, the major factor identified is the language proficiency level of learners; students with high proficiency are more conscious and aware of using various CSs than learners having low proficiency (Chan, 2021). Including this, the literature also depicts avoidance and self-repair strategies as the most frequently used CSs by Asian English speakers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Along with the use of CSs while performing oral tasks among learners, it is also advised to incorporate the instructions of using CSs in English Language pedagogy to inform learners about these strategies for effective use of CSs. Lastly, the field of CSs is vast and has a long journey to explore this area because previously, the context was confined to the second language, but now it has widened with the role of English being acknowledged as an International Language (EIL), as a Lingua Franca (ELF) and as a Global Language.

REFERENCES

- Aljohani, Nouf J., and Barbara E. Hanna. "I do Not Know what's that Word in English, but I Will Tell You about My Cousin': EFL Learners' CSs in Online Oral Discussion Tasks." *Language learning journal* ahead-of-print.ahead-of-print (2021): 1-15. CrossRef. Web.
- Ayuni Putri, Lidya. "CSs in English as a Second Language (ESL) Context." *Advances in language and literary studies* 4.1 (2013): 129-33. CrossRef. Web.
- Aziz, A. A. (2017). *Agreement Strategies Among Malaysian Chinese Speakers of English*. 23(1), 168–189.
- Bialystok, E. (1983). *Some factors in the selection and implementation of CSs* (C Faerch & G. Kasper (eds.); pp. 100–118). Longman.
- Björkman, B. (2014). *An analysis of polyadic English as a lingua franca (ELF) speech: A communicative strategies framework* (Vol. 66, p. 122). Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.03.001>
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Canale, M. (1983). *From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy* (J. C Richards & R. W. Schmidt (eds.); pp. 2–27). Longman.

- Chamot, A. U. (1987). The learning strategies of ESL students. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin, Eds., *Learner Strategies for Second Language Acquisition*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 71-83.
- Chan, J. Y. H. (2021). *Bridging the gap between ELF and L2 learners' use of communication strategies: Rethinking current L2 assessment and teaching practices*. 101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102609>
- Corrales, O. & Call, M. (2008). *At a Loss for Words: The Use of CSs to Convey Lexical Meaning*. 22, 227–237. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1989.tb02742.x>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. (1995). Communication strategies: An empirical analysis with retrospection. In J.S. Turley & K. Lusby (Eds.) *Selected papers from the proceedings of the 21st Annual Symposium of the Deseret Language and Linguistic Society* (p. 155-168). Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.
- Dörnyei, Zoltan, Scott, Mary Lee, 1997. CSs in a second language: definitions and taxonomies. *Lang. Learn.* 47 (1), 173-- 210.
- Dörnyei, Zoltan. (1995). *On the Teachability of Communication Strategies*. 29(1), 55–85. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587805>
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Faerch, Claus & Kasper, G. (1984). *Two ways of defining communication strategies*. 34(1), 45–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1984.tb00995.x>
- Fernández Dobao, A. M. (2002). *The Effect of Language Proficiency on Communication [Communication] Strategy Use: A Case Study of Galician Learners of English*. 25, 53. http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url=ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:ilcs-us&res_id=xri:ilcs-rec:abell:R03883461
- Hajhashemi, Karim, Alireza Shakarami, and Nerina Caltabiano. "Compensation Still Matters: Language Learning Strategies in the Third Millennium ESL Learners." *Online learning (Newburyport, Mass.)* 21.3 (2017): 235. CrossRef. Web.
- Hua, Tan Kim, Nor Fariza Mohd Nor, and Mohd Nayef Jaradat. "CSs among EFL Students - an Examination of Frequency of use and Types of Strategies Used." *Journal of Language Studies* 12.3 (2012): 831-48. CrossRef. Web.
- Jamshidnejad, A. (2011). *Functional approach to communication strategies: An analysis of language learners' performance in interactional discourse*. 43(15), 3757–3769. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.017>
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A. & Dewey, M. (2011). *Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca*. 44(3), 281–315. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000115>
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). *Standard, Codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the Outer Circle* (R. Quirk & H. Widdowson (eds.); pp. 11–30). Cambridge University Press.
- Kalisa, P. (2019). *CSs in English Second Language Acquisition*. 14(1), 93–102. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v14i1.21475>
- KAUR, J. (2010). *Achieving mutual understanding in world Englishes*. 29(2), 192–208. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2010.01638.x>
- Kellerman, E. (1991). *Compensatory strategies in second language research: A critique, a revision, and some implications for the classroom* (R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood, & M. Swain (eds.); pp. 142–161). Clevedon.

- Lee, J. S. (1970, January 1). *A conversation analysis of self-repair in Asian englishes: Semantic scholar*. undefined. Retrieved October 16, 2021, from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/A-Conversation-Analysis-of-Self-repair-in-Asian-Lee/2ba61dfee9d5e8887960b72a8e957ce1c0e6119d>
- Lewandowska, E. (2019). *English as a lingua franca: An overview of ...* - eric. English as a lingua franca: an overview of communicative strategies. Retrieved October 14, 2021, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED594709.pdf>.
- Lin, W. (2011). *Communicative Strategies in Second Language Acquisition A Study of Chinese English Learners' Attitude and Reported Frequency of Communicative Strategies*. http://data.europeana.eu/item/9200111/BibliographicResource_1000086005288
- Maleki, A. (2007). *Teachability of communication strategies: An Iranian experience*. 35(4), 583–594. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2007.04.001>
- Muhtarom, and Hikmatul Masykuriyah. "Speaking Strategies used by the Junior High School Students with Different Level of Speaking Ability." *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research* 434 (2019): 83-6. Web.
- Mursyid, Andi M. M., Wira Kafryawan, and Rahmawansyah. "CSs used by Papuan EFL Students." *Metathesis: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching* 5.2 (2021) CrossRef. Web.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know*. New Palmberg, R. (1979). *Investigating Communication Strategies*. 53–75.
- Paramasivam, S. (2009). *Language Transfer as a Communication Strategy and a Language Learning Strategy in a Malaysian ESL Classroom*. 11(1), 192–229.
- PARIBAKHT, T. (1985). *Strategic Competence and Language Proficiency*. 6(2), 132–146. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/6.2.132>
- Poullisse, N & Schils, E. (1989). *The influence of task- and proficiency-related factors on the use of compensatory strategies: A quantitative analysis*. 39(1), 15–46. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1989.tb00590.x>
- Poullisse, Nanda. (1993). *A Theoretical Account of Lexical CSs* (R. Schreuder & B. Weltens (eds.); pp. 157–190). John Benjamins.
- Rachmawaty, Noor, et al. "Oral CSs Training: The Case of Pre-Service English Teachers in Indonesia." *Script journal* 6.2 (2021): 168-89. CrossRef. Web.
- Raziyeh Behroozian, Nasser Ghafoori, and Saeideh Ahangari. "EFL Teachers' and Students' Perceptions about CSs Teachability." *Journal of English language pedagogy and practice (Online)* 14.28 (2021): 135-56. Web.
- Richards, Jack C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press; Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667305>
- Selinker, L. (1972). *Interlanguage*. 209–231.
- Smokotin, Vladimir M., Anna S. Alekseyenko, and Galina I. Petrova. "The Phenomenon of Linguistic Globalization: English as the Global Lingua Franca (EGLF)." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 154 (2014): 509-13. CrossRef. Web.
- Su, Ya-Chen. "College Students' Oral Communication Strategy use, Self-Perceived English Proficiency and Confidence, and Communication Anxiety in Taiwan's EFL Learning." *Educational studies (Ames)* 57.6 (2021): 650-69. CrossRef. Web.
- Subtirelu, N., Lindemann, S., Acheson, K. & Campbell, M. (2022). Sharing communicative

- responsibility: training US students in cooperative strategies for communicating across linguistic difference. *Multilingua*, . <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2021-0013>
- Syafryadin, Syafryadin, Feny Martina, and Salniwati Salniwati. "Compensation Strategies in Speaking Activities for Non-English Department Students: Poor and Competent Speakers." *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society) (Sidoarjo)* 5.2 (2020): 109-16. CrossRef. Web.
- Tarone, E. (1981). Some Thoughts on the Notion of Communication Strategy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15(3), 285–295. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586754>
- Tarone, E. (1983). *Teaching Strategic Competence in the Foreign Language Classroom*. 4(2), 121–130.
https://www.academia.edu/31569873/Teaching_Strategic_Competence_in_the_Foreign_Language_Classroom
- Tarone, Elaine. (1980). *COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES, FOREIGNER TALK, AND REPAIR IN INTERLANGUAGE*. 30(2), 417–428. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1980.tb00326.x>
- Thào, P. & Huang, C.-P. (2010). *Exploring Factors Affecting the Use of Oral Communication Strategies*. 85–104. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Exploring-Factors-Affecting-the-Use-of-Oral-Huang/468a7212e4d3bb4e359f84160c32fe3ef253bfa8>
- Thi, N. & Thu, K. (2016). *Non-majors of English at Intermediate Level* (Vol. 4, Number 3, p. 283). <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-4-3-9>
- Valentine, T. M. (1994). Agreeing and disagreeing in Indian English discourse: Implications for language teaching. In Tickoo, M. (Ed.), *language and culture in multilingual societies* (pp. 227-250). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Valeria Franceschi. "Enhancing Explicitness in BELF Interactions: Self-Initiated CSs in the Workplace." *Iperstoria*.13 (2019)Web.
- Willems, G. M. (1987). *CSs and their significance in foreign language teaching* (Vol. 15, Number 3, p. 351). Elsevier BV. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251x\(87\)90009-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251x(87)90009-1)
- Williams, Jessica, Insoe, Rebecca, Tasker, Thomas, (1997). CSs in an interactional context: the mutual achievement of comprehension. In: Kasper, G., Kellerman, E. (Eds.), *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives in the Applied Linguistics and Language Study Series*. Longman, Essex, pp. 304--322. York: Newbury House/Harper Collins.
- Yarmohammadi, L. & Seif, S. (1992). *More on Communication Strategies: Classification, Resources, Frequency and Underlying Processes*. 30(3), 223–232. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/6c27ce215bb8498d9d019f726672c6bf/1?cbl=1816531&pq-origsite=gscholar&accountid=135034>
- Yule, G. (1997). *Referential communication tasks*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.