# Teachers' Communication Strategies in ESL/EFL Pakistani Classrooms at Intermediate Level

*Afzal Khan[1]*
*Ayesha Sohail[2]*

## Abstract

*This study aims to investigate teachers' communication strategies in ESL/EFL classrooms, at intermediate level, in different settings in Pakistan. The important aspects of CSs' include the adjustments of the interlocutors, in their interaction to facilitate the communication. Mixed method design was used for the study to investigate, firstly; the frequency and type of CSs', and their relationship based on teaching institutions, and language background, across teachers and groups; secondly; the frequency and type of CSs, in regard to the focus of teachers' interaction. Twelve non-native participants-teachers participated in the study from four different instructional settings. The data mounted to 36 recordings, 3 recordings from each teacher, from 3 lessons. The study is based on the theoretical framework introduced by (Tarone, 1977, 1980, 1981). The findings reveal that communication strategies function primarily to avoid communication breakdown and sustain it during disparity. The teachers' use of L2 based communication strategies reveals to employee alternative expression assisting less proficient speakers for effective communication in the target language. L1 based strategies are employed by the less proficient speakers which decrease the effect of interaction in the target language. New findings revealed by the data in that the teachers use the strategy of 'homonyms' for providing new lexical items and increasing the effect of 'meaning negotiation' to avoid a breakdown in communication. 'Homonyms' were not included in the typology of CSs by previous studies.*

**Keywords:** Teachers' communication strategies, ESL/EFL settings, classrooms interaction

[1]PhD Scholar, Department of English, The University of AJ&K, Muzaffarabad
[2] Professor, Department of English, The University of AJ&K, Muzaffarabad

## 1. Introduction

In the Pakistani context of teaching English as ESL/EFL, the ultimate objectives of the teaching are to enhance the communicative competence of the students and enable them to communicate in a variety of situations. English language plays a vital role in Pakistan, especially due to the colonization of Great Britain, and is deemed a pre-requisite for a promising career (Rahman, 1999).  It is generally believed that the teachers in teaching foreign language should solely employ the strategy of L2 in a classroom context (Littlewood & Yu, 2011; & Pavón & Ramos, 2019). Non-native ESL/EFL teachers play a dual role in classroom interaction; a teacher and simultaneously being a learner of the target language. Teachers' proficiency is necessary to negotiate meaning and reach mutual understanding, the less proficient teachers resort to monologic practices for the fear of interaction that might expose their lack of English proficiency (Macaro, 2019; &Ma, 2019).

The concept of communication strategy was introduced by the scholars in the 1970s after Selinker's publication appeared on 'inter-language communication in 1972 (Karpati, 2017). Generally, communication strategies are defined as the linguistic devices implied by the speaker to adjust his message in communication during the disparity in interaction. Communication strategy (hereafter CS) is an organized approach that every speaker uses irrespective of being a native or non-native speaker in communication. If we examine a portion of speech produced specifically, by L2 speakers we will be able to find several strategies implied to achieve the end goal and reach a mutual understanding with the second interlocutor.

As a result, the most significant reasons for the domain of strategic linguistic use has become an important consideration, especially in the course of the last few years. In this regard, substantial findings revealed the quantity of research conducted in this area including the nature of communication strategies, the different taxonomies of CSs, the reasons that affect their use, and the applied implications of communication studies in research. So far, we do not have a universally acknowledged definition of communication strategies that exists (Dornyei & Scott, 1997). Different strategies have been given for the reason that accounts for many various taxonomies of communication and contain different linguistic devices (Tarone, 1977; Færch & Kasper, 1983; Paribakht, 1985;

Willems, 1987; Bialystock, 1990; Poulisse, 1993; &Dornyei & Scott, 1997).

Raba'ah (2005) argues that strategic communication in interaction has several advantages such as carry on the intended communication without disparity, retrieve a large number of vocabulary that helps in conveying the message. To a larger extent, L2 learners face many challenges that hinder their communication. They could only communicate effectively if the teachers are proficient in the target language to help them achieve the end goal. The use of strategic language in the L2 context increases the level of confidence on the part of the teachers as well as helps in providing opportunities to the learners which are a pre-requisite in learning acquisition.

The current study aims to depict a clear manifestation of teachers' communication strategies during the problematic stage of disparity between the interlocutors to agree on the meaning and communicate the intended concept in the target form. Tarone defines communicative strategies as 'mutual attempts of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structure do not seem to be shared' (Tarone, 1980) adapted from (Lin, 2011). The following are some of the definitions given by scholars regarding communication strategies.

*"CSs are techniques of dealing with difficulties in communicating in an imperfectly known second or foreign language" (Stern, 1983);*

*The conscious employment by verbal or non-verbal mechanisms for communicating an idea when precise linguistic forms are for some reason not available to the learner at that point in communication (Brown, 1987); adapted from (Rababah, 2002).*

*"CSs are procedural skills which learners use to overcome the inadequacies of their interlanguage resources" (Ellis (1994); adapted from (Lin, 2011).*

## 1.1 CS's Taxonomy Used in the Current Study
The theoretical framework used in the current study is adapted from Sarab (2003), Lin (2011), and Karpati (2017), based on the views of communication strategies developed by Tarone's (1980, 1981)

perspectives of social interaction as opposed to the psychological classification presented by (Faerch and Kasper, 1984; &Kellerman, Bialystok, 1997). Tarone's classification of communication strategies postulates a strong relationship between the structure of the language and socio-linguistic aspects to agree on meaning in situations where the interlocutors do not have the requisite meaning structure (Tarone, 1980). The current framework classified communication strategies into the following four categories. The taxonomy developed by Tarone includes Paraphrase (L2 Based Production Strategies), the subcategories of paraphrase consist of 'approximation' and 'circumlocution'. The 'approximation' is the use of a substitute vocabulary item by the learner and 'circumlocution' is a linguistic strategy use by the interlocutors, explaining the key semantic elements by employing the superordinate term in the structure of the target language. 'Word coinage' is also an L2 based strategy through producing a new word in a target language to convey the desired idea such as 'airball' used for 'balloon' (Frewan, 2015, pg.20).The second broader category includes Transfer (L1 Based Production Strategies), the subcategories of transfer include; 'literal translation' which refers to word for word translation based on the learner's native language. 'Language switch' is also L1 based strategy referring to switching from one language to another than the target language that is L2. Appeal for assistance is L1 based strategy that refers to direct or indirect assistance that the interlocutors seek to resolve their linguistics discrepancies in reception or production. Lastly, 'mime' is an L1 based non-verbal strategies such as gestures to convey the intended concept. The third category includes Avoidance: avoidance is a communication strategy used by the interlocutors in interaction which divides into two sub-categories: 'topic avoidance' and 'message abandonment'.

Tarone (1981) elaborated her definitions by including some other properties which indicate social aspects of interaction. Tarone states that CS 'relates to a situation where discrepancy arises between the interlocutors which require the adjustment'. Later on, she extended the notion of communication strategies by emphasizing meaning negotiation which includes 'confirmation check', 'clarification requests', and 'comprehension checks' adapted from (Caraker, 2012).

## 2. Literature review
## 2.1 Previous Studies on Teachers, CSs

Previous research on teachers' communication strategies in classroom interaction covered a wide range of areas in the field of applied linguistics from teaching TEFL, teaching English as a second language (TESL) to L2 acquisition and learning. Several studies explored the advanced or proficient level speakers used compensatory strategies to overcome for their lack of linguistic ability during communication in addition to the conversational adjustment distinguished by their extensive use of lexical repletion to resolve the communication breakdown. Therefore, advanced level or proficient speakers have access to more strategies and can solve the problems easily when faced with a situation in their speech communication where linguistic resources are inadequate. Communication strategies maximize the L2 acquisition and provide opportunities to the learners reaching mutual agreement and in sustaining the interaction (Paribakht, 1985; Clennell 1996; Ting and Phan, 2008; Spromberg, 2011; Rodriguez and Roux,2012; Sukirlan, 2014; &Daly and Sharma, 2018).

## 2.2 Classification of CSs

Tarone (1977) made the first attempt to develop the framework of communication strategies upon which the subsequent research studies in the field of communication strategies are based. Tarone's four major categories include 'paraphrase' (L2 Based Production Strategies); 'transfer' (L1 Based Production Strategies); 'avoidance'; and 'meaning negotiation strategies'. Corder (1983) distinguishing principles divide communication strategies into two: the first one refers to avoidance (reduction) and the second includes risk running (expanding) strategies.

Faerch and Kasper's (1983) taxonomy divides communication strategies into two categories: the first is the avoidance of the message (reduction) and the second is an achievement (expansion). In Bialystok and Frolich (1980) and Bialystock (1990), the classification of communication strategies are based on the principles that the interlocutors are inclined to use the strategy during communication breakdown. They classify communication strategies into three types, each one with a different perspective such as L1 based, L2 based and para-linguistic features.

## 2.3 CSs In View of Psycholinguistics

The Nijmegen group classified communication strategies into two main types: the first one is 'conceptual', and the second one is 'code'. They made this classification based on the perspectives of psycholinguistics. They divide the 'conceptual' strategy into two sub-categories such as 'analytic', and 'holistic' (Poulisse, 1990; & Keelrman, 1991). They maintain that the interlocutors during the interaction have two available options; either to opt for the 'conceptual' and use their limited available linguistic knowledge or opt to use the 'codes'. In using the 'conceptual' strategy the interlocutors use the substitute item that shares certain features of the intended concept that the listener can infer whether the concept is 'holistic' or opt for uttering certain properties of the intended referent known as 'analytic'. The use of coding strategies refers to the words used by the interlocutors other than L2 in original form or morphological and phonological modifications. This strategy is also known as 'ostension'.

Kellerman and Bialystok (1997) explain the communication strategies presented by the Nijmegen group and then compare it with the model of language processing that accounts for psycholinguistics' perspectives given by (Bialystok, 1990, 1991, 1994). The theoretical accounts presented by the Nijmegen group contain two processes, one is the analysis of linguistic knowledge and the second one is the control of the operation. Kellerman and Bialystok (1997) make a distinction in the operationalization of communication strategies. They argue that communication strategies are triggered in circumstances when the interlocutors anticipate disparity between the analysis of language representation and control processes due to the inaccessibility of required information.

## 2.4 Interactional Modifications and Language Learning

Interactional modifications stand for a wide range of interactional processes incorporated by the more proficient interlocutor to comprehend to be comprehended. Interactional negotiation in the domain of SLA refers to modification in communication between learners and native speakers, learners and teachers or between less proficient and more proficient non-native interlocutors. (Scarcella & Higa, 1981; Long, 1983a; Long, 1983b; Varonis & Gass, 1985; Xiaohui, 2010; & Al-Ghamdi and Al-Bargi, 2017).

The theoretical underpinning of communication strategies move it into two opposite direction, the psycholinguistics draw the attention towards conceptualization while on the other hand, the interactionists hold the view based on the practical manifestation and usefulness (Tarone, 1980; Yule and Tarone, 1991; Firth and Wagner, 1997; Rampton, 1997;& Wikes-Gibbs, 1997).

Some conceptual issues identified in the reviewed literature such as little attention paid to the teachers' communication strategies in classroom interaction. Moreover, a combination of sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics cannot provide an appropriate framework for the exploration of teachers' strategies because it is only applicable in a transactional setting. Finally, Communication strategies are necessary to successfully communicate and deal effectively in the target language and to address problems or breakdowns, and to remain active in communication (Chou, 2018; Lockwood & Song 2020).

### 3. Research Methodology

Mixed-methodologies are considered to be the appropriate research designs in social sciences and particularly in L2 acquisition (Chaudron, 1986, 1988; Hammersly, 1990; &Creswell and Creswell, 2017). It emphasizes the internal and external validity and reliability of the research. The mixed-Method approach is deemed appropriate in view of the research questions and helps the researcher to portray the phenomena effectively. This study aims to find answerers to the following research questions:

1.  What are the different types and frequencies of teachers' communication strategies in ESL/EFL classes of the lessons?
2.  What are the main functions these strategies perform in ESL/EFL classroom interaction?
3.  What are the similarities and differences between the teachers' linguistic skills/background in ESL/EFL and the use of their strategies pattern?
4.  Is there any relation between the frequencies and types of teachers' communication strategies in ESL/EFL classrooms lessons due to the focus of communication on activity or topic?

**3.1 Theoretical Framework**

The study is based on the theoretical framework of Tarones' (1980, 1981) 'interactional model' in communication adapted from (Sarab, 2003; Lin, 2011; & Karpati, 2017). This framework is chosen to properly address the research in view of its interactional manifestation in classroom settings. Tarones' (1980, 1981) 'interactional model' is highly influential due to its comprehensiveness which covers all aspects of interaction with a particular focus on L2 learning in classroom settings such as paraphrase, transfer, avoidance; and meaning negotiation strategies. Therefore Tarones' framework enjoys the fervor exploring the strategic pattern of the communication and is vastly employed in recent research studies specifically, in classroom settings around the world (Chou, 2018; Lockwood & Song 2020).

**3.2 Participants**

The data was collected from 12 teachers who participated in the study voluntarily, in January and February 2019. The participants in this study participated from four different institutions; two government and two private. The institutions include Khyber Public School, and College, Khwaza Khela, Swat; Hira Public School, and College, Baghderai, Swat; Government Degree College, Matta, Swat; and Government Higher Secondary School and College, Fatehpur, Swat. Specific measures were taken into consideration before collecting the data such as the teacher qualifications. Teachers had to have a degree in English, more than 2-year teaching experience and had to be currently teaching at the intermediate level.

All these teachers were subject specialists teaching at the intermediate level. They were coming from different places in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Similarly, students also come from different areas to complete their undergraduate degrees. All the teachers were non-native speakers of the English language.

Moreover, some teachers withdrew from the study after their first or second recordings and they were replaced by other volunteers in the same institution, and in some cases particularly in the case of Intermediate and Higher Secondary Schools, the researcher had to leave the school because these schools mostly have 3 teachers for teaching English. Their data is not included in the study.

### 3.3 Design of the study

Classroom observation through audio recordings was carried out for the current research to enable the scholar to explore the teachers' communication strategies by way of natural context in different classes. The study was conducted in three distinct phases each one has its different purpose. The first stage included the collection of data from the twelve participants and developing introductory categories. The second phase consisted of the identification of different strategies used by different teachers in different lessons in various institutions. The third stage focused on the quantitative analysis and discussion to examine the patterns of communication strategies and their possible associations with different contexts in the group as well as across the groups.

### 3.4 Data collection

Data were collected through audio recordings, and classroom observations. Two ordinary and one lesson about specially designed tasks was recorded from every individual teacher. Every lesson lasted about 50 to 60 minutes in length, the total data mounted to 36 hours. The voice recorder of the laptop was used for the recording of the data in the current study. Two small microphones of high quality were employed for removing ambiguity in the data. The two microphones were used, one was given to the students and the second one was adjusted to the teacher. Both the microphones were connected to the laptop through the connector.

### 3.5 Ethical Considerations

In view of ethical consideration, some measures were taken into consideration for the collection of data and dissemination of findings to abide by the research ethics of the Data Protection Act (1998) adapted from (Sohail, 2011). Teachers' consent was also obtained by signing a form to ensure their voluntary participation. The researcher also obtained permission from the concerned teacher to enter his classes for observation and record the sessions. The researcher has taken proper care to avoid using any discriminatory terminologies and refrain from any prior discussion that emanates sensitive issues. Taking into consideration the ethical perspectives, the participants were informed in written prior to the collection of data that their information will not be disclosed to the public except the researcher and his supervisor. They were also informed that the recorded data from their classes will be destroyed after the completion of the project.

**3.6 Data Analysis**

The analysis of the data carried out following two stages; in the first stage, the initial transcriptions were developed based on the theoretical frame and the available data collected from the participants. In the second stage, quantitative statistical analysis was carried out through mean scores, frequency, and percentile distribution and was followed by a descriptive-analytical procedure to show the pattern of strategies used by the teachers individually as well as across the groups and institutions.

**3.6.1 Transcription Procedure**

After listening to the collected data for several times, following the framework developed by Tarone (1980, 1981), the researcher carried out the transcription and developed the categories. The study followed the parent-child talk 'standard script' transcription procedures presented in two pairs of columns suggested by (Ochs, 1979; & Jefferson, 1978). This type of transcription procedure is chosen to accurately depict the teachers' communication strategies for classroom interaction in which action and talk simultaneously occur. This is a preferred transcription procedure in compliance with the purpose of the current study and conveying robustness and readability to the teachers' interaction which is crucial to the categories of communication strategies. The standard script indicates the teacher in the left margin of the page with the capital letter 'T', and the student is indicated with the letter 'S'. For details, please see (Appendix A) for transcription procedures used in this study.

**4. Results**

**4.1 Overall Frequencies and Types of CSs across Teachers**

The statistical analysis is carried out to show the overall pattern of communication strategies employed by the teachers irrespective of the teachers' language background and institutions. The primary aim of this analysis was to portray a bigger picture for understanding the context in terms of teachers' overall strategic patterns. Developing a clear view to show uniformity among teachers in their pattern of interaction, the comparison of the results is supported with the proportion of teachers' lessons in table 4.2 to reveal the ratio of teachers' interactions in classroom settings. Table 4.1 presents the overall frequencies, mean

scores, and standard deviation of the teachers' strategies across groups and institutions.

**Table 4.1:** Overall frequency, Means, SDs, Percentage and rank of CSs across all teachers and lessons

| S. No Categories of strategies | Freq. | Mean | SD | Percentage | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **L2  Based Production Strategies** | | | | | |
| **1.  Paraphrase** | | | | | |
| 1.1  Approximation | 499 | 41.58 | 15.30 | 12.27% | 2 |
| 1.2  Circumlocution | 102 | 8.5 | 8.42 | 2.50% | 7 |
| 1.3  Word Coinage | 8 | 0.66 | 0.94 | 0.19% | 9 |
| **Total** | **609** | **50.74** | **24.66** | **14.97%** | **3** |
| | | | | | |
| **L1  Based Production Strategies** | | | | | |
| **2.  Transfer** | | | | | |
| 2.2 Literal translation | 202 | 16.83 | 23.42 | 4.96% | 5 |
| 2.2  Language Switch | 2217 | 184.75 | 396.73 | 54.52% | 1 |
| **2.3 Appeal for assistance** | | | | | |
| a.  Implicit appeal for assistance | 7 | 0.58 | 1.38 | 0.17% | 10 |
| b.  Explicit appeal for assistance | 173 | 14.41 | 9.42 | 4.25% | 6 |
| 2.4  Mime | 8 | 0.66 | 1.31 | 0.19% | 9 |
| **Total** | **2604** | **15.65** | **12.11** | **64.04%** | **1** |
| **3.  Avoidance** | | | | | |
| 3.1 Topic Avoidance | 2 | 0.16 | 0.37 | 0.04% | 12 |
| 3.2  Message Abandonment | 3 | 0.25 | 0.43 | 0.07% | 11 |
| **Total** | **5** | **0.41** | **0.8** | **0.12%** | **4** |
| **4.  Meaning Negotiation Strategies** | | | | | |
| 4.1 Confirmation Check | 69 | 5.75 | 5.62 | 1.69% | 8 |
| 4.2 Clarification Request | 321 | 26.75 | 15.13 | 7.89% | 4 |
| 4.3 Comprehension Check | 458 | 38.16 | 22.82 | 11.26% | 3 |
| **Total** | **848** | **70.66** | **43.57** | **20.85%** | **2** |
| **Overall freq., Mean and SD** | **4066** | **137.46** | **81.14** | | |

In the first observation, all the teachers in their respective groups have used communication strategies with different frequencies. The overall frequencies of the teachers' communication strategies consisted of 4066 that includes all four categories of strategies. L1 based 'production' strategies are the major group and consisted of a total frequency of 2604, and 'meaning negotiation' strategies that formed the second highest group in frequency consisted of 848 strategies. L2 based production strategies are the third-largest group in frequency used by teachers with 609 frequency. The strategy with the lowest frequency is 'avoidance' which ranked 4th with a frequency of 5 in the data. To see the patterns and consistency more clearly, we breakdown table 4.1 into table 4.2 with 4 groups to show their differences across three lessons in every group.

**Table 4.2:** Comparison of CSs across teachers, institutions, and lessons

| S. No | Teachers | L1 | L2 | L3 | TFR | PER | Mean | SD |
|-------|----------|-----|-----|-----|------|--------|--------|--------|
| | **Institution 1/A** | | | | | | | |
| 1 | T1 | 52 | 45 | 39 | 136 | 3.34% | 45.33 | 5.31 |
| 2 | T2 | 72 | 37 | 30 | 139 | 3.41% | 46.33 | 18.37 |
| 3 | T3 | 70 | 52 | 44 | 166 | 4.08% | 55.33 | 10.87 |
| **Total** | **3** | **194** | **134** | **113** | **441** | **10.84%** | **147** | **34.32** |
| | **Institution 2/B** | | | | | | | |
| 4 | T4 | 66 | 39 | 71 | 176 | 4.32% | 58.66 | 14.05 |
| 5 | T5 | 60 | 77 | 62 | 199 | 4.89% | 66.33 | 7.58 |
| 6 | T6 | 110 | 73 | 57 | 240 | 5.90% | 80 | 22.19 |
| **Total** | **3** | **236** | **189** | **190** | **615** | **15.12%** | **205** | **21.92** |
| | **Institution 3/C** | | | | | | | |
| 7 | T7 | 377 | 149 | 385 | 911 | 22.40% | 303.66 | 109.41 |
| 8 | T8 | 30 | 34 | 50 | 114 | 2.80% | 38 | 8.64 |
| 9 | T9 | 622 | 708 | 56 | 1386 | 34.08% | 462 | 289.22 |
| **Total** | **3** | **1029** | **891** | **491** | **2411** | **59.29%** | **803.66** | **228.15** |
| | **Institution 4/D** | | | | | | | |
| 10 | T10 | 27 | 54 | 65 | 146 | 3.59% | 48.66 | 15.96 |
| 11 | T11 | 148 | 26 | 45 | 219 | 5.38% | 73 | 53.59 |
| 12 | T12 | 100 | 58 | 76 | 234 | 5.75% | 78 | 17.20 |
| **Total** | **3** | **275** | **138** | **186** | **599** | **14.73%** | **199.66** | **56.75** |
| **Total Frequency** | | **1734** | **1352** | **980** | **4066** | **100%** | | |
| **Total** | **Mean** | **433. 5** | **338** | **245** | | | | |
| **Total** | **SD** | **345.00** | **320.01** | **145.29** | | | | |

The overall frequency of strategies used by group 1, in table 4.2 showed some similarities in lessons two and three, but the frequency of lesson one increased considerably by all three teachers with the mean scores of T1 the lowest while the mean scores for T3 reveal the highest. In the second group, the use of strategies by T6 is different from the other two teachers in the same group. Across the three lessons, in the same group, T6's overall use of strategies is higher than that of his colleagues. In the third group, the overall use of strategies by T8 is different from the overall level of strategy use to that of his colleagues in the same group. In the fourth group, the overall strategy adopted by T10 is different from his colleagues by using the least number of strategies. By comparing the teachers with regards to their behavior in the groups, T3, T6, T8, and T10 have behaved differently in their respective groups.

### 4.2 The Distribution of CSs in Group 1, 2, 3 and 4

In the second phase, the quantitative comparison is carried out among all four groups. The analyses of the frequencies counts were carried out based on the results of the transcribed data. The aim was to find out the differences and similarities between these four groups due to their strategy patterns. Frequency, mean scores and SDs were calculated for each teacher across the three lessons to do the comparison. Table 4.3 shows the percentile distribution of communication strategies about individual groups in groups 1, 2, 3, and 4 across the lessons. The percentile distribution also indicated the variation and similarity across the teachers in groups as well as across groups in all lessons.

**Table 4.3:** Frequency and percentile distribution of group 1, 2, 3, 4, in subcategories of CSs

| S. No Categories | FG1 | PER | FG2 | PER | FG3 | PER | FG4 | PER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **L2 Based Production Strategies** | | | | | | | | |
| **1. Paraphrase** | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 Approximation | **145** | 3.56% | **144** | 3.54% | **63** | 1.54% | **147** | 3.61% |
| 1.2 Circumlocution | **19** | 0.46% | **27** | 0.66% | **7** | 0.17% | **49** | 1.20% |
| 1.3 Word Coinage | **0** | 0% | **2** | 0.04% | **5** | 0.12% | **1** | 0.02% |
| **Total** | **164** | 4.03% | **173** | 4.25% | **75** | 1.84% | **197** | 4.84% |
| **L1 Based Production Strategies** | | | | | | | | |
| **2. Transfer** | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2 Literal translation | **6** | 0.14% | **0** | 0% | **101** | 2.48% | **95** | 2.33% |
| 2.2 Language Switch | **5** | 0.12% | **12** | 0.29% | **2131** | 52.41% | **70** | 1.72% |
| **2.3 Appeal for assistance** | | | | | | | | |
| a. Implicit appeal | **1** | 0.02% | **1** | 0.02% | **5** | 0.12% | **0** | 0% |
| b. Explicit appeal | **60** | 1.47% | **60** | 1.47% | **25** | 0.61% | **28** | 0.68% |
| 2.4 Mime | **3** | 0.07% | **0** | 0% | **0** | 0% | **1** | 0.02% |
| **Total** | **75** | 184% | **73** | 1.79% | **2262** | 55.63% | **194** | 4.77% |
| **3. Avoidance** | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Topic Avoidance | **2** | 0.04% | **0** | 0% | **0** | 0% | **0** | 0% |
| 3.2 Message | **2** | 0.04% | **1** | 0.02% | **0** | 0% | **0** | 0% |
| **Total** | **4** | 0.09% | **1** | 0.02% | **0** | 0% | **0** | 0% |
| **4. Meaning Negotiation Strategies** | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 Confirmation | **21** | 0.51% | **21** | 0.51% | **4** | 0.09% | **23** | 0.56% |
| 4.2 Clarification | **104** | 2.55% | **127** | 3.12% | **18** | 0.44% | **72** | 1.77% |
| 4.3 Comprehension | **73** | 1.79% | **220** | 5.41% | **52** | 1.27% | **113** | 2.77% |
| **Total** | **198** | 4.86% | **368** | 9.05% | **74** | 1.81% | **208** | 5.11% |
| **Overall** | **441** | 10.84% | **615** | 15.12% | **2411** | 59.29% | **599** | 14.73% |

The findings in tables 4.3 revealed that the percentage of group 3 in the use of strategies exceeded all the rest of the groups at 59.29% VS 15.12%, 14.73% and 10.84%. The overall percentage of group 3 is five times greater than the overall percentage of group 1, almost three times greater than group 2, and group 4 as well. The findings reflected the highest inconsistency of teachers' use of strategies in group 3. The teachers in group 3 used the subcategories in 'paraphrase' with 1.84%; 55.63% in 'transfer'; 0% in 'avoidance'; and 1.81% in 'meaning negotiation strategy'. The large variation and inconsistency revealed the language background of the teachers in this group compared to the other three groups in the data.

### 4.3 The Distribution of CSs in Lesson One, Two, and Three

The quantitative analysis in Table 4.4 was carried out to show the distribution of communication strategy across teachers in lessons one, two and lesson three which will help in creating a clear image of the teachers' level of participation in individual strategies as well as across all four major taxonomies in the interaction.

**Table 4.4:** The frequency and percentile distributions of sub-categories in Lesson one, two and three by all teachers

| S. No Categories | L1 | PER | L2 | PER | L3 | PER | Total | PER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **L2 Based Production Strategies** | | | | | | | | |
| **1. Paraphrase** | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 Approximation | 263 | 6.46% | 175 | 4.30% | 61 | 1.50 % | 499 | 12.27% |
| 1.2 Circumlocution | 48 | 1.18% | 39 | 0.95% | 15 | 0.36% | 102 | 2.50% |
| 1.3 Word Coinage | 1 | 0.02% | 3 | 0.07% | 4 | 0.09% | 8 | 0.19 |
| **Total** | 312 | 7.67% | 217 | 5.33% | 80 | 1.96% | 609 | 14.97% |
| | | | | | | | | |
| **L1 Based Production Strategies** | | | | | | | | |
| **2. Transfer** | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2 Literal translation | 121 | 2.97% | 65 | 1.59% | 16 | 0.39% | 202 | 4.96% |
| 2.2 Language Switch | 990 | 24.34% | 784 | 19.28% | 444 | 10.91% | 2218 | 54.54 |
| **2.3 Appeal for assistance** | | | | | | | | |
| a. Implicit appeal | 3 | 0.07% | 0 | 0% | 4 | 0.09% | 7 | 0.17% |
| b. Explicit appeal | 66 | 1.22% | 63 | 1.54% | 44 | 1.08% | 173 | 4.25% |
| 2.4 Mime | 4 | 0.09% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 4 | 0.09% |
| **Total** | 1184 | 29.11% | 912 | 22.42% | 508 | 12.49% | 2604 | 64.04% |
| **3. Avoidance** | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Topic Avoidance | 1 | 0.02% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0.02% | 2 | 0.04% |
| 3.2 Message | 0 | 0% | 3 | 0.07% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 0.07% |
| **Total** | 1 | 0.02% | 3 | 0.07% | 1 | 0.02% | 5 | 0.12% |
| **4. Meaning Negotiation Strategies** | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 Confirmation | 12 | 0.29% | 17 | 0.41% | 40 | 0.98% | 69 | 1.69% |
| 4.2 Clarification | 105 | 2.58% | 66 | 1.22% | 150 | 3.68% | 321 | 7.89% |
| 4.3 Comprehension | 120 | 2.95% | 137 | 3.36% | 201 | 4.94% | 458 | 11.26% |
| **Total** | 237 | 5.82% | 220 | 5.41% | 391 | 9.61% | 848 | 2085% |
| **Overall** | 1734 | 42.64% | 1352 | 33.25% | 980 | 24.10% | 4066 | 100% |

The quantitative analysis showed that the orientation devices of lesson three, more features were associated with pedagogical interaction compared to lesson one and lesson two. The features of activity orientation devices were linked with the pedagogic patterns that decreased the overall strategies across the teachers in lesson three. In lesson three, the overall strategy was produced by the teachers with 980 frequency which is the lowest compared to the strategies produced with 1352 frequency in lesson two and the strategies used in lesson one with 1734 frequency. For fluency practice, more opportunities provided by the shift of communication toward the naturalistic interaction which increased the frequency of strategies in lesson one and lesson two while for the accuracy practice, more opportunities were provided by the shift of talk toward pedagogic interaction as demonstrated by the reduced frequency of strategies in lesson three. The findings align with the results of the previous studies that the designed tasks show the orientation of interaction as assumed pedagogical orientation associate with activities with reduced interaction and natural communication linked with the topic or general classroom that results in increased interaction and frequency (Van Lier, 1988; Kramash, 1985; Huang, 2010; & Siegel and Seedhouse, 2012).

## 5. Discussion

The interaction based on different phases of the lessons, research question 1 asked about the types and frequency of strategies. All four types of strategies: 'paraphrase' - L2 based production strategy; 'transfer' - L1 based production strategy; 'avoidance'; and 'meaning negotiation' were used by the teachers.L1 based strategies, with their subcategory 'language switch' was used more frequently with 54.52% as revealed by the analysis. The subcategories of meaning negotiation strategies such as 'confirmation check', 'clarification request' and 'comprehension checks' constituted 20.85% of the overall frequency in the data. The teachers used the subcategories of strategy in 'paraphrase' with 14.97% which made it the third-largest strategy used by them.  The least used communication strategy was 'avoidance', a category employed by teachers with 0.12% across the data. The teachers used both of the subcategories in 'avoidance' with almost similar percentages i.e. 0.04% VS 0.07%, thereby making it by far the least used strategy in the data.

Research question 2 asked the functions of communication strategies in classroom interaction. The findings demonstrated that the communication strategy functioned in three different ways to facilitate the conversation to adjust to the need of the L2 learners. The function of communication strategies as revealed; first, employed for the prospective use of disparity in communication to avoid anticipated breakdown; secondly, retrospectively modified the conversation to adapt to the need of the learners due to limited proficiency; finally, the strategy sustained the interaction during classroom settings.

The following example shows the use of the generic 'description' as a retrospective strategy by the teacher in which he describes the first aid medication.

**Excerpt 5.1 [T1 L1]**
S: 1     what does the word sterile mean?
T: 2     the word sterile means it should be germ-free
    3     it should be clean
    4     we should keep a clean cloth, germ-free cloth over the wound
    5     to keep safe from the environmental factors
    6     understand, okay
S: 7     got, it

In line 1, the student asks for explicit assistance where the communication obstructs due to the limited proficiency of the student. The teacher in line 2 uses a retrospective measure as he understands that the lexical item sterile breaks down the communication. In line 3, once again the teacher uses the strategy of circumlocution to keep communication moving and reach a mutual understanding. Finally, in line 7 the student agrees, and the conversation continues between the interlocutors.

In the result section, the functions of communication strategies have been subjected to quantitative analysis and divided into four major categories to reveal the exact functions of teachers' interaction in classroom settings. The former three categories such as 'paraphrase', 'transfer' and 'avoidance' are focused on communication to sustain the interaction and simultaneously, to adjust the message to agree with meaning in a situation where a discrepancy occurs in interaction. The subcategories in the fourth strategy of meaning negotiation focused on the issues of understanding

and hearing which occurred due to noise or deficiencies in the channel of communication.

Research question 3 focused to find out the relationship between the teachers' pattern of communication strategies and language skills. The difference in the use of strategy by the teachers in group 1 VS group 2 and group 4 showed a little variation in the overall percentage of the analysis such as 10.84% VS 15.12% and 14.73%.The findings revealed a significant variation in overall frequency and a percentage between the teachers in group 3 and group 1, 2 and 4 such as 59.29% VS 10.84%, 15.12%, and 14.73%.The findings revealed a significant aspect that groups 1, 2, and 4 used a relatively similar pattern and frequency with little variation but the pattern and frequency used by the teachers in group 3 demonstrated contextual effects, individual linguistic proficiency and institutional factors that influenced the interaction.

Research question 4 asked the focus of orientation in terms of communication strategies through teachers' interaction, either on activity or topic (general discussion). The analysis of lesson three was investigated by the application of the framework developed with the overall focus of interaction and its impact on frequency and type of communication strategies to be compared with lessons one and two associated with natural conversation or general discussion (topic). For fluency practice, opportunities were provided by the teachers through lessons one and two, which were supposed to focus on the topic orientation devices as well as to share more features of the naturalistic interaction. For accuracy practice, opportunities were provided by the talk over the activity-oriented phase which obtained pedagogic features with low frequency in communication.

In relation to question 4, in both phases of the interaction such as activities based lesson (lesson three) and topic-based interaction (lesson one, and two) through general discussion across the four groups, the effect of the constraints was evident in the activity-based interaction, as shown by the quantitative analysis (table 4.4).

Between the groups, systematic differences were shown by the results concerning group 3 and the other 3 groups. In comparison to group 1, group 2 and group 4, group 3 has shown the highest frequency in 'literal translation' and 'language switch'. The second difference revealed by the data was that group 3 used the lowest strategy in all the rest of the three

categories except in the category of 'transfer' which showed the language inefficiency of this group. Secondly, the findings revealed that group 3 used the 'meaning negotiation strategy' with 74 frequency compared to the highest frequency of group 1, 2 and 4 such as 74 VS 198, 368 and 208, which showed that the language skills of group 3 were largely different from the rest of the three groups. The findings revealed that teachers in lesson three used the CSs with the lowest percentage of 24.10% compared to the percentage of the strategy used by teachers in lesson one and lesson two, i.e. 42.64%, and 33.25% respectively.

A significant aspect of communication strategy revealed by the study, a new type of strategy 'homonyms' was employed by the teachers in classroom interaction to facilitate the L2 learners through providing new linguistic items for a better understanding of the target language. The teachers used the strategy of 'homonyms' that falls under the category of 'circumlocution' and clarified the different meanings of words with similar sounds by providing multiple examples to enhance the effect of communication. Homonyms can lead the interlocutors to conflicts and create the intelligibility issue in communication. Previous researchers did not include this strategy in the typology of communication strategy.

In the following illustration, the teacher uses the strategy of 'homonyms'. Homonyms are words with the same pronunciation but different meanings, sometimes in communication, a word with the same pronunciation poses a threat to communication and breaches the message especially in the context of L2 learners.

**Excerpt 5.2 [T11 L1]**
T 1:  The next pair of word we use is calendar and colander
  2:  you might have heard about this
  3:  calendar and the second one is a little different colander, c,o,l,a,n,d,e,r
  4:  so about this word calendar you are all familiar with
  5:  <u>it is a device for showing a division of time</u>
  6:  <u>it is a device for showing a division of time</u>
  7:  <u>it means which event falls on which date in a year</u>
  8:  when we say there is a calendar in our classroom
  9:  <u>but the second one colander it is a type of strainer</u>
  10: <u>now strainer, *chilni*</u>

12:     *Pa Pakhto ke che warta chanr, chanr wy*
13:     so this calendar, c,a,l,e,n,d,a,r we use it in our sentence like this
  14:   mark this date on your calendar
  15:   mark this date on your calendar
  16:   is it right
Ss 17:  yes, sir

The teacher used the strategy of circumlocution by using 'homonyms' which have the same sounds but different meanings that sometimes help the L2 learners in communicating the idea in the target language. The teacher introduced two words such as 'calendar' and 'colander' in line 1 which have the same pronunciation but are different in meaning. In line 5, 6 and 7 the teacher explained the word 'calendar'. In line 8, the teacher gave an example to clarify the intended meaning carried by the word calendar. In line 9, the teacher introduced and explained a second homonym with a different meaning. In line 10, the teacher used L1 based strategy of literal translation for the word 'colander' and in line 11, the teacher switched to L1 Pashto for a translation of the word, 'colander'. In line 14 and 15, he gave two examples to illustrate the use of 'colander' in the target language for the less proficient speakers L2 learners. In line 16, he sought agreement and in the next line 17, the students provided the agreement.

Teachers used almost all of the strategies with various contexts and with different frequencies based on the discrepancy and adjustment of the message in the interaction. The interlocutors generally adapted these strategies based on their need for the second interlocutors in communication. For both purposes, meaning negotiation and compensation of linguistic items were provided which functioned to adjust the message in a situation where the required meaning structure was not available to reach a mutual understanding (Tarone, 1980, 1981). In applied perspectives, the use of 'meaning negotiation strategies' was not more frequently demonstrated in the data compared to other categories, particularly, 'transfer' L1 based communication strategies. Given the constraints reflected by the settings for communication purposes, students' use of L2 based category and meaning negotiation were reduced, contrary to the expectation of the study.

In view of the linguistic aspects of the teacher's interaction, the participation level of students was largely dependent as clearly shown by the results of lesson three. The teacher's dominant role as an instructor and communicational manager had a constraining or facilitating effect on classroom interaction because it is the teacher who ensures students' participation by maintaining patterns and establishing an interaction. In promoting meaningful communication, the teacher played a vital role by turning the interaction from the solely pedagogic to the naturalistic interaction through the patterns of communication.

The configuration of different orientations of interaction in different phases of the lessons was based on two diverse contexts as shown (accuracy and form VS fluency). The input properties mainly determined different combinations of the interactional processes that were based on these (topic/general lessons and activity/lesson three) configurations. The enhanced level of the communication strategies as well as their varied distribution in individual lessons showed the students' level of participation. The strategies of teachers and groups were compared to each other, which revealed the increased level of students' and teachers' participation through higher frequency. Lower level frequency showed a lower range of interaction between teachers and students in the interaction. Secondly, in each phase, the relationship between pedagogic aims and the input properties was sophisticated by the teachers' knowledge of the interactional processes and their ability to interpret and manifest the pedagogic aims in optimal combinations. The orientation towards activity or topic where the two sets of mechanisms, display, and referential questions were also assumed in the interactional procedures, characterized the feedback of the teachers, affected the level of interaction and initiation moves.

The teachers' communication strategies highlighted the patterns of interaction in L2 classrooms where, in the use of target language, immense problems emerged on both sides of the interlocutors, and this aspect of interaction made the use of communication strategies an escapable aspect of teacher talk. However, the adaptation from the teacher to the students' linguistic needs facilitated the interaction. In addition to their role, CSs provided learning materials in instructional contexts to the process of L2 learning. In view of the different levels of classroom communication, the relationship between the broader orientation of teacher talk toward topic or

activity and the use of communication strategies was shown to be related to it.

The teachers' overall highest frequency in 'transfer' L1 based production strategy highlighted the less proficient teachers in terms of the target language, as well as indicated the ineffective way of interaction which deprived L2 learners of exposure to the target structure. The teachers in group 3 used the 'language switch, and 'literal translation' with the highest frequency compared to the teachers in the other three groups, which revealed the impact of the institution on the teachers in group 3.

The following excerpt demonstrates the use of L1 based production strategies through a 'literal translation' made by the teacher in classroom communication. The teacher predominantly employed language transfer throughout the whole classroom session.

**Excerpt 5.3 [T9 L1]**
T 1:    what was the impact of this war upon England?
   2:    *da dy asar saw o da Englend pa sosaiti bandy*?
   3:    *yao asar ye da wo mataso ta wayale wo abala wraz*

The teacher used the L1 based production strategy of a 'literal translation'. He asked a question in the target language in line 1, and in line 2 he made a word for word translation. The teacher even continued explaining the question in L1 without noticing that the target language is English.

The lowest frequency in lesson three indicated the one-way flow of information in classroom interaction as its implication (Pica and Long, 1986). The low frequency of L2 based production strategies and 'meaning negotiation strategies' compared to the highest frequency in the L1 based strategy revealed these patterns in the study (Long and Sato, 1983). In classroom interaction, certain general aspects are reflected by these views, which reveal important aspects of intra-and inter- teacher variation and lead to uncovering the factors which influenced it. With considerable fluency, the teachers' use of communication strategies as demonstrated by the data, and the overall orientation of interaction influenced the frequency of strategies.

As assumed earlier, the findings revealed the evidence that teachers in private institutions outperformed in the target language in classroom settings. It was empirically proved that the teachers in private institutions outperformed by employing the highest L2 based communication strategies compared to the teachers in government institutions. The teachers in government institutions used L1 based production strategies with excessive frequency in the study. Moreover, the study revealed that the teachers in Government Higher Secondary School demonstrated more proficiently in the target language than the teachers in Government Degree College (group 3 VS group 4). The teachers in Government Higher Secondary School ably sustained the conversation and adjusted the message in L2 based strategies as opposed to the teachers in Government Degree College who solely relied on L1 based strategies. Due to this reason, the findings in groups 1, 2 and 4 ruled out the differences compared to the highest variation shown by the frequency in group 3.

The following example demonstrates the use of L2 based strategy 'circumlocution'– a subcategory through the generic description by teachers in a private institution. The teacher uses the whole that refers to the part.

**Excerpt 5.4 [T2 L1]**
T 1:    Do you know silver?
   2:    <u>Silver is a color</u>
   3:    The name of a color
   4:    <u>Like gold</u>
Ss 5:    <u>Yes, sir</u>

The teacher introduced a new term silver and realized that it can be a threat to communication. In line 2, he describes the color to refer to silver. In line 4, he further explained that it is a name, and finally, in line 4, he makes a comparison with a different color. This way, the teacher succeeds in communicating his message and the students show agreement in line 5.

Using communication strategies as suggested by these issues, teachers not only provide models for their students to follow and to facilitate the communication, but their acquisition of fluency in communication is also assisted by them(Krashen & Alatis, 1980; Krashen, 1982; Long, 1983a; & Swain, 1985). And this is what communication requires, both outside and

inside the classroom. This is especially true in the context of the ESL/EFL classroom, where both the students and the teachers are the learners of the target language. In this case, both sides of the communication take place between non-native speakers. There are two aspects to this; first, more urgency was taken up by the use of communication strategies because of the discomfort on both sides in using the target language. Second, the use of CSs not only helps in communication, but also builds a case of learning, because the practice of using CSs leads to flexibility, and by using a target language, it results in high fluency. The use of subcategories in 'paraphrase' by both interlocutors' can be an asset in communication to acquire fluency when communicating with native speakers outside their classrooms.

## 6. Conclusion

The finding demonstrated that the teachers used communication strategies with considerable frequency. The primary function performed by the strategies was revealed to avoid communication breakdown during disparity. The proficiency of the speakers and impacts of the institutions was demonstrated based on the variation in frequency and patterns of strategies. They used strategies with different functions such as macro-functions which included avoiding communication breakdown or sustaining communication during disparity. L2 based communication strategies were adapted to enhance the effect of the target language in classrooms and provide the alternative meaning of expression required in a situation due to limited proficiency of the interlocutors. L1 based strategies were primarily employed by the less proficient speakers in group 3, which decreased the effect of interaction in the target language and revealed the inefficiency of the teachers in the institution. The strategy of 'avoidance' was used in limited contexts due to the risk-avoiding factor by the interlocutors. 'Mime' was employed in a few instances to enhance the dramatic effect of communication. Meaning negotiation categories were essentially adapted in response to managing the problems of understanding and hearing. The strategies adopted to negotiate the message content consisted of 'confirmation-checks' and 'clarification-requests'. Over the instructional processes, the findings of the study provided an insight into the teachers' interactional adaptation toward the linguistic needs of the students.

New findings were revealed regarding the use of 'homonyms' by the teachers as a communication strategy that functioned to provide new

lexical items and negotiate the meaning for avoiding ambiguities caused by the lexemes in the target language with the same sounds but different meaning.

In spite of the importance CSs' deserve in the field of SLA/FLA, they have received very little attention from the scholars. The promotion of this theme in research perspectives and instructional contexts is the aim of the study so that it can form part of the agenda for both practitioners and researchers. People who have had approached instruction from different angles have said much about instructional strategies. Stakeholders such as the higher hierarchy in the department of education, researchers, and policymakers need to focus on the pedagogical practices used by teachers to improve the standards of education and ensure the learning of the target language for students. Communication strategies are as important as our instructional practices. If the importance of CSs' is undermined, then it could have a contrary effect not just on learners and teachers, but also on the entire system of education.

## References

Al-Ghamdi, H., & Al-Bargi, A. (2017). The Impact of Teacher Speech Modification on the Quality of Interaction and Learning: An Analysis of Spoken Discourse in Saudi EFL Classrooms. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *9*(3), 79-101.

Bialystok, E. (1994). Analysis and control in the development of second language proficiency. *Studiesinsecond language acquisition*, *16*(2), 157-168.

Bialystok, E. (1991). Metalinguistic dimensions of bilingual language proficiency.*Language processing in bilingual children*, 113-140.

Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication strategies: A psychological analysis of second-languageuse*. B. Blackwell.

Bialystok, E., & Frolich, M. (1980).Oral communication strategies for lexical difficulties.*Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 3-30.

Brown, H. (1987). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*.Prentice-Hall.Englewood Cliffs, N. J.

Caraker, R. (2012). Issues in Second Language Acquisition: Can strategic competence betaught in the language classroom. *Studies in Humanities and Social*, 11-22.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Chaudron, C. (1986). The interaction of quantitative and qualitative approaches to research:A view of the second language classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *20*(4), 709-717.

Chou, M. H. (2018). Speaking Anxiety and Strategy Use for Learning English as a Foreign Language in Full and Partial English-Medium Instruction Contexts. *Tesol Quarterly*, 52(3), 611-633.

Clennell, C. (1996). Promoting the Role of English Prosody in a Discourse-Based Approach to Oral Interaction. *Prospect*, *11*(3), 17-28.

Corder, P. (1983).'Strategies of communication'. In C. Faerch, & G. Kasper, (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 15-19). London: Longman.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Sage publications.

Daly, N., & Sharma, S. (2018). Language-as-Resource: Language strategies used by New Zealand teachers working in an international multilingual setting. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *43*(8), 2.

Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language learning*, *47*(1), 173-210.

Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983).On identifying communication strategies in interlanguage production. In C. Faerch, & G. Kasper, (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguagecommunication* (pp. 210-238). London: Longman, 210-238.

Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1984).Two ways of defining communication strategies. *Language learning*, *34*(1), 45-63.

Frewan, A. (2015). *An Exploration of EFL Teachers' Perceptions of the Teaching of Communication Strategies* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield)

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997).On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research.*The modern language journal*, *81*(3), 285-300.

Hammersley, M. (1990).Reading Ethnographic Research. Harlow.

Huang, C. P. (2010). Exploring factors affecting the use of oral communication strategies. LongHua Technology University Journal, 30, 85-104.

Jefferson, G. (1978). Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In J. Schenkein, (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 219-248). New York: Academic Press.

Kárpáti, L. (2017). The use of communication strategies in English language education. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Development Research, 5-14.*

Kellerman, E., & Bialystok, E. (1997).On psychological plausibility in the study of communication strategies.*Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives*, 31-48.

Kellerman, E. (1991). Compensatory strategies in second language research: A critique, a revision, and some (non-) implications for the classroom. *Foreign/second languagepedagogy research*, 142-161.

Kramsch, C. J. (1985). Classroom interaction and discourse options. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *7*(2), 169-183.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition.

Krashen, S. D., & Alatis, J. E. (1980).Current issues in bilingual education. *Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.*

Lockwood, J., & Song, Y. (2020).Understanding Each Other: Strategies for Accommodation in a Virtual Business Team Project-Based in China.*International Journal of BusinessCommunication,* 57(1), 113-144.

Lin, W. (2011).*Communicative strategies in second language acquisition*: A study of Chinese English learners' attitude and reported frequency of communicative strategies.

Long, M. H. (1983a).Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *5*(2), 177-193.

Long, M. H. (1983b).Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input1.*Applied linguistics*, *4*(2), 126-141.

Long, M. and Sato, C. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. Seliger, & M. H. Long, (Eds.), Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition (pp. 268-285) Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011).First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language teaching*, *44*(1), 64-77.

Macaro, E. (2019). Exploring the role of language in English medium instruction. *InternationalJournal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-14.

Ma, L. P. F. (2019).Examining the functions of L1 use through teacher and student interactions inan adult migrant English classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *22*(4), 386-401.

Ochs, E. (1979). Planned and Unplanned Discourse in Discourse and Syntax. *Syntax and Semantics Ann Arbor, Mich.*, *12*, 51-80.

Paribakht, T. (1985).Strategic competence and language proficiency. *Applied linguistics*, *6*(2), 132-146.

Pavón Vázquez, V., & Ramos Ordóñez, M. D. C. (2019).Describing the use of the L1 in CLIL: an analysis of L1 communication strategies in classroom interaction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *22*(1), 35-48.

Pica, T., & Long, M. H. (1986).The linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced teachers. Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition, 85-98.

Poulisse, N. (1993). A theoretical account of lexical communication strategies. *The bilingual lexicon*, 157-189.

Poulisse, N. (1990). *The Use of Compensatory Strategies by Dutch Learners of English.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Rababah, G. (2002). Communication Problems Facing Arab Learners of English.

Raba'ah, G. (2005). Communication Problems Facing Arab Learners of English.*Journal of Language and Learning*, 3 (1).

Rahman, T. 1999. Language Acquisition and Power: A Theoretical Framework. Islamabad, Pakistan: Sustainable Development Policy Institute.

Rampton, B. (1997). A sociolinguistic perspective on L2 communication strategies.*Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives*, 279-303.

Rodríguez Cervantes, C. A., & Roux Rodriguez, R. (2012).The Use of Communication Strategies in the Beginner EFL Classroom. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, *6*, 111-128.

Sarab, M. R. A. (2003). *Communication strategies in second language teacher talk with special reference to Iranian teachers of English* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Leeds).

Scarcella, R. C., & Higa, C. (1981).INPUT, NEGOTIATION, AND AGE DIFFERENCES IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION 1. *Language Learning*, *31*(2), 409-434.

Siegel, A., & Seedhouse, P. (2012).Conversation analysis and classroom interaction. *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*, 1-6.

Sohail, A. (2011). *Repetition: a method for affiliation and agreement in Urdu conversation* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Sheffield).

Spromberg, S. (2011).Communication Strategies Used by High School English Language Learners in Multilingual Classrooms. *Online Submission*.

Stern, H. (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sukirlan, M. (2014).Teaching communication strategies in an EFL class at the tertiary level. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *4*(10), 2033-2042.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. *Input in second language acquisition*, *15*, 165-179.

Tarone, E. (1981). Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. *TESOL Quarterly*, *15*(3), 285-295.

Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage 1. *Language learning*, *30*(2), 417-428.

Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report. In Z. Dörnyei and M.L. Scott, Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47, 173-210.

Ting, S. H., & Phan, G. Y. (2008).Adjusting communication strategies to language proficiency.

Van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner: Ethnography and second-language classroom research*. London: Longman.

Varonis, E. M., & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied linguistics*, *6*(1), 71-90.

Wilkes-Gibbs, D. (1997). Studying language use as collaboration. *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives*, 238-274.

Willems, G. M. (1987). Communication strategies and their significance in foreign language     teaching.*The system*, *15*(3), 351-364.

Xiaohui, H. (2010). An Empirical Study on the Effects of Comprehensible Input on Incidental     English   Vocabulary   Recognition. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Foreign Language Teaching & Research Press)*, *33*(6).

Yule, G., & Tarone, E. (1991). The other side of the page: Integrating the study of communication strategies and negotiated input in SLA. *Foreign/second language pedagogy research*, 142-  161

**APPENDIX A: Transcription conventions used in the current study**

| | |
|---|---|
| T | Teacher |
| TSs | Teacher and students |
| [+ + +] | Long pauses with incomprehensible output |
| (.) | Sudden abandonment of message prematurely |
| Spelling | Presented with individual alphabet separated by a comma |
| **(-)** | Utterances ended with falling intonation |
| S | Refers to individual and general student |
| Ss | More than one student interact at a time with the teacher |

**APPENDIX B: Specially designed tasks for lesson three**
**Task A**
**Step I:**
        Your friend from the UK is organizing a short vacation trip to Pakistan. As he is not a citizen of Pakistan, he will have to deal with Immigration and Customs when he enters Pakistan. He doesn't have much room to pack a lot of things because He's planning to travel with just a backpack. Here are some of the things he is thinking of taking with him. Adapted from (Sarab, 2003).

| | |
|---|---|
| A passport | An international driving license |
| A surfboard | Books about Pakistan |
| Fresh fruit | A return airline ticket |
| A map of Pakistan | A tourist visa |
| A laptop | Photographs of his home country |
| A credit card | Tape and CDs |
| An umbrella | |
| Hiking boots | |

**Step2:**
        Use the following boxes to help him organize the belongings he wants to take to Pakistan. Work with a partner and put them in the boxes where you think they belong.

| | |
|---|---|
| I: It's necessary and obligatory: You can't enter Pakistan without this: You must take this with you. | |
| 2: It's prohibited by law: You must not take this into Pakistan. | |
| 3: It's a good idea to bring this: You should take this with you. | |

| 4 It's OK to bring this but it isn't really necessary:<br>You don't have to take this. | |
|---|---|

**Step 3:**

    Can you and your partner add any other three items to this list? Try to think of at least three more things and put them in the appropriate boxes.

**Step 4:**

    With your partner, write sentences about one or two items in each box, explaining why you think they belong there.

**Modals of Necessity, Prohibition, and Permission**

| Examples | Explanation |
|---|---|
| a) You must have a passport.<br> Or<br>b) You have to have a passport.<br> Or often by law).<br>c) You have got to have a passport. | Use must, have to, or have got to, to show something is necessary and obligatory (something that is strongly required, |
| d) You must not (mustn't) bring fresh fruit into Pakistan-<br>e) You cannot (can't) bring fresh fruit. | Use must not (mustn't) or cannot (can't) to show something is prohibited and absolutely not permitted (often by law) |
| f) You can bring a surfboard. | Use can show that something is permitted. |
| g) You should bring a credit card. | Use should show something is a good idea. |
| h) You don't have to bring a surfboard. | Use do not (don't) have to, to show something is permitted, but not necessary. You can do this if you want to, but you are not required to. |

Look back at the sentences you wrote in Step 4. Did you use must, have to, have got to, should, can, can't, mustn't, and don't have to? If you did, check to see that you used them correctly. If you didn't use them, rewrite the sentences.

**Example:** He must have a valid passport as it is required by law.

**Task B**
**Step 1:**
Work with a partner and decide which of the following are necessary and obligatory to do if you want to get a driving license in your home country.

- Know how to drive
- Practice before the test
- Take an eye test
- Take a written test
- Have a medical examination
- Have a passport or birth certificate as ID
- Pass a driving test
- Have a certificate of secondary education (SSC)
- Own a car
- Have an international driver's license

**Step 2:**
Do you know how to get a driving license in the UK? What do you have to do to get a license here in Pakistan?

In what ways is it different here? Talk to your partner and find out what he knows. Be ready to report on your findings.