NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES EMPLOYED BY ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
PREPARATORY SCHOOL STUDENTS: A CASE STUDY

MA THESIS

MERVEILLE OTSHUDI WETSHOKODI

Nicosia

January 2023

NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES EMPLOYED BY ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
PREPARATORY SCHOOL STUDENTS: A CASE STUDY

MERVEILLE OTSHUDI WETSHOKODI

Supervisor

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hanife Bensen Bostancı

Nicosia

January 2023

Approval

We certify that we have read the thesis submitted by **Merveille Otshudi Wetshokodi** titled **"Communication Strategies Employed by English as a foreign language Preparatory School Students: A Case Study"** and that in our combined opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Educational Sciences.

Examining Committee   Name-Surname   Signature

Head of the Committee: Asst. Prof. Dr. Nuket Gündüz

Committee Member*: Dr. Aida Ariannejad

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hanife Bensen Bostancı

Approved by the Head of the Department

13. .04. /2023

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kurt

Head of Department

Approved by the Institute of Graduate Studies

…. /…. /20…

Prof. Dr. Kemal Hüsnü Can Başer

Head of the Institute

*This thesis defense was conducted virtually, which was recorded. Members of the jury verbally declared acceptance. All proceedings were accurately recorded.

Declaration

I hereby declare that all information, documents, analysis, and results in this thesis have been collected and presented according to the academic rules and ethical guidelines of Institute of Graduate Studies, Near East University. I also declare that as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced information and data that are not original to this study.

Merveille Otshudi Wetshokodi

…../…../…..

Acknowledgments

My sincere appreciation goes to;

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hanife Bensen Bostancı

I value her assistance as a supervisor during this thesis. Her perspective and comments were beneficial in rekindling my excitement and propelling me ahead.

My Parents

I owe a tremendous debt of appreciation to my parents. They have been nothing short of fantastic and supportive throughout the year. Thanks to their guidance and assistance, I was able to accomplish a great deal.

Families and Friends

Thanks to my great siblings, families, and friends, among others, for supporting me throughout the ups and downs of thesis writing.

Abstract
Communication Strategies Employed by English as a Foreign Language
Preparatory School Students: A Case Study
Merveille Otshudi Wetshokodi

MA, Department of English Language Teaching

January, 2023, 79 pages

This study is inspired by the communicative strategies proposed by Dornyei and Scott (1997), and thus, adopts their taxonomy. This study thereby aims to discover the communication strategies employed by Francophone and non-Francophone students at a private institution's English preparatory school program and ascertain how often they employ certain communication strategies when learning English. In addition, this study aims to compare and contrast whether the Francophone students employ similar communication strategies as compared to the non-Francophones and, reveal how often Francophones employ communication strategies as compared to non-Francophone students. Data collected from questionnaires were used to identify the communication strategies and how often they were employed by the aforementioned students. The findings reported that the following communication strategies were employed the most by non-Francophone students: *Other-repetition strategy*, *Self-rephrasing strategy*, *Message replacement strategy, Imitation strategy* and *Imagery strategy*; and the most employed by Francophone students were: *expressing non-understanding strategy, Ignorance acknowledgement strategy, Imagery strategy* and *circumlocution*. The strategies that were used the least by non-Francophone students were seen to be *Retrieval strategy, literal translation, message reduction, asking for clarification strategy* and *mime strategy*; and the communication strategies that were the least employed by Francophones students were *Other-repetition strategy*, *message reduction/Topic avoidance, Response expand* and *Retrieval strategy.* Regarding how often they employ communication strategies, the findings revealed that non-Francophone students always employ *Code switching strategy, use of similar sounding strategy* and *asking for confirmation strategy*. While Francophone students always employ: *Other-repair strategy, asking for confirmation strategy, topic avoidance strategy, code switching strategy* and *use of fillers strategy*. As for the communication strategies that were rarely or never employed by non-francophone students were: *Mime*

strategy, topic avoidance, other-repetition strategy, circumlocution strategy, asking for clarification strategy/ response reject and *message replacement.* Whereas the Francophone students employed: *Other repetition strategy, asking for clarification strategy, mime strategy, message replacement* and *circumlocution*.

Keywords*:* Communication strategies, English as a Foreign Language, Francophones

Özet

Yabancı Dil Hazırlık Okulu Öğrencileri Tarafından Kullanılan İletişim

Stratejileri: Bir Vaka Çalışması

Merveille Otshudi Wetshokodi

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü

Ocak, 2023, 79 ayfa

Bu çalışma, Dornyei ve Scott (1997) tarafından önerilen iletişim stratejilerinden esinlenmiş ve dolayısıyla onların taksonomisini benimsemiştir. Bu çalışma, özel bir kurumun İngilizce hazırlık programındaki Frankofon ve Frankofon olmayan öğrencilerin kullandıkları iletişim stratejilerini keşfetmeyi ve İngilizce öğrenirken belirli iletişim stratejilerini ne sıklıkla kullandıklarını tespit etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca bu çalışma, Frankofon öğrencilerin Frankofon olmayanlara kıyasla benzer iletişim stratejileri kullanıp kullanmadıklarını karşılaştırmayı ve Frankofonların Frankofon olmayan öğrencilere kıyasla iletişim stratejilerini ne sıklıkla kullandıklarını ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Anketlerden toplanan veriler, iletişim stratejilerini ve bunların söz konusu öğrenciler tarafından ne sıklıkla kullanıldığını belirlemek için kullanılmıştır. Bulgular, aşağıdaki iletişim stratejilerinin Frankofon olmayan öğrenciler tarafından en çok kullanıldığını bildirmiştir: Diğerini tekrarlama stratejisi, Kendini tekrarlama stratejisi, Mesaj değiştirme stratejisi, Taklit stratejisi ve İmgeleme stratejisi; Frankofon öğrenciler tarafından en çok kullanılan iletişim stratejileri ise şunlar olmuştur: Anlamadığını ifade etme stratejisi, Bilgisizliği kabul etme stratejisi, İmgeleme stratejisi ve Geçiştirme. Frankofon olmayan öğrenciler tarafından en az kullanılan iletişim stratejilerinin Geri Getirme stratejisi, birebir çeviri, mesaj azaltma, açıklama isteme stratejisi ve taklit stratejisi olduğu; Frankofon öğrenciler tarafından en az kullanılan iletişim stratejilerinin ise Diğer-tekrar stratejisi, mesaj azaltma/Konudan kaçınma, Yanıt genişletme ve Geri Getirme stratejisi olduğu görülmüştür. İletişim stratejilerini ne sıklıkla kullandıklarına ilişkin bulgular, Frankofon olmayan öğrencilerin Kod değiştirme stratejisini, benzer seslendirme stratejisini ve onay isteme stratejisini her zaman kullandıklarını ortaya koymuştur. Frankofon öğrenciler

ise her zaman Diğer-onarım stratejisi, onay isteme stratejisi, konudan kaçınma stratejisi, kod değiştirme stratejisi ve dolgu kullanımı stratejisi. Frankofon olmayan öğrenciler tarafından nadiren kullanılan ya da hiç kullanılmayan iletişim stratejileri ise şunlardır: Mimik stratejisi, konudan kaçınma, diğerini tekrarlama stratejisi, dolambaçlı konuşma stratejisi, açıklama isteme stratejisi/cevap reddetme ve mesaj değiştirme. Frankofon öğrenciler ise şunları kullanmıştır: Diğer tekrar stratejisi, açıklama isteme stratejisi, mim stratejisi, mesaj değiştirme ve dolaylı anlatım.

Anahtar Kelimeler : İletişim stratejileri, Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce, Frankofonlar

Table of content

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

List of Abbreviations

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

CSs: Communication Strategies

SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

CHAPTER I
Introduction

Introduction

This chapter begins with an introduction to the study, the study's contexts, and then presents the study's problem statement. The purpose and goals of this study are next outlined, followed by the research significance. This chapter also discusses the study's limitations before moving to the definition of key terms.

Context of the Study

English medium universities today attract more students from different parts of the world as English is considered as the language of international communication, spoken everywhere in the world. For international students (francophones), knowing English increases their chances for getting good jobs (for better employment opportunities) within their home country or even abroad, for any purpose they want to attain in the professional level they need English.

Coming from countries where English is not a means of communication is the case of most students studying at this private university; most of them studied English as a foreign language in secondary schools as a class course but could not use the language because the environment was not suitable, as the community or environment can play a role in encouraging students in leaning and practice of the target language. So, as considered for achieving different objectives (socializing, business, internet and media, work, and so on.) learning English becomes a great motivation to achieve the goals.

When it comes to the language of education, parents prefer their children goes to study abroad, not only to get good quality education as well as literacy knowledge in foreign languages but to gain also life experience (get out of their comfort zones, develop cultural sensitivity and adapt to globalization) that one of the reasons students travel to different countries to study and mostly in English medium universities and one of their countries of choice is Northern Cyprus.

Most of the students studying in North Cyprus, especially those coming from English non speaking countries experience many challenges that prevents them to communicate well. These challenges seem to be personal as most of them lack confidence and are unfamiliar with much of the English vocabulary, these create language barrier and misunderstandings, and some of them do use the translation app in their phones in order to communicate.

According to some students studying in this private university, moving to the island was fascinating, but seems also to be a frightening experience for others. Some students who prepared their mind before coming enjoy discovering the Turkish culture, food and look forward to master the English language as soon as possible to start socializing, while others are stressed out as they find it difficult to adapt themselves with the climate, food and also socialize as they came to understand/realize that English is the lingua-franca.

From the international (francophones) students' experience, most of them neglected English when they were taught as a course at secondary school and they claim it was tough as the environment could not allow them to practice the language, today most of the francophone students recognize English as an international language that does not have many requirements than French (referring to complex grammar and linguistic nuances that does not exist in English).

Travelling to a country far from the homeland, francophone students admit to be aware of the importance of English for their future. By studying away from parents and family members students admit knowing how to define the sense of responsibility, tenacity, perseverance, initiative, resistance to shocks and attitude to control themselves. And international, particularly francophones become impatient to communicate with others fluently after taking English preparatory classes.

Background of the Study

Studies claimed that English is widely accepted and acknowledged as an international language that helps foreign trade and

investment, economics, science, technology, and education and communication in many part of the world (Juliá-Sanchis et al., 2020).

Learning and speaking English strengthens a country's competitiveness in the face of globalization and internationalism, which have compelled countries worldwide to join a global community for a variety of reasons. Alkoyak-Yildiz et al. (2019) contends that learning a foreign language comprises more than mastering vocabulary and grammar; it also requires a shift in one's self-perception and the acquisition of new social and cultural habits and ways of life.

English preparatory school Francophone students at this private University are being urged to improve their oral communication and writing skills through learning tools (Agago et al., 2021). This thesis was motivated by an active learning environment experiment conducted at a private higher institution in North Cyprus.

Active participation in these communication channels is critical for students to develop an interest in and commitment to the learning systems. As cited in Burrows, (2013), The means in which an individual manages to compensate between their communicate goal and their immediately available linguistic resources are known as communication strategies (henceforth CSs). Different scholars carried out research on Communication strategies and some came up with different models known as taxonomies. Although the taxonomies put out by different researchers initially appear to differ, they all basically state the same thing. 33 different varieties of CSs have evolved over time into around nine key taxonomies, all of which will be briefly discussed in the following chapter and more focus will be on Dornyei and Scott's taxonomy (1997) as it includes the summary of other taxonomies done by other researchers.

Effective communication conveys information in the most effective manner possible. Face-to-face communication is about bonding, providing information, and being heard and understood. In this preparatory school, instructors communicate with their students to convey knowledge, encourage understanding, and develop connections. In a face-to-face session, instructors can connect and convey their message through body language and facial expressions (Deveci & Wyatt, 2022).

A focus on communicative skills is acquired through class communication. Teachers in the English preparatory school at this private institution are recommended to develop classroom activities that provide opportunities for Francophone students to practice speaking in various contexts, including chores, role play, and exercises that require them to fill in knowledge gaps.

At the English preparatory school, teaching a foreign language, by training the international (francophone) students appropriate communication methods, it is feasible for them to achieve greater self-confidence and competency. It is common knowledge that each student has a unique communication strategy and teachers use different communication skills to teach the students to acquire English. In the English preparatory school at this private institution, some of the students lack confidence and participation. However, curriculum, pedagogy, and technology preparation, organization, and implementation are required to stimulate and sustain effective student interactions (Morsidi et al., 2021). International students embrace the preparatory class to improve their English for social, economic, and political reasons.

As a result, francophone students' English proficiency must be immediately improved to fully benefit from the implementation and the development of a knowledge-based society. Therefore, the purpose of the English preparatory school at the private institution in which this study took place, is to improve the learning skills of all students including the Francophone students through a face to face and online learning environment as the research will explore/discover the communication strategies employed by English as a foreign language student, and know often the students employ them.

Problem of the Study

Students who have travelled to English speaking countries to study have difficulties in their communication and learning skills. So, the lack of language skills, this miscommunication/misunderstanding during class lessons, not all but some second/foreign language students do not participate in class discussions and even have difficulties expressing themselves during the class presentations. They (some of them) use their

social background as an excuse for errors /oral (pronunciation) errors (Strelkova et al., 2022).

Many of the francophone students at the private institution's preparatory school in North Cyprus are incapable of communicating effectively in English. Few students attempt to speak English in the classroom, while the bulk either remain silent or use their first language for communication. Students may encounter communication barriers that prohibit them from participating in classroom discussions. Lack of communication skills and the inability to apply expertise effectively in communication is one of the most prevalent problems these students experience. However, the use of communication skills in classroom discussions is an effective means of compensating for communication inadequacies and keeping the communication channel open for language learners (Awang & Careemdeen, 2021).

Aim of the Study

This study, inspired by the communicative strategies proposed by Dornyei and Scott (1997), aims to discover the communication strategies employed by international (francophones) students at this private university and ascertain whether the international students and particularly francophones who participated in the English preparatory school at this private institution (North Cyprus) increased their capacity to communicate in English.

To be able to reach the aims the following research questions are set to guide this study:

1. What are the communication strategies employed by English as a foreign language student studying English preparatory school?
2. How often do students employ communicative strategies?
3. Are there any differences or similarities between the communicative strategies employed by francophones and non-francophone students?

Significance of the Study

Students interested in learning English can use the findings of this study to supplement their English skills outside of the classroom. The

findings of this study may be beneficial to teachers and students who wish to improve their English communication skills. An appropriate/good methods and attitudes of students will be identified in this study to adapt for successful participation and will provide remarks and/or advice for English preparatory school teachers to consider when holding English classes. The study will help also teachers to be aware of the different strategies employed by their students and propose some techniques to apply in their teaching for student's integration and development. Additionally, to other researchers who would like to know if there any differences or similarities between the communicative strategies employed by international students from different social backgrounds (as the case of students in this private institution).

Limitations

- The study is limited to communication strategies in face to face learning.

- The treatment process is limited to the preparatory students who volenteered to participate in the study.

Definition of Terms

Communication: is defined as transferring information to produce greater understanding**.**

Communication Strategies: In Bialystok's book Communication Strategies, she cites four definitions relating to the strategies of second-language learners (Bialystok, 1990, p.3) (as cited in Zhang Ya-ni, 2007):

(1) a systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his meaning when faced with some difficulty; (Corder, 1977)

(2) a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures are not shared; (Tarone, 1980)

(3) potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal; (Faerch & Kasper, 1983a)

(4) techniques of coping with difficulties in communicating in an imperfectly known second language. (Stern, 1983).

Conclusively, chapter one of this thesis presented the study's research background, addressed the problem stated in the literature, the research questions, aim and significance of this study and lastly defined the key term

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the findings and implications of previous research on communication strategies. The chapter embodied the theoretical framework and the empirical review of related studies. The following sections provide the theoretical basis for this thesis and existing research done on communication strategies. To comprehend the communication strategies for English preparatory school at this private institution in North Cyprus, one must first investigate the underlying history of communication strategies and the existing types of taxonomies of communication strategies.

Theoretical Framework

Learners' strategies are specific activities made by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more joyful, better targeted, and transferable to other settings. Velasco et al. (2022) defines learning strategies as the concepts and behaviors individuals employ to achieve a learning objective. Abdul Halim et al. (2021) defines learning strategies as techniques, methods, or planned activities that students use to acquire and retain language and content area information. A learning strategy is an optional technique of utilizing available knowledge to improve second-language ability. Second language learners employ learning strategies to increase their competency and self-confidence. Serttaş and Kasabalı (2020) notes that various learning mechanisms exist in this environment.

Various cognitive approaches can analyze, synthesize, or change instructional content. Metacognitive strategies constitute the second category of learning strategies. In metacognitive strategies, planning, monitoring, and evaluating learning are included (Wahyudi et al., 2021).

As a result of this ambiguity, academics prefer to view learning techniques and communication strategies as contentious words. Confusion exists over the meaning of the word communication strategy as it has appeared in the literature on second-language acquisition, particularly when used interchangeably with terms such as learning strategy. Learning approaches are determined by the learner's

characteristics, while language characteristics dictate communication tactics (Kanat, 2019). In other words, "attempts to exploit a limited linguistic system to improve communication" are "learning strategies," whereas "attitude and skill" are "communication strategies". Learners employ communication tactics to communicate, whereas they utilize learning techniques to acquire knowledge. According to Rubin, while communication techniques may lead to learning, their fundamental purpose is to increase communication (Komba, 2016).

The idea of second language (L2) communication strategies (CSs) was first put forth by researchers at the start of the 1970s after it was realized that the mismatch between L2 speakers' linguistic resources and communicative intentions results in a number of systematic language phenomena whose primary function is to handle communication problems or breakdowns. (Dörnyei & Scott, 1997). The term "communication strategy" was coined by Selinker (1972) on his paper "Interlanguage" referring to the methods by which foreign or second language learners use to overcome communication challenges when their linguistic resources are insufficient. The first definition of "communication strategy" was provided by Tarone and her collaborators (Tarone, 1977; Tarone, Cohen & Dumas, 1976) in two studies that were specifically focused on CSs. They also provided the first taxonomy (Tarone, 1977) that is still regarded as one of the most influential in the field. (Dornyei and Scott,1995)

As cited in Dornyei and Scott (1997), The true "career" of CSs began in the early 1980s. First, they were incorporated by Canale and Swain, as the main components of one of the sub-competencies, strategic competence, in their well-known model of communicative competence. Second, Faerch and Kasper published an edited book titled Strategies in Interlanguage Communication that included both significant newly written studies and a collection of the most significant published papers. These two publications focused on the identification and classification of communication strategies as well as their teachability. Few years later after these two publications, many researchers such as Bialystok, Poulisse and the Nijemegen group, produced a series of significant articles, reviews and publications.

Concerning the formulation of communication strategies, many authors came up with different explanations and definitions, some took a linguistic approach and others a psychological approach in explaining /defining communication strategy. For instance, Tarone's interactional view point, consider CSs as a mutual attempt by two interlocutors to reach an agreement on a meaning in situations where the necessary meaning structures do not appear to be shared. As for Dornyei and Scott's broader perspective, defined CSs as the key units in a broad description of problem-solving in L2 communication. Bialystok also defined the use of the term (communication strategy) as "willful planning to achieve explicit goals". Researchers with psychological approach all argued that CSs are inherently mental procedures, and thus CS should focus on the cognitive processes underlying strategic language use. The information of strategic language use, therefore, has been an essential studies path and a large amount of studies literature has collected on the character of CSs, taxonomies of strategic language gadgets, variant in CS use, and the sensible implications of CS studies (focusing, in particular, at the teachability of CSs). There is no universally accepted definition of CSs; as a result, several competing taxonomies of CSs exist, including different ranges of language devices, from paraphrase to filled pauses, from code switching to interactional meaning-negotiation mechanisms (such as clarification requests).

In general, researchers have agreed with Bialystok's (1990) assertion that "communication strategies are an undeniable event of language use, their existence is a reliably documented aspect of communication appears particularly salient" (Dornyei & Scott, 1997). To sum up, a review of the CS literature reveals that two defining criteria, problem-orientedness and consciousness, are consistently mentioned.

Types of Communication Strategies Models/Taxonomies

On the surface, the taxonomies proposed by various researchers appear to differ, but they all say the same thing and among the multiple kinds of models proposed by several authors, the 6 (six) most known

models are discussed briefly though this section. The taxonomies are: Tarone's (1977/1983), Faerch and Kasper's (1983), Bialystok's (1990), Dörnyei's (1995), Dörnyei and Scott's (1997), Rabab'ah's (2001).

Tarone's Taxonomy

The taxonomy of CSs proposed by Tarone (1983) was based on her investigation of nine second language learners From an interactional view or social strategies, Tarone (1977) classified social strategies into five broad categories: avoidance, paraphrase, conscious transfer, appeal for assistance, and mime. In avoidance strategies, the learner avoids the communication by using topic avoidance or message abandonment. Paraphrase consist of three subcategories: approximation, word coinage and circumlocution. Conscious transfer involves literal translation and language switch. In an appeal for assistance, the learner requests the correct term or structure. The last strategy is mime, which occurs when a learner employs nonverbal strategies rather than a meaning structure. This taxonomy is significant in the field because it covers most of CSs investigated in later studies, and Tarone's definitions and examples are clear and illustrative (Dornyei & Scott, 1997).

Faerch and Kasper's Taxonomy

Faerch and Kasper (1983) proposed the second significant classification of CSs, which consist of (1) Avoidance with Formal and Functional reduction strategies; (2) Achievement strategies with Non-cooperative and Cooperative strategies. According to Faerch and Kasper 1983, (as cited in Farrahi, 2012), learners can solve a communication problem using one of the two strategies: avoidance or achievement. The learner uses avoidance strategies to either avoid a difficult linguistic form (i.e., formal reduction) or avoids a language function at the actional level (functional reduction. Non-cooperative strategies which is an achievement strategy involve the learner attempting to solve a problem without the assistance of others by using L1/L3 strategies, interlanguage strategies, and non-linguistic strategies. And cooperative strategies entail the assistance of another person. As a result, Faerch and Kasper's CS taxonomy is more complicated than Tarone's because it includes more subtypes.

Bialystok's Taxonomy

The analysis-based and control-based strategies are the two main classes of CSs that Bialystok's taxonomy (1990) conceptualizes for process-oriented approach. The analysis-based strategies involve, in Bialystok's words (as in Farrahi, 2012), "an attempt to convey the structure of the intended concept by making explicit the relational defining features." Circumlocution, paraphrase, transliteration, and word coinage, which aim to incorporate distinctive features into the expression, as well as mime, which aim to convey significant properties, are examples of descriptive taxonomies' strategies that are included in analysis-based strategies (Bialystok, 1990).

As a result, Bialystok's proposed CS taxonomy is based on a language processing framework. It should be noted that Bialystok's taxonomy of CSs has clear definitions and exemplifications, and some strategies (e.g., circumlocution, word coinage, and mime) are similar to Tarone's taxonomy of CSs (Farrahi, 2012).

Dörnyei's Taxonomy

Dornyei (1995), discussed about three categories of communication strategies which are Avoidance or Reduction Strategies, Achievement or Compensatory Strategies, and Stalling/Time-gaining Strategies. The first strategy includes alteration, reduction or completely abandonment of the intended meaning. Achievement or compensatory strategies provide speakers with alternative plans for carrying out their original communicative goal by manipulating available language. The final category is stalling/time-gaining strategies, which differ from other strategies in that they are used to gain time and keep the communication channel open during difficult times. It should be noted that Dornyei's (1995) taxonomy adds stalling/time-gaining strategies to the existing taxonomies in the field. These strategies are not used to compensate for a lack of vocabulary, but rather to give students more time to think and maintain a conversation with their interlocutor.

Dörnyei and Scott's Taxonomy

Dornyei and Scott (1997) reviewed articles and summarized the definitions and taxonomies of CSs, which other researchers proposed in the

field. They distinguished three main categories: direct, indirect and interaction strategies.

According to Dornyei and Scott (1997), direct strategies include "alternative, manageable and self-contained means of getting the meaning across, like circumlocution to compensate for the lack of a word." Indirect strategies are not strictly problem -solving facilities. They indirectly facilitate the transmission of meaning by determining the conditions for achieving mutual understanding: preventing failures and maintaining the communication channel open or indicating less than perfect forms that require additional efforts to understand. Interaction strategies is when participants cooperate (for example, seek help and provide assistance, or request and submit explanations), so mutual understanding is a successful execution function of both speakers/interlocutors (Dornyei & Scott, 1997).

Dornyei and Scott's (1997) taxonomy of CSs is not only based on the summary of all the taxonomies in the field of CSs, but also includes some new CSs such as: mumbling, omission, feigning understanding, use of similar-sounding word and asking for repetition. This study also included the use of all-purpose words and self-repair strategies.

Rabab'ah's Taxonomy

L1 -Based Strategies and L2 Based Strategies. The first category comprises: Literal translation, Language Switch. And l2 based strategies include: Avoidance Strategies, Word Coinage, Circumlocution, Self -correction/Restructuring, Approximation, Mumbling, L2 appeal for help, Self-repetition, Use of similar-sounding words, Use of all-purpose words and Ignorance Acknowledgement.

Rabab'ah's taxonomy (2001) was based on the pilot study which was conducted to assess the suitability of the tasks for eliciting the strategic behavior and the quality of the data collection procedures. He added new sub- categories to the taxonomy which were classified under the language switch strategy and were classified according to the factors causing this switch. These sub categories involved *L1 appeal for help, L1-optional meaning, L1 ignorance acknowledgement strategy and L1 retrieval strategies*, and each one was used for a particular reason. Ignorance acknowledgement was also added as another L2-based strategy. This strategy "is used when the learner admits his ignorance and does not try

any other strategy to describe the language item needed". The basis of the taxonomy is a consideration of the source of the information on which the strategy is used. This information may derive from the learner's native language which is referred to as an L1-based strategy, or the information may derive from the target language and in this case, it is referred to as an L2-based strategy (Rabab'ah, 2001).

Related Studies

Rahman and Novia (2021) investigated types of communication strategies and the most frequent types of CSs employed by EFL students. The finding of the study shows that most of the students employed these types of CSs: asking for clarification, requesting an explanation, asking for repetition, circumlocution, message abandonment, meaning negotiation, and interaction monitoring. Furthermore, the communication strategies frequently used by students are: asking for clarification, message abandonment, and meaning negotiation. They concluded that, every student has their own CSs but research categorized those strategies into several types.

Yanju and Yanmei (2016), looked at the component in communication competence, i.e., strategy competence or the use of communication strategies in oral interactions among Middle Eastern Students and counter staff in institute of postgraduate studies (IPS) at University of Malay. It was found that the most frequently used CSs was the use of "modification devices". And the other strategies used frequently were: interaction strategies, compensatory strategies, avoidance strategies, and L2-based strategies. The result showed that students used different CSs to overcome their communication difficulties.

Carvantes and Roddringuez (2012), investigated the CSs used by two EFL teachers and their beginner level students; and the potential factors that influence the CSs they use in class. Results indicated that the CSs frequently used in both groups was "language switch". However, while the teacher who seemed more involved with students used clarification request, comprehension check and asking for confirmation; the teacher who appeared more distant from students used comprehension check and repetition. Class

size, seating arrangements and learning activity types were also some of the factors that influenced the communication strategies used.

Yusef Demir et al. (2018), explored the oral communication strategies used by Turkish EFL learners; the study used a mixed method design. As a result, the participants were perceived to use oral CSs to some extent, with negotiation for meaning having a top priority.

Fyaak and AbdlHameed (2016), investigated CSs used by EFL teachers and their student in an EFL setting. The result showed that students CSs proposed by Dornyei (1997), they used message reduction, approximation, circumlocution, and so on. Although teachers teach communication strategies, yet they are unaware of such strategies; they use them unconsciously.

Kim Tan et al. (2012), researched how and when oral communication strategies are used in group discussions by international students at UKM, a public University in Malaysia. It aimed to examine the differences in use of CSs between high and low proficient speakers. They found out that the most frequently employed CSs was: code switching; an interlingual strategy and the least used strategy was: word coinage; an interlingual strategy.

Hansson (2020) researched "Communication Strategies Used by English Teachers and Students". The study aimed to identify the communication modalities utilized by secondary school students and teachers. Hansson (2020) acquired data by conducting in-depth interviews and making casual observations. The scholar noticed that students like to communicate through guesswork, but professors prefer to do so through the use of questions.

According to Alkoyak-Yildiz et al. (2019), a student's first language has a major impact on their capacity to acquire a second language. Furthermore, Mayende et al. (2017) stated that the critical role of an individual's native language in expressing meaning and content cannot be emphasized. According to the author, time-saving and circumlocution techniques, translation, and meaning testing all affect the success of the communication process. Rather than depending on their native language, Rahman et al. (2020) advised that learners use alternative teaching language strategies such as paraphrases.

Velasco et al. (2022) conducted a study titled "Combining Communication Strategies and Vocabulary Development". The study

examined how English language learners could use communication strategies to overcome language reception and production limitations. Methodical classroom instruction and practice were also explored. According to the findings of his study, students' communication skills can be enhanced by adopting communication strategies. It helped them avoid relying excessively on dictionaries during in-class communication exercises. There are numerous ways to include strategy practice in language-learning activities. As a result, students had the opportunity to expand their vocabularies while also learning how to employ effective and efficient communication strategies.

Hansson (2020) researched "Communication Strategies Used by English Teachers and Students". The study aimed to identify the communication modalities utilized by secondary school students and teachers. Hansson (2020) acquired data by conducting in-depth interviews and making casual observations. The scholar noticed that students like to communicate through guesswork, but professors prefer to do so through the use of questions. The analysis discovered a correlation between the use of communication strategies and characteristics such as skill level, native language, and work pressure. The fifteen participants in the study were all English language learners from diverse ethnic backgrounds. Seven of them spoke Galician first language fluently, while the rest spoke Spanish first fluently. The instructor assigned three communication tasks to the participants: a picture story narration, a photo description, and a ten-minute informal talk. According to the findings, independent of their home language, both Galician and Spanish native learners utilized avoidance, achievement, and first language -based communication techniques. For unknown causes, there was a significant variance in the frequency of communication methods used by participants (Komba, 2016).

In conclusion, the literature review chapter presented a short history of communication strategies, some types of Communication Strategies models/taxonomies that exist and related research done on the employment of CSs by English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. This chapter serves as a reference for the following chapters were some of the models were used.

CHAPTER III
Methodology

Introduction

The preceding chapter gave an overview of existing research on communication strategies. However, this chapter present the methodology, participants, and data collection and analysis procedures, which seeks to provide an overview of the research methodology utilized in the study. This study was inspired by the communicative strategies proposed by Dornyei and Scott (1995a/1995b) which aimed to investigate the communication strategies employed by English preparatory students at a private institution in North Cyprus.

Research Design

The data were acquired sequentially from primary sources employing a quantitative analysis. Collecting quantitative data are used to gain insight into a phenomenon and answer research questions (Molina-Azorin, 2016).

When researchers employ quantitative methods, they can collect more information, improve the dependability of their conclusions, and more effectively illustrate their ideas by contrasting the two sets of findings (Molina-Azorin, 2016).

This study used a quantitative research method. Quantitative research involves gathering and analyzing data with a focus on numbers. It forms a logical approach emphasizing testing hypotheses using empiricist and positivist principles. Hence, a convergent methodology was utilized in this work. Convergent research is a methods study in which quantitative data are collected simultaneously and independently analyzed. The results are then compared or integrated to conclude (Schoonenboom & Johnson, 2017). Using a convergent design, quantitative data are compared and contrasted with acquiring excellent knowledge of the study problem. This methodology use quantitative,

enabling researchers to support their anecdotal conclusions with empirical evidence (Schoonenboom & Johnson, 2017).

Research Procedures

The English preparatory school at this private institution is to enable international students from non-English speaking countries to understand the English language before going for their four-year Bachelor's degree program. These six months of the one-year program are devoted to English language practice. At the outset of their first academic year, each student is provided with an English preparatory online class account and a hands-on orientation. At the end of each semester, they were required to have completed 70% of the communication skills with specified content levels (Stratton, 2021).

After ethical approval, the questionnaires were prepared and checked (the questionnaires were prepared/developed) based on Dornyei and Scott's taxonomy and also other researchers' taxonomies. We went to prep school to meet the director for their approval too and get all the necessary information and class schedule. Since the research was conducted after the preparatory school exams, some students had travelled, so only one level B1 (Common European Framework for References) was selected for the questionnaires. As a result, only 67 students were accessed during the data collection period [in which fourteen (14) students were francophones]. Hence, the data collection took more than a week, where 22 students accessed on the first day, 13 on the second day, and 20 on the third and fourth days. The data was collected in two segments or two different months. As a result, the last part was collected from 12 students (summer semester students). See appendix A and B for Questionnaires. The study's research design and methodological choices were outlined, along with an explanation of their application. Using a quantitative approach enabled us to gain a deeper grasp of the viewpoints of the students of English preparatory class at the private institution. The data collection and analysis were methodically planned and conducted to address the study objectives. Data were collected from primary sources in order to account for the vast majority

of communication skills. The study's theoretical framework was explored in light of the assessment of two data sets. Changes were made to analytical results so that researcher may consolidate and expand conclusions at various phases of data collection and processing. The analytical results will be explored in greater depth in the subsequent section.

Participants and Sampling

Convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling technique in which units are selected for the sample based on their accessibility. This could be due to geographical closeness, availability at a specific moment, or a willingness to engage in the study. Hence, this study used convenience sampling to measure the perception of the preparatory students' communication strategies at a private institution in North Cyprus since the students were conveniently available. This sampling method is practical when time is of the essence because it is quick and straightforward. Numerous scientists like convenience sampling because it takes little planning and can produce significant samples in a relatively short period (Polites et al., 2012). In total 67 students took part in the study in which fourteen (14) students were francophones and the remaining (53) were non-francophones.

Data Collection

The questionnaire was adapted then constructed referring to the taxonomy proposed by Dornyei and Scott (1995). It (the questionnaires) aimed to learn more about the students' communication skills in the English preparatory class. There were two questionnaires which were named Communication Strategy I and the other Communication Strategy II (see Appendix A and B). The two different questionnaires answer two different research questions. The respondents were asked to respond to a five-point Likert-Scale ranging from strongly agreed to strongly disagree; and second Likert scale: always to never. Respondents were required to complete the questionnaire in the English language.

Questionnaire

There are more than 400 students in different levels in the preparatory school. There were two questionnaires which were named Communication Strategy I and the other Communication Strategy II, composed of 20 and 12 items/statements respectively. The two types of questionnaires used two different Likert scales. Questionnaire 1 answers Research question one and questionnaire two also answers research question 2 (see Appendix A and B). The questionnaires aimed to find out more about the communication strategies used by students in the English preparatory school. The respondents were asked to respond to a five-point Likert-Scale ranging from strongly agreed to strongly disagree (questionnaire for research question 1); and always to never (questionnaire for research question 2). Each questionnaire was divided into 4 parts, the first part on the questionnaire was a short information or summary of the purpose of the study and questionnaire; the second part was the biographic information part, students were required to fill their *nationality*. The third part was instructions which they had to follow before answering the questions; and the last part was a table with questions and the place to mark their answers. They (respondents) were required to complete the questionnaires in the English language.

Data Analysis

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16.0 was employed to guarantee that the data could be processed and that the results were pertinent. Using the tool, the researcher can find more specific connections between variables, such as how students interacted with the class and other characteristics (peers and teachers). The question labels were encoded and inserted using the SPSS software. Visual checks and data recounts were conducted to ensure that the data was entered into SPSS accurately. A codebook supervised the SPSS data-entering process (Bozonelos, 2020).

Reliability and Validity

In this paper construct validity was used. As we aimed to find out the CSs employed and if any difference between students' CSs, we used

Questionnaires for data collection and SPSS was utilized as data analysis tool. The threats to research reliability with which, are participants errors, participants bias, research errors and research bias, were made sure the threats were reduced to the barest minimum.

Ethical Considerations

This inquiry maintained the integrity of the study participants, the study course, and the research organization. Before data collection could be conducted, participants and researchers were required to consent (Gürbüz, 2017) (see Appendix C). A method for gathering information before the study could begin, ethics approval was obtained from both the private institution management and the English preparatory school, where the participants were studying.

CHAPTER IV

Findings and Discussion

Introduction

This chapter involves the findings and discussion, and this is divided into two sections (parts), the student questionnaire focusing on Communication Strategy I with 20 items, and the student's questionnaire focusing on Communication Strategy II with 12 items. In each part there are two groups of students involved: the francophone and non-francophone students. Regarding Communication Strategies I, students were asked to indicate which strategies they employ. On the other hand, for Questionnaire 2 which focused on Communication Strategies II, they were asked to identify how often they employ the communication strategies.

In this chapter, descriptive analysis was performed to compare the responds of francophone and non-francophone students to each statement in the questionnaire. To be able to see whether there were any significant differences between these two groups inferential statistics employing an Independent samples T-test was performed.

Communication Strategy I

Thirty-three (33) students completed the questionnaire with 20 items; twenty-three (23) of them were non-francophone from Turkey, Indonesia and Iraq. The other ten (10) respondents were francophone from Congo and Burundi.

Non-Francophone – Students' Communication Strategy I

The general mean value of communication strategies I was 3.91, with an associated standard deviation of 0.15, thus indicates that the majority of the non-francophone students strongly agreed to the utilization of communication strategy I which means that the partipants employed communication strategy I to communicate in the English language. This is similar to the study of Tabrizian et al. (2019).

When the non-francophone students were asked to state whether they pay attention to what they say rather than how they say it or

pronounce it, with a mean score of 4.41 and standard deviation 0.756, most of the non-francophone students strongly agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the non-francophone students pay attention to what they, whether it is bad pronounced or not, they value the meaning. They do not care as long as the message is conveyed. Their focus is on the meaning and not on the pronunciation (Statement 2, Table 1).

When students were asked to state whether they repeat what they have just said when they need to think of what to say, with a mean score of 4.31 and standard deviation 0.693 most of the non-francophone students strongly agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the non-francophone students repeat what they have just said when they need to think of what to say (Statement 1, Table 1). This is *Other-repetition strategy* based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy.

When students were asked to state whether they enjoy supplementing the discussion with additional examples (building on a previous comment made by another student), with a mean score of 4.22 and standard deviation 0.941 most of the non-francophone students strongly agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the non-francophone students enjoy supplementing the discussion with additional examples (building on a previous comment made by another student) (Statement 9, Table 1). This is *self-rephrasing strategy*, based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy.

When students were asked to state whether they will substitute synonyms or phrases with a similar connotation to assist them in communicating my thoughts when they have difficulty in using a word(s), with a mean score of 4.19 and standard deviation 0.998 most of the non-francophone students agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the non-francophone students will substitute synonyms or phrases with a similar connotation to assist me in communicating my thoughts when they have difficulty in using a word(s) (Statement 14, Table 2). The strategy employed here is *Message replacement strategy*,

based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy. This type of strategy is also found on other researchers' taxonomies.

Table 1.

Non-Francophone Students' Communication Strategy I(a)

Statement	M	SD
1. I will repeat what I have just said when I need to think of what to say	4.31	0.693
2. I pay more attention to what I say rather than how I say it or pronounce it	4.41	0.756
3. When I have difficulty to use the right word(s), I try to describe it to the other students	3.94	1.268
4. I prefer to redirect the conversation rather than remain silent when I do not understand a discussion	3.69	1.176
5. I gradually translate the words into my first language to help me comprehend what the speaker is saying	3.63	1.185
6. I use a simpler word(s) when involving in any conversation	3.66	1.125
7. When other students do not appear to understand or agree with my point of view, I speak up	3.77	1.203
8. When others do not understand me, I use gestures and facial expressions	3.90	0.908
9. I enjoy supplementing the discussion with additional examples (building on a previous comment made by another student)	4.22	0.941
10. When I am not sure of what someone is trying to convey, I will ask them to clarify what they are saying.	3.69	1.061

Legend: 4.21 – 5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.41 – 4.20 = Agree; 2.61 – 3.40 = Undecided;
1.81 – 2.60 = Disagree; < 1.81 = Strongly Disagree
Key: M: Mean Score   SD: Standard Deviation

When students were asked to state whether they imitate how the teachers speak, with a mean score of 4.16 and standard deviation 0.92 most of the non-francophone students agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the non-francophone students imitate how the teachers speak (Statement 20, Table 2). This is *Imitation strategy* under the *non-linguistic strategies* which is a subcategory of

Achievement strategies. This strategy is found in Faerch and Kasper's (1983b) taxonomy.

When students were asked to state whether they consult the teacher's notes for suggested words and structures to assist them during the discussion when they have difficulty expressing themselves, with a mean score of 3.56 and standard deviation 1.268 most of the non-francophone students agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the non-francophone students consult the teacher's notes for suggested words and structures to assist them during the discussion when they have difficulty expressing themselves (Statement 17, Table 2). The students use their book for grammatical structures to avoid mistakes, some kind of *Retrieval strategy*, trying to get the correct structures from the book or dictionary.

When students were asked to state whether they gradually translate the words into their first language to help them comprehend what the speaker is saying, with a mean score of 3.63 and standard deviation 1.185 most of the non-francophone students agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the non-francophone students gradually translate the words into their first language to help them comprehend what the speaker is saying (Statement 5, Table 1). The students use *Literal translation (transfer)* strategy, proposed by Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy.

When students were asked to state whether they use a simpler word(s) when involving in any conversation, with a mean score of 3.66 and standard deviation 1.125 most of the non-francophone students agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the non-francophone students use a simpler word(s) when involving in any conversation (Statement 6, Table 1). This is *Message reduction (topic avoidance) strategy* where students avoid difficult words or vocabulary by using simple words that they master; this strategy is based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy.

Table 2.

Non-Francophone Students' Communication Strategy I(b)

Statement	M	SD
11. When I am confused, I seek assistance from my peers to assist me	3.78	1.099
12. When I am having difficulty comprehending something, I'll use gestures	3.69	0.998
13. When I am anxious about using a new word or phrase, I take a deep breath and try it again	3.69	1.091
14. When I have difficulty in using a word(s), I will substitute synonyms or phrases with a similar connotation to assist me in communicating my thoughts	4.19	0.998
15. My preferred method of understanding others is to request them to repeat what they just said	3.81	0.965
16. I use fillers such as 'um', 'well', 'you know, and 'I see what you mean' when I need to think of what to say	3.88	1.129
17. When I have difficulty expressing myself, I consult the teacher's notes for suggested words and structures to assist me during the discussion	3.56	1.268
18. When I don't understand what others are saying, I listen quietly and hope to understand without asking them to clarify	4.06	1.031
19. I usually make a clear mental image of [a new] word to remember it	4.13	0.976
20. I imitate how the teachers speak	4.16	0.92
	M	**SD**
General Mean	3.91	0.15

Legend: 4.21 – 5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.41 – 4.20 = Agree; 2.61 – 3.40 = Undecided;
1.81 – 2.60 = Disagree; < 1.81 = Strongly Disagree
Key: M: Mean Score   SD: Standard Deviation

When students were asked to state whether they will ask people to clarify what they are saying when they are not sure of what they are trying to convey, with a mean score of 3.69 and standard deviation 1.061

most of the non-francophone students agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the non-francophone students will ask people to clarify what they are saying when they are not sure of what they are trying to convey (Statement 10, Table 1). According to Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy, the students use *asking for clarification strategy*.

When students were asked to state whether they will use gestures when they are having difficulty in comprehending something, with a mean score of 3.69 and standard deviation 0.998 most of the non-francophone students agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the non-francophone students will use gestures when they are having difficulty in comprehending something (Statement 12, Table 2). This is *Mime strategy,* based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy. This same strategy is seen under the concept *"Nonlinguistic/Paralinguistic strategies)",* proposed by other researchers too.

Francophone – Students' Communication Strategy I

After seeking their opinion on communication strategy I, the general mean value of Francophone's responses is 3.89, with an associated standard deviation of 0.21, thus indicates that the majority of the francophone students agreed to the utilization of communication strategy I.

When students were asked to state whether they use gestures and facial expressions when others do not understand them, with a mean score of 4.38 and standard deviation 1.061 most of the francophone students strongly agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the francophone students use gestures and facial expressions when others do not understand them (Statement 8, Table 3). According to Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy, it is *expressing non-understanding strategy*, "Expressing that one did not understand something properly either verbally or nonverbally" and also, showing puzzled facial expressions, frowns and various types of mime and gestures.

When students were asked to state whether they listen quietly and hope to understand without asking them to clarify when they do not understand what others are saying, with a mean score of 4.29, (SD = 0.756) most of the francophone students strongly agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the francophone students listen quietly and hope to understand without asking them to clarify when they do not understand what others are saying (Statement 18, Table 4). This strategy is *Ignorance acknowledgement strategy*. This is an L2-based strategy discussed by Rabab'ah in his taxonomy, meaning that the learner admits his ignorance hoping to understand quietly, without trying any other strategy to describe the language item needed.

Table 3.

Francophone Students' Communication Strategy I(a)

Statement	M	SD
1. I will repeat what I have just said when I need to think of what to say	3.5	1.414
2. I pay more attention to what I say rather than how I say it or pronounce it	4.25	1.165
3. When I have difficulty to use the right word(s), I try to describe it to the other students	4.25	1.035
4. I prefer to redirect the conversation rather than remain silent when I do not understand a discussion	3	1.155
5. I gradually translate the words into my first language to help me comprehend what the speaker is saying	3.75	1.488
6. I use a simpler word(s) when involving in any conversation	3.5	1.309
7. When other students do not appear to understand or agree with my point of view, I speak up	3.38	1.302
8. When others do not understand me, I use gestures and facial expressions	4.38	1.061
9. I enjoy supplementing the discussion with additional examples (building on a previous comment made by another student)	3.75	1.389
10. When I am not sure of what someone is trying to convey, I will ask them to clarify what they are saying.	4	1.069

Legend: 4.21 – 5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.41 – 4.20 = Agree; 2.61 – 3.40 = Undecided;

1.81 – 2.60 = Disagree; < 1.81 = Strongly Disagree

Key: M: Mean; SD: Standard Deviation

When students were asked to state whether they usually make a clear mental image of [a new] word to remember, with a mean score of 4.29 and standard deviation 0.951 most of the francophone students agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the francophone students usually make a clear mental image of [a new] word to remember (Statement 19, Table 4). The strategy employed here by students is *Imagery strategy*, which is a cognitive strategy. This is in line with the findings of O'Malley and Chamot (p.119, 1990), who found that students use visual images (either mental or actual) to understand or remember new words or information when learning a second language.

When they were asked to state whether the pay attention to what they say rather than how they say it or pronounce it, with a mean score of 4.25 and standard deviation 1.165 most of the francophone students strongly agreed to this statement. In other words, most of the francophone students pay attention to what they say rather than how they say it or pronounce it (Statement 2, Table 3). In other words, most of the non-francophone students pay attention to what they, whether it is bad pronounced or not, they value the meaning. They do not care as long as the message is conveyed. Their focus is on the meaning and not on the pronunciation.

When students were asked to state when they have difficulty to use the right word(s), whether they try to describe it to the other students, with a mean score of 4.25 and standard deviation 1.035 most of the francophone students strongly agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, when francophone students have difficulty to use the right word(s), they try to describe it to the other students (Statement 3, Table 3). This is *Circumlocution strategy*, which is a subcategory of *Paraphrasing strategy* proposed by Dornyei and Scott's taxonomy (1995).

Table 4.

Francophone Students' Commuinication Strategy I (b)

Statement	M	SD
11. When I am confused, I seek assistance from my peers to assist me	4.13	1.126
12. When I am having difficulty comprehending something, I'll use gestures	3.63	1.598
13. When I am anxious about using a new word or phrase, I take a deep breath and try it again	4.00	1.414
14. When I have difficulty in using a word(s), I will substitute synonyms or phrases with a similar connotation to assist me in communicating my thoughts	4.14	1.069
15. My preferred method of understanding others is to request them to repeat what they just said	4.00	1.155
16. I use fillers such as 'um', 'well', 'you know, and 'I see what you mean' when I need to think of what to say	3.86	1.215
17. When I have difficulty expressing myself, I consult the teacher's notes for suggested words and structures to assist me during the discussion	3.57	1.134
18. When I don't understand what others are saying, I listen quietly and hope to understand without asking them to clarify	4.29	0.756
19. I usually make a clear mental image of [a new] word to remember it	4.29	0.951
20. I imitate how the teachers speak	4.20	0.83
General Mean	3.89	0.21

Legend: 4.21 – 5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.41 – 4.20 = Agree; 2.61 – 3.40 = Undecided;
1.81 – 2.60 = Disagree; < 1.81 = Strongly Disagree
Key: M: Mean; SD: Standard Deviation

When students were asked to state whether they repeat what they have just said when they need to think of what to say, with a mean score of 3.50, (SD = 1.414) most of the francophone students agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the francophone students repeat what they have just said when they need to think of what to say (Statement 1, Table 3). According to Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy, repeating what the interlocutor said in order to gain time is called *Other-repetition strategy*.

When students were asked to state whether they prefer to redirect the conversation rather than remain silent when they do not understand a

discussion, with a mean score of 3.00, (SD = 1.155) most of the francophone students agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the francophone students prefer to redirect the conversation rather than remain silent when they do not understand a discussion (Statement 4, Table 3). According to Dornyei and Scott's taxonomy (1995), it is *Message reduction/Topic avoidance strategy*.

When students were asked to state whether they use a simpler word(s) when involving in any conversation, with a mean score of 3.50, (SD = 1.309) most of the francophone students agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the francophone students use a simpler word(s) when involving in any conversation (Statement 6, Table 3). This is *Message reduction (topic avoidance) strategy* where students avoid difficult words or vocabulary by using simple words that they master; this strategy is based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy.

When students were asked to state whether they speak up when other students do not appear to understand or agree with their point of view, with a mean score of 3.38, (SD = 1.302) most of the francophone students agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the non-francophone students admit that they speak up meaning they explain/expand their point of view or simply meaning "Putting the problem word/issue into a larger context" (Statement 7, Table 1). The strategy they employ is called *Response expand*, based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy.

When students were asked to state whether they consult the teacher's notes for suggested words and structures to assist them during the discussion when they have difficulty expressing themselves, with a mean score of 3.57, (SD = 1.134) most of the francophone students agreed to this statement (see Appendix A). In other words, most of the francophone students consult the teacher's notes for suggested words and structures to assist them during the discussion when they have difficulty expressing themselves (Statement 17, Table 4). The students use their book for grammatical structures to avoid mistakes, some kind of *Retrieval strategy*, trying to get the correct structures from the book or dictionary.

Comparison of Non-Francophone and Francophone Students Regarding Communication Strategy I

In general, table 5 and 6 presents the mean response for both the Non-francophone and Francophone students. And it was discovered that non-francophone students employ the most these communication strategies as the general mean are 3.91 with an associated standard deviation of 0.15, compared to the general mean response of francophone students which is 3.89 with an associated standard deviation of 0.21 which implies that non-francophone students employ these communication strategies in general more compared to their francophone counterpart.

When the participants were asked to state whether they will repeat what they have just said when they need to think of what to say, with a mean score of 4.31 (SD: 0.693) the non-francophone students employ this strategy more as compared to the francophone students (M: 3.50, SD: 1.414). This shows us that the non-francophones use this communication strategy more than the francophone students (Statement 1, Table 5)

When the participants were asked to state their opinions on whether they pay more attention to what they say rather than how they say it or pronounce it, with a mean score of 4.41 (SD: 0.756) the non-francophone students employ this strategy more as compared to the francophone students (M: 4.25, SD: 1.165). This shows us that the non-francophones use this communication strategy more than the francophone students (Statement 2, Table 5).

When the participants were asked to state their opinions on whether they try to describe a word to the other students when they have difficulty to use the right ones, with a mean score of 3.94 (SD: 1.268) the non-francophone students employ this strategy less as compared to the francophone students (M: 4.25, SD: 1.035). This shows us that the non-francophone uses this communication strategy less than the francophone students (Statement 3, Table 5).

When the participants were asked to state their opinions on whether they prefer to redirect the conversation rather than remain silent when they do not understand a discussion, with a mean score of 3.69 (SD: 1.176) the

non-francophone students employ this strategy more as compared to the francophone students (M: 3.00, SD: 1.155). This shows us that the non-francophone uses this communication strategy more than the francophone students (Statement 4, Table 5).

When the participants were asked to state their opinions on whether they gradually translate the words into their first language to help them comprehend what the speaker is saying, with a mean score of 3.63 (SD: 1.185) the non-francophone students employ this strategy less as compared to the francophone students (M: 3.75, SD: 1.488). This shows us that the non-francophone students use this communication strategy less than the francophone students (Statement 5, Table 5).

Table 5.

Comparison of Communication Strategy I (a)

Statement	Non-Francophone		Francophone	
	M	**SD**	**M**	**SD**
1. I will repeat what I have just said when I need to think of what to say	4.31	0.693	3.5	1.414
2. I pay more attention to what I say rather than how I say it or pronounce it	4.41	0.756	4.25	1.165
3. When I have difficulty to use the right word(s), I try to describe it to the other students	3.94	1.268	4.25	1.035
4. I prefer to redirect the conversation rather than remain silent when I do not understand a discussion	3.69	1.176	3	1.155
5. I gradually translate the words into my first language to help me comprehend what the speaker is saying	3.63	1.185	3.75	1.488
6. I use a simpler word(s) when involving in any conversation	3.66	1.125	3.5	1.309
7. When other students do not appear to understand or agree with my point of view, I speak up	3.77	1.203	3.38	1.302
8. When others do not understand me, I use gestures and facial expressions	3.9	0.908	4.38	1.061
9. I enjoy supplementing the discussion with additional examples (building on a previous comment made by another student)	4.22	0.941	3.75	1.389
10. When I am not sure of what someone is trying to convey, I will ask them to clarify what they are saying.	3.69	1.061	4	1.069

When the participants were asked to state their opinions on whether they use a simpler word(s) when involving in any conversation, with a mean score of 3.66 (SD: 1.125) the non-francophone students employ this strategy more as compared to the francophone students (M: 3.5, SD: 1.309). This shows us that the non-francophone uses this communication strategy more than the francophone students (Statement 6, Table 5).

When the participants were asked to state their opinions on whether they speak up when other students do not appear to understand or agree with their point of view, with a mean score of 3.77 (SD: 1.203) the non-francophone students employ this strategy more as compared to the francophone students (M: 3.38, SD: 1.302). This shows us that both the non-francophone uses this communication strategy more than francophone students (Statement 7, Table 5).

When the participants were asked to state their opinions on whether they use gestures and facial expressions when others do not understand them, with a mean score of 3.90 (SD: 0.908) the non-francophone students employ this strategy less as compared to the francophone students (M: 4.38, SD: 1.061). This shows us that the non-francophone uses this communication strategy less than francophone students (Statement 8, Table 5).

When the participants were asked to state their opinions on whether they enjoy supplementing the discussion with additional examples (building on a previous comment made by another student), with a mean score of 4.22 (SD: 0.941) the non-francophone students employ this strategy more as compared to the francophone students (M: 3.75, SD: 1.389). This shows us that the non-francophone uses this communication strategy more than francophone (Statement 9, Table 5).

When the participants were asked to state their opinions on whether they will ask someone to clarify what they are saying when they are not sure of what the person is trying to convey, with a mean score of 3.69 (SD: 1.061) the non-francophone students employ this strategy less as compared to the francophone students (M: 4.00, SD: 1.069). This shows us that the

non-francophone uses this communication strategy less than francophone students (Statement 10, Table 5).

Table 6.

Comparison of Communication Strategy I (b)

Statement	Non-Francophone		Francophone	
	M	**SD**	**M**	**SD**
11. When I am confused, I seek assistance from my peers to assist me	3.78	1.099	4.13	1.126
12. When I am having difficulty comprehending something, I'll use gestures	3.69	0.998	3.63	1.598
13. When I am anxious about using a new word or phrase, I take a deep breath and try it again	3.69	1.091	4	1.414
14. When I have difficulty in using a word(s), I will substitute synonyms or phrases with a similar connotation to assist me in communicating my thoughts	4.19	0.998	4.14	1.069
15. My preferred method of understanding others is to request them to repeat what they just said	3.81	0.965	4	1.155
16. I use fillers such as 'um', 'well', 'you know, and 'I see what you mean' when I need to think of what to say	3.88	1.129	3.86	1.215
17. When I have difficulty expressing myself, I consult the teacher's notes for suggested words and structures to assist me during the discussion	3.56	1.268	3.57	1.134
18. When I don't understand what others are saying, I listen quietly and hope to understand without asking them to clarify	4.06	1.031	4.29	0.756
19. I usually make a clear mental image of [a new] word to remember it	4.13	0.976	4.29	0.951
20. I imitate how the teachers speak	4.16	0.92	4.2	0.837
	M	**SD**	**M**	**SD**
General Mean	3.91	0.15	3.89	0.21

Communication Strategies II

A questionnaire containing 12 statements were answered by 34 students. Thirty (30) of them were non-francophone from Turkey, Indonesia and Iraq. The other four (4) respondents were francophone from Congo and Burundi.

Descriptive analysis was performed to compare the responds of francophone and non-francophone students to each statement in the questionnaire. To be able to see whether there were any significant differences between these two groups an Inferential Statistics employing an "Independent samples T-test" was performed.

Non-Francophone Students' Communication Strategy II

The general mean of non-francophone communication strategy II is 2.72 with an associated standard deviation of 0.12, thus indicates that the majority of the respondents were rarely using Communication Stratgyies II. It was also discovered that, most of the non-francophone students do not utilize Communication Strategy II every time.

When the non-francophone students were asked to state whether they use their first language when they cannot find the appropriate English term, with a mean score of 3.14 and standard deviation 1.246, most of the non-francophone students always use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the non-francophone students always use their first language when they cannot find the appropriate English term (Statement 12, Table 7). This strategy is known as *Code Switching*, according to the taxonomy proposed by Dornyei and Scott (1995). This strategy is also included in other taxonomies: Tarone's (1977), Faerch and Kasper's (1983b), Bialystok (1983) and Willem's (1987) as "*Language switch, Transfer or Borrowing*".

When students were asked to state whether they do not mind making errors when speaking, with a mean score of 3.00 and standard deviation 1.206, most of the non-francophone students always use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the

non-francophone students do not mind making errors when speaking (statement 2, Table 7). The learners compensate for a lexical item who's unsure of the form the word (either existing or non-existing) which sounds more or less like the target item. The strategy employed is known as *Use of similar sounding words*, based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy.

When students were asked to state whether they are not afraid of asking other students to confirm the meaning of any unfamiliar words or phrases, with a mean score of 3.00 and standard deviation 1.38, most of the non-francophone students always use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the non-francophone students are not afraid of asking other students to confirm the meaning of any unfamiliar words or phrases (Statement 8, Table 7). This is *asking for confirmation strategy*, found in Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy.

When students were asked to state whether they use gestures and facial expressions when others do not understand them, with a mean score of 2.87 and standard deviation 0.968, most of the non-francophone students rarely use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the non-francophone students rarely use gestures and facial expressions when others do not understand them (Statement 6, Table 7). This is *Mime strategy,* based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy. This same strategy is seen under the concept *"Nonlinguistic/Paralinguistic strategies)",* proposed by other researchers too.

When students were asked to state whether they prefer to avoid a conversation when the meaning or structure of a word is unclear, with a mean score of 2.83 and standard deviation 1.154, most of the non-francophone students never use this communication strategy statement (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the non-francophone students do not prefer to avoid a conversation when the meaning or structure of a word is unclear (Statement 4, Table 7). According to Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy, this is *Topic Avoidance strategy*.

Table 7.

Non-Francophone Students' Communication Strategy II

Statements	M	SD
1. I repeat the words or phrases they have just said to help me understand and to gain time	2.09	1.125
2. I do not mind making errors when speaking	3.00	1.206
3. When I cannot find the appropriate word to describe something, I attempt to explain it.	2.39	0.941
4. When the meaning or structure of a word is unclear, I prefer to avoid a conversation.	2.83	1.154
5. If I don't agree with other students, I let them know	2.61	1.27
6. When others do not understand me, I use gestures and facial expressions	2.87	0.968
7. I use some phrases such as 'really, 'I agree', 'what do you mean by that' to respond to or expand on a conversation	2.61	1.033
8. I am not afraid of asking other students to confirm the meaning of any unfamiliar words or phrases.	3.00	1.38
9. I am not afraid to assist someone unsure of a word's meaning or grammatical structure.	2.77	1.152
10. When I am at a loss for a phrase or a word, I will substitute something that has a similar meaning.	2.64	1.177
11. I use fillers such as 'um', 'well', and 'you know to help myself in deciding what to say,	2.64	1.049
12. I use my first language when I cannot find the appropriate English term	3.14	1.246
	M	**SD**
General Mean	2.72	0.12

Legend: *4.21 – 5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.41 – 4.20 = Agree; 2.61 – 3.40 = Undecided;1.81 – 2.60 = Disagree; < 1.81 = Strongly Disagree*
Key: *M: Mean; SD: Standard Deviation*

When students were asked to state whether they repeat the words or phrases they have just said to help them understand and to gain time, with a mean score of 2.09 and standard deviation 1.125, most of the non-francophone students never use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the non-francophone students do not repeat the words or phrases they have just said to help them understand and to gain time (Statement 1, Table 7). According to Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy, repeating what the interlocutor said in order to gain time is called *Other-repetition strategy*.

When students were asked to state whether they attempt to explain something when they cannot find the appropriate word to describe something, with a mean score of 2.39 and standard deviation 0.941, most of the non-francophone students rarely use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the non-francophone students rarely attempt to explain something when they cannot find the appropriate word to describe something (Statement 3, Table 7). An attempt to explain something to others when not finding an appropriate way to describe it, is known as *Circumlocution strategy*, based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy.

When students were asked to state whether they let other students know when they do not agree with them, with a mean score of 2.61 and standard deviation 1.27, most of the non-francophone students rarely use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the non-francophone students rarely let other students know when they do not agree with them (Statement 5, Table 7). The fact that students rarely let others know when they don't agree with them, they make use different strategies as: *asking for clarification* (request more explanations), *Expressing non-understanding* (expressing their disagreement verbally or nonverbally) or *Response reject* (by simply saying No!), in order to communicate their disagreement.

When students were asked to state whether they use some phrases such as 'really, 'I agree', 'what do you mean by that' to respond to or expand on a conversation, with a mean score of 2.61 and standard deviation 1.033, most of the non-francophone students rarely use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the non-francophone students rarely use some phrases such as 'really, 'I agree', 'what do you mean by that' to respond to or expand on a conversation (Statement 7, Table 7). According to Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy, this is *asking for clarification strategy*.

When students were asked to state whether they will substitute something that has a similar meaning when they are at a loss for a phrase or a word, with a mean score of 2.64 and standard deviation 1.177, most of the non-francophone students rarely use this communication strategy

(see Appendix B). In other words, most of the non-francophone students rarely substitute something that has a similar meaning when they are at a loss for a phrase or a word (Statement 10, Table 7). This is *Message Replacement strategy*, based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy, also found in Willems (1987), Faerch and Kasper's (1983b) taxonomies.

Francophone Students' Communication Strategy II

The grand mean value of communication strategies II is 3.01, with an associated standard deviation of 0.13, indicates that the majority of the francophone students sometimes utilize communication strategy II but not every time.

When students were asked to state whether they are not afraid to assist someone unsure of a word's meaning or grammatical structure, with a mean score of 3.64 and standard deviation 1.152, most of the francophone students always use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the francophone students are not afraid to assist someone unsure of a word's meaning or grammatical structure (Statement 9, Table 8). According to Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy this is *Other-repair strategy* under the category of *Direct strategies*.

When students were asked to state whether they are not afraid of asking other students to confirm the meaning of any unfamiliar words or phrases, with a mean score of 3.45 and standard deviation 1.572, most of the francophone students always use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the francophone students are not afraid of asking other students to confirm the meaning of any unfamiliar words or phrases (Statement 8, Table 8). This is *asking for confirmation strategy*, found in Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy and also found in other researcher's taxonomies too.

When students were asked to state whether they prefer to avoid a conversation when the meaning or structure of a word is unclear, with a mean score of 3.36 and standard deviation 1.362, most of the francophone students always use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In

other words, most of the francophone students always prefer to avoid a conversation when the meaning or structure of a word is unclear (Statement 4, Table 8). According to Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy, this is *Topic Avoidance strategy.*

When students were asked to state whether they use their first language when they cannot find the appropriate English term, with a mean score of 3.36 and standard deviation 1.69, most of the francophone students always use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the francophone students always use their first language when they cannot find the appropriate English term (Statement 12, Table 8). This strategy is known as *Code Switching*, according to the taxonomy proposed by Dornyei and Scott (1995). This strategy is also included in other taxonomies: Tarone's (1977), Faerch and Kasper's (1983b), Bialystok (1983) and Willem's (1987) as "*Language switch, Transfer or Borrowing*"

When students were asked to state whether they use fillers such as 'um', 'well', and 'you know to help them in deciding what to say, with a mean score of 3.27 and standard deviation 1.555, most of the francophone students always use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the francophone students always use fillers such as 'um', 'well', and 'you know to help them in deciding what to say (Statement 11, Table 8). This is *Use of fillers strategy* under the category of *Indirect strategies*, based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy. Known also as *Stalling or Time-gaining strategy.*

When students were asked to state whether they repeat the words or phrases they have just said to help them understand and to gain time, with a mean score of 2.36 and standard deviation 1.567, most of the francophone students never use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the francophone students never repeat the words or phrases they have just said to help them understand and to gain time (Statement 1, Table 8). According to Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy, repeating what the interlocutor said in order to gain time is called *Other-repetition strategy.*

Table 8.

Francophone Students' Communication Strategy II

Statement	M	SD
1. I repeat the words or phrases they have just said to help me understand and to gain time	2.36	1.567
2. I do not mind making errors when speaking	3.18	1.471
3. When I cannot find the appropriate word to describe something, i attempt to explain it.	2.91	1.578
4. When the meaning or structure of a word is unclear, I prefer to avoid a conversation.	3.36	1.362
5. If i do not agree with other students, I let them know	3.00	1.789
6. When others do not understand me, I use gestures and facial expressions	2.55	1.753
7. I use some phrases such as 'really, 'I agree', 'what do you mean by that' to respond to or expand on a conversation	2.36	1.567
8. I am not afraid of asking other students to confirm the meaning of any unfamiliar words or phrases.	3.45	1.572
9. I am not afraid to assist someone unsure of a word's meaning or grammatical structure.	3.64	1.362
10. When i am at a loss for a phrase or a word, I will substitute something that has a similar meaning.	2.64	1.69
11. I use fillers such as 'um', 'well', and 'you know to help myself in deciding what to say,	3.27	1.555
12. I use my first language when I cannot find the appropriate english term	3.36	1.69
General Mean	3.01	0.13

Legend: 4.21 – 5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.41 – 4.20 = Agree; 2.61 – 3.40 = Undecided;1.81 – 2.60 = Disagree; < 1.81 = Strongly Disagree

Key: M: Mean; SD: Standard Deviation

When students were asked to state whether they use some phrases such as 'really, 'I agree', 'what do you mean by that' to respond to or expand on a conversation, with a mean score of 2.36 and standard deviation 1.567, most of the francophone students never use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the francophone students do not use some phrases such as 'really, 'I agree', 'what do you mean by that' to respond to or expand on a conversation

(Statement 7, Table 8). According to Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy, this is *asking for clarification strategy*.

When students were asked to state whether they use gestures and facial expressions when others do not understand them, with a mean score of 2.55 and standard deviation 1.753, most of the francophone students rarely use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the francophone students rarely use gestures and facial expressions when others do not understand them (Statement 6, Table 8). This is *Mime strategy,* based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy. This same strategy is seen under the concept *"Nonlinguistic/Paralinguistic strategies)",* proposed by other researchers too.

When students were asked to state whether they will substitute something that has a similar meaning when they are at a loss for a phrase or a word, with a mean score of 2.64 and standard deviation 1.177, most of the francophone students rarely use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the francophone students are afraid to assist someone unsure of a word's meaning or grammatical structure (Statement 10, Table 8). This is *Message Replacement strategy*, based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy, also found in Willems (1987), Faerch and Kasper's (1983b) taxonomies.

When students were asked to state whether they attempt to explain something when they cannot find the appropriate word to describe something, with a mean score of 2.91 and standard deviation 1.578, most of the francophone students rarely use this communication strategy (see Appendix B). In other words, most of the francophone students do not attempt to explain something when they cannot find the appropriate word to describe something (Statement 3, Table 8). An attempt to explain something to others when not finding an appropriate way to describe it, is known as *Circumlocution strategy*, based on Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy.

Comparison of Non-Francophone and Francophone Students Regarding Communication Strategy II

In general, Tables 9 and 10 present the mean response for both the Non-francophone and Francophone students. It was discovered that non-francophone students rarely employ communication strategies II as the general mean was 2.72 with an associated standard deviation of 0.12, compared to the general mean response of francophone students which is 3.01 with an associated standard deviation of 0.13 which implies that francophone students employ these communication strategies more compared to their non-francophone counterpart.

When the participants were asked to repeat the words or phrases, they have just said to help them understand and to gain time, with a mean score of 2.09 (SD: 1.125) the non-francophone students employ this strategy less as compared to the francophone students (M: 2.36, SD: 1.567). This shows us that the non-francophones use this communication strategy less than the francophone students (Statement 1, Table 9)

When the participants were asked to state whether they do not mind making errors when speaking, with a mean score of 3.00 (SD: 1.206) the non-francophone students employ this strategy less as compared to the francophone students (M: 3.18, SD: 1.471). This shows us that the non-francophones use this communication strategy less than the francophone students (Statement 2, Table 9)

When the participants were asked to state whether they attempt to explain something when they cannot find the appropriate word to describe something, with a mean score of 2.39, (SD = 0.941) the non-francophone students employ this strategy less as compared to the francophone students (M: 2.91, SD: 1.578). This shows us that the non-francophones use this communication strategy less than the francophone students (Statement 3, Table 9)

When the participants were asked to state whether they prefer to avoid a conversation when the meaning or structure of a word is unclear,

with a mean score of 2.83, (SD = 1.154) the non-francophone students employ this strategy less as compared to the francophone students (M: 3.36, SD: 1.362). This shows us that the non-francophones use this communication strategy less than the francophone students (Statement 4, Table 9)

When the participants were asked to state whether they-let other students know when they do not agree with them, with a mean score of 2.61, (SD = 1.27) the non-francophone students employ this strategy less as compared to the francophone students (M: 3.00, SD: 1.789). This shows us that the non-francophones use this communication strategy less than the francophone students (Statement 5, Table 9).

Table 9.

Comparison of Communication Strategy II (a)

Statement	Non-Francophone		Francophone	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. I repeat the words or phrases they have just said to help me understand and to gain time	2.09	1.125	2.36	1.567
2. I do not mind making errors when speaking	3.00	1.206	3.18	1.471
3. When I cannot find the appropriate word to describe something, I attempt to explain it.	2.39	0.941	2.91	1.578
4. When the meaning or structure of a word is unclear, I prefer to avoid a conversation.	2.83	1.154	3.36	1.362
5. If I don't agree with other students, I let them know	2.61	1.27	3.00	1.789
6. When others do not understand me, I use gestures and facial expressions	2.87	0.968	2.55	1.753
7. I use some phrases such as 'really, 'I agree', 'what do you mean by that' to respond to or expand on a conversation	2.61	1.033	2.36	1.567

When the participants were asked to state whether they use gestures and facial expressions when others do not understand them, with a mean score of 2.87 (SD = 0.968) the non-francophone students employ this strategy more as compared to the francophone students (M: 2.55, SD: 1.753). This shows us that the non-francophones use this communication strategy more than the francophone students (Statement 6, Table 9)

When the participants were asked to state whether they use some phrases such as 'really, 'I agree', 'what do you mean by that' to respond to or expand on a conversation, with a mean score of 2.61 (SD = 1.033) the non-francophone students employ this strategy more as compared to the francophone students (M: 2.36, SD: 1.567). This shows us that the non-francophones use this communication strategy more than the francophone students (Statement 7, Table 9)

When the participants were asked to state whether they are not afraid of asking other students to confirm the meaning of any unfamiliar words or phrases, with a mean score of 3.00 (SD = 1.38) the non-francophone students employ this strategy less as compared to the francophone students (M: 3.45, SD: 1.572). This shows us that the non-francophones use this communication strategy less than the francophone students (Statement 8, Table 10).

When the participants were asked to state whether they are not afraid to assist someone unsure of a word's meaning or grammatical structure, with a mean score of 2.77 (SD = 1.152) the non-francophone students employ this strategy less as compared to the francophone students (M: 3.64, SD: 1.362). This shows us that the non-francophones use this communication strategy less than the francophone students (Statement 9, Table 10)

When the participants were asked to state whether they use their first language when they cannot find the appropriate English term, with a mean score of 3.14 (SD = 1.246) the non-francophone students employ this strategy less as compared to the francophone students (M: 3.36, SD: 1.69). This shows us that the non-francophones use this communication strategy

less than the francophone students (Statement 12, Table 10)

Table 10.

Comparison of Communication Strategy II (b)

Statement	Non-Francophone		Francophone	
	M	**SD**	**M**	**SD**
8. I am not afraid of asking other students to confirm the meaning of any unfamiliar words or phrases.	3.00	1.38	3.45	1.572
9. I am not afraid to assist someone unsure of a word's meaning or grammatical structure.	2.77	1.152	3.64	1.362
10. When I am at a loss for a phrase or a word, I will substitute something that has a similar meaning.	2.64	1.177	2.64	1.69
11. I use fillers such as 'um', 'well', and 'you know to help myself in deciding what to say,	2.64	1.049	3.27	1.555
12. I use my first language when I cannot find the appropriate English term	3.14	1.246	3.36	1.69
	M	**SD**	**M**	**SD**
General Mean	2.72	0.12	3.01	0.13

CHAPTER V

Conclusions and Recommendations

The previous chapters offered an overview of the data analysis on students' communication practices at a private institutions' English preparatory program. The findings shed insight into the approaches the students employ in their daily contact with each other.

Conclusion

The findings reported the following communication strategies were employed the most by non-francophone students: *Other-repetition strategy*, *Self-rephrasing strategy*, *Message replacement strategy, Imitation strategy* and *Imagery strategy*. Thus, the most employed by francophone students were: *expressing non-understanding strategy, Ignorance acknowledgement strategy, Imagery strategy* and *circumlocution*. The strategies that were used the least in Communication Strategy I by non-francophone students: *Retrieval strategy, literal translation, message reduction, asking for clarification strategy* and *mime strategy*; and the communication strategies that were the least employed by francophones students were: *Other-repetition strategy*, *message reduction/Topic avoidance, Response expand* and *Retrieval strategy.* As for Communication strategy II; the findings reported the following communication strategies were always employed by non-francophone students: *Code switching strategy, use of similar sounding strategy* and *asking for confirmation strategy*. What's more the communication strategies always employed by francophone students were: *Other-repair strategy, asking for confirmation strategy, topic avoidance strategy, code switching strategy* and *use of fillers strategy*. As for the strategies that were rarely or never employed in Communication Strategy II by non-francophone students were: *Mime strategy, topic avoidance, other-repetition strategy, circumlocution strategy, asking for clarification strategy/ response reject* and *message replacement*. In addition, the communication strategies that were rarely or never employed by francophone students were: *Other repetition strategy, asking for clarification strategy, mime strategy, message replacement* and

circumlocution. Most of the francophone students rarely or never employ these strategies as their linguistic resources are insufficient. Furthermore, it was discovered that there was no significant difference between the opinions of francophone and non-francophone students regarding Communication Strategy I and II.

Second language learners adopt communication approaches when their original communication strategy does not work as planned. Due to their limited interlanguage capabilities, they resort to the usage of communication strategies. According to Yıldırım et al. (2020), "the method chosen is not only dependent on the underlying behavior, but also on the nature of the problem to be solved." Hence, this study is similar to the study of Syakira et al. (2021).

As we compared non-francophones and francophones general means, in communication strategy I the results tells that non-francophone students employ the communication strategy I in general more compared to their francophone counterpart; and also, in communication strategy II the results tell that francophone students employ the communication strategies II in general more compared to the non-francophone counterpart.

According to the analysis carried out, it can be deduced that the majority of the non- francophone and francophone students agreed to the adoption of Communication Strategy I which thereby, increases their capacity to communicate in the English language. Most of the students pay more attention to what they say rather than how they say it or pronounce it and also imitate how the teachers speak. In addition, they also substitute synonyms or phrases with a similar connotation to assist them in communicating their thoughts when they have difficulty in using a word(s). Most of them also repeat what they have just said when they need to think of what to say and usually make a clear mental image of [a new] word to remember it.

Regarding Communication Strategy II, most of the students use their first language when they cannot find the appropriate English term and they also put forth that they mostly are not afraid of asking other students to confirm the meaning of any unfamiliar words or phrases. In addition, they

are not afraid to assist someone unsure of a word's meaning or grammatical structure. Most of them also do not mind making errors when speaking and when the meaning or structure of a word is unclear, they prefer to avoid a conversation.

From the analysis, it was also discovered that, most of the non-francophone students do not utilize Communication Strategy II all the time. The same scenario was discovered with francophone students. Furthermore, it was discovered that there was no significant difference between the opinions of francophone and non-francophone students regarding Communication Strategy I and II.

Recommendations

Improving the student's English ability by employing communication strategies is essential. Hence, if students were compelled to utilize just the target language, they would be encouraged to employ less-than-ideal forms of expression when the optimal form is unavailable. The following are the recommended draws:

- Teachers should have access to training programmes emphasising classroom communication techniques. As a result, EFL teachers would be better positioned to assist their students with communication challenges from their first lesson. So, people can become accustomed to finding solutions to communication problems that do not include their language.
- The departments of Education and English langauge must pay greater attention to how the francophones students learn and speak using communication strategies.
- Teachers of a foreign language should frequently shift seating to encourage students to converse and get to know their peers. Teachers should boost students' ability to communicate and learn from one another by strategically grouping students according to the activities and tasks to be completed for each language learning objective.
- Motivation is also an important elements that teachers shouuld consider, having different learning activities may boost students to participate in

class discussions. And also by teaching communication strategies to Francophones (international) students can help students increase their ability to communicate in the society.

Implications

- A study can be carried out to compare whether students employed the same stategies online. (this study was based on face to face environments)
- An interviews could be carried out
- Comparison for communicative strategies of teachers and students can be carried out

References

Abdul Halim, N., Ariffin, K., & Darus, N. A. (2021). Discovering Students' Strategies in Learning English Online. *Asian Journal of University Education*, *17*, 261. https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v17i1.12695

Agago, T. A., Wonde, S. G., Bramo, S. S., & Asaminew, T. (2021). Simulated Patient-Based Communication Skills Training for Undergraduate Medical Students at a University in Ethiopia. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*. https://doi.org/10.2147/AMEP.S308102

Alkoyak-Yildiz, M., Babu, S. K., Anitha, P., & Mukil, M. V. (2019). 'Was It Real?'—The Effects of Virtual Reality Communication Skills Training Among University Students in India. *2019 IEEE Tenth International Conference on Technology for Education (T4E)*. https://doi.org/10.1109/T4E.2019.00073

Awang, M., & Careemdeen, J. (2021). The Relationship between Social Capital and Soft Skills among University Students. *Journal of Education Society and Behavioural Science*, *34*, 40–46. https://doi.org/10.9734/JESBS/2021/v34i1030361

Bialystok, E. (1981). The Role of Conscious Strategies in Second Language Proficiency. The Modern Language Journal. 65(1), 24-35. https://www.jstor.org/stable/326204

Bozonelos, D. (2020). *Quantitative Research Methods and Means of Analysis* (pp. 129–152).

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

Demir Y, Mutlu G, and Şişman Selim Y (2018). Exploring the Oral Communication Strategies Used by Turkish EFL Learners: A Mixed Methods Study. International Journal of Instruction. 11 (2), 539-554

Deveci, T., & Wyatt, M. (2022). Reflective writing and the self-perceived development of intrapersonal communication skills among first-year university students in the UAE. *Reflective Practice*, *23*(1), 68–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2021.1978066

Dorney, Z. and Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication Strategies in a Second Language: Definitions and Taxonomies. Language Learning, 47, (1), 173-210**.**

Faharri, S. A. Communication Strategies in Translation: A Review on the Taxonomies from 1977 to 2011. Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences 6(5), 768-779

Fyaak S, A. and AbdlHameed D, A. (2016). Communication Strategies for Teachers and their Students in an EFL Setting. International Journal of Bilingual & Multilingual Teachers of English. 4(1). DOI: 10.12785/ijbmte/040105.

Gürbüz, S. (2017). *Survey as a Quantitative Research Method*.

Hansson, M. (2020). *EFL and Communicative Competence in English Language Teaching*.

Hua, T.K; N, F. M and Mohd, N. J. (2012). Communication Strategies Among EFL Students- An Examination of Frequency of Use and Types of Strategies Used. Journal of Language Studies. 12(3), 813-846.

Hong Shi. (2017). Learning Strategies and Classification in Education. Institute for Learning Styles Journal • Volume 1, 24-31

Juliá-Sanchis, R., Cabañero-Martínez, M., Leal-Costa, C., Fernández-Alcántara, M., & Escribano, S. (2020). Psychometric Properties of the Health Professionals Communication Skills Scale in University Students of Health Sciences. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17207565

Kanat, S. (2019). The Relationship Between Digital Game Addiction, Communication Skills and Loneliness Perception Levels of University Students. *International Education Studies*. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v12n11p80

Kashmiri, H. A. (2019). Communication challenges: Saudi EFL Speaking Skills and strategies to overcome speaking difficulties. (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from Arab World English Journal. 1- 61. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/th.267

Komba, S. C. (2016). *The Perceived Importance of Communication Skills Course among University Students: The Case of Two Universities in Tanzania*. https://doi.org/10.21083/AJOTE.V4I2.3064

Mohd Padil, H., Samad, S. B. H., Amirah, A., & Nurafiqah, S. (2021, June 30). *An Exploratory Factor Analysis of Interpersonal Communication Skills Among University Students*.

Molina-Azorin, J. F. (2016). Mixed methods research: An opportunity to improve our studies and our research skills. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 25(2), 37–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.redeen.2016.05.001

Morsidi, S., Samah, N. A., Rahman, K. A. A., Ashari, Z. M., Jumaat, N. F., & Abdullah, A. H. (2021). WhatsApp and Its Potential to Develop Communication Skills among University Students. *Undefined*.

https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/WhatsApp-and-Its-Potential-to-Develop-Communication-Morsidi-Samah/1548c261ccafc7837c85fa46482ad8bf1d0bcb5c

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Polites, G. L., Roberts, N., & Thatcher, J. (2012). Conceptualizing models using multidimensional constructs: A review and guidelines for their use. *European Journal of Information Systems*, *21*(1), 22–48. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2011.10

Rababah, G. (2001). Second Language Communication Strategies: Definitions, Taxonomies, Data Elicitation Methodology and Teachability Issues. (ED 472 698). A Review Article.

Rahman, A., & Isroyana, D. (2021). Communication Strategies Used By EFL Students in English Classroom Setting. *Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching) Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa & Seni Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP*, *8*, 207. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v8i2.4482. https://e-journal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/joelt

Rhenardo, C. A., & Setiawan, J. L. (2019). Joint Leisure Time, Communication, and Marital Satisfaction among Taxi Drivers. *Undefined*. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Joint-Leisure-Time%2C-Communication%2C-and-Marital-Taxi-Rhenardo-Setiawan/3647555c8687f5d66dbcb4ea509c5e3aef44b608

Schoonenboom, J., & Johnson, R. B. (2017). How to Construct a Mixed Methods Research Design. *Kolner Zeitschrift Fur Soziologie Und Sozialpsychologie*, *69*(Suppl 2), 107–131. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11577-017-0454-1

Serttaş, Z., & Kasabalı, A. (2020). Determining the English preparatory school students' readiness for online learning. *Near East University Online Journal of Education*, *3*, 66–78. https://doi.org/10.32955/neuje.v3i2.243

Stratton, S. J. (2021). Population Research: Convenience Sampling Strategies. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*, *36*(4), 373–374. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049023X21000649

Strelkova, T., Soroka, Y., Tieliezhkina, O., Kauk, V., Kalmykov, A., Grebenyuk, V., Piataikina, M., Puholovok, K., & Vodianytskyi, D. (2022). *Online Learning Methods for Effective Communication Between Teachers and Students* (pp. 289–309). https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-8661-7.ch011

Syakira, S., Mahmud, M., & Sahril, S. (2021). An Analysis of Learners' Oral Errors: A Study in One-to-one EFL Classroom Interaction.

TLEMC (Teaching and Learning English in Multicultural Contexts), *5*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.37058/tlemc.v5i2.3937

Tabrizian, S., Molaei, B., Yusefian, M., Aslanian, R., & Amani, F. (2019). Communication skills Among Ardabil Medical University Students and its Association with Demographic Characteristics. *Journal of Behavioral Health*. https://doi.org/10.5455/jbh.20190529061803

Tarone, E. (1981). Some Thoughts on the Notion of Communication Strategy. TESOL Quarterly, 15(3), 285-295, https://www.jstor.org/stable/3586754

Velasco, S., Abalos, J., Angeles, Z., Amorganda, A., & Education, P. A. (2022). *The Learners' Learning Strategies in the Acquisition of Grammatical Skills Amidst the Online Learning*. *1*. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.19304435.v2

Wahyudi, E., Sukma, H., & Mustadi, A. (2021). The Effect of Online Learning Process on Speaking Skill. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *13*, 2607–2614. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v13i3.618

Widiarini (2019) A Closer Look at Communication Strategy: A Framework for the Term Communication Strategy Journal Of Development Research, 3(1), 14-19 DOI: https://doi.org/10.28926/jdr.v3i1.63

Ya-ni, Z. (2007). Communication Strategies and Foreign Language Learning. US-China Foreign Language, 5(43), 43-47**.**

Yanju, S and Yanmei S. (2016). Communication Strategies Used by Middle Estern Postgraduate Students at Service Encounters in University of Malaya. European Journal of Language and Literature Studies. Vol. 2 (2)

Yıldırım, S., Durgu, N., Özdeş, A. B., & Özdemir, N. (2020). The correlation of communication skills and emotional expressions among nursing students in Turkey: A public university sample. *Nursing Practice Today*. https://doi.org/10.18502/npt.v7i3.3347

Zaugg, H., & Davies, R. S. (2013). Communication skills to develop trusting relationships on global virtual engineering capstone teams. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, *38*(2), 228–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2013.766678

Zakaria, N. Y. K., Zakaria, S. N., & Azmi, N. E. (2018). Language Learning Strategies Used by Secondary Schools Students in Enhancing Speaking Skills. Creative Education, 9, 2357-2366. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2018.914176

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Students' Questionnaire 1

Dear Student,

The purpose of this section of the study is to get information or your opinion on the type of communicative strategies that you employ when speaking English and its relation to your oral skills. Below are a series of statements about your experience in communication. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking (X) in the appropriate column. Just try to be as honest and accurate as possible. Kindly do not forget any of the items and select just a single response for every statement. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes.

❖ **Biographic information**

Nationality:

❖ **Instructions to follow**: please indicate your answer by marking **X** in the appropriate column. Read below the words of the Likert Scale which represent the abbreviations on the table.

- A = stands for Agree
- SA = Strongly Agree
- U = Undecided
- D = Disagree
- SD = Strong Disagree

Thank you in advance for your attention and participation.

No	Communication Strategies You Use	A	SA	U	D	SD
1.	I will repeat what I have just said when I need to think of what to say					
2.	I pay more attention to what I say rather than how I say it or pronounce					

	it.					
3.	When I have difficulty to use the right word(s), I try to describe it to the other students					
4.	I prefer to redirect the conversation rather than remain silent when I do not understand a discussion.					
5.	I gradually translate the words into my first language to help me comprehend what the speaker is saying.					
6.	I use a simpler word(s) when involving in any conversation					
7.	When other students do not appear to understand or agree with my point of view, I speak up.					
8.	When others do not understand me, I use gestures and facial expressions.					
9.	I enjoy supplementing the discussion with additional examples (building on a previous comment made by another student)					
10.	When I am not sure of what someone is trying to convey, I will ask them to clarify what they are saying.					
11.	When I am confused, I seek assistance from my peers to assist me					
12.	When I am having difficulty comprehending something, I'll use					

	gestures.					
13.	When I am anxious about using a new word or phrase, I take a deep breath and try it again.					
14.	When I have difficulty in using a word(s), I will substitute synonyms or phrases with a similar connotation to assist me in communicating my thoughts.					
15.	My preferred method of understanding others is to request them to repeat what they just said.					
16.	I use fillers such as 'um', 'well', 'you know, and 'I see what you mean' when I need to think of what to say.					
17.	When I have difficulty expressing myself, I consult the teacher's notes for suggested words and structures to assist me during the discussion.					
18.	When I don't understand what others are saying, I listen quietly and hope to understand without asking them to clarify.					
19.	I usually make a clear mental image of [a new] word to remember it					
20.	I imitate how the teachers speak.					

Appendix B

Questionnaire 2

Dear Student,

The purpose of this section of the study is to get information or your opinion on the type of communicative strategies that you employ when speaking English and its relation to your oral skills. Below are a series of statements about your experience in communication. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking (X) in the appropriate column. Just try to be as honest and accurate as possible. Kindly do not forget any of the items and select just a single response for every statement. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes.

❖ **Biographic information**

Nationality:

❖ **Instructions to follow**: please indicate your answer by marking **X** in the appropriate column. Read below the words of the Likert Scale which represent the abbreviations on the table.

- N = represent Never
- R = Rarely
- S = Sometimes
- O = Often
- A = Always
- ➢ The first question 0 serves as an example.

  Thank you in advance for your attention and participation.

Communication Strategies You Use	How often you use each one				
	N	R	S	O	A
0. I repeat a question I did not hear well before I give an answer					X

1.	I repeat the words or phrases they have just said to help me understand and to gain time					
2.	I do not mind making errors when speaking					
3.	When I cannot find the appropriate word to describe something, I attempt to explain it.					
4.	When the meaning or structure of a word is unclear, I prefer to avoid a conversation.					
5.	If I don't agree with other students, I let them know					
6.	When others do not understand me, I use gestures and facial expressions.					
7.	I use some phrases such as 'really, 'I agree', 'what do you mean by that' to respond to or expand on a conversation					
8.	I am not afraid of asking other students to confirm the meaning of any unfamiliar words or phrases.					
9.	I am not afraid to assist someone unsure of a word's meaning or grammatical structure.					
10.	When I am at a loss for a phrase or a word, I will substitute something that has a similar meaning.					
11.	I use fillers such as 'um', 'well', and 'you know to help myself in deciding what to say,					
12.	I use my first language when I cannot find the appropriate English term					

Appendix C

**Communication Strategies Employed by English as a Foreign Language
Preparatory School Students: A Case Study**

Participant Information Sheet and Informed Consent Form

Dear Participants,

This scale is part of a research that we are carrying out in order to ascertain whether there is an increase of English communication skills among students learning English at the preparatory school. The data collected through this study will be used to understand/discover the communication strategies employed by international (francophones) students at this private university and ascertain whether the international students and particularly francophone who participated in the English preparatory school at this private institution (North Cyprus) increased their capacity to communicate in English.

Please note that your participation in the study is voluntary and whether you are agreeing to participate or not will not have an impact on your grades for the courses you are enrolled in. the data collected during the course of this study will be used for academic research purposes only and may be presented at national/international academic meetings and/or publications. To maintain the confidentiality of your identity, identifiers such as name and other information that could identify your identity would be omitted from study instruments Your identity will not be revealed in any case to third parties and pseudonyms will be used in all observational and interview data. You may quit participating in this study at any time by contacting us. If you opt out of the study, your data will be deleted from our database and will not be included in any further steps of the study.

In case you have any questions or concerns, please contact us using the information below.
Merveille Otshudi Wetshokodi
Email: merveillewe2016@gmail.com
+90 533 870 46 22

Assoc. Prof. Dr Hanife Bensen Bostanci
English language teaching department, Near East University
Email : hanife.bensen@neu.edu.tr
+90 533 886 66 36

By signing below, you agree to take part in this study
Full name:
Signature:
Date:

Appendix D

Ethical Approval Letter

07.06.2022

Dear Wetshokodi Otshudi Merveille

Your application titled **"Communication Strategies Employed by English as a Foreign Language Preparatory School Students: A Case Study"** with the application number NEU/ES/2022/854 has been evaluated by the Scientific Research Ethics Committee and granted approval. You can start your research on the condition that you will abide by the information provided in your application form.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Direnç Kanol

Rapporteur of the Scientific Research Ethics Committee

Note: If you need to provide an official letter to an institution with the signature of the Head of NEU Scientific Research Ethics Committee, please apply to the secretariat of the ethics committee by showing this document.

Appendix E

thesıs

12%	11%	3%	9%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	hdl.handle.net Internet Source	3%
2	Submitted to Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi Student Paper	2%
3	fir.ferris.edu:8080 Internet Source	1%
4	etikkurul.neu.edu.tr Internet Source	<1%
5	etheses.whiterose.ac.uk Internet Source	<1%
6	scholarworks.gsu.edu Internet Source	<1%
7	pdfs.semanticscholar.org Internet Source	<1%
8	archive.org Internet Source	<1%
9	Mohammad Alawamleh, Lana Mohannad Al-Twait, Gharam Raafat Al-Saht. "The effect of online learning on communication between	<1%