Communication Strategies for Teachers and their Students in an EFL Setting

Saraa Fyaak Al-Gharaibeh[1] and Dina AbdlHameed Al-Jamal[2]

[1] Ministry of Education, Irbid, Jordan
[2] Curricula & Instruction Department Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan

Abstract: This study aimed at investigating the communication strategies used by EFL teachers and their students in an EFL setting (i.e. Jordan). The participants of the study included tenth grade English language teachers and their students' in selected schools in Irbid city, Jordan. Dörnyei and Scott's (1997) taxonomy was adapted in designing an observation checklist steered at eliciting teachers' actual teaching practices. A questionnaire was also developed on the grounds of the same taxonomy. The findings reported the following communication strategies were used: message reduction, approximation, circumlocution, code-mixing miming, self-repetition, and other-repetition, appealing for help, comprehension- check, own- accuracy check, asking for repetition, guessing, using of fillers and hesitation devices, guessing, and feigning understanding. Interestingly, the results showed that although teachers teach communication strategies, yet they are unaware of such strategies; they rather use them unconsciously. Provided that, the study concluded that congruence between the teachers' claims and students' perceptions regarding the actual teaching of such strategies is absent.

Keywords: communication strategies, tenth grade teachers, tenth grade students.

1. INTRODUCTION

The process of teaching English as a foreign language is considered as a multi-dimensional process, which includes many partners, with most effective roles of teachers, students and textbooks. Considering the significance of the oral communication that occurs between English language teachers and their students in the classroom, oral communication strategies that help teachers to develop the communication ability of their students, as those strategies help students to overcome their linguistic breakdowns.

Oral communication strategies (hence forth CSs) were defined as: 'verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence' Canal and Swain (1980:30). Corder (1983:103) defined a communication strategy as a 'systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his or her meaning when faced with some difficulty'. Later, Faerch and Kasper (1983: 20) introduced CSs as 'conscious plans to overcome the problems facing an individual to reach the intended meaning of communication process'.

Moreover, the role of CSs is extended to inform learners on *what to say* and on *how to expand* the language communicatively. This was explained by Tarone (1977) on the grounds that when class communication is weak or incorrect in terms of lexicon or grammar, EFL and ESL learners need to be trained on CSs. Learners may improve their oral skills by developing and shaping their ability to use specific CSs to compensate for their target language imperfect knowledge. However, learners use some strategies in oral communication. According to Nakatani (2006), students who have high oral proficiency use fluency-oriented, negotiation of meaning, and social affective strategies that are more effective to keep the oral communication. That is, learners use CSs to keep conversation continuous and to gain interaction through negotiation. Students with low proficiency, also, depend on ineffective strategies such as low activity listener and message abandonment strategies.

The notion of communicative competence was derived from Chomsky's (1965) distinction between competence and ability. Chomsky defined it as ' the shared knowledge of the ideal speaker-listener set in a completely homogenous speech community' and the ability as ' the process of applying the underlying knowledge to the actual language use'. In his distinction, Chomsky focused on 'the speaker-listener, the homogenous speech community and perfect language knowledge 'as cited in (Grenfell and Harris, 1999). Specifically, he was concerned with the knowledge of grammar and the ability to use this knowledge (as cited in Hornberge, 1989), simply by producing grammatical sentences without considering for their appropriateness.

Hymes (1972) suggested that communicative competence must include the social meaning. She produced a framework for communicative competence which concluded both the rules of grammar a long with rules of use. Two popular different terms 'Use' and ' Usage', were developed further by Widdowson (1978:3). These terms refer to two aspects of communicative ability:

a- *The ability to produce correct sentences, or manifestations of the linguistic system (i.e. Usage).*
b- *The ability to use the knowledge of the rules for effective communication (i.e. Use).*

Canale and Swain (1980) suggested a model of communicative competence which included three components of competencies:1- sociolinguistic competence (the knowledge of the sociocultural code of language use), 2- grammatical competence (the knowledge of grammatical rules, lexical items, syntax and phonology of the language), 3- strategic competence (the ability to effectively transmit information to listener including the skills to use CSs to compensate for breakdowns in communication).

Later, Canale (1983) added a new component to Canale and Swain's model which is the discourse competence. Discourse competence is concerned with how a speaker selects arranges and sequences words into a unified spoken or written text (i.e. the pragmatic competence). That is, the pragmatic function of communication is an important contribution to the concept of communicative competence, which stresses the function of language 'use' to achieve meaning effectively and appropriately in social settings.

Spromberg (2011) explored CSs used by twenty five high school English language students in New York City public school while they work in small groups. In order to collect data, the researcher used video-recorded observation. The study reported that the participants used CSs featured at Dornyei and Scott's (1995) taxonomy of communication strategies. Explicitly, the findings showed that the participants used interactional coping devices such as asking for clarification, confirming, and rephrasing strategies. Regarding direct coping devices, the study reported that the participants used self-rephrasing, miming, and repairing strategies. However, the indirect coping devices reported by the study were those of structure words, self –repetition and other-repetition strategies.

Carvantes and Roddrin10guez (2012) studied CSs used by two EFL teachers and their beginner level students in Mexico City, and the potential factors that influence the communication strategy use in class. For the purpose of collecting data, the researchers used audio-recordings of naturally occurring classroom interactions, interviews with the teachers and observation field notes taken in six class sessions. Data from the interaction transcripts were examined as adapting Faerch and Kasper's (1983) taxonomy of communication strategies as analysis basis. Results indicated that the most frequently used communication strategy in both groups was language switch. However, the teacher who seemed more involved with students used clarification request, comprehension check and asking for confirmation strategies. The teacher who appeared more distant from students used comprehension check and repetition strategies. Class size, seating arrangements and learning activity tasks were also some of the factors that influenced the communication strategies use.

Abunawas (2012) examined CSs used by Jordanian EFL students and the effect of proficiency level in CSs use. The participants of this study consisted of sixty six students at Zarka University (28 males and 38 females). To collect data, the participants were put into three groups according to their proficiency levels, two instruments were used: picture description test and interviews. The findings of the study showed that Jordanian University EFL students use various CSs, such as approximation, circumlocution and code switching in spite of their levels of proficiency.

Wang (2014) explored Chinese English learners' ability to use CSs. The participants were put in a relatively real English referential communication setting. The analysis of the research data showed that Chinese English learners, when encountering problems in foreign language communication, are characterized by their frequent use of circumlocution, approximation, substitution, exemplification, literal translation, and repetition and word-coinage strategies. The study reported students' infrequent use of cultural-knowledge

and paralinguistic CSs. The high frequency of literal translation, on their L1-based strategies, suggested that EFL learners' use of L1-based CSs may depend more upon the developmental stage of their target language than the typology distance between L1 and the target language. The findings indicated that learners' use of CSs is influenced by a variety of factors, among which the development stage of their inter-language and their cultural background are identified as two important factors.

Majd (2014) studied the effect of teaching communication strategies on helping English language learners to communicate more easily and effectively. The researcher intended to prove such effect of teaching communication strategies by increasing learners 'motivation to communicate, which in turn, reduces their anxiety level. The participants were forty Iranian female students who were homogeneously selected, of the age of twelve to fourteen years old. All participants were placed in the same proficiency level according to Cambridge Proficiency Test. The researcher used three methods to collect data; namely, pre-posttests, a strategy training program based on Dornyei's (1995) taxonomy of CSs for three months, and a questionnaire. The study reported the effectiveness of the teaching of the CSs in improving learners' communication skills as well as in increasing their motivation to learn.

Megarshahr and Abdollahzadeh (2014) examined the effect of teaching communication strategies on the Iranian English language learners' willingness to communicate. The participants of the study were one hundred twenty English language learners in English language institute. They were at the age of fifteen to forty years old. To collect data, the participants were allocated in two groups: control and experimental. Regular instruction prevailed in the control group, whereas strategy instruction was dominant in the experimental group. The instruments used in the study were those of self – report adapted from *Maclntyre, Baker, Cle`ment and Conrad (*2001) along with a re-posttest. The findings revealed that the teaching of CSs assists learner keener to interact more the classroom.

Rababah (2015) examined the effect of communication strategy instruction on the ability to communicate together with the establishing strategic competence among EFL learners. The participants were eighty learners, who were divided into a control group and an experimental one. The experimental group received CSs training based on a training program designed by researcher, while the control group received the regular communicative course using *Click on 3* program which lasted for fourteen weeks as being based on the communicative language teaching approach. The communication strategies targeted in the training program included circumlocution (paraphrase), asking for repetition, appeal for help, clarification request, self-repair, confirmation request, and guessing. The instruments of the study consisted of pre-post IELTS speaking test, transcription data, and a *Click on 3* textbook existing. The study reported a significant improvement. Specifically, the participants in the experimental group significantly outperformed their peers in the control group in the IELTS speaking test scores. The results of the post-test transcription data also confirmed that the participants in the strategy training group used more CSs, which was attributed to the CS training program.

Taxonomies of communication strategies

The theoretical and empirical research on oral communication strategies taxonomies provided a detailed frame for analyzing how language learners manage to carry on meaning and to continue communication. These taxonomies are Tarone's (1977) where other taxonomies were stemmed out of it, such as Bialystok's (1983); Corder's (1983); Faerch and Kasper (1983), Paribakht's (1985), Chen's(1990), Dornyei's (1995) and Dörnyei and Scott's (1997).

In Tarone's (1977) taxonomy, CSs are classified into three major categories namely: paraphrase, transfer and avoidance. These major categories are further classified into subdivisions. Transfer includes literal translation, language switch, appeal for assistance, and mime. Under paraphrase strategy, Tarone identified approximation, word coinage, and circumlocution. Avoidance included topic avoidance and message abandonment. Tarone's taxonomy was reproduced in Tarone (1980: 229). The following is the taxonomy with its definitions and examples:

Table 1: CSs as in Tarone (1980: 429)

Paraphrase: this strategy includes three other strategies which are:		Examples
Approximation	Use of a single target language vocabulary item or structure, which the learner knows is not correct, but which shares enough semantic features in common with the desired item to satisfy the speaker.	"pipe" for " water pipe")
Word coinage	The learner makes up a new word in order to communicate a desired concept.	"air ball" for "balloon")
Circumlocution	The learner describes the characteristics or elements of the object or action instead of using the appropriate TL structure.	("She is, uh, smoking something. I don't know what's its name (what its name is). That's, uh, Persian and we use in Turkey, a lot of").
Transfer: this strategy involves the following strategies:		
Literal translation	The learners literally translate a word, a compound word, an idiom, or a structure from L1 into L2.	"He invites him to drink" for "They toast one another").
Language switch	The learners use an L1 word or phrase with an L1 pronunciation.	"balon" for "ballon" or "tirtil" for "caterpillar").
Appeal for assistance	The learner asks for the correct term or structure.	"What's this?").
Mime	The learner uses nonverbal strategies in place of a meaning structure.	Clapping one's hands to illustrate applause).
Avoidance: this strategy includes the following strategies:		
Topic avoidance	The learner simply does not talk about concepts for which the vocabulary or other meaning structure is not known.	
Message abandonment	The learner begins to talk about a concept but is unable to continue due to lack of meaning structure, and stops in mid-utterance.	

Another taxonomy of CSs was proposed by Bialystok (1983). Bialystok has developed a taxonomy which was based mostly on that of Tarone's (1977). The basis of Bialystok's taxonomy is a consideration of the source of information on which the CSs are based. The information incorporated into the strategic use may be derived from the learner's native language, the target language itself, or contextual information given with the situation. These distinctions are subdivided as native language - based strategies and target language -based strategies. Under native language-based strategies, Bialystok listed:
a- language - switch.
b- literal-translation.
c- foreignizing native language items.

Under target language-based CSs, Bialystok listed semantic contiguity description, which has three subdivisions specifying the information which has been incorporated into the description. These three subdivisions are: general physical properties, specific features, and interactional / functional characteristics; word coinage.

Furthermore, Corder (1983:17-18) suggested a different taxonomy of CSs by which he classified CSs into two major categories: message adjustment strategies, and resource expansion strategies. Among message adjustment strategies, he classified:
a) Topic avoidance: a refusal to enter into or continue a discourse within some field of topic because of a feeling of total linguistic inadequacy.
b) Message abandonment which is a less extreme form of topic avoidance: the learner tries but gives up.
c) Semantic avoidance, which refers to saying something slightly different from what you

intended but still broadly relevant to the topic of discourse.

d) Message reduction which is the least acute form of message adjustment by which the learner says less or less precisely than what he/ she intends to say. For the resources expansion strategy, the situation is different in that one cannot order the techniques according to a hierarchy; they are all risk-taking, in that they run the danger of failure (misunderstanding or communication breakdown). Amongst resource expansion strategies, Corder identified:

1. Borrowing, the use of linguistic resources other than the TL, but they include guessing of a more or less informed kind.
2. Switching to another language which is the extreme form of borrowing and the most risky enterprise.
3. C- Paraphrase or circumlocution, getting round the problem. It is considered a less risk-taking strategy - inelegant but successful.
4. Paralinguistic devices, such as gestures or appeal for help from the interlocutor for a word or expression; it is considered the least risk-taking strategy of all.

Additionally, Faerch and Kasper (1983:38-53) developed a CSs taxonomy which is based in English language learners behavior when faced with `problems in communicating. It consisted of two main strategies: reduction strategies, and achievement strategies.

According to Faerch and Kasper (1983:36) language learners can either solve problems in communication by' Adopting avoidance behavior, trying to do away with the problem, normally by changing the communicative goal, or by relying on achievement behavior, attempting to tackle the problem directly by developing an alternative plan'.

Paribakht (1985) suggested a taxonomy that was based on three approaches; linguistic approach, conceptual approach, and contextual approach. These approaches involved the semantic features of the target items, the speakers' contextual knowledge, and the speakers' world's knowledge, correspondingly.

Chen (1990) suggested another taxonomy which may fit his concept-identification task, e.g. identification of concrete and abstract concepts. Chen's (1990:162-165) taxonomy is based on the source of information identified in his data. Five types of information were identified. Which were as follows:

1-Then learned language.
2- The world knowledge.
3- The repeated information.
4- Gestures.
5- No information.

Dornyei (1995) submitted two subdivisions of CSs which are: avoidance and compensation strategies. The first subdivision refers to the tendency of the language learner not to use certain language elements due to phonological, syntactic, or lexical problems. It can also be related to the topic of discussion (Brown, 2000), topic avoidance may be the most frequent CS that learners have ever used. For example, when asked a specific question, the student who does not know the answer will just keep silent about it, hence, although useful for day to day communication, the avoidance strategy may not be the best way for EFL learners to learn a foreign language.

The second subdivision of CSs is the compensatory strategies which include compensation for missing language elements, According to Dornyei's (1995) classification, there are eleven types of compensatory strategies with varying degrees of application, for example, circumlocution, word coinage, prefabricated patterns, appealing for help and stalling, time-gaining strategies, etc.

For the purpose of this study, the researchers adapted Dornyei and Scott's (1997) taxonomy of CSs. For it includes most of CSs presented in the former communication strategy (CSs) taxonomies. This taxonomy dealt with 'how CSs help the speakers to solve the difficulties during oral communication tasks and achieve mutual understanding.' According to Dornyei and Scott (1997), these CSs achieve what may be called mutual understanding.Their classification were extended and collected on the base of CSs research.

Their taxonomy consisted of three main categories. The first category is the direct strategies, where strategies used by a speaker who faces problems during communication process. The second category is the indirect strategies where strategies used by a speaker to provide the conditions that lead to the mutual understanding. The third category is the interactional strategies that referred to the mutual cooperation which make by two or more speakers to overcome the problems that face them through communication process.

Since the ultimate goal of teaching English language as a foreign language is to develop learners' communicative competence in order to help them to communicate successfully in English (Canale & Swain, 1983), the Jordanian Ministry of Education (henceforth MOE) aims to develop this competence by the means of its available textbooks *Action Pack series*, which help Jordanian EFL learners to achieve a gradual development in communication skills (as early as at the first grade up

to the twelfth grade. The MOE, however, believes that it is important to create appropriate chances for learners to speak up in class, which may in turn, help them to enhance their oral language skills and communication in English.

Through the researchers' observations at schools, they noticed that although English language is taught in Jordan from the first grade, most tenth grade students lack the ability to communicate in English properly. In this concern, Al-Dweik (2008) asserted that Jordanian learners feel reluctant to speak, shy and unable to go on short conversations. Jordanian English language teachers stress teaching English grammar, reading and vocabulary (Abu-Helu, 2009, Al-Ja'bari, 2011); despite of the fact that the communicative approach is increasingly adopted by the Jordanian Ministry of Education. The present study, intended to explore the Jordanian tenth grade teachers' and their students' oral communication strategies use, and to what extent CSs are key elements of classroom interaction. This study, accordingly, attempted to answer the following questions

1. To what extent do the tenth grade students use CSs understudy?
2. To what extent do the English language teachers teach their students to use CSs understudy?
3. To what extent is there congruence between the English language teachers' claims concerning their use of CSs understudy and their actual use of these CSs?

2. METHOD

A. Design

This exploratory study followed the descriptive mixed method research design. The study tended to be descriptive, as it described certain behaviors of the subjects who participated in the study. These behaviors are the use of CSs by English language teachers' along with their students', with teaching these CSs in their actual English classroom settings. To achieve the objectives of the study, the researchers used a field survey (the questionnaire), as well as field notes (the observation checklist).

B. Population and Sample

The population of the study included all tenth grade English language teachers and their male (3642) and female (3737)students studying at Irbid Directorate of Education schools in the second semester at the academic year 2014-2015.The number of schools that includes tenth grade in Irbid Directorate is 47 schools for females and 33 schools for males. However, the number of the English language tenth grade teachers in Irbid Directorate of Education schools, is not available in Irbid Directorate

databases: so the researchers could not state their numbers.

For the purpose of this study, a representative random sample (by lot) was chosen. The subjects of the sample were chosen by putting names of all the schools that includes tenth grade in Irbid Directorate of Education in a basket and choosing one school of the collection. Then the researchers restored the chosen school name to the basket; in order to maintain the same chances for all schools to participate in the study.

1)The observation checklist

The researchers used the observation checklist to collect data about the actual and observed practice of English language tenth grad teachers and their students' use of CSs. This observation checklist was based on Dornyei and Scott's (1997) taxonomy of CSs. The researchers deleted some strategies of the taxonomy in the observation checklist (part one) because they are impossible to be used by the EFL teacher. The researchers content analyzed *Action Pack 10* and derived the frequent operating CSs and added them to the checklist. In order to collect data about to which extent CSs are taught in English tenth grade classes, the researchers used an observation checklist based on Dornyei and Scott's (1997) taxonomy along with strategies available in *Action Pack 10*. Each part consisted of the categories in the adapted taxonomy, which are:

(i)Direct Strategies

1- Message reduction: to leave an oral message unfinished because of language problems.(E.g. when you ask the student: Can you tell me the months of the year? He replies: I can tell you the days of the week).
2- Approximation: to use an alternative term that expresses the meaning of the target lexical item as closely as possible (e.g. Ship for sail boat).
3- Circumlocution: to describe the properties of the object instead of the exact target item. (e.g. The thing you open bottles with for corkscrew).
4- Code switching: to switch the language to the native language.

(E.g. I watched a فليم خيال علمي; instead of saying I watched a science fiction film).

5- Mime: to use non- linguistic means (e.g. gesture, facial expressions, or sound imitation) to continue their massages because of language problems.
6- Self-repetition: when student repeats what he himself said to gain time to think and produce new utterances.(E.g. the weather the weather is cloudy today, he repeated' the weather' until he can remember ' cloudy'.)

7- Other-repetition: to repeat something the interlocutor said to gain time to reproduce own utterances.

(ii)Interactional strategies

8- Appeal for help: turning to the conversation partner for help either directly (e.g., what do you call …?) or indirectly (e.g., rising intonation, eye contact).

9- Comprehension check: to ask questions to check interlocutor understanding.

10- Own-accuracy check: checking accuracy of the produced utterances, by resaying the produced utterances in correct grammatical forms.

11- Asking for repetition: to ask the interlocutor to repeat what he /she said.

12- Guessing: to continue communication by use of guessing to overcome communication inability, such as, guessing the correct answer of the teacher's questions.

(iii)Indirect strategies

13- Use of fillers / hesitation devices: to use fillers words or gambits to fill pauses to gain time to think (e.g. well, now let me see, as a matter of fact.

14- Feigning understanding: expressing non-understanding of messages.

The checklist is composed of a Table with eight columns. The first column contained the serial number of the strategy; the second column contained the strategy, the third column contained a definition of each strategy in addition of an example on each strategy, while each of the following five columns contained a five-point Likert type scale with the following weights (1=never use this strategy, 2=hardly ever use this strategy, 3=sometimes used this strategy, 4=often use this strategy and 5=always use this strategy. The definitions and the examples of each strategy were added to make it easier for the researchers and a third analyst decide which strategies did the teachers and the students use. This was added to anther checklist.

The observation checklist consisted of two parts; the first part was directed to English language tenth grade teachers, while the second part was directed to English language tenth grade students. The researchers called all the principals of the schools she visited the day before she went to observe the tenth grade teachers and their students' use of CSs, so they helped her with their teachers' consents to switch classes.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Results related to the first research question: To what extent do the tenth grade students use CSs understudy? In order to answer this question, each strategy used by the observed students was coded. Using the checklist, the strategies were categorized according to Dornyei and Scott's (1997) taxonomy. The frequencies were counted for each strategy and rank orders, means and standard deviations were then calculated.

Table 2: Rank order, means and standard deviation CSs used by tenth grade students

No.	rank	Item	Mean	Std. Deviation	Degrees
1	12	Message reduction	4.83	.592	High
2	1	Approximation	2.33	1.626	Moderate
3	3	Circumlocution	2.63	1.732	Moderate
4	2	Code- mixing	2.43	1.695	Moderate
5	4	Mime	3.23	1.478	Moderate
6	7	Self-repetition	4.03	1.426	High
7	6	Other-repetition	3.87	1.525	High
8	9	Appeal for help	4.70	.596	High
9	13	Comprehension- check	4.93	.254	High
10	8	Owen- accuracy check	4.47	1.106	High
11	10	Asking for repetition	4.73	.907	High
12	5	Guessing	3.83	1.663	High
13	11	Using of fillers and hesitation devices	4.77	.817	High
14	14	Feigning understanding	2.07	1.285	Low

Table 2 shows that the results were classified into two degrees high for items 1, 6, 7,8, 9,10, 11, 12, 13 and 14, and moderate for items 2, 3,4, and5. The strategy; feigning understanding gets the highest mean score (M=5.00, SD=.000), while the approximation strategy gets the lowest mean score (M=2.33, SD=1.626) among other strategies. The strategies:(message - reduction, self-repetition, other-repetition, appeal for help, comprehension- check, own- accuracy check, asking for repetition, guessing, using of fillers and hesitation devices), seem to be used by tenth grade students.

B. **Results related to the second research question:** To what extent do the English language teachers teach their students to use CSs understudy? In order to answer this question, each strategy was taught by the observed teachers was coded. Using the checklist, the fourteen strategies were categorized according to Dornyei and Scott's (1997) taxonomy. The frequencies were counted for each strategy and rank orders, means and standard deviations were then calculated.

Table 3: Rank order, means and standard deviation of the extent to which do teachers teach their students to use CSs

No.	Rank	Item	Mean	Std. Deviation	Degrees
1	8	Message reduction	4.90	.403	High
2	3	Approximation	4.47	1.106	High
3	1	Circumlocution	4.23	1.382	High
4	2	Code- mixing	4.33	1.241	High
5	7	Mime	4.73	.785	High
6	2	Self-repetition	4.33	1.269	High
7	1	Other-repetition	4.23	1.382	High
8	6	Appeal for help	4.70	.952	High
9	9	Comprehension-check	4.93	.254	High
10	4	Owen- accuracy check	4.57	1.006	High
11	9	Asking for repetition	4.93	.365	High
12	5	Guessing	4.67	.844	High
13	10	Using of fillers and hesitation devices	5.00	.000	High
14	10	Feigning understanding	5.00	.000	High

Table 3 shows that the results were classified into one degree; high for items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14. English language teachers teach their students to use all the fourteen strategies: message - reduction, approximation, circumlocution , code- mixing, miming, self-repetition, other-repetition, asking for repetition ,appeal for help, comprehension- check, own-accuracy check, , guessing, using of fillers and hesitation devices, feigning understanding seem to be used by tenth grade students.

C. **Results related to the third research question:** To what extent is there congruence between the English language teachers' claims concerning their use of CSs understudy and their actual use of these CSs? In order to answer this question, all the strategies were observed by the researchers using the checklist, specifically, each strategy was used by the teachers was coded. At that time, each strategy code was compared with the teachers' answers in their questionnaires where the thirteen strategies were categorized according to Dornyei and Scott's (1997) taxonomy in addition to the strategies that are presented in *Action pack 10*, and then these were compered. To check the congruence between the English language teachers' claims concerning their use of CSs understudy and their actual use of these CSs, the researchers used Correlation Coefficient Spearman's Sig. (2-tailed).

Table 4: Correlation Coefficient for teachers' use of CSs as they claimed in the questionnaire

No.	rank	Item	Mean	Std. Deviation	Degrees	Spearman's	(Sig)
1	5	Approximation	1.90	.6620	Low	.123	.5180
2	10	Circumlocution	2.37	0.928	Moderate	-.090	.6370
3	13	Code- mixing	2.93	1.081	Moderate	.406	.0260
4	9	Mime	2.33	0.994	Moderate	.009	.9630
5	7	Self-repetition	2.00	1.259	Low	.299	.1080
6	4	Owen- accuracy check	1.80	.9610	Low	.287	.1250
7	6	Asking for repetition	1.97	.8500	Low	.148	0.436
8	8	Use of filler / hesitation devices	2.30	.8370	Low	.233	.2150
9	11	Translation avoidance	2.77	1.104	Moderate	-.009	.9610
10	12	Topic avoidance	2.90	.9600	Moderate	-.062	.7440
11	1	Simplifying what you are speaking about	1.37	.6150	Low	.326	.0790
12	3	Using the contextual vocabulary items	1.63	.6150	Low	.204	.2800
13	2	In dialogues students need to think and prepare what to say, and to use some words and expressions provided in the dialogues box	1.40	.5630	Low	.193	.3080

Table 4 shows that the results were classified into two degrees, Moderate for items 2, 3, 4, 9 and 10, and Low for items 1, 5, 6,7, 8, 11,12,13, and 14. The teachers claimed that they use the strategies as Moderate for the strategies of: circumlocution which was statistically

significant (0.6370), code-mixing was statistically significant (0.026), and miming was statistically significant (0.9630). The strategies; translation avoidance

was statistically significant (0.9610), topic avoidance was statistically significant (0.7440).

While they claimed that they use the strategies in a Low degree: self-repetition, approximation, own-accuracy check, asking for repetition, use of fillers / hesitation devices, simplifying the topic, using the contextual vocabulary items, In dialogues students need to think and prepare what to say, and to use some words and expressions provided in the dialogues box were not

used by tenth grade teachers and their use is not statistically significant.

Table 5: correlation coefficient between teachers' claims concerning their use of CSs understudy and their actual use of these CSs

Item	Means of teachers claims	Means of teachers actual use	Spearman's	(Sig)
1	1.90	2.07	.1230	0.518
2	2.37	2.80	-.090	.6370
3	2.93	2.50	.406	.0260
4	2.33	2.40	.009	.9630
5	2.00	4.10	.299	.1080
6	1.80	4.90	.287	.1250
7	1.97	4.80	.148	.4360
8	2.30	4.63	.233	.2150
9	2.77	4.63	-.009	.9610
10	2.90	4.73	-.062	.7440
11	1.37	3.67	.326	.0790
12	1.63	2.70	.204	0.280
13	1.40	4.40	.193	0.308

Table 5 indicates that there is not congruence between the English language teachers' claims concerning their use of CSs understudy and their actual use of these strategies. It seems that Jordanian English language teachers realize that they use specific strategies, this could be explained by noticing the correlation coefficient and the statistical significant between their claims and their actual practice of these CSs.

Discussion

A. Discussion of the results related to the first question. This question aimed at identifying the extent to which English language students use CSs according to Dornyei and Scott's (1997) taxonomy. The results as shown in Table 2 indicate that tenth grade English language students use CSs for classroom communication, that were stated by Dornyei and Scott's (1997) taxonomy.

The study reported that the participating teachers used all the fourteen strategies vastly. Specifically, *feigning understanding* and *using fillers and hesitation devices* got top mean scores (M= 5.00). Also, both of *circumlocution* and *other- repetition* strategies had best similar mean scores (i.e. M= 4.23). *whereas Tenth grade students use the strategies of (message reduction, approximation, circumlocution, code-mixing miming, self-repetition, other-repetition, appealing for help, comprehension- check, own- accuracy check, asking for repetition, guessing, using of fillers and hesitation devices, guessing , and feigning understanding, all of these strategies got high degree.*

This result agrees with Abnawas (2012), Ugla, Adnan and Abidin (2013), and who found that that EFL university students use various CSs to overcome their linguistic breakdowns, among which, code- switching, and appealing for help.

The present study reported that tenth grade students tend to use *message reduction* strategy to a large extent (M= 4.90). This result agrees with the study of Al-Dweik (2008) who concluded that Jordanian EFL students are not risk takers who feel reluctant to speak.

The present study stated that tenth grade students participating in the study used *feigning understanding* strategy which got high mean score (M = 5.00). Typically, students use this strategy is to clarify meaning. The reasons stand beyond their low achievement in their instructional exams. This strategy involves students' expressing their lack of understanding a message understanding. Concerning the strategy of *simplifying what students speak about*, the study reported that it was used by teachers greatly with a mean score of (M= 3.67).

Yet, the study presented a surprising result regarding the strategy of *topic avoidance* where teachers use this strategy in limited manner with a low mean (M= 2.07). Out of their observations, the researchers believe that if teachers use these strategies in their teaching (namely; *simplifying what they are speaking about*, *topic avoidance*) their teaching will be more effective. For using such strategies will save a lot of efforts instead of trying to confirm/expand on the teaching of more complex grammatical rules. So it is hoped, as claimed by teachers and as mentioned in the discussion of the first question, that students are expected to perform better in their school exams together with having more time to interact orally with their teachers or their classmates. As a result, they are expected to communicate meaningfully. Unfortunately, that was not the case, that is, students cannot interact properly in the target language.

The present study reported tenth grade students' use of *approximation* and *circumlocution* strategies. This indicates that English language students are controlled by the practices of their teachers which are steered towards the teaching of vocabulary items. Even more, students are asked to communicate while using the vocabulary items tasks, i.e. lists.

The strategy of *code-mixing* was used by the students. This result corresponded with the teachers' use of this strategy. This explains why students cannot communicate in English meaningfully, as the mean scores were for the teachers as 2.50 and for students as 2.43. The following are examples of students' use of CSs:

1- *'The weather today is is very hot'*. The student here repeated 'is' twice to gain time and remember " very *hot'*.
2- *'Yesterday our school celebrated* عيد الاستقلال'. The student here cannot remember or may she don't know the English concept ' Independence Day', so she mixed her sentence with the Arabic concept.
3- ' زي ما قال عمر *I love organic food'*. The student here cannot produce his own sentence so he repeated his colleague's sentence.
4- *'I goes to school by bus everyday' no no I am sorry "I go to school by bus everyday'*. The student here realized that he produced incorrect sentence, so he made accuracy check and reproduced it accurately.
5- ' *Cleaning machine'* for 'washing machine'.
6- ' *Very high plac*e' for 'mountain'.
7- ' *Above air'* for 'climate'.
8- ' *Not existed animals'* for ' extinction'.
9- ' *Protect'* for 'conserve'.
10- '*Put*' for ' choose')

The researchers think that, although students use CSs in high rates, their use to some extent reflects gaps in their lexical and grammatical performance which stands as for their inability to overcome linguistic breakdowns. The examples which were taken through the observation classes may prove this claim.

B. Discussion of the results related to the second question. This question asked about the extent to which English language teachers use CSs according to Dornyei and Scott's (1997) taxonomy. The results of the first question showed that English language teachers teach their students to use these strategies yet not to all strategies introduced by this study.

For example, the study reported that teachers teach their students to use most of the strategies (namely; *message reduction, approximation, circumlocution, code-mixing , miming, self- repetition, other- repetition, appeal for help, comprehension check, own- accuracy check, asking for repetition, guessing , using fillers and hesitation devices*). In contrast, the strategy of *feigning understanding* was not used excessively, but rather to a slight extent.

The study, however, reported that the participating teachers teach *using fillers and hesitation devices* strategy to a large extent which came top across the means and as the highest (M= 5.00). Whereas the strategy of *feigning understanding* came last and scored the lowest mean (M= 1.40).

Throughout her field observations, the researchers noticed that teachers encourage their students to use the strategy of *approximation* by keep telling them to use synonyms and alternative items. For example, one of the teachers told his students that ' *a small plant'* is the same for ' *a steroid'*. The study indicated that teachers teach *other- repetition strategy* which has got a mean score of 4.23. This teaching this strategy, however, has benefits as evidenced by Faucette (2001). Faucette maintained that the teaching of CSs is essential for the production of the target language. Faucette recommended interactional strategies teaching as they are central to the initiation and keeping of communication and negotiation of meaning.

Matching these results with the results that are related to the second question, the researchers realized the reason behind students' inability to communicate properly. That is, teachers teach students to use these CSs, but the students still are unable to communicate properly, because these efforts for teaching CSs are limited in achieving instructional tasks rather to communicate orally.

C.Discussion of the Results Related to the third Question. This question asked about to what extent is there congruence between the English language teachers' claims concerning their use of CSs understudy and their actual use of these CSs.

English language teachers' claimed that they use strategies of *circumlocution* (M=2-37), *code- mixing* (M=2.93), *miming* (M=2.33), the strategy of *topic avoidance* (M=2.77) moderately.

Meanwhile, English language teachers' claimed that they do not use CSs in classroom communication that their class communication goes smoothly and they communicate with their students easily, these claims indicated that that they do not use strategies of *approximation*(M=1.90) , *self- repetition* (M=2.00), *own- accuracy check* (M= 1.80), *asking for repetition* (M=1.97), *using fillers and hesitation devices*(M=2.30), the strategy of *simplifying what they are speaking about* (M=1.37), the strategy of *using contextual vocabulary items*(M=1.63), and the strategy of *in dialogues students need to think and prepare what to say*, *and to use some words and expressions provided in the dialogues box* (M=1.40).

That is, the results of the Fourth question showed that there was not congruence between the English language teachers' claims concerning their use of CSs understudy and their actual use of these CSs.

English language teachers claimed when they filled in the questionnaire that they do not use CSs in classroom communication that their class communication goes smoothly and they communicate with their students easily, but these claims were invalid. Because the researchers observed their use of CSs before she asked them to fill in the questionnaire. This procedure helped to explore the gap between their claims and their actual use of CSs. Results of this question as shown in Table 5 indicated a gap between the teachers' claims and their actual use of CSs. Differences between mean scores of their claims and their actual use of CSs show the non-congruence of their claims and their actual use of CSs.

Comparing mean scores between teachers' claims and their actual use can be explained on the grounds that the teachers are unaware of the positive effect of CSs in communication management in classes.

Concerning comparing the mean scores of the strategies, the researchers were keen to highlight such differences. For example, the strategy of *asking for repetition* (claim=1.97: practice = 4.10), *using fillers and hesitation devices* (claim=2.30, practice = 4.63), the strategy of using *contextual vocabulary items* (claim=1.63, practice = 3.67), and the strategy of in d*ialogues students need to think and prepare what to say, and to use some words and expressions provided in the dialogues box* (claim=1.40, practice = 4.40).

For the statistical significance, there were statistically significant between certain strategies' claims and actual use, such as, circumlocution (Sig= 637), code-mixing (Sig=026), miming (Sig=963), self-repetition(Sig=108), own- accuracy check, asking for repetition, using of fillers / hesitation devices, translation avoidance, topic avoidance

4. CONCLUSION

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings of the present study.

1- The findings of the study revealed that the Jordanian tenth grade teachers participating in the study use CSs, in order to overcome their students' communication breakdowns. This reflects the absence of their awareness regarding the use of these CSs, is that they use CSs without being aware that they are using them.

2- The findings revealed that the Jordanian English language students face problems due to lexical (vocabulary items) gaps; that their speech out is characterized by the heavy use of a*pproximation* and *circumlocution,* and the use of *code- mixing*.

3- *Feigning understanding* was repeated as the most used CSs by students. This reflects that they have desire to learn.

4- *Comprehension-check* was repeated as the most used CSs by teachers. This reflects that they want to achieve learning outcomes, while this effort is not actually achieved because of their low use of their CSs of topic avoidance.

5- The teachers tend to solve the oral communication problems with their students by switching to Arabic.

6- *Message reduction* was repeated as the most taught CSs by teachers. This reflects that they do not encourage their students to take risk and communicate orally, instead they can give their students starting points about the concept or the topic they ask them to speak about, and in contrast they move to another student to get the answer.

7- The strategy of *students need to think and prepare what to say, and to use some words and expressions provided in the dialogues box* was repeated as the most non-congruent CSs among the teachers claims and actual use of CSs. This reflects that they are unaware of their using of CSs.

REFERENCES

Abunawas, Salah (2012). Communication Strategies Used by Jordanian EFL Learners. *Canadian Social Science*. 8(4), 178-193.

Abu-Helu, Sahara (2009).The role of the English language teachers pedagogical beliefs and cultural perceptions in teaching oral communication skills at the upper basic stage in Jordan. Master Dissertation .Yarmouk University. Jordan.

Al-Dweik, A. (2008).Speaking difficulties encountered by the learners of English as foreign language in the upper basic stage in Jordan .Unpublished master thesis .Amman Arab University for Graduate Studies .Amman, Jordan.

Al-Ja'bari, Maha (2011).The congruence between the Jordanian EFL learners' beliefs about oral skills instruction and actual classroom practices. Doctoral Dissertation .Yarmouk University.

Bialystok, E. (1983).'Some Factors in the Selection and Implementation of Communication Strategies'. In C. Faerch and G. Kasper(eds), Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. *London: Longman.*

Brett, A. G. (2001). Teaching Communication Strategies to Beginners. Language.

Brown, H.D. (2000). Principles of language learning and teaching. (4th ed.). NY: Longman.

Canale, M & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics, 1(1), 1-47.

Canale, M. (1983). From Communicative Competence to Communicative language Pedagogy. In: C. Jack, Richards & Richard W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication*. London: Longman.

Carvantes,Carmen and Roddrinduez, Ruth (2012).The use of Communication strategies in the beginner FL classroom .*Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*,6,111-128.

Chen, Si-Qing (1990). A Study of Communication Strategies in Interlanguage Production by Chinese EFL Learners. *Language Learning,* 40(2), 155-187.

Chomsky, Noam (1965). Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. *Cambridge, Mass.: M. I. T. Press.*

Corder, S. (1983). Strategies of Communication. In C. Faerch and G. Kasper, (Eds.) Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. *London: Longman*, 15-19.

Dörnyei, Z & Scott, M. (1997). Communication Strategies in a Second Language Definitions and Taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47(1), 173-209.

Dornyei, Z & Kormos, J. (1998). Problem-Solving Mechanisms in L2 Communication: Apsycholinguistic Perspective. *Studies in Second Language Acquistion,* 20, 349-385.

Dornyei, Z. (1995). On the Teachability of Communication Strategies. TESOL Quarterly, 29(1), 55-85.

Dörnyei, Z., &Thurrell, S. (1991). Strategic Competence and How to Teach it. *ELT Journal*, 45, 16-23.

Dörnyei, Z., &Thurrell, S. (1994). Teaching conversational skills Course content and rationale. ELT Journal, 48(1), 40-49.

Faerch, Claus, & Kasper, Gabriele (1983). Plans and Strategies in Foreign Language Communication. In Faerch & Kasper (1983). 20-60.

Faucette, P. (2001). A Pedagogical Perspective on Communication Strategies: Benefits of Training and an analysis of English language Teaching Materials. *Second Language Studies*, 19(2), 1-40

Majd, Golaleh (2014). Teaching Communication Strategies to EFL Learners and its Impact on Anxiety Level and Motivation: A hindering or Facilitating Factor?. *English for Specific Purposes World*. Retrieved from www.esp.world.info .

Ministry of Education (2014). English Curriculum: *Action Pack 10*. Amman. Jordan.

Ministry of Education. (2006). General Guidelines and General and Specific Outcomes for English Language. Basic and Secondary Stages. *Ministry of Education .Amman, Jordan*

Nakatani, Y. (2006) Developing an Oral Communication Strategy Inventory. *The Modern Language Journal,* 90(2).

Paribakht, T. (1985). 'Strategic competence and language proficiency'. *Applied Linguistics* 6(2), 132-144.

Grenfell. M., & Harris, V. (1999). Modern Languages and Learning Strategies, *London: Routledge*

Rababah, G. (2015). The Effect of Communication Strategies Training on the Development of EFL Learners' Strategic Competence Oral Communicative Ability. Retrieved from: www. Research gate.net. 18/05/15.

Spromberg, Sarah (2011).Communication Strategies Used by High School English language learners in multilingual classroom. Unpublished Master Thesis. Retrieved 12/4 from: http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED539153

Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious Communication Strategies in Interlanguage. *TESOL*, 77, 194-203.

Tarone, E. (1980). Communication Strategies, Foreigner Talk and Repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning,* 30, (2), 417-431.

Ugla,Read, Adnan, Nur and Abidin, Mohamad (2013).Study of the Communication Strategies Used by Iraqi EFL Students. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*. 2, 44-50.

Wan, Dianjian,Lai;Hongling and Leslie;Meaceal (2014) Chines English Learners' Strategic Competence .*Journal of Psycholinguistics Research* .Retrieved in 10/4 from http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10936-014-9313-7