Sétif 2 University

LA/ Master 2

Dr Soumia HADJAB

Lecture 12: Cognitive Accounts of Second Language Production

Communication Strategies: Historical Overview and Conceptualisation

Learners' Means and Ends: A Lack of Balance

Dörnyei & Scott (1997) found that the existence of a mismatch between language speakers' linguistic knowledge and communicative intentions caused a crucial need for CSs to help learners in their efforts to speak English as a TL. In fact, CSs help in negotiating meaning where either linguistic structures or sociolinguistic rules are not shared between a foreign language learner and a speaker of the TL (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). These devices facilitate learners' communicative competence in a foreign language and focus on interaction and interlocutors' negotiation behaviour for coping with communication breakdowns (Yaman, Irgin & Kavasoglu, 2013). Furthermore, CSs enhance the effectiveness of communication (Canale, 1983).

Communication Strategies as a Solution to Learners' Communicative Problems

The use of CSs is suggested as a solution to help learners achieve their communicative goals (Hedge, 2000; McDonough, 2006). Tarone (2005) stated that speakers use CSs to "resolve difficulties they encounter in expressing an intended meaning" (p. 488). In different words, CSs are defined as tactics taken by language learners to solve oral communication problems. Further, Yaman et al., (2013) claimed that CSs involve both listening and speaking which contribute to the foreign language learners. They are used to negotiate the meaning and to maintain the conversation (Tarone, 1980). Again, Faerch & Kasper (1983) said that CSs handle difficulties or communication breakdowns.

Communicative State of Language Learners

It seems a solid fact that no second/foreign language learner's, or even no native speaker's linguistic repertoire or control of language is perfect. Native as well as non-native speakers of a given language sometimes struggle to find the appropriate

expression or grammatical construction when they intend to get their meaning across (Faucette, 2001; Aliakbari & Allvar, 2009). And the ways in which an individual speaker attempts to compensate for this 'gap' between what he intends to communicate and his immediately available linguistic resources are known as CSs (Faucette, 2001; Oweis, 2013).

Operational Definition of a 'Problem'

In Lafford's (2004) paper, the concept of communication gap is operationalized as an interruption in the normal flow of conversational interaction between the speaker and the interlocutor owing to a breakdown in communication. Lafford (ibid) continued to say that a communication gap is a breakdown in communication caused by the learners' inability to understand their interlocutors or to express themselves in the L2/ TL. In the same vein, Nacey & Graedler (2013) explained that situations in which learners lack or are uncertain about a lexical item they require may result in a communication disruption, "when mutual comprehension is impaired by one of the speakers misunderstanding the other or when the learner is manifestly in trouble in putting across what he/she wants to say" (Haastrup & Phillipson, 1983,p. 143).

Ogane (1998) used the term problem/ difficulty exchangeably, and stated that there are two types of problems/ difficulties we face in communication: those in expressing and those in understanding. According to Tarone, Cohen & Dumas (1983), a problem is a situation where the appropriate systematic target language rules have not been found. And for Faerch & Kasper (1983), a difficulty is a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal. In sum, the concept is well-defined in Klaus & Buhr's quote as "recognition by an individual .. of the insufficiency of her .. existing knowledge to reach a .. goal and of the consequent need for expanding this knowledge" (1976,p. 974). The ' crisis' is another term which has the same qualities as the word 'problem'. It is proposed by Tarone (1977) when she defined CSs as "strategies used by an individual to overcome the crisis which occurs when language structures are inadequate to convey the individual's thought" (p. 195).

And about the types of such problems that impinge on the conversational flow, Dörnyei & Scott (1997, p. 183) characterized the subsequent incidences: (A) resource

deficits: gaps in speakers' knowledge preventing them from verbalizing messages; (B) own performance problems: the realization that something one has said is incorrect or only partly correct, associated with various types of self-repair, self-rephrasing, and self-editing mechanisms; and (C) other performance problems: something perceived as problematic in the interlocutor's speech, either because it is thought to be incorrect (or highly unexpected) or because of a lack (or uncertainty) of understanding something fully, associated with various meaning negotiation strategies.

Conceptualisation of Communication Strategies

Before the 70's

Second language learners' production was viewed as an incorrect form of the TL untill the late 1960's. Transferring from L1 was seen as the main reason of errors. It was claimed that language learning was a process of acquiring rules that were different from those of the mother tongue (Yakut, 2013). The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) composed a theoretical background of this belief, and formed a basis for detecting differences between L1 and L2. It attempted to predict areas leading to potential errors (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). However, CAH ignored the effects of intralingual factors in language learning. Since CAH could not explain many aspects of learner language, researchers developed an approach called 'Error Analysis' which is different from CAH as it seeks to find out and describe different kinds of errors to understand the use of second language data.

Main Works of the 70's

Researchers first raised the notion of second language conversational strategies at the beginning of the 1970s, following the recognition that the mismatch between language speakers' linguistic resources and communicative intentions leads to a number of systematic language phenomena whose main function is to handle difficulties or breakdowns in communication (Dörnyei & Scott, 1997). In the 1970s, four studies prepared the ground for the study of CSs, a new area of research within applied linguistics (Dörnyei, 1995): (1). Selinker's (1972) classic article on IL introduced the notion of strategies of L2 communication. (2). Váradi's study (1973, but published in 1980) and (3). Tarone (1977, also Tarone, Cohen & Dumas, 1976) elaborated on

Selinker's notion by providing a systematic analysis of CSs, introducing many of the categories and terms used in subsequent CS research. And (4). Savignon (1972) reported on a pioneering language teaching experiment involving a communicative approach, which, for the first time, included student training in CSs (or, as she termed, 'coping strategies'). Since these early studies, much research has been done to identify and classify CSs (Bialystok, 1990; Cook, 1993; Poulisse, 1987).

Main works of the 80s

In the early 1980s, the role of CSs was widely acknowledged in the field of second language learning and became the concern of many researchers due to the seminal works of Canale & Swain (1980) and Faerch & Kasper (1983). As Dörnyei & Scott (1997, p. 176) claimed, "The real 'career' of CSs started in the early 1980s".

Canale & Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) included them in their influential framework of communicative competence as one of the constituents of the sub-competences – strategic competence. In Canale & Swain's (1980) model, strategic competence consists of "verbal and non-verbal CSs that may be called into action to compensate for breakdown in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence" (p. 30). This competence, the strategic one, involves the ability to use problem-solving devices to overcome communication problems derived from lack of knowledge in any of the other sub-competences. In addition, the researchers (Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983) suggested teaching CSs in the classroom and providing students the chance to use these strategies.

'Strategies in Interlanguage Communication' was the first edited volume in the field of CS by Faerch & Kasper (1983). In this book, the most important studies and papers were put together (Bialystok, 1983; Dechert, 1983; Faerch & Kasper, 1983c; Haastrup & Phillipson, 1983; Raupach, 1983; Wagner, 1983). This compilation is divided into three main parts: CSs defined, empirical studies and problems in analyzing CSs. This collection, therefore, provides a valuable contribution to the research of CSs. Following these seminal works, an increased research interest in CS and a number of published papers were followed in the 1980. The publications of that time focused primarily on

identifying and classifying CSs, the issue of teaching CSs in the second language classroom and the factors that influenced learners' use of CSs (Bialystok, 1984; Bialystok & Kellerman, 1987; Dekeyser, 1988; Faerch & Kasper, 1984,1986; Harper, 1985; Kumaravadevilu, 1988; Paribakht, 1985,1986; Scholfield, 1987; Tarone, 1984; Tarone & Yule, 1987,1989; Willems, 1987; Yule & Tarone, 1990).

In the latter half of the 1980s, a group of researchers at the Nijmegen University in the Netherlands also conducted a large-scale empirical project on CSs. At that time, the Netherlands was the centre for research on CSs. The Nijmegen Group shed light on various aspects of CSs such as definitions, theories of CSs and also challenged some aspects of the previous taxonomies (Poulisse & Schils, 1989; Poulisse, Bongaerts & Kellerman, 1987). Researchers in the 1980s, thus, attempted to define, identify and classify CSs more systematically. They proposed various CS taxonomies based on their conceptual papers and research (Bongaerts & Poulisse, 1989; Bongaerts, Kellerman & Bentlage, 1987; Kellerman, 1991; Kellerman, Bongaerts & Poulisse, 1987; Kellerman, Ammerlaan, Bongaerts & Poulisse, 1990).

Main Works of the 1990s

Two comprehensive monographs by Bialystok (1990) and Poulisse (1989, 1990) made 1990 an important year in CS research (Dörnyei & Scott, 1997). Bialystok's (1990) book 'Communication Strategies: A psychological Analysis of Second Language Use' contains definitions and theories of CSs proposed by Poulisse (1987, 1989); Faerch & Kasper (1983); Paribakht (1982,1985); Váradi (1980); Tarone (1979, 1980, 1981); Kellerman (1978,1984); Corder (1977,1978,1983) and other researchers' works in the field of CSs were discussed. The latter parts of this book explore empiriral evidence of CSs used by children or adults in the first or second language in relation to language processing. The last part, the issue of learning and teaching CSs are discussed. The most important point Bialystok suggested was that the psychological process of speech production should be regarded as a basis for the study of CSs. She argued that language learners should be taught and practised language structure rather than strategies. Following the seminal work of Bialystok, the researchers in the 1990s, investigated CS application in relation to different proficiency level (Chen, 1990; Kebir, 1994) and

teaching pedagogy of CSs (Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1991; Rost & Ross, 1991; Yule & Tarone, 1991; Dörnyei, 1995).

'The Use of Compensatory Strategies by Dutch Learners of English' is Poulisse's masterpiece. Topics as language use and language learning, communication strategies in the L1 and L2, and the Nijmegen Group's project are explained. In the survey of literature, different issues are presented: definitions, taxonomies, and the theoretical and practical problems related to traditional taxonomies. Poulisse (1989,1990) discussed thoroughly compensatory strategies and their relation to communication. She also presented a taxonomy of compensatory strategy use. Conceptual strategies and linguistic strategies are discussed separalely then the relation between these strategies was highlighted. In addition, conceptual and linguistic strategies are discussed in terms of Level's model. Then, the cooperative principle, the role of mutual knowledge and constraints on communication are discussed under the heading of 'communication: general principles and constraints'.

Bialystok (1990) and Poulisse (1989, 1990) shed light on CS studies and provided theoretical contributions to the field at that time. Since then, the issue of CS instruction has received increasing attention from a variety of researchers. Despite the controversy about CS instruction, many researchers have defined CSs, promoted CS application and supported CS intruction (Lam, 2004; Wen, 2004; Nakatani, 2005). Wen (2004) conducted empirical studies to investigate the effects of strategy instruction on learners' use of CSs. Lam (2004) argued that it is possible and desirable to teach and raise learners' awareness of using CSs in oral communication. Nakatani (2005) also supported the idea that language learners should be made aware of how to use CSs in their communication. As has been noted, the researchers in the field of CSs have recently paid more attention to the teachability issue of CSs as well as promoted strategy instruction. They have attempted to explore the effect of CS strategy instruction in on learners' strategic behaviour and competence (Kongsom, 2009).

No Consensus on One Definition

It is difficult to find a rigorous definition of CSs, on which CS researchers have reached an agreement (Rababah, 2002). In fact, there is a wide consensus on considering

CSs as conscious plans for solving a problem to reach a particular communicative goal. However, researchers are still not in complete agreement of the concept of CSs. Karimnia & Zade (2007) considered defining CSs rigorously as a difficult task, but they provided the insights into the nature of CSs that have been stated by other researchers represented in two points. The first refers to learners' attempt to bridge the gap between their linguistic competence in the target language and that of the TL interlocutors. And the second represents the conscious employment of verbal and non-verbal mechanisms for communicating an idea when precise linguistic forms are for some reasons not available to the learner at that point in communication (ibid).

Different Researchers and Distinct Conceptualisations of CSs

The subsequent table (**Table1**) presents different conceptualizations of CSs. Generally speaking, Dörnyei & Scott (1997) highlighted that, "there is no universally accepted definition of CSs" (p. 174). This view is also elaborated by Benali (2013) who pointed out, "there is still controversy surrounding the definition or identification of CSs .. as opposed to certain types of strategies like learning and production strategies. From this background of different definitions .. we can conclude that no conclusive definition of this term can be provided due to the various terminologies" (p.39).

Table 1: Different Conceptualizations of CSs

Researcher	CS Definition
Tarone (1977, p. 195)	"…are used by an individual to overcome the crisis which occurs when language structures are inadequate to convey the individual's thought".
Tarone (1980, p.420)	"a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared".
Corder (1981, p.103 ; 1983,p.16)	"they are systematic techniques employed by a speaker to express his meaning when faced with some difficulty".
Corder (1983,p.16)	"a systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his (or her) meaning when faced with some difficulty".
Tarone (1981,p. 288)	"Learners' attempt to bridge the gap between their linguistic competence in the target

	language and that of the target language interlocutors".
Faerch & Kasper (1983 a ,p. 36)	"CSs are potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal".
Wagner (1983,p. 167)	"…predetermine the verbal planning, they serve the function of adjusting the plan to the situation,i.e., each individual utterance is to be seen as strategic. What is specific for IL users is that plans of action cannot be directly converted into verbal plans, because of gaps in the speaker's (and hearer's) linguistic repertoire".
Stern (1983,p. 411)	"…techniques of coping with difficulties in communicating in an imperfectly known second language".
Harding (1983,p. 1)	"The domain of compensation strategies must be precisely defined. It is the domain of attempts made by non-native speakers of a language to remedy the disparity that exists between their communicative needs and the linguistic tools at their disposal".

Bialystok (1983,pp.102-103)	"all attempts to manipulate a limited linguistic system in order to promote communication. Should learning result from the exercise, the strategy has also functioned as a learning strategy, but there is no inherent feature of the strategy itself which can determine which of these roles it will serve".
Poulisse (1990,p. 88)	"Compensatory strategies are strategies which a language user employs in order to achieve his intended meaning on becoming aware of problems arising during the planning phase of an utterance due to his own linguistic shortcomings".
Paribakht (1985,p. 132)	"…have generally been defined as means that speakers use to solve their communicative problems".
Mitchell & Myles (1998,p. 94)	"strategies that learners employ when their incomplete linguistic system lets them down".
Canale & Swain (1980,p. 27)	"verbal and non-verbal strategies that may be called into action to compensate for

	breakdowns in communication due to ability variables or to insufficient competence".
CEFR (2001,p. 57)	"strategies are a means the language user exploits to mobilize and balance his or her resources, to activate skills and procedures, in order to fulfil the demands of communication in context and successfully complete the task in question in the most comprehensive or most economical way feasible depending on his or her precise purpose. CSs should therefore not be viewed simply with a disability model – as a way of making up for a language deficit or a miscommunication".
Towel (1987,p. 97)	" the means used by a speaker to overcome a difficulty encountered whilst attempting to communicate in the foreign language".
Dörnyei & Scott (1997,p. 174)	"the mismatch between L2 speakers' linguistic resources and communicative intentions (which) leads to a number of systematic language phenomenon whose aim function is to handle difficulties or breakdowns in communication".
Smith (1979, p.349)	"problem-solving procedures".
Ellis (1985,p.182)	"psycholinguistic plans which exist as part of the language user's communicative competence. They are potentially conscious and serve as substitutes for production plans which the learner is unable to implement".
Tarone, Cohen & Dumas (1983,p. 5)	" systematic attempt by the learner to express meaning in the target language, in situations where the appropriate target language rules have not been formed"
O'Malley & Chamot (1990,p. 43)	"communication strategies are particularly important in negotiating meaning where either linguistic structures or sociolinguistic rules are not shared between a second language learner and a speaker of the target language".

Different Terminology about CSs

Though not many writers offered a definition of strategies, they usually referred to them by using different terms (Rababah, 2002). Communication strategies are known as 'communicative strategies' (Corder, 1983), 'communicational strategies' (Váradi,

1973), ‘compensation strategies’ (Harding, 1983), and ‘compensatory strategies’ (Poulisse et al., 1990), and also as ‘coping strategies’ (Savignon, 1972). Moreover, they are labelled ‘conversational strategies’ by Dörnyei & Thurrell (1994). In the literature, they are used interchangeably.

CSs’ Identification

Nakano (1996) regarded the term CSs as problematic because many of the instances of their use in the literature could be attributed to insufficient awareness of discourse strategies. Al-Khanji (1996) identified three components of CSs: (1) a communication difficulty owing the TL inadequacy, (2) student awareness of the problem, and (3) a solution to overcome it. Further, Nayar (1988, p. 63) proposed five criteria to identify CSs:

“1. noticeable deviance from native speaker norm in the IL syntax or word choice or discourse pattern.

2.Apparent, obvious desire on the part of the speaker to communicate ‘meaning’ to listeners as indicated by overt and covert discourse clues.

3.Evident and sometimes repetitive attempts to seek alternative ways, including repairs and appeals, to communicate and negotiate meaning.

4.Overt pausological, hesitational and other temporal features in the speaker’s communicative behaviour.

5.Presence of paralinguistic and kinesthetic features both in lieu of and in support of linguistic inadequacy”.

Effectiveness of CSs Use

CSs as Problem-Shooting Devices

The term CSs is often limited to strategies resorted to when the language learner has difficulty with communicating (Kalebić, 2007). So, a communication strategy is used when things go wrong, “a spare tyre for emergencies” (Cook, 1993, p. 119). In different terms, they are an invaluable means of dealing with communication trouble spots or as Canale & Swain (1980) said ‘breakdowns in communication’, such as not knowing a particular word, or misunderstanding the other speaker (Doqaruni & Najjari, 2013). Moreover, CSs can also enhance fluency and add to the efficiency of communication which has been hindered by ‘performance variables’. Knowing such strategies is

particularly useful for language learners because they provide them with a sense of security in the language by allowing extra time and room to maneuver (ibid).

CSs as Meaning-Negotiation Devices

According to Nakatani & Gho (2007,p. 208), "CSs are regarded not only as problem-solving phenomena to compensate for communication disruptions, but also as devices with pragmatic discourse functions for message enhancement". Furthermore, Tarone (1980) stated that CSs are considered to be an interactional phenomenon; a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures are not shared. This is quite apparent in her words that consider CSs as "tools used in negotiation of meaning where both interlocutors are attempting to agree as to a communicative goal and a shared enterprise in which both the speaker and the hearer are involved rather than being only the responsibility of the speaker" (Tarone 1980,p. 424). Thus, according to Tarone (1983), only those CSs that are marked in performance by some form of appeal on the part of the learner are considered. Ellis (1985) claimed that the interactional perspective of CSs is best tackled by discourse analysis.

Communication Strategies Taxonomies

No Agreement on One Typology

A variety of typologies referring to CSs in IL production have been proposed by Váradi (1973), Tarone (1977), Tarone et al., (1976), Corder (1978b), Faerch & Kasper (1980, 1983a). In addition, typologies relating specificall to lexical problems are provided by Blum-Kulka & Levenston (1978), and Paribakht (1982, 1985). The available research on CS typologies and classifications reveal that CSs have been classified differently according to the principles of terminology and categorisation of different researchers (Hirano, 1987; Somsai et al., 2011). Much of the literature in this field seems to lack a consensus over a taxonomy of CSs (Hirano, 1987; Rababah, 2002). However, there is considerable overlap between the types of CSs. It is very clear in the literature that a single utterance may be labelled under two different categories. Cook argues that "if the lists were standardized, at least, there would be an agreement about such categories"

(1993, p. 133). It is supposed that because of the problems of definition, there is no agreement yet for CSs types and classification (Ellis, 1985).

Different Typologies and Same Substance

Ever since Selinker's (1972) article on interlanguage introduced the notion of second language CSs, various researchers have gone about classifying these strategies in various ways (Aliakbari et at., 2009). From among these classifications, one can allude to Váradi (1973) and Tarone (1977) who introduced a classification of CSs that were used in subsequent research. Tarone (1977) described her taxonomy as a system which provides the best tool to make sense of the behaviour of the subjects in communicative situations. The author herself points out the lack of generality of her taxonomy. However, other researchers have adapted Tarone's (1977) typology and introduced other strategies (Paribakht, 1985).

This fact has promoted the existence of a rather confusing multitude of different strategies of ambiguous validity (Aliakbari et at., 2009). Bialystok (1990) believed that the variety of taxonomies proposed in the literature differ primarily in terminology and overall categorizing principles rather than in the substance of specific strategies. She remarks that, "If we ignore, then, differences in the structure of the taxonomies by abolishing the various overall categories, then a core group of specific strategies that appear consistently across the taxonomies clearly emerges" (Bialystok, 1990,p. 61).

Criteria of Classification

Many different taxonomies of CSs have been suggested over the years (Nacey et al., 2013). The classifications proposed by researchers have been organized around ceratin criteria, such as the choice of the learner as to whether to reduce or achieve the goal; or to consult different sources of information – L1-based versus IL- or L2-based strategies; or to use his conceptual, analytic versus linguistic strategies (Nacey et al., 2013; Rababah, 2002). Moreover, a variety of different terms has been developed by individual researchers to refer to more or less the same strategy ,e.g., code-switching/ language switching/ borrowing or foreignizing/ anglicizing, etc. As Bialystok (1990) noted, "the

similarity in the strategies listed, and to some extent, even in their classification, is striking" (p. 45).

In fact, though researchers have produced apparently different taxonomies with different structures, the underlying structure of these taxonomies is often the same. What is referred to as 'circumlocution' by one taxonomy is classified as 'description'or 'exemplification' in other taxonomies. For example, Bongaerts & Poulisse (1989) distinguished between two sub-types of linguistic strategy: morphological creativity and strategy of transfer. Strategy of transfer consists of transferring items from L1 or L3. It may be referred to a 'literal translation', 'foreignizing' and 'borrowing'. In Tarone's (1977) taxonomy, these strategies are referred of as 'strategies of conscious transfer' and later by Tarone (1983) as 'borrowing'.

Types of Taxonomies

Psycholinguistic vs. Interactional Typologies

The Psycholinguistic Stance (Definition and Classification)

According to Faerch & Kasper (1984), CSs are located within underlying cognitive structures and are regarded as a subclass of verbal plans. This definition distinguishes CSs from other verbal plans by two criteria: problem-orientedness and potential consciousness.

On the basis of the above definition, CSs are categorized into various subtypes. A first major categorization reflects the difference between strategies aimed at solving problems in speech production and strategies aimed at receptive problems. Most of these have previously been identified by various researchers (Tarone et al., 1976; Blum & Levenston, 1978), and some of its major strategy types have been suggested by Váradi (1973) and Corder (1978). The first major categorization of productive strategies is made according to two types of behaviours that language users may adopt when faced with a communicative problem: they can either adopt avoidance behaviour, thereby renouncing (part of) their original communication goal, or rely on achievement behaviour, attempting to maintain their original aim by developing an alternative plan. These two types of behaviour correspond to two fundamentally different types of CSs:

avoidance behaviour manifests itself in reduction strategies, whereas achievement behaviour underlies achievement strategies (Faerch & Kasper, 1984).

The Interactional Stance

An alternative definition of CSs has been offered by Tarone (1980, 1981, 1983). For her, a communicative strategy represents "a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared" (1980,p. 419). This definition implies that the negotiation of meaning as a joint effort between the interlocutors is central to the concept of CSs (Faerch and Kasper, 1984).

Tarone's (1980) typology of CSs comprises the following categories: paraphrase, transfer, mime, and avoidance. This typology is taken over without modification from an earlier study (Tarone, 1977), in which a different non-interactional definition of CS sis formulated, "conscious communication strategies are used by an individual to overcome a crisis which occurs when language structures are inadequate to convey the individual's thought" (1977,p. 194). This definition is in perfect agreement with the categories provided in the typology.

If the same set of CSs is to be compatible with the interactional definition, however, these strategies have to ber e-interpretable in an interactional way. Faerch & Kasper (1984) claimed that we can think of two ways of doing this. One possibility is to adopt a weak 'interactional claim'. By this we mean that as a result of a speaker's application of a strategy some reaction from the interlocutor is elicited. The strategy could therefore be characterized as 'interactional'.

However, there are several problems associated with the weak claim. First, it implies a confusion of a strategy, operating at the (psycholinguistic) process level of language use, with its linguistic result being the way it manifests itself at the product level of a speaker's performance. Second, interactiveness as a defining criterion of CSs makes it impossible to apply this concept to types of discourse in which no feedback is given or feedback is delayed. This means that the sender of a message does not obtain immediate confirmation or disconfirmation as to whether mutual understanding has been secured (ibid).

To sum up, the weak interactional claim does not offer a criterion by means of which communication strategies can be distinguished from other ways of using language in situations that allow for immediate feedback, while at the same time it excludes problem-solving procedures activated in discourse types with delayed or no feedback from the concept of CSs (ibid).

The 'strong interactional claim' implies that CSs are truly cooperative in nature: the interlocutors are both aware of the presence of a communicative problem which they then attempt to solve on a cooperative basis. A prerequisite for this is that the problem somehow surfaces in the performance. In the case of appeals for assistance, the learner explicitly invites the interlocutor to provide a solution to a communicative problem. In all other instances, the learner first attempts a solution, which elicits the interlocutor's cooperation. Consequently there are only two major types of CSs: direct appeals, which leave the first attempt at problem-solving to the interlocutor, and indirect appeals (e.g., paraphrase, transfer, or mime) in which the learner provides the first solution, thereby eliciting the interlocutor's participation in the process of meaning negotiation (Faerch & Kasper, 1984).

Evaluation and Critics of Previous Taxonomies

Language problems and difficulties are a salient part of communication in a L2 and problem management occurs at several levels. No wonder 'CSs', seen as the language devices used to handle communication problems, have been the target of much research during the past two decades. It is also understandable that the approaches to understanding CSs have varied according the researchers' general orientations towards language analysis (Dörnyei & Scott, 1997). And as different types of definitions evolved, they led to many different taxonomies of CSs (Xamani, 2013). The conceptual differences among CS researchers surface most explicitly when they specify the actual language devices they consider to be CSs. Accordingly, the list of strategies and their taxonomies in different studies on CSs vary significantly. Dörnyei & Scott (1997) offered a comprehensive review of the various definitions and taxonomies.

Dörnyei & Scott (1997), in their review, pulled together all the main language devices mentioned in the literature under the label 'communication strategy', and present nine different taxonomies of CSs by Tarone (1977), Faerch & Kasper (1983b), Bialystok (1983), Bialystok (1990), Paribakht (1985), the Nijmegen Group (based on Poulisse, 1987; Kellerman, 1991), Poulisse (1993), and finally Dörnyei & Scott (1995a, b). Most of the existing taxonomies distinguish several types of CSs (Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Dörnyei & 2002), and some of them propose multiple levels of subcategorization (Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Paribakht, 1986). The taxonomies of CSs have been based on criteria such as whether language users consult sources of information in their first language (L1) or in their L2, or whether they choose or reduce the communication goal. Another classification distinguishing between risk-taking strategies and risk-avoidance strategies is based on the framework of Corder (Corder, 1983).

The first thing that becomes obvious when comparing the classifications is that they concern various ranges of language devices in different degrees of elaborateness. On one end of the narrow-broad continuum are the typologies of the Nijmegen Group and Poulisse (1993), who explicitly restricted the scope of language phenomena examined the lexical-compensatory strategies. On the other end of the continuum is Dörnyei and Scott's (1995a, b) system, which concerns L2 problem-management in general.

Although the terminologies used and their levels of specificity vary a great deal, the corresponding parts of 6 of the 9 taxonomies (Bialystok, 1983; Dörnyei & Scott, 1995a, b; Faerch & Kasper, 1983b; Paribakht, 1985; Tarone, 1977; and Willems, 1987) show many similarities. Biakystok (1990) expressed this basic convergence around similar concepts when she remarked that,

> the variety of taxonomies proposed in the literature differ primarily in terminology and overall categorizing principle rather than in the substance of the specific strategies. If we ignore, then, differences in the structure of the taxonomies by abolishing the various overall categories, then a core group of specific strategies that appear consistently across the taxonomies clearly emerges (p. 61).

Three of the nine (9) taxonomies (Faerch & Kasper, 1983b; Tarone, 1977; Willems, 1987) recognize a basic duality in strategy use; strategies are used either: a/ to tailor one's message to one's resources by altering, reducing, or completely abandoning the original content; or b/ to try and convey the intended message in spite of the linguistic deficiencies by extending or manipulating the available language system.

Váradi (1973) and Faerch & Kasper (1983b) termed strategies belonging to the option 'reduction strategies' and Tarone (1977) called them 'avoidance strategies'; Corder (1981) who pointed out that they could also be labelled 'risk-avoidance strategies', preferred 'message adjustment strategies'. Faerch & Kasper (1983b) termed strategies belonging to the second option 'achievement strategies' ; Corder (1981) called them 'resource expansion strategies' and considered themm 'risk-taking strategies' because by using them the speaker ventures beyond 'playing it safe' and takes a certain risk of not being able to convey the message. Dörnyei & Scott (1995a, b) also implictly recognized the achievement – reduction duality, whereas the rest of the taxonomies cover only achievement strategies (ibid, 1997).

Also, the organizing principles in five (5) taxonomies (Bialystok, 1983; Faerch & Kasper, 1983b; Paribakht, 1985; Tarone, 1977; and Willems, 1989) primarily rest on certain properties of the language devices concerned (e.g., the role of the L1 or the type of knowledge utilized in CS realization). Bialystok and the Nijmegen Group considered the kind of descriptive categories found in these taxonomies psychologically unfounded and often over-delailed, claiming that they 'artificially carve up what are in fact unitary operations' (cit in. Dörnyei & Scott, 1997, p. 198).