COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES IN TEACHER TALK:
A CASE STUDY IN MALAYSIAN ESL CLASSROOMS

by

CH'NG LOOI CHIN
(9884)

This final year project is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Science with Honours (TESL),
Faculty of Cognitive Sciences and Human Development,
University Malaysia Sarawak.

April 2007

The project entitled **Communication Strategies in Teacher Talk: A case study in Malaysian English as Second Language (ESL) Classrooms** was prepared by Ch'ng Looi Chin and submitted to the Faculty of Cognitive Sciences and Human Development in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Science with Honours (Teaching English as a Second Language).

It is hereby confirmed that the student has done all necessary amendments of the project for acceptance:

_____

(Dr. Ting Su Hie)

Date:_____

ABSTRACT

COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES IN TEACHER TALK: A CASE STUDY IN MALAYSIAN ESL CLASSROOMS

Ch'ng Looi Chin

Communication strategies (CS) are used by language speakers to help them to get their meaning across. For learners, CS served as tool to compensate for their target language deficiency. However, little is known on the use of CS among teachers in their teaching. This study thus examined to what extent the proficiency level of learners influenced the use of communication strategies by the teachers in their teacher talk in order to deliver their lessons effectively. The study involved three ESL teachers. Data were obtained from audio observation of classes of different proficiency levels at a school in Samarahan Division, Sarawak. The verbal data were analysed based on the theoretical framework of Faerch and Kasper (1984), Tarone (1978) and Clennell (1995) on the use of CS by teachers. The types of teacher talk were analysed based on Flander's Interaction Analysis Category (Flander, 1970). The findings showed that proficiency level of the students influenced teachers' use of communication strategies in different types of teacher talk to compensate for students' language deficiency. In general, CS were regularly used by teachers in both classes of high and low proficiency level when giving lecture and asking students questions in order to enhance message and make message salient to the students. The common CS used include tonicity, lexical repetition and language switch. Nevertheless, it was also noted these CS were more frequently used by teachers in low proficiency classes especially during prompting, giving directions and accepting students' ideas. This could probably due to greater language deficiency faced by this group of students. On the whole, the study found out that ESL classroom interactions in this school were mainly one-way communication where the teachers made the most talking by using Clennell's (1995) discourse-based CS (tonicity, lexical repetition and topic fronting) to maintain their teacher talk in both high and low proficiency classes.

ABSTRAK

***STRATEGI KOMUNIKASI DALAM PENUTURAN GURU: SATU KAJIAN KES
DALAM KELAS BAHASA INGGERIS SEBAGAI BAHASA KEDUA***

Ch'ng Looi Chin

 Strategi komunikasi (CS) sering digunakan oleh pengguna bahasa dengan tujuan untuk menyampaikan maksud yang dikehendaki. Secara sedar ataupun tidak, CS sering digunapakai apabila mereka menghadapi masalah dalam komunikasi. Terdapat banyak kajian yang telah dijalankan untuk mengenalpasti jenis-jenis CS yang digunakan oleh pelajar bahasa sebagai satu cara untuk menebus kelemahan yang ada pada diri. Namun, kajian terhadap cara gunaan CS dalam kalangan guru masih tidak mendalam.Dengan itu, kajian ini bertujuan mengenalpasti saling kaitan antara tahap penguasaan Bahasa Inggeris pelajar dan jenis-jenis CS yang digunakan dalam penuturuan guru. Kajian ini dijalankan ke atas tiga orang guru yang mengajar kelas-kelas yang berbeza dari segi penguasaan Bahasa Inggeris di sebuah sekolah dalam Bahagian Samarahan, Sarawak. Data untuk kajian diperolehi melalui rakaman lisan dan transkripsi rakaman penuturan dianalisa berdasarkan model CS yang dikenalpasti oleh Faerch dan Kasper (1984), Tarone (1978) dan Clennell (1995). Jenis penuturan guru pula dianalisa mengikut Kategori Analysis Interaksi Flander (Flander, 1970). Hasil kajian menunjukkan terhadap hubung kait yang rapat antara tahap penguasaan bahasa pelajar dengan jenis-jenis CS yang digunapakai oleh guru-guru dalam penuturan mereka. CS lebih kerap digunakan oleh guru semasa menyampaikan kuliah dan mengajukan pertanyaan kepada pelajar. Keadaan ini bertujuan untuk memastikan mesej yang hendak disampaikan dapat diterimas oleh pelajar. Secara amnya, kelas Bahasa Inggeris di sekolah ini lebih didominasi oleh penuturan guru dan guru sering menggunakan CS jenis wacana yang diperkenalkan oleh Clennell.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CS   Communication Strategies

IL   Interlanguage

L1   First Language

L2   Second Language

TL   Target Language

FLAC   Flander's Interaction Analysis Category

ESL   English as Second Language

EFL   English as Foreign Language

SLA   Second Language Acquisition

ELT   English Language Teaching

PMR   Lower-Secondary Examination (*Penilaian Menengah Rendah*)

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Overview

This chapter presents the background of the study. In particular, it illustrates the existing body of knowledge on the related of communication strategies (CS) and at the same time brings forth its pertinent gaps. The underlying objectives of the study are also presented followed by the significance of the study. This chapter then end with the operational definition of terms, which are important in this study.

1.1 Background of the research problem

One of the most primary goals of second language study is the development of communicative competence in languages. This development is indeed very pivotal especially in everyday social or work interactions and to establish relationships or to convey message to others. (Massachusetts Department of Education, n.d.) In order to produce the target language (TL) for these communication purposes, second language speakers often employ strategies or "strategic plans" to get meaning across (Faerch & Kasper, 1984; Tarone, 1981). Such strategies are what Selinker (1972) coined as communication strategies (CS) in his account of the processes responsible for

interlanguage (IL). Generally, IL is a stage that the L2 speaker forms their own linguistic structure of the TL in their brain which is neither achieving the linguistic structure of the target language L2 nor similar with their first language (L1) (Selinker, 1972). Hence, at this stage, the use of CS plays an important role in assisting the L2 speakers to communicate their intended meaning in TL.

Strategic competence or use of CS is one of the four components of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980) which has been defined differently by various key researchers. For example, Canale and Swain (1980) defined strategic competence as the "verbal or non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate [or to get meaning across successfully] for breakdown in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence" (Canale & Swain, 1980, as cited in Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1991, p. 17). On the other hand, Váradi (1980) explained that CS is utilized by L2 speakers consciously to reduce or replace some elements of meaning or form in the initial plan after they discovered that they have insufficient means to carry out their original plan. This phenomenon of substituting their initial plan to bring message across with a "strategic plan" (Faerch & Kasper, 1980, as cited in Ellis, 1985) or CS is referred as "message adjustment" by Váradi (1980).

It is accepted that there is no one definite definition for CS in particular. According to Faerch and Kasper (1984), CS does not comprise an "objective" class of phenomenon like other analysis process or fixed events by the society. They added that the definition of communication strategies greatly depends on the analyst's

previous defining criteria based on the analyst's interest. Broadly, CS has been viewed from two major theoretical perspectives: the psycholinguistic view by Faerch and Kasper (1980) and interactional view by Tarone (1978) (as cited in Faerch & Kasper, 1984). Psycholinguistic definition of CS suggested by Faerch and Kasper deals with the individual speaker's experience of communication experience and solution used to overcome a communication barrier. On the contrary, Tarone's interactional view argues that CS is seen as an attempt of both interlocutors in bridging the gap of both interlocutors' linguistic knowledge in real communicative situation to negotiate "shared meaning" which is its central function. However, Clennell's (1995) pragmatic discourse perspective draws on new evidence to bring these two apparently divergent approaches together. Clennell (1995) suggested that, CS does not only act as a potentially conscious plan to solve communication difficulties but these discourse-based strategies also play role to enhance the message and to maintain the conversation at the discourse level.

Most studies on CS concluded that CS plays an important role in second language acquisition (SLA) as well as interlanguage communication. Similarly, Faerch and Kasper (1980) argued that the use of CS has a potential learning effect as it encourages achievement behaviour (risk-taking) rather than reduction behaviour (risk-avoiding). It is mainly based on the grounds that achievement behaviour encourages hypothesis formation within the L2 learners and the risk is crucial for automatization. This is further reinforced by Tarone (1980) that the use of CS, in general, enables learners to keep the channel open and at the same time it helps

learners to expand their resources during verbal exchange with native speakers as they help L2 learners use the right form to say what they want. This is essentially useful for learners to "keep [conversation] going" a stand supported by Hatch (1978) (cited in Ellis, 1985) besides fostering language acquisition and learning. Consequently, interaction of learners are mainly facilitated by CS to foster language learning by reformulating utterances, confirm comprehension and also correct what is said (either implicit or explicit). However, interaction alone is ineffective. Successful interaction will only evolve out of the need to communicate and negotiate or clarify meaning as what has been acknowledged by the L2 theories (Doyle, Goh & Zhang, 2004).

Learners with different levels of proficiency need different CS to assist them to negotiate meaning in order to achieve their interactional goals (Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980; Paribakht, 1985). Hence, a teacher who serves as a language expert plays a pivotal role in ensuring the transformation of TL into input, particularly comprehensible input (Krashen, 1981) to the learners according to their proficiency levels in order to allow meaning negotiation to take place. This negotiation of meaning provides L2 learners the context for language input and output as well as the attention to form besides making learners clear of their responses to the teachers' feedback on the production of language or output (Doyle, Goh & Zhang, 2004). Again, the teacher is fully responsible for the engagement of negotiation of meaning during classroom interaction. Therefore, various types of teacher talk are employed by teachers to deliver their input to the students during classroom instruction or

4

interaction (Tsui, 1995). This allows learners to obtain feedback about their language use and especially their errors made (Hatch, 1978; Long, 1996; Pica, 1994; Swain & Lapkin, 1998 in Doyle, Goh & Zhang, 2004) to ensure the input provided is comprehensible to give way to meaning negotiation and consequently foster language learning.

In addition to that, it has been noted by current ELT practitioners that teacher talk is a potential source of comprehensible input for the learners (Cullen, 1998) to boost language learning through constant meaning negotiation and feedback. However, studies have shown that in most ESL classrooms, a major part of its interaction is generated by the teacher asking questions. According to Tsui (1995), a typical English lesson in a Hong Kong classroom contains nearly 70 per cent of teacher talk with teacher asking questions, nominating a student to answer the question, the student answering the question and the teacher providing the feedback to the response. Furthermore, Doyle et al. (2004), agreed that such dominance of teacher talk in the classroom also persists in Malaysia where it functions as a technique to check learners' comprehension, to ensure they have acquired the knowledge imparted, to focus their attention and participate in the lesson, to move the lesson forward and to exercise their disciplinary control. The sequence is usually being identified as a three-part exchange: initiate – reply – evaluate (IRE).

This is crucial as the dominance of teacher talk happens in most ESL classrooms especially in countries or locations where the teacher is the main provider of language input (Nunan, 1989). Nunan further elaborated that such situation fits

most of the ESL classrooms such as those in Malaysia where the amount of teacher talk by English language teachers is predominantly high. According to Brock (1986), there is evidence from classroom research that certain aspects of teacher talk, such as the kind of questions the teacher asked, can significantly affect the quality of student interaction (as cited in Cullen, 1998). Most of aspects are closely related to communicative strategies (CS) used by the teacher in delivering his or her lesson particularly in ESL or EFL context.

Many studies have been done by key researchers in order to identify CS from the learners' perspective in the scope of how context, culture, tasks, language proficiency affecting their use of CS to make their communication goals a success (Barbara, 2004; Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980; Flyman, 1997; Paribakht, 1985; Wongsawang, 2001). These studies have offered some insights regarding the use of CS among the learners in different aspects but have rarely touched on how teachers use CS to cope with the learners for these different perspectives while delivering their lesson through the various types of teacher talk. On the other hand, Dörnyei and Thurrell (1991) agreed that CS is often neglected especially by the language experts or teachers. Therefore, there is a need to look into how these expert speakers, the teachers, "manipulate" the different types of teacher talk in transmitting comprehensible input to L2 learners (Krashen, 1981) of different proficiency levels through classroom interactions which could enable language learning to take place. By shifting the attention to the teacher as the central provider of comprehensible language input in classroom exchanges, it is the interest of this study to find out to

6

what extent the proficiency of the learners has relevant and important effect on teacher in using CS in their teacher talk during instructions or classroom interactions.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The purpose of this study is to investigate how teachers manoeuvre their teacher talk in classroom interaction by using CS to compensate the students' level of proficiency. Specifically, the study focused on the following research objectives in addressing the research problem:

i)   To identify and compare the types of CS used by the teacher in both high and low proficiency classes.

ii)   To determine the relationship between CS used and types of teacher talk in both high and low proficiency classes.

1.3 Significance of the study

The result of this study would provide an in-depth understanding on how learners' proficiency level affects the use of CS by the language expert (teachers) to help learners to acquire language skills and at the same time offer opportunities for meaning negotiation in promoting learners' language learning. The information eventually assist teachers in conducting an effective instruction especially for the novice language teachers who have not had much experience in adapting to the learners' demand or expectations of language learning in particular.

In relation to the self-monitoring theory suggested by Krashen (1981), this study can eventually help teachers to be conscious of their usage of teacher talk as

well as the CS used within the teacher talk according to the needs of language learning of different proficiency levels. This consciousness thus assists the development of the teachers' self improvement through self-reflection and self-evaluation. Consequently, this lends a hand for teachers to maximise the learning capability of the learners of different proficiency levels.

In terms of theoretical contributions, the present study managed to identify additional types of teacher talk (refer to Chapter Three) which are not available in the chosen framework. This would be beneficial for future analysis of multifaceted teacher talk in ESL classrooms especially in Malaysia. Hence, it served as a refinement of the Flander's Interaction Analysis Category (FLAC) framework (Nunan, 1989 in McDonough & McDonough, 1997). In terms of CS, the present study proved that the choice of CS by teachers was also greatly affected by the proficiency level of the students mainly to accommodate their language deficiency for making the lessons effective. Moreover, this study seconded the proposal of Clennell (1995) to reclassify the traditional CS. Clennell argued that, the functions of CS do not restricted to "communication problem-solving phenomena" but more to the role of "negotiation and interaction in SLA" (p. 5). Similarly, in this study, it shows that CS do not only used by teachers to solve communication problem but more to act as a tool for them to maintain their classroom interactions in their lessons.

1.4 Operational definition of terms

1.4.1   Communication strategies

CS is used not only for solving communication problems but also maintaining the interaction and enhancing the message. It is hypothetically assumed that teacher talk may consist of these elements in order to transform the comprehensible input and achieve meaning negotiation between learners and the teacher. Hence, a taxonomy (as shown in the Table 1 below) is designed by adapting the three perspectives of CS from Clennell (1995), Faerch and Kasper (1984) and Tarone (1978) mentioned earlier. However, the designed taxonomy is mainly adapted from Tarone's taxonomy (1978, cited in Tarone, 1980) as it is presupposed that classroom interaction is ideally a "mutual attempt" of both the teacher and students to attain shared communicative meaning.

Table 1

Framework of CS adapted from the three perspectives of CS

Paraphrasing	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 e.g. "pipe" for "waterpipe"
	Word coinage	The learner makes up a new word in order to communicate a desired concept e.g. "airball" for "balloon"
	Circumlocution	The learner describes the characteristics or elements of the object or action instead of using appropriate TL structure e.g. she is uh, smoking something, I don't know what's its name. that's uh, Persian, and we use in

		Turkey, a lot of"
Transfer	**Literal translation**	The learner translates word for word from the native language e.g. "He invites him to drink" for "they toast one another"
	Language switch	The learner uses NL term without bothering to translate e.g. "balon" for "balloon" or "tirtil" for "caterpillar"
	Appeal for assistance	The learner asks for the correct term or structure e.g. "what is this?"
	Mime	The learner uses non-verbal strategies in place of meaning structure e.g. clapping one's hand to illustrate applause
Avoidance	**Topic avoidance**	Occur when learner simply does not talk about concepts for which the vocabulary or other meaning structure is not known.
	Message abandonment	Occurs when the learner begins to talk about a concept but is unable to continue due to the lack of the meaning structure, and stops in the mid utterance.
Restructuring	"Whenever the leaner realised that he cannot complete a local plan which he already begun realising and develops an alternative local plan which enable him to communicate his intended message without reduction." (Faerch & Kasper 1984) e.g. "my tummy…my tummy is… I have (inaudible) I must eat something"	
Offering help	The interlocutor offers to help the speaker with a word or phase that the speaker is obviously fumbling or having problems with, or with a sentence that the speaker is unable to complete. This usually done with or without the speaker's appeal for assistance. (Clennell, 1995) e.g. *S is appealing for assistance to C* C: that' right yes+ I was a bit confused there+ B: [laughter laughter] C: and + erm what are those things called + + erm + here we go+ C: paper clip S: that's it [laughter] M offer help to B B: but I have + also + one + er+ object here + but I don't know M: yes B: English name + [laughs] + I forgot it + its + er + er + er + er +this things M: describe it. B: which we use to write + on a blackboard chalk +thank you M : chalk.	
Lexical	This multipurpose role of a ping pong exchange of lexical item or phrase of	

repetition	the interlocutor to act as a function of discourse or topic maintenance, topic salience marker, appeal for assistance and request for clarification.(Clennell, 1995) e.g. B: no yeah + M: pencil its jus a line + is it + because I have a ruler + B: but probably I don't know what means ruler + M: something to measure + B: to measure + yes + so it's ruler
Tonicity	It is a systematic use of stress and pitch of the speaker to mark the information, indicate comprehension, ask for clarification, salience to discourse, add emphasis and to mark the significance of the information.(Clennell, 1995) e.g. S: \ ruler \ yeah+ one \ [lubber] + \ yes+ A: and one \ [lubber]+ one S: what does it mean \ [lubber] + A: \ [lubber] + when+when+you S: ah \ rubber \ yes + A: write \ something by / \ pencil+ \ yes + S: one \ rubber er + there isn't / \ rubber in +our photograph A: and one / [krip]+
Topic fronting	Stating the topic before the comment of the utterance to emphasise the topic and thus making the topic more salient and easier to process.(Clennell, 1995) e.g. *Topic* *Comment* H: what about your \ ruler + + one \ small and + mm + one large

1.4.2 High proficiency

High proficiency in English in this study refers to classes where a majority of the students scored well in their PMR English language test as well as their school-based assessment (mid-term) by scoring at least grade A and B. As the classes have been streamed according to their overall proficiency level of all subjects by the

school, in this case, the high proficiency classes would be from class Form 4A to Form 4C and Form 5A to Form 5D.

1.4.3 Low proficiency

On the other hand, low proficiency refers to the classes that a majority of the students obtained grade D and E or F for their English language subject in their PMR examination and school-based assessment (mid-term). Thus, the classes for low proficiency would be class Form 4F to Form 4H and Form 5G to Form 5J.

1.4.4 Teacher talk

Teacher talk is a general term for different types of teacher talk which Ellis (1988) referred to as "the special language the teacher uses when addressing L2 learners in the classroom" (Ellis, 1988, p. 96). It can be categorized according to the linguistic aspect and functions. In this study, teacher talk is categorized according to the coding system of Flander's Interaction Analysis Category (FLAC) developed by Bowers (Nunan, 1989 in McDonough & McDonough, 1997) (see Table 2).

Flanders (1970) explained that "techniques for analysing classroom interaction are based on the notion that these reciprocal contacts can be perceived as a series of events which occur one after another" (Flanders, 1970, in Tarricone & Fetherston, 2002, p. 1). According to Tarricone and Fetherston (2002), this technique is particularly useful to obtain information about teacher behaviour which is extensively used for classroom observation studies. It is also a system to code

spontaneous verbal communication in classroom (Tarricone & Fetherston, 2002). In addition, McDonough and McDonough (1997) also suggested that, FLAC is one of what Nunan claimed "as the most user-friendly by teachers" which enable real-time observations or analysis on recording transcripts. Besides, it serves as a checklist of categories to categorise verbal behaviour especially in classroom observations. (McDonough & McDonough, 1997)

Besides, it provides the observer as well as the consulting teacher the ability to draw conclusions on the verbal climate and the ability to make inferences about the communication strategies fostered in the classroom. Classroom talk is the combination of the three aspects stated – teacher talk, students talk and the last and shared aspect by two parties, silence (Tarricone & Fetherston, 2002). However, only two from the three aspects are used in this study to check on the presence of teacher talk in the ESL classroom interactions later. They are teacher talk and silence which made up a total of eight types of observable teacher talk type in classroom interactions.

Table 2

Framework on types of teacher talk adapted from Flander's Interaction Analysis Category (FLAC)

Classroom Interactions	Types of Interactions	Subtypes of Interactions
Teacher Talk	**Response**	1. **Accepts feeling**. Accepts and clarifies an attitude or the feeling tone of a pupil in a non-threatening manner. Feelings may be positive or negative. Predicting and recalling feelings are included. 2. **Praises or encourages**. Praises or encourages pupil action or behaviour. Jokes that release tension, but not at the expense of another individual: nodding head, or saying 'Um hm?' or 'Go on' are included. 3. **Accepts or uses ideas of pupils**. Clarifying, building or developing ideas suggested by a pupil. Teacher extensions of pupil ideas are included but as the teacher brings more of his own ideas into play, shift to category five.
		4. **Asks questions**. Asking a question about content or procedure, based on teacher ideas, with the intent that a pupil will answer.
	Initiation	5. **Lecturing**. Giving facts or opinions about content or procedures: expressing *his own* ideas, giving *his own* explanation or citing an authority other than a pupil. 6. **Giving directions**. Directions, commands or orders to which a pupil is expected to comply. 7. **Criticising or justifying authority**. Statements intended to change pupil behaviour from non-acceptable to acceptable pattern; bawling someone out; stating why the teacher is doing what he is doing; extreme self-defence.
Pupil Talk	**Response**	8. **Pupil talk – response**. Talk by pupils in response to teacher. Teacher initiates the contact or solicits pupil statement or structures the situation. Freedom to express own ideas is limited.
	Initiation	9. **Pupil talk – initiation**. Talk by pupils which they initiate. Expressing own ideas; initiating a new topic; freedom to develop opinions and a line of thought, like asking thoughtful questions: going beyond the existing structure.
Silence		10. **Silence or confusion**. Pauses, short periods of silence and periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Overview of communication strategies

Communication strategies (CS) play a fundamental role especially in the process of interlanguage (IL) to facilitate L2 speakers in learning or acquiring the target language (TL). According to Selinker (1972), L2 speakers gradually go through a series of psycholinguistic processes before they successfully learn or 'take-up' the TL, which is known as IL. During this stage, speakers express their meaning in TL by forming their own linguistic structure of TL. These structures of TL spoken by the speakers usually are dissimilar with either their own mother tongue or the TL that they are learning. This is mainly due to insufficient linguistic knowledge of TL.

Moreover, IL is said to facilitate second language development by activating the five underlying central processes. These central processes referred are central to L2 learning and acquisition - language transfer, transfer-of-training, strategies of second-language learning, strategies of second-language communication and, the last, overgeneralisation of TL linguistic materials. Selinker (1972) further explained that CS is one of the strategies of L2 communication. It is used by L2 speakers to prevent

the fossilisation of IL competence and to help speakers to promote communicative competency in TL (Canale & Swain, 1980).

Generally, it is agreed by various key researchers in this scope that CS is an attempt used by the L2 speakers to convey their meaning to the interlocutor. It is essential for TL speakers, specifically IL speakers, to solve communication problems, to enhance message and to maintain their communication (Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980; Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1991; Faerch & Kasper, 1984; Tarone, 1980; Váradi, 1980). Since CS acts as a bridge to foster language learning and acquisition, it is very crucial in terms of both teaching and learning perspective. Learners need CS to facilitate their interaction especially in the classroom where comprehensible input and meaning negotiation are most needed for genuine interactions to take place. Hence, teachers, the language experts, are known as the main source of comprehensible input responsible for the classroom interactions to maximise the learners' language learning capability.

Studies have shown that learners of different proficiency levels use CS differently to negotiate meanings in achieving communication goal (Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980; Paribakht, 1985). Due to this fact, it would be possible that the teacher might use CS differently in different types of teacher talks to compensate for the different language learning needs of learners with different proficiency levels.

Thus, this chapter presents the function of CS in both IL and communicative competence followed by the functions of CS based on the three perspectives: the psycholinguistic view by Faerch and Kasper (1980), interactional view by Tarone

16

(1978) (Faerch & Kasper, 1984) and the pragmatic discourse perspective by Clennell (1995). Besides, it also touches on the role played by CS in facilitating language learning of learners from different proficiency levels. Finally, the functions of CS used by teachers in teacher talk in ESL classroom interactions will be discussed.

2.1 Interlanguage

The notion of interlanguage is introduced by Selinker (1972) who claimed that IL is a psycholinguistic structure or process the L2 speakers confront in order to produce "attempted successful performance" or their "intended meanings" (Váradi, 1980, p. 61) which they already have by using the language that they are learning. Thus, it leads to L2 speakers tending to create their own linguistic structures of the TL in order to express their meanings. Most of the time, the linguistic structure that they have formed are neither close to the structure of their TL nor L1. Selinker assumed that this psychological structure is latent in the brain and is activated when one attempts or succeeds in learning a second language. Selinker also claimed that the latent psychological structure consists of the five main central processes which is central for L2 learning and to shape IL utterances.

These five central processes that the speaker undergoes are language transfer, transfer-of-training, strategies of second-language learning, strategies of second-language communication and, the last, overgeneralisation of TL linguistic materials. As far as CS is concerned, the fourth process, strategies of second-language communication in IL would be the focus of this study. According to Selinker (1972),

strategies of second-language communication in IL refers to the situation in which the learners employ "an identifiable approach to communicate with the native speakers of TL" (p. 212). Speakers especially IL speakers often have their own communicative intentions and often find difficulties in expressing them because of the gaps in their linguistic repertoire. Ultimately, they would choose to either forestall the problem or anticipate it. Such coping strategy of the L2 speakers is what we called CS (Littlewood, 1984). Váradi (1980) called CS as a "tool" for them to convey their "intended meaning" to achieve their desired interactional goal. (p. 61) In addition, CS used by learners in the process of IL assists L2 speakers to prevent the IL competence from being fossilised and to improve their communicative competency in TL (Canale & Swain, 1980 as cited in Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1991). This is further supported by Corder (1983 in Bialystok 1990) and Faerch and Kasper (1984) that learners often try to confront their conversation problem and find alternative ways to cope with the situation, which is known as risk-taking behaviour. Such behaviour encourages learners to assimilate their current knowledge of TL they have with them to the linguistic knowledge of TL and thus promoting the mentioned communicative competency of TL.

2.2 Communicative competence

Among the various interpretations of communicative competence, the theoretical framework suggested by Canale and Swain (1980) is probably the most influential one. It has certainly influenced many studies in language teaching and a

new approach on language pedagogy (as cited in Tarone, 1980). According to Canale and Swain (1980), communicative competence is the ability to use the language appropriately in which the context is used. This communicative competence comprises four main components which are grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence. Grammatical competence is the knowledge of purely linguistic factors like pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary which enable the speaker to convey his communicative intentions. On the other hand, sociolinguistic competence is the ability of the speaker to use the language appropriately in social situations like knowing how to start and end a conversation, when and how to be polite, how to address people and so on (Littlewood, 1984). Discourse competence enables the speaker to engage in a continuous discourse such as maintaining longer speaking turns, participating in interactions, opening conversations and closing them. The latter has been defined as "verbal or non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate [or to make meaning across successfully] for breakdown in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence" (Canale & Swain, 1980 as cited in Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1991, p. 17). Hence, it is one of the pivotal elements that a speaker should be equipped in dealing with daily conversations chiefly in ensuring that the communication produced is effective to prevent any undesired outcomes.

Since communication breakdowns occur and must be overcome in any languages, CS is therefore relevant to both L1 and TL as part of the strategic

competence. The absence of communicative competence leads to the situation where the speaker with a great knowledge of grammar and vocabulary get stuck when carrying out their communicative intent (Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1991). On the contrary, IL speakers rely entirely on their strategic competence to convey their intent to the interlocutor despite their limited linguistic resources. Therefore in this case, it is difficult to separate CS from IL and strategic competence as they go hand in hand to facilitate speakers' mastery of TL.

2.3 Notion of communication strategies (CS)

The way CS is defined greatly depends on the theoretical perspectives taken by the researcher. As such, CS does not comprise an "objective" definition unlike other analysis of object, process or event. Therefore, Faerch and Kasper (1984) argued that there is no definite definition to identify CS.

However, CS has been generally viewed from three major theoretical perspectives: the psycholinguistic view by Faerch and Kasper (1980), interactional view by Tarone (1978) and pragmatic discourse perspective by Clennell (1995).

2.3.1   Definition of communication strategies

2.3.1.1 Psycholinguistic perspective of CS

Largely based on a psycholinguistic view, Faerch and Kasper (1980) recognised CS as a part of planning process which the speakers formulate in their brain without considering feedback given form the interlocutor (Flyman, 1997). The

strategies are used as a solution when the learner has problem with their original plan and cannot execute it. This is what Flyman asserts as "problematicity" that should serve as the criterion in defining CS. This also matches the definition given by Faerch and Kasper where CS is "potentially conscious plans for solving what an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communication goal" (as cited in Faerch & Kasper, 1984, p. 36). Based on this view of CS, CS are used by learners either to discard their message or resort to an alternative way to get their message across.

On the basis of the definition given, CS is categorised into two major groups which are achievement (trying to solve problem) and reduction or avoidance (trying to avoid it). The learner is said to take up reduction strategies if he faced problems with the original plan and cannot execute it, resulting in him changing or avoiding the problem that leads to a change of communication goal. However, if the learner develops an alternative plan which enables him to convey a message close to his actual intent, he is said to be using achievement strategies.

With formal reduction, the learner tries to reduce the use of language in terms of phonology, morphology, syntax, lexis due to his limited knowledge of the language and the fear of producing incorrect utterances, whereas, functional reduction involves reduced communication goals. In relation to that, Faerch and Kasper (1980), categorised communicative goals into three components known as actional, propositional and modal aspects. Actional functional reduction refers to the avoidance to perform certain speech acts or discourse functions such as to initiate a

conversation. Learner with propositional functional reduction often avoid communication topic, abandon message and replace the original meaning with another which is more general or vague and the result is that the learner does not realise the referential meaning of the original communicative intention. Finally, the modal functional reduction refers to the learner not marking a speech act for relational and expressive functions, for example, politeness formulae or apologies are omitted in normally required elements of conversations.

However, the achievement strategies act to preserve the learners' communication goals. Achievement strategies can either be used to solve problems in the planning phase or to make use of the existing resources in to get hold of the missing term, using retrieval strategies. These can be achieved either by "devising a way of expressing the communicative goal in an alternative way or by reaching a solution for the problem with the interlocutor's assistance. The sub-types of CS are based on the different code (e.g. code-switching), the IL code (e.g. inter/intra transfer), only the IL code (e.g. generalisation, paraphrase, word coinage), discourse phenomena (e.g. cooperative strategies) or non-linguistic communication (e.g. mime, gesture).

Faerch and Kasper's perspective is much related to how teachers give their instructions or teaching in front of the class. Psychologically, they construct their own solution towards the way they transmit their knowledge, thinking, ideas or facts to the students before they are uttered. Such situation takes place "internally" and no feedback from the students is required. Nonetheless, in most classroom settings,

classroom interaction is crucial to advance students' language learning progress (Tsui, 1995). This can be done by involving both student talk and teacher talk (two-way communication) to achieve meaning negotiation. Krashen (1981) further strengthened the claim by noting that student-teacher interaction increases the opportunities of TL hypothesis testing of the learners. In this case, classroom interactions require teachers to understand their interlocutors' (students) needs and vice versa in order to get meaning across and be understood by both parties. This is further explained by Tarone's (1980) interactional perspective of CS.

2.3.1.2 Interactional perspective of CS

From the interactional perspective of CS, Tarone (1980) mentioned that CS is seen as attempts to bridge the gap of linguistic knowledge between the speaker and the interlocutor in real communication situation when there does not seem to be any solution to the problem (as cited in Ellis, 1985). According to interactive definition, Tarone defined CS as "a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared" (Tarone, 1981 in Faerch & Kasper, 1984, p. 51). This definition implies that the joint effort from both the speaker and interlocutor to negotiate meaning as central to the concept of CS. In addition to that, CS according to the author has to fulfill the following criteria.

1. A speaker desires to communicate a meaning 'x' to a listener.
2. The speaker believes the linguistic or the socio-linguistic desired to communicate meaning 'x' is unavailable or is not shared with the listener.

3. The speaker chooses to :
   a) avoid – not attempt to communicate meaning 'x' or
   b) attempt alternate means to communicate meaning 'x'. the speaker stop trying alternatives when it seems clear to the speaker that there is shared meaning.

In Tarone's taxonomy, CS is classified into three main categories: paraphrasing, transfer and avoidance. Paraphrasing is "the rewording of the message in an alternate, acceptable target language construction in situations where the appropriate form or structure is not known or yet stable" (Tarone, 1980 in Flyman 1997). Paraphrasing is divided into approximation, word coinage, and circumlocution. Conscious transfer involves literal translation and language switch. Besides, when a speaker asks for the correct word, the speaker is actually appealing for assistance. The speaker also uses non-verbal strategies or mime in order to communicate his intended meaning.

On the other hand, mutual attempt of both teachers and students in using the language in classroom interaction alone is inadequate. In order to enable the students to maximise the use of language, attempts of maintaining the conversation is important to allow them to use the language in real situations rather than to know it through 'chalk-and-talk' teaching. No matter what approaches that a teacher adopt, he or she still plays a major role to prompt students, emphasise the facts or information as well as to maintain the conversations particularly during classroom discussions and while- or post- activities in the lesson.

2.3.1.3 Pragmatic discourse perspective of CS

Clennell (1995) has drawn on new evidence to bring the two divergent perspectives together—Faerch and Kasper's (1980) psycholinguistic perspective of CS and Tarone's (1980) interactional perspective of CS. With the perspective of pragmatic discourse, Clennell does not see CS as a potentially conscious plan to solve communication difficulties but rather view it as discourse-based strategies. Clennell argues that most of the research based on the existing taxonomies CS had placed too much emphasis on "speaker's short-term plan [to] surmount a communication obstacle by using a 'local' lexically based strategies such as paraphrase and word coinage" (p. 6). The author has proved that the long-term plan of the speaker, discourse-based interlanguage strategies, appears to allow speaker perform short-term functions such as appeal for assistance besides acting interactively as a marker for topic salience or conversational maintenance at a discourse level. Clennell referred the use of those strategies as "systematic use of linguistic devices". For example, lexical repetitions, tonicity and topic + comment syntactic structures (topic fronting) (Clennell, 1994 in Clennell 1995).

Lexical repetition refers to the repetition of the lexical item or phrase of the interlocutor to act as a function of discourse or topic maintenance, topic salience marker, appeal for assistance and request for clarification. Tonicity, on the other hand, serves as a systematic use of stress and pitch of the speaker to mark the information, indicate comprehension, and ask for clarification, salience to discourse, add emphasis and to mark the significance of the information. Conversely, topic

fronting is usually used by speakers when they need to emphasise something salient or important. It is easier for the listener to process the information by putting the topic in front of the conversation or the sentence. Finally, Clennell further reinforced that these strategies allow speakers not only to enhance their message but also to maintain the conversation.

Thus, different perspectives of CS reflect the many roles of CS in assisting the teacher to communicate their message to the students comprehensively to allow meaning negotiation take place for the language learning.

2.3.2   Roles of Communication strategies

CS is one of the coping strategies usually used by L2 speakers when they find difficulties in conveying their communicative intentions. This results in them trying to find ways to cope with their communicative situations. It does not mean that the use of CS only occurs when speakers speak in the TL. Similar occasions also happen when one communicates using their native language (Littlewood, 1984). Consistent with the argument brought up by Littlewood, the teacher as the language expert similarly experiences this problem when trying to express themselves. They must either change their meaning or grope outside the repertoire of the language which comes spontaneously resulting in the use of CS (Littlewood, 1984). Hence, CS has played various roles to make effective communication for both native speakers and L2 speakers.

2.3.2.1 CS as a tool to solve communication problems

The use of CS is to ensure the effectiveness of communication where the interlocutor can clearly understand what is being conveyed by the speaker. However, most of the IL speaker faces communication breakdown or problems as a result of limited linguistic knowledge in their TL that they are in the process of learning. Consequently, CS is used by the speaker to bridge the gap of both IL and TL linguistic knowledge in order to get his exact meaning in his mind across to the interlocutor.

One of the earliest studies done by Tarone (1977, cited in Bialystok, 1990) is on the production of interlanguage to ascertain the different approaches used by the learners to solve communication problem. The study was done on nine subjects "in what I estimate to be a rough order of proficiency to English" (Tarone, 1977, in Bialystok, 1990, p. 48). They were asked to describe three simple drawing and a complex picture in both TL (English language) and in their own native language. From the task it suggested that the learners used certain approaches or strategies to solve problems. These strategies were reported by Tarone in her taxonomy of conscious communication strategies (Tarone, 1977 in Faerch & Kasper, 1984, p. 52) stated clearly in Chapter 1 with examples.

2.3.2.2 CS as a tool for message adjustment

When a speaker chose to substitute his original meaning with a "near-to-original-meaning" by using strategies, it is said that the speaker has used CS as a tool

for "message adjustment" (Váradi, 1980, pp. 64-65). In an ordinary communication according to Váradi, an optimal message conveys an optimal meaning which is the speaker's original message or "communication plan" (Faerch & Kasper, 1984, p. 47). If the speaker's optimal meaning cannot be conveyed it causes him to "adjust his meaning so as to bring it within the sphere of his encoding capabilities". This expressed outcome of such adjustment is referred by Váradi as the adjusted meaning. (Bialystok, 1990, p. 32)

Váradi (1980) examined this phenomenon in an experimental research conducted in two phases on two groups of subjects. Two groups of nine and ten adult learners of English at intermediate level were chosen. One group has been taught English for sixteen hours a week for nine months and another group studied English at the same rate but only for six months and all of them entered the course with some knowledge of the language. The research conducted in two phases where the first, subjects were asked to describe the picture story in English within 45 minutes and group two was asked to describe it in Hungarian within 30 minutes. In the second phase of the experiment, subjects were asked to transcribe Hungarian version of the story to English and vice versa.

The result of this experiment revealed that once the speaker decided that his optimal message could not be executed, the speaker had to further decide whether he had to reduce or replace the meaning by an adjusted meaning which he believed is a correct TL form. This message adjustment often involves sacrificing part of the optimal meaning, loss of precision or even a complete shift from the optimal meaning

while getting the meaning conveyed. CS has been involved in this approximation system of the speaker to allow him to express either his optimal or adjusted meaning to the listener.

2.3.2.3 CS as a tool for resource expansion

Strategies that are used by the speaker to increase, extend or manipulate the available linguistic system so that it is possible for the listener to realise the intended message is referred to as resource expansion strategies by Corder (1983) (cited in Bialystok 1990). It is also similar to Faerch and Kasper's (1984) achievement strategies whereby a speaker develops an alternative way to the problem that he is confronted with. These two achievement-oriented strategies as suggested by Corder, Faerch and Kasper induce the risk-taking behaviour to encourage the process of learning and acquisition of the TL. Thus, this increases communicative competence among the IL speaker. As these strategies are often associated with a high probability of error, this would mean that the higher the up-taking of risk-taking the higher the chance of failure in communication by the speaker.

According to Corder, code-switching is the least effective means to make sure the TL listener understands what is being conveyed. Therefore, it carries a greater risk of failure. However, paraphrasing is more successful in terms of achieving this aim. Despite the low risk of failure, paralinguistic strategies may be less communicatively efficient. Faerch and Kasper also explained that achievement strategies involve speaker's attempt to conquer the communication problem. Corder,

Faerch and Kasper argue that CS is used to expand resources available to the speaker in order to achieve a solution for effective communication. This situation is depicted clearly in Table 3.

Table 3

Summarised strategies based on the classification system developed by different researchers

Classification system	*Strategies in manipulate form*
Corder	*Resource expansion* Increase risk ↑ switching borrowing/inventing paraphrasing paralinguistic strategies
Faerch and Kasper	*Achievement strategies* code switching interlingual transfer inter/intra transfer interlanguage based strategies co-operative strategies non-linguistic strategies

(Adapted from Bialystok, 1990, p. 34)

2.3.2.4 CS as a tool for enhancement and communication maintenance

Referring to the pragmatic discourse perspective of CS as introduced by Clennell (1995), CS is viewed as a tool for the speaker to enhance message and to maintain communication in the long-term plan of the speaker. These functions of CS has been categorised by Clennell into four aspects: offering help, lexical repetition,

tonicity, topic fronting (see Table 4). They allow speakers not only to perform his

short-term function such as appeal for assistance but also serve as a marker for topic

salience or conversational maintenance at a discourse level.

Table 4

Clennell's (1995) pragmatic discourse perspective of CS

Offering help	The interlocutor offers to help the speaker with a word or phase that the speaker is obviously fumbling or having problems with, or with a sentence that the speaker is unable to complete. This usually done with or without the speaker's appeal for assistance. e.g. *S is appealing for assistance to C* C: that' right yes+ I was a bit confused there+ B: [laughter laughter] C: and + erm what are those things called + + erm + here we go+ C: paper clip S: that's it [laughter] M offer help to B B: but I have + also + one + er+ object here + but I don't know M: yes B: English name + [laughs] + I forgot it + its + er + er + er + er +this things M: describe it. B: which we use to write + on a blackboard chalk +thank you M : chalk.
Lexical repetition	This multipurpose role of a ping pong exchange of lexical item or phrase of the interlocutor to act as a function of discourse or topic maintenance, topic salience marker, appeal for assistance and request for clarification. e.g. B: no yeah + M: pencil its jus a line + is it + because I have a ruler + B: but probably I don't know what means ruler + M: something to measure + B: to measure + yes + so it's ruler
Tonicity	It is a systematic use of stress and pitch of the speaker to mark the information, indicate comprehension, ask for clarification, salience to discourse, add emphasis and to mark the significant of the information. e.g.

	S: \ ruler \ yeah+ one \ [lubber] + \ yes+
	A: and one \ [lubber]+ one
	S: what does it mean \ [lubber] +
	A: \ [lubber] + when+when+you
	S: ah \ rubber \ yes +
	A: write \ something by / \ pencil+ \ yes +
	S: one \ rubber er + there isn't / \ rubber in +our photograph
	A: and one / [krip]+
Topic fronting	Stating the topic before the comment of the utterance to emphasise the topic and thus making the topic more salient and easier to process. e.g.
	Topic Comment
	H: what about your \ ruler + + one \ small and + mm + one large

(Cited from Clennell, 1995, p. 10-15)

The different functions of CS mentioned above are useful particularly for teachers in their teacher talk to allow classroom interactions and promote students' language learning. However, the function of CS in teacher talk greatly depends on the proficiency of the students themselves. Teachers have to adjust their teacher talk to suit their students' level (Tsui, 1995), thus, making CS function differently according to the needs of the students.

2.4 Language proficiency and communication strategies

The first factor that influences the selection of strategies used for communication is the proficiency level of the speaker. It cannot be denied that different individuals regardless of their proficiency levels select communication strategies differently as each strategy require different linguistic demands.

Initially, Tarone (1977) (cited in Bialystok, 1990) examined this relationship by ranking her nine subjects accordingly to their proficiency level. Later, tabulation

was done by counting the number of times they used each strategy. From the result, she concluded that "strategies preference and second-language proficiency level may prove to be related" (p. 202). In her paper, Tarone claimed that the relationship of strategies preferences and second-language proficiency level is an interesting scope to be examined in the future. However, the relationship was not proven in the study as the data collected were insufficient to further investigate such connection.

Later, another study which has explicitly tested the relationship of proficiency and the selection of strategy was done by Bialystok (1980). From this study, Bialystok (1983, in Faerch & Kasper, 1984) has categorised CS into L1-based (using resources from speaker's native language) and L2-based (using resources from target language). Bialystok examined the use of CS by 17 year-old students in French as a second language class. Students were grouped into three groups to represent three proficiency levels. These students later were administered a cloze test, Danish sentence translation and picture recognition task. The first task was to assess their proficiency in French; the second task was to indicate subjects' ability to form inferences on the basis of minimal linguistic information and the latter one was to elicit the use of CS when appropriate TL vocabulary is lacking. The result of the study showed that the advanced students used proportionally more L2-based strategies than the regular students who relied more on L1-based strategies. A group of more advanced students showed an overall similar pattern as the regular students. However, these advance students did not shun the L1-based strategies. The study concluded that, as a whole, more proficient speakers relied more on L2-based

strategies since these strategies place considerable greater demands upon the linguistic resource of the speaker irrespective to the different proficiency level of the speaker.

In addition to that, Paribakht (1985) carried out a research on the effects of proficiency level towards the use of CS in three groups of Persian ESL students with different levels of proficiency in English upon completing the communication task carried out by interlocutor in order to make the experimental task as communicative as possible. Paribakht then classified CS into four main approaches on the basis of type of knowledge utilised by the learners in their realisation. Those approaches are Linguistics Approach, Contextual Approach, Conceptual Approach and Mime. According to Paribakht's brief description of each approach in his research, some CS used are overlapping and some are actually the same but is different in terms of the given name. Further more, Paribakht clarified that the higher the L2 learners' level of proficiency, there is greater possibility that they rely on the use of CS. Paribakht also highlighted that CS used by the learners were basically dependent on their developmental stages of interlanguage.

2.5 Conversation, language learning and communication strategies

Conversation is a multifaceted activity. It is also served as a crucial vehicle for learning regardless whether it is first language or second language learning. First language researchers such as Bruner (1983) and Wells (1895) claimed that children develop their language through meaningful interaction with their care takers. (as cited in Doyle, Goh & Zhang, 2004) Additionally, a second language researcher, Hatch

(1978, in van Lier, 1988) claimed that the same applies to the second language development. Hatch further explained that conversation or discourse structure acts as the basis for the development of syntax. Learners eventually learn the rules of complexities and the skills involved in interaction in which they are not available in the grammar books or course materials. Hatch's explanation is supported by van Lier (1988) by adding that the conversation is a "*sine qua non* (crucial element) for language acquisition" (p. 270).

However, the importance of CS in the conversations especially IL speakers cannot be denied as their interactions are mainly facilitated by CS due to their less advanced linguistic knowledge in TL. Besides, CS has its potential learning effect to encourage achievement and risk taking behaviour discussed by both Faerch and Kasper (1980) and Coder (1995) earlier on. It also contributes to "keep [learners' conversations] going" supported by Hatch (1978 in Ellis, 1985) and Tarone (1980) by reformulating utterances, confirming comprehension and also correcting what is said (either implicit or explicit) to the interlocutor. This phenomenon again reinforces the statement before that the role of CS in conversation helps learners to generate hypothesis. This is crucial for second language learning as it assists learners to develop automatization in the TL, at the same time, it also "shortens" the process of IL.

As what has been acknowledged by the L2 theories, the need of communication and negotiation or clarification of meaning in order to achieve the communication goal are the key factors that promotes successful interaction and

foster the L2 learning. (Doyle, Goh & Zhang, 2004) Classrooms are often assumed as the training ground for successful interaction. It provides a linguistic environment and with the collaboration of teacher-learner it further enhances the grasp of the target linguistic knowledge (Ellis, 1988).

2.6 Teacher talk and communication strategies

As successful communication in classrooms is the primary concern of SLA teaching and learning perspectives, teacher as the expert of the TL plays a fundamental role in delivering his or her information to the learner as comprehensible as possible (Krashen, 1981) to allow meaning negotiation to take place among learners and thus foster TL learning. This negotiation of meaning offers learners the context for language input and output as well as the attention to form besides making learners clear of their responses to the teachers' feedback on the production of language or output to ensure the information provided is comprehensible (Hatch, 1978; Long, 1996; Pica, 1994; Swain & Lapkin, 1998 in Doyle, Goh & Zhang, 2004).

From the studies conducted particularly by Paribakht (1985), and Bialystok and Frohlich (1980) on the perspective of TL learners, it is understood that proficiency level of their TL does influence the selection of CS upon completing the communication tasks. However, looking from the perspective of the teacher, which in fact is the interest of this study, would their choice of CS vary depending on their proficiency level of their students?

In relation to that, Gaies (1979, 1997 in Tsui 1995) found that teachers' utterances were simpler in terms of the complexity of syntax when addressing the pupils than when they were talking amongst themselves in a seminar. Gaies also claimed that teacher talk is characterised by functional adjustment similar to the 'training strategies' characteristic of adult input to children in his teacher speech research. To support the claims, Gaies provided some examples of the characteristics such as repetition, prompting and prodding, modelling, and expansion. Correspondingly, Henzl (1979 in Tsui 1995) noted that the use of lexical, phonological and grammatical modifications in teacher talk greatly depends on the level of the learners that he was teaching. Henzl provides few examples where the teacher avoids lexical items with narrow semantic fields (e.g. young gal) with preference for general word (e.g. woman). Another research done by Wesche and Ready (1983 Ellis, 1988) also found that both an English-speaking and French-speaking professor used significantly more self-repetition when addressing L2 students in university psychology classes than when teaching the same content to L1 students. Hence, there is a possibility that teacher may use different strategies particularly CS in order to accommodate the proficiency of the students when providing comprehensible input (Krashen, 1981) to the class.

However, this hypothesis would not be made concrete without supported evidences. Therefore, in this study, a systematic observation and analysis has been used to categorise the various types of teacher talk in classroom interactions by using Flander's Interaction Analysis Category (FLAC) (Flanders, 1970, in Tarricone &

Fetherston, 2002). The FLAC framework contains seven types of teacher talk grouped under two main categories: initiation and response (refer to Table 2 in p. 13). This framework has been used widely in various classroom observation studies to obtain information of verbal behaviour particularly by teachers. (Flanders, 1970 in Tarricone & Fetherston, 2002; Nunan, 1989 in McDonough & McDonough, 1997) Besides, it served as a checklist of categories to code teachers' verbal communication in classes of both proficiency levels.

2.7 Summary

From the various literature reviewed, CS has contributed to speakers predominantly IL speakers who are in the process of learning the TL to develop and move forward from their IL process to achieve TL competency. Despite many definitions given by researchers based on the three perspectives (i.e., Clennell, 1995; Faerch & Kasper, 1980; Tarone, 1978), CS also play many roles in facilitating speakers' communication such as solving communication problems (Tarone, 1977 in Bialystok, 1990), adjusting message (Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980; Váradi, 1980), expanding the resource (Corder, 1983 in Bialystok, 1990; Faerch & Kasper, 1984) of the speaker as well as enhancing messages and maintaining communication. These are important elements in fostering second language learning among IL speakers. From the discussions of the roles played by CS, it is also crucial to notice that CS is not only being used by L2 speakers or learners but by all speakers regardless the language they are using. (i.e., Littlewood, 1984; Tsui, 1995)

Studies have implied that learners with different levels of proficiency use different CS in helping them to get their meaning across to the interlocutor in order to achieve communication goals. (i.e., Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980; Paribakht, 1985) Similarly, the teachers also employ different strategies when delivering their input to students of different proficiency level. (i.e., Gaies, 1979, 1997 in Tsui, 1995; Henzl, 1979 in Tsui, 1995; Wesche & Ready 1983 in Ellis, 1988)

Moreover, it is known that classroom interactions involve both teacher and students' interactions not mainly about the psychological message adjustment done solely by the teacher while delivering their teaching. Therefore, Tarone's interactional perspective (1978) and Clennell's pragmatic discourse perspective (1995) of CS are the emphasis of this study. It is essential as the data collected were analysed based on the CS derived from these two perspectives. On the other hand, most literature stated that the teachers' choice of CS and the students' proficiency levels were related (Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980; Gaies, 1979, 1997 in Tsui 1995; Henzl, 1979 in Tsui, 1995; Paribakht, 1985; Wesche & Ready, 1983 in Ellis, 1988). Thus, this highlights the needs to further look into the relationship between the CS used by the teacher in their teacher talk and the students' proficiency level in the classroom situation.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

As far as the purpose of this study is concerned, the qualitative research design chosen to study the phenomenon descriptively is case study. It allows the researcher to understand and explain the specific phenomenon holistically on how teachers manoeuvre their teacher talk in classroom interaction by using CS to compensate for the proficiency level of the students. Basically, data were collected in the form of audio recording of teacher talk. They were transcribed and analysed based on the theoretical framework of Faerch and Kasper (1984), Tarone (1978) and Clennell (1995) on the use of CS by teachers. In addition, the relationship between CS and teacher talk were analysed based on Flander's Interaction Analysis Category (FLAC) (Flanders, 1970 in Tarricone & Fetherston, 2002).

3.1 Research Design

According to Stake (1995), teaching does not merely comprise of traditional lecturing and delivering of information but rather to arrange the opportunity for the

learners to received proper education (McDonough & McDonough, 1997). Hence, a qualitative case study research design is best fitted for this study in order to address the research problem. This to provide opportunity to the researcher to illustrate the phenomenon through a reasonable descriptive interpretation from the analysis based on grounded theories. According to Wiersma (1997), qualitative study examines the specific phenomenon based on the "facts and values [that are] inextricably mixed [within a] context-specific [environment by using] narrative description" (p. 14). Thus, in this study, such qualitative technique is used to analyse the statistical facts obtained from the frequency count of CS used by the teachers in a tabulated form. This is then followed by a holistic explanation on the value underlying the relationship between CS and teacher talk when the proficiency levels vary in natural classroom occurrences.

A qualitative research design chosen for this purpose of interest is case study. According to Merriam (1990), case study refers to "an examination of a specific phenomenon such as a program, an event, a person, an institution or a social group" (p. 10). In this study, case study methods allow the researcher to observe the specific phenomenon on the use of CS used by the teachers through their teacher talk in classroom setting. The observation was done by analysing the transcribed audio recordings of both high and low proficiency classes. It also enables the researcher to investigate when and why CS used in teacher talk changed when the proficiency of students varies in the context of the whole lesson. As stated by McDonough and McDonough (1997), this illustration of the case study would eventually serve as a

ground or representative study of this particular scope on a specific group as it implies "a laden-value view" of the researcher to offer the case to its readers (the teacher in particular) for other interpretations and perspective or even persuasion about the view point from the generalisation made out of the study.

This study also applied a quantitative technique of data analysis which allowed the researcher to describe the phenomenon systematically. As suggested by Wiersma (1997), this technique of analysis "provides a context-free generalizations and its focus on individual variables and factors by separating facts and values of the design will hence provide a non bias data to interpret the phenomena." (p.14). Hence, the descriptive statistics obtained from the patterns of CS within teacher talk used in both high and low proficiency classes allowed the researcher to have a in-depth study of this phenomenon through qualitative descriptive manner.

3.2 Selection of participants

The subjects chosen for the purpose of this study were four experienced upper-secondary English language teachers from a school in the Samarahan division, Sarawak. Initially, two Form Four teachers and two Form Five teachers participated in this study. However, one of the Form Five teachers had to withdraw from the study due to some personal problems during data collection. Thus, the actual participants for this study were only one Form Five teacher and two Form Four teachers. These teachers consisted of one male and two female teachers whose age ranged from 30 to

53 years old. They were experienced teachers who have taught the subject for at least four years and were teaching in the selected school for more than two years.

Purposeful sampling was carried out to ensure the validity of this study. The teachers chosen were those who teach both high and low proficiency classes of the form that they were teaching. This makes it possible for the researcher to compare consistently the CS used in both high and low proficiency classes by the same teacher. Experienced English teachers were chosen as a means to minimise the problem of teachers who were struggling with the classroom situation due to the unfamiliarity with their class control or students.

Classes involved in this study were high proficiency classes and low proficiency classes. The proficiency of the students was pre-determined by the school based on their achievement in their PMR scores. Students in high proficiency classes majority scored A and B for their English language subject in PMR while students in low proficiency classes scored grades D and E or F. In this study, high proficiency classes taken range from class A until C for Form Four and class A until D for Form Five. On the other hand, low proficiency classes were from class F until H for Form Four and G until J for Form Five classes. The classes taught by the subjects were at least distant by three classes which mean form four A for high proficiency and class D for low proficiency for instance. This is to ensure that the data analysed later provides a prominent or a significant change of the choice of CS and allows researcher to make comparison on it, if any.

3.3 Data collection procedures

3.3.1   Pilot study

Before proceeding to the actual data collection, a pilot study was conducted to check whether CS and teacher talk which is the focus of this study can be found in a teaching lesson. This pilot test was done on a lecturer before the research was executed. The lessons were transcribed and analysed according to FLAC to identify teacher talk. Later, CS were coded within the identified teacher talk based on only Tarone (1978), Faerch and Kasper's (1984) framework. However, it was found that the lecturer also used Clennell's (1995) discourse-based CS to make topic salient, emphasising information and clarifying and maintaining the topic discussed during the three-hour classroom interactions. This suggested the need to fine-tune the initial hypothesis whereby teachers are only perceived to give lectures and communicate with students (teacher-student communication). Thus, Clennell (1995) discourse-based CS were added into the initial framework.

3.3.2   Actual study

The selected teachers, who participated in this study, were told that the actual study was about students' classroom behaviour. Details of the purpose of the study were not revealed so that they were not conscious in using some particular CS or types of teacher talk in their teaching. This is thus to maintain the naturalistic nature of their teacher talk and to increase the validity of the data. To increase the natural environment of classroom interaction, lessons were tape-recorded solely by the

teacher whenever they feel comfortable with the absence of the researcher within the provided time frame (once a week for both different levels for the duration of five consecutive weeks). Lessons of at least 20 to 25 minutes were taken for both levels in each week. Subjects were reminded repeatedly not to edit or delete the recordings that they have made to produce a 'better one'. Subjects were also informed that the study is not focusing on their lesson planning so it is unnecessary for them to be worried about the execution of the lesson.

Subjects were labelled as P41 and P42 for both the Form Four teachers while P51 for the Form Five teacher. A total of eighteen lessons were recorded from the six classes taught by the three participants. This consisted of nine lessons of high proficiency classes and another nine from low proficiency classes in both Forms. Each teacher in Form Four tape-recorded four lessons for high proficiency classes and low proficiency classes. However, only one lesson for both levels were obtained from the Form Five teacher.

The researcher faced some difficulties during the data collection for the Form Five classes as the SPM trial examination was fast forwarded. Thus, recordings for Form Five classes had to be reduced from five weeks to only two weeks. This uncontrollable circumstance has reduced the data collected from Form Five classes to only one recording for each proficiency level.

3.4 Data Analysis

The recordings from each teacher were then transcribed and labelled accordingly. The transcription of the data was based on Eggins and Slade's (1997)

45

key of transcription which enabled readers to read the transcription even though they are not "familiar with conversational literature or phonological prosodic symbols". The summarised key transcriptions are shown as follow:

Table 5

Eggins and Slade's (1997) key of transcription

Symbol	Meaning
No end of turn punctuation	Certainty, completion (typically falling tone)
	Implies non-termination (no final intonation)
.	Parceling of talk; breathing time (silent beats in Halliday's 1985a/94 system)
?	Uncertainty (rising tone, or wh-interrogative)
!	"Surprised" intonation (raising-falling tone in Haliday's 1994 system)
WORDS IN CAPITAL	Emphatic stress and/or increased volume
" "	Change in voice quality in reported speech
( )	Untranscribable talk
(words within parentheses)	Transcriber's guess
[words in square bracket]	Non-verbal information
= =	Overlap (contiguity, simultaneity)
…	Short hesitation within a turn (less than three seconds)
[pause-4 secs]	Indication of inter-turn pause length
Dash- then talk	False start/restart

Once the raw data were collected, they were transcribed and coded by using an inductive analysis. The verbal data comprised 28069 words with 14089 words from high proficiency classes and 13980 words for the low proficiency classes. The transcriptions were read several times to identify the teacher talk for both levels by using Flander's Interaction Analysis Category (FLAC). Then, from the identified teacher talk, CS were coded according to the theoretical framework mentioned. Both teacher talk and CS were tabulated by using simple frequency count. The descriptive

statistics obtained from the tabulated data enabled the researcher to describe the results qualitatively. This extensive qualitative description also provides an opportunity for the researcher to determine the relationship between teacher talk and CS when the proficiency levels changed which is the second objective of this study.

This extensive description of the research methodology eventually increases the reliability of the study. Besides, it may allow other researchers in the field to replicate the study especially in analysing the teacher's CS in classroom instructions. Furthermore, the result can also served as a reference or guidance to the novice teachers in understanding the students' need of instruction in relation to their proficiency levels in this school. In addition to that, it highlights the mentioned significance of this study which is to provide teachers the opportunities to reflect and evaluate the strategies that they have used. This could perhaps increase their consciousness during teaching by not only ensuring the language content, grammatical accuracy and communicative effectiveness in classroom.

3.5 Methodological issue

The study provides insight in terms of the framework chosen for the study. It was noted by the researcher that some teacher talks identified from the transcriptions were not stated in FLAC framework. However, they were prominent and had been used in most of the lessons regardless of the proficiency levels of the students. Those prominent teacher talks identified were as follows: prompting, reply students' questions, preview, rhetorical, guiding, seeking confirmation, suggesting,

commenting, sum-up and cynical. These teacher talks (as in Table 6) were later added
into the existing framework of FLAC.

Table 6

Ten new types of teacher talk apart from those stated in FLAC framework

New types of teacher talk	Descriptions
Prompting	Teacher uses this teacher talk to trigger students to think and with the intent that the students will respond or answer. Usually teacher ended an unfinished sentence with a rising tone, provide examples or end it with question(s) to prompt. e.g. T: Yes. What action? What actions are mentioned in the passage? **The last two paragraph ya. What is it? There are two ways actually. First one is/…** (end with a rising tone) S: [inaudible] T: What is the first one? All right, so, we go on to dump our rubbish. Just now you mentioned… we either dump them in the rubbish bin or bury sampah. **The other way is, for example old newspapers, old magazines, old clothes.** (providing examples) T2: River mouth. What about the east land? **Further away from this coastline. Can you find them also?** (end with a question) S2: Throughout
Reply students' questions	Basically teacher solving students' doubt or answering their questions. e.g. S: What is coaches? T: **M m ? coaches… means…this/ is coaches/. This coaches/.** S: Parade T: **Parade? The parade\, coaches\.** Ok/, words and phrases that you need to pay attention to/ are here/, numb/, do you know what is numb mean?
Preview	It is done to prepare students for the lesson by forecasting what is going to be taught in that lesson. e.g. T: **Alright, today we are going TO…go to a new theme that we are already started and finish the theme on health.**

Rhetorical	Almost similar to Asking Questions but this time teacher answers their own questions without the intention that the students will answer just to trigger them to think and highlight the information that the teacher thinks the students might not know and followed by giving explanation or Lecturing. e.g. T: **So, if/ the lake has become dead what happen inside? What does that mean? The fish inside all die. That's why is… ah … dead…lake. So, no more fish, no more flowers, nothing living inside.**
Guiding	Usually in reading aloud where the teacher provide necessary help to students in terms of pronunciation to guide them while they read. e.g. T: What example of logical connectors, can you read them? The second one…ah to show … contrast. Yes. Read all those connectors… however/ S: [reading aloud] T: Read all these/ S: [reading aloud] T: **However/** S: However [continue reading aloud] T: **Nevertheless** S: Nevertheless [continue reading aloud]
Seeking confirmation	Teacher seeks affirmation from students to reassure his/her assumption. e.g. T: Are you ready? You are not ready\. **Not ready\.**[confirming] tomorrow ah? [asking whether tomorrow is ok for the student]**Tomorrow hah?**[reassuring the decision] S: Tomorrow tomorrow lah\
Suggesting	Ideas suggested by the teacher with the hope that students might accept. e.g. T: Then who is ready? Nobody is ready\ [wait, 30 seconds] *Alex Alex / … **you hah you hah/** [suggesting], ok. *not the real name
Commenting	Giving comments based on students' work either to encourage, to praise or to improve their performance. e.g. T: Ok ok, CLASS THAT. I can see that they have put in a lot of discussions

	and a lot of thoughts into that… in ah… in ah… working out that conversation. **Can see that they are very natural/ they are very natural/. We have two very natural actors here/**, all right? Ok?
Sum-up	Teacher ends the lesson by recap what they have done in the lesson ot to summarise what they have yet to finish and wish to finish it in the coming lesson. e.g. T: **Thank you for that. So, we have listened to *Swee, one, two, three. We still have one, two, three, four, five group. We'll listen to the five groups the next lesson. Ok, thank you we continue next period.** *not the real name
Cynical	Teacher speaks sarcastically to the students. This can be happened in any types of teacher talk especially during lecturing and answering students' questions. It serves as a softer way to change the students' non-acceptable behaviour without threatening their self-esteem. e.g. T: So you know the function of all these? S: Know T: Gather gathering information/, right? **Photocopying/ you use it so/ often… ok that the lazy way out, right?** You photo/copy, you want to duplicate huh? You want to duplicate something you use photocopy machine huh? Printer/ is for/ what?

3.6 Limitations of the study

Few limitations were noted in this study. Primarily, there were some uncontrollable situations such as the physical setting of the classroom in which the recordings were done as well as the noise of the surrounding affected the clarity of the recordings. Besides that, the classroom performance can be unnatural if the teacher as well as the students were conscious about the tape recording throughout the whole lesson. For example, students might have purposely made themselves more active by providing a lot of responses which they might not do during normal lesson

or teacher tried to be cautious about their language, teaching and learning skills and etc.

On the other hand, verbal recordings were reduced from eight to only two from Form Five classes of both proficiency levels. It was mainly due to the unexpected circumstances such as the forwarded SPM trial examination, and the withdrawal of one Form Five teacher from the study. Though this study is not comparing the teacher talk between Form Five and Form Four teachers, but the quantity of verbal data from Form Five teachers may have provided more useful data for this study.

In terms of data analysis, subjectivity in the coding process was a notable limitation. To minimise this, familiarity with the coding schemes were maximised before coding the actual data. The researcher found that it was initially confusing to differentiate the teacher talk of asking questions and asking rhetorical questions. However, this difficulty was solved after the definition for both types of teacher talk were made clear. Both were almost similar but they differed in terms of the implied intention of the teacher. From the excerpts given below, teacher asked students the definitions of "literal" and "figurative" with the intention that the students would respond to his questions. Unlike asking questions, teacher asked rhetorical questions without expecting the students to answer and they often answered the questions themselves.

❖ Asking questions
P51: Step three, understand the literal as well as the figurative meaning of the poem. *You know the **difference**/ literal and figurative?*

❖ Asking rhetorical questions
P41: *So, if/ the lake has become dead what happen inside? What does that mean? The fish inside all die.*

A similar situation was faced when differentiating the teacher talk of 'accepts feelings and accepts' and 'uses ideas of pupils'. Although the definition for each type of teacher talk was provided clearly in the FLAC framework, there were no examples given as a guideline on how to differentiate those two types of teacher talk. However, based on the definition, the researcher differentiated these teacher talks by looking at whether the answers provided by the students were developed. As depicted in the excerpt below, the teacher responded "yes" as an acceptance of the answer provided by the student in a non-threatening manner without further developing it. It was coded as 'accepts feeling'. Meanwhile, when the answer of the student was extended or developed it was coded as 'accepts and uses ideas of pupils'. However, as stated in the FLAC framework, if the teacher brings in more of his own ideas or explanation into play it was coded as 'lecturing'.

P42**: [**Logical means …sensible…or/**] prompting**
   S: Must have reason
P42: **[**Yes.**] accepts feelings [** Logical <u>logical</u> is… sensible or reasonable.**] accepts and uses ideas of pupils [**The (difference between) logic and logical. All right?**] lecturing**

In terms of CS, Faerch and Kasper's (1980) definition of 'restructuring' seemed at first glance similar to the definition stated by Tarone (1978) on message 'abandonment or message avoidance'. However, 'restructuring' is the inability to continue the initial plan but chose an alternative to continue it. In this case, a speaker

usually rewords or adjusts his or her original communication plan. As in the first excerpt, the teacher restructured "300 species" to "300 different types" when she found problem in her formulation of utterance:

P41: *Come back to Malaysia farm, pit farm has 300 species of fresh water fish,* ***300 spe…300 different types ah*** *that that yet ah…*

In this second excerpt, 'message avoidance' or 'message abandonment' was involved. Instead of continuing to explain the meaning of the word "trade", the teacher stopped and started explaining the meaning of "appalling" due to the loss of words. However, it was not considered as topic avoidance as the teacher still continued with the same concept which was to define the meaning for "appalling trade". If the teacher discontinued defining the meaning of "appalling trade", by saying that "trade means some…" then it was considered as 'topic avoidance'.

P51: The man… you mean the literal meaning what is the man of the appaling trade mean? ***Trade means some…appalling means menakutkan*** *[talking to a student] um?* Right practice two, lift the word from the poem/ so you do it not have the poem in/ here\. Right?

As such, as shown in the aforementioned examples, familiarity with the chosen framework is paramount in reducing the problems in the coding process.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

The data for this study were collected from one Form Five and two Form Four teachers of upper-secondary. Each of them taught both high and low proficiency classes of the same Form. A total of eighteen recordings of classroom discourse were collected from them. Nine lessons of recordings were taken from three high proficiency classes while the other nine recordings were from the remaining three low proficiency classes. Each of the recordings consists of at least 20 to 25 minutes per lesson. Hence, the entire recorded lessons of nine hours and twenty eight minutes were transcribed verbatim and coded for types of teacher talk and CS based on the selected frameworks.

During the coding process, the researcher faced problems in categorising some of the teacher talks as they were not available in the framework chosen (Flander's Interaction Analysis Category). Therefore, ten new types of teacher talks has been added by the researcher into the existing Flander's Interaction Analysis

Category (FLAC) coding system. However, the adapted taxonomy of CS was not modified.

In this chapter, the results from the data analysis are presented and compared. As the concern of this study is to investigate the CS used within the types of teacher talk, the findings are presented according to the types of teacher talk and begin with the high proficiency classes, followed by the low-proficiency classes and ends with a comparison of both cohorts. Later, this opens a channel of discussion on the interest of the study which is to know how far the level of proficiency influences the use of CS by teachers in their teacher talk.

4.1 Overall results

The frequency of CS used in teacher talk based on the levels is shown in Table 1 that follows. As a whole, of the nine hours and twenty eight minutes of lessons recorded, 28069 words were transcribed for both high and low proficiency classes. Out of the total word count, 2057 occurrences of CS were coded from both high and low proficiency recorded lessons. In high proficiency classes, 14089 words were transcribed and 1017 occurrences of CS were found in this level. On the other hand, 1040 occurrences of CS were identified in the remaining 13980 word count of transcribed in low proficiency lessons. It is clear that the ratio between the words used by teachers and CS were almost similar and consistent for both proficiency levels which were 1: 13.9 for high proficiency classes and 1: 13.4 for low proficiency classes. Even though the ratio showed that there was not much difference found

between both proficiency levels in terms of occurrences of CS but they were different in terms of the types of CS used within the teacher talk. In addition, the preferences of different types of teacher talk in high and low proficiency classes were also varied. Out of eighteen types of teacher talk identified about nine were commonly used by all the teachers in their lessons in both high and low proficiency classes. However, the most prominent five types of teacher talk were discussed in this chapter.

In addition, out of the 14 types of CS available in the framework, only nine were used in different types of teacher talk by teachers in both levels. From the overall pattern of the results, the types of CS used most frequently were tonicity, lexical repetition, topic fronting followed by language switch, restructuring, message avoidance, mine, topic avoidance and lastly approximation. Adding to it, the frequency of CS used by teachers within their teacher talks were greatly influenced by the proficiency levels of the students.

4.2 Results of CS used in teacher talk of high and low proficiency classes

4.2.1 CS used in teacher talk in high proficiency classes

The analysis of the transcription revealed that in the high proficiency classes, there were five prominent types of teacher talk that were constantly used by the teachers. They were lecturing, asking questions, giving directions, accepting or using ideas of pupils and prompting (see Table 1). This sequence of teacher talks was arranged according to the frequency of CS used. This would mean that in 'lecturing', the most CS were used and CS were used the least in 'prompting' of the five types of

56

teacher talk mentioned. In these teacher talks, some CS were employed for various reasons. Therefore, it is essential in this section to present the findings based on this sequence of teacher talk mentioned. The predominant CS used within these teacher talks were discussed and supported by samples of coded excerpts. Table 7 in the following page shows the frequency of CS used in various types of teacher talk in percentage.

Table 7

Frequency of CS used in teacher talk in high proficiency classes by teachers in percentage

Communication Strategies (CS) \ Teacher talk	Response			Initiation				Silence											
	Accepts feeling	Praises or encourages	Accepts or uses ideas of pupils	Asks questions	Lecturing	Giving directions	Criticising or justifying authority	Silence or confusion	Prompting	Reply students' questions	Preview	Rhetorical	Guiding	Seeking confirmation	Suggestion	Commenting	Sum up	Cynical	
Paraphrasing																			
Approximation			0.1	0.1						0.1									
Word coinage																			
Circumlocution																			
Transfer																			
Literal translation																			
Language switch			0.2	0.1	0.1					0.1	0.1								
Appeal for assistance																			
Mime			0.1		0.3	0.6	0.1			0.4									
Avoidance																			
Topic avoidance																			
Message avoidance			0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3				0.2									
Restructuring			0.8	1.1	1.6	0.9			0.3	0.1	0.2					0.1			
Offering help										0.1									
Lexical repetition	1.0		2.9	5.2	6.1	4.9	1.3		0.9		1.0	0.5				0.1	0.1		
Tonicity	2.0		6.1	8.8	17.1	7.7	2.7		6.4	1.0	0.9	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2		0.3	
Topic fronting			0.8	4.0	3.9	2.3	0.3		0.8	0.5	0.5	0.1							
Total (N)	3.0		11.1	19.6	29.5	16.6	4.3		8.4	2.5	2.7	1.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.3	100
Total occurrences	1017																		

58

Lecturing

In the normal classroom interactions, it is undeniable that teachers spend most of the lesson hours to lecture or to give explanation. As shown in the quantitative findings, a great deal of CS were used by the teachers during lecturing in high proficiency classes. CS like tonicity (n=174) and lexical repetition (n=62) were prominently used when the teachers deliver their lesson by lecturing (n=300). On the contrary, restructuring (n=16) and message avoidance (n=4) were least commonly used by teachers during lecturing.

Specifically, tonicity is the most frequently used CS by the teachers during lecturing in high proficiency classes. This strategy constitutes 17% (n=174) of the total 1017 coded CS. A qualitative review of the transcripts reveals that the teachers often used tonicity as a means to stress on specific words in order to add emphasis or mark the important information. This is to make sure that the information is salient to the students. Examples of such situation are shown in the excerpts below. The words in bold and with a '/' mark indicates the rising tone of teachers' speech while the '\' mark indicates the falling tone.

P51 **Next/** paragraph, the neighbours rustle in and out, the doctors drives away, a window opens like a pod **abrubt/** mechanically…[reading the poem aloud] meaning the neighbours **come/** and **go/** and the doctor **leave\.** Suddenly a window flung open.
Somebody/ flings a mattress out/ the children hurry by, they wonder if it died on that, I used to when a boy.[read the poem aloud] So, someone throw the mattress out of the **house/**, the **children/** walk pass the house **quickly/wondering/** if he dies on the mattress. The persona wonder this too when he was **young/**.

P42   **Read/** you summary once you have **finished/** make **sure/** it **fulfils/** the **purpose/** and the word **count**, all right? So, you need to do that/. Read your summary once you have finished. Make sure it fulfils the purpose and the word count, ok? Sooo, ah… **read/** your summary so that you can make changes where is necessary whether you have fulfil the **purpose/** or the word count. All right?

As shown in the excerpts, both teachers (P51 and P42) manipulated the tone of their speeches by emphasising the words that they thought were important for the students when delivering their lecture. This could perhaps due to the role of the students as "passive listeners" that prompted the teacher to constantly make sure that what they were lecturing could be understood by the students.

Besides using tonicity, teachers were also more inclined to repeat words or phrases in emphasising specific information. Such discourse-based strategy is known as lexical repetition. It was the second highest CS used by teachers while giving lecture, which carved up 6% of the total 300 CS used in lecturing. The following excerpt illustrates how the teachers used lexical repetition in lecturing. The italicised sentences were teacher talk of lecturing and those in bold were CS of lexical repetition.

P42   Ok. Look at page one hundred eighty nine/ one hundred eighty nine/ look at that/ one eight nine. Wait. On summary 5g there. [wait-10 seconds] Attention/. Please/please/. Read the passage on pages one eight six to one eight seven again and summarise the **technological advancement. That has helped people in their real lives**. Your summary must not be more than **hundred and fifty words**. Begin you summary at follow.
S   [inaudible]
P42   This one.
S   [inaudible]

P42   I'm not going to give the answer. You are going to look for the main points. We have gone through this passage, and we have discussed. All right. Each paragraph/ gone through each paragraph before, right?

So, you summarise the… passage and about **hundred and fifty words**. *On/ the* **technological advancement has helped people in their lives**. *How? How…* **technological advancement has helped people in their lives**. *How? All right? The question is/…how/.*

The excerpt shows how the teacher (P42) explained the instructions given to the students earlier in summarising a passage. By repeating the similar phrases and words like "hundred and fifty words" and "technological advancement has helped people in their lives", it allowed the teacher to emphasise the important point or key word for the students to complete their summary.

Apart from that, another strategy used by teachers in high proficiency level classes during lecturing is restructuring (n= 16), which took up 1.5% of the total CS used in lecturing (n=300). In this case, teachers reconstructed their sentences while giving lecture or explanation when they face difficulties in continuing their original communication plans. The excerpts below demonstrate how teachers restructure their words while giving lecture. Words in bold were CS of restructuring which were within the italicised teacher talk, lecturing.

P42   All right ah… class. Look at this sentence ok. Now ah… this week have … learnt about… advancement in technology.

The importance or technology importance the importance of modern technology *to us. In this century.*

Can we start before we move to our lesson?

In this excerpt of P42, the teacher started the lecture by introducing the topic of the lesson. The word "…or technology" was substituted with "…of modern technology" and before the actual sentence was uttered, the word "importance" has been repeated twice. This phenomenon explained that the teacher was indeed adjusting the original communication plan by restructuring what was said earlier.

P41   Fresh water fish, ok. Huh? All right. So actually before that what the person said is about the large (/fright/) of flora and fauna. Not only fish huh [correcting].

Come back Malaysia farm, pit farm has 300 species of fresh water fish, 300 spe…300 different types ah that that yet ah…
*Brandi what's your question again?

*not real name

Similarly, in the second excerpt, when providing information on Malaysia pit farm, the teacher (P41) restructured the phrase "300 species" to "300 different types". Such restructuring was either to simplify the sentence or to avoid confusion as the word "species" has been mentioned earlier. It could also serve to demonstrate to the students two ways of saying something similar. Nonetheless, when teachers faced difficulties in finding a proper word to express their ideas, they often resorted to avoiding the message but still remain explaining or lecturing the similar concept.

Consequently, such strategy is what Tarone (1980) called as 'message avoidance'. This is another type of CS that was used by teacher while giving lecture in high proficiency classes. It covered 0.39% (n=4) of the total of CS used

in lecturing, N=300). Message avoidance is when the teachers stop pursuing the concept that they are talking or explaining at a particular moment due to lost of words or meaning structure. The following two excerpts are examples of CS within lecturing that are coded under message avoidance.

P51   Sad/ good. That's the response. So, that is the common reaction to that. Now, how people in that small town repond/ to that?

S   Sad

P51   ***Very/…they accept*** *of death is part and puzzle of life/. Death is not something that you should fear.* Ini jadi fear fear to the/

     In the above excerpt, the teacher, P51 has avoided continuing the message while giving the lecture on the poem by Emily Dickinson. After the student responded to the teacher's question by saying "sad", the teacher continued the lecture by stressing on the word "very" but somehow the message seem to stop there and continued with the concept of death that they were discussing earlier. This could perhaps due to the difficulty in locating appropriate words by the teacher to continue or to respond to the answer given by the student. Thus, the teacher chose to discontinue the initial plan and went back to the concept of death discussed earlier.

S   The man of the appalling trade

P51   The man of the appalling trade. Um? The man… you mean the literal meaning what is the man of the appaling trade mean? ***Trade means some…appalling means menakutkan*** *[talking to a student] um?* Right practice two, lift the word from the poem/ so you do it not have the poem in/ here\. Right? Number one, the look of the house line 3.

In this second excerpt, the teacher was initially trying to explain the word "trade". Instead of continuing the explanation, the teacher stopped and started to explain the meaning of "appalling". Though it appears that the teacher was abandoning the message but in this case it was consider as message avoidance as the teacher was still talking about the same concept which was to define the phrase "appalling trade".

All in all, the CS used by the teacher during lecturering seemed to share a similar purpose, that is to stress on important information. Most CS used especially tonicity and lexical repetition fulfilled this purpose. As mentioned earlier, such situation may be closely related to the role of the teaching during lecturing, which is to provide enough input that is comprehensible to the students.

Asking questions

Besides giving lecture, asking questions is another form of teacher talk that is commonly used in high proficiency classes. Questions were asked to the students with the intention that the students might answer. Most questions posted were to check their understanding towards the topic that teacher was teaching, to trigger students to think further and to ask students to rationalise their answers. Similar to lecturing, tonicity (n=89) is the dominant CS used in asking questions, which was about 8.7% from the total teacher talk of asking questions (n=199). Another popular CS used in this teacher talk is lexical repetition (n=53), which carved up 5.2 %. This was followed by topic fronting (n=41) and restructuring (n=11), each stood at 4.0% and 1.1% respectively. These CS were used in asking

questions mainly to make the question salient, emphasis what the teacher wants from the questions so that it is easier and clear to process by the students. Below are excerpts that show the types of CS that were used in asking questions.

❖ Tonicity

P51 They won't. no. They won't they won't. Step two, make sure you know the meaning of the phrases used in the line. We are going to look at it afterwards/. Step three, understand the literal as well as the figurative meaning of the poem. *You know the **difference**/ literal and figurative?*

S Yeah

In the excerpt shown above, the teacher (P51) asked the students whether they can identify the distinction between literal and figurative meaning by stressing on the word "difference" with a rising tone. Besides using tone while asking questions, teachers also repeat important information at least twice as in lexical repetition shown below.

❖ Lexical repetition

P42 Ok. Let's recap… we have … what we have learnt from the story the Sound Machine. Kelvin? The general idea/ from the story? Anyone? Discuss it briefly/ what you have … understood … from the story. Discuss it briefly/. Some of **the important events in the story**. *Just discuss… discuss some of the important events in the story? What happening?*

S Sound machine.

In this example, the phrase "…the important events in the story" was first uttered when the teacher was giving instruction to the students to recap the major points from the story "The Sound Machine". This phrase was then repeated by the teacher when the questions were asked. Clearly, this CS is used by teacher to

emphasise and ensure that the students provide information relevant to the important events in the story. Another CS used while asking questions is topic fronting. This is illustrated in the excerpt given below.

❖ Topic fronting

P41 Pardon. Part of our world, ok. That one is real, anymore? Ok. **The location of wetlands,** *where can you find them?*
S   River mouth.
P41 **The river mouth,** *Where?*

Unlike in written language, which allows its reader to backtrack or retrace what the reader has read, spoken language does not offer its listener such advantage. Hence, topic fronting is crucial especially for the TL learners to listen for important information. As in the above excerpt, the teacher was trying to elicit answers from the students. In order to make the questions salient to their listener, the students so that they can process the important information easily the teacher stated the topic "the location of wetlands" and "the river mouth" before the comment "where can you find them?" and "where?" of the utterances. However, when teachers found difficulties in formulate what they wanted to say they will also attempt to restructure it.

❖ Restructuring

P41 *What are some of* **the nice/…the five** *things that you will like to have?*
S   Chocalate
S   Chocolate

P41 Ok. The soil soil is aggregate. The soil is aggregate. Ok? Because of/ …low (intern) level. What is the other main point? So that the colour of the water/

S   Turn colour.

S   *Turn colour. And ah… **from above? From far is?***

As shown in the excerpt, instead of saying "the five nice things", the teacher had to restructure the intended sentence twice. In the first attempt, the teacher said "the nice/…", and when it was found that the formulation was improper to carry out the teacher's initial plan, the teacher then restructured it to become "…the five things…". This is an example of restructuring and it is used when the teachers could find a way to reorganise the sentences that they found difficult to continue.

As such, in this second type of teacher talk (asking questions), teachers are still greatly depending on the use of tonicity and lexical repetitions. Unlike lecturing, topic fronting and restructuring are also found to be common when the teachers ask questions to the student.

Giving directions

In addition to lecturing and asking questions, teachers also give commands and directions especially when instructing students to do their work or perform a task such as completing exercises and reading aloud. This kind of speech act thus helped students to improve their L2 language learning. Hence, giving directions was the fourth most frequently used teacher talk in this study. Similar to the other types of teacher talk, tonicity (n=78), was the most popular CS that the teachers preferred when they gave direction (n=169), which carved up 7.7% from the total

CS used in 'giving direction'. The second highest was again lexical repetition

(n=50) with 4.9% out of the total number of CS coded in 'giving direction'.

❖ Tonicity
P42   Ok, class, look at this **sentence/**, please read this sentence **together/**.
S   [reading aloud]

The excerpt above demonstrates how tone was manipulated by teacher

when stressing the words "sentence" and "together" in the instruction to the class

so that they can perform chorus reading on the sentence together. However, for a

clearer instruction, teachers also tended to repeat their imperative language as in

the excerpt shown below.

❖ Lexical repetition
P42   *Ok that's... we are going to look at that on page 196, **living in a world of**
      technology. This text is ah... very long/ but I would like ... please read read*
      that together/...maybe don't mind to read that... for five minutes to read that
      through and later on we... shall look at what does it says about what does it
      *says about **living in the world of technology**. Please read.* [wait-5seconds]
      read and/… understand *the text ok? Don't talk, only to read, please. **Read***
      and understand [wait-2minutes]

The teacher (P42), in this case asked the students to complete a task in the

exercise book by repeating the topic of the text "living in the world of technology"

as a salient marker to students to pay attention to the text mentioned. Besides,

instruction like "read and understand" has been repeated within the instruction

given to remind students to read than try to understand the text.

68

The aforementioned types of teacher talk are all teacher-centred whereby the teachers did most of the talking. However, a two-way communication classroom interaction is best to promote language learning. One of the many ways to encourage this effective communication is by allowing the students to respond. Accepting or using the responses of the students in the lesson provides students the context of language learning. The following section further elaborates this type of teacher talk.

Accepts or uses ideas of pupils

In this study, teachers in high proficiency classes were more likely to accept or use students' ideas (n=113). From the data, this type of teacher talk was typically used by the teachers when students provided answers or feedback. The most common CS used when teachers accept or uses the ideas of students was tonicity with 6.1% (n=62) followed by lexical repetition (n=29), 2.9%. Two samples of excerpts shown below were the use of tonicity to accept and use the ideas of students by the teacher. It was observed that the teacher repeated the answer given by the student with a rising tone.

❖ Tonicity

P42   Lo…logical connectors and/…
S   Sequence
P42   *Sequence/ connector\.*

In this case, the teacher stressed on the word "sequence" with a rising tone

followed by a falling tone on the word "connector". It served as a salient marker to mark the beginning of new input. It is also possible that the teacher tried to refresh the students' memory of the input that has been taught in the previous lesson.

P42   Why? Why he want him to be there with him? To/
S   To listen
P42   *To **listen**/ to **what**/ he has heard **and**/...* remember? The first time when he heard to the groaning sound what he want to do to the tree?

On the other hand, the second excerpt above shows how the teacher tried to use the answer given by the student, "to listen" and developed it. The stressed words like "what" and "and" were added to the student's answer as a way for the teacher to help the students to recall the type of sound heard and the action taken after the sound was heard as told in a story discussed in the lesson.

❖ Lexical repetition

P41   No/ no/ no/. Ok. What/ what/ do What/ is aggregate?
S   The **soil** [soft answer provided]
P41   *The the **soil** all right.*
S   **Soil**
P41   *Ok. **The soil soil is aggregate. The soil is aggregate.*** Ok? Because of/ ...low (intern) level. What is the other main point? So that the colour of the water/

Another way for the teacher to accept or use the students' ideas was through lexical repetition. In the excerpt above, the word "soil" was repeatedly mentioned by both teacher and student as a means to maintain the topic on soil aggregation. Similarly, the word "the soil is aggregate" appeared twice in the interaction as an initiation of the teacher to further develop the topic from the

answer given by the students. Nonetheless, the overall qualitative review of the transcripts shows that two-way communication as illustrated in the excerpts above between teacher and students was minimal and was slightly frequent in high proficiency classes.

Prompting

However, there were also times when it was hard for the teachers to use the students' ideas especially in situation where the students were passive and did not want to participate. Such circumstances forced the teachers to prompt the students, with the intention to encourage student participation. Prompting is often needed to trigger the students' thinking capabilities. Usually, teachers tried to prompt the students by ending their sentences with a rising tone with the hope that students would continue the incomplete sentences or answer the questions. This makes tonicity (n=65), the most commonly used CS in prompting (n=85), which holds up to 6.4 % of the total coded CS in prompting. Example of such usage is illustrated in the following excerpt:

P51   *Rustle in and out meanin. They **are/…*** (<u>prompting</u>-intent students to
        complete the sentence)
S   Seeking
S2   Helping
S3   Taking care

In this example of prompting, instead of providing the students the meaning of "rusting in and out", the teacher prompted the students by ending

the unfinished sentence with a rising tone. It was an indication for the students to provide the definition themselves by completing the sentence starting with "They are…".

P42   Clarifications and/ repetitions ok? Those we don't need all those.
      Examples. For example, uhmm… take for example cupboard, chairs,
      tables, desks what you call all those?
S   [inaudible]
P42   *We can summarise them into one **word**/. We can use one word to describe
      that/ examples.* (prompting- providing hints for students to guess the
      correct answer)
S   Furniture.

In this case, in order to allow the students to understand that a summary does not allow repetition and has to be precise, purposely, the teacher brought out the examples of furniture and asked the students to summarise it into one word. Thus, the words "word" and "that" were stressed to serve as hints for students to guess the correct answer, furniture. Such usage of tonicity in prompting, as shown in the two excerpts, is rather common among the teachers, and there is also a possibility that it has turned into a habitual action when the teacher want to get feedback from the students.

To conclude, the use of tonicity and lexical repetition by the teacher during lecturing and asking questions has been dominant in high proficiency classes. Both quantitative and qualitative data showed how these two CS is manipulated by the teacher in order to make sure that the intended message is received by the students. The following section will look into the prominent types of teacher talk as well as its accompanying CS used by the teachers in low proficiency classes.

4.2.2 CS used in teacher talk in low proficiency classes

In low proficiency classes, the dominant types of teacher talks were lecturing, asking questions, prompting, giving directions, accepting or using ideas of pupils and lastly asking rhetorical questions. The sequence was ranked according to the frequency of usage by the teachers. In this section, frequencies of CS used in those teacher talks are presented in descending order of frequency (highest occurrences to the lowest). Some evidences from the excerpts and brief descriptions of the role of CS in the teacher talks are included here as well. Table 8 in the following page shows the percentage of CS used by teachers in their teacher talk when teaching low proficiency classes.

Table 8

Frequency of CS used in teacher talk in low proficiency classes by teachers in percentage

Communication Strategies (CS) / Teacher talk	Response			Initiation				Silence											
	Accepts feeling	Praises or encourages	Accepts or uses ideas of pupils	Asks questions	Lecturing	Giving directions	Criticising or justifying authority	Silence or confusion	Prompting	Reply students' questions	Preview	Rhetorical	Guiding	Seeking confirmation	Suggestion	Commenting	Sum up	Cynical	
Paraphrasing																			
Approximation																			
Word coinage																			
Circumlocution																			
Transfer																			
Literal translation																			
Language switch	0.9		1.3	3.8	4.2	0.4	0.2		0.7	0.1	0.1	0.9							
Appeal for assistance																			
Mime				0.1	0.4	0.1			0.1										
Avoidance																			
Topic avoidance				0.1	0.1														
Message avoidance			0.1	0.2	0.2				0.1										
Restructuring				0.6	1.5	0.2			0.1		0.3								
Offering help																			
Lexical repetition	0.7		1.3	6.9	6.2	2.8	0.3		1.6	0.1	0.5	1.4			0.1				
Tonicity	1.7		2.7	7.0	19.4	6.3	0.5		8.2	0.3	1.6	2.4	0.7						
Topic fronting			0.4	2.9	3.6	1.4	0.1		1.1	0.2	0.7	0.6							
Total (N)	3.3		5.7	21.5	35.6	11.2	1.1		11.8	0.7	3.2	5.3	0.7		0.1				100
Total occurrences	1040																		

74

Lecturing

As in the high proficiency classes, giving lecture and explanation are the most common types of teacher talk in classroom interactions. Hence, lecturing was predominantly high in low proficiency classes as compared to other types of teacher talks. It stood at 35.6% (n=370) of the total 1040 occurrences of CS used. Within this type of teacher talk, the common CS used by the teachers were tonicity (n=202), language switch (n=44), topic fronting (n=37) and restructuring (n=16). Tonicity was mainly used in this teacher talk which was 19.4%. This was followed by language switch, (4.2%); topic fronting, (3.6%) and restructuring, (1.5%).

From the findings, language switch was used exceptionally regular in low proficiency classes in all types of teacher talk involved. Language switch is a technique normally used by the teacher in order to make the students understand better what they have taught or said as the compensation for the students' limited language repertoire. However, as noted in the findings, language switch was used by the teacher without bothering to translate as a technique to overcome the communication barrier when teaching low proficiency classes as compared to high proficiency classes. Below are excerpts showing how this type of CS was used to provide further explanation of the concept 'death'.

P51   *The theme of the poem, **apa yang kita bincangkan** …death, faham death? Ya…*
      that is part of/ our life and things people do at the time of death/ and things that
      people (draw) during the time of someone death. Maksudnya setiap orang
      mempunyai peranan mereka sendiri, jika berlakunya kematian/ apa peranan
      awak?apa peranan awak? Jika berlaku kematian apa peranan awak?
S   Peranan?

P51   Peranan. Peranan means ah… apa yang perlu kamu lakukan. Apa yang akan awak lakukan?

S   (inaudible)

P51   No. *it depends/ on… your relationship with the dead.* Betul tak? Apa kaitan awak dengan simati? ***Kalau si mati saudara awak, kamu akan/ sangat (membantu),*** betul? ***Kalau si mati itu… ah… jiran hujung/ hujung rumah, pekan sana***, apa kaitan awak dengannya? Tak banyak kan? ***Kamu cuma datang minta takziah dan lepas tu/…membantu***

In the beginning of the excerpt given, it is clear that the teacher switched the language use from English "the theme of the poem" to Malay language "*apa yang kita bincangkan*" without translating the Malay words into English while giving lecture. This situation happened in low proficiency classes and it was usually served to compensate the students' language deficiency so that they could easily understand what was being taught. In the second example of the excerpt above, the teacher was trying to relate the relationship of the dead with the students so that they can understand the role of the people during the time of someone's death by using Malay language such as "*Kalau si mati saudara awak*"and etc. The following excerpts demonstrate further the use of language switch within the similar context.

P51   What is funeral pocession?

S   [quiet]

S2   Funeral pocession

S3   Perayaan … perayaan si mati.

P51   Perayaan. ***Bila orang itu mati***, *dari rumah from the housse/ they bring the coffin… ah!*[agree with the answer] *To the grave yard*. So, what do you call that?

S   Song song song ying la. (funeral pocession in mandarin)

P51   Hantar ya. Apa beza pengebumian, peranakan.

S   Peranakan

P51   Funeral pocession use ah… coaches which are decorated. Coaches. Coaches.

S   Decorated?

P51   ***Bila orang mati kita guna peti, kan? Kadang-kadang kereta kan? Orang-***

       orang dulu mereka guna kereta tarik. Ah … [agree]

S   Kereta tarik

      The excerpt above illustrated how teacher used questions to give further explanation or definition for the word "coaches" by saying "*bila orang mati kita guna peti, kan*?". By using the Malay language, it allows the teacher to relate the definition of the word "coaches" to the local culture. As a whole, language switch is prominent in the low proficiency classes as they face greater language deficit compared to the students in high proficiency classes. Teachers often resort to language switch so that the student could understand the content of the lesson taught.

Ask questions

      Besides solely showering students with information, asking questions also helped teachers to deliver their message in a more interactive manner. Thus, in low proficiency level, questions were frequently asked by teachers. It was the most dominant type of teacher talk after 'lecturing'. Teachers usually ask questions (n=224) by using tonicity (n=73, 7.0%), lexical repetition (n=72, 6.9%), language switch (n= 39, 3.8%) and topic fronting (n=30, 2.9%). Teachers often raise their tone and repeat the words together when asking questions to emphasise and make the information salient to the students. As a result, the percentage for both tonicity and lexical repetition were almost similar. In fact, it was also found out in the observation that both CS were jointly used by the teachers in asking questions in order to make

students pay attention to what they are teaching due to the noisy surroundings. The following excerpt best demonstrate such situation.

P42 So,… the point will be in paragraph/ two ok? All right? So, you are to extract the main/…ideas\ from that/ paragraph\. Look/ for the **key/ word/** first\. Cuba cari **kata kunci** ya/. In that ah… sentence. That will determine … that will help\ you to look for the main point. Ok? All right, can you do first? And we'll look at the main point in ah… paragraph two\. [wait-10 seconds] Just/ read\ through and … try to get the main/ point\ in the paragraph. So, I mean the **key/ word/** first\ ok? Then we can ah… draw the main idea from that/ paragraph. *Tahu **kata/ kunci/**? Apa itu **kata/ kunci/**? **Key/ word/**.*

When teaching the students how to extract the main points from the paragraphs the teacher stressed repeatedly on the words "key/ words/" with rising tone. It served as means to maintain the topic as well as to emphasise that finding the key word is the most important criteria to extract the main idea from the paragraph.

P42 Ok. We move on to sequence connectors. [wait-5seconds] *ok, **sequence connectors/** how do we use **sequence connectors/?***

Apart from that, teacher may also repeat and stress on the word in a question as in the excerpt, "sequence connectors/", to serve as a maker of starting a new input.

Prompting

Unlike in the high proficiency classes, teachers prompted the students in low proficiency more instead of accepting or using the students' ideas. Prompting (n=123) was third dominant of all teacher talks in low proficiency classes. This was

78

mainly due to the reluctant of the students to provide responses or the incapability to answer questions of the teachers resulting from their level of proficiency in the language. Hence, teachers often prompt the students to talk to make the classroom interactions more lively and beneficial. Similar to high proficiency classes, tonicity (n=85) was the main CS used in this teacher talk which stood at 8.2% of 1040 total occurrences of CS in low proficiency level. Subsequently, it was followed by lexical repetition (n=29), 1.6% and language switch (n=7), 0.7%. the function of prompting not only open a channel for students to gain information but also to try to interact in the target language though students might only giving a simple one word answer. However, positively, it served as a starting point for them to learn how to use the language rather than passively perceived what language is about. Moving on to use the language, teachers in low proficiency classes would prefer to give directions to the students to read aloud.

Giving directions

Another notable type of teacher talk is giving directions. Instructions were given (n=116) by teachers in low proficiency classes to ask the students to read aloud a short paragraph from passage or asked students to complete tasks of exercises (usually in pair or group work). This indirectly enabled students to notice the use of language to fulfil certain functions. Teachers usually use CS of tonicity (n= 65) in this teacher talk, which was 6.3% with rising tones. Thus it served as significant marker to indicate what was asked by the teachers to the students. However, CS of

that language switch (n=4) was less used in this teacher talk as it only occurred four times, which is 0.4% of the total coded CS. Though it was less used in low proficiency classes but the amount of usage were more than the high proficiency classes. Excerpts below show situations of tonicity and language switch in giving directions.

❖ *Tonicity*

P42 *Get *Alex to read **please**/, *Roger. Yes. Read. ***Susan/** please **read**/.*
[reading aloud]
*not real name

P42 Yes, connectors. They jumble up connect cause we have other … words/ which are call connectors ok? there are others examples of connectors however/, I think we have come across all these words before. All right? *All right, now, look at **page**/ one hundred and nine. Turn to page one hundred and **nine**/ of your text **book/.***

For the first example, the teacher stressed on the imperative language like "please" and "read" when giving directions and the name of the student "Susan" was mentioned to indicate the person who was supposed to follow the direction given. In the second example, the teacher stressed on the information that the students should fulfil like which page number "page/ one hundred and nine/" and where they can find it "book".

❖ *Language switch*

P41 Contoh-contoh activiti pertanian/? Menanam, pertanian. Padi.
S   Getah
P41 What is getah in English?
S   Rubber
P41 Rubber huh rubber. So we have one already/, rubber. What else? ***Namakan lain***. Yes?
S   Sugar cane

P41 So we have seen the passage or read the passage about acid rain. *Now I want*

you to go to your group. Pergi ke kumpulan kamu. Right. **Bincang dan cuba buat latihan ini/**. *Write down the answer on the, right. In the paper or in the paper or what so ever. Go to your own group.*

Language switch was also being used while giving directions as a mean to communicate rather than to teach like in excerpt three and four. Malay language like "*namakan lain*" and "*bincang dan cuba buat latihan*" were used by the teacher to instruct the students in the lesson.

Rhetorical

As mentioned earlier, low proficiency classes tend to be passive and provide less answers or responses to the teacher. Thus, teachers were forced to prompt and ask questions to make the classroom teaching and learning more effective and lively compared to the high proficiency classes. From the observations, teachers asked questions with the intention that the students would provide the answer. Meanwhile prompting was used with the expectation that the students would continue or complete the unfinished sentences. However, there were times where teachers asked questions and answered on their own without the intention that the students will answer. In this situation, the type of teacher talk involved is called as rhetorical or asking rhetorical questions. This teacher talk was not found in FLAC but was added in as it is a kind of conversation generated only by teachers in most of the classroom interactions. Asking rhetorical questions are useful to enhance further understanding of the topic which they are teaching to the students by giving extra information through related self-generated questions. This is sometimes purposely done in classes

where students are passive or bored in normal language learning classrooms. In this study, there were only four types of CS used in this type of teacher talk. Firstly, tonicity (n=25) is the most common in rhetorical (n=55) which is about 2.4 % of the total CS used in teacher talk of low proficiency classes. This is then followed by lexical repetition (n=15, 1.4%), language switch (n=9, 0.9%) and topic fronting (n=6, 0.6%). The excerpts below demonstrated how the teacher ask rhetorical questions and use tonicity within the teacher talk in Malay language "Industrialise? Industrialise? *Ialah kawasan-kawasan / perindustrian*." (industrialised area). The teacher asked and answered the question asked without the intention that the students will answer. The word "*kawasan-kawasan*" (area) was stressed to serve as an explanation towards to word "industrialised".

P41   Paragraph number three. In most of the country, above and developing country/ all right? Dalam negara yang…yang sudah/ dibangunkan/ dan masih… dalam proses membangunkan especially those industrialised. *Industrialise? Industrialise? Ialah **kawasan-kawasan** / perindustrian.* Kawasan di Bandar ada banyak kilang or urbanised area. ***Urbanised/, kawasan sini kawasan/** Bandar.* All right? *For these areas, what happen to them? They are **highly/ polluted/**. Highly polluted? **Diperbanyak dengan/** (helium).* So, rain has become acidic. Hujannya turun/ menjadi asid. Not for the function. Bukan tujuan untuk di/… digunakan.

4.2.3 Comparison between the CS used in teacher talk at both levels

Table 9

Patterns of CS used in teacher talk of both levels of classes

Rank	High proficiency	*f(N)	Low proficiency	*f(N)	Remark
1	Lecturing	300	Lecturing	370	More CS were used in low proficiency classes (Tonicity, lexical repetition, language switch)
2	ask questions	199	ask question	224	
3	Giving directions	169	Prompt	123	
4	Accept/uses ideas of pupils	113	Giving directions	116	CS used more frequent in high proficiency
5	Prompt	85	Accept/uses ideas of pupils	113	
6	Reply Student's questions	25	Rhetorical	55	

*f(N) is the total number of frequency of CS used in the particular type of teacher talk.

Table 3 illustrates the comparison done from the results of both high and low proficiency classes. The types of teacher talk ranked were according to the frequency of CS within the types of teacher talk. As shown in the table, lecturing in high proficiency classes has the highest occurrences of CS (N=300). Meanwhile, teacher talk of reply students' questions has the least occurrences of CS (N=25) used within it in the same level of proficiency.

As noted from the findings, lecturing and asking questions were the most common types of teacher talk in both high and low proficiency classes. However, the total coded CS in lecturing was slightly higher (N=370) in low proficiency classes.

Similarly, the occurrences of CS in asking questions (N=224) in low proficiency classes were higher than high proficiency classes (N=199). Of those coded CS, tonicity, lexical repetition and language switch in particular were used considerably more in low proficiency classes when giving lecture and asking questions by the teachers compared to the high proficiency classes. Two possible interpretations were drawn from these patterns found. Firstly, both teacher talks were ranked the same in both levels. It was possible that lecturing and asking questions were usual classroom interaction for language learning process where teachers start to emphasise on certain important information (e.g. pronunciation, spelling, words, sentence, and concept) using tonicity and lexical repetition. This was to allow their language students to move from the stage of noticing the use of language later to comprehend the meaning of the language and at last be the user of the language themselves. This deductive or bottom-up learning is very crucial in second language learning. (Elis, 1985; Krashen, 1981; Thornbury, 1999)

Looking at the fact that the frequency of CS used in low proficiency classes of the same types of teacher talks, it was perhaps due to the language deficiency of the low proficiency students. Teachers in this proficiency classes need to switch their language more constantly compared to other CS used. In comparison, more language switch has been used by the teachers when giving lecture (n=44) and ask students questions (n=39) in low proficiency classes. In high proficiency classes, language was only switched once (n=1) by the teacher. This happened particularly in low proficiency classes as a compensatory strategy to overcome the students' language

deficiency. Also, to allow students to get the gist of the lesson as much as they can with minimal obstruction, which is the language.

It is obvious that teachers gave directions more regularly in high proficiency classes (n=169) than in low proficiency classes (n=116). As a result, 'giving directions' was ranked as the third commonly used teacher talk in high proficiency classes while forth in the opposite level. This difference would mainly due to the fact that the language mastered by the high proficiency students allowed them to understand the lessons better and thus making the presentation stage of the teacher reduced and fasten. Consequently, a longer time was allocated for these high proficiency students to do their exercises. Therefore, it is explainable that the teachers gave more instructions for the high proficiency students to do their exercises which resulted the use of CS within this teacher talk increased. However, it does not mean teachers do not give directions to the low proficiency students in completing their exercises. Teachers in low proficiency classes spent more time in instructing them to read aloud. It was also prominent that the teachers in low proficiency classes spend more time to polish their language skills in terms of reading and pronunciation.

Similar to the case of giving directions, teachers also accept or use the ideas generated from students more frequently in high proficiency classes than in low proficiency classes. Therefore, this type of teacher talk was ranked a level higher as opposed to the low proficiency classes. It is clear that the number of occurrences of CS in this teacher talk were the same in both levels (n=113). Teachers used the same amount of CS in this teacher talk in both levels which indicated that both levels

participated in the lesson as well as responded to the teachers equally. However, the activeness of students in both proficiency levels could also be determined by the ranking of prompting. It is obvious that prompting in high proficiency was rank as the fifth (n=85) meanwhile for low proficiency it was ranked as the third (n=123). This switch indicates that the students in high proficiency classes were more responsive in terms of providing the teachers answers and responses when the teachers ask them questions. This is perhaps due to the proficiency level of their language which allows them to understand and express their ideas efficiency to the teachers. However, for the low proficiency classes, students tend to be more passive. Hence, this results the teachers to prompt them rather than to ask them questions. Prompting in low proficiency classes eventually serves as a tool for teachers to trigger them to think and to test their understanding from time to time. This also indicates that the low proficiency students' language has been a barrier for them to understand and express what they have in mind contrary with the high proficiency students.

In addition, teachers also ask more rhetorical questions in the low proficiency classes (n=55) than in high proficiency classes (n=12). In low proficiency classes, teacher tended to ask rhetorical questions rather than to answer students' questions (n=25) as in high proficiency class. Again, this indicated the passiveness of low proficiency classes as they need teachers to initiate most of the talk. Knowing very well by the teachers that the low proficiency students were disadvantaged by their language, they resorted to ask questions and answered their own without expecting the students to answer. This was done by the teachers mainly to highlight certain

important definition or concept that they think that the students might not understand. In low proficiency classes, it was possible that the students might shut their mind off easily as a result of their language deficiency. Hence, rhetorical questions asked by the teachers also served as a tool for just them to make the students to pay attention the lessons.

On the other hand, the high proficiency students with a better grasps of the target language were more responsive to ask teachers questions. Consequently, CS used by teachers such as tonicity (n=10) and topic fronting (n=5) were used to make the answer more salient for them. Moreover, the activeness of the high proficiency students sometimes obstructed the execution of the lesson. This was supported by the statistic where teachers use more tonicity (n=27) in criticising and justifying authority compared to change students' behaviour form non-acceptable to acceptable compared to low proficiency classes (n=5).

Besides, there were also some special cases like in the types of teacher talk like seeking confirmation, suggesting, commenting, sum-up, and cynical were only form one lesson which happened to be in high proficiency class. In this lesson, the students were having a discussion where they were asked to continue a story and present it in front of the class. The teacher was supposed to confirm the plot presented by the students as well as comment and suggest a better plot to improve the story. The teacher also acted cynically when students failed to provide the desired responses even though they are given extended time frame.

As a whole, CS like tonicity, lexical repetition, and topic fronting were mostly used by teachers in their teacher talks. This suggested that CS proposed by Clennell (1995) is used more frequent in this context of study compared to the other two, Tarone (1978) and Faerch and Kasper (1980).

4.3 Discussion on the relationship between CS and teacher talk

From the findings, it is proposed that the use of CS by teachers is much related to the students' proficiency level. If the proficiency level of students is high, less CS is needed in the teacher talk to enhance the teaching or the communication with the students. Hence, it is safe to say that the proficiency level of the students would serve as either a tool to assist or a hindrance for students to process the information given by the teachers during the lessons. For example, more tonicity, lexical repetition, and topic fronting were used when the teachers were delivering their lessons especially for the low proficiency classes. This gave two suggestions for the interpretation.

Firstly, according to Clennell (1995), these discourse-based CS were mainly used by speakers as topic maintenance similar to the teachers teaching in low proficiency classes in this study, they used them to maintain their interaction with students. Directly, it mirrors the classroom situation of the low proficiency classes that there were mostly one-way communication where the teachers do the most talking.

Secondly, the use of these CS would probably function as compensation to the students' lack - language. Students in low proficiency classes would have had low concentration level as a result of their low proficiency level in language that shut them off from the input given by the teacher most of the time. Consequently, teachers have to constantly make the topic salient by utilising these CS with the combination of various teacher talks to make them process the information easily. Hence, this explains why teachers do most of the talking in low proficiency classes as in the first interpretation. However, in most cases, CS were used to enhance the teaching of the lessons and make to lessons more effective to the students by making the topic or massage salient to the students to process. Also, translations or code switching were used to enable students to understand a particular concept concretely.

An interesting finding from the study was that almost all the teachers used idiosyncratic expressions like *all right, right?, ok, ok?, ya, ya?*. These also served as another strategies for teachers to maintain conversation, seek confirmation, clarification or sometimes served a marker to start new information. Perhaps these idiosyncratic preferences should also be included as one of the CS as they serve similar function of discourse-based strategies.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Summary

Studies on the investigation and description of CS used to overcome communication problem by learners due to their language deficiency were common particularly in the field of SLA. From the literature reviewed, it is known that the proficiency level of the learners and the employment of CS in their speech were closely related (i.e. Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980; Paribakht, 1985; Tarone, 1977 in Bialystok, 1990). On the other hand, several researchers reported that proficiency level of the learners do affect the way the teacher deliver their lessons (i.e. Gaies, 1979, 1997 in Tsui, 1995; Henzl 1979 in Tsui, 1995; Wesche & Ready, 1983 in Ellis, 1988). From the studies done, they have opened up a new scope for this study to examine how teacher manipulate their teacher talk to compensate the learners' proficiency levels by employing CS to make their teaching comprehensible to them.

In particular, the objectives of this study are:

- identify and compare the types of CS used by the teacher in both high and low proficiency classes.

- determine the relationship between CS used and types of teacher talk in both high and low proficiency classes

Purposeful sampling was chosen to address the objectives above. Subjects chosen were one Form Five and two Form Four teachers of upper-secondary English language from a school in Samarahan Division, Sarawak. They have been teaching English for more than four years as well as teaching in the school for at least two years. In order to compare the CS used in teacher talk consistently at both levels, the teachers were those that teach both high and low proficiency classes of the same form in the school.

Audio observation was chosen as the methodology of this study in order to allow an in-depth illustration on how and why CS used in different types of teacher talk from the audio recordings. Audio recordings were done by the teachers in the absence of the researcher to increase the naturalistic nature of the normal classroom environment. A total of eighteen recordings of classroom discourse were collected. Approximation of nine hours and twenty eight minutes recording from both high and low proficiency classes were transcribed based on Eggins & Slade (1997) key of transcription. In order to analyse the data, types of teacher talks were identified according to Flander's Interaction Analysis Category (FLAC) developed by Bowers

(Nunan, 1989 in McDonough & McDonough, 1997) which is highly recommended by Nunan (1989, in McDonough & McDonough, 1997) and Tarricone and Fetherson (2002) for its systematic coding system to categorise the classroom spontaneous verbal interaction. Then, from the types of teacher talk identified earlier CS were coded based on the taxonomy adapted from Clennell (1995), Faerch and Kasper (1984) and Tarone (1978).

From the findings, several prominent patterns could be found. Firstly, the results indicate that the number of occurrences of CS was predominantly high during lecturing followed by asking questions at both levels. However, in comparison, CS particularly tonicity, lexical repetition and language switch were used in these types of teacher talk more often in low proficiency classes. Consequently, the occurrences of CS used by teachers to lecture and ask questions in low proficiency classes were higher than high proficiency classes. As the nature of language inadequacy in low proficiency classes, these CS indeed served as a tool for the teachers to make information comprehensible to students in their teacher talk by emphasising, making the topic salient, or repeating and explaining the concept to them.

Secondly, teachers often accepted and used the ideas provided by students and answered students' questions in high proficiency classes. On the contrary, teachers have to prompt and ask students rhetorical questions in low proficiency classes. This was mainly due to the language mastery of the high proficiency students. Their language competency allowed them to interpret and understand the information given by the teachers quickly. As a result, they were more active in providing answers and

responses. The teacher does not have to trigger them to think and test their understanding which is what teachers have to do in low proficiency classes.

Furthermore, teachers spent more time giving directions to students to do their exercises in high proficiency classes. However, in low proficiency classes, teachers basically instruct the students to read aloud. Besides, less CS were used in high proficiency classes when the teachers were giving directions. The proficiency level of the students in high proficiency classes indirectly assisted the teachers to deliver their teaching without much explanation, repetition, and code switching within the teacher talk. Hence, it shortened the presentation stage of lessons and more time could be allocated for exercises in high proficiency classes to further enhance their academic skills. In low proficiency classes, more time was spent to help the students to acquire their language skills such as pronunciation, reading and comprehension.

Besides that, CS of restructuring and language switch were significantly different in terms of the usage in both levels. Restructuring was used mostly in high proficiency classes while language switch was used in low proficiency classes by the teacher in their teacher talk. The proficiency in language is an advantage for the high proficiency students to understand what the teacher was trying to deliver when the teachers were restructuring their sentences. Unlike the low proficiency students, the inability to figure out the messages that the teachers were trying to send making the teachers use another strategies which was language switch to explain the same concept by using a shared language which they could probably understand.

In addition to that, teachers compensated for the students' language deficiency by using L1-based CS rather than L2-based. This means that teachers often employed CS based on the students' native language resources in low proficiency classes such as language switch. However, in high proficiency classes, L2-based CS (CS drawn from using the resources of the target language) were used by teacher in their teacher talk such as restructuring to make input comprehensible. Bialystok (1980) claimed that most proficient learners tend to use L2-based CS while in this study a new claim derived from it - teachers tend to use L2-based CS while teaching proficient learners and L1-based CS were used more often in teaching students of lower proficiency.

As a whole, more one-way communication took place in both high and low proficiency classes or ESL classroom as a result of the frequent usage of discourse-based CS as introduced by Clennell (1995) such as tonicity, lexical repetition and topic fronting. However, teachers had a greater tendency to use these CS in low proficiency classes not only to maintain their interactions in classrooms but also to compensate for students' language proficiency. As in the case of high proficiency classes, the same CS used by teachers were mostly to enhance the message delivered.

5.1 Implications of the study

This study supports the claim of previous studies conducted particularly by Bialystok (1980) and Paribakht (1985) that proficiency level does influence the choice of CS used. Unlike the studies done, the subjects of this study were L2 learners but the teachers who were teaching L2. Hence, a new insight initiated by this

study to the field of CS is that the use of CS by teachers was not to overcome their language impairment but to compensate their students' lack, which is the language. In another word, language proficiency of the students affects the way the teachers teach by using different CS within their teacher talk. Nonetheless, there is still a need to further look into this relationship in particular by covering greater number of teachers.

Moreover, ten additional types of teacher talk have been identified and added to the existing Flander's Interaction Analysis Category (FLAC) framework (Nunan, 1989 in McDonough & McDonough, 1997) which has only eight categories of teacher talk. Those newly identified types of teacher talk were: prompting, replies students' questions, preview, rhetorical, guiding, seeking confirmation, suggesting, commenting, sum-up and cynical (refer to Chapter Three). The discovery served as an improvement to enhance the FLAC framework so that it allows a more thorough investigation on the multifaceted teacher talk in ESL classrooms in Malaysia.

Since Clennell's (1995) discourse-based CS were used considerably high in various types of teacher talks as compared to Faerch and Kasper (1984) and Tarone (1978) typology of CS, this study seconded the proposition of Clennell where the reclassification of the traditional CS is a need. This is to allow the discourse-based CS to be included as part of the CS which act as a tool for teachers to maintain their classroom interactions in their lessons. In addition, idiosyncratic preferences should also be added in as they help teachers not only to maintain conversation but to seek confirmation, clarification or as a marker for new incoming information. Besides, this

is important to make spoken language salient to students to process information from the utterances.

On the other hand, in terms of practicality, this study has indeed provided language teachers an insight on the types of teacher talk and CS preferred by students from different proficiency classes which allows language teachers to consider the learning capability of the students in different proficiency levels. One of the common examples from the results of this study is that teachers used to prompt and ask rhetorical questions when dealing with low proficiency students. Due to the students' language deficiency, teachers in low proficiency classes used these types of teacher talk mainly to overcome the students' passive participation in the lesson and to test their understanding from time-to-time. Besides, in order to make information comprehensible for this group of students, teachers often employ CS such as tonicity, lexical repetition and language switch to highlight the important points and to make topic salient for them. Hence, this study is important for language teachers especially novice teachers who have not had much experience to identify the learning needs and expectations of students from different proficiency levels. With the understanding of students' language learning needs, it assists language teachers to maximise the students' potentials in language learning effectively.

In addition, the understanding of students' language learning needs of different proficiency levels through the use of preferred types of CS in teacher talk by teachers is essential for teacher to generate their consciousness while delivering their lessons. Consistent with the self-monitoring theory suggested by Krashen (1981), this

consciousness helps teachers to enhance students' language learning potentials efficiently by constant self-monitoring and self-evaluating.

5.2 Recommendations for future research

From this study, there are some recommendations for future studies in order to contribute to the field of CS besides the field of teacher talk. As teachers tend to ask questions and answer students' questions more while doing revision on literature and give more lecture in teaching comprehension, it is clear that the type of teaching or task has a certain influence on the use of CS and teacher talk in their lessons. Hence, future studies can be done to investigate the influences of types of task on the use of CS in teacher talk. This is to study how the types of task, for example, literature, comprehension, and speaking influence the use of CS by teachers in their teacher talk while delivering their lessons. On the other hand, an investigation can be done on how the teaching of different tasks affects the teacher talk used in the classroom.

Furthermore, taking previous studies done on CS as a guide, more studies are encouraged to identify and classify CS used by teachers of L2 rather than solely improving on the classification of CS from the perspective of L2 learners. It was noticed from the study that teachers used CS not to overcome their communication problems but to encourage or trigger students to provide response desired by the teachers. Thus, more studies should be done from the perspective of a teacher, as to

look into how teachers use types of teacher talk and CS to deliver their message effectively in class.

In addition to that, it is also possible to conduct a research to study the CS used by teachers during classroom interactions and interactions among colleagues. As the mode has switched from formal to informal and from authoritative to neutral, perhaps it would affect the use of CS in their conversations.

5.3 Conclusion

Previous studies have shown that CS were used either consciously or unconsciously by speakers to overcome their communication problems particularly among L2 learners (Clennell, 1995; Faerch & Kasper, 1980; Tarone, 1978). Some of the research studies investigated the factors that influenced the use or choice of CS in their spoken language, which included proficiency level. Undeniably, proficiency level is one of the influential factors in the usage of CS as a compensatory strategy for overcoming the communication problem (Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980; Paribakht, 1985; Tarone, 1977 in Bialystok, 1990). On the other hand, studies done by Gaies (1979,1997 in Tsui, 1995), Henzl (1979 in Tsui, 1995), and Weshche and Ready (1983 Ellis, 1988) have proven that teacher talk also served as the functional adjustment and it is greatly depending on the level of student that they are teaching.

In this study, CS used by the teachers is greatly influenced by the proficiency level of the students as a means to compensate the students' language deficiency. Teachers often manoeuvred their different types of teacher talk with the assistance of

CS to compensate for students' proficiency level in order them to get the gist of the lesson. Consequently, the usage of CS - tonicity, lexical repetition and language switch were comparatively high in most types of teacher talk as strategies for them to emphasise, make important information delivered salient to the students who were disadvantaged by their language particularly. Adding to the previous studies, it was noted from this study that CS used by teachers was not only to overcome their communication problem while teaching but they also to help students to get the desired answers or concepts that the teacher intended them to pursue.

Hence, by bridging these pervious studies, the present study further strengthen the role of proficiency level in influencing the choice of CS, not only from a different perspective (CS used by teachers) but also by looking at CS as a tool to facilitate language teaching rather than compensating the teachers' language deficiency.

REFERENCES

Bialystok, E, & Frohlich, M. (1980). Oral communication strategies for lexical difficulties. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 5, 3-30.

Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication strategies: A psychological analysis of second-language use*. UK: Basil Blackwell.

Brabara, A. L. (2004). The effect of the context of learning on the use of communication strategies by learners of Spanish as a second language. In J. Collentine & B. F. Freed (Eds.), *Studies in second language acquisition: Learning context and its effects on second language acquisition* (pp. 201 - 218). USA: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approach to second language teaching and learning. *Applied linguistics, 1(1),* 1-47.

Clennell, C. (1995). Communication strategies of adult ESL learners: A discourse perspective. *Prospect*, *10*(3), 4-20.

Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher talk and the classroom context. *ELT Journal 53*(3), 179-187.

Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1991). Strategic competence and how to teach it. *ELT Journal*, *45*(1), 16-22.

Doyle, P. G., Goh, C.C.M., & Zhang, L.J. (2004). *Language education concepts. A guide for English language teachers.* Singapore: Longman.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Ellis, R. (1988). *Classroom second language development*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Eggins, S., & Slade, D. (1997). *Analysing casual conversation*. London: CASSELL.

Faerch. C., & Kasper, G. (1984). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. New York: Longman group limited.

Flyman, A. (1997). Communication strategies in French as a foreign language. *Working Papers 46*, 57-73

Gay, L. R. (1992). Educational research. *Competencies for analysis and applications*.(7th ed.) (pp. 196-208). USA: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Littlewood, W. (1984). *Foreign and second language learning: Language acquisition research and its implications for the classroom*. USA: Cambridge University Press.

Massachusetts Department of Education (n.d.). *Foreign language curriculum framework: Communication Strand*. Retrieved March 17, 2006, from http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/foreign/1999/comstrand.html

McDonough, J., & Mcdonough, S. (1997). *Research methods for English language teachers*. Great British: Arnold.

Merriam, B. S. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers,

Nunan, D. (1989) *Understanding Language Classroom.* UK: Prentice Hall.

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

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL*, *10*, 209-231.

Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage. *Language learning*, *30*, 417-431.

Tarone, E. (1981). Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. *TESOL Quaterly*, *15*(3), 285-290.

Tarricone, P., & Fetherson, T. (2002). *Teachers and the temporal*. Retrieved 28 August, 2006, from http://www.aare.edu.au/02pap/tar02064.htm.

Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to teach grammar*. Edinburgh Gate: Longman.

Váradi, T. (1980). Strategies of target language learner communication: message-adjustment. *IRAL*, *18*(1), 59-72.

Wongsawang, P. (2001). Culture-specific notions in L2 communication strategies. *Second Language Studies*, *19*(2), 111-135.

Wiersma, A. (1991). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and
     Bacon.

Tsui, A. B. M. (1995). *Introducing classroom interaction*. England: Penguin Group.

APPENDIX

Sample Coded Transcript

T   **[**Ok class, look at this <u>sentence/</u> (tonicity) , please read this sentence <u>together/</u> (tonicity)**]** **giving directions**

S   [Reading aloud]

T   **[**Ok ok. <u>One/</u> (tonicity) <u>word/</u> (tonicity) missing in that sentence.**] lecturing**

S   But but

S2   However/

S3   But

T   **[**How can <u>this/</u> (tonicity) <u>to ah… = = make it better</u> (restructuring)?**] asking questions**

S   = = but/ but/ but

S2   However however

S3   But

T   **[**All right listen to … *Richard. What's the answer? <u>*Richard</u> (topic fronting), what is your answer?**] giving directions**

S   But but

T   **[**Ya? But?**] accepts feeling [**<u>Is that correct but</u> (topic fronting), they have to get into two month?**] asking questions** [filling in the connector into the sentence read before]

S   However however

T   **[**Yes, that's right.**] accepts feeling [**just repeat please.**] giving directions**

S   [reading aloud]

T   **[**Yes.**] accept feeling [**<u>How/…ever/,</u> (tonicity)using however**] accepts and uses ideas of pupils** = = **[**why use the word however?**] asking questions**

S   = = [student claps]

S   Because

S2   Opposite

T   **[**Ya?... Opposite   or   (<u>your/   (tonicity)…   contrast/</u>(tonicity)   )(restructuring)   ya (<u>contrast\</u>(tonicity)) (lexical repetition)**] accepts and uses ideas of pupils [**So thus what we called <u>as/</u> (tonicity)…**] prompting**

S   Co/nector

T   **[**Connector ok. <u>Connector</u> (lexical repetition).**] accepts and uses ideas of pupils [**All right, turn to page one zero nine. <u>One hundred and nine</u> (topic fronting), <u>connectors</u> (lexical repetition) <u>connectors</u> (lexical repetition) at that page.**] giving directions [**What are connectors? **] asking questions**

S   To link in order

T   [Right. that's right,**] accepts feeling [**the definition,**] accepts and uses ideas of pupils [**thank you.**] praises or encourages [**<u>connectors/</u> (tonicity, topic fronting) are <u>words/</u> (tonicity) and phrases that <u>link/</u> (tonicity) ideas together in a logical <u>or/der</u> (tonicity).**] lecturing [**The key word use that <u>is/</u> (tonicity)**] prompting**

S   Together

T   **[**Link…. What is link? Another words for = = link, sorry?**] asking questions**

S   = = join

S2 Combine

T [Combine. Join. Join.(lexical repetition) Join (lexical repetition).] **accepts feeling** [What else? Another word?] **asking questions**

S Connect

T [Connect yes.] **accepts feeling** [So, (connectors are words/ (tonicity) and phrases that link/ tonicity) ideas together in … a logical order) (lexical repetition) in another word, link. (In another word (lexical repetition) in another word (lexical repetition) for that) (topic fronting), link/ (tonicity)is join] **lecturing**

S Join

S2 Connect

T [Connect ok.] **accepts feeling** [That we use to reflect link/ (tonicity)… idea/ (tonicity) together (idea/ (tonicity) together)(lexical repetition) in a logical order. Here, things that more than one/ (tonicity) (more than one/ (tonicity)) (lexical repetition) being link together, ok? We are going to look on the two types of two types of (lexical repetition)connectors (lexical repetition) here. Right. The first one is logical. Logical connectors/ (tonicity, lexical repetition).] **lecturing** [What is lo logical connectors use for?] **asking questions**

S Connect the sentence before and after to form ah= =

T [= =all right that you read that… *Swee, can you read there, the description there/ (tonicity)… logical connectors/ (tonicity).] **giving directions**

S [reading aloud]

T [Yes.] **accepts feeling** [All right, ah… logical connectors logical connectors (lexical repetition) are use to connect ideas to form a logical order, all right?] **lecturing** [students making noises] [teacher knocking the table] [ok, start ha… ok.] **giving directions** [Logical connectors are use to connect ideas to form logical order.(lexical repetition)] **lecturing** [What is logical order?] **asking questions**

S Logic

T [Logic, (topic fronting) [look at the word logic,] **giving directions** what does that means?] **asking questions**

S Logic

S2 Logic

T [Another word (lexical repetition) for logic? Or logical?] **asking questions**

S Logic sentence lah

T [Logical means (topic fronting)…sensible…or/ (tonicity)] **prompting**

S Must have reason

T [Yes.] **accepts feelings** [Logical logical (lexical repetition) is… sensible or reasonable.] **accepts and uses ideas of pupils** [The (difference between) logic and logical. All right?] **lecturing** [what is logical? Logical is an adjective. Adjective.(lexical repetition) All right?] **rhetorical**

S Right teacher

T [So, logical connectors are use to connect ideas involve a logical order.(lexical repetition) All right. we have three purposes that/ (tonicity)… three purposes (lexical repetition) of/ (tonicity)

logical connectors.(lexical repetition) <u>Three purposes.</u> (lexical repetition)**] lecturing [**<u>The first one/ (tonicity)</u>,(topic fronting) what is it?**] asking questions [***<u>Ying</u>, (topic fronting) what is the first purpose?] giving directions [**(<u>The first purpose of/</u>(tonicity))(lexical repetition) … <u>logical connectors</u> (lexical repetition)? To link… in for mation.**] rhetorical [**The word/…key word there <u>is/</u> (tonicity)…**] prompting**

S   Information

S   Add

T   **[Add.] accept feelings [** Just to add information, you learn about ah…addition, in mathematic right? add. <u>To add information.</u>(lexical repetition)**] accepts and uses ideas of pupils [**So the first <u>logical connectors</u> (lexical repetition) for these (<u>is the is the (lexical repetition) for example in addition</u>) (message abandon) , what else?**] asking questions**

S   To show connect

T   **[What else? *Chai, what else? What have in addition = = yes?] giving directions**

S   = = (inaudible)

T   **[Heart beat.] accepts feeling [**An example of (<u>logical connectors\</u> (tonicity))(lexical repetition)?**] asking questions**

S   Eh… example /shi ma/ (oh, example)

T   **[**<u>For this purpose</u>,(topic fronting) to add information.**] lecturing**

S   (inaudible)

T   **[**I'm asking about the kind <u>of/</u> (tonicity) connectors…for this purpose, yes?**] criticising and justifying authority**

S   Moreover, but, but, in addition [students give out answers simultaneously]

S2 Moreover

T   **[Yes.] accepts feeling [**That's it. In <u>addition/</u> (tonicity), <u>besides/</u> (tonicity), <u>furthermore/</u> (tonicity), <u>also/</u> (tonicity), <u>as well as/</u> (tonicity), and, <u>moreover/</u> (tonicity), <u>plus/</u> (tonicity), last one in fact. Those <u>are/</u> (tonicity) examples right for ah … this purpose, <u>to add … information</u> (lexical repetition) ok? There are some examples of sentence <u>there/</u> (tonicity), all right?... **[**ok, we move on to the next <u>one/</u> (tonicity) the next purpose.**] giving directions** <u>To show/ to show/ contrast</u> (tonicity, lexical repetition) ok? <u>To show contrast.</u>(lexical repetition**] lecturing**
    [*Addy/, *Addy what is the next purpose? *Rachael *Racheal *Racheal Wang. To show what?**] giving directions**

S   Contrast teacher

T   **[Yeah.] accepts feeling [** <u>To show contrast.</u>(lexical repetition)**] accepts and uses ideas of pupils [** So what is contrast? Ah?**] asking questions**

S   Ah….[lost of words]

T   **[**<u>A different</u> (offering help)**] replies students' questions**

S   Ah…[to agree with the synonym given]

T   **[**To show <u>a different.</u>(lexical repetition) We place two things for example. Ok? To show contrast. (a vast different to a different).**] lecturing** [wait-4 seconds] **[**all right, what are the examples of <u>logical connectors</u> (lexical repetition) here?**] asking questions [***Susan.**] giving directions**

S   However

T   **[Louder] giving directions**

S   On the other hand

T   [On the other hand] **accepts feeling**

S   (inaudible)

T   [Despite.] **accepts feeling** [Ok, those are <u>logical connectors</u> (lexical repetition) to <u>show/</u> (tonicity) contrast. All right, <u>next one..</u>(topic fronting) the … the third <u>purpose/</u> (tonicity) (<u>the third purpose/(tonicity)</u>)(lexical repetition) <u>to show/ to show/</u> (lexical repetition, tonicity) cause or result <u>of/</u> (tonicity) something.] **lecturing** [wait-5 seconds]

S   Ah… mmm. [Student yawning laudly]

T   [Pay attention, *Eric. Right, please <u>pay attention</u> (lexical repetition) other wise you are going to miss im… important information <u>that/</u> (tonicity) I'm going to tell you for this.] **criticising and justifying authority** [Ok, the the third purpose is <u>to show/</u> (tonicity, lexical repetition) cause or… <u>the/</u>(tonicity)… result.] **lecturing**

S   Result

T   [Of something <u>to show</u> (lexical repetition) cause or the result of <u>something/</u> (tonicity) for this ah… you have ah… <u>logical connectors</u> (lexical repetition) to be <u>use/</u> (tonicity) for <u>example/</u> (tonicity) <u>therefore/</u>, <u>thus/</u>, <u>because/</u> (tonicity), or this, <u>consequently/</u>, <u>other wise/</u>, <u>as a result/</u>(tonicity), right, those are of the examples of the <u>cause or result</u> (lexical repetition) <u>logical connectors</u> (lexical repetition).] **lecturing** [Next/ one, we go… move on to ar next] **giving directions** [wait-10seconds]. [<u>Sequence</u>. (topic fronting) What you understand by sequence?] **asking questions**

S   Arrange in sequence.

T   [Arrange in <u>sequence/</u> (tonicity) order or arrange in correct correct … order.] **accepts and uses ideas of pupils** [Correct sequence. Sequence connectors are use to <u>connect/</u> (tonicity) ideas to that they … go… in… a conservative sequence. So they <u>use to connect ideas</u> (lexical repetition), join ideas so that they go in a … sequence <u>in a/</u>(tonicity) sequence (lexical repetition). Sorry in a <u>conservative sequence</u>(lexical repetition).] **lecturing** All right? [for <u>example/</u> (tonocity)…] **prompting**

S   (inaudible)

T   [In a very (inaudible) procedure, we <u>need/</u> (tonicity)words like what = =] **asking questions**

S   = =First, second, next

T   First

S   Second, next

T   [Second, next, finally , all right.] **accepts feelings** [Those are some of the words that you can use all right the exam… the purpose here, to show relationship or action, events or ideas <u>in/</u>(tonicity)… time. ok, show relationship. <u>Show relationship or action, events or ideas in time</u>(lexical repetition).] **lecturing** [Can you read examples of connectors here? *Eric, please read loudly. <u>*Eric/</u> (tonicity), can you read the examples of those connectors/ for this purpose?] **giving directions**

S   [reading aloud]

T   [Right thank you.] **praises or encourages** [so, <u>we have … example that, meanwhile, afterward, then , secondly, third or thirdly, finally, in conclusion, sum up ok</u> (topic fronting) all these are use to show/ show/ what?] **asking questions** [<u>Show/</u>(tonicity)] **prompting**

S   Relationship

S2   Sum up [asking the meaning of the word]

T   [Yeah relationship… sum up/ here (<u>at… to conclude/</u>(tonicity))(restructuring) for example.

Ok?**] accepts and uses ideas of pupils [**To conclude. <u>To show relationship events or action in time or ideas in time</u>(lexical repetition). ah… <u>the topic we have one more</u>(restructuring), purpose <u>there/</u>(tonicity)… <u>to show /</u>(tonicity, lexical repletion) organisation and presentation of a … a writer's <u>or/</u>(tonicity) a <u>speaker's /</u>(tonicity) idea.**] lecturing [**What do you understand by organisation?... and presentation? [<u>Organisation/</u> (tonicity) come from the <u>word/</u>(tonicity) organise.**]lecturing** What do you understand by <u>organise</u>? <u>Organise</u>? (lexical repetition)**] asking questions**

S   Arrange

T   **[**Ok, arrange.**]accepts feeling [**For example, arrange all right? … <u>ter/ teratur</u>(tonicity) organise… ok?**] accepts and uses ideas of pupils [**So that is the word right first, second, third. You can see<u> examples/</u>(tonicity) by itself ok**] lecturing**. **[**Any questions? Any questions? Any questions?**] asking questions**

S   No

T   **[**<u>No\</u>(.tonicity)**] accepts feeling [**You understand <u>now/</u>(tonicity) what is meant <u>by/</u>(tonicity)… connectors?**] asking questions**

S   Yes

T   **[**<u>Yes/ </u>(tonicity)**] accepts feeling [**how many types? You have two majors?**] asking questions**

S   Two types.

T   **[**Two <u>types/</u>(tonicity) ok.**] accepts feeling [**All right the first <u>one/</u>(tonicity)**] prompting**

S   Logical connectors

T   **[**Yes.**] accepts feeling [**The second <u>one/</u>(tonicity)**] prompting**

S   Sequence connectors

T   **[**Yes.**] accepts feelings [**<u>Sequence connectors</u>(lexical repetition) and ah… examples for each yeah ok? So next <u>ah for mak ah making for each /</u>(tonicity) <u>we do page </u>(message abandon) one hundred and ten.**] lecturing** [wait-5 seconds] **[**look at… inside ah… page <u>one hundred and ten</u>(lexical repetition). One one O. we try ah… the first two questions <u>together/</u>(lexical repetition) we try ah the first two questions <u>together\</u>(lexical repetition, tonicity). **] giving directions**

S   Do for you

T   [wait-5seconds] **[**ok you read through first and try to look for the answers. Try to read <u>first/</u>(tonicity).**] giving directions** [wait-10 seconds] **[**ok? Have you got the answers? **] asking questions**

S   (inaudible)

T   (inaudible), **[**please read the first <u>one/</u>(tonicity)**] giving directions**

S   The the first part ah?

T   **[**Yes.**] replies students' questions [**<u>The the first question</u>(topic fronting), what is the answer?**] asking questions**

S   (reading aloud)

T   **[**Is that correct?**] asking questions**

S   Yes

T   **[**Yes.**] accepts feeling [**Very good.**] praises or encourages** (inaudible) **[**ask Rosnah to sell off the house because he was transferred to <u>another/</u>(tonicity)…**] prompting**

S   Town.

T   **[**Town. Ok. That is <u>correct/</u>(tonicity).**]accepts feeling [**Next, {<u>number/</u>(tonicity) two, question

(number <u>two/</u>(tonicity))(lexical repetition)}(topic fronting) quickly, read.**] giving directions** [wait-10secodns] **[**write down the answers yeah. Yes, (So Li), number <u>two/</u>(tonicity)**] giving directions**

S   (Reading aloud)

T   **[**He <u>tried/</u>(tonicity)**]guiding**

S   He tried (continue reading aloud)

T   **[**He helps Mrs (Phee) **] guiding**

S   He helps Mrs (Phee) (continue reading aloud)

T   **[**Her work**]guiding**

S   Her work (continue reading aloud)

T   **[**Yes right. **] accepts feeling [**besides of (work), Mrs (Phee) neglect her <u>work/</u>(tonicity)**] prompting**

S   Consequently

T   **[**<u>Consequently\</u>(tonicity)**] accepts feeling**. **[**He was fired.**] accepts or uses ideas of pupils** **[**This <u>is/</u> (tonicity) <u>to show/</u>(tonicity, lexical repetition) what?**] asking questions [**<u>To show/</u>(tonicity, lexical repetition)**] prompting**

S   Result

T   **[**Result. .**] accepts feeling [**On… sequently**] accepts or uses ideas of pupils**   **[**All right. you can write the rest for me and pass in ya… (inaudible) with the right <u>with the right</u> (lexical repetition) word … write down the correct answer right? [wait-20seconds] Do…that… now. **] giving directions**

S   All right.

T   [wait-35seconds]

*recording ends here