An Examination of the Use of Oral Communication Strategies by Second-Year University Undergraduate Students in Intensive Speaking Class

Gigih Widy Merbawani[1*], Didik Hartono [2]

Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia[1]
Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia[2]
Email: gigih.20027@mhs.unesa.ac.id[1]

ABSTRACT

For many university-level EFL students, speaking in a second language can be quite a challenge. It often involves grappling with the complexities of the L2 language. To help tackle these hurdles and boost students' speaking confidence, Oral Communication Strategies can be quite beneficial. In this research, we used a mixed-method approach, which included surveys via questionnaires and in-depth interviews. We received responses from 110 completed questionnaires and gained further data by interviewing 10 students. The findings revealed that students tend to rely on Oral Communication Strategies when they face difficulties in communicating in a second language. They often resort to such strategies, such as using gestures, facial expressions, miming, or sound imitation, especially when they struggle to explain a vocabulary item. These results are anticipated to be a valuable resource for educators and practitioners, assisting them in tailoring the curriculum and providing a more enriching learning experience for students learning a second language. The study's findings can help language learners and educators in higher education by using oral communication strategies to create effective learning environments for improved communication.

Keywords: *communicative competence; intensive speaking; oral communication strategies; speaking; students perception*

INTRODUCTION

Language is essential for communication as it allows people to convey their thoughts, emotions, and ideas. According to Chomsky (2007), language is also a means of expressing thoughts. With over 6,000 to 7,000 languages spoken worldwide (Lewis, 2009), language varies based on culture, country, and civilization, which can create communication barriers and lead to failure due to linguistic constraints (Byram, 1997; Gerard, 1987).

Some countries differentiate between English as a foreign language (FL) and English as a second language (ESL) (L2). English usage has been classified based on its intended application, including education, commerce, and tourism (Hülmbauer et al., 2008). Qian (2020) and Fantini (2019) agreed on statement that suggested the use of language as a medium in some important sectors of education, whereas English as a Foreign Language is described as the principal language of advanced study, but it is limited as a medium of instruction and as a major instructional language. According to Syamsudin (2015) English was designated as a Foreign Language in Indonesia.

Oral communication strategies are systematic approaches that a speaker uses to convey their ideas when faced with language barriers and communication difficulties. EFL learners have also employed oral communication strategies to communicate with others and achieve specific goals during conversations (Chairat, 2017).

The term 'communication strategies' in L2 contexts was first introduced by Selinker in the 1970s. It gained attention in the late 1970s and early 1980s as a psycholinguistic approach to problem-solving in interlanguage errors. The strategies were defined as mechanisms to compensate for non-native speakers' linguistic deficiencies when communicating with native speakers.

In the past, such as Zhao (2013), Dornyei (1997), Nakatani (2006) have attempted to categorize oral communication styles. However, the conceptual differences among communication strategy researchers have led to a wide range of communication strategy classifications. Dornyei's (1997) communication methods are one of them.

Table 1. Dornyei's Taxonomy of Oral Communication Strategies (1997)

No	Types of Communication Strategies	Description
1.	Message Abandonment	Leaving a message unfinished because of language difficulties.
2.	Topic Avoidance	Avoiding topic areas or concepts that pose language difficulties.
3.	Circumlocution	Describing or exemplifying the target object or action (e.g., *the thing you open bottles with* for *corkscrew*).
4.	Approximation	Use an alternative term that expresses the meaning of the target lexical item as closely as

5.	Use of All-Purpose Words	possible (e.g., ship for sail boat). Extending a general, empty lexical item to contexts where specific words are lacking (e.g., the overuse of *thing, stuff, make, do,* as well as using words like *thingie,* what-do-you-call-it).
6.	Word Coinage	Creating a non-existing L2 word based on a supposed rule (e.g. vegetarianist for vegetarian, paintist for painter).
7.	Use of Non-Linguistic Means	Mime, gesture, facial expression, or sound imitation.
8.	Literal translation	Translating literally a lexical item, an idiom, a compound word or structure from LI to L2.
9.	Foreignizing	Using a LI word by adjusting it to L2 phonologically (i.e., with a L2 pronunciation) and/or morphologically (e.g., adding to it a L2 suffix).
10.	Code Switching	Using a LI word with LI pronunciation in L2.
11.	Appeal for Help	Turning to the conversation partner for help either directly (e.g. What do you call. . . ?) or indirectly (e.g., rising intonation, pause, eye contact, puzzled expression).
12.	Use of Fillers/Hesitation Devices	Using filling words or gambits to fill pauses and to gain time to think (e.g., *well, now let me see, as a matter of fact*).

Having a different perspective from Dornyei's (1997), classification of communication strategies by Nakatani (2006) demonstrated a different perspective on communication strategy classification. He created the Oral Communication Strategy Inventory as a communication strategy inventory (OCSI). He divided communication methods into two categories: communication strategies for dealing with speaking issues and communication strategies for dealing with listening issues.

Table 2. Communication Strategies by Nakatani (2006)

Communication Strategies Classification	
Categories	**Communication strategies**
Strategies for Coping with Speaking Problems	1. Social Affective
	2. Fluency-oriented
	3. Negotiation for meaning while Speaking
	4. Accuracy-Oriented
	5. Message Reduction and Alteration
	6. Nonverbal Strategies while Speaking
	7. Message Abandonment
	8. Attempt to think in L2
Strategies for Coping with Listening Problems	9. Negotiation for Meaning while Listening
	10. Fluency-Maintaining
	11. Scanning
	12. Getting the Gist
	13. Nonverbal Strategies while Listening
	14. Less Active Listener
	15. Word-Oriented

Learners need to acquire certain knowledge to communicate effectively.

According to Syamsudin (2015), language learners should comprehend three elements of information: 1) Grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation rules - This means using the right words in the right context and pronouncing them correctly. 2) Transaction and interaction function - Learners should understand that clear communication is essential for effective conversation. 3) Knowledge of culture and social norms - This includes understanding the rate of speech, turn-taking, the roles of participants, and the length of pauses between speakers. Additionally, learners must be able to anticipate who is speaking to whom, when they are speaking, what they are talking about, and why they are speaking (Savignon, 2017).

Learners may face a particular problem while learning the target language. According to Byram (1997), language learners are frequently inadequate in recalling words to understand a topic, and therefore communication fails to develop. As a result, the adoption of Oral Communication Strategies is required to assist language learners in improving their speaking skills. Furthermore, Gerard (1987) investigated certain aspects that influenced language learners' choices of Oral Communication Strategies. Based on the study's backdrop, the following research questions are formulated:

1) What are the Oral Communication Strategies utilized by second-year English major students during Intensive speaking classes,
2) What are the leading strategies employed by second-year English major students during Intensive speaking classes
3) What factors influence the oral communication strategies employed by second-year English major students during intensive speaking classes

METHOD

To address the research questions, the researcher has outlined different approaches and research designs that may be suitable. The current study utilizes a Mixed Methods approach. The prevailing issue identified among students is their tendency to make several mistakes, which creates barriers to communication. Therefore, the researcher aims to identify communication strategies employed by students to overcome these barriers. Additionally, to pinpoint the underlying problem, the researcher has decided to administer a questionnaire and conduct interviews to inquire about students' communication styles. 110 second-year undergraduate students majoring in English Education took part in the study. The participants were chosen from both high-achieving and low-achieving classes to assess their tendencies to make mistakes.

The research involved second-year English major students enrolled in Intensive Speaking programs at an

Indonesian Public University. There were about 110 learners, divided into four intensive speaking classes, each with 28 students. To evaluate the Oral Communication Strategies (OCS) used by the students, the researcher used questionnaires adapted from Hua et al. (2012). Hua et al. used the same questionnaire in a previous study. The questionnaire included five choices for students to indicate how often they used OCS during communication in a foreign language: (a) Always, (b) Often, (c) Sometimes, (d) Seldom, and (e) Never. In addition to the questionnaires, interviews were conducted to gain insight into the reasons behind the use of OCS in the intensive speaking classes.

The questionnaire was found to yield accurate results. The researcher chose to adapt the questionnaire because it covers all 12 categories of OCS classification according to Dornyei's taxonomy. The other instrument used was interviews. The researcher followed the steps and interview guidelines outlined by Boyce and Neale (2006) for conducting these in-depth interviews. To collect data, the purposeful sampling technique was used, following the interview guidelines outlined by Boyce & Neale (2006). The study results are based on two approaches, the questionnaires' result are analyzed using SPSS, and the interview results are gathered and analyzed based on Dornyei's classification of oral communication strategies (1995).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
RQ1; Oral Communication Strategies Used by Students

The questionnaire divides the aspects of oral communication methods into two categories: avoidance/reduction strategies and achievement/compensatory strategies. Compensatory techniques are further subdivided into two sub-dimensions: interlingual strategies (strategies involving transfer from L1 to L2) and intralingual strategies (strategies that involve only L2). The findings were categorised by the researcher depending on each sub-dimension.

Avoidance

The questionnaire includes two items in the sub-dimension of Avoidance. In question 1 '*You begin to explain about a topic but are unable to continue and leave a message unfinished due to linguistic issues,*' students chose 19.4 percent of never, 14.8 percent of seldom, 30.8 percent of sometimes, 31.5 percent of often, and 3.7 percent of always, according to able 3.

Table 3. Massage Abandonment Strategy

Q1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	21	19,4	19,4	19,4
	Seldom	16	14,8	14,8	34,3
	Sometimes	33	30,6	30,6	64,8
	Often	34	31,5	31,5	96,3
	Always	4	3,7	3,7	100,0
	Total	108	100,0	100,0	

Table 4 depicts students' perceptions of utilizing communication strategies in

response to question number 2: '*You avoid talking about topic areas or concepts that pose language issues.*' The outcome is 4.6 percent never, 28.7 percent seldom, 48.1 percent sometimes, 15.7 percent often, and 2.8 percent always.

Table 4. Topic Avoidance Strategy

Q2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	5	4,6	4,6	4,6
	Seldom	31	28,7	28,7	33,3
	Sometimes	52	48,1	48,1	81,5
	Often	17	15,7	15,7	97,2
	Always	3	2,8	2,8	100,0
	Total	108	100,0	100,0	

The use of oral communication strategies is strongly connected to students' English proficiency. Previous studies have outlined various reasons why students employ these strategies. Ahmed & Pawar (2018) discovered that high-ability EFL students often use effective strategies such as paraphrasing and seeking help, while low-ability students tend to avoid the topic or switch to their mother tongue when encountering communication barriers. The study also notes that students' lack of exposure and training hampers the effective use of communication strategies.

In a study by Rohani (2021), it was observed that students with higher proficiency in a foreign language tend to use social affective strategies in oral communication. This study involved 110 students in the Business Administration Department of the State Polytechnic of Malang, Indonesia. The findings also suggest that teachers can utilize this information to create more opportunities for students to enhance their foreign language communication strategies.

Meigouni & Shirkhani (2020) explained in their study that when it comes to using oral communication strategies and their relationship with learners' self-efficacy beliefs and anxiety levels, students tend to avoid abandoning their message. The study revealed that when dealing with speaking problems, students mainly focus on accuracy, and abandoning the message is their least frequently used strategy in such situations. This low frequency of "message abandonment" shows that learners are willing to do their best to express themselves.

The comparative studies also highlight the results of the present studies, showing that most language learners view these strategies as the least used. This is evident from Table 15, where "Massage abandonment strategies" have a mean of 2.85, and "topic avoidance strategies" has 2.83. Furthermore, these results highlight that avoidance strategies are barely used by the students.

Interlingual strategies

The questionnaire includes three items from the subdimension of interlingual techniques. The third question, '*You described or exemplified the object or action instead of utilizing the proper target language item or structure,*' yielded the following results: 0.9 percent never, 20.4 percent seldom, 39.8 percent sometimes,

30.6 percent often, and 8.3 percent always. Table 5 shows the computation.

Table 5. Circumlocution Strategy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	1	,9	,9	,9
	Seldom	22	20,4	20,4	21,3
	Sometimes	43	39,8	39,8	61,1
	Often	33	30,6	30,6	91,7
	Always	9	8,3	8,3	100,0
	Total	108	100,0	100,0	

Q3

Question 4 is also classed as an interlingual strategy. According to Table 6, students perceive the question '*You make up a non-existing target language word that shares enough semantic features in common with the desired lexical item (e.g. ship for a sailboat)*' as 12.0 percent never, 24.1 percent seldom, 28.7 percent sometimes, 33.3 percent often, and 1.9 percent always.

Table 6. Approximation Strategy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	13	12,0	12,0	12,0
	Seldom	26	24,1	24,1	36,1
	Sometimes	31	28,7	28,7	64,8
	Often	36	33,3	33,3	98,1
	Always	2	1,9	1,9	100,0
	Total	108	100,0	100,0	

Q4

Table 7 displays the results of students' perceptions in question number 5, or the last question in the Interlingual techniques category, '*You use a general or empty lexical item to fill gaps in vocabulary command (e.g. the over use of thing, make, do)*'. In a total of 108 students, 11.1 percent choose seldom, 42.6 choose sometimes, 35.2 choose often, 11.1 choose always, and none of the students choose never.

Table 7. Use of All-Purpose Words Strategy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Seldom	12	11,1	11,1	11,1
	Sometimes	46	42,6	42,6	53,7
	Often	38	35,2	35,2	88,9
	Always	12	11,1	11,1	100,0
	Total	108	100,0	100,0	

Q5

Oral communication studies have significant correlations with the issues language learners commonly encounter when communicating in the target language. Dörnyei and Scott (1995) categorized linguistic problems in L2 interactions into four main categories: *resource deficits*, *processing time pressure*, *own-performance problems*, and *other performance problems*. *Resource deficits* refer to problems caused by a deficiency in L2 linguistic knowledge, such as limited vocabulary and inappropriate pronunciation.

Processing time pressure includes difficulties in planning and producing grammatically correct utterances in real-life communication. *Own-performance problems* occur during speaking and monitoring speech, often due to a lack of vocabulary or uncertainty about correctness. *Other performance problems* stem from comprehension difficulties caused by the interlocutor's speech, such as a lack of vocabulary or contextual knowledge. The classification system categorizes

communication problems in L2 into self-expression and comprehension issues.

The use of oral communication strategies in the Intralingual sub-dimension is closely correlated with how language learners tackle language barriers within these four problems, reflecting the underlying difficulties and challenges faced by students.

Intralingual strategies

The questionnaire's third sub-dimension is intralingual strategies. This sub-dimension is derived from the achievement/compensatory tactics dimension. The things discussed in intralingual methods are communication strategies that solely use L2.

This sub-dimension consists of questions 6 through 12. Table 8 depicts students' perceptions of question 6: '*You create up a non-existing target language word based on a supposition (e.g. vegetarians for vegetarian).*' According to the data, 15.7 percent of students choose never, 17.6 percent choose seldom, 25.9 percent choose sometimes, 31.5 percent choose often, and 9.3 percent choose always.

Table 8. Word Coinage Strategy

Q6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	17	15,7	15,7	15,7
	Seldom	19	17,6	17,6	33,3
	Sometimes	28	25,9	25,9	59,3
	Often	34	31,5	31,5	90,7
	Always	10	9,3	9,3	100,0
	Total	108	100,0	100,0	

Question 7 is also included in the intralingual strategies subdimension. This method is illustrated by the question '*You communicate using target language using mime, gesture, facial expression, or sound imitation.*' Table 9 depicts students' perceptions of question number 7. It is revealed that 0.9 percent choose never, 10.2 percent choose seldom, 18.5 percent choose sometimes, 34.3 percent choose often, and 36.1 percent choose always.

Table 9. Use of Non-Linguistic Means Strategy

Q7

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	1	,9	,9	,9
	Seldom	11	10,2	10,2	11,1
	Sometimes	20	18,5	18,5	29,6
	Often	37	34,3	34,3	63,9
	Always	39	36,1	36,1	100,0
	Total	108	100,0	100,0	

The researcher discovered the students' impression of oral communication tactics in the question '*You translated literally a lexical item, an idiom, a compound term or structure from a native language into a target language.*' It shows that 4.6 percent of the 108 students chose never, 22.2 percent chose seldom, 33.3 percent chose sometimes, 26.9 percent chose often, and 13.0 percent chose always.

Table 10. Literal Translation Strategy

Q8

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	5	4,6	4,6	4,6
	Seldom	24	22,2	22,2	26,9
	Sometimes	36	33,3	33,3	60,2
	Often	29	26,9	26,9	87,0
	Always	14	13,0	13,0	100,0
	Total	108	100,0	100,0	

The outcome of students' perception in question number 9 is shown in Table 11: '*You utilize an L1 term by adapting it to L2 phonologically (i.e., with an L2 pronunciation) and/or morphologically (e.g., by adding an L2 suffix to it).*' In a total of 108 pupils, 13.0 percent chose never, 32.4 percent chose seldom, 26.9 percent chose sometimes, 19.4 percent chose often, and 8.3 percent chose always.

Table 11. Foreignizing Strategy

Q9

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	14	13,0	13,0	13,0
	Seldom	35	32,4	32,4	45,4
	Sometimes	29	26,9	26,9	72,2
	Often	21	19,4	19,4	91,7
	Always	9	8,3	8,3	100,0
	Total	108	100,0	100,0	

Question number ten is part of the Intralingual Strategies sub-dimension. This method is illustrated by the question '*You utilize a native language word or phrase in the target language with a native language pronunciation.*' Table 12 depicts students' perceptions of question number ten. It is revealed that 3.7 percent choose never, 23.1 percent choose seldom, 33.3 percent choose sometimes, 37.0 percent choose often, and 2.8 percent choose always.

Table 12. Code Switching Strategy

Q10

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	4	3,7	3,7	3,7
	Seldom	25	23,1	23,1	26,9
	Sometimes	36	33,3	33,3	60,2
	Often	40	37,0	37,0	97,2
	Always	3	2,8	2,8	100,0
	Total	108	100,0	100,0	

Table 13 depicts students' responses to question 11: '*You turn to the interlocutor for assistance (e.g., What do you call...?, Can you talk more slowly?, Do you understand?)*' According to the data, 0.9 percent of students choose never, 16.7 percent choose seldom, 24.1 percent choose sometimes, 25.0 percent choose often, and 33.3 percent choose always.

Table 13. Appeal for Help Strategy

Q11

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	1	,9	,9	,9
	Seldom	18	16,7	16,7	17,6
	Sometimes	26	24,1	24,1	41,7
	Often	27	25,0	25,0	66,7
	Always	36	33,3	33,3	100,0
	Total	108	100,0	100,0	

The final calculation is for question number 12: '*You employ filling words or gambits to fill pauses and gain time to consider (e.g., well, now let me see, in fact)*'. In Table 14, the researcher discovered that 12.0 percent of pupils choose seldom, 46.3 choose sometimes, 30.6 choose often, 11.1 choose always, and none pick never.

Table 14. Use of Fillers/Hesitation Devices Strategy

Q12

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Seldom	13	12,0	12,0	12,0
	Sometimes	50	46,3	46,3	58,3
	Often	33	30,6	30,6	88,9
	Always	12	11,1	11,1	100,0
		108	100,0	100,0	

In oral communication, intralingual strategies differ from the other classification -interlingual strategies- in function and usage. They are used within or

between languages, focusing on learners' construction of new grammatical structures and English proficiency. A study conducted by Prawiro et al., (2022)'s that focuses on undergraduate students in a debate class found that the most common strategy used is the "*use of fillers/hesitation devices*". This study also showed that students used various communication strategies to maintain communication, such as stalling, mixing languages, and expanding their communicative sources to solve problems. This previous study demonstrates that students' challenges in constructing spoken language are more effectively addressed using communication strategies rather than leaving the topic or message unaddressed.

RQ2; Dominant Strategies Used by Students

Table 15. Code Switching Strategy

Statistics

		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
N	Valid	108	108	108	108	108	108	108	108	108	108	108	108
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2,85	2,83	3,25	2,89	3,46	3,01	3,94	3,21	2,78	3,12	3,73	3,41
Median		3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	4,00	3,00
Mode		4	3	3	4	3	4	5	3	2	4	5	3

After distributing the questionnaire, the researcher obtained the following information on the students' oral communication strategies. The data is shown in Table 15. The mean data for questions 1 through 12 are displayed in the following order: 2.85, 2.83, 3.25, 2.89, 3.46, 3.01, 3.94, 3.21, 2.78, 3.12, 3.73, and 3.41.

Based on the explanation, it is inferred that students favor approach number 7, which is '*You utilize Mime, Gesture, Facial expression, or Sound imitation to communicate using the target language,*' with a mean score of 3.94. Several studies conducted by different researchers came to the same conclusion. Students can overcome language barriers by communicating more verbally when using this strategy.

When the speaker is having difficulty explaining the target word, the following most popular method is used to help them communicate better by inviting interlocutors to interpret the meaning of some words (Chairat, 2017; Chew et al., 2018; Lai Kuen et al., 2017). The second most popular method is represented in question 11: '*You turn to the interlocutor for assistance (e.g., What do you call...?, Can you talk more slowly?, Do you understand?*' with an average score of 3.73.

Moreover, Questions 5 and 12 are two other popular solutions. '*You employ a broad or empty lexical item to replace holes in vocabulary command (for example, the overuse of thing, make, do)*' in question 5 and '*You employ filling words or gambits to fill pauses and gain time to consider (e.g., well, now let me see, as a matter of fact)*' in Question 12 have a mean score of 3.41. Because these strategies appeared to be the next most popular, some students used them more frequently as a result of their high anxiety levels when communicating in the target language.

According to the research, Nugroho (2019) and Mir et al. (2020) agreed that low-achiever students are more likely to use OCS, and it has a strong relationship with their self-efficacy beliefs and anxiety level.

Furthermore, Questions 3 and 8 are two other tactics used in the middle range. Question 3 '*You described or exemplified the object or action instead of using the appropriate target language item or structure*' has a mean score of 3.25, and question 8 '*You literally translated a lexical item, an idiom, a compound word, or structure from a native language into a target language*' has a mean score of 3.21. The other methods' means are located beneath the average mean score of 3.20. Students will have a minor in those strategies. These findings are consistent with the findings of other studies. Mohamed et al., (2021) conducted research on debaters and their coping mechanisms when employing an oral communication strategy. According to the findings of the study, the preference for these strategies assists debaters in organizing ideas and articulating and confidently presenting arguments despite their own shortcomings and interruptions from opponents.

Discussing the most frequent strategies used by students in present studies, the researcher has classified several reasons why they employ communication strategies. Jaquen (2020) emphasizes that there are three oriented functions of communication strategies used by language learners: 1) language-oriented function, 2) context-oriented function, and 3) communicators-oriented function. The language-oriented problems are mainly caused by a gap between the required language resources and the immediately available linguistic resources for successful L2 communication. Context-oriented functions suggest that limited opportunities for verbal communication in settings where English is not the primary language pose a challenge for individuals learning a second language.. Lastly, communicators' expectations and perceptions play a role in creating meaning and can lead to communication problems when disrupted. Issues in L2 oral communication are predominantly social occurrences influenced by how communicators perceive themselves and others in the interaction.

Concerning this, students' current study choices show that the main communication strategies they use (non-verbal means) are associated with the second function, which is context-oriented. The primary purpose of using these strategies is to extend the conversation and promote further discussion in the EFL context. Therefore, the use of these communication strategies is indeed beneficial for the learners' improvement.

In contrast, students seem to use the strategy of Foreignizing (utilizing a native language word or phrase in the target language with a native language pronunciation) the least during communication, and this is correlated with the third function. This is because of the

small number of English native speakers to talk to, which means the function of being communicators-oriented is not being fulfilled. Additionally, students tend to use their native language when communicating with peers during class. As a result, this communication strategy appears to be the least used by most students.

RQ3; The determinant reason of Using OCS

The researcher used the snowball sampling technique to find respondents, who are 10 English Education students who took the Intensive Speaking class. The researcher processed the data using Miles & Huberman (1994) collecting data technique. Table 16 displays the findings of the qualitative investigation.

Table 15. Students perception toward OCS.

No	Oral Communication Strategies	Respond
1	Massage Abandonment	3/10
2	Topic Avoidance	3/10
3	Circumlocution	3/10
4	Approximation	2/10
5	Use of all Non-Purpose Words	1/10
6	Word Coinage	2/10
7	Use of Non Linguistic Means	6/10
8	Literal Translation	3/10
9	Foreignizing	2/10
10	Code Switching	3/10
11	Appeal for help	4/10
12	Use of Fillers/Hesitation Devices	1/10

According to the results of Table 16, the Oral Communication Strategies that are commonly employed by ten students differ. Students' perceptions and motivations for adopting Oral Communication Strategies differ as well. Their preferences for using Oral Communication Strategies are strongly related to their level of English proficiency. Some students stated that they struggle with vocabulary mastery. Because most students are unable to recall certain English words, the use of Non-Linguistic Means strategies has become the students' preferred method (Demir et al., 2018; Su, 2021).

The attitude of students toward the use of oral communication strategies is strongly related to their intention to continue the conversation in the target language. Furthermore, the importance of speaking strategy training in learner education in terms of learners' attitudes toward language learning and oral language output should not be underestimated (McLaren, 2019; Rastegar & Gohari, 2016). The results of the In-Depth Interview for students are shown below;

- Because of their inadequate vocabulary mastery in L2, the majority of students employed Oral Communication Strategies.
- Students are hesitant to explain a topic because they do not understand the proper sentence form.
- When students lack a specific lexical item in L2, they tend to extend the dialogue with the interlocutor by using an empty lexical item such as thing, stuff, or make.

- Because they do not know the words, pupils explain the lexical item utilizing Mime, Gesture, Sound Imitation, and Facial Expression in order to keep the discussion with the interlocutor.
- Students that have L1 exposure feel more at ease conversing in L1, thus they drag L2 and utilize it more in L1.
- This approach is typically used when students who study L2 utilize L1 on a regular basis and it has become their habit, making it difficult for them to acquire a new form of L2.
- This method might make kids feel satisfied when they find the answer after taking some time to think by utilizing the words "well," "now let me see," or even the term "hmm."

It has been proven that Oral Communication Strategies (OCS) can be extremely helpful for students who are learning a new language, mainly English. However, to get the most benefit from OCS, it is crucial that the teacher or educator introduces the technique and assists in its usage during teaching and learning. Students often become nervous and anxious when faced with complex tasks and activities(Nova, 2022), and this is where teachers can help by introducing OCS. Using this technique can help students better cope with their problems and improve their language acquisition skills.

CONCLUSION

Finally, students tend to adopt Oral Communication Strategies to overcome any difficulties encountered while communicating in a foreign language. The study discovered that students had employed all forms of Oral Communication Strategies based on Dornyei's Taxonomy of Oral Communication Strategies (1995). The use of OCS is determined by the pupils' qualities in learning a foreign language. In certain situations, students must employ oral communication tactics. When students meet a foreigner who can only speak their native language, they usually employ mime, gesture, facial expression, or sound imitation to communicate in the target language when they don't know how to define a specific lexical item. Aside from that, the researcher discovered from the interview that students' reasons for using Oral Communication Strategies are (1) students' limited vocabulary in L2, which leads to the biggest gap and the main reason for using OCS; and (2) the student's responses also revealed that the communication strategies that they have used during Foreign-Language communication are not related to sentence structure and grammatical pattern.

The author also advises that future researchers take this study to the next level by adopting Nakani's (2006) Oral Communication Strategies Inventory (OCSI) classification and conducting research on the next level of speaking, such

as public speaking, so that this research can be used as a reference.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

All authors contributed equally to this work. Each author participated in the research design, data collection, analysis, and manuscript preparation. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. T. S., & Pawar, V. S. (2018). A Study of Communication Strategies Employed by Radfan College EFL Students in their Classroom Interactions. *New Academia: An International Journal of English Language, Literature and Literary Theory*, *VII*(III), 163–176.

Boyce, C., & Neale, P. (2006). CONDUCTING IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS: A Guide for Designing and Conducting In-Depth Interviews for Evaluation Input Want more papers like this? Pathfinder International Tool Series, 1–17.

Byram, M. (Ed.). (1997). Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence Multilingual Matters (Series). Multilingual Matters.

Chairat, P. (2017). Oral Communication Strategies Used by English Major Undergraduates during the Internship Program. International Conference on Literature, History, Humanities and Interdisciplinary Studies, 49–52. https://doi.org/10.17758/eap.ed0717032

Chew, S. W., Fang, W. C., Hsu, C. N., & Chen, N. S. (2018). Effects of reciprocal feedback on EFL learners' communication strategy use and oral communicative performance. Lecture Notes in Educational Technology, 5(11), 31–39. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-8743-1_6

Chomsky, N. (2007). Language and Responsibility. Revista Brasileira de Ergonomia, 9(2), 10.

Creswell, J. W. (2018). Research Desaign (Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches). In Sage. http://www.elsevier.com/locate/scp

Demir, Y., Mutlu, G., & Sisman, Y. S. (2018). Exploring the oral communication

strategies used by turkish EFL learners: A mixed methods study. International Journal of Instruction, 11(2), 539–554. https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.1 1237a

Fantini, A. E. (2019). Intercultural Communicative Competence in Educational Exchange (A. E. Fantini (Ed.)). Routledge.

Gerard, W. (1987). Communication Strategies and Their Significance. I(3), 351–364.

Hua, T. K., Nor, N. F. M., & Jaradat, M. N. (2012). Communication strategies among EFL students - An examination of frequency of use and types of strategies used. GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 12(3), 831–848.

Hülmbauer, C., Böhringer, H., & Seidlhofer, B. (2008). Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): Precursor and Partner in Intercultural Communication. Enseigner Apprendre Utiliser Le Francais Langue Internationale En Europe Aujourdhui Pour Une Perspective Comparatiste Synergies Europe 309, 3, 25–36. http://ressources-cla.univ-fcomte.fr/gerflint/Europe3/hulmb auer.pdf

Lai Kuen, G., Rafik-Galea, S., & Swee Heng, C. (2017). Effect of Oral Communication Strategies Training on the Development of Malaysian English as a Second Language Learners' Strategic Competence. International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies, 5(4), 57. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v. 5n.4p.57

McLaren, I. (2019). Science Students' Responses to an Oral Communication Skills Development Initiative: Attitude and Motivation. International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 31(1), 73–85. http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/

Meigouni, E. A. M. M., & Shirkhani, S. (2020). Oral Communication Strategies Used by Iranian EFL Learners and their Relationship with the Learners' Self-efficacy Beliefs and Anxiety Level. *Relp (Research in English Language Pedagogy)*, *8*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.30486/RELP.2019. 669075

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). An Expanded Sourcebook Qualitative Data Analysis Second Edition. In SAGE Publication.

Mohamed, A. S., Mustapha, N. F., Mohamad, A. H., Shamshudeen, R. I., & Mohmad Rouyan, N. (2021). Oral Communication Strategies Preferences in Arabic Debate among Non-Arabic Speakers. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 11(9), 131–151. https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v11-i9/10758

Nakatani, Y. (2006). Developing an Oral Communication Strategy Inventory. TheModern Language Journal, 90(2), 151–168.

Nugroho, A. P. (2019). Communication Strategies Used by EFL Learners with Different English Achievements in Oral Communication. 4(3), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.30957/ijotl-tl.v4i3.606.competencies

Nova, M. (2022). Using Online Podcast as a Speaking Activity in Online Classroom. *Pedagogy : Journal of English Language Teaching*, *10*(1), 38. https://doi.org/10.32332/joelt.v10i1.4602

Prawiro, I. Y., Diyales, C. F., & Wati, A. (2022). an Investigation of Undergraduate Students' Oral Communication Strategy (Ocs) in Debate Class. *Journal of English Language Learning*, 6(1), 24–34. https://doi.org/10.31949/jell.v6i1.2502

Qian, Y. (2020). Speaking English as a Second Language. In A. Jamshidnejad (Ed.), Speaking English as a Second Language. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55057-8

Rastegar, M., & Gohari, S. S. M. (2016). Communication Strategies, Attitude, and Oral Output of EFL Learners: A Study of Relations. Open Journal of Modern Linguistics, 06(05), 401–419. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2016.65036

Rohani, S. (2021). The Use of Oral Communication Strategies across Students of Different Proficiencies. AISOFOL. Jakarta. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348756553_The_Use_of_Oral_Communication_Strategies_across_Students_of_Different_Proficiencies.

Savignon, S. J. (2017). Communicative Competence. The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0047

Su, Y. C. (2021). College Students' Oral Communication Strategy Use, Self-

perceived English Proficiency and Confidence, and Communication Anxiety in Taiwan's EFL Learning. Educational Studies - AESA, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2021.1919677

Syamsudin. (2015). Communication Strategies in Speaking Skill of EFL Learners. Language and Learning., 3(1), 1–6

Zhao, T., & Intaraprasert, C. (2013). Use of Communication Strategies by Tourism-oriented EFL Learners in Relation to Attitude towards English Speaking and English Language and Exposure to Oral Communication in English. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 3(5), 1–8. www.ijsrp.org