

Language Learning Strategies and Communication Strategies: A Synthesis

KAUSAR HUSAIN

Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, India

ABSTRACT

Since Selinker's (1972) historic invocation of language learning strategies (LLS) and communication strategies (CS) as two distinct processes involved in the development of interlanguage, it has become customary in SLA literature to distinguish the strategies of learning from the strategies of communication. It has been argued in this article that since in learning a language one essentially learns to communicate through it, there appears to be no need at all to view these two constructs as different from each other. Through a brief review of past research in learning strategies and communication strategies and a comparison of their respective taxonomies, the author has attempted to demonstrate the similarities between the so-called "two" strategy types, which are different names given to the same set of universal mental processes, subsumable within the two megastrategies or mental processes postulated by the researcher, namely simplification and elaboration. By presenting this two-strategy, hierarchically organized taxonomy, the researcher aims to address the problems of confusion and vagueness prevailing in strategy literature at present.

COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES RESEARCH BACKGROUND: IDENTIFICATION AND CLASSIFICATION

The notion of communication strategies originated in SLA research in the early 70s with Selinker's invocation of them as one of the five central processes responsible for the development of interlanguage (Selinker 1972). Since then CS came to be

viewed as devices used by L2 speakers as a result of a mismatch between their linguistic resources and communicative intentions. Tarone published the first taxonomy of CS in 1977, which listed avoidance, paraphrase, transfer, and appeal for assistance and mime as some of the major categories. Canale & Swain (1980) listed communication strategies as one of the components of communicative competence. Faerch & Kasper (1983a, 1983b) positing CS in a speech production model listed the strategies in two groups: reduction and achievement, and further divided reduction strategies as formal reduction and functional reduction. Bialystok listed similar L1 and L2 based strategies in her taxonomy, such as language switch, foreignizing, transliteration word coinage and non-linguistic strategies. One thing common with all these early attempts at classification was a primarily linguistic approach in defining CS, based on the language output of the speakers. Later on, a more mentalistic view of CS emerged as evident in the work of Bialystok (1990) and the Nijmegen Group (Bongaerts, Kellerman, Bentlage 1987; Bongaerts & Poulishse 1989). The proponents of this approach criticized the traditional view of conceptualizing CS in terms of output because it led to “confounding grammatical form, incidental and inherent properties of referents, and encoding medium with putative cognitive processes.” They also maintain that, “this inconsistency has led to a proliferation of strategy types with little regard for such desirable requirements as psychological plausibility, parsimony and finiteness” (Kellerman & Bialystok 1997: 158). Thus, parsimony being an essential requirement, Bialystok (1990) presents in her recent taxonomy only two broad strategy categorizations: analysis based and control based, which is similar to Kellerman’s (1991) two strategy taxonomy, that is, conceptual and code strategies, employed in the Nijmegen project (e.g. Poulishse 1987). While conceptual strategies manipulate the concepts or properties related to the language item, code strategies manipulate the word form (Kellerman & Bialystok 1997: 34). Dornyei & Scott (1995a, 1995b) listed all the communication strategy types mentioned in the literature under the three rubrics of direct strategies, indirect strategies, and interactional strategies.

It is notable that recently, the proponents of the earlier linguistic approach have designated it as the sociolinguistic one. This visualization is manifested in Tarone's definition in which she views CS as "a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared" (Tarone 1983: 65). The psychological approach considers CS as universal mental processes, while the interactive one focuses on the products of CS use. Yule & Tarone (1997) have tried to combine the psycholinguistic taxonomy of the Nijmegen Group (conceptual strategy vs. code strategy) with Tarone's product-based taxonomy though they themselves candidly admit that such an attempt "disguises a number of serious methodological and pedagogical differences that require further consideration" (p. 19). The most serious problem with this combination according to the writer is that it arbitrarily mixes up cognitive and paracognitive strategies, the trouble afflicting all the strategy taxonomies at present because of which no consensus has been arrived at on the issue of classification of strategies. Even the most economical typology of the Nijmegen Group, which claims to study only the mental processes underlying external output confounds cognitive and paracognitive strategy types, by placing "mime," and "pointing at some object" in the categories of conceptual and code strategies. It is evident that mime and gesture are not in themselves mental processes, though they might be associated with some simultaneous mental processing.

LEARNING STRATEGIES RESEARCH BACKGROUND: IDENTIFICATION AND CLASSIFICATION STUDIES

According to the often quoted definition by Rigney (1978), "learning strategies are operations or steps used by a learner to facilitate the acquisition, storage or retrieval of information." Wittrock (1988: 288) calls them "ways that are used to acquire knowledge, to solve problems, to build mental representations and to make sense of experience." Work on learning strategies in cognitive psychology had already made considerable advances before similar work began in SLA. The distinction between two types of strategies, cognitive and metacognitive is an important

contribution made by Brown & Palincsar (1982) in cognitive psychology research. Cognitive strategies are concerned with direct manipulation of input such as inferencing or adapting of material while metacognitive strategies are related to thinking about the learning process such as directed attention and self-talk. Dansereau (1985) makes a similar distinction, though using the terms primary and support strategies.

In SLA, learning strategy literature originated from the “good language learner” studies (Rubin 1975; Stern 1975; Naiman et al. 1978). The strategies identified at this nascent stage of research appear to be usually general and broad and the classification schemes arbitrary. In spite of classifying strategies into direct and indirect categories, Rubin mixes the two by listing clarification, verification and monitoring (paracognitive strategies) with guessing, inductive and deductive reasoning (cognitive strategies) in the same group of direct strategies. Stern focused mostly on metacognitive strategies such as an active approach to learning, technical know-how about tackling a language, willingness to practice and to experiment, and self-monitoring. Naiman et al. (1978) attempted to extend Rubin’s work. Wong-Fillmore (1976, 1979) stressed social strategies in her work on children, whom she found especially interested in establishing rapport with their friends through social strategies such as joining a group and pretending to understand what is going on. Interestingly, she includes the strategies of getting started with a few words, getting some formulaic expressions and directing attention to big things first in the category of cognitive strategies, which are in fact metacognitive strategies. O’Malley et al. (1985a) collected strategy data on the basis of interviews with secondary school ESL learners, teacher interviews and observation, and classified strategies in a cognitive psychology framework. They identified twenty-six strategies and divided them in three broad groups: metacognitive, cognitive and socio-affective. Based on mental processing rather than overt behavior, O’Malley et al.’s classification is both comprehensive and systematic. Wenden (1986) concentrated on self-directed learning and focused on metacognitive strategies which she placed in three categories: knowing about learning, planning and self-evaluation.

Oxford (1985) synthesized all other classification schemes under two broad categories of primary and support strategies. In Oxford's classification of 1985, primary strategies include nine subcategories yielding a long list of sixty-five strategies in all. However, Oxford's approach is neither systematic nor convincing. Criticizing it, O'Malley & Chamot (1990) remark,

What Oxford apparently tried to do was to subsume within her classification virtually every strategy that had been previously cited in the literature on learning strategies. The problem with this approach, so far as a taxonomy of strategies is concerned, is that this extended listing is far removed from any underlying cognitive theory, and fails to prioritize which strategies are most important to learning, and generates subcategories that appear to overlap. (p. 103)

However, Oxford's work has served the purpose of establishing the basis for Strategy Inventory for Language Learning – SILL (1986) and has helped researchers in item-generation in their questionnaires.

SIMILARITY BETWEEN CS AND LLS, AND FAULTY CRITERIA OF COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

It is clear from a review of past literature that CS have always been distinguished from LLS as those strategies which are concerned with output or production rather than assimilation of input or production. Brown made this distinction clear in the following words:

The field of second language acquisition has distinguished between two types of strategies: learning strategies and communication strategies. The former relates to input processing, storage and retrieval. The latter has more to do with output – or how we express meaning in the language, how we act upon what we already know or presume to know. (1987: 91)

Nevertheless, some researchers did voice a presentiment about the overlap or some similarity between the so-called “two types” of strategies. For example, Bialystok remarked that “...any strategy may potentially operate as either a learning or a

communication strategy: ideally the implementation of a strategy leaves a positive mark on both learning and communication” (1983: 102).

Tarone also pointed out the overlap between learning and communication strategies; observing that paraphrase, borrowing and avoidance can be used both in reception and production. (1977: 183). Faerch & Kasper also referred to “receptive” communication strategies. (1983: 54). Tarone, Cohen & Dumas stated that

...certain interlanguage strategies associated with production apply to comprehension of language as well” and they cited “negative transfer” as one of such examples. (1983: 4). They took care however, to make the cautious remark at the end and thus almost nullify their stand: “We do not suggest that interlanguage comprehension data look like interlanguage production data. We aren’t sure what they look like... we simply wish to broaden the terminology to include this dimension of communication as well. (1983: 5)

Recently, Tarone & Yule (1989) have acknowledged the existence of communication strategies not just used by the speaker but also by the listener. Oxford & Cohen (1992) have also noticed that the same general principles apply to compensating for missing knowledge in reading and writing as in speaking and listening. A change in perspective is evident as reflected in the words of Cohen: “Second language learner strategies encompass both second language learning and second language use strategies. Taken together, they constitute the steps or actions consciously selected by learners either to improve the learning of a second language, the use of it or both” (1998: 5).

Conceptualizing LLS and CS as two distinct constructs is actually based on the faulty criteria attributed to CS, which are as follows:

1. *Use of communication strategies only by L2 learners*

Reviewing some of the definitions of CS, Kasper & Kellerman (1997: 2), remark that “CS are generally conceived as mental plans implemented by the second language learner in response to

an internal signal of an imminent problem.” However, since communication is a universal enterprise, it must be acknowledged that L1 learners use these strategies as well. Admitting this fact, Corder says, “It is now fairly clear that all language users adopt strategies to convey their meaning, we are only able more or less readily to perceive these when the speaker is not a native speaker” (1985: 15).

2. *The criterion of problematicity*

The other criterion of problematicity is also a spurious one, since according to the accepted mentalist view of learning, all learning is seen as problem solving. Therefore, problem-orientedness should not be deemed a criterion exclusively for a particular type of mental strategies used in the production of language. Hypothesis-formation and hypothesis testing, the chief processes in L1 acquisition cannot be performed without any perception of a problem whether conscious or unconscious. Interestingly, SLA literature has identified another type of strategy, namely “production strategy” for cases when the language user does not seem to encounter any problems in communication “...in addition to communication strategies, there seems to be another kind of notion – the notion of production strategy. A production strategy, like a communication strategy, is a strategy of language use. I would define a production strategy as an attempt to use one’s linguistic system efficiently and clearly with a minimum of effort (Tarone 1983: 66). Thus, if by using the strategy of generalization of the past tense suffix -ed, the learners produce the word “worked”, they will be considered using a production strategy, but if they arrive at the word “beated,” using the same strategy of generalization, they will be said to have used a CS. Kasper & Kellerman (1997) report however, that some scholars (Bialystok 1983; Dechert 1983; Wagner 1983) have voiced some opposition to problematicity and maintained that “language use is always strategic” (p. 3).

3. *The criterion of consciousness*

Communication strategies are unanimously conceived to be “potentially conscious” plans for solving problems in a

communicative situation. There has been a lot of fruitless debate on the conscious or unconscious nature of learning. Dornyei & Scott (1997) admit, “consciousness has in fact so many connotations that one would best avoid it altogether”(1997: 184). According to Faerch & Kasper, “...consciousness is perhaps more a matter of degree than either-or” (1983: 35). Further, Gass and Selinker point out that strategies may be automatized or routinized and “seem to drop from consciousness” (1994: ix). The fact is that learning takes place both consciously and subconsciously, and there is a constant transfer of information from the conscious mind to the subconscious mind and vice-versa.

When we review the above faulty criteria assigned to CS and abandon them, oppositions to which have been voiced by individual researchers sporadically, the similarity between the so called LLS and CS becomes clear:

1. CS apply to production as well as to reception tasks, encompassing all the four macro-skills as in the case of LLS.
2. CS apply to L1 situations as well as to L2 and L3 situations like LLS.
3. CS can be both conscious and un/subconscious, just like LLS.
4. CS can be problem-oriented, but then all communication and learning of communication has a problem solving nature; CS and LLS are both related with finding solutions to problems. Besides, even if a problem is not observable in the output of the user, it might be the case that i), the problem has already been solved successfully on the spot or, ii) the user has already overcome the problem sometime in the past and has mastered the language item. This phenomenon applies both to L1 and L2 users.

Lastly, on a very commonsensical basis, the point that needs to be made is that if language learning means learning to communicate, strategies of learning a language cannot be differentiated from the strategies of communicating in it.

Learning a language means learning all the four skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing and similarly, communication also envelops all the above four skills.

LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES: A REVISED TAXONOMY WITH A PSYCHOLOGICAL BASIS

This section aims to present a revised taxonomy of language learning/communication strategies. It has already been argued earlier that LLS and CS are the same. The taxonomy presented derives from O'Malley et al.'s (1990: 119), in that it incorporates their three broad categories of cognitive, metacognitive and socioaffective strategies but collapses metacognitive and socioaffective groups into a single broad category viz paracognitive. Thus, learning / communication strategies can be classified into two basic categories: cognitive and paracognitive. Cognitive strategies are those which operate directly upon the input, such as guessing, inductive and deductive reasoning. While the paracognitive strategies involve thinking about the learning process and involve planning, execution or evaluation of the communication or learning task, and might also involve resources other than the purely cognitive in enhancing linguistic reception and production tasks. For example, selecting relevant portions of the text for studying, mime, gesture, asking for clarification or repeating something to memorize it, can be listed as paracognitive strategies.

However, it must be noted that the paracognitive strategies have always a cognitive component to them. For example, in mime or gesture, resources other than the purely cognitive are used to enhance communication; but employment of these resources is based on the cognitive strategy of relating one thing to another, because of similarities between the gesture and properties of the referent. It is hypothesized here that cognitive strategies being universal mental processes, are the same for all learning and can be either conscious or unconscious. Metacognitive and socioaffective strategies are mostly, but not always conscious and they are the same for language learning and communication. However, they might not always be generalized to

other learning situations. This paper does not aim to elaborate on the paracognitive category of strategies, since the focus here is on presenting the cognitive strategies of learning in a psychological framework.

Cognitive strategies of learning

The cognitive strategies of learning are hypothesized as being of two main types: Simplification and elaboration.

1. Simplification

Simplification can be called either a major learning process or a megastrategy of learning. The word “process” has connotations of automaticity and involuntariness, while the term “strategies” implies consciousness. As has been said earlier, learning takes place both consciously and unconsciously and there is a constant flow of information from the conscious to the un/subconscious compartments of the mind. In the context of language learning, language which has been “acquired” unconsciously, such as one’s L1 can be subjected to conscious scrutiny and analysis resulting in a subsequent discovery of rules. In the same manner, aspects of consciously “learnt” language can be automatized and dropped from consciousness. Simplification further consists of two subprocesses or strategies of analysis and control/selection. The function of analysis is to break the input into its component parts and that of selection is to select from these broken parts, those chunks of information which are considered relevant for processing.

2. Elaboration

The other major category of mental processes is elaboration, which again consists of the two sub-processes of correlation and synthesis. In a way, this process can be viewed as diametrically opposed, but complementary to the mega strategy of simplification, because while simplification helps in breaking the given input into its component parts, and selecting one or some of these analyzed portions, elaboration involves taking a holistic view of things and tends to join things or ideas with each other on the basis of the relationships underlying them. It is important

to note that in simplification, analysis comes prior to selection, while in elaboration, correlation precedes synthesis.

SIMPLIFICATION = ANALYSIS → SELECTION
ELABORATION = CORRELATION → SYNTHESIS

It is hypothesized here that the above two megastrategies, namely simplification and elaboration, are the basis of all learning in the world. The researcher has attempted to prove that all the cognitive strategies of learning as yet identified in the literature fall either within the category of simplification or of elaboration. This is demonstrated here by explaining the comprehensive typology provided by O'Malley & Chamot (1990: 119) in terms of the above two basic strategies.

LIST OF COGNITIVE STRATEGIES OF LEARNING FROM O'MALLEY & CHAMOT'S (1990: 119-120) TYPOLOGY IN TERMS OF SIMPLIFICATION AND ELABORATION

Advance organizers, directed attention, functional planning, selective attention, self-management, self-monitoring and self-evaluation as mentioned in the metacognitive list, are all paracognitive strategies alongwith the socioaffective strategies of question for clarification, and cooperation.

The cognitive strategies mentioned in O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) list is as follows:

1. **Resourcing:** "Using target language reference materials i.e., dictionaries, encyclopedias, textbooks". This strategy is in fact a metacognitive strategy dealing with decisions about planning or execution of the learning tasks.
2. **Repetition:** "Imitating a language model, including overt practice and silent rehearsal." This is again a metacognitive strategy, which involves the decision of the learner regarding repeating a language item silently or loudly for consolidating learning.
3. **Grouping:** "Classifying words, terminology or concepts...." This strategy is actually the cognitive strategy of synthesis,

according to the researchers revised taxonomy, a sub strategy of elaboration, consisting in first relating different items of input/output, and then placing them according to their relations in two different groups.

4. **Deduction:** "Applying rules to understand or produce the language." This might involve the employment of both the strategies of simplification and elaboration. For example, in deducing the rule of the plural morpheme-s to nouns, the strategy of elaboration is employed first, relating all nouns to the morpheme-s. Subsequently however, when the learner encounters exceptions such as oxen, deer and fish, the simplificational strategies of analysis and selection are employed, analyzing nouns into two groups: those to which -s is added and those which do not take an-s. This grouping in turn again involves the elaborative strategy of synthesis.
5. **Imagery:** "Using visual images..." This is obviously based on the strategy of elaboration, as the mind associates an object or idea with its visual/ auditory representation.
6. **Auditory representation:** "Playing back in one's mind the sound of a word, phrase, or a longer language sequence." Relating something to its auditory representation in the mind, this is again a substrategy of elaboration.
7. **Keyword Method:** This vocabulary-learning device which involves relating an L2 word to a similar-sounding word in L1, is evidently a type of correlational strategy, a substrategy of elaboration.
8. **Elaboration:** "Relating new information to prior knowledge..." It is obviously a strategy of elaboration.
9. **Transfer:** "Using previous linguistic knowledge or prior skills..." It is obviously based on the strategy of elaboration, which involves relating new information to previous knowledge and might be preceded by analysis and selection of the given material or what is already stored in the brain.
10. **Inferencing:** In inferencing, the given input is related to other items in fresh input or available past information in the mind. This is also a strategy of elaboration.
11. **Note-taking:** "Writing down key words or concepts in abbreviated verbal, graphic or numerical form..." Note-

taking makes use of elaboration, i.e. correlation. In a substantial way abbreviations, graphic and numerical forms are all representations of original words, phrases, or ideas based on some sort of relationship between the signs and signifiers. Note-taking does also involve simplification.

12. **Summarizing:** "Making a mental, oral or written summary of new information...." A complex skill, used both in reception and production, involves use of various substrategies of simplification and elaboration. First of all, the given input is analyzed and then some of its components are selected on the basis of priority or significance. Later, these important points are related with each other through the elaborative strategy of correlation and organized through both the elaborative strategies of correlation and synthesis.
13. **Recombination:** "Constructing a meaningful sentence or larger language sequence by combining known elements in a new way..." This involves the use of the simplification strategy of analysis of the components of the sentence string, and then the use of selection of some of the relevant parts, and is followed by the strategy of "correlation" i.e., relating the components in a new way, and finally, grouping or "synthesis."
14. **Translation:** This involves basically the correlational strategy of elaboration, that is, relating parts of L2 with matching parts in L1 or L3; used both in reception and production tasks. (List of strategies taken from O'Malley & Chamot 1990; adapted from O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Kupper & Russo 1985a).

COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES TAXONOMY (DORNYEI & SCOTT 1997) EXPLAINED WITHIN THE REVISED TAXONOMY

The researcher presents below the comprehensive strategy inventory compiled by Dornyei and Scott (1997) coalescing the taxonomies of Tarone (1977), Faerch and Kasper (1983 b), Bialystok (1983), Paribakht (1985), Willems (1987), Bialystok (1990), Willems Nijmegen Group, Poullisse (1993) and Dornyei and Scott (1995a, 1995b). It should be noted that some of the

strategies mentioned in Dorneyi and Scott's inventory are paracognitive strategies, and they have been mentioned as such. The researcher's focus is on cognitive strategies, rather than paracognitive strategies, and she has attempted here to explain Dorneyi and Scott's long list of communication strategies within the two cognitive megastrategies of learning i.e. simplification and elaboration. Dorneyi and Scott henceforth will be mentioned as D & S.

1. **Message abandonment:** The decision to abandon a message because of lack of adequate resources or some other reason is a paracognitive strategy.
2. **Message reduction or topic avoidance:** This is a combination of a paracognitive strategy and the cognitive strategy of simplification. The decisions about avoidance or reduction of topic involves a paracognitive element, but the actual reduction or avoidance of linguistic items involves the strategy of selection, a substrategy of simplification.
3. **Message replacement:** Here again, the decision to replace the message is a paracognitive strategy, but the actual replacement involves the cognitive strategy of elaboration which relates the original intended message with the final output based on the relationship envisaged by the mind between the two.
4. **Circumlocution:** This also involves relating the intended object or message to its approximate linguistic representation in the absence of an exact one. Hence, a cognitive strategy of elaboration.
5. **Approximation:** It is the same in nature as circumlocution and involves correlation, a substrategy of elaboration.
6. **Use of all-purpose words:** Similar in nature to circumlocution and "approximation", this also involves the replacing of an exact word with some blanket term, based on some kind of relationship which the speaker views between the two, hence a strategy of elaboration.
7. **Word coinage:** "Creating a non-existing L2 word by applying a supposed L2 rule to an existing L2 word": The application of an L2 rule is obviously based on some kind of

relationship between the new word and some familiar word, morpheme or sound. In the example given by D&S “dejunktion” and “unjunktion” for “street clearing,” the use of the negative “de” is based on some kind of perceived parallelism.

8. **Restructuring:** “Abandoning the execution of a verbal plan... leaving the utterance unfinished, and communicating the message according to an alternative plan.” Paracognitive strategy combined with correlation, a substrategy of elaboration.
9. **Literal Translation:** Translation is obviously based on equivalence which consists in relating one thing to another. Hence, this too is a strategy of elaboration.
10. **Foreignizing:** This is also a strategy of elaboration. For example, foreignizing of native sounds is based on their similarity with the foreign language rounds, as in aspirating the initial /p/ sound in Hindi words, following the pattern in English.
11. **Code Switching:** This involves the replacement of L2 word / expression with its L1 counterpart, based on an existing relationship. Hence, a strategy of elaboration.
12. **Use of similar-sounding words:** Obviously based on relationships, a strategy of elaboration.
13. **Mumbling:** In fact this is a paracognitive strategy rather than a cognitive one, indicating hesitation, may be an indirect appeal for help.
14. **Omission:** This involves selection of some items and omission of others, hence, a strategy of simplification.
15. **Retrieval:** “(.....incomplete or wrong forms before reaching the optimal form)”: Grouping for the appropriate linguistic item in this manner might involve a paracognitive strategy but extracting it finally from the relevant scheme is based on the relationship strategy of elaboration.
- 16a. **Self-repair** 16b **other-repair:** Paracognitive strategies involving monitoring of output.
17. **Self-rephrasing:** This involves repeating oneself in other words, which is a paracognitive strategy, but the actual replacing is based on equivalence and relationships between

the initial and subsequent utterances or expression employing the strategy of elaboration.

18. **Over-Explicitness:** This too is based on viewing relationship, and is a strategy of elaboration.

The strategies listed from 19-26 i.e. 19) **Mime**, 20) **Use of fillers** 21a) **Self repetition**, 21b) **Other-repetition**, 22) **Feigning understanding**, 23) **Verbal strategy markers**, 24a) **Direct** and 24b) **Indirect appeal for help**, 25) **Asking for repetition**, 26) **Asking for clarification**, 27) **Asking for confirmation**, are all paracognitive strategies involving the monitoring of the process of communication.

The rest of the strategies in the list i.e., 28-33 are as follows: 28) **Guessing**; 29) **Expressing non-understanding**; 30) **Interpretive summary**; 31) **Comprehension check**; 32) **Own accuracy check**; 33a) **Response**: a) **Repeat**, b) **Repair**, c) **Rephrase**, d) **Expand** e) **Confirm** and 6) **Reject**. These are all paracognitive strategies, involving planning, monitoring and evaluation of the process of communication except the strategies 28 and 30 which are explained as follows:

28. **Guessing:**

Guessing involves relating some known information to some unknown information; hence a strategy of elaboration.

30. **Interpretive Summary:** "Extended paraphrase of the interlocutors message to check that the speaker has understood correctly":

This combines a paracognitive strategy of "repetition" combined with "paraphrasing", a strategy based on the relationship of equivalence. Hence, a strategy of elaboration.

The above is only an attempt to show that all the above mentioned cognitive strategies of communication in DS's list are derived from simplification or elaboration which are hypothesized earlier as the two mega-strategies of learning.

SUMMARY

The researcher has attempted to argue and demonstrate in this article that communication strategies and language learning

strategies are theoretically the same, but they may be given different labels according to the focus of the user in practical contexts. Since it is obvious that in learning a language one learns to communicate through it, there appears to be no need to view them as separate constructs even on a commonsensical basis. The researcher has also tried to argue that all learning is based on the two mega-strategies of simplification and elaboration, the two main cognitive strategies of learning, and that these two mega-strategies are also used in the process of communication.

Of the two types language learning strategies, cognitive and paracognitive, the former are the same as general strategies of learning as has also been proved through empirical research, since cognitive strategies identified in SLA were also found to be employed for general learning in cognitive psychology and were applied to reading comprehension, thinking skills and problem - solving (e.g., Brown, Bransford, Ferrara & Campione 1983; and Chipman, Segal & Glaser 1985). It seems that Cognitive strategies of learning are universal mental processes and all human beings are endowed with them. They are generalizable across languages, subjects and situations; and hence, need not be taught. The same does not apply to paracognitive strategies, which are always conscious to begin with, but may be automatized later with repeated use. For example, a particular gesture may become automatically associated with a particular linguistic expression. The strategies in the researcher's paracognitive category combine the metacognitive strategies such as monitoring one's learning process and the socioaffective strategies such as of feigning understanding. As stated earlier, there is always a cognitive aspect to every paracognitive strategy. In the case of metacognitive strategies, all administrative decisions regarding the learning process have to be accompanied by some mental processing. For example, metacognitive planning and organization entails the use of the cognitive strategy of correlation, a substrategy of elaboration, which helps in relating a particular task to its proper environment. Likewise, picking up formulaic chunks, a socioaffective strategy, is also based on the

cognitive strategy of correlation, that is, relating specific linguistic expressions to their appropriate contexts.

REFERENCES

- Bialystok, E. 1983. Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategy. In C. Faerch and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 100-118). Harlow, U. K.: Longman.
- . 1990. *Communication Strategies*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bongaerts, T., Kellerman E., & Bentlage, A. 1987. Perspectives and proficiency in L2 referential communication. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 9, 171-200.
- , & Poulisse, N. 1989. Communication strategies in L1 and L2: same or different? *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 253-268
- Brown, A. L. & Palincsar. 1982. Inducing strategy learning from texts by means of informal, self- controlled training. *Topics in Learning and Learning Disabilities*, 11, 1-17.
- , Bransford, J. D., Ferrara, R. A. & Campione, J. C. 1983. Learning remembering and understanding. In J. H. Flavell & M. Markham (Eds.), *Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology*, 3, 77-166. N. Y: John Wiley & Sons
- Brown, D. 1987. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. 1980. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Chipman, S. F., Segal, J. W., & Glaser, R. 1985. *Thinking and Learning Skills: Research and open Questions*. Vol. 2. Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum.
- Cohen, A. D. 1998. *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*. New York: Longman.
- Dansereau, D. F. 1985. Learning strategy research. In J. W. Segal, S. F. Chipman & R. Glaser (Eds.), *Thinking and Learning Skills*. Vol. 1. Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum.
- Dechert, H. 1983. How a story is done in a second language. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 175-195). Harlow: Longman.
- Dornyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. 1995a. Communication strategies: What they are and what they are not? Paper presented at the *Annual Conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics* (AAAL), Long Beach, CA.

- . 1995b. Communication strategies: An empirical analysis with retrospection. In J. S. & K. Lusby (Eds.), *Selected papers from the proceedings of the 21st Annual Symposium of the Deseret Language and Linguistics Society* (pp. 155-168). Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.
- . 1997. Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47, 173-210.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. 1983a. *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. Harlow, U. K.: Longman.
- . 1983b. Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp.20-60).
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. 1994. *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kellerman, E. 1991. Compensatory strategies in second language research: A critique, a revision, and some non-implications for the classroom. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second Language Pedagogy Research: A Commemorative Vol. for Claus Faerch* (pp. 142-161). Clevedon, U. K.: Multilingual Matters.
- . & Bialystok, E. 1997. On psychological plausibility in the study of communication strategies. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. H., and Todesco, A. 1978. *The Good Language Learner*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- O'Malley J. M. and Chamot, A. U. 1988. How to teach learning strategies. In A. U. Chamot, J. M. O'Malley and L. Kupper (Eds.), *Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) Training Manual*. Arlington, Va.: Second Language Learning.
- . 1990. *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , Stewner-Manzanares, G., Russo, R. P., and Kupper, L. 1985a. Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 285-296.
- Oxford, R. L. 1985. *A New Taxonomy for Second Language Learning Strategies*. Manuscript. Washington D.C.: Eric Clearing House on Language and Linguistics.
- . 1986. Development and psychometric testing of the strategy inventory for language learning. ARI Technical Report 728.

- Alexandria Va, U. S. Army Research for the Behavioural and Social Sciences.
- . 1992-93. Learning strategies in a nutshell: Update and ESL suggestions. *TESOL Journal*, 2, 18-22.
- . & Cohen, A. D. 1992. Language learning strategies: Crucial issues of concept and classification. *Applied Language Learning*, 3, 1-35.
- Poulisse, N. 1987. Problems and solutions in the classification of compensatory strategies. *Second Language Research*, 3, 141-153.
- Rigney 1978. Learning Strategies: a theoretical perspective. In H. F. O'Neil (Ed.), *Learning Strategies*. New York: Academic Press.
- Rubin, J. 1975. What the good language learner can teach us. *TESOL quarterly*, 9, 41-51.
- . 1981. Study of cognitive processes in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 117-131.
- Selinker, L. 1972. Interlanguage. *IRAL*, 10, 209-230.
- Stern, H. H. 1975. What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31, 304-318.
- Tarone, E. 1977. Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report. In H. Brown, C. Yorio & R. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '77* (pp. 194-203). Washington: TESOL.
- . 1983. Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. In Faerch & Kasper (Eds.), *Studies in Interlanguage Communication*. Harlow, U. K.: Longman.
- , Cohen, A. D., & Dumas, G. 1983. A closer look at some interlanguage terminology: A framework for communicative strategies. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 4-15). Harlow, U. K.: Longman.
- . & Yule, G. 1989. *Focus on the Language Learner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wagner J. 1983. Dann du tagen eineeeee – weisse platte: An analysis of interlanguage communication in instructions. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 159-174). Harlow: Longman.
- Wenden, A. 1986b. What do language learners know about their language learning? A second look at prospective accounts. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 186-205.
- Weinstein, C. E., & Mayor, R. E. 1986. The teaching of learning strategies. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (pp. 315-327). 3rd ed. New York: Mcmillan.

- Wittrock, M. C. 1988. A constructive review of research on learning strategies. In C. E. Weinstein, E. T. Goetz & P. A. Alexander (Eds.), *Learning and Study Strategies: Issues in Assessment, Instruction and Evaluation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wong-Fillmore, L. 1976. The Second Time Around: Cognitive and Social Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- . 1979. Individual differences in second language acquisition. In C. J. Fillmore, D. Kempler and W. S. Wong (Eds.), *Individual Differences in Language Ability and Language Behavior*. London, New York: Academic Press.
- Yule, G., & Tarone, E. 1997. Investigating communication strategy in L2 reference: Pros and cons. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. London, New York: Longman.

DR. KAUSAR HUSAIN

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH,
ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY,
ALIGARH 202002, INDIA

E-MAIL: <KAUSAR05_HUSAIN@YAHOO.CO.IN>