Can Tho University Journal of Science
website: ctujs.ctu.edu.vn

The influences of oral communication strategies on students' English speaking proficiency

Nguyen Thi Thanh Ha, Vu Viet Phuong[*], and Do Thi Tieu Yen

Faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Economics – Technology for Industries, Ha Noi, Viet Nam

*Correspondence: Vu Viet Phuong (email: vvphuong@uneti.edu.vn)

Article info.	ABSTRACT
  Keywords 	*This study aims to examine the spoken communication techniques of non-English major students at University of Economics – Technology for Industries (UNETI) to get a better knowledge of language acquisition techniques, namely oral strategies used in communicative activities. Data were collected through questionnaire adapted from the Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OCSI) by Nakatani (2005) and analyzed using OCSI. Participants were 50 EFL students from the Faculty of Accounting, UNETI. The results show that students utilized certain communication strategies (CSs) when they encountered oral communication difficulties. It was additionally anticipated that UNETI students would think more deeply about their oral communication abilities. Consequently, teachers will develop more effective methods of teaching them how to communicate successfully with others throughout the process. Moreover, students will acquire additional CSs that they may use more effectively in real-world conversations with native and non-native speakers. Thus, speaking strategy training should not be overlooked throughout students' learning process.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The Vietnamese education system used to be dominated by teacher-centered approach, and students' English competence was almost entirely determined by grammar-based exams (Bui, 2016). As a consequence, the majority of students attempted to communicate smoothly and confidently. This may be ascribed to a lack of oral practice time in class and a shortage of opportunities for discussion outside the class in English as a foreign language (EFL) educational settings. Additionally, some students who do well in English classes struggle with daily interactions due to a lack of real-world experience (Bialystok, 1990). Second language learners often find it hard to select suitable words, phrases, or subjects in communicative situations, and communication suffers (Tarone,

1981). University graduates' lack of language proficiency is thought to be the biggest drawback. Numerous second language acquisition researchers, namely Willems (1987), Bialystok (1990), and Cohen (1996), think that strategies are advantageous for language acquisition and usage. The deficiency in the target language may be compensated for by developing the ability to use certain communication methods that substitute for their absence (Bialystok, 1990; Dornyei, 1995). Acquisition techniques emphasized achievement; whereas compensatory strategies highlighted avoidance (Tarone, 1980; Bialystok, 1990; Nakatani, 2006) resulting in learners devising an alternative method for completing their original goal, using whatever resources are available. These are referred to as "good learner" strategies. When those learners use

several strategies, they are able to avoid expressing a problem and eventually give up. Interactions that are inappropriate are often seen among low-proficiency learners. The literature emphasizes how to define a communication strategy and a few oral communication strategy taxonomies developed by linguistic researchers in this field.

Today's EFL teachers are increasingly focusing on communicative language teaching, and Vietnamese educators are not the exception (Huyen, 2016). Nearly all institutions require students to have basic knowledge of a foreign language in order to be active participants both inside and outside the classroom. At University of Economics – Technology for Industries (UNETI), the majority of these students are non-native English speakers. In particular, third-year non-English major students seldom enroll in speaking courses. In fact, teachers, educational environments, and instructional materials have little effect on students' success or failure in acquiring fluency in spoken language. Students place a higher emphasis on English, one of six required subjects at high school. Speaking and listening abilities are not taken into account since they are not assessed on the college admissions exam. It is a fact that every higher education course requires students to achieve four language skills. Most EFL students, nevertheless, likely fail to develop speaking abilities for several reasons, which is anticipated by institutional pedagogists. Reasonably, third-year students have already adjusted to university life via new friendships, part-time employment, and so on. They lack the time and motivation to seek out opportunities to enhance their English. Without practice in real-world situations, students lack both experience and confidence. Vocal proficiency is the most challenging area of study for UNETI third-year students.

Due to the status and obstacles, UNETI teachers make an effort to stimulate them to speak in the target language. Students should be willing to practice speaking and negotiating meaning in order to improve their communication skills. Teachers may help students by providing strategy training in accordance with its materials. The techniques used by language learners are one of three linked factors affecting their language learning. This research aimed to investigate communication strategies (CSS) in order to highlight the critical role these tactics play in learning to communicate with the population of third-year non-English major students at UNETI. From the objectives of the study, the following research question was formulated:

What oral communication strategies do third-year non-English major students use to tackle speaking problems in the EFL classroom at UNETI?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Definitions of CSs

Communication strategies are defined as intentional strategies for resolving what seems to a person as a difficulty in achieving a specific communication objective (Færch & Kasper, 1980). Tarone (1980) claims communication strategies as the joint effort of two interlocutors to agree on meaning. Canale (1983) states CSs as attempts to improve the effectiveness of communication. Bialystok (1990) points out that CSs are methods of communicating effectively through the use of language. Besides, Dornyei (1995) proposes an extension of the definition of CSs to include the primary purpose of meaning negotiation. According to the criteria provided above, many academics see CSs as modes of communication facilitated by the use of particular technologies. These definitions vary in their specificities; however, all of them attribute to CSs same objective, namely the resolution of communication issues.

2.2. Classifications of oral CSs

There have been a few taxonomies of oral communication strategies, among which were based on the interactional approach by Færch and Kasper's (1980), Tarone (1981), Bialystok's (1990), and Dörnyei's (1995). Table 1 demonstrates the different classifications of oral communication.

According to some researchers, such as Bialystok (1990), and Nakatini (2006), Tarone's typology is likely the best in terms of emphasizing the cognitive processes underlying various problem-solving strategies, whereas Færch and Kasper's typology is less analytic and more psychological in nature. For this research, the similarities instead of the differences between these typologies are more important. Language experts believe that adopting certain communication strategies might help compensate for a learner's target language deficiency (Dornyei, 1995). Oxford (1990) believes appropriate language learning strategies are essential for communicative competence development. Students utilize a wide range of diverse language learning techniques to improve their speaking skills. Ellis (1994) and Nakatani (2005) argue that competency impacts learning strategies.

Table 1. Classifications of oral communication strategies

Færch and Kasper's (1980)	Tarone (1981)	Bialystok (1990)	Dörnyei (1995)
• Reduction strategies • Formal reduction • Functional reduction • Achievement strategies • Compensatory strategies or non-cooperative strategies • Retrieval strategies	• Paraphrase: Approximation, word coinage, circumlocution • Borrowing (Conscious transfer): Literal translation, language switch, appeak for assistance, mime. • Avoidance: Topic avoidance. message abandonment.	• First language based strategies • Second language based strategies • Non-language strategies • Analysis-based strategies • Control-based strategies	•Avoidance or reduction strategies •Message abandonment •Topic avoidance •Achievement or compensatory strategies •Approximation •Use of all purpose words •Word coinage •Use of non-linguistic means •Literal translation •Foreignizing •Coding Swtiching •Appeal for help •Time-gaining strategies •Use fillers or hesitation devices

(Source: Extracted from Bui, 2016)

Firstly, regarding social effective strategies, the emotional factors in connection to their social surroundings are linked with the students' emotional variables. High-proficiency students are said to be able to control their anxiety while still enjoying the practice of spoken communication (Ellis, 1994; Nakatani, 2005). They are eager to put in significant effort so as to learn English and to make mistakes. It is important for them to have a good social presence and to avoid interruption while communicating with others.

Secondly, fluency-oriented strategies refer to students' ability to communicate fluently. It is their goal to help listeners by concentrating on the rhythm, pronunciation, and clarity of the speech. They take their time so that they do not send the wrong signals to their interlocutors throughout their conversations.

Thirdly, in terms of negotiation for meaning while speaking strategies, they are linked to the speaker's negotiations with interlocutors. Interlocutors must adjust their contact to ensure successful communication. Their goals must be crystal clear to their audience. They offer examples of words till the listener understands their intended meaning. They additionally look to check whether their interlocutor is getting their messages.

The fourth strategy is regarded as the accuracy-oriented one. Since speakers want to communicate properly, they attempt to be precise by self-correcting at any time. While they are aware that it would be tough, they would want to emulate the local's accents. Being conscious of the appropriateness of one's speech is regarded as a critical aspect of language development.

With regard to message reduction and alteration strategies, these techniques assist learners in condensing an original message, simplifying their utterances, and confidently using terms they already know. Without the aid of their interlocutor, learners devise strategies to assist them in overcoming obstacles. They use paraphrasing, approximation, and rearranging to find suitable words. Foreign language students employ a familiar language, even though they are often conscious that their speech is diametrically opposed to their goals.

About nonverbal strategies while speaking strategies, it is populated with values from two variables pertaining to non-verbal communication methods. Hence, body language is inextricably linked to this strategy. Learners interact with one another via eye contact, gestures, and facial expressions. When speaking English, students may use eye contact to elicit the listeners' attention.

Gestures and facial expressions help the listeners deduce what the speaker is trying to convey.

Another important communication component is plagued with message abandonment. When individuals find difficulties adopting their first speaking approach, they become disheartened and stop trying to communicate. When problems in the target language occur, students utilize various strategies to avoid communicating. When they are unable to locate appropriate forms or rules, they abandon communication in the middle of a phrase. Numerous gaps follow without the interlocutor being asked to resume the conversation. In the worst-case scenario, they remain silent. This was necessary owing to a lack of knowledge in the target language. Thus, lower-level foreign language learners' techniques are frequently utilized. Due to their lack of strategic competence, these learners must leave the engagement. There is evidence that these are message abandonment strategies (Færch & Kasper, 1980).

Last but not least, the strategy of attempting to think in English strategies significantly encourages learners to think as much as possible during genuine discussion. A skilled communicator reacts promptly to interlocutors. Learners express dissatisfaction with the process of thinking in their original language and then producing an English sentence. The effort made by students to think in English makes great sense. In other words, proficient oral learners are also likely to use these strategies.

2.3. Empirical studies on oral CSs

There have been several empirical studies on oral communication strategies.

Dornyei (1995) conducted a six-week experiment on CS in a Hungarian high school. The findings indicated that participants used three reduction and achievement strategies, regarding avoidance and replacement, circumlocution, and fillers and hesitation devices. During the study, the strategy training group made significant improvements in both strategy use and overall speech performance. Additionally, learners' views about training were shown to be favorable. Strategy training has a positive impact on second language development. This research showed that CSs may be teachable, and learners' strategy usage may be influenced by instruction. Although Dörnyei's study is relevant to the present study, it is limited to only the three strategies mentioned above. The present research focuses on several CSs (such as reduction methods,

accomplishment, changed interaction, and social interaction).

Nakanati (2005) studied the effect of oral communication techniques on the discourse of Japanese EFL learners and came to completely opposite conclusions. Nakatani's research focused on the benefits of increasing awareness of communication strategy usage. Sixty-two female learners were split into a treatment group and a control group. Those in the control group got just the usual instruction, while those in the treatment group received training in meta-cognition and "reduction" and "achievement strategies" over 12 weeks. It also featured 'message abandonment' and 'interlanguage-based reduction techniques' and included "help-seeking". It was reported that changed interaction techniques were regarded as accomplishment strategies.

Jindathai (2016) examined 382 Thai engineering students' usage of oral CSs and their ability to communicate in English. The quantitative analysis revealed that students commonly used message reduction and altering tactics to overcome speaking challenges and most typically reported negotiation of meaning while listening to prevail oral difficulties. In addition, social affective, circumlocutional, and fluency-oriented communication strategies were strongly influenced by students' experiences with oral communication difficulties in the target language.

An investigation of Turkish EFL learners' use of oral CSs conducted by Demir et al. (2018) was employed a mixed-method approach. The qualitative data from the interviews which corroborated the quantitative findings from questionnaire indicated the participants' ability to use oral CSs with meaning negotiation gaining primacy. Furthermore, the findings indicated that students' motivation for communicating in English was the main reason why they utilized oral CSs.

In a Vietnamese-context research on the "Exploring English Oral Communication Strategies used by Vietnamese Students in Transactional Education Advanced Programs in Viet Nam", Bui (2016) provided a broad look at students' oral CS habits and the strategies they used to confront their English communication problems which were analyzed from the questionnaire and interview. This mixed-method research examined English OCS to deal with their English OCS problems as well as to enhance their English oral communication competence. A significant correlation between the

utilization of English oral communication strategies and students' motivation and their language competency was additionally discovered. This new study reveals fresh findings on Vietnamese learners in this setting.

In another domestic setting, intermediate-level English speakers were studied by Nguyen & Nguyen (2016) on their communication approaches. The participants of the research were third-year non-English major students at People's Police University who were selected for their availability, preference for participation, and level of English proficiency. Questionnaire and group discussion were employed to gather both quantitative and qualitative data on students' preferences of CSs and their perspectives towards using those strategies. The research also discovered the prevalence of communication techniques and students' opinions on using communicative strategies. This research yielded suggestions for teaching and studying English for communicative competency in Viet Nam.

A study conducted by Le et al. (2020) significantly determined the most frequently utilized strategies in oral English communication at Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology (HUTECH) in Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam. The researchers employed questionnaires and focus-group interviews as the main instruments to collect data from 213 English-major sophomores, juniors, and seniors at HUTECH. The study discovered that the most frequently utilized speaking strategies are "fluency-oriented," "message reduction and modification," and "meaning negotiation while speaking," and that students used achievement strategies more frequently than reduction strategies. Furthermore, computer science utilization is consistent across all three academic levels of learners. The findings from the study are expected to contribute to the development of communicative competence and the use of CSs at HUTECH in particular, and in Vietnamese tertiary education in general.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research design

Quantitative and qualitaty methodology were employed in this current study to investigate students' use of oral CSs in EFL classes. The mixed methodology was utilized to offer the researchers more evidence and insight than a single one (Creswell, 2008).

3.2. Setting and participants

The study was conducted at University of Economics – Technology for Industries (UNETI) which offers students such as Accounting, Banking, and Finance, Electronics, Electricity, Linguistics Students at UNETI are obviously required to complete four English credits to be entitled to take the graduation examination.

Participants in this study were selected among the researchers' EFL classes in semester 2, the academic year 2020 – 2021.The population consisted of 50 third-year non-English major students from Faculty of Accounting. Third-year students were chosen due to the fact that they were acquainted with speaking English at university which was totally different from their focus on grammar and structure at high school.

Concerning the ethical concerns of the study, the initial stage was to get the headmaster's permission to conduct the research, followed by assistance from colleagues and staff at UNETI. Confidentiality and anonymity of participants were preserved since their participation in the research might impair their health, privacy, values, or beliefs. In reality, all the students were well-informed about the study at the beginning of the semester, regarding the objectives, methodology, and evidence from their interviews or questionnaire. Moreover, students were entitled to abandon their participation at any moment without consequence, and the study did not influence on their academic results. Students who were conscious of their own well-being were more inclined to interact comfortably, enthusiastically, and freely.

3.3. Data collection instruments

Interviews facilitate researchers' understanding of others' life experiences and the values as well as meaning they attach to them (Seidman, 2006). Interviews allow researchers to investigate each student's distinct strategies. Interviews enable individuals to express themselves freely since they are neither distracted nor affected by group opinions. The researchers formulated a series of questions, each of which was left open-ended to offer responders the opportunity to provide their own viewpoints. The interviews were additionally conducted in English to avoid misunderstanding and ambiguity.

In the second place, a questionnaire in Nakatani (2005) called the Oral Communication Strategy Inventory was adapted. It was designed with a five-point Likert-type questionnaire divided into two

sections. The first section included 32 items relating to tactics based on the eight oral CSs, while the second section contained 26 statements relating to strategies based on the seven oral CSs. This demonstrates that the original questionnaire addresses both listening and speaking issues. The current research, however, focuses only on speaking problems, excluding listening impairments. The updated questionnaire included just one item on participant strategies, speaking. To increase the clarity and credibility of the English and nonverbal thinking strategies, the researchers added two items to the questionnaire. Due to the need to prevent participant pressure, it was impossible to incorporate a data collecting component. The participants were asked to rate 32 items on a scale from 1 to 5. To guarantee that the questionnaire was understood by all the respondents, the researchers developed a bilingual-language version.

3.4. Data procedure and data analysis

The questionnaire was first delivered to the students. They were expected to fill out the survey honestly without any influence from teachers or researchers. It took them approximately 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire. For the interview, the ones who volunteered to be interviewed would be scheduled at an appropriate time for each participant. Moreover, students were asked for their permission to be recorded during the interview.

Quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS version 22. The reliability of the scales in this study was evaluated through Cronbach's alpha, corrected item-total correlation, and Cronbach's alpha if item was deleted. The reliability coefficient determining the internal consistency of a multiple-item questionnaire was calculated to be .83. This implied that all the questions were constructed similarly.

Qualitative data were transcribed into a textual form which was cross-checked the number calculated to gain a deeper understanding of students' CSs choices. Six phases were required to do the data analysis in accordance with Creswell's approach (2008). Ethical concerns were considered in this current study, therefore, after translating and transcribed, the researchers used pseudonyms to code and kept the data in separate files to ensure student anonymity. To avoid ambiguity, the translation was reviewed and adjusted by lecturers of English at UNETI. When the written data was gathered, the researchers attempted to fully absorb it in the subsequent phase by reading it over and over again. The third step is to identify and classify the data, which includes information on the students' oral communication strategies. These categories were used to group together smaller subjects such as social affective, fluency-oriented, negotiation for meaning, accuracy-oriented, message reduction and alteration, nonverbal strategies, message abandonment and attempt to think in English. The results of this research were compared to the quantitative data, and then checked with those of other comparable studies to see if they agreed or disagreed with those reported in the literature review.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Mean scores and rankings were demonstrated to analyze the significant role of CSs to improve students' communication competence

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and rank of oral communication strategies used

	Items	Corrected item-total correlation	Cronbach's alpha if item deleted	Mean score	Overall mean score	Rank
Social Affective (α = 0.841, n = 6)	I try to relax when I feel anxious	.737	.811	3.36		
	I try to enjoy the conversation.	.579	.825	3.54		
	I try to give a good impression to the listener.	.652	.809	3.45		
	I actively encourage myself to express what I want to say	.529	.827	3.38		
	I don't mind taking risks even though I might make mistakes	.610	.815	3.27		
	I try to use fillers when I cannot think of what to say	.658	.823	3.28	3.38	5
Fluency-Oriented (α = 0.841, n = 6)	I pay attention to my rhythm and intonation.	.712	.816	3.35		
	I pay attention to my pronunciation.	.656	.828	3.56		
	I pay attention to the conversational flow.	.766	.781	3.49		
	I change my way of saying things according to the context.	.542	.835	3.43		
	I take my time to express what I want to say	.559	.838	3.36		
	I try to speak clearly and loudly to make myself heard.	.658	.831	3.49	3.45	1
Negotiation for Meaning (α = 0.835, n = 4)	I make comprehension checks to ensure the listener understands what I want to say.	.730	.782	3.43		
	I repeat what I want to say until the listener understands.	.650	.817	3.44		
	While speaking, I pay attention to the listener's reaction to my speech.	.713	.787	3.44		
	I give examples if the listener doesn't understand what I'm saying.	.603	.828	3.37	3.42	3
Accuracy-Oriented (α = 0.817, n = 5)	I pay attention to grammar and word order during conversation.	.632	.765	3.25		
	I notice myself using an expression which fits a rule that I have learned.	.656	.763	3.45		
	I correct myself when I notice that I have made a mistake.	.526	.798	3.01		
	I try to emphasize the subject and verb of the sentence.	.612	.786	3.16		
	I try to talk like a native speaker.	.605	.789	3.36	3.25	7
Message Reduction and Alteration (α = 0.738, n=3)	I reduce the message and use simple expressions.	.583	.642	3.28		
	I use words which are familiar to me.	.573	.675	3.09		
	I replace the original message with another message because of feeling incapable of executing my original intent.	.574	.654	3.26	3.21	8
Nonverbal Strategies (α = 0.738, n = 3)	I try to make eye contact when I am talking.	.556	.698	3.43		
	I use gestures and facial expressions if I can't communicate how to express myself.	.576	.657	3.28		
	I always try to smile when communicating with others by the best friendly way	.568	.654	3.35	3.35	6
Message Abandonment (α = 0.886, n = 4)	I leave a message unfinished because of some language difficulty.	.732	.854	3.45		
	I ask other people to help when I can't communicate well.	.751	.843	3.36		
	I give up when I can't make myself understood.	.742	.845	3.28		
	I abandon the execution of a verbal plan and just say some words when I don't know what to say.	.737	.847	3.54	3.41	4
Attempt to Think in English (α = 0.810, n = 3)	I think first of a sentence I already know in English and then try to change it to fit the situation.	.654	.763	3.55		
	I think of what I want to say in my native language and then construct the English sentence.	.685	.720	3.35		
	I think about trying to arrange in order to develop the contents in English	.648	.758	3.41	3.44	2

Table 2 indicates the research's reliability through corrected item-total correlation and Cronbach's alpha if item deleted. All scales were considered reliable because Cronbach's Alpha > 0.7 and 0.3 < Corrected item-total correlation < Cronbach's alpha if item deleted < Cronbach's alpha. Besides, eight strategic variables, comprising 34 scales, also guaranteed the necessary statistical reliability theory and set the stage for analysis and subsequent inspections.

Moreover, the table demonstrated that the Fluency-oriented Strategies had the highest mean score at 3.45. The highest-ranked item was consistent with Nakatani's (2005) results. The current study indicated that competent learners seem to use more fluency-oriented methods, such as negotiation for meaning while speaking, and social-affective strategies. It was reported that during the conversation, learners claimed their concentration on rhythm, intonation, and pronunciation to avoid misunderstandings. They would additionally avoid silence or pauses in order to keep the conversation going. This may suggest their ability to cope with any possible breakdown in communication successfully. Thornbury (2005) asserts that when pronunciation is the primary focus, it is often treated in isolation. Training and practice in interactive real-time communication are often limited to the chat stage at the start and end of the courses. In comparison with the data yield from the interview, the researchers found the explanation from the students as follows:

Listening to music or watching Western films helps me to imitate native speaker's pronunciation, intonation or accent. I think it is the most influential factor in English conversations.

The second-ranked item was recognized with Attempt to Think in English Strategy that the calculated mean score was 3.44. The researchers discovered that students usually thought and visualized in English before attempting to convert their thoughts into words, instead of concentrating in their native language. They supposed that these enabled learners to speak more effectively and improved their overall communication skills. Today, language education techniques recommend that students should be encouraged to think in their target language before constructing and speaking native language sentences. In teaching circles, such an approach is considered appropriate in EFL. Willems (1987) asserts that successful language learners actively pursue the goals of developing the target language into a separate reference system and attempting to think in English as soon as possible. This item was most recently used in conjunction with three other items in the Attempt to Think Strategies. Due to the fact that English is a foreign language, students seldom get opportunities to practice their communication skills with native speakers. In other situations, learners engage but not in Vietnamese. To make speaking English a challenge, many learners must resort to using their native language as a facilitative strategy. According to the study's results, learners who think in English will aid in the development of their oral communication abilities. Thus, language teachers must provide students with efficient and useful oral simulated real-life tasks and practices that are interwoven with strategy training in order to encourage students to think in English before speaking, rather than their native language, which contributes to their communication breakdowns (Dörnyei, 1995).

Participants voted to use Negotiation for Meaning (mean score = 3.42) as the third most preferred approach. Nakatani (2005) claims that advanced students got involved in communication-maintaining strategies or Negotiation for Meaning when speaking. Meanwhile, elementary-level students often engaged in communication disruption tactics which could be regarded as Message Abandonment indicated as the fourth utilized by students at UNETI. This finding is consistent with Jindathai (2016) and Demir et al. (2018). Tarone (1980) said that when a language learner begins speaking on a subject but is unable to complete it, s/he abandons the engagement. When speaking with native speakers of a language, a second or foreign language learner may choose to stop a sentence owing to a vocabulary deficiency in their second language. According to Nakatani (2005), speakers use these methods when they are experiencing difficulty with the target language. When they are unable to find appropriate forms or standards, they either stop communication or stay silent and unresponsive. This author also states that students adopted Message Abandonment Strategies when they encounter difficulties. Interviewees reported about the use of Message Abandonment Strategies that:

I ignored what I didn't understand in order to remain attentive to the teacher, maybe due to my lack of vocabulary.

I heard the teacher's question and knew the way, but I had no idea how to tell her in English. Finally, I shook my head to convey that I don't know.

Through the descriptive statistics,the fifth CSs was Social Affective with the mean score of 3.38 and the sixth one as Nonverbal Strategies of which the mean score was 3.35. Among those techniques, it was notable that students tended to make impression on the listening by making eye contact, trying to avoid mistakes, communicating in as much friendly way as possible. A possible reason might be that students seemed to feel nervous when they spoke English. However, this does not align with results analyzed from Jindathai (2016) in which social affective was reported to be strongly impacted on students' experience with oral CSs. Concerning the interviews, some students even struggled to maintain the talk by thinking in their mother tongue first, then translating their ideas into English, especially with complicated messages. Another resolution made by participants was reported with their gestures or body language to express themselves when they could not find any appropriate ways to continue conversations verbally. This finding was consistent with Nakatani (2005) that Nonverbal Strategies put many positive influences on students' speaking competence.

On the other hand, the lowest-ranked strategy with the mean score of 3.21 was Message Reduction and Alteration; then Accuracy-oriented Strategies was rated with 3.25. Among the least popular CSs, students were determined to replace the original message with another one because they could feel incapable of executing their original intent. The replacement used might be simpler and within their range of current vocabulary; which could be called compensatory replacement. It could probably be explained that students are merely concentrating on pursuing communication and attempting to convey their meaning and intent more clearly. Another cause might be to facilitate understanding with their peers. Those possible reasons were as similar as those in Nakatani (2005), Huyen (2016), Tuyen et al. (2020). Compared with analysis from interviews, students, correspondingly, reported their preference on using vocabulary that they were sure they knew. Regarding Accuracy-oriented Strategies, respondents did not focus on linguistics-related strategies and ignored following the rules that they had been taught or highlighted the subject and the verb in a sentence with a mean score = 3.45; and tried to make themselves keep going with the talk which sounded like a native speaking in accordance

with mean score = 3.36 respectively. The data drawn from the interview also revealed that almost all the participants maintained the conversation despite their linguistics-related problems. To be more specific, some students reported that:

I always try to use simple and common words or phrases to continue my conversation. If the listener can't understand, I will change other topics, instead of quitting the conversation.

If there is something that I don't understand, I will ask them to repeat for me to classify the message in a slower intonation; so that I could reflect the information.

In short, the three most favorite CSs among participants are Fluency-oriented, Attempt to Think in English, and Negotiation for Meaning; whereas, the three least ranked strategies are Message Reduction and Alteration, Accuracy-Oriented and Nonverbal Strategies. It could be supposed that learners enjoyed developing communicative proficiency by attempting to employ strategies in oral communication.

5. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study is to examine oral communication techniques, particularly as applied to higher-education students to identify differences in use. The findings reveal that students utilized all eight types of oral strategies in English oral communication. The two speaking strategies that are least commonly used are Message Reduction and Alteration and Accuracy-oriented. It is conceivable that the study participants exceeded their students' competence levels. They have increased their language comprehension, which has enabled them to communicate considerably more effectively in English.

These findings provide a plethora of instructional insights to not only researchers but also educators. First and foremost, teachers should offer chances for youngsters to speak verbally. Exposure to the target language may not be sufficient for fluency development. When producing output, the learner's knowledge of a second language is learned, and with time, the capacity to articulate a particular meaning is implanted. To achieve this objective, teachers should offer students realistic simulations of activities such as seeing a doctor or buying meals in a restaurant. Such groups may help students practice using communication strategies in their real settings. The on-the-job practice of oral communication skills needs suitable tasks. Students

may be unaware of the potential of these strategies to aid their English learning; thus, teachers should be encouraged to offer and promote communication strategies to them. When communication methods are used correctly, learners will be able to bridge the gap between pedagogic and non-pedagogic communication situations. Students' communication fluency and skills will also increase as a result of strategic competency. Focusing on CS instruction may aid in second language development to encourage students in their academic and their daily communication as well. Thirdly, training in classroom communication should be promoted. No course can possibly offer all of the information about a language and the instructor must encourage

students' self-discovery. Students should be not only be motivated to participate in activities such as English clubs or English-speaking competitions but also essentially able to work independently outside the classrooms.

REFERENCES

Bialystok, E. (1990). Communication strategies. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Bui, M. H. (2016). *Exploring English oral communication Strategies used by Vietnamese students in transnational education advanced programs in Vietnam* (doctoral dissertation). RMIT University.

Canale, M. (1983). From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy. In J, C. Richards and R, W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication*. Harlow: Longman (pp. 2-27).

Cohen, A. (1996). Second language learning and use strategies: Clarifying the issue. *A revised version of a paper originally prepared for presentation at the Symposium on Strategies of Language Learning and Use*, 13 (16) 1-25.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Demir, Y., Mutlu, G., & Şişman, 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.2018.11237a

Dörnyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(1), 55-85.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Færch, C., and Kasper, G. (1980). Process and strategies in foreign language learning and communication. *Interlaguage Studies Bulletin*, *5*(1) 47-188.

Jindathai, S. (2016). Use of communication strategies by engineering students in relation to exposure to oral communication in English at a Thai private higher education institution. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network (LEARN) Journal*, *9*(2), 135-154.

Le, V. T., Hoang, T. A., & Kieu, T. H. (2020). Strategies used by undergraduate English-majored students in oral communication. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies. 36*(1), 156-179.

Nakatani, Y. (2005). The effects of awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use. *Modern Language Journal*, *89*(16), 76–91.

Nguyen, T, T., & Nguyen, T. K. T. (2016). Oral English communication strategies among Vietnamese non-majors of English at intermediate level. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *4*(3), 283-287. Doi: 10.12691/education-4-3-9.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.

Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning*, *30*(2), 417-431.

Tarone, E. (1981). Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. *TESOL Quarterly*, *15*(3), 285–295.

Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Harlow, England: Longman.

Willems, G. M. (1987). Communication strategies and their significance in foreign language teaching. *System*, *15*(3), 351-364.