Nacey, S. & Graedler, A.-L. (2013). Communication strategies used by Norwegian students of English. In S. Granger, G. Gilquin & F. Meunier (eds) *Twenty Years of Learner Corpus Research: Looking back, Moving ahead*. Corpora and Language in Use – Proceedings 1, Louvain-la-Neuve: Presses universitaires de Louvain, 345-356.

Communication strategies used by Norwegian students of English

Susan Nacey, Anne-Line Graedler
Hedmark University College

Abstract

This paper investigates the use of communication strategies by Norwegian learners of English, based on transcribed interviews recorded as part of the Louvain International Database of Spoken English Interlanguage (LINDSEI) (Gilquin *et al*. 2010). The data consists of 380 instances of communication strategies which have been categorized according to a taxonomy compiled from various pre-existing taxonomies of such strategies. The study reveals that the learners resort to achievement strategies in 96% of the cases. Among the achievement strategies, L2-based strategies are the most common, which makes sense considering the learners' fairly high competence level in English. A substantial number of instances of L1-based strategies, such as code switching, can be attributed to the fact that the interviewers understand Norwegian perfectly despite being native speakers of English. This strategy type thus contributes positively to fluency, rather than disrupts communication. Other aspects that are analyzed include the tendency for different strategy types to occur in clusters, and the success of different types of cooperation strategies, where the learner implicitly or explicitly appeals to the interviewer for assistance.

Keywords: communication strategies, L2 language learning, LINDSEI.

1. Introduction

Different strategies are available to the language learner when communicating in a second language (L2). Such strategies are generally termed *communication strategies* (Tarone 2005: 488). This paper investigates the use of such strategies by Norwegian advanced learners of English, based on transcribed material from recorded interviews. Our research questions are: what types of communication strategies are utilized by the Norwegian learners in our study, and to what extent and in which contexts are such strategies used?

Communication strategies may be divided into receptive and production strategies. Since our material does not contain any indications of comprehension problems on the part of the learners, our investigation deals solely with production strategies, techniques "employed by a speaker to express his meaning when faced with some difficulty" (Corder 1983: 16).

Situations in which learners lack or are uncertain about a lexical item they require may result in a communication disruption, "when mutual comprehension is impaired by one of the speakers misunderstanding the other or when the learner is manifestly in trouble in putting across what he/she wants to say" (Haastrup & Phillipson 1983: 143). In our material, any such sign of disfluency or disruption has been noted by the

investigators as a potential communication problem, regardless of whether it was perceived as such by the participants in the conversation.

2. Material and method

This investigation is corpus-based, in the sense that our primary data is retrieved from a corpus, viz. the Norwegian component of the second edition of the Louvain International Database of Spoken English Interlanguage (LINDSEI) (Gilquin *et al*. 2010). The LINDSEI corpus is designed to allow for comparison of the spoken English of learners with different first languages (L1s). The LINDSEI subcorpora each contain 50 interviews of roughly 15 minutes, following the same tri-fold structure: a conversation about one of three set topics, then a period of informal free conversation, and finally a picture description task. The interviews used for our investigation were collected in the spring semesters of 2010 and 2011. At the time of our investigation (late 2011), the Norwegian component was still under compilation at Hedmark University College (HUC). Twenty-nine interviews had been carried out, and twenty of these had been transcribed.

2.1. Participants

The informants were all volunteers recruited from a 60 ECTS university course in English at HUC. All the informants have Norwegian as their L1, and their English proficiency level may generally be rated as high-intermediate to advanced. Four of the informants are male, sixteen are female. Fourteen of the students were in their twenties at the time of the interview, while the remaining six were in their forties.

Two English native speaker lecturers at HUC carried out the interviews, but only four of the informants had the interviewer as their own instructor. Although the interviewers make a habit of communicating with the students in English only, both are fluent in Norwegian, a fact that the informants were all aware of.

2.2. Type of data

Each interview followed the tri-fold structure required by LINDSEI (see above). The interviews were transcribed following the LINDSEI guidelines,[1] including empty and filled pauses, back-channeling, truncated words, non-verbal vocal sounds, and overlapping speech. The transcriptions include the marking of foreign words as well as words with foreign pronunciation, contracted and non-standard forms, and unclear passages.[2] The twenty interviews providing the primary data for this paper comprise approximately five hours and fifteen minutes of speaking time.

Two analysts (the authors – one Norwegian and the other American) listened to each recording, identifying potential communication disruptions and the corresponding communication strategy in evidence. This study is thus product-oriented. The two independent evaluations were then compared to create individual learner profiles for each informant.

[1] The guidelines are found here: http://www.uclouvain.be/en-307849.html.

[2] Empty pauses are denoted by 1-3 period marks depending on pause length; filled pauses by *e.g. (eh)* or *(em)*, back-channeling by *(mm)* or *(mhm)*, truncated words by =; non-verbal vocal sounds and overlap are marked by comments encased in angled brackets (< >); unclear passages are denoted by <*X*>.

3. Communication strategies

Many different taxonomies of communication strategies have been suggested over the years (see *e.g.* Bialystok 1983; Blum-Kulka & Levenston 1983; Corder 1983; Færch & Kasper 1983a Paribakht 1985; Poulisse 1987; Tarone 1983). They have been organized around various criteria, such as *reduction* versus *achievement* strategies, *L1-based* versus *interlanguage (IL)* or *L2-based* strategies, and *analytic* versus *linguistic* strategies. Moreover, a variety of different terms has been developed by individual researchers to refer to more or less the same strategy, *e.g. code switching/language switching/borrowing* or *foreignizing/anglicizing*, *etc*. As Bialystok (1990: 45) notes, however, "the similarity in the strategies listed, and to some extent, even in their classification, is striking". We have therefore chosen to employ a taxonomy that is a rough compilation of several different pre-existing classification systems. An overview is provided in Table 1 and elaboration follows.

Reduction		Achievement										
		Cooperative			Compensation							
Message abandonment	Topic avoidance	Non-verbal signal	Verbal signal	Explicit appeal	Retrieval	L1-based			L2-based			
						Code switching	Foreignizing	Calques	Restructuring	Word coinage	Paraphrase	Approximation

Table 1. Communication strategy taxonomy

First, we divide communication strategies into *reduction strategies* and *achievement strategies*, following Færch & Kasper (see *e.g.* Færch & Kasper 1983b, 1984). With reduction strategies, the communicated message is 'reduced' due to linguistic difficulties. Learners change the message they intend to convey, either by refusing to discuss a particular subject (*topic avoidance*), or by attempting to convey something but then giving up (*message abandonment*). Both are so-called functional strategies, where learners change their communication goals. Færch & Kasper also discuss formal reduction strategies, where learners simplify their language to such an extent that they never risk encountering any communication disruptions (Færch & Kasper 1984: 48). We have not included this last subtype because determining whether a student has employed this risk-avoiding strategy on the basis of a single 15-minute interview would be no more than speculation.

If learners maintain their original communication goals despite disruptions, then they employ achievement strategies. Both *cooperative strategies* and *compensation strategies* are subsumed under this category. Cooperative strategies entail the learner appealing to an authority for assistance, and may be accomplished through various means:

- Non-verbal signal: rising intonation, hesitations (empty or filled pauses), etc.
- Verbal signal: *I don't know the: English word* (NO002)[3]
- Explicit appeal: *What do you call it in English* (NO006)

With compensation strategies, by contrast, learners attempt to solve their communication difficulty themselves rather than rely on an outside authority. Compensation strategies are divided into three subgroups: *retrieval, L1-based and L2-based.* We have chosen to exclude non-verbal compensation strategies such as miming, gesturing or sound imitation from our study, as they are for the most part impossible to identify on the basis of audio material alone (only one identifiable example of sound imitation occurred in our material).

Retrieval strategies are delaying tactics used when learners feel that they know the appropriate term but need a moment to access it. Such strategies are frequently evidenced by disfluencies in the form of empty and/or filled pauses, sometimes accompanied by the learner starting to say a word and then suddenly breaking off.

We identify three main L1-based compensation strategies:

- Code switching: insertion of an L1 word into the target language (TL), without modification. Example: *my father helped out with the* ***stabbur*** [Norwegian storage house on pillars] (NO028). In rare cases, the inserted term is from another foreign language.
- Foreignizing: modification of an L1 term to follow TL structure or rules. Example: *they were just swimming around really fast like the* ***stims*** *of fish* [Norwegian *stim* 'school, shoal'+ English plural suffix *–s*] (NO016)
- Calques: literal translation of an L1 term or expression into the TL. Example: *if you become a teacher in Norway you normally have end up in (em) .* ***children's schools*** [Norwegian *barneskoler* for *primary schools*] (NO017)

We also identify four types of L2-based compensation strategies, where learners rely on the TL alone to communicate, despite a lexical gap:

- Restructuring: the learner tries to express something, abandons the attempt and then tries again in a different manner. Example: *but (eh) when I started cleaning* ***it was .. I was working alone*** (NO002)
- Word coinage: creation of a non-existent TL word or expression. Example: *the other two days I work as a (em) .* ***stand-in teacher*** [for *substitute teacher*] (NO009)
- Paraphrase: rewording the message in an acceptable TL manner. Example: *we had this (eh) .* ***little thing in our ear*** [for *single ear headphones*] (NO007)
- Approximation: use of a more general TL term which shares semantic features with the target lexis. Example: *spiders* for *tarantulas* (NO009)

[3] The examples are marked with tags identifying the learners' L1 (NO = Norwegian) and a number indicating the individual interview.

4. Communication strategy taxonomy in practice

The empirical basis for our study is identifiable signs of disfluencies or disruptions in the data, which were subsequently categorized according to the taxonomy described in the previous section. However, in a number of cases the categorization into different communication strategies turned out to be problematic.

4.1. Message abandonment *versus* running out of things to say

Reduction strategies imply a change in the learners' communicative goal, either by their avoiding discussion of certain topics, or abandoning the message they have started to convey. We find that identifying reduction strategies, however, is difficult in practice. The only sure way to detect topic avoidance in spoken language is if the learner explicitly refuses to discuss a certain topic, something that never occurred in our material. Although a learner may potentially have known in advance that she lacked the vocabulary to deal with a particular topic and would therefore try to avoid it, it is impossible to detect such negative data on the basis of the recorded interviews alone.

Potential instances of message abandonment abound in the data, as in the following example (L = learner, I = interviewer):

1. L: so I think it's one of the biggest (eh) sailboats in the .. I don't know if it's the biggest in the world but at least in Europe **and ..**

   I: and when you were in the Orkneys and Shetland you slept on the boat (NO008)

Here the learner breaks off mid-sentence, with a slightly long empty pause. One possibility is that she lacked the lexis to continue and consequently abandoned the message altogether. A perhaps more likely hypothesis is that she simply ran out of things to say about the topic and just trailed off. The interviewer responds by waiting for her to continue, and then jumping in with a question when the student remains silent for a beat too long. This is part of the natural give-and-take of conversation, a collaborative effort between both participants. Although this type of message abandonment occurs often in the data, at no point did an interviewer challenge the learner to complete the thought. In sum, although message abandonment clearly is a communication strategy – one not unique to non-native speakers – it would be impossible to attribute this to linguistic inadequacy with any degree of validity.

4.2. Retrieval *versus* implicit appeal

There is a theoretical distinction between the cooperative strategy using non-verbal signaling and the compensation strategy of retrieval. In the former, the learner appeals to an authority – in this case the native speaker interviewer – for the target lexis or for approval. In the latter, the learner attempts to solve the problem herself. In practice, however, it is often difficult or impossible to distinguish these strategies as they can be manifested in identical ways. Hesitations, pauses and rising intonation may signal an implicit appeal for an 'answer', or they may simply be the student's way of providing a bit of breathing room while she searches for the desired term or expression. Moreover, the interviewer's interpretation provides a complicating factor because the learner's hesitations may be interpreted either as appeals for assistance or as retrieval

strategies (or may perhaps go completely unnoticed), regardless of the learner's actual motivation. Further, neither participant may be consciously aware of the communication disruption; it may be picked up only by the analyst after the fact (see *e.g.* Haastrup & Phillipson 1983: 144). In such cases we chose to differentiate the two strategies by relying on context. Specifically, if there was insufficient context for the interviewer to provide the target lexis, then the case was judged as a retrieval strategy. By way of illustration, consider the following example:

2. L: […] it also surprised me a little bit because **. the (eh) the (em) .. view**
   we get from Turkey and . <overlap> the
   I: <overlap> (mm)
   L: news in Norway is so different […] (NO001)

Here the learner stumbles, producing empty pauses of different length, repetition, and filled pauses until he finally finds an appropriate word, *view*, enunciated with some emphasis and freeing him to continue his message. No clues in the preceding text allow the interviewer to help the learner out; hence, the disfluencies most probably signal the learner's struggle to find the term he needs, rather than an appeal for assistance.

5. Use of communication strategies

We find a total of 380 individual instances where communication strategies are employed in the 20 interviews. Although the average is thus 19 instances per student, the median is only 14.5, with a range from 7 to 44. In 96% of the cases, the learners resort to achievement strategies rather than reduction strategies (see Table 2). This indicates that these students possess the skills and competence needed to talk about the topics in question, here often related to the learners themselves and their personal experience.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Reduction strategies
4% (n=17)</td><td colspan="4">Achievement strategies
96% (n=363)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Cooperative strategies
18% (n=65)</td><td colspan="3">Compensation strategies
82% (n=298)</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Retrieval
34%
(n=102)</td><td>L1-based
21%
(n=63)</td><td>L2-based
45%
(n=133)</td></tr>
</table>

Table 2. Overall distribution of communication strategies

If we turn to achievement strategies alone, as shown in Table 2, these students far more often prefer compensation strategies (82%) to cooperative strategies (18%). In short, the informants attempt to solve problems themselves rather than rely on the expertise of another. When they do appeal to authority, they tend to do so indirectly, through non-verbal or verbal signals rather than through explicit appeal. Moreover, although all the students turned to such indirect cooperative strategies at least once,

only eight of the 20 students appealed directly to the interviewer. This again reflects these learners' competence in speaking and their access to strategic resources, but probably also the fact that for the most part they are allowed to speak freely about familiar and/or self-chosen topics.

L2-based strategies are the most frequent of the three subtypes of compensation strategies (45%), mainly due to the abundance of restructuring, which again accounts for 44% of the L2-based strategies (see Table 3). Here, the student begins articulating one thought but breaks off mid-sentence only to attempt to express the same thought in a different way – all the time in English. Paraphrase and approximation, two closely related strategies, together account for approximately half of the L2-based strategies. Word coinage, by contrast, is rare, only used six times in the five hours of transcribed material; this finding is consistent with those of Haastrup & Phillipson (1983: 155).

L2-based compensation strategies (n=133)			
Restructuring 44% (n=58)	Word coinage 4% (n=6)	Paraphrase 37% (n=49)	Approximation 15% (n=20)

Table 3. Distribution of L2-based compensation strategies

5.1. L1-based compensation strategies

L1-based strategies are only half as frequent as L2-based strategies, representing one-fifth of the total number of compensation strategies and 16% of the total instances of communication strategies. This is perhaps not so surprising, given the advanced proficiency level of the learners and their habit of speaking only English with their college lecturers. Still, all but one of the 20 learners rely on their native Norwegian at least at some point in the conversation.

All three subtypes of L1-based strategies are found, but code switching is by far the most common, accounting for more than 78% of the L1-based instances (see Table 4). The strategies of calquing and foreignizing are much less common, representing 14% and 8%, respectively.

L1-based compensation strategies (n=63)		
Code-switching 78% (n=49)	Foreignizing 8% (n=5)	Calques 14% (n=9)

Table 4. Distribution of L1-based compensation strategies

Looking more closely at code switching, we find that all but two of the learners utilize this strategy at some point, averaging 2.5 times per student. Use of Norwegian is typically accompanied by either no or only very slight hesitation on the part of the learner, and no special remark by the interviewer other than back-channeling. Consider (3) below, where the student is describing a stay at a Norwegian language summer camp in the US:

3. L: and they learned **hardangersøm** and (eh) **rosemaling** (NO028)

Culture-specific terms – such as those here referring to two types of Norwegian handicraft – are typical examples of the kinds of lexical elements subject to code switching, along with system-specific educational terms. Here the interviewer does not react by questioning the term or suggesting English correspondents, in effect disregarding the code switching. Indeed, such equivalents may be difficult to find, generally requiring explicitation, so this lack of reaction is not unusual. Any back-channeling by the interviewer thus indicates comprehension or encouragement to continue, rather than confirmation of appropriate lexis.

Successful conveyance of the message and maintaining the flow of conversation would therefore seem to be natural priorities, more so than formal correctness. This is also shown in Haastrup & Phillipson's (1983) study where they too note the lack of follow-up by native speakers to the learners' use of their L1. In their study, however, the English native speakers did not understand the learners' L1, indicating that comprehension is not always a top goal in conversation. In our cases where the interviewers actually did understand the message, insertion of an English term might have seemed overly pedantic, with the risk of stifling the learners' flow of words. Even cases where the learner first uses an L1 term and then manages to correct herself using the English equivalent might be regarded as less effective in such a setting, perhaps because they violate Grice's maxim of quantity.

Several studies have pointed out the relative ineffectiveness of L1-based compensation strategies (see *e.g.* Bialystok 1983: 110-114, 1990: 29; Haastrup & Phillipson 1983: 154-155). Haastrup & Phillipson (1983: 155), for example, first postulate a continuum of communicative potential before concluding that "L1-based strategies nearly always lead to partial or non-comprehension and IL-based strategies often lead to full comprehension. As might be expected". An important caveat to such blanket statements, however, concerns the language background of the conversation partner. In cases where one interlocutor does not understand the L1 of the other interlocutor, L1-based strategies may prove unsuccessful. Whereas foreignizing and calquing may possibly successfully communicate, code switching is unlikely to help the listener. In our study, however, even though the language in the interviews is consistently English, both interviewers understand Norwegian. Seen from this perspective, L1 switching proves to be a highly effective strategy that not only does not cause any communication disruption, but may actually contribute to a smooth flow of conversation.

5.2. Strategy clusters

Even though we register 380 separate uses of communication strategies, we find that they are grouped into only 202 individual episodes. When faced with difficulty in expressing themselves, learners frequently resort to a cluster of strategies to convey their desired meaning. An example is (4) below:

4. L: because he was allergic to: (em) oh what do you call it in English *knott* (laughs) . (eh) the li= little mosquitoes
   I: ah yes little yes little mosquitoes
   L: yeah the little ones
   I: gnats or something probably I'm not that good on ... (eh)
   L: yeah . yeah he was allergic to them (NO006)

Here the learner first employs a retrieval strategy of hesitation, indicated by syllable lengthening followed by a filled pause (*to: em*), as she realizes that she lacks the required lexis. She then explicitly appeals to the interviewer (*what do you call it in English*) and follows this up by code switching (*knott*). Before the interviewer begins to respond, however, the learner quickly changes strategies to that of paraphrase, by describing what she had in mind (*little mosquitoes*). When the interviewer merely echoes her description, she repeats it, this time with extra stress on *little*. The interviewer finally ventures a guess while conceding that entomology is not his field. Even though the interviewer's guess is actually wrong – the target lexis is *midge* – the learner acknowledges this term as a sign of successful communication and the conversation moves on. Indeed, mutual understanding is reached, despite lexical inaccuracy. Moreover, the conversation flows naturally, with this cluster comprising only 20 seconds of recorded time. Such clusters abound in our material, indicating both the range of communication strategies at active disposal of these learners, together with their determination to make themselves understood.

Although clustering is a clear tendency, four strategy types have a greater propensity to occur alone. First, message abandonment occurs alone in 58% of the instances registered. As discussed in Section 4.1, however, it is possible that in such cases the learners simply do not have anything more to say about the matter at hand, rather than lack the relevant lexical item. Restructuring, where learners break off and reword their phrasing, occurs as a single strategy in 43% of all instances, exemplified in (5) below, where the learner apparently has no need of further strategies because she quickly shifts focus to alternative phrasing that allows her to continue.

5. L: so I think **her stay was . a= she experienced a lot** and . about herself and cultures and stuff (NO005)

Furthermore, one in three instances of code switching also occurs as a single strategy, already seen in example (3) above, where the learner simply inserts Norwegian cultural terms into an English sentence – again, an effective strategy given that the interlocutor understands the learner's L1. Finally, we find that 16% of cases involving retrieval occur singly, illustrated by the repetition and hesitation in example (6), where the learner struggles to recall a term.

6. L: we **had a . have had a . cottage** (NO008)

This situation is resolved without recourse to further strategies because the learner succeeds in finding the elusive target lexis (*cottage*). This is not the only case where learners themselves resolve a language disruption with an appropriate term; half of the learners do so on at least one occasion, accounting for a full 10% of the total of 202 episodes involving communication strategies. More common, however, is for such a

successful resolution to appear amidst a cluster of communication strategies rather than immediately after a single one. Indeed, the target lexis need not be the final word on the matter; at times, learners are unaware or unsure of having come across the appropriate term and thus continue with yet another strategy in their effort to ensure understanding.

5.3. Cooperative strategies

In another 10% of the episodes, the interviewer intervenes by attempting to supply the target lexis, or in two cases by explicitly stating that s/he also lacks the required term, as in example (4) above. Interviewer intervention usually involves the use of a cooperative strategy, usually in combination with other strategies in a cluster. Our material shows that successful resolution of a communication disruption – in terms of being supplied with the missing term or given confirmation of the lexical choice – depends in large degree upon the type of cooperative strategy employed. Non-verbal appeals are implicit, evident not by what is said but by how it is said. Hesitations, slowed diction, and prosodic features such as rising intonation serve as indications of indirect appeals for assistance. Being unspoken, they are easily overlooked by the interlocutor, either inadvertently because they are not interpreted as appeals for help, or deliberately, as determination of the term might interrupt communicative flow. Indeed, we find that two thirds of instances of non-verbal appeal result in no (verbal) indication whatsoever on the part of the interviewer. In a few instances, the learner confirms her own choice of lexis and moves on. Only one fifth of all non-verbal appeals are answered either by the interviewer suggesting a term or, alternatively, by back-channeling, as in (7) and (8).

7. L: they had **(eh) . house keeping** (NO005)
8. L: **(eh) .. college** third year in college (NO011)

In both instances, the learners first pause and then hesitantly venture a term, pronounced slowly and with rising intonation, and the interviewer responds by back-channeling, *mhm*. Such response must be interpreted with caution, however. In (7), the learner has found the appropriate term, so back-channeling presumably indicates comprehension and correct choice of lexis. The learner's choice in (8), by contrast, is incorrect because the topic at hand is upper secondary school rather than tertiary education. Back-channeling here thus indicates comprehension and encouragement to continue, rather than confirmation of appropriate lexis.

Implicit verbal appeals of the type *I'm not sure what you call it* (NO003) have a slightly better success rate, even though 56% of such appeals are effectively disregarded by the interviewer. However, 37% receive a response, in most cases a suggested term, while the learners find their own solutions in the remaining cases.

The most successful cooperative strategy is explicit appeal, where the interviewer supplies a suggested term in half of the 14 instances. In the remaining cases, however, the appeal functions more as a retrieval strategy, where the learner holds the floor – often with a series of different strategies – while attempting to resolve the difficulty himself, as in (9), where the speaker succeeds in finding the appropriate lexis on his own.

9. L: we went to to **what do you call it (eh) (eh)** some temples (NO009)

Finally, in the majority of instances where the interviewer provides a term, learners typically respond with verbal confirmation that the lexis is indeed the appropriate term, either by affirming the choice or by repeating and/or actively employing the term. Acceptance is not necessarily automatic, however, as the learners sometimes reject or question the supplied lexis, as in the exchange in (10), where the learner rejects the first term offered. In such cases, the problem is clearly one of temporary recall, rather than unknown lexis.

10. L: we don't wh= what do you call it when you do all this things in houses
    (em) make up it's a it's a program in England I think was
    I: to refurbish your house I don't
    L: not <overlap> refurbish
    I: <overlap> decorate
    L: decorate yeah that's the word yeah . s= we don't do so much decorating (NO011)

6. Concluding remarks

When dealing with learner data it is natural to look for implications for L2 teaching. Our data indicates that these advanced learners have a varied repertoire of communication strategies. Since explicit teaching of strategic competence has not been a common feature of English teaching in the Norwegian educational system, we presume that these speakers transfer their general communicative competence to their L2 conversational skills. As a consequence, it is probably unnecessary to give much focus to this aspect of communication in teaching and learning at higher levels; at less advanced levels, however, the situation may be a different one.

Nevertheless, there are several avenues of research about communication strategies in L2 learner language worthwhile pursuing, particularly after the Norwegian subcorpus of LINDSEI is completed. These include the following:

- correlation between the individual learner profiles and factors of fluency, personality type, age, etc.
- correlation between task type and communication strategy. Are there any differences with respect to the type of strategy used in different parts of the interview? For example, the final task in the LINDSEI interviews is a relatively controlled activity; our impression is that learners resort to cooperative strategies more frequently in this part of the interview.
- comparison of the Norwegian subcorpus with other LINDSEI subcorpora.

Finally, something to hope for in the future for this type of research is video-recorded conversations, which would provide access to non-verbal data. This in turn would allow for a wider range of strategies, including visual information, and the richer data would most likely make it easier to distinguish between different strategy types. Video recordings would also give a much better basis for interpreting the relationship between the participants in the interaction.

References

Bialystok, E. (1983). Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (eds) *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman, 100-118.

Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication Strategies: A Psychological Analysis of Second-Language Use*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Blum-Kulka, S. & Levenston, E. (1983). Universals of lexical simplification. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (eds) *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman, 119-139.

Corder, S.P. (1983). Strategies of communication. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (eds) *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman, 15-19.

Færch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983a). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (eds) *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman, 20-60.

Færch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983b). On identifying communication strategies in interlanguage production. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (eds) *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman, 210-238.

Færch, C. & Kasper, G. (1984). Two ways of defining communication strategies. *Language Learning* 34, 45-63.

Gilquin, G., De Cock, S. & Granger, S. (eds) (2010). *Louvain International Database of Spoken English Interlanguage (LINDSEI).* Louvain-la-Neuve: Presses universitaires de Louvain.

Haastrup, K. & Phillipson, R. (1983). Achievement strategies in learner/native speaker interaction. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (eds) *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman, 140-158.

Paribakht, T. (1985). Strategic competence and language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics* 6, 132-146.

Poulisse, N. (1987). Problems and solutions in the classification of compensatory strategies. *Second Language Research* 3, 141-153.

Tarone, E. (1983). Some thoughts on the notion of ‘communication strategy’. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (eds) *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman, 61-74.

Tarone, E. (2005). Speaking in a second language. In E. Hinkel (ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning.* London. Routledge, 485-502.