

The Types of Communication Strategies Used by Speaking Class Students with Different Communication Apprehension Levels in English Department of Petra Christian University, Surabaya

Nani I. Tiono, Agatha Sylvia

English Department, Faculty of Letters, Petra Christian University,
Surabaya-Indonesia
e-mail: nitiono@peter.petra.ac.id

Abstract: This article reports on a study that aims to find out the types of Communication Strategies used and mostly used by students with high and low levels of Communication Apprehension and whether students with high level of Communication Apprehension used more numbers of Communication Strategies. The subjects in a created classroom were asked to retell a pictorial story and a pictorial instruction. The results showed that students with high Communication Apprehension level used more numbers of Communication Strategies.

Key words: anxiety, language anxiety, communication apprehension, Communication Strategies

Language Anxiety can bring about several problems in the process of language learning since it can hinder the students from mastering the language; for example, an anxious learner may avoid delivering difficult messages, avoid being involved in class discussion, reduce their performance in public communication, et cetera. Anxiety refers to concern and fear, especially about what might happen (Oxford dictionary, 1995, p. 16) and language anxiety refers to a type of anxiety unique to second language learning (Horwitz et al., 1991, p. 25). To speak or to perform something using foreign language in a classroom situation can cause students' anxiety because they have to perform unfamiliar sounds in front of an audience, or because teacher and other students ask questions and give corrections or comments excessively.

Once, a student of the English Department of Petra Christian University was asked about her feelings towards language skill activities in class. Her answer was surprising because she said that the most

terrifying language skill class was speaking class since in this lesson she was forced to speak so that she always panicked. What she did was avoiding speaking although she had some ideas in her mind. She kept silent since she always got stuck in the middle of the conversation. Some students might even escape from class.

The highly anxious students usually construct learning strategies, such as learning certain tricks that help them to keep the conversation going on, in order to be able to perform well in their oral activities. Those strategies are called Communication Strategies. A Communication Strategy is defined as “a systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his or her meaning when faced with some difficulty (Corder, 1981, in Dornyei, 1995, p. 56). It can be in the form of using circumlocution, fillers, code switching, et cetera (Dornyei, 1995, p. 58). In other words, Communication Strategies can help the anxious students to be able to perform well in oral performance since they do their best to be able to give clear message to the listener.

Daly (1991) coined a term “Communication Apprehension” to identify anxiety of speaking a foreign language, which is defined as “the fear or anxiety an individual feels about orally communicating (p. 3). Communication Apprehension is one of the types of Language Anxiety which a person experiences in learning a second or foreign language. Horwitz et al. (1991, p. 28) stated that students with high communication apprehension tended to avoid delivering a difficult message, while students with low communication apprehension attempted different types of Communication Strategies to be able to deliver their message.

Communication Apprehension in this research was divided into two levels, high and low Communication Apprehension levels. Then the types of Communication Strategies used and mostly used by students with high and low levels of Communication Apprehension were investigated. It was assumed that students with high communication apprehension would use more Communication Strategies because if they were very anxious they might hesitate too much so that they forgot the words they intended to say and made many errors.

The subjects of this research were Speaking II and VI students of the English Department of Petra Christian University. Speaking VI students were chosen because speaking VI is the last level of speaking class in the English Department of Petra Christian University and it was assumed that students of speaking VI might not experience high communication

apprehension since they had experienced difficulties from the previous speaking classes and they had mastered communication using English well.

Therefore, the focus of this research was to find out the types of Communication Strategies used and mostly used by different levels of Communication Apprehension, high and low Communication Apprehension levels and to find out if students with high level of Communication Apprehension used more numbers of Communication Strategies than those with low level of Communication Apprehension.

THEORIES

According to Horwitz et al. (1991), language anxiety means the feeling of nervousness, worry, or uneasiness experienced by foreign language students, especially English Foreign Language (EFL) students. Many students, especially in a classroom situation, find that learning a foreign language is stressful especially if they have to perform something using foreign language due to the fear of making mistakes, high feelings of self-consciousness, and the desire to be perfect when speaking (Foss et al., 1991). Difficulties in speaking can create more anxiety than other tasks, such as reading, writing, and listening. There are three divisions of language anxiety: test anxiety, fear of negative evaluation, and communication apprehension.

“Communication apprehension is the fear or anxiety an individual feels about orally communicating.” (Daly, 1991, p. 3). It usually occurs in a classroom situation. Students may avoid talking in foreign language because they are unprepared, uninterested, lacking confidence, and because they are afraid of communicating. The characteristics of a person with high communication apprehension level are they have difficulties in concentrating, become forgetful, and sweat much (p. 3). If there are conditions which force a person who is highly apprehensive to become involved in communication with others, he/she normally will feel uncomfortable, nervous, and embarrassed, and will appear shy to others (McCroskey et al., 1985). The most commonly used measure is made by McCroskey et al. (1985) which is called Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA). It consists of 24 items related to communication apprehension. Students experiencing high Communication Apprehension are those who score high in PRCA, while students with low Communication Apprehension level are those who score low in PRCA.

High Communication Apprehensive students are likely to avoid classes which involve communication. They tend to be silent, do not want to be involved in class discussion, and are unlikely to raise their hands to either ask or answer questions. On the other hand, students with low Communication Apprehension will get involved in class discussion, sit in front of the class, choose to discuss a difficult topic in class.

Horwitz (1991) also stated that “Anxiety about speaking a language can affect the quality of oral language production, making individuals appear less fluent than they really are” (p. 56).

“Anxiety can affect the Communication Strategies students employ in language class. That is, the more anxious student tends to avoid delivering difficult or personal messages in the target language.” (Horwitz et al., 1991, p. 28). Students who concern too much on their performance may become anxious when speaking in front of others. They sometimes make errors due to their nervousness, lack of vocabulary and hesitate too much. In addition, they may try to compensate for their errors, lack of vocabulary and hesitation by doing Communication Strategies. Therefore, Communication Apprehension influences Communication Strategies they use.

A Communication Strategy is defined as “a systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his or her meaning when faced with some difficulty” (Corder, 1981, in Dornyei, 1995, p. 56). Communication Strategies help the learners to keep on using the language in communicating with others. According to Dornyei (1995), there are twelve (12) types of Communication Strategies:

1. Message abandonment: the strategy of leaving message unfinished because of language difficulties. For example: a learner says “he took the wrong way in mm...” (He/she does not continue his/her utterance).
2. Topic avoidance: the strategy where learners try not to talk about concepts which they find it difficult to express. For example: a learner avoids saying certain words or sentence because he/she does not know the English terms or forget the English terms.
3. Circumlocution: the strategy used by learners in which they describe or paraphrase the target object or action. For example: if a learner does not know the word *corkscrew*, he/she replaces it by saying ‘*the thing that you use to open the bottle*’.
4. Approximation: the strategy in which a learner uses an alternative term to express the meaning of the target lexical item as closely as possible. For example: *ship* for *sail boat*; *pipe* for *water pipe*

5. Use of all-purpose words: This is the strategy when learners expand an empty lexical item to context where certain words are lacking. For example: the overuse of the words *thing, stuff, make, do, what-do-you-call-it, what-is-it*.
6. Word coinage: a learner creates an L2 word based on his/her knowledge of morphological rules. For example: *vegetarianist* for *vegetarian*. (*vegetarianist* is not stated in the dictionary).
7. Use of nonlinguistic means: a learner uses non-linguistic resources such as mime, gesture, facial expression, and sound imitation to help him/her in expressing the meaning. For example: a learner uses his/her hands and acts like flying to refer to *birds*.
8. Literal translation: the strategy in which learners translate a lexical item, an idiom, or a structure from their L1 to L2. For example: *do not enter sign* for *no entry sign*.
9. Foreignizing: learners use L1 word by adjusting it to L2 phonologically. For example: a learner does not know the word *tap*, he/she uses the L1 word, that is *kran* but with L2 pronunciation, so he/she says *kren*.
10. Code switching: the strategy in which learners use their L1 word with L2 pronunciation. For example: if a learner does not know the word *baki*, he/she will say '*baki*' with L2 pronunciation.
11. Appeal for help: the strategy where the students ask other students or teacher for help because they do not know or forget some words, structures, or idioms. for example: a learner may ask his/her friend by saying '*What do you call.....?*'
12. Use of fillers/hesitation devices: a learner may use filling words to fill pause and to gain time to think. For example: *well, as a matter of fact, now let me see*. Wajnryb (1987) added the examples of fillers such as *I think, you know, you see, um, mm, ah, sort of, OK, right, really*.

METHODOLOGY

The approach of this study was qualitative. The data contained Communication Strategies used by EFL students of the English Department. The subjects were thirty (30) students from Speaking II and Speaking VI classes. 15 of them (7 from Speaking II and 8 from Speaking VI) had high communication apprehension level and the other 15 subjects (5 from Speaking II and 10 from Speaking VI) had low communication apprehension level. The distribution of the high and low communication

apprehension levels of the subjects was determined after they filled in 100 PRCA-24 (Personal Report of Communication Apprehension) forms.

The instruments used were: a tape recorder to record the subjects when they were retelling pictorial stories given to them; a pictorial story telling and a pictorial instruction as the tasks (the pictorial story was about a young man who wanted to have a driving-license, and he had to follow a driving test. However, that young man made so many mistakes in the street so that he failed to get a driving license and he was arrested by the police for making so many mistakes in the driving test. The pictorial instruction was about how to make potato salad); Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24) by McCroskey et al. (1985) in Mejias et al. (1991) which was composed of twenty four statements concerning feelings about communication with other people and indicated the level of anxiety the subjects feel about participating in various oral communication situations; and Retrospective Questionnaire to find additional strategies such as topic avoidance, message abandonment, and appeal for help.

DATA AND SOURCE OF DATA

The data were collected from an oral presentation in English done by the subjects of Speaking II and VI in a created classroom situation in which the subjects had to speak in front of other people they do not know as the audience or the listeners. This created classroom situation was chosen so that they speak naturally – as if they were in a real classroom - and qualified data could be collected.

PROCEDURES OF DATA COLLECTION AND DATA ANALYSIS

100 PRCA-24 (Personal Report of Communication Apprehension) forms were distributed to twelve students of Speaking II class and eighteen students of speaking VI class of the English Department, Petra Christian University. Seven subjects from Speaking II and eight subjects from Speaking VI had high communication apprehension level and the other fifteen subjects (five from Speaking II and ten from Speaking VI) had low communication apprehension level. There was audience or listeners of about ten people who listened to the subjects while they were performing the tasks in front of the class. The audience was not allowed to interrupt or ask questions in the middle of the subjects' performance, but

they were allowed to help when the subjects appealed for help. The subjects had to come in the classroom one by one. After the subject had got the explanation of what they should do, they started telling a story and giving directions in English based on the pictures given to them. The subjects were taped while they were doing the tasks and the recording of each subject lasted about 10-20 minutes. After each subject had done the two tasks, he/she was given a retrospective questionnaire which required him/her to write down the difficulties they had faced during their performance and the ways they overcame it. The whole process of each subject lasted about 20-25 minutes.

The first procedure of data analysis was transcribing the data. Then collecting the Communication Strategies produced, classifying them into the types of Communication Strategies and identifying the types of Communication Strategies based on the high and low communication apprehension levels of the subjects.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Findings and Discussions on the Types of Communication Strategies Used by Subjects with High Communication Apprehension

There were twelve (12) types of Communication Strategies found in this section: message abandonment, topic avoidance, circumlocution, approximation, using nonlinguistic means, literal translation, code switching, appealing for help, using fillers, using wrong terms, self correction, and repetition. However, three Communication Strategies namely foreignizing, word coinage and using all purpose words were not found. Based on the data analysis, additional Communication Strategies called using wrong terms, self correction and repetition were found.

Repetition here got the highest number with the percentage of 23.84%, or as many as 196. The following is an example of repetition: when a subject intended to say 'turn on the engine' but she did not know or forgot the English of it, she gained time to think by using repetition words like "*he starts to ... he starts to ... he starts to ... up the machine*". In this strategy, the subjects repeated the same word or words to gain time to think. They spent too much time to think of certain words, phrases or sentences because they forgot words or structures they actually knew. In other words, they could not concentrate well due to their nervousness.

Thus repetition here was used to avoid silence while thinking of the appropriate terms so that communication – in this case the oral task – seemed to run smoothly.

Table 1. Types of Communication Strategies Used by Subjects with High Communication Apprehension Level

Sub- ject	Types of Communication Strategies											
	MA	TA	C	A	UW	UN	LT	CS	AH	UF	SC	R
1	-	3	1	8	1	2	-	10	11	10	2	9
2	1	2	2	7	8	3	-	-	2	5	4	10
3	4	5	1	11	-	-	-	3	3	7	8	20
4	1	1	1	10	5	3	1	3	10	7	10	16
5	1	5	1	15	3	3	-	-	-	4	4	11
6	-	3	1	11	-	4	-	4	4	8	2	5
7	4	4	2	8	2	-	-	-	3	2	5	8
8	1	7	2	7	3	-	-	-	4	3	3	2
9	-	4	2	11	3	4	-	-	28	4	4	21
10	1	5	-	12	3	2	-	4	2	6	2	15
11	1	3	-	11	5	2	-	5	8	7	10	13
12	-	5	-	10	7	4	1	1	4	4	12	21
13	-	-	-	11	-	3	-	12	-	9	1	30
14	-	5	2	4	4	2	1	-	3	6	5	7
15	-	4	2	10	1	5	3	2	3	12	7	8
Total	14	56	17	146	45	37	6	44	85	94	79	196
%	1.7	6.81	2.06	17.76	5.47	4.5	0.73	5.35	10.34	11.43	9.61	23.84

MA : Message Abandonment

TA : Topic/Concept Avoidance

C : Circumlocution

A : Approximation

UW : Using Wrong Terms

UN : Use of Nonlinguistic Means

LT : Literal Translation

CS : Code Switching

AH : Appeal for Help

UF : Using Fillers

SC : Self Correction

R : Repetition

The total number of approximation used by subjects with high communication apprehension is 146 or equals 17.76%. For example, a subject said *circle road* to refer to ‘roundabout’. It might be that subjects with high level of communication apprehension found difficulties in retelling certain objects in the tasks due to their apprehension. In this example, the subject tried to overcome the difficulty of finding the term ‘roundabout’ by using “an alternative term to express the meaning of the target lexical item as closely as possible” (Domyei, 1995, p. 56). Since the shape of the ‘roundabout’ was round or circle and it was on the road, the subject just created her own term by saying ‘circle road’.

Using fillers was the third strategy mostly used by the subjects, with the percentage of 11.43%, or the same as 94. The example of using fillers is “*there was uh... no entry sign*”. The aim of this strategy was the same as repetition, that is to gain time to think while trying to make the oral task run smoothly at the same time, but in this strategy they used hesitation device such as *mm* and *uh*. The subjects might forget words or utterances they actually knew, or they could not concentrate well due to their apprehension or anxiety in speaking in front of the classroom.

Appeal for help got the percentage of 10.34%. The example of appeal for help is “*perempatan tu apa?*”. The subjects used this strategy mainly because they lacked vocabulary or forgot some English words due to their nervousness. In addition, possibly because these subjects were afraid of making mistakes, they might think that it would be better to ask someone else than to produce the wrong words themselves.

Self correction, which was the additional strategy found in this study, got the percentage of 9.61%. This is the strategy in which the subjects corrected the utterance they had made before so that the listener could understand what he/she actually meant; for example “*a man and an instruction... I mean a man and an instructor*”. Self correction might happen because subjects with high level of communication apprehension might be so nervous to speak in front of the listeners so that they made quite a number of mistakes while retelling the stories; but since they realized they had made mistakes after they produced the words or phrases, they corrected their mistakes immediately. Based on the data, almost all of the mistakes in this self correction strategy were grammatical mistakes such as prepositions mistakes (*he turn out* eh *he turn on the car*), verbs mistakes (*he go ... he goes*), and article mistakes (pass *the policeman ... a policeman*). This showed that actually the subjects knew the correct grammatical forms they should have produced. Self correction strategy also happened because the subjects wanted to make clear the phrases or terms they already uttered so that they felt it was necessary to add a word modifier. It could be seen from these examples: *the exam ... the driving exam, the driver ... the other driver*, the making of *salad ... potato salad, square ... little square*. The other reason of having self correction strategy was because the subjects thought the vocabulary they chose was wrong or not appropriate so that they changed their words; for example: he stops on his *machine* eh ... *gasoline; gas station ... gasoline station*; with the *gas ...* eh with *petrol*; into the *fridge ... refrigerator*. Actually what the

subjects did for self correction here was mostly by changing the words with the synonyms; it might be because by doing this, the subjects could have time to think of the next thing they had to say.

Topic or concept avoidance got the total of 56, as much as 6.81%. The subjects in this strategy avoided telling the words or sentences which were difficult for them. Possibly, these subjects were afraid of making mistakes; thus, they preferred to avoid saying the words, sentences or concepts rather than to express them and just went on to the next words, sentences or concepts.

Using wrong terms, which is the new strategy found in this study, got the percentage of 5.47%. The subjects used other words, it could be English or Indonesian, but with different meaning from the target words. The example, to refer to ‘sauce pan’, for example, they said *stainless wok*. The low number of using wrong terms strategy used by these subjects indicate that only some of them were willing to replace the target words into the different or wrong words due to the fear of making mistakes in front of the listener or due to their thought that this strategy could not overcome their problems while most of them preferred to use repetition in which they can gain time to think the best words or terms or sentences.

Code switching terms got about 5.35%. The subjects just said the concepts or words in Indonesian, such as *perempatan* to refer to ‘crossroad’ and *panci* to refer to ‘sauce pan’. It could be because subjects with high level of Communication Apprehension tended to avoid delivering difficult words or sentences owing to the shy feeling or worry of making mistakes; thus they switched the English words or sentences into their native language, which is Indonesian and since the listeners were all Indonesians, they thought it would not be a problem though they just used Indonesian words.

The next strategy with the percentage of 4.5% was using nonlinguistic means such as mime, gesture, facial expression, and sound imitation to help the subjects in expressing the meaning; for example, a subject rounded her fingers to refer to ‘roundabout’. So, while they were retelling the story, they used mime or gesture to help them in expressing certain things.

Circumlocution in which the subjects described or paraphrased the target object or action got 2.06%; for example, “*make the potato lost its skin*” to refer to the word ‘peel’. Although the phrases produced here

sounded strange, they could still be understood; therefore, the subjects used this strategy. The number of message abandonment used was 14 or equal to 1.7%; for example, a subject did not finish her sentence by saying “*he fail to...*”. It might be that they lacked vocabulary, found difficulties in arranging the structure of their utterance, were confused to continue due to their nervousness, and were worried of making mistakes.

The least strategy used by subjects with high communication apprehension was literal translation. For example, a subject said ‘*lamp street*’ or ‘*lamp road*’ to refer to ‘street lamp’. In this case, the subject got the term by translating the Indonesian phrase ‘*lampu jalan*’ word by word and became lamp (‘*lampu*’) street/road (‘*jalan*’). The low numbers of using nonlinguistic means, circumlocution, message abandonment, and literal translation could be interpreted that these strategies do not help them in getting the target language.

Findings and Discussions on the Types of Communication Strategies Used by Subjects with Low Communication Apprehension

There were thirteen (13) Communication Strategies used by these subjects: message abandonment, topic avoidance, circumlocution, approximation, using all purpose words, using of nonlinguistic means, literal translation, code switching, appealing for help, using fillers, using wrong terms, self correction, and repetition. Foreignizing and word coinage could not be found; however, there were some additional Communication Strategies, that is, using wrong terms, self correction and repetition.

Approximation is the Communication Strategy mostly used by these subjects. Approximation got the percentage of 25.74%. The example of approximation found in this study was the subject used the word *mix* to refer to ‘stir’, or the word *cut* to refer to ‘slice’. It could be interpreted that these subjects used this strategy mostly because they do not have enough vocabulary so that they just used words that had similar meanings to the target words. In the example above, the word ‘slice’ actually contains the action of cutting, although ‘slice’ has a more specific type of cutting; therefore, this subject used the word ‘cut’ instead of ‘slice’. From this fact, it could be concluded that they were also not afraid of making mistakes when retelling stories in front of the listeners.

Table 2. Types of Communication Strategies Used by Subjects with Low Communication Apprehension Level

Sub- ject	Types of Communication Strategies												
	MA	TA	C	A	UP	UW	UN	LT	CS	AH	UF	SC	R
1	2	1	-	12	4	1	1	2	-	3	19	3	8
2	-	3	1	6	1	-	-	-	3	-	7	6	1
3	4	5	2	6	-	2	-	1	-	1	9	2	5
4	-	-	2	4	-	1	2	-	3	-	5	4	1
5	-	1	6	11	2	1	-	-	2	1	4	4	15
6	1	-	2	6	-	1	3	-	-	1	6	8	5
7	-	2	2	7	-	1	-	-	-	4	8	2	7
8	4	-	-	9	-	3	-	2	4	-	11	5	5
9	-	3	1	7	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-
10	-	-	-	6	-	2	3	1	-	-	3	3	2
11	-	-	2	12	-	-	2	-	4	-	2	4	6
12	-	1	-	7	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	4	2
13	-	3	-	12	-	2	2	2	4	1	1	1	6
14	-	-	1	8	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	1	6
15	-	1	1	8	1	3	2	-	-	-	2	6	3
Total	11	20	20	121	8	28	15	8	20	11	79	54	72
%	2.34	4.26	4.26	25.74	1.7	5.96	3.19	1.70	4.26	2.34	16.81	11.49	15.32

MA : Message Abandonment**TA** : Topic/Concept Avoidance**C** : Circumlocution**A** : Approximation**UP** : Use of all Purpose Words**UW** : Using Wrong Terms**UN** : Use of Nonlinguistic Means**LT** : Literal Translation**CS** : Code Switching**AH**: Appeal for Help**UF** : Using Fillers**SC** : Self Correction**R** : Repetition

The next highest number of strategy besides approximation was using fillers with the percentage of 16.81%. The example of using fillers in this study was “*mm... mix the potato*”. *Mm* showed one of the examples of fillers. Repetition got the percentage of 15.32%. The example of repetition was “*you have to... you have to prepare the potato*”. The subjects used these strategies probably because they wanted to communicate smoothly. They only repeated one or two words and used fillers to think for a while, then continued their explanation. Thus, it could be concluded that these subjects did not hesitate too much.

Self correction, as the additional strategy besides repetition, was the next Communication Strategy after repetition. It got the total number of 54, or as much as 11.49%. The example, “*he faces a test with his teacher... I mean with his driving teacher*”. This strategy was used

possibly because they wanted to give clearer explanation to the listeners. Similar to what happened to the subjects with high communication apprehension level, by adding a word modifier these subjects wanted to make clear the phrases or terms they already uttered. In the example above, the words 'his teacher' actually were already understandable based on the context; however, the subject thought it was not clear enough so that she added the word 'driving'.

The fifth strategy used was the new strategy, using wrong terms, which got the total number of 28, or equals 5.96%. The example: to refer to the word 'boiled', she said "*wait until it soften*". Since the subject did not know or possibly forgot the word 'boiled', she just tried to find a word that produced the same result as 'boiled' in the sense that, if something is boiled it would be cooked and soft so that the word 'boiled' was changed into 'soften'. It could be concluded that the subjects used this strategy because they were confident enough to take risks by using wrong words as long as they could explain the tasks fluently.

Code switching, topic avoidance, and circumlocution got the same percentages, that is, 4.26%. The example of code switching was "*he meets the... dilarang masuk sign*"; whereas the example of topic or concept avoidance was that a subject avoided mentioning 'crossroad'. In addition, the example of circumlocution was, to refer to 'street lamp', a subject described the characteristics or element of the object or word by saying "*the light which on the road*". Using non linguistic means was the next strategy with the percentage of 3.19%.

Message abandonment and Appealing for Help got the same percentage of 2.34%. The example of message abandonment was instead of saying 'seasoning', 'roundabout', and so on, a subject made her utterance unfinished. In appealing for help strategy, the subjects asked for the English term of '*menyalip*'.

The low numbers of topic/concept avoidance and message abandonment indicated that subjects with low level of Communication Apprehension did not avoid explaining difficult words or sentences. Instead, they kept trying to explain them. In addition, the low numbers of appealing for help showed that these subjects, since they were not afraid of making mistakes, tried to overcome the difficult words or concepts by finding other words or concepts that had similar meanings to the target words or concepts instead of asking the listeners. Moreover, the low numbers of circumlocution, using non linguistic means, using all purpose

words, literal translation, and code switching indicated that these strategies could not help them much in retelling the message in English.

The least strategy was Using All Purpose phrase and Literal Translation, which was 1.7% for each of them. Using All Purpose phrase, for example, a subject used the words '*what is it?*' in the middle of her utterance. It might be because these subjects were confident enough to get the audience's attention by uttering the words "*what is it?*"; while in Literal Translation, for example, a subject used the term '*do not in*' to refer to '*no enter*' sign.

Findings on Total Numbers of Types of Communication Strategies Used by Subjects with High and Low Communication Apprehension Levels

Table 3. Total Numbers of Types of Communication Strategies Used by Subjects with High and Low Communication Apprehension Levels

Communication Strategies	High Communication Apprehension Level	Low Communication Apprehension Level
1. Message Abandonment	14	11
2. Topic Avoidance	56	20
3. Circumlocution	17	20
4. Approximation	146	121
5. Use of all Purpose Words	-	8
6. Use wrong terms	45	28
7. Use non linguistic means	37	15
8. Literal Translation	6	8
9. Code Switching	44	20
10. Appeal for Help	85	11
11. Using Fillers	94	79
12. Self Correction	79	54
13. Repetition	196	72
Total	819	467
Percentage	63.68%	36.31%

The total number of Communication Strategies used by subjects with high communication apprehension level was 819, or equals 63.68% while the total number of Communication Strategies used by subjects with low communication apprehension level was 467, or equals 36.31%. Those findings indicated that subjects with high level of communication

apprehension used more strategies – though they did not use the strategy of using all purpose words – than those with low communication apprehension level, just as what was assumed in the statement of the problem.

Furthermore, it could be concluded that the subjects who had high level of communication apprehension, either subjects of Speaking II or VI, were so nervous and worried in retelling the stories in front of the listeners that they forgot things they actually knew or they lacked vocabulary, hesitated too much, and made many errors; so, to overcome that, they used many Communication Strategies to help them in retelling the stories. In addition, the existence of the listeners whom they were not familiar with might cause these subjects to be nervous and anxious because they might think that they were being examined and monitored. In contrast, the subjects who had low level of communication apprehension, either subjects of Speaking II or VI, were confident enough in retelling the stories in front of the listeners that they did not hesitate too much or were not afraid of taking risks so that they could concentrate and focus on the tasks well, as a result, they used fewer Communication Strategies.

CONCLUSION

Overall, this study aims to find out type of Communication Strategies used and mostly used by subjects with high level of Communication Apprehension and by subjects with low level of Communication Apprehension. In addition, this study aims to find out whether it is true or not that subjects with high level of Communication Apprehension use more numbers of Communication Strategies than subjects with low level of Communication Apprehension. The main theories which support this study are the theory about anxiety and communication apprehension from Horwitz (1991) and the theory about Communication Strategies from Dornyei (1995). The data are collected from individual conversations of two tasks which are held in a created classroom.

The writer finds twelve types of Communication Strategies used by subjects with high level of Communication Apprehension, that is, message abandonment, topic avoidance, circumlocution, approximation, using non linguistic means, literal translation, code switching, appealing for help, using fillers, using wrong terms, self correction, and repetition.

Repetition, which is used to gain time to think, is the Communication Strategies mostly used by subjects with high level of Communication Apprehension. There are thirteen types of Communication Strategies used by subjects with low level of Communication Apprehension, that is, message abandonment, topic avoidance, circumlocution, approximation, using all purpose words, using non linguistic means, literal translation, code switching, appealing for help, using fillers, using wrong terms, self correction, and repetition. Here, the strategy mostly used by subjects with low level of Communication Apprehension is approximation. Subjects with high level of Communication Apprehension also use more numbers of Communication Strategies than those with low level of Communication Apprehension.

The higher percentage of repetition strategy used by subjects with high communication apprehension level indicates that they were not confident enough in retelling stories in front of the class; they hesitated too much. The higher percentage of approximation strategy used by subjects with low communication apprehension level indicates that they were confident enough in retelling stories in front of the class; they were also brave enough to take risks by saying something which has close meaning with what they intended to say. The higher numbers of Communication Strategies used by subjects with high Communication Apprehension level compared to those with low Communication Apprehension level indicates that subjects with high level of Communication Apprehension are nervous, afraid of making mistakes, hesitate too much, and make many errors.

At last, this study about Communication Apprehension related to Communication Strategies is useful for students who learn English as second or foreign language because students learning English, especially in classroom situation, are usually worried, anxious and nervous to communicate. Knowing, understanding, and using the types of Communication Strategies can help the students make their conversation go smoothly and clearly. Through this study, it is expected that students who are apprehensive or anxious too much in communicating using English can improve the quality of their speaking performance. Furthermore, the writer hopes that this study can give contribution to those who want to conduct further research such as finding the reasons for having communication apprehension and finding the appropriate style of teaching speaking in a foreign language classroom which can reduce students' anxiety.

REFERENCES

- Daly, J. 1991. Understanding communication apprehension: an introduction for language educators. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language Anxiety: from Theory and Research to Classroom Implication* (pp. 3-13). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Dornyei, Z. 1995. On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 55-85.
- Foss, K. A., & Reitzel, A. C. 1988. A relational model for managing second language anxiety. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22 (3), 437-454.
- Horwitz, E. K. 1991. Preliminary evidence for the reliability and validity of a foreign language anxiety scale. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language Anxiety: from Theory and Research to Classroom Implication* (pp. 37-39). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. 1991. Foreign language classroom anxiety. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language Anxiety: from Theory and Research to Classroom Implication* (pp. 27-36). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Mejias, H., Applbaum, R. L., Applbaum, S. J., & Trotter II, R. T. 1991. Oral communication apprehension and hispanics: an exploration of oral communication apprehension among Mexican American students in Texas. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language Anxiety: from Theory and Research to Classroom Implication* (pp. 27-36). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Oxford Dictionary. 1995. New York: Oxford University Press.