

# Use of Communication Strategies by Tourism-oriented EFL Learners in Relation to Attitude towards English Speaking and English Language and Exposure to Oral Communication in English

Tao Zhao, Channarong Intaraprasert

School of Foreign Languages,  
Institute of Social Technology, Suranaree University of Technology, Thailand

**Abstract-** This study investigated the relationship of attitude towards English speaking and English language, exposure to oral communication in English, and communication strategy use by tourism-oriented EFL learners studying at the universities in the Southwest China to improve their oral English communication. The communication strategy questionnaire (CSQ) and the attitude towards English speaking and English language questionnaire (AESEL) were used for data collection, and the quantitative method such as Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Chi-square tests were employed for data analysis. The findings showed that students' use of Communication Strategies (CSs) had strong relationship with the variable of attitude towards English speaking and English language, although the variable of exposure to oral communication in English was found to have just minor relationship with the students' choice of CSs. This study implied that the tourism-oriented EFL learners should be instructed on the basis of their strong motivation and encouraged to have more exposure to the target language.

**Index Terms-** communication strategies, tourism-oriented EFL learners, attitude towards English speaking and English language, exposure to oral communication in English

## I. INTRODUCTION

English as the global language has never been denied because it truly links the world together. British Council (2011) stated that English has already become a country's successful participation in the global economy and it works as an effective communication tool for providing individuals with access to useful knowledge, skills and employment opportunities. It has been found that communication among non-native speakers of English represents 80 percent of global English use (Finster, 2004). With the rapid development of economy, China, although it is a non-English speaking country, has been involved in more and more communication in English.

World Tourism Organization (WTO) predicated that China would be the world's largest tourist destination by the year 2020 based on China Daily's estimate (2004). Communicating in English with tourists in terms of understanding their expectations are keys to the tourists' satisfaction. In tourism industry both the supplier and the demander should communicate perfectly in order to ensure the quality and the needed performance standards. Feng (2011) claimed that with the rapid development of tourism industry, China now needs millions of English-speaking people to work in a variety of tourism fields, including hotels, travel agencies, tour guides, etc.

With this, much progress of tourism-oriented EFL teaching and learning should be made to meet the needs of the development of society. Tourism-oriented EFL programs in China are offered at different school levels: colleges or universities, vocational colleges, and secondary vocational schools. The tourism-oriented EFL learners at tertiary level are expected to have better English language proficiency, especially their oral communication ability. However, the lack of oral communication opportunities and communication strategies leads to the difficulty of oral communicating with English-speaking people for the tourism-oriented EFL learners in underdeveloped or developing areas. The southwest is one of the developing areas in China, and the tourism-oriented EFL learners in this area need more help with their English communication. Dörnyei (1995) brought up an important and interesting point in his study on the teachability of communication strategies (CSs) and even further suggests that "some people can communicate effectively in an L2 with only 100 words. The importance of communication strategies has been recognized and attracted many researchers' interests.

In terms of the definition of communication strategies, Tarone et al. (1976, p. 5) provided an early definition of communication strategies (CSs) as "a systematic attempt by the learner to express or decode meaning in the target language, in situations where the appropriate systematic target language rules have not been formed". Furthermore, Tarone (1983, p. 419) defined communication strategies as "mutual attempt[s] of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared". As these strategies reflected learners' attempts to make themselves understood to their interlocutors, they were considered interactional in nature. Moreover, Tarone (1983, p. 65) offered the following necessary criteria for communication strategies, in which she explicitly distinguished production strategies from learning strategies: 1) A speaker desires to communicate meaning to a listener; 2) The speaker believes the linguistic or sociolinguistic structure desired to communicate meaning and the

structure is unavailable or is not shared with the listener; 3) The speaker chooses to: a) avoid --- not attempt to communicate meaning; or b) attempt alternate means to communicate meaning. It was accepted that communication strategies are alternate means to express a concept or an intention, the correct way of saying which does not exist in learners' interlanguage system. The three criteria needed to be fulfilled for a strategy to be called communication strategy.

Researches have been increasingly conducted to improve the tourism-oriented EFL learners' communication ability. A great number of research works on communication strategies have been conducted. The first group mainly focused on the nature of communication strategies, namely, the definitions, identifications and classifications (e.g. Tarone, 1977; Bialystok, 1983 and 1990; Nakatani, 2006; Mariani, 2010; Somsai and Intaraprasert, 2011; Bui and Intaraprasert, 2012). Then, there were empirical studies which investigated the use of communication strategies in relation to different factors, such as communicative tasks, learners' general language proficiency, types of programs (e.g. Liskin-Gasparro, 1996; Wannaruk, 2003; Paramasivam, 2009).

However, the available research on communication strategies showed that although the role of communication strategies in developing learners' communication competence is important, very few studies have been conducted with Chinese students. To the best knowledge of the researcher, empirical works on communication strategy use carried out with tourism-oriented EFL learners in relation to attitude towards English speaking and English language and exposure to oral communication in English in the Chinese context have not been found. Thus, this present investigation aimed to fill this gap so that English communication strategy could be used for its expected goal.

In this study, two research questions were answered: 1) What is the overall frequency of each type of communication strategies employed by Chinese tourism-oriented EFL learners in relation to attitude towards English speaking and English language and exposure to oral communication in English? 2) Does the employment of strategies for coping with oral communication problems vary significantly according to the attitude towards English speaking and English language and exposure to oral communication in English? If it does, what are they?

## II. RESEARCH ELABORATIONS

### **A. Terms used in the study**

#### **- Communication Strategies**

The term 'communication strategies' (CSs and communication strategy for CS) for the present investigation refers to knowledge or ability used by tourism-oriented EFL learners to cope with oral communication problems due to their inadequate linguistic knowledge and sociocultural knowledge in an oral communication in English as well as learning techniques employed by the students in an oral interaction in order to improve, and maintain their oral communication in English. Communication strategies may occur in either pseudo communication or real-life communication both inside and outside language classroom settings. In the present study, 'communication strategies' and 'strategies for coping with oral communication problems' will be used interchangeably.

#### **- Students**

'Students' for the present study refers to Chinese undergraduate students who are tourism-oriented EFL learners from Guizhou University and Guizhou Normal College in Guizhou Province, Yunnan University and Yunnan Normal University in Yunnan Province, Guangxi University and Guangxi University for Nationalities in Guangxi Province, all of which are located in the southwest of China.

#### **- Attitude towards English Speaking and English Language**

'Attitude towards English Speaking and English Language' indicates the students' thoughts, feeling and emotion towards English. 'Attitudes towards English Speaking and English Language' in the present study will be divided into two groups: 'positive attitude' and 'negative attitude' based on the responses to the Attitude towards English Speaking and English Language questionnaire (AESEL).

#### **- Exposure to Oral Communication in English**

'Exposure to Oral Communication in English' in this study refers to opportunities students can use English to communicate orally, whether with native English speakers or non-native English speakers, like their teachers and friends. The students will be classified as: limited exposure to classroom English only and non-limited exposure to classroom English.

### **B. Research objectives**

The present study was carried on with exploratory purposes. It aimed at:

-Investigating whether the choices of communication strategy use vary significantly by the attitude towards English speaking and English language, and the students' exposure to oral communication in English;

-Examining the patterns of a significant variation in the frequency of the students' reported communication strategy use at three levels of the overall, categorized and individual CSs use with reference to the attitude towards English speaking and English language and the exposure to oral communication in English.

### **C. Participants**

Because not all the universities in southwest China offer tourism-oriented bachelor degree program, convenience sampling method was adopted for data collection. 814 tourism-oriented EFL learners were purposively selected from 6 universities (2 universities in Yunnan Province, 2 universities in Guizhou Province and 2 in Guangxi Province). The detailed information about the 814 participants was in Table 2.

### **D. Instruments**

-The instruments used in the present study included two questionnaires. The first questionnaire is the Communication Strategy

Questionnaire (CSQ). This questionnaire was modified by the researcher based on the topologies of communication strategies by Dörnyei and Scott (1997), Nakatani, (2006), Mariani (2010), and Somsai and Inatarprasert (2011), which were considered as the most recently established ones. With considerations of the research objectives, the research context, and the operational definition of communication strategies of this present study, this questionnaire included 35 items, including 20 items of strategies for coping with communication problems (CCP), 10 items of strategies for understanding interlocutor’s messages (UIM), and 5 items of strategies for carrying on the conversation as intended (CCI).

-The second questionnaire is Attitude towards English Speaking and English Language Questionnaire (AESEL). It was constructed on the basis of Ockert’s (2010) language learning attitude questionnaire and the researchers’ language learning attitude questionnaire (LLAQ), in which all of the items were modified to be used for the AESEL. The modification included: slightly changed items for being appropriate for the present study, covering 40 items. The first 20 items included the attitudes towards speaking English and the last 20 items include the attitudes towards English language. Additionally, the sum of scores would be taken to identify the students’ attitudes towards speaking English and the English language on the basis of 5-Point rating scale. As the possible maximum score was 200 and the possible minimum score was 40, the respondents who got 120 scores (including 120) or over would be considered to hold positive attitude, while those who got under 120 scores would be considered to hold negative attitude.

-These items were firstly translated from English to Chinese by the researcher in order to avoid the respondents’ misunderstanding or unanswering, and then were double checked by two Chinese experts in the field of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). The questionnaires were piloted and improved.

**E. Procedure**

During November and December, 2012, the researcher went to the six universities in the Southwest China in person to collect the data from the Communication Strategy Questionnaire (CSQ) and Attitude towards English Speaking and English Language Questionnaire (AESEL), to which 814 university tourism-oriented EFL learners gave their responses.

**F. Analysis**

The data collected were analyzed in quantitative method as follows:

-Information about the students’ attitude towards English speaking and English language and exposure to oral communication in English were coded with numbers.

-The data about the students’ exposure to oral communication in English and attitude towards English speaking and English language were processed with assistance of SPSS and cross-checked to avoid mistakes that might influence the results. The items in CSQ were categorized into three groups: strategies for coping with communication problems (CCP) including 20 items, strategies for understanding the interlocutor’s messages (UIM) including 10 items, and strategies for carrying on the conversation as intended (CCI) including 5 items. Meanwhile, the items in AESEL questionnaire were calculated to categorize into positive and negative processed by SPSS.

-The reliability was examined to see whether the data would be qualified for quantitative analysis. The results of Alpha Coefficient ( $\alpha$ ) or Cronbach Alpha was used to check the internal consistency of the CSQ and AESEL. The reliability of the two questionnaires was 0.90 which was considered acceptable and was above the acceptable criterion of 0.70 as suggested in Fraenkel and Wallen (1993). The reliability estimate of the CSQ and AESEL according to 814 Chinese tourism-oriented EFL learners was demonstrated in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Reliability Estimate of the CSQ and AESEL as a Whole and the Three Categories

CSQ Category	CSQ as a Whole (35 items)	Category 1 (20 items)	Category 2 (10 items)	Category 3 (5 items)
Reliability Estimate (Alpha Coefficient: $\alpha$ )	.90	.84	.83	.72

III. FINDINGS

**A. Variation in frequency of the students’ overall reported CS use**

Table 2: A Summary of First Level Analysis

Variables		Number	Mean	S.D.	Sig. Level	Variation Pattern
Attitude towards English Speaking and English Language	Positive	579	2.61	.37	P<0.01	Positive> Negative
	Negative	235	2.46	.38		
Exposure to Oral Communication in English	Limited Exposure to Classroom English	638	2.56	.37	N.S	---
	Non-limited Exposure to Classroom English	176	2.60	.39		

Note: ‘N.S.’ stands for no significance.

As shown in Table 2, the results from the ANOVA revealed that the frequency of students' overall strategy use varied significantly according to students' attitude towards English speaking and English language. It meant that the students whose attitude was positive towards English speaking and English language employed the strategies more frequently than those whose attitude was negative. Meanwhile, there was no significant difference found regarding exposure to oral communication in English.

**B. Variation in frequency of the students' use of CS under the three categories**

- Variation according to attitude towards English speaking and English language

Table 3: Variation in Frequency of Students' Use of CSs in the CCP, UIM, CCI Categories according to Attitude towards English Speaking and English Language

Strategy Category	Positive (n=579)		Negative (n=235)		Sig. Level	Variation Pattern
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
<b>CCP Category</b>	2.57	.40	2.42	.42	P<0.01	P>N
<b>UIM Category</b>	2.70	.48	2.61	.53	P<0.01	P>N
<b>CCI Category</b>	2.60	.52	2.31	.54	P<0.01	P>N

As shown in Table 3, the results from the ANOVA showed that significant variations were found in frequency of students' use of strategies in the CCP, UIM and CCI categories in relation to attitude towards English speaking and English language. The students with positive attitude towards English speaking and English language reported employing the strategies more frequently than the students with negative attitude towards English speaking and English language did.

- Variation according to exposure to communication in English

Table 4: Variation in Frequency of Students' Use of CSs in the CCP, UIM, CCI Categories according to Exposure to Oral Communication in English

Strategy Category	Limited Exposure (n=638)		Non-Limited Exposure (n=176)		Sig. Level	Variation Pattern
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
<b>CCP</b>	2.52	.40	2.56	.45	N.S.	-
<b>UIM</b>	2.68	.48	2.68	.53	N.S.	-
<b>CCI</b>	2.49	.53	2.64	.56	P>0.05	Non-limited>Limited

The results from the ANOVA in Table 4 demonstrated that the significant variations were found in the use of strategies related to exposure to oral communication in English in the CCI category, although no significant difference was found in the CCP and UIM categories. It meant that the students with non-limited exposure to oral communication in English reported more frequent use of these CCI strategies than those whose exposure to oral communication in English was limited.

**C. Variation in frequency of the students' CS use at individual level**

- Variation according to the students' attitude towards English speaking and English language

Table 5: Variation in Frequency of Students' Use of Individual CSs according to Students' Attitude towards English Speaking and English Language

Individual Communication Strategies		% of high use (3 and 4)		Observed $\chi^2$
Used More by Students with Positive Attitude towards English Speaking and English Language		Positive Attitude	Negative Attitude	P<.05
<b>CCP 2</b>	Using familiar words, phrases or sentences	78.6	61.3	$\chi^2=28.33$ P<.001
<b>UIM 6</b>	Trying to catch the interlocutor's main point	75.6	62.1	$\chi^2=15.32$ P<.05
<b>UIM 10</b>	Noticing the interlocutor's gestures and facial expressions	71.5	54.5	$\chi^2=29.96$ P<.001
<b>UIM 8</b>	Guessing the meaning of what the interlocutor has said	68.9	58.7	$\chi^2=8.93$ P<.05
<b>CCI 5</b>	Responding to the interlocutor despite an imperfect understanding of the message	61.7	45.1	$\chi^2=25.55$ P<.001
<b>CCP 5</b>	Using simple expressions	61.5	67.7	$\chi^2=14.87$ P<.05
<b>CCP 10</b>	Speaking more slowly to gain time to think	61.5	50.6	$\chi^2=9.03$ P<.05

<b>CCP 16</b>	Referring to mobile phone dictionary or another type of document	60.6	55.7	$\chi^2=8.56$ P<.05
<b>CCP 14</b>	Asking the interlocutor to confirm that one's made oneself understood	60.1	48.5	$\chi^2=9.46$ P<.05
<b>CCI 2</b>	Sending continuation signals to show one's understanding	55.8	40.4	$\chi^2=25.31$ P<.001
<b>CCP 11</b>	Correcting the incorrect and inappropriate utterances by oneself	55.1	41.3	$\chi^2=15.83$ P<.05
<b>CCI 1</b>	Trying to enjoy the conversation	53.7	36.6	$\chi^2=27.75$ P<.001
<b>CCP 3</b>	Correcting one's own pronunciation, grammar and lexical mistakes	51.8	31.5	$\chi^2=31.04$ P<.001
<b>CCP 1</b>	Using synonym or antonym	51.5	34.0	$\chi^2=33.72$ P<.001
<b>UIM 7</b>	Appealing for assistance from other people around	48.1	37.0	$\chi^2=9.62$ P<.05
<b>CCP 4</b>	Speaking Chinese instead when one doesn't know how to say in English	47.8	46.0	$\chi^2=11.19$ P<.05
<b>CCP 13</b>	Thinking first of a sentence one already knows in English and then trying to change it to fit the situation	47.3	38.7	$\chi^2=14.27$ P<.05
<b>UIM 5</b>	Asking the interlocutor to give an example	47.2	35.7	$\chi^2=8.88$ P<.05
<b>CCP 19</b>	Making use of expressions found in some sources of media	44.7	33.2	$\chi^2=11.93$ P<.05
<b>CCI 4</b>	Feeling all right if the conversation does not go smoothly by keeping talking	43.9	30.2	$\chi^2=22.02$ P<.001
<b>CCP 18</b>	Appealing for assistance from other people around	40.2	32.3	$\chi^2=8.57$ P<.05
<b>CCI 3</b>	Feeling all right for taking risks while speaking	38.3	20.4	$\chi^2=33.76$ P<.001
<b>CCP 9</b>	Repeating what the interlocutor has just said	37.1	28.1	$\chi^2=8.6$ P<.05

The results from the Chi-square tests in Table 5 showed that tourism-oriented EFL learners with positive attitude reported significantly higher use of 23 strategies than the negative attitude learners did. It meant that 23 out of 35 communication strategies across the CSQ and AESEL questionnaires varied significantly according to the attitude towards English speaking and English language. This variable was found to have the strongest relationships with students' choices of strategy use, with a larger proportion of significant variations in students' use of individual strategies. It was obvious that there was a significantly greater percentage of tourism-oriented EFL learners with positive attitude reported employing more strategies than the negative attitudes learners did.

- Variation according to the students' exposure to oral communication in English

Table 6: Variation in Frequency of Students' Use of Individual CSs regarding Exposure to Oral Communication in English

<b>Individual Communication Strategies</b>		<b>% of high use (3 and 4)</b>		<b>Observed <math>\chi^2</math></b>
<b>Used More by Students with Exposure to Oral Communication in English</b>		<b>Non-limited Exposure</b>	<b>Limited Exposure</b>	<b>P&lt;.05</b>
<b>CCI 2</b>	Sending continuation signals to show one's understanding	60.8	48.7	$\chi^2=13.2$ P<.05
<b>CCI 1</b>	Trying to enjoy the conversation	58.5	46.1	$\chi^2=8.64$ P<.05
<b>CCP 6</b>	Using nonverbal language such as body language	56.3	48.4	$\chi^2=11.37$ P<.05
<b>CCP 1</b>	Using synonym or antonym	54.0	44.4	$\chi^2=9.38$ P<.05
<b>CCI 3</b>	Feeling all right for taking risks while speaking	41.5	30.9	$\chi^2=7.92$ P<.05
<b>CCP 17</b>	Drawing a picture	27.8	16.5	$\chi^2=12.60$ P<.05

The results from the Chi-square tests in Table 6 revealed that there were six individual strategies varying significantly according to this variable. There were three CCP items and three CCI items. It demonstrated that the students with non-limited exposure to English employed six individual strategies more frequently than those whose exposure to English was limited in the classroom did. It showed that the students with non-limited exposure to English found it easier to use strategies for coping with communication problems (CCP) as well as for carrying on the conversation as intended (CCI).

To conclude, the findings revealed that significant variations were found according to the variable of attitude towards English speaking and English language, showing greater percentage of CCs use in all the categories of CCP, UIM and CCI. Significant variations were also found in the CCI category according to exposure to oral communication in English, as well as in some individual items of CSs of CCP and CCI categories in relation to exposure to oral communication in English, however, minor significant difference was found in the students' overall reported strategy use in relation to the variable of exposure to oral communication in English.

#### IV. DISCUSSIONS

The present study was intended to explore the use of communication strategies in relation to attitude towards English speaking English language and exposure to oral communication in English among tourism-oriented EFL learners in the universities in Southwest China for improving their communication. The results mentioned above were discussed as follows:

##### ***A. Use of CSs and students' attitude towards English speaking and English language***

The findings of this present study for the communication strategy use and the attitude towards English speaking and English language revealed that great significant variations had been found in the overall strategy use, in all the categories of CCP, UIM and CCI as well as the 23 individual items among the total 35 items. It showed that tourism-oriented EFL learners with positive attitudes reported significantly higher use of 23 strategies than the negative attitudes learners did. It meant that 23 out of total 35 communication strategies varied significantly according to the attitude towards English speaking and English language, and this variable had the strongest relationships with students' choices of strategy use, with a larger proportion of significant variations in students' use of individual strategies across the strategy inventory found to be related to their attitude towards English speaking and English language. It was obvious that a significantly greater percentage of the positive attitudes tourism-oriented EFL learners reported employing more strategies than the negative attitudes learners did. The tourism-oriented EFL learners with positive attitude surely did their best to know more about the strategies which could help them better communicate because they valued much about English for their future career. This might be a reasonable justification for the more frequent use of CSs by the participants holding positive attitude in this study.

Furthermore, at the individual level, most of the individual items consisted of self-reliant achievement strategies. Some possible factors might contribute to the reasons why this variable affected the communication strategy use so much in the positive way. The first possible hypothesized factor was motivation which was used to cause the differences in students' CS use related to their Attitude towards English Speaking and English Language. Gardner (1985) regarded attitudes as components of motivation in language learning. Besides, the research of Gardner and MacIntyre (1993) seemed congruent with what Oxford and Nyikos (1989, p. 294) concluded: "The degree of expressed motivation to learn the language was the most powerful influence on strategy choice." Oxford and Shearin (1994) declared that it is of utmost importance to understand students' motivation which directly affects the strategy use. In addition, the findings of the present study showed that more students held positive attitudes towards not only English speaking but English language as well and they had high motivation in communicating orally in this language, employing CSs use including functional practice strategies, such as 'extracurricular effort to communicate in the target language'; and conversational input elicitation strategies, such as 'asking for pronunciation correction', 'requesting slower speech', and 'guessing what the interlocutor will say', more often than did the less motivated students (Oxford and Nyikos, 1989), which was consistent with what Tamada (1996) found that differences in motivation orientation (instrumental or integrative) significantly influenced the use of language learning strategies.

Based on the findings of the present study, the effects of attitude on the choice of the strategy use were found to be significant. Students with positive attitude used CCs more frequently than those who held negative attitude, which was supported by the same result found in some similar studies (Bui and Intaraprasert, 2013) as well as the findings of Oxford and Nyikos (1989), with respect to students' use of strategies, highly motivated students reported employing CSs including functional practice strategies, such as 'extracurricular effort to communicate in the target language'; and conversational input elicitation strategies, such as 'asking for pronunciation correction', 'requesting slower speech', and 'guessing what the interlocutor will say', more often than the less motivated students did.

Another factor which might explain the significant variation was the students' language proficiency level after observing the types of CSs used more often by the students of higher language proficiency ability. This revealed that the students who had a good command of English language were more confident in communication (Chen, 2005; Huang and Van Naerssen, 1987). They could communicate orally by using verbally, e.g., synonyms and antonyms linguistically as well as nonverbally, e.g., body language. Therefore, the factor of their language proficiency level had been evidenced to relate to learners' CS use in empirical studies conducted by different researchers, namely Huang and Van Naerssen (1987), Margolis (2001), Wannaruk (2003), Weerarak (2003), Nakatani (2006), Lam (2010) and Bui & Intaraprasert, (2013).

One more possible factor for the variations of individual CS use in students with different attitude towards English speaking and English language would be encouragement. The characteristics of the research subjects indicated that a significantly greater proportion of positive attitude students' obtaining more encouragement than the other people. The encouragement can happen in class or after class. Students who obtained encouragement easily became positive attitude towards English speaking and the English language. This finding was consistent with what Dörnyei (1995) suggested that communication strategies need to be taught and he also suggests procedures for strategy training. Dörnyei argued that teachers should raise students' awareness, encourage them to take risks, and provide them with models and opportunities to use communication strategies. Undoubtedly, the students would make marvelous

progress with the language use if they were encouraged to try to take risks and used communicative strategies or to manipulate available language without being afraid of making errors.

In conclusion, the three hypothesized factors of motivation, language proficiency level and encouragement were used to explain the existence of significant variations in the students' use of CSs and attitude towards English speaking and English language.

### **B. Use of CCs and exposure to oral communication in English**

The findings of this present study showed that there were no significant variations either in the overall strategy use or in the CCP and UIM categories in terms of students' employment of communication strategies related to exposure to oral communication in English. However, the significant variations in the CCI category had been found according to exposure to oral communication in English, the students with non-limited exposure to oral communication in English reported more frequently than those whose exposure was limited to oral communication in English. Based on the individual items of communication strategies, the students reported their strategy use verbally or nonverbally to solve communication problems better than the ones who lacked exposure to the target language. The findings in the CCI category were also consistent with what Norton and Toohey (2001) pointed out that the success of good language learners, especially in communication, depends very much on the degree and quality of exposure to variety of conversations in their communities. It showed that language learners who were exposed to the target language or had conversational interaction in the actual situations tended to be more flexible and successful in using communication strategies.

The possible factor which may explain the significant difference for the CCI category and the six individual items, such as 'Using synonym or antonym (CCP 1)' or 'Using nonverbal language such as body language (CCP 6)' was that the students with non-limited exposure to oral communication in English were much more motivated by the non-limited exposure to classroom English. It revealed that they might experience the sense of achievement after the interaction in English with people and become motivated. The result was consistent with what Ushioda (2008, p. 25) states, "...motivation develops through social participation and interaction." This meant that the more exposure to oral communication in foreign language of learners, the more opportunities for them to become motivated in language learning. Oxford and Nyikos (1989) found that the more motivated students used learning strategies of all kinds, including functional practice strategies and conversational input elicitation strategies, more often than the less motivated students did. Accordingly, it meant that language learners who had more variety in their exposure to oral communication in English are likely to be more motivated to learn languages leading in turn to a high and wide range of strategy use in their oral communication.

In summary, the two hypothesized factors which were more exposure led to success and flexibility of language using and motivated for social interaction might contribute to the high CSs use by students who were not limited their exposure to oral communication in English.

## V. CONCLUSION

This present study aimed at investigating the use of communication strategies by tourism-oriented EFL learners to improve and maintain their communication. The Communication Strategy Questionnaire and Attitude towards English Speaking and English Language Questionnaire were employed to collect the data in six universities in Southwest China. The statistical methods such as frequencies, ANOVA, and Chi-square were adopted for data analysis. The findings of this study were discussed according to three levels of the investigation related to attitude towards English speaking and English language and exposure to oral communication in English: the overall CS use level, the CS category level, and the individual CS level. In terms of attitude towards English speaking and English language, the results revealed that significant variations and greater percentage of CSs use were found in all the three levels of students' reported CSs use and importance of attitude was proved again in the use of CSs in the present study. Regarding exposure to oral communication in English, interestingly, the finding showed that significant variations were found in the CCI category level and the individual CS level, revealing that more exposure to the target, more confident and much easier the students may found. This present study implied that the tourism-oriented EFL learners should be instructed on the basis of motivation and encouraged to have more exposure to the target language. Moreover, some further study should be conducted in relation to other variables, for example, tourism-oriented EFL learners' personality and CS instruction, etc., to investigate the further understanding about the use of communication strategies.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to extend their heartfelt gratitude to all the teachers and the students who are involved in this present study. Special thanks go to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Xueqin Liu in Guangxi University for Nationalities, China; Mr. Yi Wang in Yunnan University, China; and Ms. Xiaofang Jin in Yunnan Normal University, China. Without their help, the completion of this study would be impossible.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bialystok, E. (1983). Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies. In C. Færch and G. Kasper (Eds), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 100-118). London and New York : Longman.
- [2] Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communicative strategies*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- [3] British Concil (2011). British Council Partners with HSBC in Indonesia to Provide Teacher Training. <http://www.britishcouncil.org/accessenglish-news-partners-with-hsbc-indonesia-provide-teacher-training.htm>.
- [4] Bui, Q. T. T. and Intaraprasert, C. (2012). Gender, High School Background and Use of Strategies by English Majors in Vietnam for Coping with Communication Breakdowns. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, P. 1, Volume 2, Issue 12, February 2012.

- [5] Chen, Y. H. (2005). Computer mediated communication: The use of CMC to develop EFL learners' communicative competence (On-line). *Asian EFL Journal*. Available: [http://asian-efl-journal.com/march\\_05\\_yhc.php](http://asian-efl-journal.com/march_05_yhc.php).
- [6] China Daily, (2004). *China a top tourist destination by 2020*. May 13, 2004. Beijing: China Daily.
- [7] Dörnyei, Z. (1995). On the Teachability of Communication Strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), pp. 55-48.
- [8] Dörnyei, Z., and Scott, M. L. (1997). Review Article, Communication Strategies in a Second Language: Definitions and Taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47(1), pp. 173-210.
- [9] Feng, A. (2011). *English Language Education Across Greater China*. UK: St Nicholas House.
- [10] Finster, G. (2004). What English do we teach our students? In A. Pulverness (Ed.), *IATEFL 2003 Brighton Conference Selections* (pp. 9-10). Canterbury: IATEFL.
- [11] Fraenkel, J.R. and Wallen, N. E.. (1993). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. London: The McGraw-Hill Companies.
- [12] Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitude and Motivation*. London, GB: Edward Arnold.
- [13] Gardner, R. C., and MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). A student's contributions to second language learning. Part II: Affective variables, *Language Teaching*, 26, 1-11.
- [14] Huang, X., and Van Naerssen, M. (1987). Learning Strategies for Oral Communication. *Applied Linguistics*, 8, pp. 287-307.
- [15] Lam, W. Y. K. (2010). Implementing communication strategy instruction in the ESL oral classroom: What do low-proficiency learners tell us? *TESL Canada Journal / Revue TESL Du Canada*. 27 (2): 11-30.
- [16] Liskin-Gasparro, J. E. (1996). Circumlocution, Communication Strategies, and The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines: An Analysis of Student Discourse. *Foreign Language Annuals*, 29(3), pp. 317-330.
- [17] Margolis, E. (2001). *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education*. Great Britain: Routledge.
- [18] Mariani, L. (2010). Communication Strategies: Learning and teaching how to manage oral interaction. NA: *Learning Path-Tante Vie Per Imparare*.
- [19] Nakatani, Y. (2006). Developing an Oral Communication Strategy Inventory. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90( ii), pp. 151-168.
- [20] Norton, B. and Toohey, K. (2001). Changing perspectives on good language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(2): 307-322.
- [21] Ockert, D. (2010). Research articles: Survey research: How to develop a questionnaire for ESL / EFL research. *ELT Weekly*. 2 (75): 8-13
- [22] Oxford, R., and Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students, *Modern Language Journal*, 73(3), 291-300.
- [23] Oxford, R. and Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework, *Modern Language Journal*, 78(1), 12-28.
- [24] Paramasivam, S. (2009). Language Transfer as a Communication Strategy and a Language Learning Strategy in a Malaysian ESL Classroom. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*. 11 (1): 192-299.
- [25] Somsai, S. and Intaraprasert, C. (2011). Strategies for coping with face-to-face oral communication problems employed by Thai university students majoring in English. *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies*. 11 (3): 83-96.
- [26] Tamada, Y. (1996). The relationship between Japanese learners' personal factors and their choices of language learning strategies, *Modern Language Journal*, 80(2), 120-131.
- [27] Tarone, E.; Cohen, A., and Dumas, G. (1976). A closer look at some interlanguage terminology: a framework for communication strategies. *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 9, 76-90.
- [28] Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report. In H. D. Brown, C. A. Yario and R. C. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '77* (pp. 194-203). Washington: TESOL.
- [29] Tarone, E. (1983). Some Thought on the Notion of 'Communication Strategy'. In C. Færch and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 61-74). London and New York: Longman.
- [30] Ushioda, E. (2008). Motivation and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (pp. 19-34). United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- [31] Wannarak, A. (2003). Communication Strategies in an EST Context. *Research report*, Suranaree University of Technology, Nakhon Ratchasima, Thailand.
- [32] Weerarak, L. (2003). Oral Communication Strategies Employed by English Major Taking Listening and Speaking 1 at Rajabhat Institute Nakhon Ratchasima. Unpublished master's thesis. Suranaree University of Technology, Nakhon Ratchasima Thailand.

#### AUTHORS

**First Author** – Tao Zhao, Ph.D. candidate of School of Foreign Languages at Suranaree University of Technology, Thailand; Faculty of School of Foreign Languages at Guizhou Normal College, China. Email address: [tzhao65@hotmail.com](mailto:tzhao65@hotmail.com)

**Second Author** – Channarong Intaraprasert, Assoc Prof., Ph.D., School of Foreign Languages, Suranaree University of Technology, Thailand. Email address: [georgeintara@sut.ac.th](mailto:georgeintara@sut.ac.th)