

FOCUS ON THE FORM VERSUS FOCUS ON THE MESSAGE IN *LINGUA FRANCA* CONVERSATION

Natalja Zagura

Abstract. The present article looks at the speech of two Estonian twelfth-grade students in an informal conversation in English. The aim of the article is to characterise the speech of these two non-native speakers of English in terms of the communication strategies used and their effectiveness as judged by the further progress of the conversation. It is observed that the student who normally gets good marks at school considers correct linguistic forms to be important, but at the same time she also has difficulties with using effective communication strategies when production problems arise in a conversation. The second student focuses primarily on conveying his message clearly and, when language-related difficulties occur, he skilfully employs effective communication strategies such as restructuring, circumlocution, approximation, word coinage etc. It is concluded that in order to communicate in a foreign language successfully, it is sometimes not enough to have a good command of the language and adequate amount of practice, some learners may also gain from explicit instruction in communication strategy, which can motivate them to be more active and fluent speakers of the target language.*

Keywords: language learning, conversation analysis, communication strategies, English, Estonian

1. Introduction

According to the Estonian National Curriculum for Secondary School (2011: Appendix 2, section 3.1.1), one of the main aims of foreign language learning at school is that the students are able to communicate in the target language, both orally and in writing. Secondary school graduates are expected to speak fluently, with mostly correct grammar, and taking into account the cultural norms of the target language. Most non-native speakers (NNS) inevitably have certain difficulties while commu-

* The research has been partly supported by the Estonian Research Foundation grant No. 8008.

nicating in a foreign language. Nevertheless, it depends on the individual what they consider to be a problem in their foreign language use and how they deal with that.

Salla Kurhila (2005) has investigated interaction between native and non-native speakers of Finnish, pointing to a difference in the participants' orientation towards grammatical correctness. In the data she studied a tendency could be noticed that in conversations in Finnish NNS oriented to grammatical details and correctness, thus "doing being a second language learner" (*ibid.*: 157). Native speakers, on the other hand, mostly did not consider grammatical correctness an important factor in conversation, going beyond the level of linguistic forms and thus avoiding emphasis on linguistic asymmetry (*ibid.*). Kurhila suggests that this discrepancy may impede successful communication and lead to misunderstanding and even negative stereotyping.

Learners of English are more likely to use this language for communication with NNS as English performs the function of *lingua franca* around the world. It seems that talking to other NNS of English, people should be more relaxed, not focus so much on the possible linguistic asymmetry and stop emphasising one's identity as a language learner. Indeed, some learners of English mostly prefer fluency over accuracy, focusing primarily on the message they want to convey rather than linguistic forms. Nevertheless, it can still be observed that some NNS of English treat grammatical correctness as being a highly important factor in oral interaction and make an extra effort to use the correct language. Thus, they talk a diligent language learner's identity into being. It is impossible to say which approach is better because the choice would depend on a number of factors, such as the context, the roles of the conversational partners, their aims, attitudes etc. Both accuracy and fluency are important aspects of communication in a *lingua franca* and the most appropriate proportion of both should be identified by the interactants themselves in a particular situation.

The present article looks at one example of an informal *lingua franca* conversation where NNS of English are involved. The speech of two Estonian twelfth-grade students provides the data for the analysis – one of them mainly focuses on the message he is trying to convey, the other often pays attention to the linguistic forms she uses. The aim of the article is to characterise the speech of these NNS in terms of the communication strategies used and their effectiveness as judged by the further behaviour of other conversational partners. As this analysis is based on qualitative (rather than quantitative) data from a limited corpus, no far-reaching conclusions and implications can be pointed out. Nevertheless, some suggestions can be made in relation to the communication strategies that are likely to be effective in similar contexts. Moreover, some possible implications for foreign language (not exclusively English) instruction are discussed in the final section of the paper.

2. Data, method and key concepts

The data used for the present study consists of slightly more than two hours of naturally occurring informal conversation. This data originates from the corpus MUSU (*TÜ Multimodaalse suhtluse andmebaas*), the sub-corpus ISU (*Interaktiivsete suhtlussituatsioonide allkorpus*). The conversation has been both video-

recorded and audio-taped. The researcher was not present in the room at the time of the conversation, which hopefully contributed to its authenticity. Moreover, as the conversation lasted for quite a long time, the participants were able almost to forget about the recording being made and to talk relatively naturally. There are five 19–23 year-old students involved, three of them being Estonian twelfth-graders who at the time of recording were about to graduate from the secondary school (further coded as E1, E2 and E3), the other two are exchange students from Spain (further coded S1 and S2), who at the time of recording were studying English language and literature at the University of Tartu. The Estonian students have studied English for approximately 10 years and have reached level B₂, one of them probably even C₁. The international university students speak English at level C₁. The present study takes a closer look at the speech of two Estonian students coded as E1 and E2.

The method of Conversation Analysis (CA) (see Hutchby, Wooffitt 1998, ten Have 1999) has been used for transcribing and analysing the conversation. This method has been chosen since it can treat the roles/identities of the participants (e.g. language learner, student, teenager) as a dynamic factor and makes it possible to relate the relevance of a particular category to certain interactional phenomena. Moreover, CA is an ideal method for detailed qualitative analysis of “talk-in-interaction” (Drew, Heritage 1992: 4).

In the course of analysis, the phenomena of interest are discussed within the framework of communication strategies (CS). The term “communication strategy” was coined by Selinker (1972) in his seminal paper on “interlanguage”, where he discussed the “strategies of second language communication” (*ibid.*: 229). CS research attracted many scholars after Canale and Swain (1980) included CS in their influential model of communicative competence, presenting them as primary constituents of one of the subcompetences, strategic competence. From that time on, numerous studies have been addressing the issues related to the description, use and teachability of CS. Despite and also partly due to the great scholarly interest in the topic, there is little agreement about what CS are, how they could be classified and whether they can or should be learnt in the classroom. The various definitions and taxonomies have been summarised and categorised by Dörnyei and Scott (1997).

In broad terms, CS can be defined as the strategies used by NNS when they lack some language structures or skills necessary for solving communication problems (Hennoste, Vihalemm 1999) or, as Faerch and Kasper (1983: 81) put it, “potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal”. In essence, CS represent the same mechanism which in CA is called “repair organisation”. In the present article the notion of CS rather than repair organisation is used in the course of analysis since it involves various detailed taxonomies. Labelling the phenomena analysed in the present study as particular CS makes the discussion clearer and more systematic. For the purpose of this study the taxonomy suggested by Hennoste and Vihalemm (1999) has been selected as it systematises a great variety of strategies in a clear and logical way. Moreover, it uses the same criteria as repair organisation in CA does: at which level of communication the strategy is used (turn level, topic level or phrase/word level); to whose text it is applied; who is the initiator of the use of a strategy and who suggests the solution; what is the direction of the process of strategy use; and finally, who comments on the process of strategy use or on the

solution, if anyone (*ibid.*: 1585). This taxonomy is a supplemented and systematised version of the one suggested by Dörnyei and Scott (1997: 188–194). Due to limits of space, the taxonomy itself is not discussed in the present article. The relevant CS, however, are characterised in the course of analysis. The present study focuses on the word/phrase-level strategies as they are predominantly used by the interactants.

As for the distribution of various CS and the relationship between strategy use and target language proficiency, relatively little attention has been paid to these issues. Moreover, the findings of relevant studies may even contradict each other. According to Nakatani and Goh (2007: 215), this discrepancy can be related to several reasons: scholars use different criteria for identifying the proficiency level of non-native speakers; moreover, they use different taxonomies of CS and thus count CS differently. Speaking of the general trends, some researchers claim that higher-proficiency learners use fewer CS because of the adequate linguistic and sociolinguistic knowledge they have at their disposal. Other scholars have determined that higher-level learners still use some achievement strategies (e.g. topic shift, paraphrase etc.), while lower-level learners tend to prefer reduction strategies (e.g. message abandonment) (*ibid.*). It should be noted that the present study does not aim to provide any quantitative data concerning the frequency and distribution of certain CS. This article presents detailed analysis of some specific instances of CS use and discusses the possible rationale for and outcomes of this use.

3. Communication strategies in *lingua franca* conversation

3.1. Focus on the form

One of the Estonian students participating in the conversation, a 19 year-old female, throughout the conversation tended to pay attention to the linguistic forms she uses – she tried to choose grammatically correct forms (e.g. verb forms, tenses, prepositions) and use the English words which closely correspond semantically to the Estonian words that she had in mind. It can be argued that the issue of using semantically precise words does not fall under the category of orientation towards using the correct form. Nevertheless, it has been included here as it reflects the NNS's desire to use as precise language as possible, to translate the words from the native language (L1) into the target language (TL) directly and succinctly, without resorting to any creativity.

(1) Topic: leisure time in Estonia¹

- 1 E1: well Estonians do go out for ee (.) in the (.) at weekends.
- 2 eeee but eee (o.2) usually (.) in ee (.) at in workdays. there there
- 3 are not so many people at the streets like if (.) if you come out at about
- 4 10 o'clock the the s- streets maybe (o.2) completely empty.
- 5 S1: yes, yes

¹ The transcription conventions used in the examples are explained at the end of the article.

Example (1) illustrates the strategy of self repair, which could be observed in the speech of E1 on several occasions throughout the two-hour conversation. Having started a phrase ‘go out for (weekends)’ (line 1), E1 probably decides that the preposition ‘for’ would not be correct in this context and thus she starts searching for a different suitable preposition, exposing her so-called “mental path” (Kurhila 2005: 146) towards the target word, which she (correctly) decides to be ‘at’ (line 1). Immediately after that she struggles to choose the correct preposition to precede the noun ‘weekdays’. Having started with ‘in’, E1 repairs it to ‘at’ and then again (incorrectly) to ‘in’ (line 2). This demonstrates that E1 considers it important that she uses correct prepositions even in an informal conversation in English despite the fact that in this context incorrect use of a preposition would not radically change the meaning of the utterance. Displaying the effort she takes in formulating the utterance correctly, E1 orients to her role as a NNS/language learner.

This extract also contains strategies that are meant to stall for time, such as pausing to gain time (Est *edasilükkamispaus* (Hennoste, Vihalemm 1999: 1590)), using certain sounds to fill pauses (line 2) (Est *üneem* (*ibid.*)) and self-repetition (lines 2, 3 and 4). However, it seems that these strategies are used for formulating one’s ideas rather than because of the production difficulties related to the foreign language use.

Other participants in the conversation patiently wait for E1 to formulate her ideas in the form she finds appropriate and then the discussion continues. No signs of misunderstanding can be noticed but, again, it seems that even incorrect use of prepositions, with no attempts to correct mistakes, would not have impeded this conversation and it would have proceeded exactly the same way.

(2) Topic: stereotypes about Estonia

- 1 E1: I know that ee in 2008 when the Germans came here. (0.5)
- 2 that ee (0.2) we had a lot of that kind of ee (.) mm (.) *suhtumine*
- 3 ((looks at E2))
- 4 E2: attitude
- 5 E1: attitude (0.2) .hh that eee (0.5) we are still part of Russia=
- 6 E2: =yeah
- 7 E1: Estonia is a modern country (0.5) it’s (0.2) we don’t have
- 8 electricity, we don’t have warmth, we don’t .hh (0.5) we are just aaa
- 9 E2: an extension of Russia=
- 10 E1: =just an extension of Russia. (.) we are so slow we are not developed at all

In example (2) E1 is looking for the English word for ‘*suhtumine*’. At first she pauses, using the filler ‘kind of’ and the sounds ‘ee’ and ‘mm’. However, having failed to retrieve the necessary word, she takes advantage of the fact that there are also other speakers of Estonian involved in the conversation and she just switches to Estonian, while also looking at E2, as if asking for help (indirect appeal for help). She does get the help in the form of ‘attitude’ (line 4) and repeats this response to indicate acceptance of the suggested word. It is clear that E1, who is in general a diligent student and a high-level speaker of English, does know the word ‘attitude’ but at that point it just slipped her mind. In such a situation she resorted to the strategy

that is far too often used in language classroom – switching to L1 and asking the teacher or classmate for help/translation. In itself, it might be considered an effective strategy as the desired word/phrase is found very quickly. Nevertheless, in a situation where there are no other speakers of E1's L1 present, she would not be likely to get this help. Therefore, another CS, such as circumlocution (paraphrase) or approximation (use of a superordinate or a related term) could be more effective in such a situation. E1 might have chosen code-switching and appeal for help as it seemed the easiest way to get the right word; however, it is also possible that she has too little experience with circumlocution or approximation and therefore fails to use them in this situation.

Further in the conversation (lines 7-8) E1 successfully uses the strategy of restructuring – she leaves the problematic utterances unfinished and formulates new ones, with the structure which she feels more comfortable with. At the end of line 8 she again has trouble with finding the right word and reacting to the pause filled with 'aaa' (an indirect appeal for help) E2 suggests the possible expression, which E1 happily accepts by repeating it (line 10). As the discussion about popular stereotypes is continuing and other participants develop the points suggested by E1, it can be claimed that here the use of CS had a positive influence on the progress of the conversation.

(3) Topic: Estonian Song Festival

- 1 E1: it's amazing to be here (0.2) under this ee ((gesture showing an
- 2 arch, looks at E2 and E3)) (.) *kaar* ((gesture showing an arch))
- 3 ((E1 smiles, E3 laughs))
- 4 (0.8)
- 5 S2: also it was different (.) it is (0.5) I was surprised that you do that (.)
- 6 because in Spain you (0.2) ok you can find a lot of people together
- 7 but you can't find the people being in that way (.) all together,
- 8 singing,

Example (3) demonstrates that sometimes E1 is more creative. In lines 1-2, failing to remember or maybe not knowing the word 'arch', she uses the strategy of miming – describes the phenomenon non-verbally, with a gesture. However, at the same time she looks at E2 and E3, thus indirectly appealing for help and then also switching to the Estonian '*kaar*'. Since E2 and E3 cannot help (E3 laughs in a friendly way to mitigate the inability to help), E1 also smiles in a slightly embarrassed way and just abandons the message; after a pause of 0.8 sec (line 4) S2 takes the turn. He continues with the same general topic, although it is unclear whether he has actually understood the message in lines 1-2. It seems possible to suggest that E1's CS of miming was actually successful; what could have confused S2 is the fact that the utterance was never finished and thus the message remained unclear.

It can be seen from the examples above that E1, who is actually a diligent student and a successful language learner at school, orients to grammatical correctness in her speech and also occasionally needs assistance in finding the suitable word in English. She thus clearly positions herself as a NNS and language learner in this informal *lingua franca* conversation. It can be suggested that in this context, excessive attention to linguistic forms is not vital and it might seem a bit strange

or unnecessary to some conversational partners. As for E1's difficulty with finding the right English words, it could be a result of her slight nervousness. Being a good language learner and having used English mostly in the classroom context, she might not be used to having such difficulties and therefore cannot use CS automatically. Because of her somewhat limited experience of real-life interaction in English, E1 might be slightly confused and therefore instinctively resorts to the CS often used in the classroom – code switching and appeal for help, which would not necessarily be the most productive ones in a conversation with people who do not speak her L1.

In the conversation analysed, E1 did not use any other types of CS, such as circumlocution or approximation, for example.² This can be due to her slight nervousness or limited experience, as suggested before. However, it should also be taken into account that the corpus analysed is relatively small – the conversation lasted for slightly more than two hours and due to E1's good command of English, she did not need to use a lot of CS. The typical examples of all the strategy types found in E1's speech have been discussed above.

3.2. Focus on the message

Another Estonian student, a 19 year-old male, although (according to his marks at school) slightly less proficient in English than E1, orients to his NNS status considerably less. He pays less attention to the search for grammatically correct forms and skilfully uses CS in order to overcome occasional production difficulties.

(4) Topic: Lower density of population in Estonia

- 1 E2: it's it's a northern country (0.2) it's (0.5) ((shows upwards)) north
- 2 from the the (0.2) globe (0.2) it's (0.5) there's less population here

In example (4) E2 is talking about the relatively low density of population in Estonia. Several instances of self repetition, pausing and also restructuring (leaving an utterance unfinished and using an alternative wording for the intended message; line 2) can be seen here. However, it seems that this hesitation results from E2's attempt to formulate his idea better rather than from the production difficulties related to the use of a foreign language. It is worth attention, though, how E2 uses mime (a gesture showing upwards) and approximation (using a superordinate 'globe') in order to explain his idea that the density of population in Estonia is smaller than in most countries due to the country's position relatively far to the north of the equator. For some reason having forgotten the word 'equator', he uses a general term 'globe' (equator being a component of it). The resulting explanation is rather clumsy, but conversational partners have no difficulty with understanding the idea and further continue the conversation on this topic. Thus, it is a positive fact that E2 has not abandoned the message because of the lack of a suitable word, but used approximation to convey his idea.

² I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for pointing out that this essential information was missing in the first version of the article.

(5) Topic: Tourist attractions in Pärnu

- 1 E2: and in Pärnu. (1.2) there are the (0.5) bicycles called tandems
2 a two-man bicycles (0.5) I: suggest you to rent them (0.5)
3 ((E3 laughs)) and ride (.) around the town.
4 E3: *omad kogemused*
5 S1: hehee
6 E3: from his experience
7 S1: yeah
8 E2: for for about 25 kroons or something you can rent (.) rent
9 the bike and ride around the city for an hour. and ee (0.2) it's it's
10 a lot of fun!

When talking about tourist attractions in Pärnu (example (5)), E2 touches upon an opportunity to rent tandems there. The word 'tandem' is the same in both English and Estonian, it is just pronounced slightly differently. Here, E2 pronounces it in an Estonian way. This could be, of course, a pronunciation error; however, it is also possible that E2 is not sure whether the word is the same in English – he just transfers it from Estonian and for the sake of clarity uses circumlocution, describing it as a 'two-man bicycle'. Still, an alternative interpretation is also possible – E2 may be unsure whether his conversational partners (S1 and S2) know this term and defines it for them. S1 and S2 smile and nod, which could be considered as a sign of them getting the point.

(6) Topic: Summer employment for young people

- 1 E2: in Estonia, here in Tartu we have ee (.) some kind of a (0.2) *malev*.
2 *maleva* (0.5) *kuidas sa tõlgid seda* ((looks at E3)) (0.2)
3 we have some kinds of events. (.)
4 when young children come together .hh (0.2) and they do
5 some kind of ee (0.5)
6 E3: yeah, public work=
7 E2: =public works (0.5) so they paint fences, clean eee (0.5) graveyards
8 and so on .hh (0.2) and ee for a week pay (0.2) eee (.) two eem
9 two-week pay was about (.)eee (.)twenty euros I guess (0.2)
10 two weeks in summer
11 S2: mmm

Circumlocution is also needed when the L1 terms that do not exist or are rarely used in the TL are discussed. In the example (6) above E2 talks about summer employment opportunities for young people. Quite naturally, he does not know the English for '*malev*'. At first, he pauses, then says the Estonian word (strategy of code-switching) and addressing E3 presents a direct appeal for help (line 2). Within the pause of 0.2 sec having understood that E3 does not know the translation either, he decides to describe what '*malev*' is (circumlocution). This is a good decision because even if E2 found the precise term, there is no guarantee that S1 and S2 would know this term and understand it. The description suggested by E2, on the other hand, makes it clear for the international students what the word '*malev*' stands for.

(7) Topic: The history of Estonia

- 1 E2: when you came to Estonia. (0.2) did you know anything (0.5) about
2 Estonia being (0.2) aaa (0.5) sub-country for Russia (0.5) maybe (0.5)
3 S1: yeea (0.2) we learnt something (0.2)
4 E2: that we were the Russian extension (0.5) have you heard
5 anything like that?
6 (1.0)
7 S2: no
8 S1: do you mean (0.2) that Estonia was part of Russia.
9 E2: we were a part of Russia but as a separate state

In the final example (above), when talking about the history of Estonia, E2 does not know how to name the status that Estonia had within the Soviet Union. So, he coins the word “sub-country”, knowing that the prefix sub- often implies an object/subject being a part of something larger and thus getting a word with quite a transparent meaning. This coinage, however, seems somewhat ambiguous to the Spanish students. S1 carefully confirms that they have studied “something”, probably meaning that they are aware of the history of the Soviet Union and its member states, but he is not quite sure what this status of “sub-country” could mean. Having noticed that S1 is puzzled, E2 makes another attempt, this time suggesting another coined term – “the Russian extension”. Unfortunately, it does not make the situation much clearer for the Spanish students and after a pause of 1.0 sec S2 has to confess “No”. S1 uses the strategy of an interpreted summary, suggesting his understanding and checking whether this interpretation is correct (line 8). It can be seen that the strategy of word coinage was effective and in general terms S1 has understood what E2 was trying to say (i.e. Estonia being a part of the Soviet Union). However, it is important for E2 to emphasise the view that while being a part of the Soviet Union, Estonia was still a separate entity. Such a description seems confusing to the Spanish students, they do not manage to understand E2’s point completely and eventually the topic is abandoned. Despite this misunderstanding, it is still possible to claim that the strategy of word coinage can be a productive one or at least it can be used when other resources are not available.

The examples above characterise the strategy types used by E2 and they demonstrate that although E2 has certain difficulties when speaking English, he uses CS skilfully and is able to communicate freely, mostly being able to convey his message successfully. He does make grammatical mistakes but (in the conversation analysed) does not focus on them, thus (completely appropriately) he is “doing being” a young man, a student, an Estonian etc. rather than a language learner. It is difficult to say whether E2 is just naturally a skilful communicator or has extensive experience of interacting in English, or maybe both. What is certain is that, when having some difficulty in communication in English, he does not get stuck because of that but immediately attempts to overcome the problem. As discussed above, the strategies of circumlocution, approximation and word coinage (in some situations also code-switching and appeal for help) can be effective aids in overcoming perceived problems in *lingua franca* interaction. There are certainly also other effective CS, but in this particular dataset it can be observed that the abovementioned types of CS have been used.

4. Conclusions

The present article has looked at a relatively small corpus of *lingua franca* communication with the aim to study in detail and characterise the speech of two young Estonians – both NNS of English. One of the participants in the conversation tended to orient to the form – grammatically correct language and precise words (consequently, succinct language), thus emphasising her identity as a language learner. Moreover, she was relatively helpless when she did not know or remember a certain word³. Another twelfth-grader mostly did not consider the form to be of major importance and used a variety of CS to overcome production difficulties and convey the intended meaning as precisely as possible. In the course of interaction he assumed the roles of a young man, a student, an Estonian etc. rather than that of a language learner.

On the basis of the analysis it is possible to suggest that in similar informal *lingua franca* conversations grammatical correctness is not considered vital as long as errors do not interfere with the meaning conveyed. NNS might be tempted to switch to L1 and ask for help, as they are used to doing in the language classroom. If there are other people speaking this L1 involved in the conversation, the abovementioned strategies are likely to be effective. However, code-switching would not be an effective strategy if the conversational partners do not share any other language in addition to the *lingua franca* currently used. If the interactants do not despair in the case of a communication problem and use some CS, like restructuring, approximation, circumlocution or even word coinage, they are more likely to succeed in conveying their message and achieving the communicative goal.

Some people just are good communicators and encountering a problem they automatically use a suitable CS. Some NNS of a language might acquire this ability naturally, in the course of practice – the more experience they have, the more automatic the CS use becomes, yet there could also be some language learners who would gain from explicit instruction in CS use. It is a fact that some NNS are afraid of making mistakes when speaking a foreign language. For this reason they prefer to abandon current topics and messages when they encounter some difficulty or problem. If their negative attitude towards errors and risk-taking is changed, and potentially productive CS are introduced and practised, NNS might be more motivated to use them and, in general, also be more motivated to communicate in the foreign language. In turn, the more practice they have, the more active and competent speakers they can become.

Indeed, to date, a number of studies on CS instruction have been conducted⁴. Although scholars admit that it is somewhat difficult to evaluate the effect of strategy instruction, they recognise that there is evidence that such instruction can produce positive results. Having seen in the present study that even the language learner who is considered diligent and successful might have difficulties in real-life communication in the TL, it seems especially important to identify the most effective methods of strategy instruction and to develop suitable didactic materials.

³ A similar phenomenon could be observed in another study (Zagura 2006), where the performance of twelfth-graders in mock gate-keeping interviews was analysed.

⁴ For an overview, see e.g. Nakatani, Goh 2007.

Abbreviations and transcription conventions

- CA Conversation Analysis
CS communication strategies
E1 Estonian student 1 (female)
E2 Estonian student 2 (male)
E3 Estonian student 3 (female)
L1 first/native language
NNS non-native speaker
S1 Spanish (university) student 1 (male)
S2 Spanish (university) student 2 (male)
TL target language
- (0.5) The number in brackets indicates a time gap in tenths of a second.
(.) A dot enclosed in a bracket indicates a pause in the talk of less than two-tenths of a second.
= The 'equals' sign indicates 'latching' between utterances.
[] Square brackets between adjacent lines of concurrent speech indicate the onset and end of a spate of overlapping talk.
.hh A dot before an 'h' indicates speaker in-breath. The more h's, the longer in-breath.
hh An 'h' indicates an outbreath. The more h's, the longer breath.
(()) A description enclosed in a double bracket indicates a non-verbal activity or comments.
: Colons indicate that the speaker has stretched the preceding sound or letter. The more colons the greater the extent of the stretching.
. A full stop indicates a stopping fall of tone.
, A comma indicates 'continuing' intonation.
? A question mark indicates a rising inflection. It does not necessarily indicate a question.
und Underlined fragments indicate speaker emphasis.

References

- Canale, Michael; Swain, Merrill 1980. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to language teaching and testing. – *Applied Linguistics*, 1 (1), 1–47. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>
- Drew, Paul; Heritage, John 1992. *Analysing talk at work: An introduction*. – Paul Drew, John Heritage (Eds.). *Talk at Work. Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3–65.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán; Scott, Mary Lee 1997. Review article. Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. – *Language Learning*, 47 (1), 173–210. <http://dx.doi.org/0.1111/0023-8333.51997005>
- Estonian National Curriculum for Secondary School = Gümnaasiumi Riiklik Õppekava. <https://www.riigiteataja.ee/akt/114012011002> (28.09.2011).
- Faerch, Claus; Kasper, Gabriele (Eds.) 1983. *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Hennoste, Tiit; Vihalemm, Triin 1999. Võõrkeele suhtlusstrateegiad. – *Akadeemia*, 125 (8), 1571–1608.
- Hutchby, Ian; Wooffitt, Robin 1998. *Conversation Analysis. Principles, Practices and Applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kurhila, Salla 2005. Different orientations to grammatical correctness. – Keith Richards, Paul Seedhouse (Eds.). *Applying Conversation Analysis*. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 143–173.

- Nakatani, Yasuo; Goh, Christine 2007. A review of oral communication strategies: Focus on interactionist and psycholinguistic perspectives. – Andrew D. Cohen, Ernesto Macaro (Eds.). *Language Learner Strategies*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 207–227.
- Selinker, Larry 1972. Interlanguage. – *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10 (1–4), 209–231. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209>
- ten Have, Paul 1999. *Doing Conversation Analysis. A Practical Guide*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Zagura, Natalja 2006. The communicative language ability of secondary school leavers in an English-language gate-keeping interview. – Unpublished graduation thesis of the Teacher Training Programme. University of Tartu, Department of English language and literature.

Natalja Zagura (University of Tartu) has used conversation analysis for studying the following issues: strategic language use and influence of gender roles on communication, the use of English and Estonian interlanguages in an institutional context as well as the use of communication strategies in the speech of Estonian learners of English.

natalja.zagura@ut.ee

SÕNUMILE VÕI KEELELISELE VORMILE KESKENDUMINE VÕÕRKEELSES VESTLUSES

Natalja Zagura

Tartu Ülikool

Artikkel käsitleb kahe eesti 12. klassi õpilase kõnet mitteametlikus ingliskeelses vestluses. Eesmärgiks on iseloomustada nende kahe inglise keelt võõrkeelena kõneleja kõnet suhtlusstrateegiate kasutuse seisukohalt ning vestluse edasise kulu põhjal analüüsida nende strateegiate kasutamise edukust.

Analüüsist ilmneb, et see õpilane, kes on koolis võõrkeeles õppes edukas, peab grammatiliselt korrektset keelt tähtsaks ka kõnes. Samas tekib tal raskusi tõhusate suhtlusstrateegiate kasutamisega, kui mingi suhtlusprobleem vajab lahendamist. Suure tõenäosusega valib ta koodivahetuse ja abiküsimise strateegiate seast. Teine õpilane peab aga esmatähtsaks hoopis sõnumi edastamist, ning seda võimalikult arusaadaval kujul. Kui tema keelevahendite või -oskuste komplekt on ebapiisav, kasutab see õpilane edukalt selliseid tõhusaid suhtlusstrateegiaid nagu näiteks restruktureerimine, mõiste/sõna/väljendi väljautlemine kirjelduse või näite abil, mõtte väljautlemine üldisema tähendusega sõna kaudu ning isegi uute, keeles olematute sõnade tuletust.

Jõutakse järeldusele, et kui inimesel on soov võõrkeeles edukalt suhelda, ei piisa mõnikord vaid heast keeleoskusest ja suhteliselt suurest keelepraktikast. Mõne keeleõppija puhul on eriti kasulik tõhusate suhtlusstrateegiate tutvustus ja nende harjutamine, mis omakorda võib motiveerida inimest olla aktiivsem ja julgem võõrkeele kasutaja.

Võtmesõnad: keeleõpe, vestlusanalüüs, suhtlusstrateegiad, inglise keel, eesti keel