

The Asian EFL Journal
Professional Teaching Articles
December 2016
Special Issue Volume 5



Senior Editors:
Paul Robertson and John Adamson

Production Editor:
Eva Guzman

- [Submit an Article](#)

Navigate to ...



The Asian EFL Journal

- [Home](#)
- [About](#)
 - [Introduction](#)
 - [FAQ](#)
 - [Advertising](#)
- [Editorial Board](#)
- [Articles](#)
 - [Main Editions](#)
 - [Monthly Editions](#)
 - [Theses](#)
 - [Special Editions](#)
 - [Conference Proceedings](#)
 - [Book Reviews](#)
 - [Indexed In](#)
- [Submission](#)
 - [Submit an Article](#)
 - [Submission Guidelines](#)
 - [Submit a Book Review](#)
 - [Submitted Paper Inquiry](#)
 - [Author Rights](#)
- [Submit an Article](#)

Editorial Board



[Home](#) » [Editorial Board](#)

Editorial Board

Paul Robertson
Founder and Executive Editor

Asian EFL Journal
Asian ESP Journal

TESOL International Journal
Linguistics Journal
English as an International Language Journal

Chief Editor

Prof. John Adamson

Alternative article reviews

University of Niigata Prefecture, Japan

Eminent and Distinguished Scholar

Prof. Rod Ellis

Curtin University

Perth, Australia

Senior Associate Editors

Dr. Custodio Martins University of Macau	Dr. Pisarn Bee Chamcharatsri University of New Mexico	Dr. Nahla Shalhoub Bacha Lebanese American University Lebanon
---	--	---

Distinguished & Honored Advisors

Dr. Z. N. Patil Former Professor of English and Head, Department of Training and Development The English and Foreign Languages University, India Professor Winnie Cheng Professor of English, Director, Research Centre for Professional Communication in English (RCPCE) Fellow, Hong Kong Academy of the Humanities Department of English The Hong Kong Polytechnic University	Prof. Roger Nunn Petroleum Institute UAE Dr Reima Sado Al-Jarf College of Languages and Translation King Saud University Riyadh, Saudi Arabia BioProfile Dr. James P. Lantolf Centre for Language Acquisition Pennsylvania State University, U.S.A. University homepage	Dr. Francis Mangubhai University of Southern Queensland Australia BioProfile Professor Robert Phillipson Faculty of Languages, Communication and Cultural Studies Copenhagen Business School Denmark BioProfile Dr. Phyllis Ghim-Lian Chew Nanyang Technological University Singapore University homepage
--	---	--

Professor David Nunan
Director & Chair of
TESOL
Anaheim University,
USA
University homepage

Prof. Paul Nation
Victoria University
New Zealand
BioProfile

James Dean Brown
Professor and Chair
Department
Second Language
Studies
University of Hawaii at
Mānoa
1890 East-West Road
Honolulu, USA
BioProfile

Professor Claire
Kramsch
University of
California
Berkeley, U.S.A.
BioProfile

Prof. Wang Lifei
University
International Business
& Economics
Beijing, China
University homepage

Dr. Beata Webb
Applied linguistics
Bond university
Australia

Dr. Eva Bernat
Digital Learning
& Innovation |
University Partnerships
Pearson
Australia

Arif Ahmed Al-Ahdal,
PhD
Qassim University
Saudi Arabia

Senior Advisors

Huw Jarvis
Salford University, UK
University homepage

Dr. Jeong-Bae Son
University of Southern
Queensland, Australia
BioProfile

Dr. Yasuko Kanno
Asst Professor English
University of
Washington, U.S.A
BioProfile

Dr. Robert David
Carless
Hong Kong Institute of
Education, Hong Kong
University homepage

Dr. Robert J. Dickey
Gyeongju University,
Korea
University homepage

Dr. Luke Prodromou
Leeds Beckett
University, UK
BioProfile

Dr. Alan Tonkyn
Applied Linguistics
Dept.
The University of
Reading, UK
University homepage

Dr. Wen-Chi Vivian
Wu
Distinguished
Professor, Department
of Foreign Languages
and Literature
Associate Dean,
International College
Director, Center for
international Academic
Exchange
Asia University
Taichung, Taiwan

Associate Editors

Dr. Aly Anwar Amer
Sultan Qaboos
University

Dr. Xiuping Li
Newcastle University,

Farzaneh Khodabandeh
Mobarakeh University,

College of Education
Sultanate of Oman
University homepage

UK
University homepage

Iran
BioProfile

Mr. David Litz
United Arab Emirates
University, UAE
University homepage
BioProfile

Dr. I-Chin Nonie
Chiang
National Open
University
Taiwan
Email

Naoki Fujimoto-
Adamson
Niigata University of
International and
Information Studies
Japan
Bioprofile

Nolan Weil
Intensive
EnglishLanguage
Institute, USA
Utah State University
BioProfile

Dr. Ahmad Al-Hassan
University of Petra
Jordan

Dr. John A. Unger
Associate Professor of
English for Academic
Purposes
School of
Education/Transitional
Studies
Georgia Gwinnett
College
Georgia USA
BioProfile

Dr. Alexander Gilmore
Tokyo University,
Japan
University homepage

Dr. Rachel Kraut
Rice University, USA

Dr. Vajjaganh
Suriyatham
Thammasat University,
Thailand

Dr. Joshua M. Paiz
The George
Washington University

Dr. Jun Zhao
Augusta University,
USA

Dr. Martin Andrew
Victoria University,
Australia

Dr. Phalangchok
Wanphet
Nord University,
Levanger, Norway

Dr. Peter Ilic
University of Aizu
Japan

Dr. Yangyu (Shirley)
Xiao
The University of Hong
Kong

Andrew Pollard
Charles Darwin
University, Australia

Dr. Winfred Wenhui
Xuan
Hong Kong
Community College
The Hong Kong
Polytechnic University

Dr. Muhammed Fatih
Gökmen
Siirt University,
Turkey
Bonjovi H.
Hajan
Jose Rizal University,
Philippines

Dr. Bruce Lander
Matsuyama University,
Japan

Production Heads

David John Coventry
UAE University
UAE

Jun Scott Chen Hsieh
National Central
University
Taiwan

Dr. Aradhna
Malik Vinod Gupta
School of Management
Indian Institute of
Technology
India

Dr Custodio Martins
University of Macau

Dr. Bonifacio T.
Cunanan
Bulacan State
University, City of

Dr. I-Chin Nonie
Chiang
National Open

Malolos
Philippines
Jun Chen Hsieh (Scott)
Network Learning
Technology
National Central
University, Taiwan
BioProfile

University
Taiwan

Reviewers/Editors

Prof. Dr. Ni Nyoman Padmadewi Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Singaraja Bali Indonesia	Dr. Malcolm Benson Hiroshima Shudo University, Japan BioProfile	Professor Chen Yong School of Foreign Languages Chongqing University China University homepage BioProfile
Dr. Yu Ling Cheun National University of Education Taiwan, China University homepage	Annie Hong Qin Zhao Education Department University of Bath, UK University homepage	Dr. Michael Thomas University of Central Lancashire UK
Dr. Mohammad Ali Salmani-Nodoushan University of Zanjan, Iran University homepage	Aisling O Boyle Lecturer in Education Course Director (Postgraduate) Programme Coordinator MSc TESOL School of EducationQueen's University, Belfast BioProfile	Dr. Joan Cutting Senior Lecturer in TESOL The Moray House School of Education The University of Edinburgh, UK University homepage BioProfile
Dr. Mohamed El-Okda Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics Department of English Imam University Riyad Saudi, Arabia	Marcus Otlowski Department of International Communication Kochi University, Japan University homepage	Joseph P. Vitta Kyushu University, Japan
Veronica Wynne Boulder Valley Schools Boulder, CO, USA University homepage	Dr. Will Baker Southampton University UK University homepage BioProfile	Dr. Peter Petrucci Massey University New Zealand University homepage
Dr. Keiko Sakui Associate Professor Kobe Shoin Women University, Japan University homepage	Dr. Afefa Banu Associate Professor In English Department Of English King Khalid Women University Abha,Saudi Arabia University homepage	Dr. Mabel Victoria Lecturer Edinburgh Napier University, UK
Parvin Safari	Dr. Ismail Yaman	Ahmed Al-Kilabi

University of Yazd, Iran	Ondokuz Mayıs University, Turkey	Kufa University, Iraq Email
Stan Pederson Kumamoto University, Japan Email	Dr. Nooreiny Maarof Universiti Kebangsaan, Malaysia Email	María Luisa Carrió Pastor Universitat Politècnica de València, Spain Email
Anne Ma Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong Email	Maria Luis Spicer Escalant Utah State University, USA Email	Dr. Phan Thi Thanh Thao Hue University of Foreign Languages, Vietnam
Dr. Saleh Al-Busaidi Sultan Qaboos University, Oman	Dr. Neslihan Önder Özdemir The University of Sheffield, UK Email	Rouhollah Askari Bigdeli Yasouj University, Iran
Dr. Zahra Shahsavar Shiraz University of Medical Sciences School of Paramedical Sciences Shiraz, Iran	Aaron Martinson Sejong Cyber University, Korea	Shu-Chin Su Department of English Aletheia University, Taiwan BioProfile
Dr. Seetha Jayaraman Dhofar University, Oman	Dr. Linda Fitzgibbon Queensland University of Technology	Aysegül Nergis Istanbul University Istanbul, Turkey
María Belén Díez- Bedmar, PhD Associate Professor Department of English Studies University of Jaén, Spain	R.K. Jaishree Karthiga Thiagarajar College of Engineering Madurai, India	Habsah Hussin Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM)
Sebastian Rasinger Anglia Ruskin University, UK	Dr. Derya Bozdoğan TED University, Ankara, Turkey	Prem Phyak Tribhuvan University, Nepal
Barbara Skinner University of Ulster, UK	Stefanie Shamila Pillai University of Malaya, Malaysia	Bryan Meadows Fairleigh Dickinson University, USA
Dr. Pin-hsiang Natalie Wu Associate Professor Department of Applied Foreign Languages Chien-kuo Technology University Chang-hua, Taiwan Email	Yasunari Fujii Daito Bunka University, Japan	Mehdi Soleimani, PhD English Language Program The University of Calgary, Canada
Seyyed Ali Ostovar- Namaghi Associate Professor of TEFL University of Shahrood, Iran	Dr. Zahariah Pilus Department of English Language and Literature Kulliyah of Islamic Revealed Knowledge and Human Sciences International Islamic	Dr. Shudong Wang Shimane University, Japan

	University, Malaysia University homepage	
Sandhya Rao Mehta Sultan Qaboos University Oman	Dr. Natasha Pourdana Professor at KIAU, Iran	Hong Shi China University of Petroleum-Beijing
Dr. Diana Elena Popa University of Vermont USA	Dr. Xixiang Lou Minnan Normal University China	Dr. Salim Razi Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University Turkey
Dr. Pham Huu Duc International University – Vietnam National University HCMC Vietnam	Dr. Amerrudin Abd Manan Universiti Teknologi Malaysia Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	Farhad Mazlum Zavarag University of Maragheh Iran
Dr. Corazon D. Sampang Jocson College Philippines	Dr Yingli Yang University of International Business and Economics China	Dr. Shafiq Anwar Fakir University of Aden Yemen
Dr. Joseph Decena Dayag Shinas College of Technology Oman	Dr. Ian Done Ramos The University of Suwon South Korea	Dr. Samuel de Carvalho Lima Instituto Federal de Educação Ciência e Tecnologia do Rio Grande do Norte Brazil
Dr. Bachrudin Musthafa Widyatama University Indonesia	Ju Seong (John) Lee University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign USA	Edsoulla Chung Open University of Hong Kong
Dr. Ali Karakaş Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Turkey	Dr. Mohammad Salehi Sharif University of Technology Iran Email	Dr. Tyler Barrett Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center in San Antonio Texas, USA
Dr. Bill Batziakas Lecturer in English Studies Wenzhou-Kean University China		Dr. Faisal Al-Maamari Sultan Qaboos University Oman
Dr. Junithesmer D. Rosales Polytechnic University of the Philippines Email	Dr. Gökhan Öztürk Department of Foreign Language Education Anadolu University Turkey	George Whitehead Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Korea
Dr. Nguyen Thi Thuy Loan Kalasin University, Thailand	Dr. Maha Alawdat Israeli Ministry of Education	Dr. Carol Griffiths Fatih University, Istanbul, Turkey Email
Dr. Ali Shafaei Islamic Azad	Dr. Suthathip Thirakunkovit	Ribut Wahyudi Maulana Malik Ibrahim

University, Bukan Branch Iran	Mahidol University, Thailand Email Dr. Amirul Mukminin The Faculty of Education/Graduate School, Jambi University Indonesia	State Islamic University Malang Indonesia Dr. Reza Zabihi University of Neyshabur Neyshabur, Iran
Dr. Joshua M. Paiz The George Washington University	Dr. Dararat Khampusaen Khon Kaen University, Thailand	Dr. Martin Andrew Victoria University Australia
Dr. Zuraina bt Ali Universiti Malaysia Pahang	Dr. Xiaodong Zhang Beijing Foreign Studies University China	Prof. Dr. Md. Enamul Hoque Education and Development Research Council (EDRC) Bangladesh
Dr. Naashia Mohamed University of Auckland New Zealand	Dr. Beena Anil SDNB Vaishnav College for Women India	Dr. Kyungsook Paik Hanyang Women's University South Korea
Rachel Luna Peralta Institute for Tourism Studies Macau	Romualdo Mabuan Lyceum of the Philippines University – Manila Philippines Email	Dr. Syed Abdul Manan Balochistan University of Information Technology Engineering and Management Sciences (BUIITEMS) Quetta, Pakistan
Dr. Mike Tiittanen Toronto District School Board Canada	Dr. Jeremy D. Slogoski Southern Illinois University USA Email	Dr. Phalangchok Wanphet Nord University Levanger, Norway
Mohammad Naeim Maleki Herat University Herat Province, Afghanistan	Dr. Intakhab Alam Khan King Abdulaziz university Jeddah, Saudi Arabia	Dr. Konstantinos Pitychoutis University of Nizwa Oman
Dr. Md Al Amin University of Canterbury Christchurch, New Zealand Email	SM Akramul Kabir School of Teacher Education University of Canterbury NZ	
Mohammad Mosiur Rahman School of Languages, Literacies and Translation Universiti Sains Malaysia Penang, Malaysia	Steven Ping Hei Yeung The Chinese University of Hong Kong Email	
Dr. Shizhou Yang Yunnan Minzu University China	Wilson Cheong Hin Hong Institute for Tourism Studies Macau	Dr. Irish Chan Sioson Thaksin University Songkhla, Thailand

Dr. Tiffany Ip
Hong Kong Baptist
University

Dr. Leo H. Aberion
University of San Jose-
Recoletos
Philippines
Dr. Kenan Dikilitas
Bahçeşehir University
Turkey

Zahra Fakher Ajabshir
PhD in TEFL
University of Bonab,
East Azarbaijan, Iran

Dr. Peter Thwaites
Keimyung University
South Korea
Email

Dr. Kenan Dikilitas
Bahçeşehir University
Turkey

Robert Weekly
Nottingham Ningbo
China

Joseph Falout
Nihon University
Japan

Dr. Zahra Amirian
University of Isfahan
Iran

Dr. Joshua M. Paiz
The George
Washington University

Harriet Lowe
University of
Greenwich
UK

Dr. Abdelhamid
Ahmed
Qatar University

Dr. Jun Zhao
Augusta University
USA

Ayşe Ciftci
University of York
UK

Dr. Xiuping Li
Newcastle University
UK

Dr. Farzaneh
Khodabandeh
Mobarakeh University
Iran

Sixian Hah
Nanyang Technological
University
Singapore

Dr. Ahmad Al-Hassan
Competent Translation,
Editing and Research
Co.
Amman, Jordan

Lilia S. Borquez-
Morales
University of
Southampton
UK

Dr. Andy (Anamai)
Damnet
Kasetsart University
Thailand

Dr. Sviatlana Karpava
University of Central
Lancashire
Cyprus

Dr. Nicola Halenko
University of Central
Lancashire
Email

Naoki Fujimoto-
Adamson
Niigata University of
International and
Information Studies
Japan

Dr. Seiko Harumi
School of Oriental and
African Studies
(SOAS)
University of London
sh96@soas.ac.uk

Janie Brooks
University of St
Andrews
UK
Email

Dr. Zahariah Pilus
International Islamic
University Malaysia

Amy Aisha Brown
Abertay University
UK

Dr. Sima Khezrlou
Independent
Researcher

Dr. Stewart Gray
Hankuk University of
Foreign Studies,
Yongin, South Korea

Dr. Mohsen
Shirazizadeh
Alzahra University,
Tehran, Iran

Dr. Anna Kuzio
Adam Mickiewicz
University, Poznań,
Poland

Zhenjie Weng
The Ohio State
University

Dr. Muhammad Waleed
Shehzad
Foundation University
Islamabad, Pakistan

Dr. Toshinobu
Nagamine
Ryukoku University,
Japan
BioProfile

Dr. Duygu Candarli
University of Dundee,
UK

Dr. Sumathi
Renganathan
Universiti Tunku Abdul
Rahman, Malaysia

Dr. Muhammed Fatih
Gökmen
Siirt University, Turkey

Bonjovi H. Hajan
Jose Rizal University,
Philippines

Dr. Malihe Mousavi
Payame Noor
University, Iran

Dr. Sultan
Universitas Negeri
Makassar, Indonesia

Dr. Mohammed Jasim
Betti
College of Education
for Humanities
University of Thi-Qar,
Iraq

Dr. Musa Nushi
Shahid Beheshti
University, Iran

Patrisius Istiarto
Djiwandono
Universitas Ma Chung,
Malang
Taman Sulfat, Malang,
Indonesia

Paul Spijkerbosch
Matsuyama University,
Japan

Dr. Ratna
Rintaningrum
Institute of Technology
Sepuluh Nopember
(ITS)
Surabaya, Indonesia

Web Architect

Engr. Paul Silmaro

Recent Articles

Volume 28 Issue 3.3 June 2021

Volume 28 Issue 3.2 June 2021

Volume 28 Issue 3.1 June 2021

Volume 25 Issue 3 May 2021

Volume 28 Issue 2.3 April 2021

Subscribe to receive updates

Enter your email address below to receive updates each time we publish new journals and articles.



Latest Teaching Article



1. Ratna Rintaningrum Investigating Reasons Why Listening in English is Difficult: Voice from Foreign Language Learners 2. Ribahan Students' Perceptions

[Read More](#)

Latest Thesis



Name: Daniel Morgan
MEd TESOL Research Dissertation:
Teacher cognition and academic vocabulary: to what
extent do teachers' beliefs match their practices?
Date: 15/08/2018

Over the last 30 years, a growing number of studies have concentrated on the correlation between second language teachers' beliefs and their pedagogical practices.

[Read More](#)

[Asian EFL Journal](#)

- [Home](#)
- [Publication Ethics](#)
- [License](#)
- [Privacy Policy](#)
- [Sitemap](#)

© 2021 Asian EFL Journal. All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

DIAH KRISTINA, PH.D.	4
BRANDING PRODUCTS AND SERVICES LINGUISTICALLY	4
SANTRI E. P. DJAHIMO	18
WOMEN VERSUS MEN IN TEACHER'S PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	18
(A CASE STUDY OF THE POTENTIAL FOR CONTINUED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR ENGLISH TEACHERS IN RURAL AND DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS IN INDONESIA)	18
VANESSA PETROJ	35
THE ROLE OF NATIVE LANGUAGES ON ESL LEARNING	35
EUNICE BARBARA C. NOVIO, MAWD / JOSEMARI V. CORDOVA	54
GENDER MAINSTREAMING IN EFL LEARNING	54
THE CASE OF VONGCHAVALITKUL UNIVERSITY	54
FRANCES SHIOBARA	66
WHERE ARE ALL THE WOMEN?	66
SURTI NUR UTAMI	75
THE EFFECT OF CREATIVE READING INSTRUCTION: A COMPARISON OF TECHNIQUE BETWEEN NUMBER HEAD TOGETHER (NHT) AND MAKE A MATCH IN NARRATIVE TEXT AT THE SEVENTH GRADE OF JUNIOR LEVEL	75
IKHFI IMANIAH / AIDIL SYAH PUTRA	83
THE STRATEGY OF IMPLEMENTATION OF BILINGUAL PROGRAM OF FIRST GRADE STUDENTS AT SD ISLAM RAUDAH	83
HUYNH NGOC TAI / NGUYEN NGOC THAO NHUNG / NGUYEN HIEU THAO	95
FOSTERING STUDENT-WRITERS' WRITING SELF-EFFICACY WITH WORDLE	95
RATNA RINTANINGRUM	111
MAINTAINING ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILL IN THEIR HOMELAND THROUGH TECHNOLOGY: PERSONAL EXPERIENCE	111
MARTHA CASTILLO NORIEGA / MIRNA ROMERO COLOMA	124
REGAINING LEADERSHIP THROUGH ONTOLOGICAL COACHING FOR FEMALE EFL INSTRUCTORS	124
HEE SIO CHING / AZLIN ZAITI ZAINAL	139
DIRECT VS INDIRECT INDICATORS IN NEGOTIATION OF MEANING AMONG HIGH PROFICIENCY ESL LEARNERS: GENDER INTERACTION	139
XUYING FAN	153

AN INVESTIGATION OF TEACHERS' INTERPRETATIONS AND PRACTICE OF TEACHING THINKING SKILLS IN CHINESE EFL CLASSROOMS.....	153
KIMBERLY JOY R. VILLANUEVA.....	169
<i>THE BET</i> , (A POP FICTION): A SYMBOL OF ACHIEVEMENT AND INSPIRATION.....	169
CORAZON DAUZ SAMPANG, PH.D.....	178
COLLEGE STUDENTS' ESSAYS: A SUBJECT ANALYSIS.....	178
TANZIL HUDA.....	203
GENDER-BASED COMMUNICATION STRATEGY.....	203
YOKO KOBAYASHI / JITSUKO KITSUNO.....	218
CONSIDERING PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY: A CASE STUDY OF A FEMALE ENGLISH TEACHER IN SECONDARY EDUCATION.....	218
ROSALYN S. HERRERA.....	227
GRAPHIC ORGANIZERS AS EFFECTIVE TOOLS IN IMPROVING.....	227
READING COMPREHENSION IN ENGLISH.....	227
ROZINA ABDUL GHANI / MAS AZILA AHMAT / RATNAWATI MOHD ASHRAF.....	280
BLOGGING AS A TOOL IN DEVELOPING WRITING SKILLS:.....	280
LESSONS FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF THE STUDENTS AND CLASS TEACHER.....	280
RATNAWATI MOHD ASRAF / AINUL AZMIN MD ZAMIN.....	294
USING THE DEVELOPMENTAL RUBRIC.....	294
AS A TOOL IN THE TEACHING OF ACADEMIC WRITING.....	294

Author

Tanzil Huda
Muhammadiyah Jember University

Title

Gender-Based Communication Strategy

Bio:- Tanzil Huda is an English lecturer at Muhammadiyah Jember University, East Java, Indonesia. He got his Doctor in English teaching from State University of Malang, Indonesia in 2013. His major interest is the curriculum development of English education. He also conducts research on TESOL. His current academic position is the Chair of Center of Educational Studies and Development, Muhammadiyah Jember University.

Abstract

The issue on gender differences has become one of the research topics for a few decades and considered as one of the important factors in second or foreign language acquisition. This study is aimed at investigating the communication strategies of male and female EFL learners which specifically analyzes the following issues i.e., how male and female EFL learners performed their communication strategies; what kinds of communication strategies which were established by male and female EFL learners. The study is expected to give significance information about communication strategies performed by male and female EFL learners in non-English mainstream. This study may also give a valuable contribution to the area of language teaching for it will give the other perspective about the gender issue in language acquisition and learning. This study was conducted by employing a qualitative approach. While the design of this study was descriptive as it tried to describe data represented in the form of spoken utterances which transcribed in written form. The subjects of the study who also became the source of data were the fourth and fifth semester undergraduate students of English Education Program. Based on the findings of this study, the conclusion of the research is drawn as the followings. English language learners overcome their communication problems by using communication strategies. Generally, the subjects resorted to using some kinds of strategy while communicating to overcome their communicative problems. Strategies adopted by the learners were determined by knowledge of the language

they possessed. The results of the study also indicated that the majority of the English language learners used achievement strategies to cope with problems.

Keywords : Gender-based, Communication strategy.

Muhammadiyah Jember University is on Jl. Karimata 49 Jember 68121, East Java, Indonesia

Introduction

Interlanguage is a learning stage which must exist in every foreign or second language learning before the learners achieve the native speaker like performance. In such stage, the learners of EFL, taken as an example, often experience a discrepancy between what they would like to say (i.e., their communication intention) and what they know about what to say it in English (i.e., their interlanguage knowledge). In order to bridge the gap between communicative needs and limited communicative resources or competence, the learners may make use of communication strategies.

Communication strategy is one of the areas in the study of second language acquisition (SLA) and its language phenomena become the interest of Sociolinguistics. There exists a number of the studies of communication strategies which also exhibit categorization of them. Bialystok (1983) categorizes communication strategies into 1) first language (L1) based strategies, which include language switch, foreignizing, and transliteration; 2) second language (L2) based strategies, which include semantic contiguity, description, and word coinage. Meanwhile, Corder (1978) in Faerch and Casper (1983) proposes two main types of strategies that are totally based on interlanguage use applied by second language learners when they find problems in performing communication, which are commonly called as message adjustment strategies and resource expansion strategies.

In message adjustment strategies, the learners can tailor a message to the available resources, that is, they adjust the end to their means. Corder in Faerch and Casper (1983) divides the message adjustment strategies in four sub-types: topic avoidance, message abandonment, semantic avoidance, and message reduction. The learners apply the topic avoidance strategy when they avoid topics which pose language difficulties. The learners may also decide not to continue a discourse within the same topic. The message abandonment strategy is conducted when the learners leave a message unfinished because of language difficulties. The semantic avoidance strategy is implemented by the learners by saying something slightly different from

what the interlocutor intends. The message reduction strategy is conducted by saying less than what the speaker intends to say.

The second type is resource expansion strategies. The learners can attempt to increase their resources by one way or another in order to their communication intention. Corder (1978) in Faerch and Casper (1983) classifies the resource expansion strategies into three types: borrowing, switching, and paraphrasing or circumlocation. The borrowing strategies are implemented when the learners attempt to use invented or borrowed items. When the learners switch to another language, they implement the switching strategy. The paraphrase or circumlocation strategies are conducted by describing and exemplifying the target object or action.

Meanwhile, communication between men and women or communication across sex can be considered cross cultural communication. This kind of communication is supposed to be one of the aspects of language convergence and similarized as culture. Some studies in sociolinguistics show that people from different cultures speak various dialects. This phenomenon should also exist in men and women communication which appears to vary.

There are numerous general differences that characterize gender communication. Compared to women, men are more likely to interrupt the speaking of other people (Fasold, 1990:9). A study of faculty meetings reveals that women are more likely to be interrupted than men. Some of the interruptions that women experience come from other women (women, when they do interrupt, are more likely to interrupt other women than they are to interrupt men). Women are more likely than men to allow an interruption of their talk to be successful (they do not resist the interruption as much as men do). In meetings, men gain the "floor" more often, and keep the floor for longer period of time, regardless of their status in the organization (Fasold, 1990:91). In professional conferences, women take a less active part in responding to papers. When women do ask a question, they take less time in asking it than men. In addition, they employ much less pre-question prediction; they are less likely to ask multiple questions; and they are more likely than men to rephrase their questions in personal terms.

The differences of men and women in communication are claimed by Tannen (1990) who states that men and women express themselves in different ways and for different reasons. Men use communication to maintain independence, while women talk to maintain intimacy. Whether conscious or unconscious, men often talk to establish status from others. Women use words to connect themselves emotionally, to express feelings, or to build rapport. Men often

share acts and figures as in report. These communicative differences then are labelled as “rapport-talk” and report-talk.”

Tannen (1990) also notes that body language is also used differently by men and women. Women typically use nonverbal communication directly but men use it indirectly. Women stand in close proximity of each other and maintain eye contact and gesture more frequently. Men hold their distance, rarely establish eye contact and gesture less dramatically. Men and women also handle conflict differently. Women avoid conflict in order to insure closeness, while men use conflict to gain status.

Further, Tannen (1990) claims that men and women express communication differences in content, style, and structure. In particular, men often talk about sports, money, and business. They often express themselves to fix a problem, converse for competition, and talk to resolve problems. They typically use precise words, without descriptive details. On the other hand, women most often discuss about people, feeling, and relationship. They most often express themselves to understand, converse to support, and talk to connect. When talking, women are more detailed, apologetic, and vague.

Various studies on communication strategies have been done and successfully in analyzing and predicting communication needs. Those studies vary in terms of theoretical framework, methods, analysis, and the subjects used in. Bialystock (1983) studied the use of L1-based strategies and L2-based strategies to solve vocabulary problems in communication. He found that the most efficient strategies were those which were L2-based strategies and took account of specific features of the intended concepts. The study showed that adults used a greater variation of strategies, which meant they were more flexible in their ability to adopt their strategic attempts to meet the need of specific concepts.

A compare and contrast study of L1 and L2 referential communication was done by Bongarts and Poulish (1989). The study tried to confront Dutch learners of English with a set of unfamiliar abstract shapes which they had to describe both in Dutch and English. The study found that when a methodology which was adopted confronted native and non-native speaker with essentially the same problem, L1 speakers and L2 learners handled their referential problems in much the same way.

Some other studies with different focus had been done by some researchers. A study by Chen (1990) found that the frequency, type and effectiveness of communication strategies employed by the learners varied according to their proficiency level. A study about the communication strategies used by “good” versus “poor” speaking partners of individuals with aphasia was done by Mackie and Kagan (1999). Different study about male and female

languages which was done by Baalen investigated the hedging devices in male and female conversations. A study which focused on how English language learners could make use of communication strategies to overcome limitations in receptive and productive languages (Williams, 2006). The study also presented steps for carrying out active in-class training and practice for strategies. A study by Liberman (2008) emphasized the practical differences in male and female styles of communication.

On the basis of the rationale and previous studies on communication strategies, the researcher was interested in conducting a study of communication strategies. The recent study focused on the communication strategies which were established by the students of English as foreign language related to their sex.

Therefore, the study was carried out which aimed to:

investigate the strategy the students in performing their communication;

classify the types of strategies the students used in relation to their sexes;

find out the similarities and the differences of strategies among the different sexes;

point out the strategy/ies the students most frequently used.

Method

This study was conducted by using a qualitative approach. While the design of this study was descriptive as it tried to describe data represented in the form of spoken utterance which transcribed in written form. Specifically, this study used content analysis (Holsti, 1968:42-43) that aimed at analyzing the corpus of spoken-transcribed discourse. Content analysis was appropriate in this study for it described the characteristics of content and made inferences about the cause of content and the effect of content. This technique was used to determine rhetoric and linguistic features of the essays (Krippendorff, K, 1980; Miles and Huberman, 1994). The objective analysis of the essays was accomplished by means of explicit rules called criteria of selection which must be formally established before the actual analysis of data (Berg, 1989). This concept conforms with the principle and the nature of this study.

The descriptive design was applied because it was relevant to the aim of the study. It was to describe spoken-transcribed discourse taken from students utterances, in which the researcher set out the study by posing himself as the key instrument, working out by analyzing the data himself until drawing the inferences to substantiate theory.

While the procedure of the research performed in this study were 1) selecting spoken-transcribed discourse taken from students utterances; 2) investigating the style used by the male and female students as their strategy in communication; 3) drawing inferences about

types of strategy performed by male and female students in their communication. However, the researcher did those steps repeatedly or by several re-checks before cross-checking with other colleagues who were experts in that matter.

The subjects of the study were the fourth semester undergraduate students of English Education Program at Muhammadiyah Jember University. So, the students became the source of data of this study who uttered spoken discourses during the conversation among them taken place. The discourses chosen were mainly in the form of utterances appeared during the conversation among the students.

In this study, the data were the constituents used in the discourse such as words, phrases, and sentences of the discourse. The data also comprised the threads of discourse in the form of expression or utterance patterns used by the students in delivering the idea or information to their counterparts during the conversation.

Considering that this study was qualitative, the key instrument of the research, as Bogdan and Biklen (1992:29) proposed was the researcher himself with his knowledge of Discourse Analysis, text Analysis, Sociolinguistics, and Pragmatics. The instrument was employed because the source of the data was merely in the form of discourse properties. Therefore, this study might be categorized into textual one. While the main focus of this investigation was the utterances mode and types or other language expression behavior.

There were two techniques applied in collecting the data of this study, namely, documentation in the form of recording instrument and text analysis (Silverman, 1993). The use of these methods was described in the following steps. First, all the expression or utterances made by the students were collected by using recorder. Second, the collection of the utterances were transcribed into written form. Third, the utterances were selected by classifying those produced by male and female students.

Data analysis in this study was conducted in two phases. First, the data analysis was done during the activities of data collection. Second, data analysis was conducted after collecting data. Data analysis during the activities of data collection was aimed at anticipating the possibilities of data exaggeration. This analysis also helped the researcher to analyze the data step by step. Furthermore, data analysis during and after collecting data was conducted in three stages: reducing data, displaying the data, and drawing conclusion or verifying the data (Miles and Huberman, 1992).

Findings

Language Switch

According to Bialystok (1983), language switch refers to the insertion of a word or a phrase in a language other than the target language, usually in the learners' native language without bothering to translate. The strategy found in the following examples.

Can give them to ... go ... *apa luar negeri* ... to foreign ya (F1)

President's policy in *kenaikan bahan bakar minyak*. (M1)

To pay the *biaya telepon, listrik*. (M1)

The ... *kekayaan* ... wealthy ... wealthy is under the level *di bawah rata-rata*. (M1)

This strategy occurred 5 times in the data. There were some reasons why the subjects used Indonesian words in their speech production. First, the subjects were unaware of the English equivalents for such Indonesian words or expressions. Second, they had limited vocabulary which prevented them from using the intended words. Third, when the subjects faced difficulties in communicating their ideas, they used their mother tongue to achieve their communication goals.

Foreignizing.

Foreignizing is the strategy to use a word from the native language with phonological and morphological adaptation to the target language. The strategy can be seen in the following examples.

President's policy in *kenaikan BBM*. (M1)

The decision of the increase of *BBM*. (M2)

This strategy was employed 7 times. The subjects used foreignizing since they did not know the equivalent words in English. Therefore, they foreignized their phonological system as it was in English. For instance, the subjects pronounced "BBM" as /bi-bi-em/ and not /be-be-em/.

Transliteration.

Transliteration involves the use of L2 lexicon to create literally L1 phrase. The subjects tended to translate word-for-word from their native language as exhibited in the following examples.

"I think it's not bad until they can get a high good enough education to develop their resources and we can see ... ee ... develop our country may be from that" (By having enough experts, we can exploit our natural resources). (F2)

“From their fund can ... ee ... can give ... ee ... the good ... ee ... can give them ... to go ... ee ... apa luar negeri ... to foreign ya ...” (Therefore, President can take some of the people’s representatives’ salary from the funding of education for the potential people). (F2)

“So many people can get a new job and get a good high ... high ... economic to do that is not directly may be ... long time” (Although it takes much time, the results will increase job employment). (F1)

“I think it’s better than only for static without develop” (It’s better than only speaking without action). (F1)

“Politician of Indonesia ... always ... always against with him” (however, some Indonesian politicians always against him to do that). (M2)

“Nothing politic” (non political aspects). (M1)

This strategy was the most commonly employed by the students (52 times). The main reason was that the students tended to think in Indonesian style of expression when they attempted to speak and, as the consequence, interference of Indonesian rule and style occurred. The expressions or utterances used by the subjects always sounded strange and even, sometimes they did not make sense. The expression or utterances did not convey the intended meaning in the target language. The data also revealed that the subjects first did their thinking and formulation in Indonesian before coming up with a literal equivalence in English. These data indicated that “transliteration” had taken place.

The L2-based communication strategies found included semantic contiguity, word coinage, repetition, and self-improvisation. In addition, there was also a non linguistic strategy i.e., non verbal language.

Semantic Contiguity.

Semantic contiguity involves the use of lexical items to cover the meaning of a certain word which the learners do not know. The strategy can be seen in the following examples.

During Jokowi as a President (Jokowi’s presidential). (F2)

Because its old tradition (previous tradition). (F1)

Make our country better the exception (except). (F1)

I think like that (I think so). (F2)

That so she (he). (F1)

Indonesian needed (needs). (F2)

Her (his). (M1)

She had nothing (he had nothing). (M1)

Advantage with (profit from). (M2)

Semantic contiguity appeared only 13 times. The subjects adopted this strategy when they faced difficulties in finding the appropriate word for a particular context. As shown in the examples above, the subject used pronoun *she* instead of *he* because in Indonesia there is only one third personal pronoun (*dia*).

Word Coinage.

Word coinage is a strategy which creates L2 lexical item by selecting a conceptual feature of the target language item. It usually produces items which do not exist in the target language, or if they do, they are contextually incorporated. The strategy can be found in the following examples.

We can actually no many develop (development). (F1)

Pain (people being suffered). (F2)

I mean there are still ... reinforce (worse). (M2)

Dark side (drawbacks). (M2)

The trade side (trade aspects). (M1)

The strategy was employed 5 times by the subjects. The data revealed that the subjects had problems in selecting and using the selected words in appropriate contexts. They used the words which existed in English irrelevantly to the intended meaning, for instance, the word “reinforce” existed and was used by the subject, but it was unacceptable or irrelevant in this particular context. The subject adopted this strategy because they had limited vocabulary. As a result, they used lexical items which were contextually inappropriate.

Repetition.

Repetition is a communication strategy in which the subjects repeat the same word or phrase of a clause twice or more. The purpose is to search other utterances to say further; therefore, it is better for the subject to repeat the same utterances as he or she seeks another utterance in their minds. The examples of the strategy are as follows.

President especially to think ... to think. (F1)

President should ... should ... (F1)

He ... he ... (F2)

Wealthy ... wealthy ... (F2)

Our ... ee ... our ... (F2)

More measurable ... more measurable. (F1)

He had nothing ... he had nothing ... ee. (F2)

I agree with him to change the situation ... so ... I agree with him to change. (M1)

If President ... ee ... if President ... (M1)

Many Indonesian people ... ee ... many Indonesian people ... (M2)

If we ... ee ... if we ... (M2)

The repetition strategy was employed 34 times in this study. This indicated that before they continued their further utterances, they had to think, unfortunately, because of limited vocabulary and ideas, they repeated their previous utterances to avoid being silent.

Self-Improvisation.

Self-improvisation is a communication strategy employed by the subjects to improve their previous utterances. It is a mean of self-correction or clarification on what the subjects intend to say. The example of the strategy can be seen in the following data.

There is no ... there are no much. (F1)

His government I mean ... Jokowi government. (F1)

Become ... ee ... they had tried to ... (F1)

They try to ... ee ... they had tried to ... (F1)

But we can ... ee ... we have (F2)

The only ... he only (F2)

He needs to ... to take ... ee ... he needs to concern. (F2)

Not any aprties ... party. (M1)

We must ... ee ... we have to. (M1)

Sometimes we can said ... we can say ... (M2)

The Jokowi' people ... the Jokowi's policy (M2)

Some people of Indonesian ... ee ... politician of Indonesia. (M2)

In this study, the self-improvisation strategy occurred 30 times. As displayed in the examples, the subjects tried to improve their previous utterances because they realized that their previous utterances were wrong.

Nonverbal Language.

The other interesting finding of the study is the exploration of nonverbal language which was exhibited by the students in attempt to clarify their utterances. It appears that the intensity of the use nonverbal language were different between male and female students. The

study reveals that female students exhibited more nonverbal language than male students. The female students made use of their hand and arms to explain their utterances they thought were hard to be understood by the hearers.

The distribution of communication strategies used by male and female students is described in Table I.

Tabel I. Distribution of Communication Strategies.

Strategies	Basis	Sex	Total	%	Total for each Strategy
Language	L1	Male	4	80	5
Switch		Female	1	20	
Foregnizing	L1	Male	7	100	7
		Female	0	0	
Transliteration	L1	Male	21	40.4	52
		Female	31	59.6	
Semantic	L2	Male	3	23.1	13
Contiguity		Female	10	76.9	
Word Coinage	L2	Male	3	60	5
		Female	2	40	
Repetition	L2	Male	18	53	34
		Female	16	47	
Self-	L2	Male	12	40	30
improvisation		Female	18	60	
Nonverbal	L2	Male	1	10	4
language		Female	3	40	
Toal					150

Tabel I indicates that the subjects used language switch strategies 5 times or 3.42 % from the whole strategies. Whereas 4 out 5 or 80 % strategies were employed by male learners and 1 out of 5 or 20 % were employed by female leaners. It proved that most learners preferred to switch their production from L2 into L1 when they did not understand the expression in L2. There were 7 times or 4.80 % foreignizing strategy appeared and all were employed by male learners. There were 52 times or 35.6 % strategy of transliteration appeared and used by the

learners. Out of 52 times, 21 times or 40.4 % were employed by male learners, whereas 31 times or 59.6 % were employed by female learners. The strategy was most dominant ne employed by the learners.

Semantic contiguity strategy took place 13 times or 8.90 % from the whole strategies. Out of 13 times or 23.1 % were employed by male learners and 10 times or 76.9 % were employed by female learners. There were 5 times or 3.42 % strategy of word coinage appeared in the data. Out of 5 times or 60 % were employed by male learners and 2 times or 40 % were employed by female learners. There were 34 times or 23.3 % strategies employed by female learners. There were 34 times or 23.3 % strategies employed by the learners which were concerned with the repetition strategy. Here 18 times or 53 % were employed by male learners and 16 times or 47 % were employed by female learners. The strategy was the second dominant strategy employed by the learners. There were 30 times or 20.5 % strategy of self-improvisation occurred in the recent study. Out of 30 times, 12 times or 40 % were employed by male learners while 18 times or 60 % were employed by female learners. The last strategy, nonverbal language was dominantly performed by the female learners. From 5 or 50 % occurrences of the strategy, 4 (40 %) was exhibited by female learners. There existed only 1 or 10 % of the strategy was applied by male learner.

Discussion

The findings presented in the table and elaborated earlier show that all types of L1-based and L2-based communication strategies were used by the subjects. This phenomenon could be explained that most of subjects' problems dealt with the limited vocabulary to express their ideas. Therefore, when they wanted to express it, they tended to express it inappropriately.

Male learners dominantly used L1-based strategies rather than female learners. In contrast, female learners dominantly used L2-based strategies. That was due to the fact that the topic discussed in the present study was about the political system in Indonesia and male learners were assumed to know more than the female learners. Therefore, female learners did not face many troubles to express it in L2. Their troubles were mostly caused by their limited knowledge about the subject matters being discussed in the process of collecting the data.

The findings also showed that male learners tended to switch their language into Indonesian. This indicated that male learners faced troubles in expressing their ideas in English. Meanwhile, they knew more than female about the subject matters. Male learners

also tended to foreignize L1 utterances as it was like in L2. They pretended to be clever so that when to be seen as having troubles in vocabulary mastery.

The findings also indicated that female learners mostly faced troubles to express their own ideas in English appropriately, so they expressed their ideas in English using the system of Indonesian language, while male learners did not face many troubles to express their ideas compared to the females. The data showed that transliteration was the most dominant strategy employed by the learners in overcoming their communication problems. Moreover, female learners dominantly used semantic contiguity than male learners did; therefore, it was summed up that female learners dominantly expressed the inappropriate utterances to overcome their communication problems. Table 1 showed that male learners mostly repeated their previous utterances as a bridge before they uttered their further utterances. It means that male learners tended to repeat their previous utterances rather than to keep silent.

The findings above are relevant with the belief that communication strategies deal with the use of linguistic knowledge. Tarone (1981, cited in Faerch & Casper, 1983) says that communication strategies are used to compensate for some lacks in the linguistic system, and focus on exploring alternate ways of using what one does know for the transmission of a message without necessarily situational appropriateness. The subjects used transliteration as an L1-based strategy because they did not know the appropriate lexicons to produce. However, their lexical limitation did not result in their halting. They used a wide range of strategies to achieve their communicative goal.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, the conclusion of the research is drawn as the followings. English language learners overcome their communication problems by using communication strategies. Generally, the subjects resorted to using some kinds of strategy while communicating to overcome their communicative problems. They were aware of the existence of their deficiency in the target language as was demonstrated by their adoption of different strategies in this communicative production. Strategies adopted by the learners were determined by knowledge of the language they possessed. The less knowledge of the language they have, the more strategies they adopted.

The results of the study showed that the majority of the English language learners used achievement strategies to cope with problems. The subjects resorted to strategies when they faced with the problems, concepts or things and which there was no word in their native language. To solve these problems, the learners expanded their communicative resources by

using a wide range of achievement strategies of which the most common ones were “transliteration”, “repetition”, and “self improvisation”. The learners had a strong drive to communicate so they used “language switch” and “semantic contiguity”. To communicate effectively, the learners required strategies which were relevant to their knowledge.

Recommendations

Based on the result of the research, the following recommendations are offered due to EFL lecturers and other researchers. The EFL lecturers or teachers should be aware of the communication strategy difference between male and female learners. Then they should be aware of the difference as the important factors in teaching English as a foreign language. This effort helps them in finding the appropriate method and strategy for teaching English to Indonesian students. To other researchers who interested in the topic are suggested to employ larger and wider data to explore the issue.

References

- Baalen, I. V. (2001). *Male and Female Language: Growing Together?* Retrieved from <http://F://maleandfemale.html>
- Bialystok, E. 1983. Some Factors in the Selection and Implementation of Communication Strategies. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in International Communication*. London: longman.
- Bongarts, T., & Poulisse, N. (1989). Communication Strategies in L1 and L2: Same or Different? *Applied Linguistics*. 10: 253-268.
- Catalan, R. M. J. (2003). Sex Differences in L2 Vocabulary Learning Strategies. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 13 (1): 54-77
- Chen, S. (1990). A Study of Communication Strategies in Interlanguage Production by Chinese EFL. *Language Learning Journal*. 40: 155-187.
- Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (Eds.) (1983). *Strategies in International Communication*. London: Longman.

Fasold, R. W. (1990). *The Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Liberman, S. (2008). *Differences in Male and Female Communication Styles*. Retrieved from <http://F://maleandfemale.html>

Mackie, N. S., & Kagan, A. (1999). Communication Strategies Used by 'Good' Versus 'Poor' Speaking Partners of Individuals with Aphasia. *Aphasiology Journal*. 13 (11): 807-820.

Nasution, A. K., (2010). *Communication Strategies Used by EFL Learners of Different Sexes*. In Cahyono, B. Y. (ed). *Second Language Acquisition and English Language Teaching*. Malang. State University of Malang Press.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New Yprk: Ballatine Books.

Williams, J. (2006). Combining Communication Strategies and Vocabulary Development. *The Internet TESL Journal*. 12 (2). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Williams-communication-strategies.htm>