

Communication Strategy Use in a Bilingual/Bicultural Child

Scott E. BINGHAM

Communication Strategies (CS) are the methods which speakers use to compensate for difficulties in communicating and studies in CS have tended to focus on students learning a second language. However, bilingual children, especially children who are both bilingual and bicultural, also face many unique difficulties communicating within two different language communities. Having been raised with two languages, these children, however, almost always have one language, known as their *primary language*, in which they are more proficient. Their other language is known as their *subordinate language* and is weaker and less fluent in most cases. In order to compensate for this, bilinguals, especially bilingual children, learn unique strategies to meet their communicative needs in both languages. The study below presents a case study on CS use in a seven-year-old, bilingual, bicultural child. First, the author will give an outline of CS research, especially research associated with CS use in bilingual subjects. Then, language samples obtained from story-telling sessions will be analyzed in order to describe the subject's use of CS.

Key Words : Communication Strategies (CS), bilingual, bicultural, English, Japanese, child

Table of Contents

- I Introduction
- II Background
 - 2.1 Bilingualism and Biculturalism
 - 2.2 Communication Strategy
 - 2.3 Communication Strategy Use in Monolingual Children
 - 2.4 Communication Strategy Use in Non-Japanese/English Bilingual Children
 - 2.5 Communication Strategy Use in Japanese/English Bilingual Children
- III Research Question
- IV Methodology
 - 4.1 Subject
 - 4.2 Data Collection

4.3 Typology of Communication Strategies

V Results and Discussion

VI Conclusion

I. Introduction

Since the early 1970's researchers have been looking into the methods in which language learners overcome deficiencies in language production and reception. These methods of dealing with linguistic difficulties have become to be known as Communication Strategies (CS). Since the seminal work of Tarone in the early 1970's, a variety of studies have been undertaken to describe the different kinds of strategies that speakers use within a variety of contexts. More recently, researchers have attempted to go beyond description and develop theories of the psycholinguistic processes that govern strategy use. Unfortunately, the data that both the descriptive analysis and the process hypotheses are based have come from a rather selective group of learners and contexts. In order to address this lack of scope, the study reported here will focus on one of the least researched types of subject and setting. The purpose of this paper is to describe the use of Communication Strategies in a *primary bilingual, bicultural* child living in Japan. Samples of the subject's English, his subordinate language and the language of his home environment, will be analyzed.

II. Background

2.1 Bilingualism and Biculturalism

In studies dealing with bilingual subjects, the researcher must be very careful in defining what it means to be both bilingual and bicultural. As for bilingualism, Beardsmore (1989) acknowledged the difficulty in finding a satisfactory, all-encompassing definition by describing the array of labels that different researchers have used to describe the conditions of their subjects - among these are the distinctions between societal and individual bilingualism, receptive and productive bilinguals, and the maximal and minimal approach to bilingual proficiency.

Garcia (1985), however, gives a clear definition of bilingualism as ". . . the simultaneous acquisition of more than two languages during the first five years of life" (pg. 13). For Garcia, to be truly bilingual, subjects must meet three conditions. (See Table 1)

Table 1. Conditions and Attributes of Bilingualism

Condition	Attribute
linguistic	Child must be able to comprehend, produce, and discriminate between two or more languages. Proficiency is an important, but not limiting factor.
social	Child must have natural exposure to two language systems requiring a substantial bilingual environment in the first three to five years of life. Exposure often comes from within family organization but other types of exposure may apply.
developmental	Linguistic development in both languages must be simultaneous to ensure both cognitive and physiological development as they relate to bilingual acquisition.

(Adapted from Garcia, 1985)

Although Garcia does not provide titles for the different categories of bilingualism, his framework meshes nicely with what Houston (1972) calls *primary bilinguals*, those who learned two languages at home as a child, as opposed to *secondary bilinguals*, those who picked up more than one language by moving into a new language community. Although secondary bilinguals may eventually meet Garcia's linguistic and social conditions, the lack of exposure to two languages since childhood and the resulting lack of the development of the necessary cognitive and physiological skills would produce clear-cut differences between secondary and primary bilinguals. For the purposes of the current study, the author will focus on CS in *primary bilingual* as defined by Garcia (1985) and Houston (1972).

In addition to this explicit definition of bilingualism, it is also important to look into what it means to be bicultural and how that affects bilingualism. Unfortunately, notions of culture are often based on the community setting of the subject and not their genetic makeup. Although many speech communities have been studied, few studies focus on subjects, especially children, who may be the product of cross-language marriages and how that may affect their choices in language use. Several studies have shown the development of bilingualism within families of mixed parentage in a Japanese setting (Kamada et al., 1995; Oka, 1989; Yamamoto, 1987, 1992, 1995). However, none of these studies looks at biculturalism and bilingualism as a linguistic phenomenon, but rather as a sociological one. Therefore, the focus of these studies has been on *whether* subjects develop bilingualism and to *what extent*, and not on the process or description of that development. By themselves, these studies are interesting and important, yet they do little to either explain or describe how bicultural children use language.

2.2 Communication Strategies (CS)

From the time that CS became a topic of investigation in the early 1970's, a growing body of literature has been produced. Most of the literature can be broken down into roughly three categories: (a) descriptions and categorizations of CS use (Tarone, 1977; Faerch & Kasper, 1983b; Bialystok, 1983; Paribakht, 1985; Tarone and Yule, 1987; Dornyei & Scott, 1995a, 1995b; for review see Dornyei & Scott, 1997), (b) theoretical explanations of the psycholinguistic processes involved in CS use (Bialystok & Kellerman, 1987; Poulisse & Schils, 1989, Bialystok, 1990; Kellerman, 1991; Poulisse, 1993; for review see Kellerman & Bialystok, 1997), and (c) the pedagogical implications and applications of CS (Faerch & Kasper, 1986; Willems, 1987; O'Malley, Chamot, & Kupper, 1989; Yule & Tarone, 1990; Dornyei, 1995; Liskin-Gasparro, 1996; Thompson & Rubin, 1996). In the study described below, the author has taken a descriptive approach to CS use in a bilingual child and therefore the review below concentrates primarily on studies that are descriptive and/or share similarities with either the subject or context of the present study.

2.3 CS Use in Monolingual Children

Although research in CS use in children, either monolingual or bilingual, is not as abundant as the studies done on adults, a few studies have delved into how children deal with situations of linguistic difficulty. According to Bialystok (1990), one of the challenges that researchers face in studying strategy use in children is the apparent lack of any systematic way of predicting the choice of strategy a child will make in any given moment. The child's current vocabulary knowledge in conjunction with the communicative intention will determine strategy choice. Even though children lack systematicity, several researchers have reported tendencies in child subjects to use the following L1 strategies.

Overextension (Anglin, 1977; Rescorla, 1980; Clark, 1983)

example: the use of the term *doggie* for all four-legged animals.

The use of overextension indicates an underdeveloped, yet highly systematic conceptual knowledge (Rescorla, 1980). As a strategy to overcome lexical deficiencies, overextension minimizes the degree of cognitive and linguistic effort by reducing the number of objects and labels that need to be organized and named. In addition, the speaker can exploit the shared knowledge of the listener by following a simple rule of functional utility in naming objects (Anglin, 1977).

All-Purpose Terms (Bloom, 1973)

example: the use of words such as *this*, *that*, *do*, or *make* to signify a wide range of

specific concepts.

The use of these words enables the child to talk about subjects that would normally be beyond their level. The effectiveness of this strategy is highly dependent on the sympathies of the listener and as a result is often accompanied by considerable gesturing since children are not limited to confining their meaning to verbal expression. The use of this strategic option points out a major problem that researchers face when studying children. As Bialystok points out, "to know what a child is saying, you must see what the child is doing" (Bialystok, 1990, p. 89). CS studies often demand that subjects be limited to verbal expression, thereby creating a burden on the child that is not found in a natural setting.

Word Creation (Carroll, 1981; Clark, 1983; Clark & Berman, 1987)

examples: using verbs derived from nouns such as *keying* the door.

using compound nouns such as *plantman* for gardener

This strategy transfers words from one already known context to another that is not correct. Word-Creation utilizes what is familiar and extending it with minimal modification to a new situation. Entirely new words, however, are almost never created (Carroll, 1981). Most coined terms were compounds and phrases in which common nouns were modified.

2.4 CS Use in Non-Japanese/English Bilingual Children

Although Communication Strategy research was originally initiated in the 1970's, not until the early '90's was research directed toward strategy use in bilingual children. Bialystok (1991) looked at CS in a group of 18 English/French bilingual children enrolled at a Canadian French immersion school. Her methodology utilized a description task where a pair of subjects would take turns describing and selecting pictures from a 3-by-12 matrix of pictures. Before discussing her results it important to mention two very important caveats presented in her work. First, these children cannot be clearly defined as primary bilinguals since the author does not give any reference to their linguistic home environment. In addition, it is important to mention that Bialystok's primary goal in this study was to refute the reliability and validity of the many product-oriented taxonomies that have been developed on CS and introduce a process-oriented framework that reduces the types of CS to two general strategies which she has labeled as Analysis-Based Strategies and Control-Based Strategies. It is evident from her analysis that she had a specific agenda as seen in her selection of testing method and her willingness to make very broad statements from a rather limited selection of subjects, settings, and samples. Considering this, Bialystok does offer some interesting conclusions on the subject of CS use in general, and, more specifically, on the use of strategies

in "bilingual" children. The most salient of these conclusions is her determination that strategies used in this very controlled referential task by the children attending the immersion school were the same as those used by adult L2 learners. Whether these same strategies would be used in a more naturalistic setting with a larger variety of subjects is a question left unanswered.

Using a similar referential communication task which focused on the production of noun phrases modified by adjectives indicating color and size, Deutsch, Bruhn, Masche, & Behrens (1997) report on a comprehensive study involving 19 bilingual German/Spanish, 21 monolingual Spanish, and 20 monolingual German children between the ages of five and eight. The bilingual children in this study differ from those of Bialystok (1991) in that they fall under the definition of primary bilinguals as defined above. In their study, the authors found that none of these children could be described as truly "balanced" bilinguals. By the age of five, their languages had separated with one becoming more dominant than the other in terms of precision and usage. This gives strong support to earlier studies by Myers-Scotton (1993) in which she develops a model of code-switching based on this separation into a dominant (the matrix language) and a subordinate (the embedded language) language. The result of this language separation in the study by Deutsch, et al was seen most evidently when transfer was used as a communication strategy. In most cases, transfers shown in this very specific referential task were from the dominant to the subordinate language. An additional finding was that grammatical errors specific to this referential task did not have a negative impact on the success or failure of the communicative function. In fact, the object references of the bilingual children were often more successful than those of the monolingual children. No concrete conclusions are given for this evident disparity, but the authors are among the first to propose the notion of the importance of culture on strategy use.

In another study looking at both primary bilinguals and monolingual children, Juvonen (1991) focused on self-repair strategies. This is one of the first studies on strategy use that attempts to broaden the data-gathering methodology by using story-telling sessions instead of very controlled referential communication tasks. In this study, the author reports that the bilingual subjects used both overt and covert repairs of errors. Overt repairs were described as those where obvious changes were made in either prosodic features, syntactic structure, or perspective. Covert repairs were those that were more difficult to determine exactly what the problem was, but which could be identified through careful analysis of language samples. The results from this study show that bilingual and monolingual children use similar repair strategies yet differ in the frequency of those types. Bilingual children used more repairs in

both languages, attempted more repairs in their subordinate language, used more covert than overt strategies, and tended to make overt repairs immediately, either intra-word or immediately upon completion of the repaired item.

The final two articles in this section deal with studies that differ rather dramatically in their use of "naturalistic" data collection. Both studies gather language samples of primary bilingual children through at-home observations and do not include any specific task that the children are expected to perform. Another aspect that sets these studies apart is their focus on overall strategy use and not on the calculation of the frequency of specific strategies (Juvonen, 1991; Deutsch, et al., 1997) or an explanation of the process of strategy use (Bialystok, 1991).

In the first, Turian and Altenberg (1991) are primarily researching L1 attrition in a three-year-old primary Russian/English bilingual child, but in respect to the use of any strategy used to compensate increasing language deficiencies. The authors identified strategy use by the subject's use of false starts, hesitations, and overt comments. Although this child was only three years old, he demonstrated a wide variety of compensation strategies including code-switching, lexical borrowing, syntactic transfer, lexical innovation, approximation, overt comments and appeals for assistance. In this use of the same type of strategies seen in adult L2 learners, the subject showed strong evidence that the cognitive development of even very young children is sufficient for use of the same strategies found in adults. This would suggest the notion that when strategies are not evidenced in child language samples, it may be a result of the types of tasks chosen by the researcher, or a conscious decision by the child to use or not use specific strategies.

Genessee, Boivin, and Nicoladis (1996) give further evidence of conscious strategy choice in children, especially in regards to code-mixing when used as a compensatory strategy. Using at-home observations similar to Turian and Altenberg (1991), Genessee, et al. (1996) went a step further by recording their four primary bilingual English/French subjects interacting with a variety of interlocutors. These interlocutors included mothers alone, fathers alone, and a monolingual French or English speaker who was a stranger to the subjects. In each case, these two-year old children were able to differentiate their languages and use appropriate forms with both familiar interlocutors and with those whose linguistic backgrounds were unknown. These children were able to quickly and accurately judge the strangers and modify their language appropriately. The authors propose these findings as strong evidence that bilingual use code-mixing "as a general pragmatic strategy used by bilingual children to extend their limited communicative abilities in their less proficient

language" (1996, p. 440).

2.5 CS Use in Japanese/English Bilingual Children

Although several studies in Communication Strategies have included Japanese-speaking subjects (Dickson, Miyake, & Muto, 1977; Ross, 1997; Russell, 1997; Shea, 1993; and Yule & Tarone, 1990), these studies focus on subjects and utilize methodologies that are so far removed from the study reported below as to limit their utility and salience. No studies to date could be found which specifically address the overall use of Communication Strategies in primary bilingual children whose dominant and subordinate languages were Japanese and English, respectively. However, two studies share similarities in either the type of subject or the focus of the study.

In the first, Clancy (1990) compared samples from Japanese monolingual adults and children in order to research the development of the ability to choose between elliptical and nominal references. Using samples obtained through storytelling and the retelling of the plot from a short animated TV program, the author was able to compare the frequency and type of referential choices made by sixty children aged 3 - 7 and ten adults aged 18 - 24. She found that Japanese children were able to make what she describes as "adult-like" referential choices. More importantly, she found that children as young as three were able to evaluate the needs of the listener and make appropriate referential choices. This finding mirrors similar results in two of the studies reviewed above (Genessee et al., 1990, and Turian & Altenberg, 1991).

In the final study to be reviewed, Fotos (1990) researched the structural and functional characteristics of code-switching in four primary bilingual Japanese/English children. Two of the children were 7 years old and two were 11. It is important to note that this is one of the few studies in which entirely naturalistic data was obtained through tape recordings of play sessions. Although the analysis did not specifically focus on code-switching as a strategy to overcome linguistic difficulty, it is evident from the language samples that in many cases switches were made to fulfill this function - in particular, instances where switches were used to indicate clarification of a perceived misunderstanding on the part of the listener. All of these switches were made from the subordinate (English) to the dominant language. Fotos also reports similar finding with Juvonen (1991) in that switches were most often used intra-sententially, indicating an almost instantaneous perception of the need to make adjustments.

III. Research Question

As mentioned above, this study is primarily focused on cataloging actual strategy use in the subordinate language of a primary Japanese/English bicultural child. This study is not concerned with attempting to elicit all the strategies that a child in this setting is capable of, but rather how this child actually deals with linguistic difficulties when performing a story-telling task. Therefore, the research question for this study is:

1. What types of communication strategies does a primary Japanese/English bilingual, bicultural child use when attempting to tell a story in his subordinate language?

IV. Methodology

4.1 Subject

At the time of the study, the subject, K, was a seven-year-old the son of an American father and a Japanese mother. He had lived his entire life in Japan, but had spent time in the U.S. on several family vacations (about 3 months total). He had attended Japanese schools since he was 18 months old and he was completely fluent in his primary language, Japanese. He never had any formal instruction in English; however, he had access to English videos, books, and computer programs that he was encouraged, but not required, to use. Although K's primary language is Japanese, English was the language of his home environment. Therefore, using the previously described definitions by Garcia (1985) and Houston (1972), K will be defined as a primary bilingual with Japanese as his primary language and English as his subordinate language.

4.2 Data Collection

The goal of this study was to provide a description of the types of Communication Strategy (CS) use in the subordinate language of a bilingual child. The data to be analyzed was collected through story-telling sessions. The stories were elicited from picture books both familiar to the subject (The Lion King and Momotaro: the Story of Peach Boy) and unfamiliar (Merry Frog). Video-tape recordings in English (his subordinate language) were analyzed. A video-tape recorder was used in order to catch both oral and paralinguistic features of the samples.

4.3 Typology of Communication Strategies

For the purpose of this study, the description of strategy types comes from Tarone's (1978) Typology of Communication Strategies and from one of the studies on first-language strategy use (Bloom, 1973). Although typologies that are more comprehensive have been developed, Tarone's typology offers a good balance between brevity and depth and is considered the benchmark. Tarone's Typology is divided into three categories: Paraphrase, Transfer, and Avoidance. Paraphrase is a strategy used by the speaker to compensate for a lack of specific vocabulary by using words with similar semantic features or longer descriptive expressions. Transfers are examples of the speaker's a) using their L1 to compensate for unknown vocabulary, b) asking the interlocutor for assistance, or c) using paralinguistic features to describe an object. Avoidance is usually communicative failure on the part of the speaker in that they refuse to discuss unknown topics or give up mid-sentence. Bloom's (1973) study includes one additional avoidance strategy that is not included in Tarone's Typology (1978), yet was evidenced in the data set for this study. Although Tarone's Typology lists nine types of strategies, only those in bold print (see Table 2) were seen in the language samples for this study.

Table 2: Communication Strategy Categories and Types

Researcher	Category	Type
Tarone (1980)	Paraphrase	Approximation Word Coinage Circumlocution
	Transfer	Literal Translation Language Switch Appeal for Assistance Mime
	Avoidance	Topic Avoidance Message Abandonment
Bloom (1973)	Paraphrase	All-Purpose Terms

V. Results and Discussion

Approximation

Approximation is when the speaker resorts to using a single vocabulary item that is close in semantic meaning but is not quite correct (Tarone, 1978). This was, by far, the most evident strategy used by this subject. It is obvious that K relies heavily on a repertoire of known words and phrases that he uses in a variety of interesting and creative ways. (See Table 3) Although many of his uses of approximation were flagged by pauses in his narrative, he seemed little concerned with using expressions that he knew were not "correct." As with many of the later examples, K relies heavily on his interlocutor's ability to decode what he is saying.

Table 3: Samples of Approximation

Transcript Location (Story/Page)	Sample	Explanation
1/1 1/2 3/1	<i>kid</i>	the use of the word "kid" is applied to the young of both animals and humans
1/3 1/9 3/4 1/10	<i>got big</i> <i>got big</i> (1) <i>got big</i> <i>was big</i>	"got big" and "was big" are used to imply that something increased in age
1/1 1/3 3/8	<i>rock</i> (1) <i>rock</i> (1) <i>in the rockfs place</i> (1)	"rock" is used to describe a ledge or high place overlooking the valley
1/7	<i>bisons</i>	"bison" is used for water buffalo, although why he used this rather unusual word is unknown.
2/4	<i>tree</i>	"tree" is used to describe a log floating in the water.
2/5 3/6 3/13	<i>laughed</i> <i>laughing</i> <i>laughing</i>	"laugh" and its derivatives are used to describe people or animals that are happy.
2/6 2/13	<i>bug</i> (1) <i>bug</i>	"bug" used to describe different kinds of insects
2/6	<i>frog</i> (1)	"frog" in this case is used to describe a snail
2/7	<i>water</i> (1)	"water" is used to describe a lake or pond
2/12	<i>turtlefs up</i> (1)	"turtle's up" is used to describe the turtle's back or shell
3/1	<i>grandpa and grandma</i> (1)	"grandpa and grandma" is used to describe an old man and old lady.
2/8	<i>flower-thing</i>	"flower-thing" is used to described a lily pad

(1) flagged with pause or hesitation

Literal Translation

Relying on the L1, literal translation is a word-for-word translation of an L2 expression that is semantically similar, yet pragmatically incorrect. It is very curious that K did not resort to this strategy more, especially since he knew his interlocutor also understood his native Japanese. (See Table 4) Even at such a young age, he seemed to be able to keep his dominant Japanese from interfering with his subordinate English. This is evidenced in that there were no overwhelmingly obvious literal translations and only one example of an English word used in a Japanese setting.

Table 4: Sample of Literal Translation

Transcript Location (Story/Page)	Sample	Explanation
3/11	the monkey opened the key (1)	"opened the key" is a direct transliteration of the Japanese phrase " <i>kagi-o akeru</i> ". In Japanese, "lock" and "key" can be the same word " <i>kagi</i> " and can be used interchangeably

(1) flagged with pause or hesitation

Language Switch

Language switching, or code-switching, is often considered a communicative failure, in that the speaker abandons the L2 entirely in favor of the L1. However, it is the author's opinion that whether it is a failure, or a conscious effort by the speaker to maintain the conversation at whatever cost, depends entirely on the context of the conversation. Even when K knew that his interlocutor could speak Japanese, the instances of language switches were limited to a few highly specific words and phrases. (See Table 5) In the case of "*onitaiji*," "*oni*," and "*takaramono*," the language switch was flagged by both a pause and hesitation - clearly signaling his recognition that what he was saying was not "correct." Therefore, these examples could be considered a communication failure. His use of "*onigashima*," however, was not flagged and showed his inability to realize that "*onigashima*" might not be understood. In this case, the author feels that K was using "*onigashima*" as a place name and not as a description of the location. In his mind, it was like saying "Tokyo" or "Miyazaki" and not "island of the demons." Whether this is representative of all bicultural children is not yet known; however, it is obvious from the lack of language switches that K was very concerned with limiting his narrative to English.

Table 5: Samples of Language Switch

Transcript Location (Story/Page)	Sample	Explanation
3/5 3/10	<i>onigashima</i>	" <i>onigashima</i> " means "island of the demons"
3/6	<i>onitaiji</i> (1)	" <i>onitaiji</i> " means "capture the demons"
3/11	<i>oni</i> (1)	" <i>oni</i> " means demon
3/13	<i>takaramono</i> (1)	" <i>takaramono</i> " means treasure

(1) flagged with pause or hesitation

Appeal for Assistance

Appeal for assistance describes situations where the speaker either verbally ("What is this?") or paralinguistically (a pause followed by a pleading or questioning look) seeks assistance from the interlocutor. In this data sample, there were no verbal appeals for assistance. On two occasions, however, K used paralinguistic methods in order to confirm whether a risky word-choice was acceptable or not. In Story 1/Line 7 with the word "*bison*," the subject followed the risky word with a questioning look at the interlocutor and when no negative reaction was received, he continued with the story. In Story 2/Line 15 with the word "thing", a questioning look was accompanied by a rising intonation. From these results, it is obvious that K realized he was expected to speak only English.

Message Abandonment

Message Abandonment is complete communicative failure when the speaker simply gives up trying to maintain the current topic. Unfortunately, this was also one of the most prevalent strategies used in K's story-telling sessions. (See Table 6) There were several occasions of abandonment and K showed little hesitancy in giving up when he felt it necessary. Without getting feedback from K, it is almost impossible to know why a message was abandoned and any attempt by the author to provide explanation would be to guess at what was going on in the head of the subject.

The amount of message abandonment could, however, be accounted for by remembering that the task was to tell a story and K had complete control of story content. He was allowed and encouraged to tell the stories however he felt best. Therefore, there was little

communicative risk to omitting parts of the narrative that were difficult for him. It must be noted, though, that additional instances of message abandonment might have been masked by the subject simply turning the page and continuing with the story. Table 6, therefore, shows the evidenced samples only.

Table 6: Samples of Message Abandonment

Transcript Location (Story/Page)	Sample (1)
1/2	give it to the ... [] he looked to the sun
2/8	so they down ... [] find this ... []
2/10	and the wa ... [] played and
2/14	night and the ... [] and the fox

(1) brackets indicate break in message

All-Purpose Words

As described by Bloom (1973), all-purpose words are lexical items, which take on a variety of functional and semantic uses. In his stories, K heavily relied on two words, *got/getting* and *thing*, for a variety of situations. (See Table 7) As with his use of approximations, this heavy use of all-purpose words shows K's dependence on a relatively small amount of vocabulary and a reliance on the interlocutor's ability to make meaning of his sentences.

Table 7: Samples of All-Purpose Words

Transcript Location (Story/Page)	Sample	Explanation
1/1; 1/3 1/2; 1/3; 1/5; 1/9; 2/3; 3/4 1/6 1/7 1/10; 1/11 1/13 2/4; 2/12 2/6; 2/13 2/9 3/11 3/12	<i>got/getting</i>	used to mean to climb up used to mean to become used to mean to arrive home used to mean to make stampede used to mean to make someone angry used to mean to have a baby used to mean to climb onto used to mean to catch used to mean to leave (the pond) used to mean to enter used to mean to take
2/14 2/15 3/2 3/5; 3/6	<i>thing</i>	used to instead of owl, bat, raven, mouse, or rabbit used to describe the moon used to describe clothes used to describe articles needed for his journey

VI. Conclusion

Upon first viewing of the video-taped story-telling sessions, K seemed to use few of the classic strategies that have been described in the literature. When considering, however, that the purpose of this study was to describe what is used rather than what *can* be used, these findings are not surprising. It is quite clear from the data samples that this subject relies heavily on the interlocutor's ability to translate his somewhat vague and incomplete descriptions into language that can make sense. He is not overly concerned if the story he is telling will be understood. He is simply completing the task in the best way he can. The task in this case, therefore, has determined which Communication Strategies have been used and the extent to which the subject has perceived the need for these strategies as necessary.

In order to overcome this, further studies of subjects like K would need to devise tasks that more overtly elicit strategy use in order to ascertain his full range. In this study, the author has shown which strategies are used when little or no pressure is placed on the subject by the interlocutor. It is obvious that this type of subject will follow the path of least resistance by relying on those strategies that demand the least amount of risk-taking. The determination as to whether these results are his entire strategic repertoire will have to be based on future studies that include more demanding tasks and interlocutors.

References

- Anglin, J. M. (1977). *Word, object, and conceptual development*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Beardsmore, H. B. (1989). *Bilingualism: Basic principles*. Avon: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
- Bialystok, E. (1983b). Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 100-18). London: Longman.
- Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication strategies: A psychological analysis of second-language use*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bialystok, E. (1991). Metalinguistic dimensions of bilingual language proficiency. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp. 113-40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bialystok, E., & Kellerman, E. (1987). Language strategies in the classroom. In B. Das (Ed.), *Communication and learning in the classroom community* (pp. 160-75). Singapore: SEAMEO RELC.
- Bloom, L. (1973). *One word at a time: The use of single word utterances before syntax*. The

- Hague: Mouton.
- Carroll, M. M. (1981). Creating names for things. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 10, 441-55.
- Clancy, P. M. (1992). Referential strategies in the narratives of Japanese children. *Discourse Processes*, 15, 441-467.
- Clark, E. V. (1983). Meanings and concepts. In J.H. Flavell and E.M. Markman (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology, Vol. 3: Cognitive Development*. New York: John Wiley.
- Clark, E. V., & Berman, R. A. (1987). Types of linguistic knowledge: Interpreting and producing compound nouns. *Journal of Child Language*, 14, 547-67.
- Deutsch, W., Bruhn, N., Masche, G., & Behrens, H. (1997). Can one be more than two? Mono- and bilinguals' production of German and Spanish object descriptions in a referential communication task. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 146-167). London: Longman.
- Dickson, W., Miyake, N., & Muto, T. (1977). Referential relativity: Culture-boundedness of analytic and metaphoric communication. *Cognition*, 5, 215-233.
- Dornyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 55-85.
- Dornyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1995b). Communication strategies: An empirical analysis with retrospection. In J. S. Turley & K. Lusby (Eds.), *Selected papers from the proceedings of the 21st Annual Symposium of the Desert Language and Linguistics Society* (pp. 155-168). Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.
- Dornyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47(1), 173-210.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983b). Introduction. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.) *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. xv-xxiv). London: Longman.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1986). Strategic competence in foreign language teaching. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Learning teaching and communication in the foreign language classroom* (pp. 179-93). Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press.
- Fotos, S. S. (1990). Japanese-English code switching in bilingual children. *JALT Journal*, 12, 1, 75-98.
- Garcia, E. E. (1983). *Early childhood bilingualism*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Genessee, F., Boivin, I., & Nicoladis, E. (1996). Talking with strangers: A study of bilingual children's communicative competence. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 17, 427-442.
- Juvonen, P. (1991). *Self-repair in bilingual children: A study of Finnish-Swedish schoolchildren's self-repairs in narrative discourse*. Stockholm: University of Stockholm, Centre for Research on Bilingualism. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 345 098)
- Kamada, L., Liu, X. Y., Silva, W., & Noguchi, M. G. (1995). The nurture and nature of bilingual acquisition. Proceedings of the JALT 1995 Conference. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service ED 402 769)
- Kellerman, E., & Bialystok, E. (1997). On psychological plausibility in the study of communication strategies. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 31-48). London: Longman.
- Kellerman, E. (1991). Compensatory strategies in second language research: A critique, a revision, and some (non-) implications for the classroom. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research* (pp. 142-61). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kepes, J. (1961). *frogs merry*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Lion King*. (1994). Burbank, CA: The Walt Disney Company.
- Liskin-Gasparro, J. E. (1996). Circumlocution, communication strategies, and the ACTFL proficiency guidelines: An analysis of student discourse. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 317-330.
- Nishimoto, K. (1993). *Momotaro: The story of peach boy*. Tokyo: Popular Publishing.
- Meyer, M. (1969). *Frog Where Are You?* Hong Kong: South China Printing.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Oka, H. (1989). Bringing up children bilingually in Japan. *Studies in English Language and Literature*, 39, 113-32.
- O'Malley, J., Chamot, A., & Kupper, L. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 10(4), 419-437.
- Paribakht, T. (1985). Strategic competence and language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 132-46.
- Poullisse, N. (1993). A theoretical account of lexical communication strategies. In R. Schreuder & B. Weltens (Eds.), *The bilingual lexicon* (pp. 157-89). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Poullisse, N., & Schils, E. (1989). the influence of task- and proficiency-related factors on the use of compensatory strategies: A quantitative analysis. *Language Learning*, 39, 15-48.
- Rescorla, L. A. (1980). Overextension in early language development. *Journal of Child*

Language, 7, 321-36.

- Ross, S. (1997). An introspective analysis of listener inferencing on a second language listening task. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 215-237). London: Longman.
- Russell, G. (1997). Preference and order in first and second language referential strategies. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 65-97). London: Longman.
- Shea, D. P. (1993). Situated discourse: The sociocultural context of conversation in a second language. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 4, pp. 28-49). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage. In H. Brown, C. Yorio, & R. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '77* (pp. 194-203). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning*, 30, 417-31.
- Tarone, E., & Yule, G. (1987). Communication strategies in East-West interactions. In L. Smith (Ed.), *Discourse across cultures* (pp. 49-65). Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- Thompson, I., & Rubin, J. (1996). Can strategy instruction improve listening comprehension? *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 331-342.
- Turian, D., & Altenberg, E. P. (1991). Compensatory strategies of child first language attrition. In H.W. Seliger & R. M. Vago (Eds.), *First language attrition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Willems, G. (1987). Communication strategies and their significance in foreign language teaching. *System*, 15, 351-64.
- Yamamoto, M. (1987) Significant factors for raising children bilingually in Japan. *The Language Teacher*, 11, 10, 17-23.
- Yamamoto, M. (1992) Linguistic environments of bilingual families in Japan. *The Language Teacher*, 16, 5, 13-15.
- Yamamoto, M. (1995). Bilingualism in international families. *Journal of Multilingualism and Multiculturalism Development*, 16, 1-2, 63-85.
- Yule, G., & Tarone, E. (1990). Eliciting the performance of strategic competence. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 179-94). New York: Newbury House.

APPENDIX

STORY TRANSCRIPTIONS

Page	STORY ONE Lion King
1	some day lions kid got ... up to the rock ... rock
2	and the monkey hold the kids lion and ... give it to the ... he looked to the sun and ... his friends Scar's got mad to ... the big lion so he got mad
3	and he got big so ... the big lion get up to the ... la... uh ... rock so then he and ... big lion looked at sun
4	and the kid's lions name was Simba and Simba went to the Pride ... uh ... to the Shadow Land
5	and he was looking and he the hyenas come out so they got scary
6	and Mufasa got out and they got home and looked the stars
7	and ne ... xt day they was ... the hyenas was talking and Scar got the bisons ... out and Simba was gonna die
8	but he didn't ... die but his father died
9	and he ... got big
10	and he Nara was big too so they played but they went away soon and the monkey take ... get him mad
11	and he can look father and ... Simba looked Scar getting his ... uh Nara mad
12	so they fight and Scar get ... lose
13	and they got new baby

Page	STORY 2 Merry Frogs
1	there was a egg in the water
2	and fish eat the egg but just four went away
3	and the egg got into frog
4	and one frog got in the tree so he ... jumped once
5	and next day the three frogs find the ... one frog ... and the one frog laughed
6	and ... the one ... one got the ... bug one ... one got the rock and one got ... one got the ... um ... frog
7	and when they was playing the bird come to eat the frog but they went in the ... water
8	and they was in the ... flower things so they down ... find this
9	so they went ... so they got it out
10	and they wa ... played and ... fall
11	and they was playing turtle come and try to eat but they didn't eat it
12	and they got on the fro ... turtles ... up and turtle went
13	and frog got the bug and frog eat it
14	and frog eat ... the ... thing in night and the ... and the fox and ... thing come
15	and frog went in the ... frog went in the ... the ... the... um... the ... thing.

Page	STORY 3 Momotaro: The Story of Peach Boy
1	There were a ... grandpa and grandma and grandpa and grandma want kid
2	and grandma was washing the ... thing and the peach come
3	and try... grandma tried to cut the peach come ... um ... boy come out from the peach
4	the boy was nice boy and small boy got big and helped everybody
5	and someday Momotaro ... uh the kid wanna go to the <i>onigashima</i> so kid say to grandma and grandpa so grandma and grandpa fix the thing
6	so he went and grandma laughing ... to ... fixing the thing and Momotaro went to ... <i>onitaiji</i>
7	and when he was going dog come
8	and dog went to in ... in the rock's place monkey come and monkey gonna come too
9	and next bird come and bird is gonna go too
10	and there was a boat so Momotaro went in the boat to <i>onigashima</i>
11	and the monkey opened the ... key and Momotaro got in and fight with the ... <i>oni</i>
12	and Momotaro win so Momotaro got the <i>takaramono</i>
13	and go home ... so everybody was laughing

