



The adaptation study of oral communication strategy inventory into Turkish

Şaziye Yaman¹
Mehtap Kavasoglu²

Abstract

Individuals use a variety of strategies in the course of speaking which can be identified via measurement tools. In the literature, strategy inventories are regarded as the most commonly used measurement tools. However, most of the strategy inventories lack the reliability and validity studies. Furthermore, most of them represent strategies that the learner could use throughout the language learning process and they are not directly relevant to the skill of speaking. Moreover, in the literature, most of the studies carried out on speaking strategies are based on the inventories developed for learners learning English as a second language. With respect to other measurement tools, Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OCSI) developed by Nakatani (2006) for Japanese learning English as a foreign language had a clear factor structure and it seemed less problematic. Thus, the purpose of this study was to adapt OCSI into Turkish. Our concern in the adaptation study of OCSI is to investigate whether oral communication strategies classified in OCSI developed by Nakatani (2006) would also measure Turkish EFL students' speaking strategy use. Within the scope of adaptation study, the inventory was translated to Turkish and evaluated with the method of back translation. The equivalence between English form and Turkish form, construct validity and internal consistency were examined. The research was conducted with 808 students studying English as a foreign language at ELT departments of three different universities and Anatolian High schools. Based on the findings concerning the reliability and validity studies, it can be concluded that the classification of the original form of OCSI differs from the adapted version to some extent in that the Turkish form is made up of seven factors in contrast to the original inventory consisting of eight factors. *Non verbal strategies* which existed in Nakatani's original inventory did not appear in the adaptation form. Instead, the items that consist of *nonverbal strategies* gave loadings to *negotiation for meaning strategies*, which implies that the purpose of the interlocutors while using one strategy may be culture specific.

Keywords: Communication strategies; Oral communication strategies; Strategy instruments; Foreign language learning; Speaking skill.

¹ Assistant Professor Dr., Mersin University, Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching Department, syaman33@gmail.com

² Instructor, Mersin University, Foreign Languages School, mehtapkavasoglu@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Learning a language is learning to communicate, so speaking can be considered as one of the important components of learning a foreign language. However, acquiring speaking ability can be seen much more difficult for some students than other skills because there are many other factors affecting the degree of speaking such as age, motivation, the context in which language is learned: in a second language context or foreign language context. Speaking competence also involves a variety of processes. First of all, there is a need for sufficient linguistic knowledge to maintain the conversation in communicational contexts. In order to be competent in speaking, apart from the ability to use language correctly (linguistic competence), the students should have other competences; that is, sociolinguistic and strategic competence, which are the components of communicative competence (Savignon, 1983). It is believed that learners can develop communicative proficiency by developing an ability to use communication strategies that enable them to compensate for their target language deficiency (Bialystok, 1990). As a result, it can be concluded that students need to have communication strategies to develop speaking skill and there is a need to identify those communication strategies. Selinker (1972) was the first researcher to make reference to “strategies”. In the following year, Varadi (1973) used the term “communication strategy”. Communication strategies (henceforth CSs) are used to negotiate meaning (Tarone, 1980), to maintain the conversation (Long, 1981) or to handle difficulties or communication breakdown (Faerch & Kasper, 1983) (as cited in Kongsom, 2009). Researchers have studied CSs from two major perspectives: the interactional view and psycholinguistic view. The interactional view of CSs is based on the interaction process between language learners and their interlocutors for negotiation of meaning. The interactional view of CSs has its origins in the work of Tarone (1980). As to Tarone (1980),

CSs are tools used in negotiation of meaning where both interlocutors are attempting to agree as to a communicative goal and a shared enterprise in which both the speaker and the hearer are involved rather than being only the responsibility of the speaker (p.424).

Whereas Tarone and the researchers who supported the interactional view considered CSs as a mutual attempt by participants in a communicative situation to maintain communication, in psycholinguistic view; CSs are considered as a cognitive process of the speaker himself/herself with a focus on comprehension and production. Faerch and Kasper (1983) define CSs in terms of the individual’s mental response to a problem rather than as a joint response by two people, which means that CSs deal with language production problems that occur at the planning stage.

Therefore, the psycholinguistic view of CSs has been mainly associated with strategies for overcoming limitations in lexical knowledge. Based on these views above, there have been two perspectives in the classification of CSs, which will be discussed in the following paragraph.

Tarone (1980), from the perspective of interactional view, classifies CSs as *approximation, word coinage, circumlocution, literal translation, language switch, appeal for assistance, mime and avoidance*. On the other hand, from a psycholinguistic view, Faerch and Kasper (1983) propose two strategies in general for solving a communication problem: *avoidance strategies* and *achievement strategies*. *Avoidance strategies* include *formal reduction strategies* and *functional reduction strategies*. *Achievement strategies*, on the other hand, consist of *compensatory strategies* and *retrieval strategies*. The compensatory strategies of Faerch and Kasper (*code switching, transfer, inter-language based strategies, cooperative strategies, and nonlinguistic strategies*) show some similarities with Tarone's taxonomy although they are classified from different perspectives. With respect to Tarone's taxonomy (1981), Faerch and Kasper's classification (1983) is relatively compatible with its aim. Moreover, the distinction between avoidance and achievement strategies are more clearly stated in Faerch and Kasper's classification.

There have been many instruments carried out in the field of English Language Teaching in order to elicit, measure and classify the strategies used by the students learning English as a second language (ESL). However, the number of the instruments developed for the students learning English as a foreign language seems quite few in number. Although the most commonly used measurement tools in ELT literature can be considered the use of inventories or questionnaires, most of them are exposed to criticisms by researchers.

With regard to qualitative methods for eliciting learner strategies, Seliger (1983) doubted whether "the verbalizations of learners represent some form of internal reality (as cited in Macaro, 2006, p.322). In terms of strategy measurement, Lo Castro (1994, 1995) argued that general learner strategy inventories are not transferrable across sociocultural domains and that their results and conclusions might therefore be invalid. According to Dörnyei (2005) the most fundamental problem is the literature's inability to explain the difference between 'engaging in an ordinary learning activity and a strategic learning activity (as cited in Macaro, 2006, p. 322). In addition, Dörnyei and Skehan (2003) questioned whether a strategy could contribute to both knowledge and language skills and posited that there was no theoretical explanation for how strategies might be related to skills (as cited in Macaro, 2006, p.322). Based on these criticisms, it can be concluded that the common points the researchers focus on are the inventories which should be culture and skill specific. When the measurement instruments relevant to speaking were reviewed in the literature, it was revealed that instruments such as *speaking strategy checklist* (Cohen, Weaver & Li, 1996), *language*

skills development strategy questionnaire (Oxford, Cohen & Chi, 2002) have problems such as lacking reliability and validity studies. Another problem with speaking strategy instruments is that they represent strategies that the learner could use throughout the language learning process and they are not directly relevant to the skill of speaking. Furthermore, in Turkey most of the studies (Kılıç, 2003; Gümüş, 2007) carried out on speaking strategies are based on the inventories used in western countries and developed for learners learning English as a second language, regardless of the compatibility with Turkish culture. Nakatani (2006), being aware of the deficiency in the field, developed Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OCSI) on Japanese learners, so it was designed considering the communication problems faced by the people learning English as a foreign language. It investigates the college English majors' speaking strategy use. Nakatani (2006) classifies speaking strategies as *social-affective, fluency oriented, negotiation for meaning, accuracy oriented, message reduction and alteration, nonverbal strategies while speaking, message abandonment, and attempt to think in English strategies*. According to Nakatani (2006) the reliability of 32 items was .86 with acceptable internal consistency. OCSI was conducted by many researchers: Chen (2009) conducted OCSI in order to investigate oral communication strategies by English major students at the college level in Taiwan. It was also carried out by Gökgöz (2008) at Dumlupınar University, Department of Foreign Languages preparatory classes in order to investigate the relationship between degrees of learner autonomy, use of strategies for coping with speaking problems and success in English speaking classes.

2. Purpose

After reviewing all the measurement tools related to speaking skill, it was concluded that with respect to others OCSI had a clear factor structure and it seemed less problematic. Thus, we decided to adapt OCSI developed by Nakatani (2006) into Turkish. Our concern in the adaptation study of OCSI is to investigate whether oral communication strategies classified in OCSI developed by Nakatani (2006) would also measure Turkish EFL students' speaking strategy use. For this purpose, the validity and reliability studies in the Turkish sample group were conducted.

3. Method

3.1. Data Collection

3.1.1. Participants

The total number of the participants was 808 consisting of learners studying English as a foreign language at English Language Teaching departments of three different universities and Anatolian

high schools in Turkey. The participants from Anatolian High Schools were the students of English Division studying English as a foreign language.

3.1.2. Data Collection Tool

Oral communication strategy inventory (OCSI)

The inventory developed by Nakatani (2006) was used as a data collection instrument. Although the inventory consists of both listening and speaking skill strategies, they are not integrated and they can be separated. In the current study, we decided to use only the speaking part as our concern is speaking skill. The speaking part of OSCI, the 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never or almost never true of me) to 5 (always or almost always true of me), consists of 32 items (see Appendix A). OCSI consists of eight factors: *social affective, fluency oriented, negotiation for meaning while speaking, accuracy oriented, message reduction and alteration, nonverbal strategies while speaking, message abandonment, and attempt to think in English.*

3.1.3. Data Collection Method

3.1.3.1. The translation validity of OCSI

When adapting OCSI into Turkish, the items in the original scale were translated from English to Turkish through back translation by a group of English teachers and then, the opinions of experts in the field of ELT were obtained. Translation was compared with the original inventory and necessary modifications and corrections were made. For the translation validity of the inventory, the Turkish and English forms of the inventory were implemented at different times, with a gap of three weeks on the same group including the senior and master degree students (n=65) studying at English Language Teaching Department, who were proficient in both Turkish and English languages. Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) which is a *measure of the strength of the association* between the two variables was determined in order to find out whether there was a meaningful difference between two forms of the inventory. The correlation coefficient between two inventories, Turkish and English versions, was found over .70. The items of which correlation coefficient was below .70 were revised in terms of wording and structure. Finally, the correlation between the Turkish and English versions of the inventory was found to be $r = .78$, indicating acceptable internal consistency. By this way, the Turkish equivalent of OCSI was obtained (see Appendix B). As our concern is to find out whether the factorial structure of Oral Communication Strategy Inventory developed by Nakatani (2006) will change when it is adapted into Turkish, the reliability and validity of the translated version of OCSI will be dealt with in the following section.

SMEAN(N8)				,652
SMEAN(N1)		,319	,334	,493
SMEAN(N9)	,332			,382
SMEAN(N23)				,759

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

However, as one of the items was alone in the 8th factor with a high loading -759, it was excluded from the analysis. Later on, another principal component analysis, using promax rotation method, was conducted with the remaining 31 items (see Table 2).

Table 2

Principal component analysis

Items	Components						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(N19)	,796						
(N17)	,731						
(N16)	,636						
(N21)	,618						
(N22)	,613						
(N18)	,612						
(N15)	,595						
(N20)	,582						
(N25)	,473						
(N13)		,802					
(N12)		,800					
(N11)		,770					
(N10)		,623					
(N14)		,531					
(N29)			,786				
(N26)			,727				
(N28)			,695				
(N27)			,577				
(N30)		,329	,549				
(N32)				,782			
(N24)				,754			
(N31)				,708			
(N4)					,789		
(N3)					,703		
(N5)					,528		
(N6)				,389	,502		
(N7)						,781	
(N8)						,696	
(N9)						,399	
(N1)							,831
(N2)			,312				,675

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

As a result of the last factor analysis, seven factors remained (see Appendix D). The items that came together for each factor were determined and they were examined to see whether they are associated with each other meaningfully. In the following paragraphs, the similarities and differences between the factorial structure of Nakatani's study and the adapted version will be explained.

Factor-1 included the items 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22. As a result of the reliability analysis, Cronbach's alpha value was found to be .81 with 8 items on this factor, and they were also all related with each other meaningfully. However, in Nakatani's classification (2006), only the items "19, 20, 21, 22" came together under the factor *negotiation for meaning strategies*. In Nakatani's classification, the item "I correct myself when I notice that I have made a mistake." and the item 18 "I notice myself using an expression which fits a rule I have learned." were under the factor *accuracy oriented strategies*. In addition, the item 15 "I try to make eye contact when I am talking" and the item 16 "I use gestures and facial expressions if I can't communicate how to express myself." were under the factor *non-verbal strategies*. It is meaningful that these items come together in the current study. The reason why Turkish students use gestures, eye contact or the grammar structures they are familiar with may be due to the fact that they want to be understood easily in order to maintain the conversation. It therefore seems reasonable to label factor 1 as *negotiation for meaning strategies*.

Factor-2 included the items 10-11-12-13-14. As a result of the reliability analysis, Cronbach's alpha value was found to be .79 with 5 items on this factor. All of these items are concerned with *fluency oriented strategies* as Nakatani (2006) classified. However, in Nakatani's study the item 9 "I change my way of saying things according to the context" was also in the factor *fluency oriented strategies*, but it gave loading to *accuracy oriented strategies* in the adaptation form.

Factor-3 consisted of the items 26, 27, 28, 29, 30. As a result of the reliability analysis, Cronbach's alpha value was found to be .741 with 5 items on this factor. Although in Nakatani's classification the item 30 "I try to speak like a native speaker." represented *accuracy oriented strategies*, in the adaptation form, all variables in the third factor appeared to be concerned with learners' affective factors in social contexts. That's why it was labeled as *social-affective strategies*. In addition to the items stated, in the original inventory of Nakatani, the item 25 "I try to give a good impression to the listener.", which

gave loadings to *negotiation for meaning strategies* in the current study, loaded on *social affective strategies* factor.

Factor-4 included the items 24, 31, 32. As a result of the reliability analysis, Cronbach's alpha value was found to be .65 with 3 items on this factor. All the items on this factor were associated with *message abandonment strategies* as in Nakatani's inventory. However, in Nakatani's study, there was one more item on this factor: the sixth item "I abandon the execution of a verbal plan and just say some words when I don't know what to say." In the current study, the translated form of this item was "söylemek istediğim şeyi ifade edemediğimde, planladığım söyleme şeklinden vazgeçer, söyleyeceklerimi birkaç kelimeyle geçiştiririm." In contrast to Nakatani's study, the sixth item gave loadings on *message reduction and alteration strategies* in the current study.

Factor-5 represented the items 3, 4, 5, 6. As a result of the reliability analysis, Cronbach's alpha value was found to be as low as .55 with 4 items on this factor. In Nakatani's inventory, all these items (except the sixth item, which gave loadings on 'message abandonment' category as mentioned in the previous paragraph) were concerned with *message reduction and alteration*.

Factor-6 consisted of the items 7, 8, 9. As a result of the reliability analysis, Cronbach's alpha value was found to be as low as .62 with 3 items on this factor. In Nakatani's classification *accuracy oriented strategies* involve the items "7-8-17-18-30". However, in this adaptation form, 17 and 18 were labeled as *negotiation for meaning* and 30 was labeled as *social affective strategies*. In addition, although the item 9 "I change my way of saying things according to the context." is related to *fluency strategies* according to Nakatani's classification, it was grouped under *accuracy-oriented strategies* in the adapted version of the inventory.

Factor-7 included the items 1, 2. Both of the items were consistent with Nakatani's classification as *attempt to think in English*. However, as a result of the reliability analysis, Cronbach's alpha value was found to be as low as .578 with 2 items on this factor.

The internal consistency reliability coefficient for the whole inventory was found as ,83. The reliability coefficients were found to be in the 0,55-0,83 range, which shows high reliability coefficients (see Table 3).

Table 3

Internal consistency reliability coefficients for the whole and sub-dimensions of the inventory

	Alpha
Oral Communication Strategies (whole inventory)	,83
Negotiation for meaning strategies	.81
Fluency Oriented Strategies	.79
Social-affective Strategies	.74
Message Abandonment Strategies	.65
Message Reduction and Alteration Strategies	.55
Accuracy oriented Strategies	.62
Attempt to think in English	.58

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

As a result of the validity and reliability analyses of the adaptation study, the factorial structure of OCSI was confirmed to some extent. However, some items gave loadings to factors different from the original inventory. *Non verbal strategies* which existed in Nakatani's original inventory did not appear as a separate factor in the adapted version. Instead, the items belonging to *nonverbal strategies* gave loadings to the factor labeled as *negotiation for meaning strategies*. Furthermore, there were some changes in the items that represent each factor which may result from the differences in the purpose of participants while using a particular strategy. For example, the perception of message reduction/alteration strategies and message abandonment strategies differed in two versions. For Turkish students, abandoning the execution of a verbal plan and just saying some words does not mean giving up the message but reducing message. Moreover, they apply to gestures and eye contact for the purpose of negotiating for meaning. Thus, it may be implied that students' perceptions of oral communication strategies differ in Turkish culture. This finding may imply that although strategic competence must exist in all languages and cultures, "the particular types of strategy preferred for use in such situations may be culture specific or language specific" Tarone, 1980, p.422).

To sum up, it may be said that although OCSI was developed considering the communication problems faced by the people learning English as a foreign language, the factorial structure changed when it was adapted to Turkish. Therefore, we can conclude that in order for a scale to be high quality and beneficial, it should be used in various research attempts and for different samples on different occasions and validity and reliability investigations should be conducted, which will contribute not only to the scale but also to the field considerably.

Moreover, the measurement of oral communication strategies via a valid and reliable inventory can help teachers be aware of the communication strategies used by learners in the course of speaking so that they can make learners be conscious of strategies existing in their repertoire and help them focus their energies on other strategies that could actually work.

6. References

- Bialystok, E., (1990). *Communication strategies: psychological analysis of second language use*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Chen, H. W. (2009). *Oral communication strategies used by English major college students in Taiwan*. Master thesis, Chaoyang University of Technology, Taichung, Taiwan.
- Cohen, A.D., Weaver, S. J., & Li, T. Y. (1996). *The impact of strategies-based instruction on speaking a foreign language*. (CARLA Working Paper Series No. 4.) Minneapolis: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota. Retrieved March 3 2009 from <http://www.carla.umn.edu/about/profiles/CohenPapers/SBIimpact.pdf>
- Cohen, A. D., & Chi, J. C. (2001). *Language Strategy Use Survey*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota. Retrieved March 3 from http://www.carla.umn.edu/about/profiles/cohenpapers/lg_strat_srvy.html
- Dörnyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 55-85.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983a). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.). *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 20-60). Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983b). On identifying communication strategies in interlanguage production. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman.
- Genç, B. (2007). *An analysis of communication strategies employed by Turkish speakers of English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of English Language Teaching, Çukurova University, Adana.
- Gökgöz, B. (2008). *An investigation of learner autonomy and strategies for coping with speaking problems in relation to success in English speaking class*. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Kongsom, T. (2009). *The effects of teaching communication strategies on Thai learners of English*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southampton, School of Education, Thailand.
- LoCastro, V. (1994). Learning strategies and learning environments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 409-414.

Yaman, Ş., Kavasoglu, M. (2013). The adaptation study of oral communication strategy inventory into Turkish. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 10(2), 400-419.

Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: revising the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 320-337.

Nakatani, Y. (2006). Developing oral communication strategy inventory. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 151-168.

Savignon, S. J. (1983). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209-230.

Shumin, K. (1997). Factors to consider: Developing adult EFL students' speaking abilities. *English Teaching Forum*, 25(3).

Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report. In H. D. Brown, C.A. Yorio & R.C. Crymes (Eds.) *TESOL* (pp. 194-203). Washington: TESOL.

Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, a foreigner talk and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning*, 30, 417-431.

Tarone, E. (1981). Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15, 285-295.

Appendix A
Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OSCI) (Nakatani, 2006)

Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OSCI) <i>Strategies for Coping With Speaking Problems</i>	Never or almost never true of me	Generally not true of me	Somewhat true of me	Generally true of me	Always or almost always true of me
1.I think first of what I want to say in my native language and then construct the English sentence.					
2.I think first of a sentence I already know in English and then try to change it to fit the situation.					
3.I use words which are familiar to me.					
4.I reduce the message and use simple expressions.					
5.I replace the original message with another message because of feeling incapable of executing my original intent.					
6.I abandon the execution of a verbal plan and just say some words when I don't know what to say.					
7.I pay attention to grammar and word order during conversation.					
8.I try to emphasize the subject and verb of the sentence.					
9.I change my way of saying things according to the context.					
10.I take my time to express what I want to say.					
11.I pay attention to my pronunciation.					
12.I try to speak clearly and loudly to make myself heard.					
13.I pay attention to my rhythm and intonation.					
14.I pay attention to the conversation flow.					
15.I try to make eye-contact when I am talking.					
16. I use gestures and facial expressions if I can't communicate how to express myself.					
17. I correct myself when I notice that I have made a mistake.					

18. I notice myself using an expression which fits a rule that I have learned.					
19. While speaking, I pay attention to the listener's reaction to my speech.					
20. I give examples if the listener doesn't understand what I am saying.					
21. I repeat what I want to say until the listener understands.					
22. I make comprehension checks to ensure the listener understands what I want to say.					
23. I try to use fillers when I cannot think of what to say.					
24. I leave a message unfinished because of some language difficulty.					
25. I try to give a good impression to the listener.					
26. I don't mind taking risks even though I might make mistakes.					
27. I try to enjoy the conversation.					
28. I try to relax when I feel anxious.					
29. I try to encourage myself to express what I want to say.					
30. I try to talk like a native speaker.					
31. I ask other people to help when I can't communicate well.					
32. I give up when I can't make myself understood.					

Appendix B
Turkish Equivalent (Version) of OSCI

Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OSCI) <i>Strategies for Coping With Speaking Problems</i>	Never or almost never true of me	Generally not true of me	Somewhat true of me	Generally true of me	Always or almost always true of me
1. Konuşurken, ifade etmek istediğim şeyi önce ana dilimde düşünür sonra İngilizcesini kurarım.					
2. Konuşurken, önce İngilizcesini bildiğim bir cümleyi aklıma getiririm sonra onu o andaki duruma uyacak şekilde değiştiririm.					
3. Konuşurken, bildiğim sözcükleri kullanırım.					
4. Söylemek istediklerimi basit ifadelerle kısaca anlatırım.					
5. Anlatmak istediğimi tam olarak ifade edemediğimde anlatmak istediğimden uzaklaşır başka bir ifadeye başvururum.					
6. Söylemek istediğim şeyi ifade edemediğimde birkaç kelimeyle geçiştiririm.					
7. Konuşurken, dilbilgisi ve söz dizimine dikkat ederim.					
9. Konuşurken bulunduğum ortam ve koşullara göre ifade şeklimi değiştiririm.					
10. Söylemek istediklerimi ifade etmek epey zamanımı alır.					
11. Konuşurken telaffuzuma dikkat ederim.					
12. Konuşurken ses tonumu anlaşılabilirliğim şekilde kullanmaya çalışırım.					
13. Konuşurken vurgu ve tonlamama dikkat ederim.					
14. Karşılıklı konuşmada, konuşmanın akışına dikkat ederim.					
15. Konuşurken karşımdakiyle göz teması kurmaya özen gösteririm.					
16. Konuşurken kendimi yeterince ifade edemediğimi hissedersen jest ve mimiklerimi devreye sokarım.					
17. Konuşurken hata yaptığımı fark edince kendimi düzeltirim.					
18. Konuşurken, öğrenmiş olduğum kurallara uygun ifadeler kullandığımı fark ederim.					
19. Konuşurken, dinleyicinin konuşmama nasıl tepki verdiği dikkat ederim.					
20. Söylediklerim anlaşılmadığı zaman örnekleme					

başvururum.					
22. Konuşurken, ne söylemek istediğimin dinleyici tarafından anlaşılıp anlamadığını kontrol ederim.					
23.Konuşurken söyleyeceğim şey aklıma gelmeyince, Türkçe’de “ee”, “yani” gibi kelimelerin karşılığı olabilecek İngilizce ifadeler kullanırım.(örn.well, I know, vb)					
24.Konuşurken dille ilgili problem yaşarsam konuşmamı tamamlamam.					
25.Dinleyicide iyi bir izlenim bırakmaya çalışırım.					
26.Konuşurken hata yapsam da risk almaktan çekinmem.					
27.Karşılıklı konuşmaları yaparken konuşmadan keyif almaya çalışırım.					
28.Konuşurken endişelendiğim zamanlarda rahatlamaya çalışırım.					
29.Söylemek istediğimi ifade edebilmek için kendimi cesaretlendirmeye çalışırım.					
30.İngilizce konuşurken, ana dili İngilizce olan kişiler gibi konuşmaya çalışırım.					
31.Konuşurken, iletişim kuramadığımı hissettiğim an yardım isterim.					
32.Konuşurken kendimi ifade edemediğimde konuşmaktan vazgeçerim.					

Appendix C

Factorial Structure of Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OCSI) by Nakatani (2006)

Factor 1: Social Affective Strategies

- 28. I try to relax when I feel anxious.
- 27. I try to enjoy the conversation.
- 25. I try to give a good impression to the listener.
- 29. I actively encourage myself to express what I want to say.
- 26. I don't mind taking risks even though I might make mistakes.
- 23. I try to use fillers when I cannot think of what to say.

Factor 2: Fluency Oriented Strategies

- 13. I pay attention to my rhythm and intonation.
- 11. I pay attention to my pronunciation.
- 14. I pay attention to the conversational flow.
- 9. I change my way of saying things according to the context.
- 10. I take my time to express what I want to say.
- 12. I try to speak clearly and loudly to make myself heard.

Factor 3: Negotiation for Meaning while Speaking

- 22. I make comprehension checks to ensure the listener understands what I want to say.
- 21. I repeat what I want to say until the listener understands.
- 19. While speaking, I pay attention to the listener's reaction to my speech.
- 20. I give examples if the listener doesn't understand what I am saying.

Factor 4: Accuracy Oriented Strategies

- 7. I pay attention to grammar and word order during conversation
- 18. I notice myself using an expression which fits a rule that I have learned.
- 17. I correct myself when I notice that I have made a mistake.
- 8. I try to emphasize the subject and verb of the sentence.
- 30. I try to talk like a native speaker.

Factor 5: Message Reduction and Alteration Strategies

- 4. I reduce the message and use simple expressions.
- 3. I use words which are familiar to me.
- 5. I replace the original message with another message because of feeling incapable of executing my original intent

Factor 6: Non Verbal Strategies while Speaking

15. I try to make eye contact when I am talking.
16. I use gestures and facial expressions if I can't communicate how to express myself.

Factor 7: Message Abandonment Strategies

24. I leave a message unfinished because of some language difficulty.
31. I ask other people to help when I can't communicate well.
32. I give up when I can't make myself understood.
6. I abandon the execution of a verbal plan and just say some words

Factor 8: Attempt to Think in English

2. I think first of a sentence I already know in English and then try to change it to fit the situation.
1. I think of what I want to say in my native language and then construct the English sentence

Appendix D

Factorial Structure of Turkish Version of OCSI in Adaptation Study

Factor 1 Negotiation for Meaning Strategies

15. Konuşurken karşımdakiyle göz teması kurmaya çalışırım.
16. Konuşurken kendimi yeterince ifade edemediğimi hissedersen jest ve mimiklerimi devreye sokarım.
17. Konuşurken hata yaptığımı fark edince kendimi düzeltirim.
18. Konuşurken öğrenmiş olduğum kurallara uygun ifadeler kullandığımı fark ederim.
19. Konuşurken, dinleyicinin konuşmama nasıl tepki verdiğine dikkat ederim.
20. Söylediklerim anlaşılmadığı zaman örnekleme yaparım.
21. Dinleyici anlayıncaya kadar söylemek istediklerimi ifade etmeye devam ederim.
22. Konuşurken, ne söylemek istediğimin dinleyici tarafından anlaşılıp anlaşılmadığını kontrol ederim.

Factor 2: Message Abandonment Strategies

24. Konuşurken dille ilgili problem yaşarsam konuşmamı tamamlamam.
31. Konuşurken iletişim kuramadığımı hissettiğim an yardım isterim.
32. Konuşurken kendimi ifade edemediğimde konuşmaktan vazgeçerim.

Factor 3: Social Affective Strategies

26. Konuşurken hata yapsam da risk almaktan çekinmem.
27. Karşılıklı konuşmaları yaparken konuşmadan keyif almaya çalışırım.
28. Konuşurken endişelendiğim zamanlarda rahatlamaya çalışırım.
29. Söylemek istediğimi ifade edebilmek için kendimi cesaretlendirmeye çalışırım.
30. İngilizce konuşurken anadili İngilizce olan kişiler gibi konuşmaya çalışırım.

Factor 4: Message Reduction and Alteration Strategies

3. Konuşurken bildiğim sözcükleri kullanırım.
4. Söylemek istediklerimi basit ifadelerle kısaca anlatırım.
5. Anlatmak istediğimi tam olarak ifade edemediğimde, anlatmak istediğimden uzaklaşır başka bir ifadeye başvururum.
6. Söylemek istediğim şeyi ifade edemediğimde planladığım söyleme şeklinden vazgeçer söyleyeceklerimi birkaç kelimeyle geçiştiririm.

Factor 5: Attempt to Think in English

1. Konuşurken ifade etmek istediğim şeyi önce anadilimde düşünürüm.
2. Konuşurken, önce İngilizcesini bildiğim bir cümleyi aklıma getiririm sonra onu o andaki duruma uyacak şekilde değiştiririm.

Factor 6: Accuracy Oriented Strategies

7. Konuşurken, dilbilgisi ve söz dizimine dikkat ederim.
8. Konuşurken cümlenin özne ve yüklemine vurgulamaya çalışırım
9. Konuşurken bulunduğum ortam ve koşullara göre ifade şeklimi değiştiririm.

Factor 7: Fluency Oriented Strategies

10. Söylemek istediklerimi ifade etmek epey zamanımı alır.
11. Konuşurken telaffuzuma dikkat ederim.
12. Konuşurken ses tonumu anlaşılabilir şekilde kullanmaya çalışırım.
13. Konuşurken vurgu ve tonlamama dikkat ederim.
14. Karşılıklı konuşmada, konuşmanın akışına dikkat ederim.