2.1 Introduction

One of the most popular words in the twentieth century, "communication" has great influence in the language teaching world. It is not only because of its high frequency appearance in the research world, but because of its essential meaning that represents the gradual globalization from the past century.

The word communication is derived from the Latin term ‘Communicare’ or ‘Communico’ both of which means ‘to share’. But communication is not merely transmission of meaning from one person to another through symbols. It implies that the system of communication is commonly owned, accepted and recognized by the members of a community. It enables them to acquire, exchange, store, retrieve and process information. Communication is thus essentially a social affair.

Communication is the basic attribute of human life and language is the main tool of human communication (Thompson 2003). Initially this communication was within societies and communities at the local level but it took a new dimension as people from various societies, communities and
nations started interacting with each other. The period following the 1950s saw a tremendous increase in the use for communication among the people of the world in various spheres of international contact, like politics, academics, economics, technology and culture. The World had started becoming a global village. This gave birth to the need and pressure of adopting a common lingua franca for this global village to facilitate communication and make it more practical for the people of various linguistic backgrounds. The concept of Communicative Competence came about in reaction to the following assertion made by Noam Chomsky. He states that:

Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community who knows his language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions shifts of attention and interest, and errors in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance (Chomsky 1965 p.3).

Chomsky clearly distinguished the description of language form (competence) and language use (performance) and established that the speaker-listener’s internal grammar that judges the grammaticality of sentences should be the main object of investigation for linguists. To mark
the significance of Chomsky's views on communicative competence Wilga Rivers states: "To Chomsky competence was internalized knowledge of the system of syntactic and phonological rules of the language that the ideal speaker-hearer possesses in the native language and performance was language in use by the individual" (1983 p.23).

No sooner had Chomsky's notion of idealized Linguistic Competence evolved than it came under attack by Dell Hymes (1972), a sociolinguist as well as an ethnographer of communication, who was the first among many distinguished language scholars, to introduce the idea of communicative competence in terms of the "appropriateness of socio-cultural significance of an utterance" (Canale and Swain 1980 p.80). Hymes, retaining the idea of Chomsky's underlying grammatical competence, looks at contextual relevance as one of the crucial aspects of one's knowledge and claims that meaning in communication is determined by its speech community and actual communicative event in question.

For a person to say he or she knows a language, therefore, he or she must know "when to speak, when not to, what to talk about, with whom, when, where and in what manner in addition to how to make a sentence grammatical" (Hymes 1972 p.277). In other words, he maintains that the knowledge of language that Chomsky associated with competence, should
be taken more comprehensibly to include knowledge about the above mentioned components namely the rules of language use.

Since Dell Hymes, first proposed the concept of Communicative Competence, Chomsky's scope of linguistic theory confronted an attack of breaking the Chomskyan idealism. For Chomsky, he focuses his attention on the rules of language for a generative grammar. However, for Hymes, his concern is not only on grammatical possibilities in a language, but on feasibility and appropriateness as well. As the Communicative Competence has embarked on the academic and pedagogic world, many linguists enrich the contents and features of communicative competence. After Hymes (1972), Canale and Swain (1980) and Bachman (1990) are the representatives who have developed and extended the notion of communicative competence, which attempts to include all these dimensions: the grammatical, the social and the psychological.

2.2 The Three Aspects of Communicative Competence

Communication, verbal and non verbal, evolved as a satisfying measure to man's communication urges which began as a process of exchanging and negotiating information. In Canale and Swain's (1980) framework, it includes socio-cultural rules of use in the sociolinguistic component to
highlight the importance of context. And Bachman’s (1990) model deepens and extends the subdivisions of Communicative Competence.

The three aspects of Communicative Competence and their teaching and testing application are explored respectively in accordance with Bachman’s recent version. They are Organizational, Pragmatic and Strategic competence. Organizational competence concerns about grammatical and contextual abilities, which is the knowledge aspect of Communicative Competence. Pragmatic competence is a system of rules that enables to match the functions with linguistic structures in certain contexts, which decides the aspect of ability. And Strategic Competence could be regarded as a technique or a tool to make the most effective use of available abilities to carry out verbal or non-verbal tasks.

2.3 Hymes’s Model of Communicative Competence

In order to understand Hymes’s model of Communicative Competence, recalling Chomsky’s use of the term Linguistic Competence would help to find out the points with which Hymes reacts back. Linguistic competence was defined by Chomsky as the system of knowledge possessed by native speakers of a language. It is, according to Chomsky, the system of knowledge that makes it possible for speakers to produce and understand an
infinite number of sentences in their language, and to distinguish grammatical sentences from ungrammatical sentences.

In Chomsky’s theory, his primary concerns were the “ideal speaker-listener, the homogeneous speech community, and perfect language knowledge, which is idealized and uniform within a group” (Grenfell & Harris 1999 p. 16). Furthermore, his defining of competence was limited to the knowledge of grammar and performance was categorized into the other kind of knowledge of when, where, how and with whom, which was unsatisfactory since he simply produces the grammatical sentences with no regard for their appropriateness. In the publication of Gumperz and Hymes’s, “The Ethnography of communication” in 1964, Hymes had already proposed that Communicative Competence should include social meaning. It is the person that becomes the highlight of Communicative Competence. Hymes (1972 p.284) included both rules of grammar and rules of use into it, which he generalized into four questions as the framework of communicative competence, which is as follows:

1. Whether (and to what degree) something is formally possible.
2. Whether (and to what degree) something is feasible.
3. Whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate.
4. Whether (and to what degree) something is done.
These four sectors consider the individual’s linguistic system, the psycholinguistic capacity of the individual, the nature of communication and possibility, feasibility and appropriateness respectively. Hymes provides a good starting point for the development of Communicative Competence and gradually it becomes the aim of language learning and teaching. As Ellis R. notes, “Hymes not only set the sociocultural ball rolling, but he also demonstrated how language variation correlated with social and cultural norms of speech events or certain defined public interactions” (1994 p. 44).

Communicative Competence gave tremendous impetus to linguists frustrated by a principal focus on Grammatical Competence. In relatively simple terms there has been a change of emphasis from presenting language as a set of forms (grammatical, phonological, lexical) which has to be learned and practised to presenting language as a functional system which is used to fulfill a range of communicative purposes.

2.4 Canale and Swain’s Model of Communicative Competence

Canale and Swain’s framework includes sociocultural rules of use in the sociolinguistic component to highlight the importance of context, but they seem to overemphasize Hymes’ appropriateness sector. Moreover, they limit the conception of appropriateness into the context, but somehow ignore the formulation of the form (grammatical accuracy) in order to achieve the directive function (communicative function).

2.5 Components Underlying Speaking Effectiveness

“Language proficiency is not a uni-dimensional construct, but a multi-faceted modality, consisting of various levels of abilities and domains” as stated by (Carrasquillo 1994 p.65) Hymes (1971) also assumes that L2 learners need to know not only the linguistic knowledge, but also the culturally accepted ways of interacting with others in different situations. His theory of Communicative Competence consists of the interaction of grammatical, psycholinguistic, social linguistic and language components. Based on Hymes’s theory Canale and Swain (1980) propose that Communicative Competence includes Grammatical Competence, Discourse Competence, Sociolinguistic Competence and Strategic Competence as abilities of speaking proficiency. It is shown graphically and classified as:
2.5.1 Grammatical Competence

Grammatical competence is an umbrella concept that includes increasing expertise in grammar (morphology, syntax), vocabulary and mechanics. With regard to speaking, the term mechanics refers to basic sounds of letters and syllables, pronunciation of words, intonation and stress. In order to convey meaning, EFL/ESL learners must have the knowledge of words and sentences. That is, they must understand how words are segmented into various sounds, and how sentences are stressed in particular ways. Thus, Grammatical Competence enables speakers to use and understand English language accurately and unhesitatingly, which contributes to their fluency.

2.5.2 Discourse Competence

In addition to Grammatical Competence, ESL/EFL learners must develop Discourse Competence, which is concerned with internal relationships. In discourse, whether formal or informal, the rules of cohesion and coherence apply which aid in holding the communication together in a meaningful way. In communication, both the production and comprehension of language require one’s ability to perceive and process stretches of discourse. Therefore, effective speakers should acquire a large repertoire of
structures and discourse markers to express ideas, show relationship of time, and indicate cause, contrast, and emphasis (Oxford 1990).

2.5.3 Sociolinguistic Competence

Knowledge of language alone does not adequately prepare learners for effective and appropriate use of the target language. Learners must have competence which involves knowing what is expected socially and culturally by users of the target language; that is, learners must acquire the rules and norms governing the appropriate timing and realization of speech acts. Understanding the sociolinguistic side of language helps learners know what comments are appropriate, how to ask questions during interaction, and how to respond nonverbally according to the purpose of the talk. Therefore, “adult second language learners must acquire stylistic adaptability in order to be able to encode and decode the discourse around them correctly” (Brown 1994 p.238).

2.5.4 Strategic Competence

Strategic Competence, which is the way the learners manipulate language in order to meet communicative goals, is perhaps the most important of all the communicative competence elements. With reference to speaking, “strategic competence refers to the ability to know when and how to take the floor, how to keep a conversation going, how to terminate the
conversation and to clear up communication breakdown as well as comprehension problems” (Brown 1994 p. 228.).

Figure 2.1

Model of Communicative Competence

- **Grammatical Competence:** knowledge of the language code syntax, lexis phonology, morphology
- **Sociolinguistic (pragmatic) competence:**
- **Strategic Competence:** verbal and nonverbal communication strategies compensate for breakdowns in communication. Ability to get one’s meaning across successfully when problems arise.
- **Sociocultural rules:** rules of using language appropriately in a given social situation, concerned with style, politeness, register etc.
- **Discourse Rules:** knowledge of combining language structures to produce unified texts in different modes: writing speaking

2.6 Bachman’s Model of Communicative Competence

Bachman’s model (1990) is a more current attempt to take forward the subdivision of Communicative Competence provided by Canale and Swain. He proposes that the framework of Communicative Language Ability (CLA) should include language competence, strategic competence, and psychological mechanisms. His interest is placed on the influence of Strategic Competence on language test performance and its measurement. And we could generalize his idea, that is, in order to achieve a communicative goal, language competence is the implement which is utilized in the channel and mode offered by psycho-physiological mechanisms. Strategic Competence determines the most effective means.

Three versions of Communicative Competence mentioned clearly indicate three stages of development, which are the initiation, the complementing, and the application. This development was spurred by the global spread of English, which also strengthened people’s communicative needs. When Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) appeared in 1970s, how the goal of Communicative Competence is being met in teaching contexts became the focus.

These major developments are not in linguistic theory alone, but it has given an impetus to an establishing concept for language teaching and
learning. The introduction of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) provides an approach to use language for communicative purposes, which could finally help learners to attain communicative competence.

2.7 Approaches and Methods of Teaching English- A Brief Résumé

The notion of teaching methods has had a long history in language teaching as is witnessed by the rise and fall of a variety of methods throughout the recent history of language teaching. These methods have been considered as a panacea for the language teaching problem. The 1970s and 1980s were perhaps the years of the greatest enthusiasm for methods. More than three decades ago Edward Anthony (1963) gave a definition of method which quite admirably withstood the test of time. His concept of method was the second of three hierarchical elements namely approach, method and technique. An approach according to Anthony was a set of assumptions dealing with the nature of language, learning and teaching. Method was defined as an overall plan for systematic presentation of language based on selected approach. Techniques were specific classroom activities consistent with a method. However there has been agreement and disagreement over the question of the effectiveness of a particular method. Ironically the whole concept of separate methods is no longer a central issue in teaching practice (Kumaravadivelu 1994). Stern termed it as “a century old obsession, a
prolonged preoccupation that has been increasingly unproductive” (1985 p.251).

The search for an ultimate method began around 1880 with François Gouin’s publication of the Art of Teaching and Learning Foreign Languages in which a series of methods was advocated. This followed by the Berlitz Method. The Audio Lingual Method of the late 1940s and the Cognitive Code of Learning Method of 1960s followed. It was in the 1970s that arose what David Nunan (1989) termed the Designer Methods i.e. Community Language Learning, The Silent Way, Suggestopedia, Total Physical Response and others. But gradually in spite of a plethora of methods they were no longer the milestones of our language teaching journey through time. David Nunan (1991 p.228) summed it up nicely. “It has been realized that there never was and probably will never be a method for all and the focus in recent years has been, the development of classroom tasks and activities which are consonant with what we know about second language acquisition and keeping with the dynamics in the classroom itself”.

2.8 A General Survey of ELT Methods Followed in India

The method most popular in Indian educational institutions at the beginning of the twentieth century was the Grammar Translation Method. During this period formal English grammar was given great emphasis. In
English classes the teachers would read and translate the literary texts and learners memorized the grammar of English. Immediately after the first decade of the twentieth century, a more feasible method, the Direct Method for teaching English was tried in Indian schools. The method though popular at first failed to be successful as the demand for competent teachers with perfect command of both written and Spoken English could not be met. But again by the middle of the twentieth century a need for a still better method was felt.

After Independence the changed position of English in India compelled the authorities to bring improvement in materials and methods of Teaching English at all levels. In 1952 the first Structural Syllabus was introduced first in Madras. It spread fast and was adopted by state level system in several parts of the country. By the 50’s and 60’s of the twentieth century witnessed a large scale acceptance of what has come to be called Structural Approach.

Although the Structural Approach did not fetch the expected results, David Wilkin’s Notional Syllabus (1976) was a good alternative to replace the Structural Syllabus with its communicative method of teaching English. Another experiment lead by N.S Prabhu (1984) was his publication of the Procedural Syllabuses. It contained some four hundred experimental tasks from ordinary classrooms. Prabhu claimed that grammatical competence was
achieved unconsciously and therefore the language used in the performance of the activities is learned incidentally.

A brief outline of the main characteristics of methods and approaches is as follows:

2.8.1 Grammar Translation Method

This method was a predominant one in Europe in the nineteenth century. It is considered ineffective by most instructors. The method follows the traditional deductive method of language teaching. According to Richards & Rodgers (1986) it is a way of studying language first through detailed analysis of its grammar rules, followed by application of this knowledge to the task of translating sentences and texts into and out of the target language. This method is best suited to teach a classical language. It emphasises accuracy, instructs students in grammar and provides vocabulary with direct translations to memorise it. The learner then applies the rules of grammar in translating sentences and parts of texts from the mother tongue into the target language and vice-versa. Here “The first language is maintained as the reference system in the acquisition of the second language”. (Stern 1983)
Grammar is taught prescriptively, accuracy is given greater importance and translation is a distinctive feature of this method. Vocabulary is taught through bilingual word list and the mother tongue is used to explain new items and make comparisons with their equivalents in the target languages. The teacher is totally dependant on the text as she follows the given lessons and exercises in it rigidly. She has little scope for innovative planning to incorporate the actual needs of the learner in the classroom. The learner is exposed only to literary languages. Communication skills are neglected with little attention to correct pronunciation.

2.8.2 The Direct Method

The Direct Method known by various labels as the Reform Method, the New Method, the Natural Method, refrains from using the learners’ native language and just uses the target language. It was established in France and Germany around 1900. The Direct Method operates on the idea that learning must be an imitation of first language learning. The Direct Method emphasises the use of grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary and sentences in the target language. It advocates teaching of oral skills. It is learned in the same manner as students learn their mother tongue. “The central idea of the Direct Method is the association of words and sentences with their meaning
through demonstration, dramatisation, pointing etc” (Robert Lado 1957 p.62).

2.8.3 The Structural Approach

The Structural Approach stresses the importance of structures which are carefully graded. Structural grading consists of arranging structural items and patterns into a suitable order. The basis of teaching is structures and patterns of English. Situations actions, pictures and drawings are extensively used. Oral and group drills to reinforce the language items taught are given.

2.8.4 The Audio Lingual Method

A movement which developed in the United States in the 1950s based on the precepts of structural linguists and behaviorist psychologists is known as the Audio Lingual Method (ALM). The ALM dominated the teaching of English as a second language in North America for some twenty-five years and materials prepared by Robert Lado (1957) and others were widely used there and elsewhere. The content is derived from an analysis of the phonemes, morphemes and sentence patterns of the target language. Classroom activity is taught through pattern practice, drills taught by techniques of mimicry and memorisation is known for short as mim-mem.
2.8.5 The Notional Functional Approach

In the early 1970s there developed in Europe an approach to Language Teaching focused on two kinds of semantic and performance criteria: notions, such as time, place, quantity, emotional attitudes, and functions, such as describing, enquiring, apologizing and criticizing. The introduction of such ideas has influenced subsequent syllabuses and course books. However, courses whose content is entirely notional and functional are often difficult to teach and learn from, because some notions and functions presuppose knowledge of grammar and vocabulary for which no provision may have been made. It is probable that no definite list of notions or of functions exists or may even be possible, but the concept has proved useful.

2.8.6 The Cognitive Code Approach

This approach to language teaching, which developed especially in the US in the 1980s, advocates conscious (cognitive) awareness of the structure of the target language and argues that study of rules, pronunciation and grammar will give learners a practical command of that language. Some commentators see it as the grammar-translation method in a new form, others as essentially a rejection of behaviourism and the audio-visual method.
2.8.7 The Bilingual Method

This method developed by Dr. C. J Dodson (1972) makes use of two languages the mother tongue and the target language. Words and sentences in the target language are presented with L1 equivalents. The use of L1 is restrictive to the teacher. However there is no simulation or recreation of situation. The method is to make the pupil fluent in the spoken as well as written medium. It places unusual demand on the teachers as they are to be proficient in the two languages, L1 & L2. However the mother tongue is used only by the teacher. The method aims at fluency and accuracy in the spoken and written medium. It is skill oriented with a practical emphasis on verbal skills.

2.8.8 The Situational Approach

This approach popular in 1960s – 70s took a practical approach that teaching items were grouped around situational themes such as ‘At the post office’, ‘At the Hairdressers’. Dialogues and narratives in the text derived from these settings were simulated to resemble real situations successfully by the teachers. The strength of the topic was language appropriate to a situation, but its weakness, the difficulty of generalizing what is learned, led to its being used along with other procedures than in its pure form.
2.8.9 The Communicative Approach

In the 1970s - 80s there developed in both Europe and North America an approach to Foreign and Second Language Teaching that drew on the work of anthropologists, sociologists, and sociolinguists. In many ways a lineal descendant of the Direct Method, it has concentrated on language as social behaviour, seeing the primary goal of language teaching as the development of the learner’s Communicative Competence. In addition to formal linguistic knowledge, learners are considered to need both rules of use to produce language appropriate to particular situations, and strategies for effective communication. Partly through the influence of the Council of European Language Projects, the movement at first concentrated on Notional Functional Syllabuses, which depended on analyses of semantic and functional categories of language use rather than on those of formal grammar. In the 1980s, however, the approach was more concerned with the quality of interaction between learner and teacher rather than the specification of syllabuses, and concentrated on classroom methodology rather than on content, which remained similar to that of situational and notional-functional course materials.

Of late the CBSE board has designed its syllabus of the English language for the attainment of Communicative Competence and the method
to be followed is the Communicative Approach. Likewise, The State Council of Educational Research and Training has brought in changes in the mode of teaching English in Kerala. English Language Teaching starts now from the fourth grade onwards. A new method called DPEP (District Primary Education Programme) which aims at developing communicative skills of the children starts from the first grade. The Syllabus in schools too is designed to develop communicative efficiency among students. Colleges also are geared towards this methodology that promotes communicative ability.

2.8.10 A Plethora of Methods

A wide range of approaches to L2 teaching are currently available, ranging from the Grammar Translation Method and the Communicative Approach through the now less influential Audio Lingual Method or Structural Method to such radical approaches as Gattegno’s (1976) Silent Way and Georgi Lozanov’s Suggestopedia (1978). The Silent Way seeks to give the learner maximum investment in the language-learning process, by reducing the speaking role of the teacher as much as possible. Highly formal charts for pronunciation and grammar provide the major teaching aids.

Suggestopedia is based on the view that relaxation enables learners to exploit their capacities for language acquisition to the maximum degree.
Emphasis is placed on comfortable surroundings, use of music and chanting, and trust in the authority of the teacher. Particularly used to assist memorization, the procedure relies on making language learning different from the stressful effort to produce appropriate communication for predefined needs. Holistic methods emphasize putting the learner into a frame of mind for learning or developing the education of the ‘the whole person’, and diminishing the teacher’s appearance as an authority figure. The Humanistic Approach similarly seeks to emphasize the shared interests and needs of teachers and students and provide a caring environment in which to learn. Many pragmatists, however, endorse no particular pedagogical or ideological position in their teaching, a style sometimes referred to as the Eclectic Approach.

2.9 Teaching of English at the Tertiary Level

English continues to be taught in colleges as a compulsory second language in many states throughout India. The objective is to provide the students with an effective tool for scholastic, occupational and social purposes, but for a majority of students it becomes a difficult burden and an obstacle to their academic progress. This is particularly true of those who have received their secondary education in regional medium schools.
Earlier English was taught by the Grammar Translation Method. This has now been replaced by the so called “Structural Approach” the main features of which are linguistic grading of teaching materials and the use of pattern practice in the classroom. The disadvantage of this approach is that it does not provide students enough opportunity to learn the free and spontaneous use of the language. Exposure to English is limited within the classroom and there is no occasion to read anything besides the prescribed text books. Further problems are sometimes caused by lack of competent teachers, overcrowded classes, inappropriate methods and undue concentration on passing examinations rather than learning. Hence, it is not surprising that the language achievement of a majority of students falls far below the expected level set by the prescribed syllabus.

While for many years language teaching had been equated with the teaching of literature or grammar, it is now felt that the goal of language instruction ought to be the ability to communicate. As Pit Corder (1973) has pointed out, the second language teacher has to develop in his pupils not just grammatical competence in the Chomskyan sense, but Communicative Competence. He has to teach not only the “formative rules” of the language but in addition what Hymes has called the “communicative rules” (Corder 1973 p.93). The emphasis is not only on correctness but the appropriateness
of language use. These developments have already begun to influence decisions regarding curriculum design and the preparation of materials for teaching. Whenever the needs of the learners are specific and well-defined, the appropriate variety of language can be presented in a logical sequence. Thus, special language courses are being designed for scientists, engineers, business executives, secretaries and people preparing for other careers. It is rather difficult to visualize the ‘personal’ and ‘transactional’ needs of purpose learners (Gumpurz 1970). Hence, while the concept of Communicative Competence as a goal of language instruction is generally accepted in theory, no significant practical changes have so far been introduced in the English teaching programmes for under-graduates in Humanities and Social Sciences.

2.10 Communicative Language Teaching in India

Communicative language teaching emerged from a number of disparate sources. During the 1970s and 1980s applied linguists and language educators began to re-evaluate pedagogical practice in the light of changing views on the nature of language and learning and the role of teachers and learners.
The introduction of CLT in India had direct bearing on the language process and there was a change at two levels;

a) At the level of syllabus

b) At the level of methodology.

English as a global language has always been recognized in India as it was seen as an important vehicle for success with a change in political attitudes towards the learning and use of English there was also significant shift in demands for better teaching of the language. The status of English underwent a change and every English language user wanted to improve his or her performance.

A sudden change in education particularly with respect to English in India had taken place. Students started realizing the need for functional English. Effective communication was regarded as a symbol of social status and pride. The liberalization of economy led to the entry of multi nationals resulting in enormous job opportunities that required a good command of English. Spoken English institutes sprang up every where and training centres in communicative English began to be established in every corner of the state. Students started learning the language to meet the need of the hour, that is, a comfortable job. The mushrooming of training institutes all over India made the academicians take another look at the English syllabus.
With the change in the learners’ need CLT started creeping into English classrooms in India. As gradually success began to be measured in terms of fluency there came a situation to introduce need based and task based courses according to learner’s requirements. This reformed and restructured the entire language teaching system. The learners knew why a second language was important and also the practical use of learning a second language. It was a learner centred syllabus based on the students’ point of view. The CLT syllabus as a practical one became relevant because it helped the learners to become employable.

2.11 The Need of Introducing Communicative Syllabus for Teaching English in Kerala

English is taught as a compulsory subject at different levels (from class 1 to B.A/B.Sc. level mainly using the grammar translation method in Kerala. The teacher plays a dominating role in the classroom and students are rarely involved in the teaching-learning process. The syllabus puts emphasis on the usage rather than the use of language. The students are given intensive practices in reading and writing. The purpose is however not to develop their skills but to prepare them for their exams. As a result, they learn the grammar rules and acquire limited reading and writing skills but are hardly able to use English for different communicative purposes. Keeping the
importance of English and the objectives of teaching the language in view, an attempt is made to explain how the situation can be improved by introducing the communicative syllabus.

2.12 Communicative Syllabuses

Before the communicative syllabuses were introduced, it was felt that the other syllabus types, which put emphasis mainly on teaching of grammatical points, were not able to prepare the learners to use the target language in real life situations. According to Wilkins (1976) this problem had become especially urgent in Europe where the European community had expanded and grown in importance bringing countries closer together and yet each member country had its own language(s). A study was commissioned by the Council of Europe to examine the situation and then make recommendations for improving the situation so that the people from the member countries could communicate as visitors to a foreign country or with foreign visitors to their own country. For this purpose, different language learning theories and language teaching models were discussed and examined. It was agreed that ‘language acquisition’ is the model for learning a second language, i.e. to design syllabuses on the principles based on the Mentalist Language Learning Theory (Aitchison 1998). Efforts were also made to offer solutions to the problems of classroom organization and the
relationship between teachers and students. It was felt that not only the knowledge of rules but also the ability to use these rules for determining appropriate use of language in living situations had to be taken into account. So, attempts were made to specify in practical terms the foreign language learning skills which were needed for communication, and the things which the learners would be doing in the target language were taken into consideration before designing a syllabus (Cunningsworth 1995). The point that it might be very difficult to provide similar situations for teaching a second language as we have in acquiring our first language, certain theories for mastering the target language was also taken into consideration. (Wilkins 1985).

2.13 Advantages of the Communicative Syllabus

Communicative Syllabuses stress the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use their English for communicative purpose and characteristically attempt to integrate such activities into a wider programme of language learning. It is believed that we learn language most efficiently by using it in realistic situations, so communicative syllabuses aim at developing students’ ability to use the target language through activities which actually simulate target performance (Nunan 1989).
As has already been mentioned, students know the rules of language but are not able to use them for communicative purposes. They need to have both the knowledge of usage as well as use, as it is not sufficient for learners to simply have knowledge of target language forms, meanings and functions. They must also be able to apply this knowledge in negotiating meaning while communicating "One kind of meaning is that which language items have as elements of language systems and the other is that which they have when they are actually put to use in acts of communication. The communicative syllabuses pay due attention to these points" (1979 p.118).

Communicative Syllabuses are arranged keeping the needs of learners in view and so are specified not only in terms of language items learners are likely to need but also in terms of the kinds of meaning they may want to express and the things they may want to do with the language. So, the language to be taught is chosen according to the social and cultural relationship involved, i.e. the most socially appropriate form of the language learners are speaking or would speak is selected in order to ‘fit in’ with the society in which they are or would be participating (Littlewood 1981). And, according to Widdowson (1979 p.118), “Communication only takes place when we make use of sentences to perform a variety of different acts of essentially social nature and so the teachers arrange group work and pair
work which enable the students to use the language, practising all the language skills. The situation becomes student centred rather than teacher centred”.

Taking into consideration grammatical and lexical items that will be needed by the learners, materials taking into account the different ways in which people use language are developed. They may be organized around topics, or functions of language-and they will be so organized that students are forced to try to express themselves through the language, often without much help of the teachers, i.e. the teaching techniques suit the learning situations. Communicative Syllabuses see language teaching as an effort to involve ‘the whole person’ that is, it cannot be treated as a purely technical exercise but it should relate to students’ genuine feelings, interests and needs (Brumfit 1982).

Communicative Syllabuses, according to Richards and Rodgers (1986), aim at developing procedures for the teaching of four language skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication. Thus no skill is ignored as is the case in Grammar Translation Syllabuses and so students can achieve all kinds of competence required for effective communication and the objectives mentioned above can be achieved.
Communicative Syllabuses offer a classroom where learners use the target language which provides them a point of accountability for assigned work in the form of tasks given to the students which they perform by using the target language. They do the activities using the target language which they will need outside the classroom. The activities are communicative and task oriented. Task is an activity which is carried out as a result of processing or understanding language (Breen 1987, Nunan 1989). The use of a variety of different kinds of tasks in language teaching is said to make language teaching more communicative because it provides a purpose for classroom activity which goes beyond the practice of language for its own sake.

The communicative Syllabuses make the classroom a small world of social relations in which needs are found or contrived and the second language is put to use and it is shown how things happen as a result of using language and why the learners have to have the knowledge of linguistic forms, meanings and functions. They have to learn that different forms can be used to perform a function and that a single form can serve a variety of functions. They learn the usage as well as the use of language. The classroom encourages student to student interaction and also co-operation because they can remove the inhibitions of those who feel intimidated by
formal classroom activities and so the amount of students’ talking time is increased which provides them an opportunity to express themselves in the target language. The students are not only offered a great deal of practice in making appropriate choices in terms of register, but also grammatical points, appropriate vocabulary and so on.

The Communicative Syllabuses offer student centred activities in which the focus is placed on the students who become protagonists of their own learning. The activities are designed keeping in view the level of understanding, the interests and the feelings of the students which are supposed to give them hidden practice of language points without making them conscious of it. The role of the teacher in the classroom is that of a manager, an initiator, a facilitator, and an advisor, etc, who is always there to help and guide the students (Harmer 1991).

Above all, the materials written or selected for the students reflect the uses (present and future) which learners will make of the language i.e. the materials correspond to learners’ need and match the aims and objectives of the language learning programme. It helps students to equip themselves for using language effectively for their own purposes.

If we look at the situation with reference to the use of English as a second language and the objectives outlined above, we can very confidently
remark that Communicative Syllabuses can cater to the needs of the learners and so it is strongly recommended that Communicative Syllabuses should be introduced for teaching English as these syllabuses pay due attention to all language skills which can prepare students to use the language for communicative purposes. They do not offer a situation where teachers play a dominating role; students are equally involved in the teaching-learning process by offering them interesting and motivating activities and teaching materials.

2.14 The Traditional Approach versus the Communicative Approach

An upsurge of interest in the field of second language learning and teaching, which has gained momentum in recent years is the modern approach, variously referred to as the Communicative or Functional/Notional approach to the teaching of English as second language.

The Communicative Approach which has finally established its edge over the Traditional Methods in language teaching is essentially a manifestation of the 1970s. Towards the end of the 1960s, it could be discerned among language teaching practitioners and applied linguists, a growing dissatisfaction with the prevailing traditional methodology of the time, the main emphasis of which was on the mastery of the language
structures. Though this is a generalization, it is true that language learners were required above all, to manipulate grammatical forms accurately, and this procedure was the main measure of competence in a foreign language. All English language teachers will be familiar with the conventional type of exercise instruction that asks students to convert active sentences into their passive voice equivalent or to supply the correct verb form for a given tense or to distinguish adjectives from adverbs. This kind of teaching, produced “structurally competent” students who were often “communicatively incompetent”, i.e., they would be unable to transfer the structural knowledge even to talk about themselves in a real life setting. Therefore this kind of Grammatical Competence has been described as necessary, but not sufficient.

One of the direct causes for this dissatisfaction was undoubtedly the fact, that by the late 1960s the world had started to shrink, in the positive sense that possibilities for international, professional cooperation and travel, whether for business, higher studies or other purposes were possible. Particularly in Western Europe, interdependence grew with the development of the European common market and with it a parallel educational need for changes in the way in which the various European languages were taught (Richards and Rodger 2001).
Wilkins (1976) was instrumental in setting out the fundamental considerations for a Functional/Notional Approach to syllabus design based on communicative criteria. However, the central figure is socio-linguist. Hymes' (1972) concept of ‘Communicative Competence’ and his criticism of Chomsky’s view of language on the grounds that Chomsky paid exclusive attention to ‘correctness’ at the expense of ‘appropriateness’ of use in specific contexts. This perspective was further developed by Canale (1983) who put forward four components of Communicative Competence: grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence. Therefore the adoption of the communicative-oriented foreign/second language teaching popularly known as Communicative Language Teaching, in English class rooms had been stressed repeatedly by SLA researchers, and indeed there had been many studies attempting to determine its effects on L2 learners.

In discussing the modern communicative syllabus designs, Canale and Swain (1980) justify the application of communicative language teaching by defending it against the claim that the communicatively oriented syllabus tends to be disorganized in terms of acquisition of grammar. They believe that the functionally organized Communicative Approach is more likely than
the Traditional Approach to have positive consequences for learner motivation, as it provides a form of in-class training that makes learners feel more comfortable, confident and encouraged, with a clear visible purpose for L2 learning, which is mainly the desire to communicate. Consequently there is much relevance in throwing light on what a learner does inside the classroom to develop his or her communicative competence.

Brown (2000 p. 102) viewing, Communicative Language Teaching as an ideal approach describes four characteristics in defining this modern approach i.e. Communicative Language Teaching in a second language classroom. He advocates that:

a) Focus in a classroom should be on all the components of Communicative Competence of which grammatical or linguistic competence is just a part.
b) Classroom activities should be designed to engage students in the pragmatic, authentic and functional use of language for meaningful purposes.
c) Both fluency and accuracy should be equally important in a second language learning classroom and they are complementary.
d) Students have to use their target language, productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts, under proper guidance, but not under the control of a teacher.
It is clear from these features of Communicative Language Teaching that it implies a major departure from the earlier pedagogical, conventional Grammar Translation Methods which pay undue attention to structural rules. Brown (2000) further lists six key words of Communicative language Teaching to better understand what it aims at: learner-centered, co-operative, interactive, integrative, content centered, and task based.

There is, however, a considerable amount of fluidity and eclecticism in theorizing about and practising the communicate approach to language teaching. Within the parameters of its basic principles, it means different things to different people depending upon their predilection and experience. According to Littlewood (1981 p.1), for example, “One of the most characteristic features of communicative language teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language”. For others, however, it means using procedures where learners work in pairs or groups employing available language resources in problem-solving tasks. What is essential in the various approaches is an interaction or transaction of some kind where one person has an intention and the other reacts to it.
2.15 Strong and Weak Versions of CLT

Howatt (1984 p.279) distinguishes between a ‘strong’ and a ‘weak’ version of Communicative Language Teaching. There is, in a sense, a ‘strong’ version of the communicative approach and a ‘weak’ version. The ‘strong’ version of communicative teaching, on the other hand, advances the claim that language is acquired through communication. So that it is not merely a question of activating an existing but inert knowledge of the language, but of stimulating the development of the language system itself. If the former could be described as ‘learning to use’ English, the latter entails ‘using English to learn it’. The weak version stresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use their English for communicative purposes and, characteristically, attempts to integrate such activities into a wider programme of language teaching.

Communicative Language Teaching has thus a rich theoretical base. Some of the main characteristics of this approach are given below:

- Language is a system for the expression of meaning.
- The primary function of language is for interaction and communication.
- The structure of language reflects its functional and communicative uses.
The primary units of language are not merely its grammatical and structural features, but categories of functional and communicative meaning as exemplified in discourse (Richards & Rodgers 1995 p.71).

The Communicative Approach to language teaching unfolds certain significant implications for teaching of second/foreign languages with regard to learners, teachers, objectives and needs, syllabus, teaching materials, methodology, and so on. Most of the work on Communicative Language has been done with the adult learner at the centre stage. In this kind of teaching the learner has to play a role different from the one found in most traditional language classroom. Talking about the role of the learner in Communicative Language Teaching, Breen and Candlin observe:

“The role of learner as negotiator between the self, the learning process, and the object of learning emerges from and interacts with the role of joint negotiator within the group and within the classroom procedures and activities which the group undertakes. The implication for the learner is that he should contribute as much as he gains, and thereby learn in an independent way” (1980 p. 110).
This learner-centred approach heavily banks upon ‘learning by doing’. Learners are expected to interact primarily with each other, and correction of errors may be absent or infrequent. This kind of learning is not different from Montaigne’s learning of Latin. Montaigne says: “Without methods, without a book, without grammar or rules, without a whip and without tears, I had learned Latin as proper as that of my schoolmaster” (2004 p.63). This kind of learning has also been called “the experience approach.” (Hilgard & Bower 1966).

2.15.1 Teacher Roles

Teacher might appear in the Communicative Approach to be playing less important role than the one played by him in a traditional system. But he still occupies key position in the learning process.

The teacher has two main roles: the first role is to facilitate the communication process between all participants in the classroom, and between these participants and the various activities and texts. The second role is to act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group. The latter role is closely related to the objectives of the first role and arises from it. These roles imply a set of secondary roles for the teacher: first, as an organizer of resources and resource himself; second, as a guide within the classroom procedures and activities. A third role for the teacher
is that of a researcher and learner, with much to contribute in terms of “appropriate knowledge and abilities, actual and observed experience of the nature of learning and organizational capacities” (Breen & Candlin 1980 p.99).

The teacher may also function occasionally as a needs analyst, counselor, and group process manager, besides being a friend, philosopher, and guide. If either the teacher or the learner fails to perform his role adequately, learning of language will not take place.

Communicative Language Teaching, like any other kind of language teaching, should be geared to the objectives of the course and the learners’ needs. Piepho (1988) has discussed the following levels of objectives in a Communicative Approach:

1. Interactive and content level (language as a means of expression)

2. Linguistic and instrumental level (language as a semiotic system)

3. Affective level of interpersonal relationships (language as a means of expressing value judgments)

4. Level of individual learning needs (remedial learning)

The above are, however, general objectives applicable to any teaching situation. Instructional objectives for a Communicative Language Teaching course should reflect specific aspects of Communicative Competence
according to the learner’s proficiency level and communicative needs. It is the teacher’s responsibility to determine and respond to the learner’s language needs. This may be done informally or through a formal assessment of the learner’s motivation for studying the language. The British linguist D.A. Wilkins (1972) was probably the first to analyse communicative meaning that a learner needs to understand and express. He proposed a need-based, functional or communicative definition of language that could serve as a basis for developing communicative syllabi for language teaching. Wilkins described two types of meanings: notional categories (concepts such as time, sequence, quantity, location, frequency etc.) and categories of communicative functions (requests, denials, offers, complaints etc.). Wilkins’s views, which he later revised and expanded in 1976, had a considerable impact on the development of Communicative Language Teaching.

Wilkins feels that the notional framework suggested by him will “provide the means by which a certain minimum level of communicative ability in European languages can be set up”, which can be taken for granted in planning “more situational oriented units”. “The value of the Notional Approach”, he adds, “is that it forces one to consider the communicative value of everything that is taught” (Wilkins 1979 p.86).
It may be remembered in this context that Wilkins Notional Syllabus Model did not go uncriticised. It was held that Wilkins specified products rather than communicative processes and that he replaced one inventory (of grammar items) with another (of notions and functions). Widdowson (1979 p.254), for example argued that notional-functional categories enumerated by Wilkins provide only a very partial and imprecise description of certain semantic and pragmatic rules which are used for reference when people interact. They tell us nothing about the procedures people employ in the application of these rules when they are actually engaged in communicative activity. If we are to adopt a communicative approach to teaching which takes as its primary purpose the development of the ability to do things with language, then it is discourse which must be at the centre of our attention.

2.16 A Synthetic Approach to CLT

Of late, the ESL/EFL teachers in non-English speaking countries have become aware that the exclusive use of either the Communicative or the GTM does not suit all English teaching situations. “What might be called traditional methods and skills are not necessarily unworkable alongside modern English as EFL/ ESL teaching methods. The idea that the two are mutually exclusive is absurd.” (Harvey 1985 p.184)
Therefore what teachers need to do now is modernize, English teaching. They need to combine the new with the old so as to adapt the Communicative Approach to traditional teaching structures. Since teaching and learning is deeply rooted in the local culture, the students’ social milieu and habits in language acquisition must be considered. Although the GTM is out of favour, students of non-native English learning countries show interest in language structures and linguistic details when learning the language. They believe that if they understand the system they could use the language more effectively. Appropriate grammar analysis is essential for beginners especially in a Chinese or an Indian context. Translation from the target language and vice versa is an important part of teaching. Vocabulary work, pattern drills may familiarize students with sentence structures.

A fusion or synthesis of both methods would be appropriate in many English as a Second Language backgrounds. Instead of blindly teaching grammar traditionally, teachers could relate them to meaning and use. Accuracy and fluency are essential to language teaching and modern society is so demanding of fluent English speakers that students need rigorous language training in spoken English in their curriculum. Soon after the students have mastered the language forms they ought to be given fluency practice. The emphasis though should be on error free spoken English,
teachers should tolerate errors and students left to understand that error-making is not at all disgraceful but natural. Therefore fluency and accuracy are not mutually exclusive but interdependent.

The table below draws a clear distinction between the Traditional and CLT approaches of teaching English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory of language</th>
<th>Theory of learning</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Syllabus</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Approach</td>
<td>Language is a system of rule governed structures hierarchically arranged.</td>
<td>Control of the structures of Sound, form and order, mastery over symbols of the language; Goal- Native like mastery.</td>
<td>Graded syllabus of phonology, morphology, and syntax. Contrastive analysis.</td>
<td>Dialogues and drills; repetition and memorization; pattern practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Approach</td>
<td>Language is a system for the expression of meaning: Primary function-interaction.</td>
<td>Activities involving real communication; carrying out meaningful tasks and using language that is meaningful to the learner promote learning.</td>
<td>Will include some or all of the following: structures, functions, notions, themes and tasks. designing will be guided by learner needs.</td>
<td>Engage learners in communication; involve processes such as information sharing, negotiation of meaning and interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of learner</td>
<td>Organisms that can be directed by skilled training techniques to produce correct responses.</td>
<td>Learner as negotiator, interactor, giving as well as taking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of teacher</td>
<td>Central and active; teacher dominated method. Provides model: controls direction and pace.</td>
<td>Facilitator of the communication process, needs analyst, counselor, Process manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of materials</td>
<td>Primarily teacher oriented. Tapes and visuals; language lab often used.</td>
<td>Primary role of promoting communicative language use; task based, authentic materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.17 Literature in CLT

The place of literature in the teaching of English as Second Language is encouraging in the sense the learner can use the text to develop an awareness of the operation of grammatical processes and to develop interpretative and critical thinking. Literature can foster cultural experiences of different times and places, thereby giving students an opportunity to explore their own sense of personal and social identity. The ability to read literary texts with pleasure and understanding is a fundamental component of the communicative competence of the educated native speaker, which is again the final goal of a non-native learner of English. Communicative Language Teaching also means paying attention to meaning that is communicated, and all literature is an effort to communicate.
Another dimension in using literature in Communicative Language Teaching is the dimension of creativity. Literary texts create a world with language. Communicative Language Teaching emphasizes meaning before form and literature stands for meaning through form, thus enriching communicative teaching. Literature adds human touch to communicative tasks which would otherwise be dull and dry.

Communicative Language Teaching is a methodology. It has no fixed syllabus. It is this flexibility and openness that makes it the ideal methodology for curing the ills of literary studies. Task based communicative teaching of literature can reduce the boredom of routine lectures. It offers two very distinct advantages. First, it brings the students closer to the language used in real life. They can study text through tasks and compare it with the language they use in everyday life. Second it fosters closeness with the text. They get the feel of the text by working on the details of plot, character and theme.

The GTM meant a tedious paraphrase-translation analysis routine. The Communicative Approach has given meaning to the teaching of literature. Therefore the best approach would be to continue the communicative aspects with literary studies and broaden the perspective of both.
Communicative tasks would be richer, and literary studies will cease to be boring. The gap between skill-getting and skill-using could be bridged.

English as Second Language/English as Foreign Language with its traditional implications still work well in many non-native English speaking backgrounds. To derive the best from both the traditional and the modern setting would be the most applicable reconciliation in the present context.

Finally, what has emerged from this brief survey of the traditional and the modern curriculum development in English Language teaching is that there is a need for flexibility and openness to change from the broader viewpoint of general education.