The second language classroom represents a miniature world comprising learners with varying ability levels, a myriad of language and cultural backgrounds, an abundance of interests, and an assortment of learning profiles. The learners need comfortable communication activities that do not undermine their self-image to transform their potential to performance. They need a supportive learning environment that promotes diversity, nurtures creativity, recognizes the relevance of L1, and above all, accommodates different learning styles. The classroom communication activities, thus, should consider all these factors to overcome system constraints and facilitate uninhibited and meaningful expressions in the TL.

The investigation into the link between language and the communicative functions has proved beyond doubt the influence of the pragmatic communicative functions on the formation and evolution of linguistic structures. It also supports the need to provide the learners with the freedom to select and execute tools and strategies in a self-directed manner in the implementation of the communicative activities in the classroom. The teaching of additional languages should have a great degree of flexibility with regard to the learners’ preferred cognitive style, learning strategies, use of L1 and communicative intentions. Such flexibility is important considering the fact that second language learning is not a simple linear process, but a more complex one involving linguistic, cultural and psychological implications. There is a relationship
between language acquisition and psychological orientations in which the experiences the learners bring to the classroom combine with affective factors to positively or negatively influence language acquisition. The following is the consolidation of the conclusions drawn by this research on various aspects of instructional communication.

Communicative competence in a second language emerges from implicit knowledge that develops consequent to the learners’ interactive and reflexive experience, assisted by the socio-cultural environment. Instruction generally aims at developing explicit knowledge that may be assessed under standard test conditions through controlled measuring processes. In the actual use of a second language, the learners rely primarily on their explicit knowledge and this explicit knowledge gets necessary back up from the internalised linguistic codes. This means that the role of instruction is to develop in the learners the capacity to turn implicit knowledge into explicit knowledge in the processes of communication. Therefore, instruction should help the learners develop a variety of communication skills with the help of the required back-up knowledge that makes them efficient self-correctors. Such self-check capabilities further facilitate the refinement of implicit knowledge.

The development of communicative competence in a second language does not follow any absolutely natural or systematic route, especially in the preliminary stages. There are sequences of development for transitional structures, which involve the acquisition of a set of interim rules in the processing of the input data. This is where the learner tends to use his native language structures to draw comparisons and contrasts with the target language structures. In internal code-switching and code-mixing, what we can see is not only an attempt to make one’s communication comprehensible but
also a desire to process input data using all the means of expressions and forms of language at his/her disposal.

The means of expressions and forms of language originate from all kinds of linguistic, social and personal experience of the learners. As they gain experience of a variety of contexts, they build up competence with regard to language use appropriate to different situations. This concept of competence includes the selection of languages, their forms and functional varieties that can best serve the purpose of the user in a given context. In addition, competence building, in this view, would attribute great importance to the process of code transferring, which is manifest in the acts of ‘code-switching and code-mixing’, as communication efficiency boosters. Therefore, it is argued that using them profusely in classroom communication would be beneficial to the second language learning.

The construction of competence, according to the principles of social constructivism, presupposes support from scaffolding. Literally, scaffolding is a support structure that is erected to support a building under construction. When the building becomes strong enough, the scaffolding can be removed and the building will remain strong and stable. Similarly, in SL learning, scaffolding refers to the support provided by not only teachers, peers, and reference materials, but also the mainstay support the learners receive from their L1. Considering this, the teachers have the responsibility to help the learners judiciously employ the L1 in their L2 learning activities. Tasks involving application of their knowledge of both the languages simultaneously will provide the learners with the self-esteem necessary for them to cultivate positive attitudes and self-direction.
There seems to be a misconception that it is always possible to provide the learners with absolutely authentic, natural communication tasks and real life opportunities in the second language classroom, and this will enable them to communicate naturally and effectively in the target language. Citing the benefits of genuine, natural communication, we proclaim that language is just a means for carrying out the communication process that takes place naturally in real life situations, and for transmitting relevant contextual messages without any devaluation of meaning. Consequently, there is an insistence that the communicative activities simulated in the classroom for instructional purposes should carry all the features of the natural communication that takes place outside the classroom. Moreover, there is also an expectation that the learners will exhibit the qualities of the genuine, natural communicators who have gained a reasonably good command of the target language.

It is argued in this thesis that all these views supporting the creation of ‘natural’ communicative situations in the classroom in our context do not carry conviction. In fact, the learners’ awareness that they are in a second language classroom practising language items and solving communicative tasks has the potential to make the whole learning environment and its associate activities look perfectly contrived. Therefore, it is a reasonable proposition that the learners need to be given the freedom to switch and mix codes at will in order to activate the processes of comparisons, contrasts, translation, correlation and other such cognitive activities, especially at the ‘skill getting stage’ (Rivers 1983: 43). By the time they reach the ‘skill using stage’, they will have gained an awareness of the target language and the way in which it manifests itself in
communicative situations. This alone can make the communicative activities appear meaningful and significant to the second language learners.

It has also been argued that the learners' frequent applications of code switching and code mixing have a positive effect on the languages involved, particularly on the recessive one. If this is so, the bilingual environment provides the learners with an opportunity to use their code-switching and code-mixing mechanisms to promote communication, and subsequently, the learning of the target language. While using languages in real life communication, it is the users’ awareness of the linguistic background of the interactants that determines the choice of language; not any desire to practise a particular language to promote its learning. This is precisely the reason why the idea of using ‘genuine, natural target language communication’ in the S L classroom is flawed. No amount of persuasion or cajoling would help the learners replace the impressions they gather from their experience to believe that what they go through in the classroom is genuine, natural target language experience.

This thesis also makes out a strong case for translation, not exactly the kind we generally employ in the S L classrooms for meaning transfer, but the one in which we make structural, semantic and morphological comparisons. It is the type that is intended to be used in bilingual communication activities (cf. Appendix I). Through such translation involving structural comparisons, learners gain an explicit knowledge of language along with an idea of its overt structural relationship with meaning when they undertake translation as a learning and communication activity. It is therefore unfair to underestimate the role translation plays in second language learning and communication, especially in the case of adult learners. In fact, translation is an activity
in which many cognitive processes get operational. While criticising the unfeasibility of the grand old grammar-translation method, many researchers seem eager to unleash a campaign against the use of translation in second language instruction realising little that many of the cognitive processes involved in second language learning and communication involve the activity of translation in a no less significant manner.

It is, however, not intended to argue that the way the grammar-translation method employs translation is sufficient to make the learners communicatively competent, but to point out the fallacy of entirely negating the role of translation in the second language learning processes in the guise of making communication spontaneous and natural. In fact, it has already been established that the L1 has a role in the S L learning, but the way it has traditionally been used produces little effect. We have been consistently using the L1 for translating, and interpreting the T L texts, while the learners seldom use the T L in communication. In fact, their entire T L use is confined to producing a little written work, and then perhaps, some answers in examinations. Actually, dialogue occurs all around us, but it is between different interacting participants who use different languages on different occasions. The learners spend least time using English, but it cannot be helped because of the precarious situation they are in. The way we can turn this deficiency into an opportunity is to make a sensible use of the L1, which the learners use most, and are most comfortable with.

Learning takes place better when the learner has clear perceptions of its relevance and utility. There cannot be any underrating of the use of L1 that has a significant supporting role in the process of L2 learning and communication in formal settings. In fact, translation plays an important role in the instructional communication
processes aimed to develop L2 learning. The idea of internal translinguistic application of knowledge, especially in adult SL learners, this study puts forward is different from translation in the conventional sense. This process has been named correlative transcoding and this is integrated into the cognitive processes of L2 learning along with translation and other problem-solving capabilities.

In the processes of translation and transfer, the mental operations not only find their application but also help the learners with the processes of mental representation and active engagement. All these processes have to be active during the ‘skill getting stage’ where the learners tend to use unconventional methods to quicken the internalisation of linguistic structures. In the ‘skill using stage’, the learners become more autonomous, as they are able to exploit their self-directional tendencies to become efficient communicators who have mastered the linguistic structures of both the languages. The argument presented here considers these views to advocate a different application of the L1 in our SL classroom communication, from the way it is recommended in the bilingual method advocated by Dodson (1972), and also from the way it has traditionally been used (cf. Appendix II).

In the analysis of the views of Fodor and Krashen, this study found that there is an inherent translinguistic code-transferring mechanism within SL users as well as polyglots. This system controls their language and expressions while they communicate, either generally or in an instructional manner. The language of thought or brain language (Fodor 1975), bears no resemblance with any natural language and the monitor (Krashen 1982) is a control device that helps the users by enabling them to review and recast linguistic structures in the processes of communication. If we accept
that such systems operate within individuals, it is easy to make sense of the argument in favour of 'internal translinguistic application of knowledge' or 'correlative transcoding' that this study puts forward.

There is a general feeling that second language users tend to formulate language constructions in their native language, and later at the expression stage, they translate them into the target language. This is far from being true since the kind of 'translation' taking place within the learners is not the translation process we generally conceive of. On the contrary, it could be a process of code transferring which can be described as 'internal translinguistic application of knowledge'. This may be an internal precursor to the translation process later manifested externally in linguistic communication. This research has discovered its relevance and significance in the acts of L2 learning and communication and termed it as 'correlative transcoding.'

The study also makes out a case for proactive bilingual communication in the classroom which may lead to language modification and linguistic restructuring. In the process of communication, the learners also learn things through language in the sense that learning is both a meaning system to be built up by the learners, and the means by which they develop knowledge systems. Therefore, one of the primary intentions to learn a second language could be the need to widen the scope of experience and knowledge acquisition. While developing linguistic systems, the learners also try to put the system to use in their attempts to understand other non-linguistic phenomena.

This brings to the fore the need for incorporating proactive strategies into the classroom communication in second language learning, which is in no way an
absolutely natural, authentic communicative instance. The best way to do this is to tap the potentials of the bilingual situation in such a way that it sustains proactivism in communication activities taking advantage of the learners’ knowledge of other languages. To make it effective, we need to encourage individual initiative as much as possible by promoting self-directed learning. The Indian concept of self-direction is not merely the learners taking responsibility for their learning; rather it has to do more with the learners’ emotional involvement in what they are doing with a clear perception of its content and utility.

The recognition of the sense of purpose is what makes communication effective and it can well be achieved by means of meaning-focused activities. Humans depend greatly on reflection, a process that has given credence to many an ancient philosopher. The process of reflection, which is a natural and familiar process, is generally used to learn from experience and thus it is considered to be associated with experiential learning and proactive communication activities. The proactivism involved in the processes of reflection and experiential learning essentially makes use of the L1, and thus, the communicative practices in SL learning should give the L1 its due share.

Thus, there is hardly any need to insist on the use of the target language all the time in the classroom for instructional and other type of communication, as such attempts are likely to put on a lot of pressure on the learners by generating discomfort and unfavourable attitudes. General communication and the instructional communication activities in the classroom should preferably be carried out simultaneously in both the languages based on the learners’ comfort levels. However, the learners should be encouraged to use the target language wherever possible
without inhibition, and at the same time, allow them to engage freely in code-switching and code-mixing in such a way that these processes stimulate code transferring and correlative transcoding mechanism.

The experiments conducted as part of this research point to the need for using certain modified strategies in S L classroom communication activities. (cf. Appendix I). They consolidate the view this study puts forward that the idea of using the target language for all the purposes of communication in the classroom is greatly constrained; such communication can never be made genuine or natural as it is propagated to be. The learners are naturally inclined to using their native language but they are not averse to using English if they find that frequent code-switching and code-mixing are acceptable, or are never considered awkward.

These experiments (cf. Appendices I and II) also convince us that bilingualism is a reality that is integrated into the national culture as well as the learners’ consciousness. There is no point attempting to suppress the expressions of bilingual behaviour in the classroom in the guise of developing target language proficiency. In fact, optimum participation presupposes the learners’ understanding of their comfort level with regard to the target language use. The activities involving bilingual reading, writing, listening and speaking are of great help, in this regard (cf. Appendix II). The advantage is that the bilingual activities help the learners draw up comparisons and contrast, though not deliberately, to consolidate certain linguistic structures. It may also help them understand structural and semantic characteristics each language possesses. However, it is important to clearly instruct the learners to use the target language whenever and wherever they think they can, and switch over to the native
language the moment they feel it is hard to carry on. This is to avoid situations where there is a breakdown of communication in terms of its content and flow, and the resultant shattering of the learners’ confidence. It is necessary for us to keep in mind the fact that the learners carry with them a lot of ‘dormant English’ that gets aroused only when the mechanism of correlative transcoding leading to structural and semantic comparisons and contrasts is activated. To facilitate this, certain bilingual activities involving the application of both the languages could be considered (cf. Appendix II).

The research reinforces the importance of developing self-direction in our S L learners. The learners may have different expectations of the teachers’ role and they desire varying degrees of assistance from the teachers in carrying out their learning activities. The roles to be played by the teachers and learners have to be clearly defined and understood. The state of ‘learner centredness’ should give way to ‘learning centredness’ in which both the teachers and students are convinced of the relevance of goals, approaches, strategies and outcome of their learning. Mutual feedback is another important requirement according to which teaching and learning strategies can be modified. Simultaneous use of native and target languages should be seen as a natural development, and this can be followed up by setting activities involving bilingual engagement. (cf. Appendix II).

As in the case of any learning experience, in a foreign language learning too, the learners learn what falls within their experience. If all their language production is controlled from outside, they will hardly be competent to control their own language production. The success of language learning lies in the learners’ ability to transfer their knowledge from a language-learning situation to a language-using situation. To
accomplish this, learners should have the freedom to express their ideas in a way they are comfortable with, by using the language items and structures they have already acquired. It is also important to look into how the language teachers can facilitate learning by incorporating reflection, translation, and peer interaction into language classrooms. It seems desirable to incorporate counselling into language learning programmes. Language counselling can help the learners develop specific personal goals for language learning, accommodate the learner’s feelings and offer emotional support. While language counselling is seen as fundamental to self-directed language learning programmes, it is not given due importance in traditional formal educational programmes.

How can we ensure self-direction and readiness in the S L learning and communication activities? This is where ‘learning how to learn’ comes to the fore prompted by the factors responsible for developing positive attitudes towards learning a second language. A learner-oriented instructional setting adds a promotional character to the interactive processes because it takes care of the relationship between linguistic and cultural needs. In an integrated approach to second language learning, the learning of linguistic structures and language items occurs in a place where the contextual, social, emotional and motivational factors are in harmony with one another.

What then accords a promotional character to a communicative, interactive setting? It is not just the positive attitude of the individuals who take part in the communicative venture. The individuals, who are able to participate in social life as users of language, should have the ability to integrate the use of language with other modalities of communication. In the self-directed attempts to learn and use a language,
the participants not only focus on meaning and structures but also concentrate on the translinguistic applications of knowledge. The communication acts, in such processes that sustain interest in communication in view of functional efficiency, would make use of all the tools including intrapersonal exchanges and the other languages at the learners’ disposal.

The classroom activities involving short presentations, discussions and seminars may be useful in developing T L communication skills. In the course of teaching and supplementary action research, modified versions of such programmes in which students are encouraged to look for and select appropriate instructional materials, and use them in ways which they consider useful, have been tried out. Such activities have revealed their potential stimulate the learners’ self-directional orientation in order to enhance the level of participation that is otherwise hard to come by. The learners need to work with materials that are familiar to them, and with which they feel at home since familiarity and relevance with regard to materials allow them to bring their own life experience to learning. These materials could be any text or communicative situation they come across during their normal functioning in institutions/society. Such familiar materials may include newspapers, magazines, journals, newsletters, notices or any written/published material that can rouse their curiosity and interest.

It is, therefore, relevant to consider providing the learners with activities involving problem solving, comparison, contrasting and analysing to stimulate divergent thinking, reflection and self-direction. Such activities should promote active engagement and proactive bilingual interactions that make use of the potential of all the languages the learners can use proficiently or less proficiently. In such a situation, it is necessary to
recognise corruptions, distortions and neologisms involving bizarre combinations of languages as natural processes in second language development, and place no sanctions to restrain the learners from indulging in them.

This study, with all its associate experiments, reflection and analysis, has found that the second or foreign language learning in a classroom context is more a deliberate or conscious activity than spontaneous or unconscious. It attributes the lack of success in instructional S L classroom communication to the improper or unimaginative use of the existing knowledge, particularly the L1, and to the insistence on genuine, natural T L communication. In addition, it identifies the inability to recognise emerging micro-contexts as the reason for sidelining of the issues involving self-direction, empowerment and strategies of learning and communication. Further research can prospectively look into the ways of dealing with these aspects in a more elaborate manner.