CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

6.0 Preview

The basic objective of the present research is to explore the Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance of the post-graduate students. Accordingly, throughout the early part of the thesis, the researcher has provided the detailed discussion of the issues related to the present study. Chapters IV and V are devoted to the analysis and the assessment of the elicited data. By the way of conclusion, it is essential to refer to some of the facts that emerge from the ongoing discussion. Accordingly, the early discussion in the chapter concentrates on such general considerations as the most fruitful Language Learning Theory for the acquisition of Communicative Competence and the ability of Communicative Performance. The norms of appropriateness in the use of English for the Indian non-native students are discussed with certain examples from the collected data. It follows the discussion of the basic issues of the research: The assessment of Linguistic, Pragmatic and Communicative Competences and Performances, the relation between the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance, the Communicative Strategies employed by the students, the syllabus of ‘English for Communication’ and the problems faced by the students in regard to the Communicative Performance. The model for the improvement of the Communicative Competence and Performance of the students is proposed and the pedagogical implications of the findings are also dwelt upon. The chapter ends with the account of the suggestions for further research and the concluding observations.

6.1: General Issues:

Throughout the early part of the thesis, specifically in Chapters I and II, the researcher has discussed some of the important general issues related to the present research. After completing the analysis, the researcher intends to register some of the observations regarding them:
6.1.1 Language Learning Theories and the Acquisition of Communicative Competence

In the first chapter, the discussion of the second language acquisition theories has been provided accompanied by their relevance for the acquisition of the Communicative Competence and the ability for Communicative Performance. It is essential here to consider the most appropriate of the language learning theories for the acquisition of the communicative abilities in the light of the analysis of the data collected for the present research. The theories discussed earlier are broadly classified into the following three categories:

I: Behaviourist-Structural Theories
II: Cognitive-Computational Theories
III: Socially-oriented Theories

The Behaviourist Structural theories of language learning are primarily concerned with the acquisition of linguistic elements in a predetermined pattern like the acquisition of phonemes, followed by the acquisition of morphemes, etc. However, such view of language learning cannot be accepted for the following reasons:

1. Language is not learned in a predetermined pattern, one linguistic level after the other.
2. The theory does not pay any attention to the context in which the language is learned in that it emphasizes the acquisition of the individual linguistic elements at the cost of the acquisition of both the grammatical and the pragmatic aspects of language.

The Cognitive-Computational theories are classified into two phases: the earlier and the latter. The earlier phase is influenced by Chomsky’s theory of Universal Grammar. The basic focus of these theories is on the cognitive development of the language learner accompanied by the acquisition of the linguistic elements. However, since the theory is concerned with the acquisition of ‘competence’, a highly abstract notion, it does not refer to the social context in which the language is learned and used. Moreover, it suffers from what has been called the ‘native speaker fallacy’. Similarly, Chomsky’s theory of UG proved to be of very limited value in the acquisition of additional language.
The latter phase of Cognitive-Computational theories is referred to as ‘Information-Processing Models’. Various theoreticians have provided their models of language processing. It seems that the information processing theories of language learning are rewarding in that they concentrate on the way learners acquire individual linguistic element. The cognitive processes involved in the acquisition are clarified. However, this theory also has some drawback. The most important of such drawbacks is that it does not refer in any way to the social context and the way it conditions the learning process.

The **Socially-oriented** theories have various manifestations like Communicative Language Learning, Acculturation Model, Language Socialization, etc. The most important thing about these models is that they acknowledge the role of the social context in the acquisition of language. However, these theories are not free from limitations; therefore, they cannot be accepted wholeheartedly. One of the most important limitations of these models is that they equate the Target Language with the Target Culture. According to these theorists, target language can best be acquired and taught in the context of the target culture and that the target language cannot be separated from the target culture. However, as has been asserted earlier, the target culture is not available in the Indian context or in any context where English is taught and learned as an additional language. Thus, we may say that these theories also suffer from the native speaker and the native culture fallacy. In fact, though the Communicative Language Learning is concerned with the acquisition of linguistic elements and the social context associated with them, no reference has been given to the possibility that there might be the same linguistic elements associated with different social contexts for the non-native learners.

If none of the theories of language learning can account for the language learning phenomenon in India, what can be the alternative? It seems that in order to explain the phenomenon, the theory should be both cognitive and social at one and the same time. That is to say, it must be a socio-cognitive theory so that it can refer to the cognitive development of the students while learning the linguistic elements and should also care for the norms of appropriateness for these learners. Such a theory should consider the multilingual background of the Indian learner and should also account for the acquisition of the linguistic elements. It should pay attention to the fact that the rules of appropriateness for the Indian non-native learner of English are based on the Indian socio-cultural context and not on the British or the American context.
6.1.2 Norms of Appropriateness in the Use of English

One of the important issues raised in Chapter II is that the European and the American models of Communicative Competence are largely irrelevant in the present context because they are not sensitive to the Indian norms of appropriateness which the students seem to employ while using English. The basic reason for this argument is the assumption that the Pragmatic Competence of the students is essentially based on their pragmatic knowledge related to their mother tongue. That is to say, for the students, the rules of appropriateness are largely the Indian rules of appropriateness. In fact, since the students are employing English in communication with another Indian, the Indian norms of appropriateness seem to be acceptable. Therefore, in such contexts, the European or American norms of appropriateness are largely irrelevant. The data collected for the present research supports this assumption and records the following instances of the Indian norms of appropriateness in the use of English by the these non-native speakers of English:

As has been discussed in the earlier chapters, there are three addressees employed in Part III of the Questionnaire: a friend, a classmate and a professor which involves intimate, informal and formal relations between the participants respectively. It is required that the students should vary their use of language accordingly. For example, a student may use the ‘direct’ form of the request when requesting a friend or a classmate, but such a request will be out of place if does not contain appropriate Politeness. For example, the responses like the following are possible and acceptable when employed for a friend and a classmate:

- Give me a lift, please.
- Please give me your mobile.

But such a ‘direct’ form will be out of place when requesting a professor. It requires some indirect techniques like:

- Can you assess my answer-sheets, please?

In fact in the Western context, it will require more Polite response like the following:

- Sir, will you please assess my answer-sheets? Or
- Sir, can you please spare some time for assessing my answer-sheets?

However, it is found that many students have employed the ‘direct’ form of request for the Professor as well. The following are some of the examples:
‘Please sir you check the answer sheets’ (47: 3)
‘Sir you change the schedule of the tour’ (47: 6)
‘Please check this’ (55: 3)
‘Sir, please check my question paper’ (56: 3)
‘Sir, please check this’ (65: 3)
‘Please check it and suggest the mistake’ (68: 3)
‘I am not participate in the study tour’ (82: 6)
‘Sir, please examine this answer sheet’ (83: 3)

As the above responses indicate, many students have employed the Imperative structure to request a professor. In fact, such responses will be treated as inappropriate, because they lack in the required Politeness. However, in Indian context, such responses can be treated as acceptable because the students who have employed such responses seem to think that the relation between a student and a teacher is close enough so that the ‘direct’ request is acceptable. Accordingly, the responses are treated as appropriate.

Such responses are not only present in the Face-threatening Speech Acts, many students in their responses to the Face-saving Speech Acts also employed the single word ‘thank you’, or ‘thanks’ to communicate their sense of gratitude. The following are some of the examples:

‘Thank you sir’ (82: 24)

In fact this response has been used by not less than 15 students. However, considering the favour the teacher has shown to the student (assessing the answer-sheets) the student is expected to acknowledge the favour and the way it will be helpful for the student. However, considering the Indian situation, it seems that the sense of gratitude expressed by the phrase is sufficient, and accordingly the responses have been assessed as appropriate. Some other students have employed the phrase ‘thanks’ in the same situation. The researcher has, however, treated them as inappropriate. Similarly, the students have employed the same phrase ‘Thank you’ for a classmate who has helped the student in the restaurant. In fact, considering the help the classmate has extended to the student, the student is expected to use at least ‘Thank you very much’. But many students have not employed the latter phrase. Still the responses are treated as appropriate.
6.2: Specific Issues:

The following are the findings and the conclusions regarding the specific issues of the research:

6.2.1 Linguistic Competence

The present research focuses on Communicative Competence as inclusive of both Linguistic and Pragmatic Competences. Similarly, the students have been classified into three categories, on the basis of their Faculty, Sex and Residential Location. Specifically, Part II of the Questionnaire is concerned with the assessment of the Linguistic and the Pragmatic Competences and the overall Communicative Competence of the students. Therefore, the conclusions regarding these competences are expounded with reference to the performance of these students in response to this part of the Questionnaire.

The Linguistic Competence of the students has been assessed with the help of the Sections I, II, III and V of Part II of the Questionnaire. The findings of each of the sections have already been discussed. However, in order to draw the conclusive remarks, the findings need to be discussed again. The following table shows the faculty-wise percentage of the marks obtained by the students in all the sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Section 1</th>
<th>Section 2</th>
<th>Section 3</th>
<th>Section 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts English</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi &amp; Marathi</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Faculty-wise Percentage of Linguistic Competence

As the table shows, the Linguistic Competence of the students of English from the Arts Faculty is the highest as compared to that of the students from the other faculties, though it is not stable across the sections. The highest percentage of the Linguistic Competence of these students is for Section I and the second highest is found in the Section V. There is a substantial decrease in the percentage of the Linguistic Competence of the same students for the Cloze Test. It means that the students find the Cloze Test more difficult than the other tests. If we treat 50% as the average ability, it may be said that the students performed below the average for the Cloze Test. For all
the other Tests (Discrete Item Test, Vocabulary Test and MCDCT), their Linguistic Competence is above the average. Considering the students of Hindi and Marathi, in three out of the four sections, their Linguistic Competence is above the average and for one of them, it exceeds 60%. However, as with the other students, these students also find the Cloze Test difficult.

The Linguistic Competence of the students of Sciences is not static across the sections. In two sections (Section I and Section V), their Linguistic Competence is above the average; but for the remaining two tests, i.e. the Cloze Test and the Vocabulary Test, their competence is below the average. As is the case of the Arts students, the students of Sciences faculty also seem to face difficulties in solving the items of the Cloze Test.

In the case of the students from the Commerce Faculty, their Linguistic Competence for two tests (Vocabulary Test and MCDCT) is above the average and for the remaining two tests it is below the average. As is the case of the Arts students, the students of Sciences faculty also seem to face difficulties in solving the items of the Cloze Test.

The Linguistic Competence of the students of Social Sciences is above the average in three sections: Discrete Item Test, Vocabulary Test and MCDCT. However, their Linguistic Competence for the Cloze Test is very low. In fact, their percentage is the lowest that the consulted students can obtain for the Cloze Test. It means that these students find the Cloze Test the most difficult test. However, their Linguistic Competence is quite ordinary in the remaining sections, since it is just above the average. The following table indicates the sex-wise percentage of the Linguistic Competence of the students in all the four sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Section 1</th>
<th>Section 2</th>
<th>Section 3</th>
<th>Section 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.31</td>
<td>35.30</td>
<td>51.80</td>
<td>53.94</td>
<td>47.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.26</td>
<td>44.47</td>
<td>58.95</td>
<td>61.44</td>
<td>55.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Sex-wise Percentage of Linguistic Competence

As the table shows, the Linguistic Competence of the male students in all sections is lower than that of the female students. However, their Linguistic Competence varies to a great extent across the four sections. In two sections, the Linguistic Competence of the male students is below the average and for the remaining
two, it is above the average. The total Linguistic Competence of the male students is 47.33%. It means, the Linguistic Competence of the male students is below the average. On the contrary, the Linguistic Competence of the female students in three sections is above the average and only in the Cloze Test, their Linguistic Competence is below the average. However, their total Linguistic Competence is not only higher than the male students but also above the average. The following table visualizes the Linguistic Competence of the students with respect to their Residential Location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Location</th>
<th>Section 1</th>
<th>Section 2</th>
<th>Section 3</th>
<th>Section 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>53.91</td>
<td>41.08</td>
<td>52.17</td>
<td>55.55</td>
<td>50.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>49.23</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>57.21</td>
<td>49.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3: Residential Location-wise Percentage of Linguistic Competence

The Linguistic Competence of the students from the Urban area is higher than that of the Rural students. Similarly, the Linguistic Competence of the students from both the residential locations varies to a great extent across the sections. The lowest percentage of the marks obtained from both the categories is for Section II. Though the Linguistic Competence of the rural students for the Vocabulary Test and the MCDCT is better than that of the urban students, their overall Linguistic Competence is lower than the urban students. On the basis of the ongoing discussion of the Linguistic Competence across variables like Faculty, Sex and Residential Location, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The Linguistic Competence of the students of English from the Arts Faculty is better than that of the students from the other faculties.
2. The Linguistic Competence of the female students is better than that of the male students.
3. The Linguistic Competence of the urban students is better than that of the rural students.
4. There are great variations in the Linguistic Competence of the students across the sections.
5. Though there is difference in the percentage of the Linguistic Competence of the students from the urban and the rural area, as compared to the difference present in other classifications, this difference is not great. It supports the researcher’s argument.
that the urban areas in the present context are not essentially different from the rural areas, specifically in terms of the exposure the students receive to the Target Language.

6. The students find the Cloze Test as the most difficult test, resulting in the lower Linguistic Competence of all the students in it.

6.2.2 Pragmatic Competence

Since the Pragmatic Competence is another important dimension of the construct of the Communicative Competence, it is essential to explore it across the three groups of the students. The following table indicates the faculty-wise Pragmatic Competence of the students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Section 4</th>
<th>Section 5</th>
<th>Section 6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi &amp; Marathi</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4: Faculty-wise Percentage of the Pragmatic Competence

The Pragmatic Competence of the students of English is the highest in all the three sections. The students of the other subjects and faculties are far behind in terms of their score. However, the Pragmatic Competence of the students from all the faculties for Section IV and VI is above 60%. Similarly, the Pragmatic Competence of the students from all the faculties in Section V is above the average. It means that the Pragmatic Competence of the all the students is greater than their respective Linguistic Competence. The following table elaborates the data related to the Pragmatic Competence of the students in term of their Sex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Section 4</th>
<th>Section 5</th>
<th>Section 6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63.15</td>
<td>53.94</td>
<td>61.84</td>
<td>59.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74.75</td>
<td>61.44</td>
<td>72.58</td>
<td>69.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5: Sex-wise Percentage of Pragmatic Competence

The Pragmatic Competence of the male students in all the three sections is lower as compared to that of the female students. The Pragmatic Competence of the female students is almost 70% and the distance between the Pragmatic Competence of the male and the female students is about 10%. Both the male and female students have shown
lower percentage of the Pragmatic Competence for Section V. However, here again the Pragmatic Competence of all the students is above the average.

The following table indicates the Pragmatic Competence of the students in terms of their Residential Location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Location</th>
<th>Section 4</th>
<th>Section 5</th>
<th>Section 6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>68.84</td>
<td>55.55</td>
<td>67.75</td>
<td>64.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>68.91</td>
<td>57.21</td>
<td>66.02</td>
<td>64.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6: Residential Location-wise Percentage of Pragmatic Competence

The most important fact that emerges from the table is that the percentage of the total Pragmatic Competence of the students from both the Urban and the Rural areas is the same. Whatever difference we perceive in the table is in the percentage of Section V. Otherwise there is no great difference between the Pragmatic Competence of the students from the urban and the rural areas. However, the Pragmatic Competence of the students from both the areas is not only above the average but also beyond 60%.

On the basis of the ongoing discussion, the following conclusions regarding the Pragmatic Competence of the students may be drawn:

1. The Pragmatic Competence of the students of English is higher than that of the students from other subjects and faculties.
2. The Pragmatic Competence of the female students is higher than that of the male students.
3. There is no difference between the Pragmatic Competence of the students from the Urban and the Rural areas. It again supports the assumption that there is no difference in the exposure the students get either in the urban or in the rural area.
4. The Pragmatic Competence of the students with reference to every classification is above the average. That is to say, there is no student whose Pragmatic Competence is below the average.
5. Most importantly, the Pragmatic Competence of the students is higher than their respective Linguistic Competence.

6.2.3 Overall Communicative Competence

After considering the Linguistic and Pragmatic Competences of the students, it is essential to find out the overall Communicative Competence of the students with
regard to their classifications. The following table illustrates the faculty-wise Communicative Competence of the students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Linguistic Competence</th>
<th>Pragmatic Competence</th>
<th>Communicative Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi &amp; Marathi</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6.7: Faculty-wise Percentage of the Communicative Competence*

The Communicative Competence of the students of English from the Arts faculty is higher than that of other students. This finding supports the hypothesis of the research that the Communicative Competence of the students of English is better than that of the students from other subjects and faculties. Similarly, another hypothesis of the study is that since English is the medium of instruction for the students of the Sciences, their Communicative Competence is better than that of the other students except the students of English. The data presented in the above table also supports the hypothesis. The lowest percentage of the Communicative Competence is that of the students from the Commerce faculty. Quite interestingly, the Communicative Competence of the students from all the faculties is above the average, though that of the students of English transcends 60%.

The finding in regard to the Communicative Competence of the students as per their classification on the basis of their sex is quite interesting. The following table indicates the data with reference to this variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Linguistic Competence</th>
<th>Pragmatic Competence</th>
<th>Communicative Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.33</td>
<td>59.64</td>
<td>53.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55.28</td>
<td>69.59</td>
<td>62.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6.8: Sex-wise Percentage of the Communicative Competence*

The table shows that the Communicative Competence of the male students is far lower than that of the female students. However, the Communicative Competence of both the male and the female students is above the average. The Communicative
Competence of the female students transcends 60%. The following table shows the Communicative Competence of the students on the basis of their Residential Location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Location</th>
<th>Linguistic Competence</th>
<th>Pragmatic Competence</th>
<th>Communicative Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>64.04</td>
<td>57.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>49.37</td>
<td>64.04</td>
<td>56.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.9: Residential Location-wise Percentage of Communicative Competence

As the table illustrates, the Communicative Competence of the Urban students is higher than that of the Rural students, but the difference between them is not great. The difference is only of 0.65%. This result supports the assertion that the researcher has made regarding the quality and quantity of exposure to English the students in the urban and the rural areas get: There is no great difference between the urban and the rural students as far as their Communicative Competence is concerned.

Hymes (1972) asserts that the students acquire Communicative Competence in the same developmental matrix where they acquire Linguistic Competence. It means that the development of the Communicative and the Linguistic Competence is parallel and complementary to each other. Accordingly, one of the hypotheses of the present study is that ‘the development of the Grammatical Competence of the students entails the development of their Communicative Competence’. As the above elaboration of the hypothesis shows, it is related to the two competencies: Linguistic and Communicative. Looking at the received data from this perspective, it is seen that the Linguistic Competence of the students is 50.0% and their Communicative Competence is 56.56%. That is, their Communicative Competence exceeds their Linguistic Competence. It means that the development of the Linguistic Competence of the students does not necessarily reflect the development of their Communicative Competence. It suggests that the assertion of Hymes may be acceptable in the context of the first language acquisition but it does not find support from the data collected for the present research which is essentially the case of the second language learning.

6.2.4 Linguistic Performance

After considering the results regarding the Linguistic, Pragmatic and the Communicative Competences of the students, it is now essential to discuss the performance of the students on each of them. As discussed in the earlier chapters, Part III of the Questionnaire examines the Communicative Performance of the students with
the help of the Written Discourse Completion Test. Every issue related to the Questionnaire has already been discussed in detail; therefore, it would be better at this juncture to concentrate only on the results that are obtained.

Diagram 6.1: Faculty-wise Linguistic Performance

As the above diagram indicates, the Linguistic Performance of the students of English is the highest; however, it is only 45.3%. That is to say, the highest percentage of the Linguistic Performance is below the average. The Linguistic Performance of the students of Hindi and Marathi and the other faculties is also below the average and none of them is able to cross 30%. It shows how difficult the students find to use grammatically correct language for authentic communication. It seems that it is easy for the students to identify the ungrammatical responses and also the grammatical mistakes in the sentences; but when they are asked to produce sentences for a specific purpose, the students are seen to committing the same mistakes which they have identified earlier. The Linguistic Performance of the students with reference to their classifications according to Sex and Residential Location is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Linguistic Performance</th>
<th>Residential Location</th>
<th>Linguistic Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>32.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34.95</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>29.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.10: Sex-wise and Location-wise Percentage of Linguistic Performance

The tables show that the Linguistic Performance of the female students is higher than that of the male students. However, the Linguistic Performance of both the male and the female students is below the average. Similarly, the Linguistic Performance of
the urban students is higher than that of the rural students. Here again the Linguistic Performance of both the rural and the urban students is below the average.

The following are some of the conclusive remarks based on the above data:

1. The Linguistic Performance of the students with respect to every classification is below the average. No doubt, the students of English seem to have reached near the average percentage since their Linguistic Performance is 45.3%.

2. The students seem to produce ungrammatical language when they have to use language for a communicative function.

3. Many students, while writing in English, tend to follow their line of thought and in the process do not care for the grammatical accuracy of the language.

4. As a result, many students use complex sentences in their responses.

6.2.5 Pragmatic Performance

The responses received from the students are also assessed for their ability to employ pragmatically appropriate language. This ability is here referred to as their Pragmatic Performance. The following diagram and tables show the distribution of the data regarding Pragmatic Performance of the students with reference to all the classifications:

As the diagram shows, the Pragmatic Performance of the students of English is the highest. It is 73.9%, which is much above the average. The Pragmatic Performance of the students of Sciences and Hindi and Marathi is also above the average and it is
55.3% and 51.9% respectively. However, the Pragmatic Performance of the students of Social Sciences and Commerce is just below the average and it is 49.3% and 48.7% respectively. However, the Pragmatic Performance of these students is far better than their respective Linguistic Performance. The following tables visualize the sex-wise and location-wise distribution of Pragmatic Performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Pragmatic Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Location</th>
<th>Pragmatic Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>58.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>55.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.11: Sex-wise and Location-wise Percentage of Pragmatic Performance

The table shows that the Pragmatic Performance of the female students is higher than that of the male students; similarly, the Pragmatic Performance of the Urban students is better than that of the Rural students. However, quite interestingly, in both the classifications, the percentage of the Pragmatic Performance is above the average percentage. Certain conclusion regarding the Pragmatic Performance of the students may be drawn from the assessment of the data:

1. The Pragmatic Performance of the students is far better than their respective Linguistic Performance.
2. The Pragmatic Performance of the students of English is better than that of the other students.
3. The Pragmatic Performance of the students of Sciences is better than that of the other students except the students of English.
4. There is great difference between the Pragmatic Performance of the male and the female students and also between the urban and the rural students.
5. The Pragmatic Performance of the students of Commerce and Social Sciences is below the average.

6.2.6 Linguistic and Pragmatic Performances

In literature dealing with the acquisition of Communicative Competence and the ability of Communicative Performance, the linguists are seen concerned with the development of the Linguistic and the Pragmatic Competences and Performances of the non-native learners. Some linguists (like Bardovi-Harlig, 2001) are of the opinion that
the Linguistic Competence of the non-native students develop prior to the development of their Pragmatic Competence. On the other hand, other linguists (for example, Koike (1989), Dittmar (1992), etc.) consider that the development of the Pragmatic Competence takes place prior to the development of their Linguistic Competence. The latter linguists attribute the prior acquisition of Pragmatic Competence to the universal pragmatic abilities of the language learner. Considering this factor in terms of the score of the students on both the Competence and the Performance aspects, it is observed that the Pragmatic Competence of the students is higher than their respective Linguistic Competence. To be more precise, the Linguistic Competence of the students is 50.0%, whereas their Pragmatic Competence is 63.48%. However, this data does not prove anything. Therefore, it is essential to refer to the findings based on the Linguistic and the Pragmatic Performances of the students.

While analyzing the responses of the students to the Written Discourse Completion Test, the students are categorized and assessed in the following categories: ‘Communicatively Competent’, ‘Grammatically Competent’, ‘Incompetent’, ‘Pragmatically Competent’ and ‘Resistant’. Out of these five categories, two are important for the present issue: ‘Grammatically Competent’ and ‘Pragmatically Competent’. The term ‘Grammatically Competent’ is employed to refer to the student whose response is grammatically correct but is not pragmatically appropriate. It means that the student has acquired the target like Linguistic Competence but not the knowledge of employing the language in the appropriate way. On the other hand, ‘Pragmatically Competent’ refers to the student who has used pragmatically appropriate but grammatically incorrect response.

Quite interestingly, the elicited data provides cases of both the types. The following are some of the responses which are grammatically correct but pragmatically inappropriate:

*Give me lift on your bike upto your house.* (29: 1)

In fact, the student in the above response has identified the correct Illocutionary Force required in the situation, but does not use the required Politeness in the context of the relation between the classmates. Moreover, there is no Politeness marker, and the response is in the ‘direct’ nature. All these factors make the response an Order and thus pragmatically inappropriate, though it is grammatically correct.

The following is another of such responses:
Sorry, I will not come to your party because my mother is ill & I want to stay there. (86: 5)

This response is also grammatically correct and seems that it is appropriate as well. However, considering the relation between the student and a friend, the direct denial ‘I will not come to your party’ seems to be odd. Moreover, the use of the word ‘sorry’ is not sufficient because the friend is expected to convey his inability with appropriate ‘amount of information’. The response fails in this respect as well. The following is another of such grammatically correct response:

How careless you are. (138: 7)

The situation for which the response has been provided consists of the classmates where the classmate of the student has lost the notes given by the student. In fact, the response is grammatical and also has identified that the situation requires the Speech Act of Complaint, but complaining in the extreme form of accusation is not appropriate, because it will surely break the relationship. Therefore, this response is treated as pragmatically inappropriate.

In the above responses, the students have not employed the required Politeness, but in the following response, the student has employed extreme Politeness than is required for correcting a friend:

Dear friend, I would like to tell you that the correct answer is D. (18: 11)

The Politeness expressed with the help of the phrase ‘would like to tell you’ clashes with the earlier part of the response ‘Dear friend’. As a result, the response is treated as pragmatically inappropriate.

The following are some of the examples of pragmatically appropriate but grammatically incorrect responses:

Friend, There is some problem. I have joined a class of PD. Today, the teacher of the class engages the class beyond the regular time. Therefore, I miss the last bus. So I need your lift on the bike please. (65: 1)

Good morning sir, I solved number of previous question paper & please examine the answer sheets and guide me. (124: 4)

Sir, will you please allow me to not come for study tour because my father is out of station. (49: 6)
Sir, there was a date suitable to all students which is in a next week. (56: 15)

I foragate study material please wait I will return it in the evening after complete the class. (128: 17)

All the above responses are grammatically incorrect but are pragmatically appropriate in that the information they contain, the variety of the language they are formed in and also the Politeness they express is appropriate with regard to the participants.

Turning to the point of acquisition of the Pragmatic and the Linguistic Competences, since the data contains both the types of responses we need to consider the percentage of the responses belonging to each type. Out of the total 3600 responses received, 95 (2.6%) are grammatically correct but pragmatically inappropriate, whereas 1032 (28.7%) responses are pragmatically appropriate but grammatically incorrect. Since the percentage of the ‘only pragmatically appropriate’ responses is greater than that of the ‘only grammatically correct’, we may say that the students have acquired the Pragmatic Competence prior to acquiring the Linguistic Competence.

The above finding also point to the discussion provided in Chapter II specifically with regard to Halliday’s theory of language learning and the concept of Multi-competence. According to Halliday (1973, 1978), learning a language is ‘learning the meaning potential of the language’. The meaning potential consists of the acquisition of the functions of language. He does not refer to the grammatical system of language. Applying this argument in the case of the learning of additional language, we may say that the students have already learned the meaning potential associated with the Indian socio-cultural milieu. Since English language is employed in Indian context with Indian norms of appropriateness and for the function which are essentially Indian, we may say that the students have already acquired the Pragmatic Competence. Simply they are learning the linguistic forms to express the already acquired communicative functions. The same argument has also been provided by Cook in his theory of Multi-competence. According to him, the basic difference between the monolingual and the multilingual person is that there is only one underlying conceptual base and only one linguistic system in a monolingual person. However, in the case of a multilingual person, only one underlying conceptual base is expressed in two or more different linguistic systems. Thus, both the theories: Halliday’s theory of language learning and Cook’s theory of Multi-competence support the view that the learners in the present
context have acquired the Pragmatic Competence prior to their acquisition of the Linguistic Competence.

6.2.7 Overall Communicative Performance

The following diagram elaborates the Communicative Performance of the students with respect to their faculties:

![Diagram 6.3: Faculty-wise Percentage of Communicative Performance]

The very first thing that emerges from the diagram is that none of the students from any faculty is able to transcend the average percentage. The highest score of the Communicative Performance is that of the students of English; however, it is also far below the average. It is 41.5%. As for the students from the other languages and the remaining faculties, none of them are able to transcend even 30%. The second highest percentage of the Communicative Performance is that of the students of Hindi and Marathi (27.3%), followed by the students of Sciences (26.0%). The Communicative Performance of the students of Social Sciences and Commerce is below 25%.

Let us now consider the Communicative Performance of the students with reference to their Sex and Residential Location. The following table gives the details of the data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Communicative Performance</th>
<th>Residential Location</th>
<th>Communicative Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.19</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>30.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32.21</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>26.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.12: Sex-wise and Location-wise Percentage of Communicative Performance
As the table indicates, the Communicative Performance of the female and the urban students is better than that of the male and the rural students respectively. In fact, the Communicative Performance of the female and the urban students is above 30%. Some of the conclusions regarding the Communicative Performance of the students are as follows:

1. The Communicative Performance of the students is below 50%.
2. The Communicative Performance of the students of English is better than that of the students of the other languages and the other faculties.
3. The Communicative Performance of the female students is better than that of the male students.
4. The Communicative Performance of the urban students is better than that of the rural students.
5. Since the Linguistic, Pragmatic and the Communicative Performances of the urban students are higher than those of the rural students, the urban students seem to have greater abilities with regard to the use of language.

Considering the relation between the Linguistic Performance and the Communicative Performance, the Linguistic Performance of the students is 30.85% and their Communicative Performance is 28.2%. It means that the Communicative Performance of the students is lower than their Linguistic Performance. This finding also does not support the hypothesis that the development of the Linguistic Competence entails the development of the Communicative Competence. In fact, we have already seen that there are certain students who are only ‘Grammatically Competent’ in their responses to the situations in the Part III of the Questionnaire. It means that these students have employed the grammatically correct responses though their responses are not appropriate with respect to the situation. It signifies that the Linguistic Performance of the students does not necessarily reflect their Communicative Performance.

6.2.8 Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance

The results emerging out of the assessment of the analyzed data confirm the important hypothesis of the present research that the Communicative Performance of the students does not correspond to their Communicative Competence. To illustrate this, we need to compare the Linguistic, Pragmatic and the Communicative Competences and Performances. In order that the difference between the Competence and the Performance is clear, the following tables juxtapose the data discussed above:
Even a cursory glance at the above tables indicates that there is a great difference between the Linguistic Competence and the Linguistic Performance of the students across all the classifications. The similar is the case with the Pragmatic Competence and the Pragmatic Performance and the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance. It means that the Communicative Performance of the students does not correspond to their respective Communicative Competence. The researcher may as well refer to other conclusions that are evident:

1. Both the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance of the students of English are better than that of the students of other languages and other faculties.

2. Though the Communicative Competence of the students of Sciences is better than the other students (except the students of English), their Communicative Performance is lower than that of the students of Hindi and Marathi.
3. In both the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance the female students are ahead of the male students.

4. Though there is no great difference between the Linguistic, Pragmatic and Communicative Competences of the urban and the rural students, the data shows that there is a considerable difference in the percentage of the Linguistic, Pragmatic and the Communicative Performances of the same students. Employing the terminology of Bialystok, the ‘knowledge’ aspect of the urban and the rural students is almost the same; but as for the ‘control’, the rural students are found poor in this respect. The probable reason for this situation is that the rural students do not use English, as generally is used by the urban students.

6.2.9 Communicative Strategies

Communicative strategies help the language user to compensate for the difficulties faced in the process of communication. It may happen that the student may not find the appropriate word or may not remember a word. At such junctures, the students are seen using words which are similar in meaning or words having more general meaning. There are many cases of such words. Most of the time, while using preposition, the students are seen using incorrect preposition, for examples, ‘on your mobile’, instead of ‘from your mobile’, ‘give me lift in your bike’ rather than ‘on your bike’, etc. The following is one of such examples:

‘my physical condition is not very well’ (3: 18)

It seems that the student want to say ‘I am ill’. But since it was not possible for the student to think of the proper words and the construction, the student has used the lengthy and in a way confusing construction. Another construction is ‘Don’t take tension’. In fact, the phrase ‘take tension’ is the literal translation of the Marathi phrase.

Many students, instead of using the word ‘friend’ in English have employed the Marathi word ‘yaar’. It seems that the students have thought the latter word to be more effective than the English word.

The Supportive Moves which are employed in order to support the core Speech Act of the response are another place where the communicative strategies are seen to be used. Students have used different communicative strategies while employing such supportive moves. The following are some of the examples:
‘It is not the proper way to use the notes’ (3: 7)
‘What are you saying?’ (4: 7), (14: 8) (showing disbelief)
‘It is very bad thing that’ (5: 8)
‘Are you mad?’ (6: 7)
‘Your new T-shirt is very nice, from which shop you bought it. I also want to bought the same piece.’ (8: 21)
‘Where you lost my notes?’ (9: 7)
‘You have to return my notes in any situation’ (11: 7)
‘this is not good thing’ (14: 7)
‘This is not fair’ (50: 7)
‘What can I say to my parents?’ (64: 8)
‘It is not good’ (79: 7), (86: 8)

All the above responses are the direct renderings from Marathi language. Many of the times, the complaint in Marathi is made with the help of showing disbelief or communicating that the speaker has dissatisfied with the behaviour of the addressee. As a result, the number of such responses is great.

The response in which the student asks the information of the shop where the friend has purchased the T-shirt is the case of potential miscommunication. In fact, the response may be taken as conveying the jealousy of the speaker in the non-Indian context. However, in the Indian context, it means that the speaker has sincerely liked the T-shirt and therefore wants to purchase one. Another of the response which might cause miscommunication is the one in which the speaker has referred to the parents: ‘What can I say to my parents?’ In fact such reference to the parents is a common phenomenon for the college students, because they think themselves responsible for their parents. In fact, the non-Indian reader of this sentence may get confused as to why the speaker should bring in the parents when the matter is between two friends. However, the fact remains that all the above responses communicate the Indian background of the students.

One of the most important hypotheses of the present study is that the Communicative Performance of the students, particularly, the communicative strategies employed by the students in their performance reflect the influence of their mother tongue. As has been discussed above, almost all the communicative strategies referred to above are the result of the L1 of the students. In fact, there is a great variation in the
influence: the cases of code-mixing are present, the cases of influence of the L1 in the use of preposition are evident, the cases of direct rendering of the L1 content are present and, moreover, the Indian ways of using language are also evident. At last, as pointed out earlier, the norm of the appropriateness of the responses is also Indian. Thus, it is clear that the influence of the L1 of the students is not limited only to the lexis and syntax of English; it goes well beyond them in that it is visible on the discourse and the pragmatic aspects of English as it is employed by the students. It means that the collected data supports the hypothesis referred to above.

6.2.10 ‘English for Communication’ Texts

In the light of the discussion of the syllabi provided in Chapter I, the role of the syllabi of ‘English for Communication’ needs to be considered for the acquisition of the communicative abilities. The following part is devoted to the discussion of this issue with reference to the faculty of the students:

**Commerce Faculty**: The syllabus of ‘English for Communication’ for these students consists of the technical topics like ‘writing business letters’, ‘use of English in advertising’, ‘English for marketing’ etc. and very less importance has been allotted to the face-to-face communication. Out of the total 14 units included in the course, one unit is ‘interview for a job’. This is the only unit which involves the face-to-face communication. In all other units, the students are simply and implicitly made aware of the way language varies from situation to situation. This can be one of the reasons of the lowest score of these students in Linguistic Competence, Pragmatic Competence and Communicative Competence. Similarly, in all the communicative situations, except in the situation of Expressing Gratitude, the lowest number of the ‘Communicatively Competent’ students is from this faculty. Moreover, the lowest percentage of the students who are ‘Communicatively Competent’, ‘Grammatically Competent’ and ‘Pragmatically Competent’ are from this faculty. It suggests that, in addition to the units dealing with technical communication, the syllabi of English for Communication for these students should also include some units dealing with the interpersonal use of English.

**Sciences Faculty**: In addition to the units dealing with some technical communication, the syllabus for this faculty includes some units related to the personal use of English language like ‘How to express your views and opinions’, ‘Talking about personal experience’ ‘Interacting in a Group-discussion’ and ‘How to face an interview’. Besides
these, the units dealing with the common errors in English are also prescribed. It means that these students have received some additional exposure to use English for communicative purposes which is not possible for the students of Commerce. This, therefore, can be one of the reasons of the Communicative Competence of the students (they stand second in terms of their Communicative Competence). However, the Communicative Performance of these students is lower than their Communicative Competence and they stand third in the rank.

**Students of Social Sciences, Other Languages and English**: All these students study in Arts Colleges where they have to study the paper ‘English for Communication’ for all the three years of their Undergraduation. Moreover, varied kinds of units have been prescribed in the syllabus: From the use of English for personal purposes (like ‘Introducing Yourself’, ‘Talking about Personal Experience’, ‘Giving Directions’, etc.) to technical and official use of English. However, if we look at their Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance, the communicative abilities of the students of Social Sciences are very low and are just above that of the students of Commerce. Though the Communicative Performance of the students of Hindi and Marathi is second in the rank, their Communicative Competence is third in the rank. Students of English are first in the rank in terms of both their Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance.

The most striking thing about the performance of these students is the variation in their abilities. The basic question here is ‘how to account for the varying abilities of these students?’ It also means that the syllabus is not the only factor which is responsible for the variation, because all of these students have learned the same units. In fact, the case of the students of English can be different since they have learned English as a Special subject at the Undergraduate level and as Entire English at the Post Graduate level. Still, the Communicative Competence of the students is just above the 50% and their Communicative Performance is just above 30%. In this context, the basic question is: does the syllabus help the students to achieve Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance?

In fact, as has been asserted earlier, there is nothing wrong in the syllabus since it assigns almost balanced importance to the development of both the Linguistic and the Pragmatic Competences. Moreover, to ensure the required exposure to the students, it also includes the ‘Pair-work’ and the ‘Group-work’ activities. However, as Agnihotri (2001) hints at, the answer for the problem is to be sought in the teaching practice.
Consciously or unconsciously, the teachers of English are more particular about the grammatical and the linguistic aspect at the cost of the communicative abilities. Even the communicative activities are taught in terms of the grammaticality of the sentences. However, it does not mean that the teachers should not care for the grammaticality of the language. Quite the contrary, the researcher thinks that the balanced focus on both the grammatical and the communicative activities will surely help the students to improve their Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance.

6.2.11 Problems the Students Face in Effective Communication

After accepting the view that most of the students have already acquired the Pragmatic Competence, we can concentrate on the problems the students face in communicating effectively. In communication the students have to employ the target language in order to perform the already acquired functions. However, many students seem to lack in the ability to convey their meaning across. The most probable reason for this is their inability to use grammatically correct and comprehensible language. In fact, as has been discussed earlier, the Linguistic Competence of the students is 50.0% and the Linguistic Performance is 30.85%. Considering the Linguistic Performance reflected in their responses, we may say that many of the students are incompetent because they are unable to use grammatically correct and comprehensible language. Many of the time, the students have used English language as they think in Marathi. The following are some of the examples:

*First she attend the class and consciously to listening the lecture then she has not understood then I tell her that in our library there is available the book on this topic then you will understand easily because language is simple in that book.* (26: 13)

*Friend sorry I cannot mony on home.* (91: 16)

*Read your this is book means the understanding the your chapter.* (103: 13)

*I know that the correct Answer is option D but for your convienience, we can see in the text itself What is the correct answer.* (5: 11)

The language in the above responses is ungrammatical to such an extent that it is not possible to comprehend what the students want to say. The above examples and the similar examples received in the data help us say that if the students can learn how to
communicate with the help of English language, it is possible for them to convey their meaning across easily.

There are some other kinds of error which the students are generally seen committing in the connected discourse: Many students have not employed the inverted construction in Interrogative Sentences. For examples:

‘You will drop me?’ (3: 1)
‘How you have lost those notes?’ (5: 7)

Students do not seem to care for the correct use of the plural marker:

‘some economical problem’ (3: 16)
‘because of some problem’ (21: 16)
‘this notes’ (22: 7)

Many times the students are seen unable to use conditional sentences which lead to the incomprehensibility of the response:

‘I will be there if my mother was not ill’ (4: 5)

Students are seen confusing in the use of correct tense required in the situation:

‘I will surely brought it tomorrow’ (4: 17)

Besides these mistakes, there are innumerable errors related to the use of the correct preposition and the correct article which cause difficulty in the understanding of the responses.

It seems that if the students are able to employ the grammatically correct language, many of the problems for effective communication will be solved.

6.3 Proposed Model for the Improvement of Communicative Competence and Performance

In Chapter II, the models provided by the scholars from the American Midwest have been discussed followed by the objection to the models with reference to the arguments of the linguists from both India and abroad. At this stage, it is essential to pinpoint the most comprehensive model of Communicative Competence. The researcher thinks that the model of Celce-Murica (2007) is the most comprehensive of all, because she has included almost everything related to the production of the grammatical, appropriate, and cohesive language. However, the model seems to be a little
complicated. The theoretical model needs to be implemented for the practical purposes and such a complicated model might pose certain problems.

Similarly, in the context of the responses cited above, it seems that the opinions of the linguists like Sridhar and Sridhar, Braj Kachru, Cook, Bearns, Saville-Troike, Shinde, etc. is correct when they argue that Indian English has been nativized in India and has evolved its own norms of appropriateness. Therefore, while accepting the appropriate model of Communicative Competence, care must be taken of the following issues:

1. The model must be simple
2. It must be practicable
3. It must account for the Indian norms of appropriateness
4. Different competences involved in the model should be well connected to one another.

Since every model projected by the linguists from Canale and Swain to Celce-Murica suffers from the ‘native speaker fallacy’ and none of them can be accepted because they cannot account for the Communicative Competence of the Indian students of English. For example, when the students have used the Imperative Sentence with a Politeness marker ‘please’ to request the Professor, or when the students have used the response ‘Thank you sir’ to show their sense of gratitude, they have been treated as acceptable and appropriate. However, none of the model presented by the Western scholars will treat these and such responses as appropriate, since they are specifically concerned with the ‘native-like’ acquisition of both the grammatical and the pragmatic abilities. Such a level of competence is very difficult to attain in the contexts like that of India. Therefore, the models are not suitable for the present case.

The researcher therefore thinks that whenever the abilities of the language learner are assessed, both the aspects (grammatical and pragmatic) need to be considered in the company of each other. The researcher wants to present the following crude model of Communicative Competence, which fulfils all the above criteria and will be useful for the improvement of the Communicative Competence and Performance of the students:

The researcher here does not intend to present a totally innovative model, because the earlier models are also prepared taking into account the nature of communication. Therefore, we should not throw the baby with the bathwater. Since most of the ingredients of the earlier models of Communicative Competence are useful,
they will be retained and rearranged to suit the purpose at hand. Moreover, the researcher is of the view that the model of Communicative Competence should be as simple as possible so that it can be implemented in both language teaching and language testing activities.

As the above discussion underlines, while preparing a model of Communicative Competence, we need to adopt pragmatic perspective rather than linguistic, because pragmatics includes not only the language knowledge but the ways in which language is employed for a social purpose. That is to say, rather than assessing language devoid of any real social purpose, we need to include social use of language in assessment. Such an integrative perspective may be achieved with the use of the two words employed by both Leech (1983:11) and Thomas (1983). They have classified general pragmatics into two categories: Pragmalinguistics and Sociopragmatics. Pragmalinguistics has its orientations toward grammar, whereas Sociopragmatics has toward society and its culture. Pragmalinguistics refers to the resources for conveying communicative acts and relational or interpersonal meaning. Such resources include pragmatic strategies such as directness and indirectness, routines and a large range of linguistic forms which can intensify or soften communicative acts. Sociopragmatics is ‘the sociological interface of pragmatics’ (Leech, 1983:10). By this Leech means the social perceptions underlying the participants’ interpretation and performance of the communicative action. Speech communities differ in their assessment of speakers’ and hearers’ social distance and social power, their rights and obligations, and the degree of imposition involved in particular communicative acts. Accepting these two terms, on the basis of the focus of the present study, the researcher proposes the following model of Communicative Competence:

I **Pragmalinguistic Competence**, which includes:

1. Linguistic Competence
2. Discourse Competence

II **Sociopragmatic Competence**, including:

1. Sociolinguistic Competence
2. Socio-cultural Competence including Conversational and Actional Competence
3. Illocutionary Competence

III: **Strategic Competence**, including Formulaic Competence
Discussion: The very first thing that will strike is the grouping of the different competencies of the model under the three broad heads. The reason of using the terms ‘Pragmalinguistic’ and ‘Sociopragmatic’ as group terms is that their use provides a link between the two orientations of the model: linguistic and social. In the earlier models such link has not been explicitly rendered. The model explicitly indicates that the two types of knowledge, linguistic and social, are not independent of each other; rather, they are complementary to each other. Language is a social entity and transmits and preserves the social values. Therefore, they should be discussed together. They cannot be separated from each other.

Since each of the components used in the model are discussed earlier in the models elaborated by the earlier linguists, there is no need to repeat what they mean. However, the researcher is expected to mention what he means by them and the logic of choosing them rather than the other ones. Therefore, the researcher intends to elaborate each of the ingredients of the model:

**Linguistic Competence:** The researcher will use the term “Linguistic Competence” rather than ‘Grammatical Competence’ because grammar does not include everything of linguistics. Grammar will include the rules of syntax and at most those of morphology. That is to say, it is limited in its scope and cannot include the total of the meaning of ‘linguistics’. Linguistic Competence refers to the phonological, graphological, lexical, morphological, syntactic and semantic abilities of the language user. All these levels, though separated for convenience, do interact with each other.

**Discourse Competence:** It means the rules with the help of which the larger chunks of language are created out of the smaller ones. It includes the concepts of ‘Cohesion’ and ‘Coherence’. The researcher has included this competence in Pragmalinguistics because it is related to Linguistic Competence, though some part of it like ‘dexis’ is on the verge of both linguistic and sociolinguistic knowledge. Cohesion, as has been discussed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) refers to the grammatical links between two or more grammatical units, whereas coherence refers to the semantic link underlying the discourse. Thus, both of them are akin to Linguistic Competence rather than to any other competence of the model.

**Sociolinguistic Competence:** It is used in the sense of the knowledge of different varieties of language like dialects, sociolects, registers, etc. Thus, it is the ability of selecting appropriate linguistic form to achieve the communicative purpose. The basic concern of Sociolinguistics as a branch of Linguistics is with the variation in the use of
language. In the present context, also, the word is used in the same sense. It is expected that the learner should possess the knowledge of the varieties of language so that he may employ them as and when required. This variation in language use is dependent upon the social factors like age, status, familiarity, gender, role, relationship, etc. Therefore it is included under Sociopragmatic group.

**Socio-cultural Competence:** This competence includes competences like Conversational Competence and Actional Competence. At this point it is essential to make a distinction between Sociolinguistic and Socio-cultural Competence. As pointed out earlier, Sociolinguistic Competence is concerned with the knowledge of the varieties of language, whereas Socio-cultural Competence is basically concerned with the knowledge of society without reference to language. Cultural norms here are important rather than the linguistic norms. The difference, therefore, is basically of orientation. Socio-cultural Competence refers to the beliefs, attitudes, and the ways of interpretation underlying the behaviour of the members of the speech community. For example, the degree of imposition and the requirement of showing Politeness in a specific situation will vary from culture to culture. Therefore, the social information regarding the participants like their culture, gender, age, social class, familiarity, and their role in the interaction is important. These are non-linguistic factors but are essential to linguistic communication, because the language user employs strategies to show his awareness of these cultural norms.

Actional competence has already been discussed by Celce-Murica (2007); therefore, there is no need to discuss it again. However, Conversational Competence needs to be discussed in some details. By Conversational Competence, it is meant that the learner should have some knowledge of the way conversation takes place in that speech community. Every speech community has its own norms of conversation: When to speak, when to take turns and change it, how to interpret the behaviour of the others, when to be silent, when to pause, when to interrupt the others, etc.

**Illocutionary Competence:** This competence will be understood as it has been understood by Bachman (1990). It is based on the concept of ‘Illocutionary Force’ in Speech Act Theory explained by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). By Illocutionary Act, Austin means the intention of the speaker in uttering a particular piece of language. Austin relates this act to the functions performed by the utterance. These functions are like requesting, apologizing, complaining, etc. which are, in turn, derived from Halliday’s (1973, 1978) notion of the functions of language. One of the important
aspects of the theory of Speech Act is that the speaker, it is maintained, when he will select the linguistic elements in his utterance, he will do so with reference to his intentions. That is to say when language will be used by the speaker, he will be careful to select and use only such a language that will clearly convey his intention. Therefore, the speaker should be aware of the restriction which the social context imposes upon the choice of language and the communication of his intentions. By Illocutionary Competence is meant that the learner should be able to communicate his intention using the language and also be able to identify the intention of the others.

**Strategic Competence:** Strategic Competence means the mastery of the communication strategies. Faerch and Kasper (1983) define communication strategic as ‘potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular goal’. Thus, they present two criteria for communicative strategies: problem orientedness and potential consciousness, the first of these is widely considered to be essential. Most researchers now agree that the main purpose of the communication strategies is to manage communication problems.

In the definition of the communication strategies, three words emerge as prominent— technique, problem, and guiding toward a communication goal. On this basis, communication strategies could be regarded as techniques or skills used by the speaker and hearer when he faces a problem in communicating or understanding a communicative goal. The inclusion of this competence in Communicative Competence is important because, regardless of the experience and proficiency in any language, one cannot claim to know all the language. Such a communication strategy will help the speaker/listener when his knowledge is inadequate for the purpose in hand. Thus, it could be seen as problem solving strategy. Moreover, such a strategy will be either linguistic in its nature or extra-linguistic, in that the language user may sometimes use tact to sound Polite and appropriate in the given situation. Such a social strategy, therefore, will be included in this competence. Quite interestingly earlier models of Communicative Competence do not include such orientation in Strategic Competence.

**Formulaic Competence:** This competence, as it has been used to by Celce-Murcia (2007), refers to the language users’ knowledge of the chunks of language which are remembered by heart and produced as and when required. The difference between the formulaic speech and the normal speech is that the normal speech is processed in the cognitive make-up of the individual, whereas the formulaic speech is not processed and is produced as it is. Most of the time, L2 learners remember some part of the L2 in this
manner and such remembered part is produced when required. The researcher includes this competence in Strategic Competence because Formulaic Competence can be seen as a type of a communication strategy.

The researcher intends to repeat that this is the simplified model of Communicative Competence prepared basically for the present research in order to assess the performance of the students under investigation. The researcher also believes that these students should have mastery over the specified aspects of the model so that it will be possible for them to use language for their purposes. That is to say, if the students are able to acquire these abilities, it may be said that, they will be able to improve their Communicative Performance as well.

Another important point needs to be made here, that is, the distinction between Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance. In the literature cited, it could be seen that there is no agreement over the distinction between Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance. Opinions vary to a great extent. Halliday’s is the extreme view in which he maintains that the ability of using language should not be considered in terms of competence and performance, which is associated with ‘intra-organism’ perspective. He strongly opposes the distinction between Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance. However, Hymes is somewhat liberal and accepts the distinction explicitly by using the terms like ‘knowledge’ and ‘ability for use’. Other theoreticians, however, like Canale, Swain, Bachman seems to be distinguishing them. In the present research the distinction is made for the sake of convenience to assess both the communicative knowledge of the students and their communicative ability to use it.

6.4 Pedagogical Implications

The findings of the present research imply the following pedagogical considerations: As elaborated in the study, the ultimate objective of language learning or language teaching is the acquisition of Communicative Competence and the ability for Communicative Performance. Once the objective is set, the next issue is to trace how the objective is attained. The model of Communicative Competence presented above offers the answer to this query. Out of the different competencies included in the above model, the Socio-cultural Competence, and the Illocutionary Competence have already been achieved by the students when they have learned their first language. The question needs to be addressed only in terms of the remaining competences: Linguistic
Competence, Discourse Competence, Sociolinguistic Competence and Strategic Competence.

It seems that there are at least three principles of language teaching which can help achieve these competences:

1. Use of Speech Acts
2. Use of Communicative Strategic
3. Provision of enough/ necessary exposure

They are further discussed as follows:

1. Use of Speech Acts:

   The researcher believes that instead of teaching language as it is taught traditionally (teaching language without reference to the social context and its communicative functions), language should be taught in terms of Speech Acts. Speech Acts have been defined and elaborated by various linguists and Austin (1962) has contended that the total language consists of Speech Acts. Accepting this view, we may say that a language can be taught with the help of the Speech Acts it contains. There are various benefits of this approach:

   a. Specific linguistic elements can be focused so that students will not commit mistakes in the use of that linguistic element in future.
   b. The functions for which the forms are employed are clarified.
   c. Different linguistic forms expressing the same function can be taught.
   d. Different functions associated with a specific form can be elaborated.
   e. Students may realize language variations and different reasons of its variations like social context, age, sex, status of the participants, etc.
   f. Exposure to limited linguistic forms at a time may provide better results.
   g. Students can be asked to perform different functions with different linguistic forms, leading to natural communication in the classroom.
   h. It will make the students aware of the different ‘degrees of politeness’ required in different situation involving different participants.

   No doubt, while teaching language with the help of Speech Acts, care must be taken to use only those Speech Acts which are appropriate with reference to the Indian norms of appropriateness. If the teacher thinks that the students needs to be made aware of the
difference between the Indian and the Western models of appropriateness, he may contrast the possible form of the Speech Acts probably used by the native speaker of the language.

2. Communicative Strategies:

   Strategic Competence is essentially a problem solving mechanism in that it helps the learners to solve the problem they face in communicating effectively. The researcher thinks that if the students are taught different kinds of strategies employed in different kinds of problems, it will be possible to develop the cognitive make-up of the students so that they can employ such strategies when they find similar problems and will be able to communicate effectively.

3. Provision of enough/necessary exposure:

   The researcher is of the opinion that if the students are provided enough receptive and productive exposure in the target language, it will be possible for them to practice whatever linguistic forms they have learned for the real social purposes. Similarly, the principle of ‘practice makes man perfect’ will be helpful for the students, because such a practice of the exposure will help students remember some of the formulaic chunks to be produced as and when required.

6.5 Suggestions for Further Research

   Since research study is concerned with the Communicative Competence and Performance of the post-graduate level, the topic may further be explored in the context of the Oral Production of Speech Acts. Similarly, some other topics are: A Longitudinal Study of Teaching Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance using the pedagogical considerations and the model of Communicative Competence and Performance proposed in the present research, a Comprehensive Study of the Norms of Appropriateness for different Speech Acts across different variables in terms of P, D and R factors, Communicative Strategies in Connected Discourse, the Realization of Individual Speech Acts and the preference for the Semantic Strategies and a Comparative Study of the Politeness Strategies employed by the native and the non-native speakers.

6.6 Concluding Observations

   When we discuss the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance of the post-graduate students studied for the research, we arrive at the
general conclusion that the students of English from the Arts faculty fare the best, whereas the students of Other Languages i.e. Hindi and Marathi lack in proper competence and do not perform well. The students of the Sciences faculty perform better, their medium of instruction being English. The students of the faculties of Social Sciences and Commerce possess less competence and consequently, perform also in the least satisfactory manner. The reasons for the weak Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance are the lack of proper exposure to English and also the proper training in Communication Skills. Hence, as the research suggests, it is necessary to concentrate more on the improvement of Competence and Performance of the students from the Social Sciences and Commerce faculties. The present study ascertains the hypotheses held in the beginning of the research work and emphatically illustrates:

1. Linguistic Competence is not sufficient for successful communication; it also needs Pragmatic Competence.
2. The development of the Linguistic Competence of the post-graduate students does not necessarily entail the development of their Communicative Competence.
3. The Communicative Performance of these students does not correspond to their Communicative Competence.
4. The Communicative Performance, particularly with reference to the communicative strategies employed by the students, reflects the influence of the mother tongue of these students.
5. The norms of appropriateness for the students are, most of the time, the Indian norms of appropriateness.
6. The Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance of the students of English is higher than that of the students of other subjects and other faculties.
7. There is no difference between the Communicative Competence of the urban and the rural students; but such a difference is present in their Communicative Performance.
8. In regard to both the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance, the female students are better in their abilities than the male students.