CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Preview

The present research is basically undertaken in order to explore the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance of the post-graduate students of Shivaji University. From this point of view, in this chapter, the researcher discusses the introductory account of the issues related to the present study. The Chapter is divided into five parts. Part I is the introduction to the two important concepts utilized for the present research: Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance. The study investigates the communicative abilities of the Indian non-native students of English who learn it as a second language. This requires the consideration of the second language learning theories. As a result, Part II provides the developmental account of the SLA theories and their contribution for the acquisition of Communicative Competence. The importance of learning English and the status of English in India are discussed in Part III. This Part elaborates the specific users of English in India and its uses. Moreover, the role of English in Primary, Secondary, Higher-Secondary, Undergraduate and Post-graduate levels in Indian educational system is hashed out in details. Any research is established into its tradition; therefore, the discussion of the work already done on the topic is essential, which is considered in Part IV. Part V considers the rationale for the selection of the research topic with the help of the statement of the research problems followed by the aims and objectives of the present research and its limitations.

1.1 ‘Communicative Competence’ and ‘Communicative Performance’

Since the present research is concerned with the assessment of Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance, it is essential, at the outset, to understand the meaning of the basic terms employed in the research: ‘Communicative Competence’ and ‘Communicative Performance’. The terms are used by Hymes (1972) in his paper: ‘On Communicative Competence’. In fact, Hymes uses the terms as a reaction against the stronger version (Campbell and Wales, 1970) of the notions of ‘Competence’ and ‘Performance’ introduced by Chomsky (1965). Chomsky uses these
terms both in strong and weak senses. Canale and Swain (1980) quote the following passage from Chomsky to designate the weaker sense of the terms:

We thus make fundamental distinction between *competence* (the speaker-hearer’s knowledge of his language) and *performance* (the actual use of language in concrete situations)...In actual fact, it [performance] obviously could not directly reflect competence. A record of natural speech will show numerous false starts, deviations from rules, changes of plan in mid-course, and so on. (1965: 4)

In the stronger version, Chomsky brings in the ideal native speaker and asserts that Competence is the linguistic system of such a speaker. Performance, on the other hand, is concerned mainly with the psychological factors involved in the perception and production of speech. Thus, according to Chomsky, only the ideal native speaker-hearer has Competence or that such a person should be the model of competence studies.

According to Hymes, Chomsky’s concept does not account for the differences in language as it is used by actual speaker-hearer and also that the socio-cultural factors have not been given an explicit and constitutive role. In the theory of Chomsky, Hymes continues:

Acquisition of Competence is also seen as essentially independent of socio-cultural features, requiring only suitable speech in the environment of the child to develop. (1972: 271)

Competence, or as Hymes prefers to call it, ‘Linguistic Competence’ of Chomsky is concerned with the knowledge of the grammaticality and no reference is made to the competence of socio-cultural rules which help the language user to use language appropriately.

Performance, for Chomsky, is concerned with the use of Competence in actual situations. Thus, Performance alone is concerned with the criteria of acceptability. But even in the theory of Performance, the socio-cultural factors are neglected ‘since for Transformational Generative Grammar, Performance is conceived to be psychological by-product of the analysis of grammar’ (Hymes, ibid). According to Hymes, this ignorance of socio-cultural rules is not accidental and also not for the sake of simplification. For Chomsky, Competence is ideal and Performance is imperfect. This dichotomy, says Hymes, is a Garden of Eden view. To oppose this excessive dominance
of grammar in this theory, Hymes says that ‘there are rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless’.

In the view of Chomsky (1965: 9), Performance should be equated with ‘language use’ ‘the theory of language use– the theory of Performance’. However, there are certain difficulties in equating ‘language use’ with Performance, as it is conceived by Chomsky, for in Performance, almost everything of socio-cultural significance is omitted and attention is focused upon such questions as ‘which among grammatical sentences are most likely to be produced, easily understood, less clumsy, in some sense more natural’ (quoted in Hymes, 1972: 280). There is, thus, confusion about the use of the word ‘Performance’ in Chomsky. According to Hymes there are two ways in which ‘performance’ could be understood:

1. (Underlying) Competence vs. (actual) Performance; and
2. (Underlying) Grammatical Competence vs. (underlying) models/rules of Performance.

(1972: 280)

As a result, Hymes maintains that in order to incorporate the socio-cultural in linguistic theory, one must transcend the present formulation of the dichotomy of Competence and Performance as presented by Chomsky.

It is in this context that Hymes proposes his concepts of Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance. Hymes maintains that the knowledge of the rules of language is almost always insufficient to enable the speaker to use language for any natural communication. It requires some other knowledge as well. Thus, Hymes includes four kinds of knowledge in his concept of Communicative Competence: Possibility, Feasibility, Appropriateness, and Occurrence. All these four judgments are available in the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance of the individual. By Competence, Hymes (1972: 282) means the capabilities of a person which are dependent on both the ‘tacit knowledge’ and ‘ability for use’. Thus, for Hymes, knowledge is distinct from both Competence and Performance. Communicative Competence, for Hymes, consists of ‘knowledge’ and ‘ability for use’ and both these factors pertain to each of the four parameters specified above. As Widdowson (1989: 130-133) puts it, Hymes’ Communicative Competence includes eight types of judgments: knowledge of possibility, feasibility, appropriateness and occurrence and ability for use of what is possible, feasible, appropriate and done. These four kinds of
knowledge will be elaborated in detail in the next chapter. However, it is sufficient to point out that Hymes is responsible for bringing in the social knowledge in the construct of language knowledge.

As for Communicative Performance, Hymes argues that there is never one-to-one correspondence between the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance. For Hymes, Communicative Performance includes the following three components and the interrelations among them:

1. Communicative Competence of the self (knowledge, ability for use)
2. Communicative Competence of the others
3. The properties of the speech event itself

Thus, Communicative Performance interacts with the social context surrounding the language use, the Communicative Competence of the other participants and the Communicative Competence of the addresser.

Almost at the same time, Halliday (1973, 9176 and 1978) proposed his theory of ‘Meaning Potential’. He asserts, ‘learning a language is learning the meaning potential of the language’ (1978: 19). Canale and Swain (1980) observe that Halliday’s notion of ‘meaning potential’ ‘is not unlike’ Hymes’ notion of Communicative Competence in that both Hymes and Halliday consider that learning a language is not limited only to the learning of the grammatical rules of language. Rather, it includes many socio-cultural and contextual factors.

With the assertions of both Hymes and Halliday, the scholars working in the area of language acquisition tried to account for the acquisition of such a Communicative Competence by proposing their theories. Gradually, the realization made the scholars working in the paradigm of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) to change the objective of language learning and substitute it by a comprehensive competence like the Communicative Competence. It explains the shift from the Cognitivist model of Second Language Acquisition (influenced by Chomsky’s notion of Universal Grammar) to the Socially-oriented models of SLA. With the growth and development in the latter models, the notion of Communicative Competence is firmly established as the ultimate goal of language learning.

Simultaneous with the development of the SLA theories to account for the acquisition of Communicative Competence, there is a similar development in the model of the Communicative Competence, as well. Since both Hymes and Halliday have
proposed their respective theories of Communicative Competence and Meaning Potential in the context of first language acquisition, scholars investigated the possibilities of ‘recontextualizing’ (Leung, 2005) the model in the context of second and foreign language learning. The outcome is the different models of Communicative Competence: Canale and Swain (1980), Canale (1983), Van Ek (1987), Bachman (1990), Bachman and Palmer (1997), Celce-Murcia, et al. (1995), and Celce-Murcia (2007). Taking different theoretical starting points, these scholars tried to prepare their model to suit their respective needs. It explains the variety of the components the scholars included into their models and the importance they allotted to different constructs of the model. However, there are certain common competences which are included into almost every model: Linguistic Competence, Sociolinguistic Competence, Discourse Competence, Strategic Competence, etc. Each of these models of Communicative Competence will be elaborately discussed in the next chapter.

What this discussion underlines is that the acquisition of the Communicative Competence and the abilities of Communicative Performance have been accepted as the ultimate goal of language learning. Since the researcher is concerned with the investigation of the Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance of the Indian students who have been learning English as a second language for not less than 10 years, it seems essential here to refer to the development of the Second Language Acquisition theories. Thus, in the following part, the researcher will provide the account of the SLA theories and the way they are useful for the acquisition of Communicative Competence. The discussion of the theories is largely based on the account of SLA rendered by Johnson (2004).

1.2 Theories of Second Language Learning

Asserting that Communicative Competence should be the ultimate goal of language learning is not sufficient. We need to point out the ways and the processes through which such a competence is acquired. According to Hymes (1972: 278-79), Communicative Competence develops in the same social-developmental matrix in which the Linguistic Competence develops. However, simply pointing to the social-developmental matrix will not help us here. For one thing, the social-developmental matrix in the present situation is generally the classroom because the learners do not seem to use language outside the classroom context. Therefore, we need to think of the acquisition of the Communicative Competence in the classroom context.
Such a discussion of the acquisition of Communicative Competence in Second and Foreign Language context has been crystallized by Saville-Troike (1996: 374-75). According to her, there are three sources through which Communicative Competence can be acquired: (1) Formal Education, (2) Social Interaction, and (3) Multilingual Context. All of these sources rely on the way language is learned. Therefore, it is imperative here to elaborately discuss the theories of language learning, more particularly those related to the second or foreign language.

The theory of language learning refers to the psycholinguistic and cognitive processes involved in language learning and the condition required for learning a language. Corresponding to these factors, there are two types of language learning theories: Process-oriented and Condition-oriented. The following pages provide a detailed account of the theories of second language acquisition.

Having its beginning in the Behaviourist tradition of learning, the development of research in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) could be stressed through the traditions of psychology and sociology and their ancillary branches: Behaviourist model of language learning i.e. Contrastive Analysis to cognitively oriented UG models of Chomsky and IIO (Input-Interaction-Output) models of 1990s to socio-cultural models of Canale and Swain and Bachman to socio-cognitive approaches of Vygotsky and Bakthin. This part will deal with the development of the theories of Second Language Acquisition through these different stages with particular attention to the learning theories foregrounded in these stages. Simultaneously, the researcher will try to elaborate the usefulness of each of these theories for the acquisition of Communicative Competence.

1.2.1 Behaviourism and SLA

Behaviourism, as a learning theory, is generally traced back to Aristotle and his essay “Memory” that focuses on the association being made between events like lightning and thunder. Subsequently, other philosophers like Hobbes, Hume, Brown, Bain, and Ebbinghause followed Aristotle. More recently, Pavlov, Watson, Thorndike and Skinner are responsible for the developments in the theory. Although the term ‘behaviourism’ is credited to Watson, it is the work of Skinner that represents the culmination of the behaviourist theory of learning. Behaviourism as a learning theory prevailed until the end of the 1960s. This theory saw learning as a straightforward
process of response (R) to stimuli (S). The reward or reinforcement of the process is believed to strengthen the response.

The 1940s to the 1960s are the heydays of Behaviourism in Linguistics in general and Second Language Acquisition in particular. In the Second Language context, the most explicit manifestation of the assumptions of Behaviourism is encountered in the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) and Audio-lingual method. The focus in behaviourist theories of learning is on the external environment. Learning is considered a process of habit formation – a process of making a link between stimuli and response. Therefore, the link is to be ‘reinforced’, ‘observed’, ‘corrected’ and ‘practiced’. The principle– practice makes man perfect– is followed very closely.

The mental processes of the learner like consciousness and introspection do not have any role to play in this theory. Rather, they are disregarded because the mental processes are not externally observable. This explains why the subjects are treated like objects in the laboratories without any thought or feelings. The subjects’ behaviour was manipulated, and the relation between S and R is statically established. S is seen as an independent variable, selected, manipulated and controlled by the researcher, whereas R is treated as dependent variable. Spillane in this regard asserts that ‘the mind at work cannot be observed, tested, or understood’ therefore, Behaviourists are concerned with the explicit actions of the learners (2002: 380).

**Contrastive Analysis (CA)**

Contrastive Analysis, as a method in SLA, involves elaborated description of the native and the target languages of the learner. The goal of Contrastive Analysis was to formulate teaching materials that would prevent the learner from acquiring wrong habits– making errors. In Europe, Contrastive Analysis is considered as an integral part of general linguistic theory and as such its goal is to understand and explain the nature of natural languages. In the United States, however, Contrastive Analysis has strong pedagogical foundations. Two theoretical traditions in America provided general principles for Contrastive Analysis: Behaviourism– a theory of learning, and Structuralism– a theory of language. Language learning (both L1 and L2) is seen as similar to the behaviourist theories of learning. Learning is said to be advanced by making ‘a stimulus-response connection, by creating new habits by means of reinforcement and practice of the established links between stimuli and response’
In accordance with the behaviourist theories, Contrastive Analysis undermined the role of mental processes in language learning.

In the Structural Theory, language is viewed as a structural phenomenon. It is structured hierarchically on the following levels: phones, phonemes, morphemes, phrases, clauses and sentences. In this tradition, learning is viewed as acquiring mastery of these structural units and rules for combining these units. Thus, language learning is considered in terms of the building blocks of pyramids as presented in the following diagram:

![Figure 1.1 Structural view of language learning](Johnson, 2004: 21)

Following the structural model of language, it was believed that it is possible to conduct a thorough investigation of the structural characteristic of each linguistic unit independent of other levels.

Second Language Teaching in this model followed the path of Structural Linguistics in that it starts with the phonetic level and when this level is mastered the next unit in the hierarchy presented above is introduced. As in the case of the first language, second language learning is also viewed as a process of habit formation. However, it is different in that the old habits (of the first language) are viewed as the difficulties in second language learning process. Charles Fries, in his Forward to Lado’s *Linguistics Across Cultures*, writes:

> Learning a second language, therefore, constitutes a very different task from learning the first language. The basic problems arise not out of any essential difficulty in the features of the new language themselves but primarily out of the special ‘set’ created by the first language habits.
Robert Lado was the first to grasp the significance of these basic facts for the building of efficient valid measures of achievement and progress in mastering a foreign language. (1957)

According to Lado (1957), learners are in the habit of transferring the old habits to the new language. Such transfers are classified into two types: positive, when it facilitates the learning of the second language; and, negative, when the earlier habits restrict or create difficulties in the learning process. Transfer, according to Lado, is available both in the production and the reception of the second language.

There are two versions of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis: Stronger or *a priori* version and weaker version or *a posteriori* version. In the stronger version, on the basis of the comparison of the descriptions of the first and the second language, the difficulties on all levels of language in learning are predicted in advance. On the contrary, in the weaker version the recurring difficulties in the learning process are stressed and are accounted for the differences between the learner’s native and the target languages.

The stronger version is largely criticized for both theoretical and empirical reasons. The theoretical criticism is that the teacher may not be in the position to compare objectively the different languages of the world. Empirical findings have shown that not all the predicted difficulties are actually observed in the learner performance. However, in both these versions, learner errors are regarded as ‘sins’ and bad habits and are to be avoided at all cost. As for the usefulness of Behaviourist theory of language learning for the acquisition of Communicative Competence, the theory cannot account for such a competence. The reasons seem to be that it is based on the structural view of language in which no reference to the social context is attributed. Second, it seems to lay more emphasis on the grammatical knowledge at the cost of the knowledge of the appropriateness of language use and subsequently concerned with the comparison of languages in void. Similarly, the learner development does not correspond to the building-blocks in which language is said to be structured. Moreover, the major focus of this theory is up to the sentence level of language, whereas Communicative Competence essentially transcends the sentence level to encompass the discourse level of language.

In 1959, Chomsky attacked Skinner and his behaviourist theories. Chomsky refers particularly to ‘the poverty of stimulus argument’. This attack is viewed as one of
the important reasons leading to the change from the behaviourist to the cognitive perspective.

1.2.2 Cognitive-Computational Models:

The Cognitive Models of SLA are totally different from the earlier Behaviourist Models in that their major concern is with the inner/mental states of the individual learner which were denied any role to play in the learning process in the behaviourist tradition. Johnson (2004) divides the Cognitive-Computational theories in two categories:

1. The Older Version – called hypothetico-deductive or logico-deductive model associated primarily with Chomsky and his Universal Grammar (UG)
2. The New Version – called more popularly Information-Processing-Computational model

The Older Version: This tradition in cognitive science is embedded in Cartesian philosophy and his dictum: I think; therefore, I exist. According to Cartesian, human mind is superior to human body. Therefore, the main focus of the scientific investigation should be human mind and not human behaviour. Thus, unlike behaviourism in which outward bahaviour is scientific, the cognitive school views the inward behaviour as scientific and as such thinks that it should be the focus of scientific investigation. The problem of inaccessibility of inner behaviour is solved by using the ‘hypothetico-deductive’ or ‘logico-deductive’ method of inquiry. In contrast to the behaviourist tradition, “subjects’ own interpretation of the elicited behaviour and understanding of the investigated mental phenomenon are taken into consideration” (Johnson, 2004: 12). For example, the intuitive judgments of the subjects regarding grammaticality or ungrammaticality of the sentences are used both in Chomsky’s theory of UG and SLA theories based on UG. In SLA context, such type of grammaticality judgments of the non-native are considered to be helpful to know their accessibility to Language Acquisition Device (LAD). This cognitive orientation is also seen in the way the scope of linguistic theory in general is restricted to the cognitive aspects of language. The two very prominent linguists who have shaped the nature of linguistics itself in 20th century are Ferdinand de Saussure and Noam Chomsky and both of them have restricted the concern of linguistics to the cognitive aspects of language— for
Saussure linguistics should restrict itself to the study of ‘la langue’, whereas Chomsky’s theory accounts for the competence of the ideal native speaker-listener. This cognitive orientation of linguistic theories also explains the importance of cognitive tradition in SLA research. For that matter, in considering the history and development of SLA, the linguistic tradition in SLA will be discussed in the cognitive tradition.

**Chomsky’s Theory of Universal Grammar**

Besides the cognitive tradition, the course of SLA is also influenced by Noam Chomsky’s linguistic theory and the theories of first language acquisition which, in turn, as pointed out earlier, represent the cognitive considerations. Chomsky (1965, 1980, 1981a, b) argues for the existence of an innate domain specific language faculty which is indispensible for acquiring the first language. Chomsky calls this innate faculty ‘Language Acquisition Device’ (LAD). LAD for Chomsky includes Universal Grammar. Closely related to his theory of the first language acquisition is his assumption of language. For Chomsky, language is not ‘speech’ used in real-life communication, but is ‘a set of formal properties inherent in any natural language grammar’.

Though Chomsky realizes that ‘language’ is not only the ‘Grammatical Competence’ but also includes the ‘Pragmatic Competence’ (1980: 225), his theory of first language acquisition based on the principles of UG is limited to the acquisition of Grammatical Competence and does not attempt to explain the child’s ability to use this grammatical knowledge in the real-life situations. The reason for not accounting for the Pragmatic Competence is that it contains variability and also is more concerned with ‘knowledge of conditions and manner of appropriate use, in conformity with various purposes’ (Chomsky, 1980: 225) than with knowledge of forms and meaning, which is the main object of his scientific inquiry. For Chomsky, Grammatical Competence is restricted to the domain of syntax with occasional references to semantics and phonology. This knowledge of Grammatical Competence in the native speaker is essentially implicit, i.e. it is unconscious, intuitive. Thus, Chomsky’s theory of competence is essentially about the implicit rather than explicit knowledge of L1 grammar (Johnson, 2004: 31).

According to Chomsky (1980: 38), this separation between the Grammatical and the Pragmatic Competence is essential to account for UG which assists the child in the
acquisition of what he calls ‘a core grammar’. Chomsky’s claim of the existence of UG is based upon the following arguments:

1. Logical Problem of Language Acquisition: it refers to the difference between the input that the child receives and its linguistic output.
2. Poverty of Stimulus Argument: it claims that the input to which the child is exposed is ‘degenerate’ and undermined

These arguments help Chomsky to assume the existence of an innate autonomous and domain-specific mental mechanism that assists the child in the first language acquisition. Johnson, in this connection, writes:

... according to Chomsky, the available linguistic input or experience is often degenerate, incomplete or ungrammatical. Based on the available input, it would be impossible for the child to determine which sentences are grammatical and which are ungrammatical. Also, the available input undermines the final grammar the child is able to acquire in a very short time. (2004: 32)

Chomsky also differentiates between ‘acquisition’ and ‘development’. ‘Development’, as Cook (1985: 4-5) interprets it, refers to ‘the real time learning of language by children’, whereas ‘acquisition’ is ‘language learning unaffected by maturation’. Thus, ‘development’ indicates the ‘interaction among various cognitive mechanism such as cognition, UG, and the social context. However, for Chomsky, UG is autonomous; therefore, there is no possibility of such interaction. As a result, the focus of Chomsky’s theory is on ‘acquisition’ and not on ‘development’. According to Chomsky, the investigation of ‘performance’ falls under the category of ‘development’ and not that of ‘acquisition’, because it cannot be said to be studying the properties of language faculty which he refers to as ‘mental organ’.

However, Chomsky’s specification of acquisition raises some questions like: Is UG available to child in its entirety in acquisition of his/her native language? There are different stands taken by scholars on this question. For example, White (1981) contends that UG is available in its entirety right from the beginning, whereas Felix (1984) is of the opinion that it unfolds in stages in a predetermined sequences. However, according to some other researchers, ‘development’ cannot be separated from ‘acquisition’, since
the child does not produce all sentences with the same degree of complexity at the same time.

Environment \[\rightarrow\] LAD \[\rightarrow\] Universal Grammar \[\rightarrow\] Grammatical Competence

Input (Triggering Effect)

Figure 1.2 Chomsky's Model of First Language Acquisition (Chomsky 1981b)

As the model shows, the acquisition of grammatical knowledge is dependent on the growth of the mental organ, UG, which is biologically predetermined. It is essential to trigger off the predetermined growth to proceed the grammatical knowledge. Chomsky (1980:33) writes: “a central part of what we call ‘learning’ is actually better understood as the growth of cognitive structures along an internally directed course under the triggering and partially shaping effect of the environment”. As the above discussion shows, in order to understand the acquisition of first language by a child, one needs to rely on logical rather than empirical evidence. Therefore, Chomsky’s model is the example of the older ‘logico-deductive’ version of cognitive paradigm. It is interesting to note that Chomsky’s model of language acquisition and his linguistic theory have undergone a major change and revision: from Transformative-Generative Grammar to Government and Binding Theory and currently the Minimalist Programme.

1.2.2.1 Early Cognitive Approaches to SLA

Error Analysis

As pointed out earlier, in Behaviourist account of Contrastive Analysis, errors are treated as ‘sins’ or ‘bad habits’ and are to be eliminated at all costs. However, Error Analysis registered a major change and revision of attitude toward the learner errors. Interestingly, Error Analysis has certain methodological similarities with the weaker version of Contrastive Analysis approach. But unlike Contrastive Analysis, the explanation of the learner errors is not sought with reference to L1 but in the target
language itself. Errors are not seen as the result of Transfer but rather looked upon as
the evidence of learners’ strategies of learning. Learner errors are no longer seen as
‘sins’ but, as Stephen Corder (1967) points out, “Errors are indispensible for second
language learning”. Corder classified the learner errors in two groups: mistakes and
errors— the former are the errors of performance and therefore non-systematic; the
latter, on the contrary, are the errors of ‘transitional competence’ and therefore
systematic. The focus in Error Analysis, therefore, says Corder, should be on the errors
which are systematic and which represent the ‘transitional competence’ of the learner at
a point in time. That is to say, errors reveal the underlying knowledge of the target
language to date. Corder assigns great importance to the learner errors which should be
the focus of scientific investigation. It seems that the errors committed by the learner
are unconscious phenomenon for him/her since they are the part of his/her current state
of knowledge of the target language.

The learner errors are significant for all involved in the process of second
language acquisition and teaching. For the teacher, errors are the evidence of the learner
knowledge of the target language. Therefore, it is possible for him/her to decide the
next topic to be taught. For the researcher, the errors provide proof of how language is
acquired and what strategies of learning are used by the learner. Moreover, errors are
the manifestation of the nature of innate universal mechanism in second language
learning. The significance of the errors from the learner’s point of view is that errors are
used for testing his/her hypothesis about the nature of the language he/she is learning.

In Error Analysis, second language learning is viewed as similar to first
language acquisition provided that the learner is motivated. However, the important
contribution of Error Analysis is that it represents a shift of attention from the learner
external factors to the learner internal factors: The mental processes involved in second
language learning. This shift toward internal, however, does not help in visualizing the
way in which Communicative Competence is acquired. For one thing, the major focus
of these studies is on the L2 grammar and not on the external socio-cultural context,
which is said to be essential to acquire the norms of appropriateness. This internal shift
is obviously essential but it is not sufficient to elaborate the acquisition process of
Communicative Competence.
Interlanguage

In 1972, building on the concepts and procedures of Error Analysis, Larry Selinker introduces the term Interlanguage to refer to ‘the intermediate states of a learner’s language as it moves toward the target L2’ (Saville-Troike, 2006: 40-41). However, Corder has already used the term ‘transitional competence’ to refer to the same phenomenon. These linguists believe that the development of interlanguage (IL) is a creative process, and that it is driven by the inner forces in interaction with both L1 and the target language. Though both the L1 and L2 elements are clearly recognized in IL, the emphasis in IL study is on IL as a third system itself rather than any other language. An ‘interlanguage’ is believed to possess the following characteristics:

1. It is systematic in that at any point or stage of development, the IL is governed by rules which constitute the learner’s internal grammar. These rules are discoverable by analyzing the language used by the learner at that time.
2. It is dynamic in that the rules which the learners have in their minds changes frequently, i.e. they are in a state of flux, which results in a succession of interim grammars.
3. It is variable. Even though systematic, IL is sensitive to different contexts of language use.
4. It is reduced system, both in form and function. It has fewer complex grammatical structures that typically occur in target language and also narrower range of communicative needs for which the IL is used.

(Saville-Troike, 2006: 41)

According to Selinker (1972), there are differences in the way L1 is acquired by children and IL development in SLA in that the later includes certain cognitive processes which are not available in the former. Moreover, in IL development there is strong likelihood of fossilization. By 'Fossilization' Selinker means ‘the probability that the learners will cease their IL development in some respects before they reach target language norms, in spite of continuing L2 input and passage of time’ (Saville-Troike, 2006: 41). Selinker gives the following reasons for the fossilization phenomenon in IL development: Language Transfer from L1 to L2; Transfer of Training, or how the L2 is taught; Strategies of Second Language Learning; Strategies of Second Language Communication; Overgeneralization of the Target Language linguistic material.
In assessing the usefulness of IL studies for the acquisition of Communicative Competence, we can definitely say that it helps in the acquisition of the L2 grammar. However, as with Error Analysis, it lays emphasis only on the linguistic elements of both L1 and L2 and does not acknowledge the role of social context in the acquisition of second language.

**Morpheme Order Studies**

Morpheme Order Studies refer to a group of studies that have been undertaken with certain similar assumptions. One of the basic assumptions underlying these studies is that second language learning is similar to first language acquisition in that both are guided by universal, innate mechanism. This assumption has been popularly known as ‘L1=L2 hypothesis’. The important tenet of these studies is that ‘if such an innate mechanism exists, the grammatical features of the second language will be acquired in a predictable and invariant order, regardless of learners’ native language background’ (Johnson, 2004:27).

Duley and Burt (1974) in their study found that despite their different linguistic backgrounds, learners show a similar pattern in their acquisition of English morpheme system. The implications of the findings are that learner errors are not the result of interference but are developmental in nature and that there must be an innate mechanism that aids the learners in L2 acquisition. Second language learning guided by such mechanism is referred to as “creative construction” which they define as “the process in which children gradually reconstruct rules for speech they hear, guided by universal innate mechanism which cause them to formulate certain types of hypotheses about the language system being acquired, until the mismatch between what they are exposed to and what they produce is resolved” (Duley and Burt, 1974: 37). This definition of creative construction completely rejects the behaviourist view of automatic habit formation.

In the same year, Bailey, Madden, and Krashen (1974) report that only 3 to 5 % of errors committed by L2 learners are the result of transfer and the remaining are developmental in nature. This study provides the empirical evidence for the existence of the ‘natural route of acquisition’, through which all L2 learners must go in order to learn a second language. The assumption of the natural route of L2 learning contributed
to change in attention– from the learner external to the learner internal process of language acquisition.

Like the earlier approaches, Morpheme Order Studies as well do not refer to the process of acquisition of knowledge of appropriateness of language use and seem to be primarily concerned with the native speaker-listener of Chomsky.

**Chomsky’s UG and SLA**

Chomsky’s theory of UG and first language acquisition soon attracted the attention of those working in SLA. Kevin Gregg, one of the staunchest proponents of Chomsky, asked for the application of Chomsky’s theory of UG to second language acquisition. Gregg (1989) is of the opinion that the domain of SLA should be confined to the Grammatical Competence and should not include the Grammatical Performance. Once the domain of SLA is fixed, what is needed is a theory to account for the acquisition of Linguistic Competence. Such a theory will be the theory of ‘grammar’ and its nature will be ‘autonomous’ and ‘modular’. By ‘autonomous’, Gregg means that such theory should be separated from other theories which are discourse based, as the discourse based theories consider language as communication. Moreover, for Gregg, this theory should be formal theory modelled on Chomsky’s generative grammar. Such a formal theory would “add both clarity and explanatory power to research being carried out in SLA. Beyond that, by relating SLA research to first language acquisition theory and linguistic theory, ‘such a perspective can give our field something else it could do with: a sense of direction’ (Gregg, 1989: 34-35).

According to Gregg, the cognitive systems of language learning can be best explained with reference to the formal logical rules and Chomsky’s theory provides such rules. These rules will explain the cognitive mechanism involved in SLA. Thus, Gregg advocates the application of Chomsky’s theory of UG and first language acquisition to the L2 learning. This call is followed by different studies on L2 learners’ access to UG principles and parameters. The major data-elicitation tool used in these studies is ‘grammaticality judgments’. However, some researchers like Robert Bley-Vroman (1989) openly denied that L2 learners had access to UG.

**Fundamental Difference Hypothesis**

To justify his position that L2 learners do not have access to UG, Robert Bley-Vroman (1989) describes nine fundamental different characteristics of SLA. These
differences are meant to show that adults do not acquire L2 with the assistance of UG. Some of the important differences between L1 acquisition in childhood and L2 acquisition by adults are:

1. Lack of “general guaranteed success” on the part of L2 learners. This difference helps Bley-Vroman to claim that L2 acquisition is guided by “general human cognitive learning capacities rather than by some domain-specific module which guarantees child’s success in first language acquisition” (1989: 44).

2. In SLA, there is substantial variation in ‘degree of attainment’, in course of learning, and in strategies of learning. These variations lead Bley-Vroman to contend that UG is not available and that no domain-specific cognitive mechanism must be utilized by adult foreign language learners.

3. Unlike L1, there are different goals as to the desired level of L2 mastery.

4. L1 and L2 acquisition are different in that ‘fossilization’ dominates in L2 situation.

5. Unlike L2, L1 acquisition is unaffected by such factors as personality, motivation, attitude, and aptitude, which play important roles in adult Second Language Acquisition.

These differences, according to Bley-Vroman, are internal, linguistic and qualitative in nature: internal, because they are caused by differences in the internal cognitive states of adults and children, and not by some external factor or factors; linguistic, in the sense that they are specifically caused by a change in the learning faculty, not by some general change in learning ability; and they are qualitative and not only quantitative in that the domain-specific system is not just weakened, it is unavailable.

Thus, on the basis of these and other differences, he concludes:

. . . the domain-specific language acquisition system of children ceases to operate in adults, and in addition, that adult foreign language acquisition resembles general adult learning in fields for which no domain-specific learning system is believed to exist.     (1989: 49)

In adults, the domain-specific language faculty is substituted by a general (non-domain-specific) cognitive system which is the general abstract problem-solving system. Since such ability varies from individual to individual, there are many individual variations in L2 attainment.
In spite of this controversy regarding the role of UG in SLA, the field is influenced by Chomsky’s theories to a great extent.

**1.2.2 Recent Cognitive Trend in SLA (Information Processing Models)**

In his response to Firth and Wagner (1997), who advocated for more inclusive social paradigm for SLA, Michael Long (1997) claims that the focus of SLA should be on describing and explaining mental processes responsible for second language acquisition. Long rather contends that the implicit negative feedback provides facilitative role in L2 acquisition. Thus, by underlying the role of implicit feedback, Long is separating himself from Chomsky’s tradition of SLA, because such a role contradicts the notion that L2 learner has access to UG. According to Long, the main object of SLA inquiry should be the acquisition of linguistic knowledge, which he associates with the acquisition of phonology, lexicon, and morpho-syntactic rules (Johnson, 2004: 43).

**Krashen’s Input Hypothesis**

Krashen’s Input hypothesis has profound impact on SLA theory and language teaching. The hypothesis has established two most controversial issues in SLA theory

(a) The role of input in SLA, and

(b) The role of grammar instruction in SLA.

The input hypothesis of Krashen is a part of larger theoretical framework of SLA process which consists of five hypotheses:

1. **Acquisition-learning hypothesis:** According to Krashen (1985), there are two different ways of acquiring L2, which are two independent processes: acquisition and learning. Acquisition is a subconscious process and results in acquired knowledge; learning, on the contrary, is a conscious process which results in explicit knowledge of grammatical properties of language. Since formal teaching does not lead to acquisition, the teaching of grammar is related in Krashen’s framework to the periphery and is associated with the operation of the monitor hypothesis.

2. **Natural Order of Development:** For Krashen, SLA proceeds according to a well defined order, ‘a predetermined way’, ‘non-alterable natural path of acquisition’. This hypothesis sets a stage for the information processing view of SLA.
3. Monitor: it accounts for the presence and use of ‘learned’ knowledge which is explicit in nature. Such access to monitor is available in limited set of conditions: (a) learner must have enough time to apply such knowledge, and (b) s/he must know a grammatical rule.

4. Input Hypothesis: This hypothesis contends that “humans acquire language in only one way- by understanding messages, or by receiving ‘comprehensible input’” (Krashen, 1985: 1-2). Comprehensible input is indicated as ‘i +1’. Here ‘i’ represents the learner’s current level of language competence and ‘1’ the next level of competence in the natural order of development. Importantly, input hypothesis is applicable only to acquisition and not to learning. Krashen argues that if there is enough comprehensible input ‘the necessary grammar is automatically provided’ (1985), i.e. there is no need to teach grammar deliberately and explicitly, because it can be acquired subconsciously with the assistance of the internal language processes- LAD. Krashen is one of those researchers who believed that L2 learners have full access to UG.

5. Affective Filter Hypothesis: The affective factors for Krashen are motivation, self-confidence and anxiety. As for the role of these factors, Krashen is of the opinion that they serve as ‘mental block’. This mental block prevents language acquirers from employing the comprehensible input fully. When this affective filter is ‘up’, the input does not reach to LAD, and when it is ‘down’, the input will be delivered to LAD. (Johnson, 2004: 46-52)

Krashen’s reliance on LAD and his contention that acquisition is a subconscious process makes his theory a part of cognitive paradigm. His model is one of the earliest versions of information processing model and contains three classical elements: input, a cognitive mechanism (here, LAD), and output.

**Swain’s Comprehensible Output Theory**

According to Merille Swain (1985, 1993, 1995) not only input but ‘comprehensible output’ is also important in that it plays a very crucial role in SLA. For her, output is not only the ‘representation of acquired competence’ that does not play any role in SLA. She argues (1995: 125) that earlier, output is considered simply as the evidence of already taken place learning and that it does not serve any function in SLA except as self input.
According to her, the comprehensible output performs three functions with reference to accuracy rather than fluency:

1. The “noticing/triggering function” or consciousness-raising function: comprehensible output makes the learner aware of something that s/he needs to find out about L2 grammar.

2. The hypothesis testing function: Accepting Corder’s view that learner output is the hypothesis testing process on the part of the learner, Swain says that output is essential in that it provides an opportunity to learner to see what is possible in the target language and what is not.

3. The meta-linguistic function or the reflective role of output: Output provides learner an opportunity to reflect on the forms and structures of the target language, which improves the quality of learner interlangue. (1995: 128)

**Long’s Interaction Hypothesis**

Expanding Krashen’s input hypothesis, Michael Long (1983a, 1983b), introduces the term ‘Conversational Adjustments’. He claimed that conversational interaction, particularly, conversational modifications can provide context not only for the practice of grammatical rules but also for the acquisition of these rules. That is to say, knowledge of grammatical rules develops from conversational interactions. Long (1996) revises and updates the role of Conversational Adjustments in his Interaction Hypothesis (IH). He defines IH as:

> It is proposed that environmental contributions to acquisition are mediated by selective attention and the learner’s developing L2 processing capacity, and that these resources are brought together most usefully, although not exclusively, during negotiation for meaning. Negative feedback obtained during negotiation work or elsewhere may be facilitative of L2 development, at least for vocabulary, morphology, and language-specific syntax and essential for learning certain specific L1-L2 contrasts. (1996:414)

Long, in contrast with Krashen, seems to be of the opinion that the implicit focus on form facilitates the acquisition process. As the definition of IH shows, Long is focusing on negotiation for meaning and negative feedback. The implicit negative feedback, Long asserts, obtained during negotiation for meaning brings the learner’s attention to
the target language forms, which may lead the learner to notice the gap in his or her Linguistic Competence and to converting the incoming input into intake. One type of evidence of such negative feedback is ‘recast’ which he defines as ‘utterances that rephrase a child’s utterances by changing one or more sentence components (subject, verb or object) while still referring to its central meaning’. Such recasts allow the learner to compare his/her ungrammatical utterances with the grammatical utterances of the others making the learner notice the gap between input and his/her interlanguage.

**Van Patten’s Input Processing Model**

This model of Input Processing draws heavily on the ideas from cognitive psychology, particularly the role of ‘attention’, and Van Patten (1996: 14) argues that learners are limited capacity processors. The model is based on three principles:

P1 – Learners process input for meaning before they process it for form.

(a) Learners process content words in the input before anything else.

(b) Learners prefer processing lexical item to grammatical items (i.e. morphological markings) for semantic information.

(c) Learners prefer processing “more meaningful” morphology before “less” or “non-meaningful morphology”.

P2 – For learners to process form that is not meaningful, they must be able to process informational or communicative content at no (or little) cost to attention.

P3 – Learners process a default strategy that assigns the role of agent to the first noun (phrase) they encounter in a sentence called “first-noun strategy”.

(a) The first-noun strategy can be over ridden by lexical semantics and event probabilities

(b) Learners will adopt other processing strategies for grammatical role assignment only after their developing system has incorporated other cues.

(Johnson, 2004: 66-67)

As these principles show, Van Patten sees processing as “attending to and detecting linguistic data in input”. The claim that meaning and form compute for ‘attentional processing’ indicates that not everything in input can be attended to and thus potentially detected. Thus, the model accounts for the process of making a link (mapping) between form and meaning. Once such a link is detected, the processed input is delivered to the next stage, intake, for further processing. Thus, only after the input is processed
according to the three principles above, it is converted into Intake which is available for processing in the next stage of developing system, with two sub-processes—accommodation (either adding or rejecting) and restructuring. Van Patten’s model consists of three stages visualized in the following figure:

I  
Input  
Input Processing

II  
Intake  
Accommodation and Restructuring

III  
Developing System  
Output  
Access

Figure 1.3 Van Patten’s Input Processing Model (1996)

Gass and Selinkar’s Model

Though this model appears in Gass and Selinkar (2001), Gass (1988, 1997) is its true author. She conceives five major stages from Input to Output: (1) Apperceived input, (2) Comprehended Input, (3) Intake, (4) Integration, and (5) Output. Each of these stages contains stage specific features and the last stage ‘Output’ is again recycled to become ‘Intake’:

1. Apperceived Input Stage: It is a process of understanding by which newly observed qualities of an object are related to past experience. Thus, for Gass, past experience is responsible for ‘noticed material’. This stage consists of two processes: understanding and selection of noticed material. The factors responsible for selection of some material and not others are frequency, affect (social distance, status, motivation, and attitude), prior knowledge, and attention. The prior knowledge can include knowledge of native language, other languages, existing knowledge of L2, world knowledge, language universals, and so forth. All of them are responsible for the interpretation of language data and success or lack of success in understanding it.

2. Comprehended Input Stage: There is difference between Krashen’s Comprehensible input and Gass’ Comprehended input in that Krashen’s term
refers to learner external factors whereas Gass’ refers to learner internal process. Krashen’s input is either comprehensible or not i.e. it is either or relation; Gass’ Comprehended input there is continuum of possibilities ranging from semantic to detailed structural analysis. For Gass, comprehension includes both structure and meaning.

3. Intake: According to Gass, all comprehended input does not become intake because some its part may be comprehended only for the immediate purpose of conversational interaction. Intake, for her, “refers to the process of attempted integration of linguistic information. Thus input is only used in a conversation and for the sake of that conversation is not regarded as intake.” Thus input cannot become intake unless it passes through two stages: apperceived input and comprehended input.

4. Integration: is a stage in which the Intake is integrated.

5. Output: This stage interacts with intake. (Gass and Selinker, 2001: 400-08)

All these Information Processing Models— the models of Krashen, Long, Van Patten and Gass and Selinker—represent a break in the cognitive tradition established by Chomsky. Still, these models are cognitive in nature. One of the important points to be considered in terms of these models is that all of them have transcended the boundaries of individual cognition in that they consider the cognition of all the persons involved in the interaction. However, as Johnson (2004: 83) remarks, these models are not social in the sense that even the social interaction is not presented as dynamic and multidimensional in nature but rather as a linear process developing from Input to Output. Moreover, they are primarily concerned with the acquisition of Grammatical Competence and nowhere the development of the Communicative ability is considered. As for the importance of the models for acquisition of Communicative Competence, these models, particularly that of Long and the subsequent models, have accepted that communication of meaning is not a straightforward process where listener/reader understands whatever is said/written by the speaker/ writer. Rather understanding meaning is perceived as ‘negotiation’ where the parties involved in interaction try to be meaningful.

1.2.3 Socially-oriented Models

In the socially oriented models of language learning, the researcher discusses important theories that emerge in SLA research after the introduction of the term
“Communicative Competence” by Hymes (1972). Unlike the earlier theories of SLA, the social theories accepted the acquisition of Communicative Competence as the goal of SLA. The major tenets of these theories are summed up by Saville-Troike (2006: 53):

- Focus is on the use of language in real situations (performance) as well as underlying knowledge (competence). No sharp distinction is made between the two.
- Study of SLA begins with the assumption that the purpose of language is communication, and that development of linguistic knowledge (in L1 or L2) requires communicative use.
- Scope of concern goes beyond the sentence to include discourse structure and how language is used in interaction, and to include aspects of communication beyond language.

These models discuss the relationship between social context and second language use and acquisition. They show that the L2 input that learners receive and the processing of L2 input in social settings is socially mediated. Again, they also deal with the ways in which social and linguistic contexts affect linguistic use, choice, and development. The models assert that the social identities of the learners are intentionally asserted through their L2 in communicating in social context. These models view the language learner as a social being and his/her cognitive processing of L2 is affected by the social interaction and social relationships with others involved in the interaction who provide L2 input and corrective feedback to the learners.

1.2.3.1 Early Approaches

Communicative Language Learning

The discussion of Communicative Language Learning (CLL) is based on Hymes’ view on Communicative Competence and the theoretical foundation that informs Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). A major characteristic of Chomsky’s theory of language is that it takes structure of language as an end in itself and undermines the use of such structures. According to Hymes (1972), Chomsky’s distinction between Competence and Performance is related to Saussure’s distinction between ‘la langue’ and ‘la parole’. Competence, for Chomsky, refers to the underlying knowledge of language, which is an ideal construct, whereas performance is the ‘use of
language in concrete situations’. However, according to Hymes, when language is used in concrete situations, the social context in which it is used affects not only the performance but the ‘underlying’ inner competence itself. As a result, the social context of the use of language should be taken into consideration in the process of language acquisition. To overcome this absence in linguistic theory, Hymes introduced the notion of Communicative Competence which accounts for and considers the importance of social context in language learning. Communicative Competence, for Hymes, has four aspects: Grammaticality, Feasibility, Acceptability and Actual Performance. For Hymes, the knowledge of rules of grammar is not sufficient for the use of language in real situations; it needs knowledge of and ability to use what is grammatical, acceptable, feasible and possible in that language. As far as the acquisition of these different abilities is concerned, Hymes is of the view that the development of these abilities is to be seen in the same developmental matrix in which child learns language.

Systemic Linguistics

Systemic Linguistics is developed by M. A. K. Halliday. In this model, language is analyzed in terms of interrelated systems of choices available for expressing meaning. The basic notion of the approach is that language structures cannot be idealized and investigated without reference to the circumstances of their use, including the social context. According to Halliday, language acquisition:

\[ \ldots \text{needs to be seen as the mastery of linguistic functions. Learning one’s mother tongue is learning the uses of language, and the meanings, or rather the meaning potential, associated with them. The structures, the words and the sounds are the realization of this meaning potential. Learning language is learning how to mean.} \] (1973:375)

Thus, the process of language acquisition consists of mastering certain basic functions of language and developing a meaning potential for each. Besides the basic functions of language for a child, the universal functions of adult language are: Ideational, Interpersonal, and Textual.

The linguistic structures that are acquired by learners are the ‘direct reflections’ of the functions that language serves. Thus, the development of learners is closely related to social and personal needs of the learners. Applying these views to SLA, L2 learning is seen as a process of adding multilingual meaning potential to what has
already been acquired in L1. Referring to the process of SLA in the tradition of Systemic-Functional Approach, Saville-Troike et al. (1984: 60) claims that “Second language acquisition is largely a matter of learning new linguistic forms to fulfill the same functions [as already acquired and used in L1] within a different social milieu.”

**Acculturation Model**

Schumann (1978) proposes the Acculturation Model on the basis of his study of his subject called Alberto. This model of SLA is both social and psychological in its orientations. Acculturation, for Schumann, is “the social and psychological integration of the learner with the target language group”. The model subsumes two variables: social and affective. Schumann’s social variables are:

- The power relations between the groups of L2 learners and target language speakers (dominance, non-dominance, subordination)
- L2 group’s integration pattern (assimilation, acculturation, preservation)
- L2 group’s relative enclosure
- L2 group’s relative cohesiveness
- The size of the L2 group
- The cultural (in)congruence of the L2 group and target groups
- The mutual group attitudes, and
- The L2 group’s intended duration of stay in the target language community (Schumann, 1978)

Since all SLA situations cannot be assessed with these social distance variables, Schumann therefore adds psychological distance variables. These affective factors are:

- Language shock
- Culture shock – “the anxiety resulting from the disorientation encountered upon entering a new culture” (Schumann, 1978:88)
- Integrative vs. instrumental motivation, and
- Ego permeability, a psychological concept roughly equivalent to empathy

According to Schumann, the social and the psychological variables determine the distance between the learner community and target community. Schumann contends that low social and psychological distance leads to high acculturation and vice versa. The high acculturation predicts the successful L2 acquisition. Schumann suggested that
any learner can be placed on this scale and accordingly his/her success in L2 can be predicted.

**Language Socialization**

Language Socialization is an interdisciplinary approach to the process of enculturation and language acquisition and draws on sociology, psychology, linguistics, and anthropology, specifically on the ethnography of communication. It has been defined as “the process whereby children and other novices are socialized through language, part of such socialization being socialization to use language meaningfully, appropriately and effectively” (Ochs, 1996: 408). Thus, language here is both the means and the central goal of socialization. The locus of such socialization is concrete activities in which novices participate with experts. Through these activities, they attain socio-cultural knowledge of specific activities and context. In a broader perspective, language socialization is seen as a lifelong process through which social groups and individuals transform themselves and each other by alternating expert and novice roles. However, unlike Socio-cultural theory of Vygotsky, Language Socialization is not one-way process. That is to say, the novice is not essentially a passive recipient but takes an active role including contesting and resisting socialization and also “counter” socializing the expert.

Since Language Socialization concerns itself with socialization through the use of language and socialization to use language, all aspects of language use in social context can be investigated. However, particular attention is focused on the role of indexical, i.e. linguistic resources that derive their meaning from conventional association of linguistic forms with dimensions of context. According to Ochs (1996) “a basic tenet of language socialization research is that socialization is in part a process of assigning situational, i.e. indexical meanings”. Since the use of these indexical markers is constrained by cultural presupposition, so also in interaction their choice involves cultural expectations and values.

As far as the nature of Language Socialization is concerned, on the whole, it is largely implicit. Considering Language Socialization in Classroom setting, the classroom is said only to provide opportunities for the explicit socialization. In SLA literature, according to Kasper and Rose (2002) there are two types of Socialization: Pragmatic and Discourse Socialization. Blum Kulka (1997: 3) defines Pragmatic Socialization as “the ways in which children are socialized to use language in context in
socially and culturally appropriate ways”. And Discourse socialization refers to “the interactional processes by which novices learn how to participate in discourse-mediated activities” (Kasper and Rose, 2002: 45-47).

1.2.3.2 Recent Developments

According to Elaine Tarone (2007: 837), the Sociolinguistic approach to SLA is “one that studies the relationship between such social contextual variables as interlocutor, topic, or task and the formal features of learner language or interlanguage (IL) production”. One of the important aspects of such approaches is that they study the relationship between the social context in which IL is used and the cognitive processes of the learner that affect learner language variation and change, and how it leads to acquisition.

Socio-cultural Theory

The Socio-cultural theory of SLA is based on the works of two Russian scholars– Vygotsky and Bakhtin. These scholars have given importance to interaction for both language development and overall psychological development of an individual. The SLA researchers working in the tradition of Socio-cultural theory, like Language Socialization process, view interaction as a tool for L2 learning and as a competency in its own right. According to this theory, human cognition is mediated in various ways, through different tools- semiotic systems (especially language), and social interaction. Social interaction, which itself is mediated by language, is seen as inseparable from learning process itself. Thus for Vygotsky, social interaction is learning or “cultural development”.

Vygotsky expresses his views on the relationship between social interaction and the development of higher cognitive functions as:

Any function in the child’s cultural development appears twice, on two planes. First it appears on the social plane, and then on the psychological plane. First it appears between people as an inter-psychological category, and then within the child as an intra-psychological category. (1981: 163)

Since the higher cognitive functions have their origin in social relationships, examining novices in interaction with expert participants affords a view on the micro-genesis of cognitive processes. That is to say, through the assistance of the experts, the novices are
enabled to accomplish task which are not possible for them performing independently. Learning language is thus a collaborative activity of social interaction in which the experts or the other participants help in the learning activity.

Vygotsky’s theory of psychology is further developed by a group of Soviet psychologists who proposed the Theory of Activity that has become the cornerstone of the Socio-cultural theory: “An activity is a functional category that integrates external and cognitive aspects of action.” (Kasper and Rose, 2002: 34). Within ‘Activity’ as a super-ordinate term, three levels of analysis can be distinguished:

1. Activity (as a subordinate category)– is identified by its motives and the objects toward which they are addressed,
2. Actions– are defined as goal-directed such that different goals result in different actions,
3. Operations– are recognized by the material, semiotic, and interaction means by which they are produced including the social circumstances of their production.

In this connection, Lantolf and Appel (1994: 22) observe:

The level of motive answers why something is done; the level of goal answers what is done, and the level of operation answers how it is done. The link between socio-culturally defined motives and concrete actions and operations is provided by semiotic systems, of which language is the most powerful and pervasive.

The Socio-cultural theory thus emphasizes the role of interaction in language development and how it assists in the performance in concrete socio-historical context.

1.3 English in India

This part will shed light on the arrival of English language in India, its history, its status in the past and the present, its users, and the functions it serves in India. In addition, the role of English language in the Indian educational system is elaborated with respect to Primary, Secondary, Higher-Secondary and Higher education in India.

1.3.1 Importance of Learning English as a Second Language

Like any other variety of English, native and non-native, Indian English, i.e. English as it is used by the educated Indians, has been accepted as a legitimised variety of English in its own right. The use of different terms by scholars to refer to Indian
English – ‘non-native’, ‘indigenized’, ‘nativized’, ‘transplanted’, etc. - points to the fact that this status of English has been accepted the world over. Shinde (1991:2) contends that Indian English is established as a legitimized variety of English due to the sustained efforts of Indian linguists, critics, creative writers and teachers of English over years. It is interesting to note that the Edinburgh University Press has published a book called *Indian English* in 2009 under the series ‘Dialects of English’ which underlines this accepted and legitimized status of Indian English. The role and place of English in India after Independence underwent a major change. Both the Union Government and the State Governments have constantly emphasized to decrease the dominance of Imperial English and to assign new roles to indigenous languages in public life. However, the reality is different. English continues to be an inseparable part of the ‘communicative matrix’ of India, particularly the urban India. Khubchandani (1994) refers to the downward movement of English language in urban India– English slipped from upper to the middle class and also to the grassroots levels. He maintains that 4% of total population of India (i.e. about 35 million people) knows some kind of English. It suggests the growth and spread of English in India. As a result, today, we have more number of English users than when the British left India. As was the case in the pre-Independence times, masses do not show much disenchantment with and hostility toward English. English is now looked upon as a ‘passport to upward social mobility’ and ‘an entry-pass into the social elite classes’. As a result of all these factors, English got further detached from the native speakers of English. The growth in technology, education, and urbanity proved to be congenial for the scope and intensity of communication in English in both international and intra-national contact. English in the post-Independence period came to be associated with the modernization process.

English was introduced in India in 18th century when the officers of the East India Company came over here. However, it was not at this time that Indians started learning English in masses. It was the purposeful and conscious effort on the part of Macaulay and others to create Indian man-power for their work that started the teaching and learning process of English in India. However, it doesn’t mean that Indians were not learning English before Macaulay and his *Minute*. But the fact remains that right from this time, English language has been learnt in India deliberately and in the formal school setting. Interestingly enough, the situation is not different even today. Mostly, English is not learned in informal way as the other languages are acquired by the
Indians. Thus, there is a type of association between English language and the formal school setting.

Another important factor associated with English in India is that right from the beginning it has been looked upon as ‘a language of opportunity’. In the colonial days, when it was introduced in formal school situations, the objective was, as Macaulay says, to create such a class which could function as mediator between the British and the indigenous people. Most of those who opted to learn English language at that juncture were looking at it as a language of opportunity, for self-improvement. In the post-Independence scenario, English has been one of the compulsory languages from the first standard itself in the Three Language Formula introduced by the Indian Government. It is, no doubt, a good decision on the part of the Indian Government; but most of the students who are learning English in such situation do not know why they are learning English, a foreign language. Often, the answer to the question ‘why do you study and learn English?’ is ‘because it is compulsory and prescribed’.

Nonetheless, the introduction of English as a compulsory subject shows the awareness of the education policy-makers, teachers and parents of the fact that English serves various purposes in Indian society. English enjoys the status of the Associate Official Language in India. Moreover, three states– Meghalaya, Nagaland and Mizoram and eight Union Territories have accepted it as the sole Official Language. Besides, there are other functions as well which English serves in Indian context. It serves important purposes in the fields like education, commerce, information technology, mass media, law, jurisdiction, etc. Since the functions of any language are associated with the users of the language, it is essential to look at the users of English in India. Verma (1982:174) provides a list of such users. According to him, the users of Indian English include school, college and university students; school, college and university teachers; officers and clerks working in Central and State Government institutions; employees working in prestigious hotels, restaurants and business institutions; scholars participating in national or international seminars, workshops; journalists, magazine columnists; doctors, lawyers, and above all creative writers. This extensive list of users of English language should also include the youth working in the multinational companies established in the metropolitan cities as a result of the policy of globalization. Thus, it seems that everyone who has received his/her formal education is the user of English language in India.
On the basis of these users of Indian English, the functions of English in India may be determined. Verma (1994: 116-119) elaborates the functions of English on both the National and the Individual levels:

**National Level:** English, on this level, is ‘window on the world’, i.e. it provides access to the growing fund of knowledge in all branches. Therefore, it is looked upon as ‘language of development’ and ‘language of upward social mobility’. It also serves the function of being the major international link language. At the intra-national level, it is used as a link language to promote interstate mobility and contributes to national unity and integrity. As the Associate Official Language, it is the official link between Central Government and Non-Hindi speaking state governments. It is also a language favoured by all-India institutions, all-India conferences/seminars, the legal and banking systems, trade and commerce and defense. In the educational context, it is the main or associate medium of instruction, and where other languages are used as the language of medium, it serves as the ‘library language’.

**Individual Level:** At this level, as pointed out earlier, English is looked upon as ‘language of opportunity’, ‘language of upward social mobility’ and is also used in transactional interactions.

**1.3.2 English in Indian Education:**

**1.3.2.1. Macaulay and his Minute**

English in India is the outcome of the colonial encounter and as such English language education in India has its roots in colonial history. It was in the process of colonization that English was introduced in India. Thus, it can be said that the history of English in India started with the establishment of the British East India Company. However, it was in 1792 that one of the Directors of East India Company, Charles Grant, prepared the first blueprint of English education in India. Before this period, East India Company imparted English education only to the children of the European employees of the Company. Charles Grant, however, was the first who, realizing the needs of the Company, recommended the introduction of English language as the medium of instruction in the schools of the colony. He also recommended that English should be adopted as the official language of the Company and the Government. At the same time, due to the renewal of the Charter of the Company and the Government, a large number of missionaries came to India to educate Indians and to convert them to a
new language, new culture, and new religion. With this purpose, they established a number of Christian schools in different parts of India. By 1830, the Company realized that it is difficult to run the administration smoothly only with English officials. There was a requirement of English-knowing Indians to the Company. In this background Macaulay prepared his Minute in 1835 – *Manifesto of English Education in India*. In the Minute, Macaulay has clearly stated the goal of English education in India. Kachru (1983: 22) refers to the goal of Macaulay of forming “a new class of persons, Indians in blood and colour but English in taste, in opinion, in morals and in intellect”. Thus, the aim was to create ‘baboos’ i.e. clerks. The same role was carried out by English language in Indian Education up to the Independence.

In 1857, three universities were established in India- the universities of Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras (now Mumbai, Kolkata, and Chennai, respectively). With this, English became the dominant medium for higher intellectual activities. The spread of English was so deep-rooted that by the 1920s, it became the language of political discourse. The growth of English in Indian education thus could be associated with the spread of colonial power. Indian education was greater anglicized as the English language rooted in an alien linguistic, cultural, administrative and educational setting. By the time India received Independence, English had become so prevalent that it created its own space in education, administration, judiciary, and the Indian media, and had also produced a highly proficient elite class. At present, a duel attitude toward English is seen, whereby, on the one hand, politicians are seen speaking against the spread and use of English, while at the same time, knowledge of English seems to be imperative.

From the time of its inception in India, the issue of English both as a medium and as a subject in Indian Education has remained controversial. A large group of people opposed its use for the following reasons: (1) A child is best taught through its mother tongue; (2) The use of English alienates the learner and has disastrous psychological consequences; (3) English is associated with colonization and slavery; (4) Our native languages increasingly become impoverished with the use of English; (5) Innovative ideas are possible only in one’s native language; (6) English sustains and in fact widens the gulf between the rich and the poor; etc. Another group, however, supported and encouraged the use of English for the following reasons: (1) Upward social mobility; (2) Access to knowledge and power; (3) Better occupation; (4)
Both the above views are partially true. But it seems that none of them appreciate the Indian sociolinguistic reality and also do not consider the theoretical issues like the nature of language, processes of language acquisition, and the relationship between language and culture. According to Agnihotri (2001), the important issues related to English in Indian Education are:

1. At what stage should English be introduced?
2. Should it be a medium of instruction or learned only as a subject?
3. What should be the essence of teacher training programmes so far as English is concerned?
4. What should be the norm of English language teaching?
5. How should its knowledge be evaluated?
6. What lessons can be learned from the history of English in India?
7. How is English related to our multilingualism?
8. What role, if any, can it play in the process of democratization and participatory planning?

However, it is beyond the scope of the present research to explore all these issues, though the researcher will try to focus on some of the relevant issues.

The Independence of the country does not find any significant change in the education policies. After the division of States on the basis of the regional languages, Central Advisory Board of Education (CABE) proposed the ‘Three Language Formula’ in 1958. The same was accepted by the Conference of Chief Ministers in 1961. Kothari Commission (1964-66) also accepted it and modified it into a ‘graduated three-language formula’. Since then, every education Commission has accepted this formula. Agnihotri (2001) refers to the report of Kothari Commission because it epitomizes the current thinking about English:

For a successful completion of the first degree course, a student should possess an adequate command of English, be able to express himself with reasonable ease and felicity, understand lectures in it, and avail himself of its literature. Therefore, adequate emphasis will have to be laid on its study as a language right from the school days. (Govt. of India 1966:15)
Accordingly, syllabi and materials are prepared in order to implement at both the school and the university levels.

1.3.2.2 Teaching of English up to Higher Secondary

Earlier, English with Hindi was introduced as a subject from 5th Standard in the case of Maharashtra. It was a subject and more emphasis was laid on the acquisition of the grammatical knowledge of the language. Nowhere was it aimed that the student should be able to communicate in English. As Agnihotri (2001: 198) says, the method of teaching classical languages like Greek and Sanskrit was imposed upon the teaching of English language. It was forgotten that it is a living language and the focus should be on its use. But in recent years not only is English introduced at the 1st Standard but also the teaching material is prepared with the view that the students will try to use it for their immediate purposes. The initiative on the part of the government to introduce English from the 1st standard has been really important. However, Agnihotri (2001), quoting Duley, Burt and Krashen (1982), says that the early introduction of language helps in the acquisition of sound system of language and that lexicon and syntax can be acquired at any age. We now need to wait and see the actual outcomes of this move of the government. English as medium of instruction is introduced at 11th level for the sciences faculty. In terms of the Semi-English students at Secondary Level it is introduced at the 8th class. In the English Medium schools, English both as a subject and as medium is introduced from the 1st standard itself.

1.3.2.3 English in Higher Education

In 1978, the working group appointed by the University Grants Commission recommended that English should be the medium of instruction in higher education instead of the regional languages. The reasons they gave for this decision include: ‘English is a highly developed language and best suited for India’s industrial and scientific progress and that English was less divisive because of its neutral character, i.e. a language which all can learn on equal terms’ (Gargesh, 2006: 96). Gargesh is of the opinion that the education system in India reveals a pyramid structure ‘with the mother tongues forming the base, the regional standards occurring in the middle, and English emerging as the sole language at the top’ (ibid: 94).

In Higher Education, with reference to Shivaji University, again, English is used both as a medium and as a subject. As a subject, it is a compulsory subject for all the
faculties at the undergraduate level: three years for Arts Faculty, and two for both Sciences and Commerce Faculties. Since most of the learning material of both sciences and social sciences subjects is easily available in English, they use it as their medium. A small group of students of Arts Faculty opt for English as their Optional Subject at the First Year and Second Year of Graduation. English is studied further as a Special Subject at the Third Year. As a compulsory subject, in accordance with the innovations noticeable in the policies of the government, ‘English for Communication’ course is introduced. Since the research is concerned with the Faculty-wise assessment of the Communicative Competence of the students of Shivaji University, it will be helpful here to refer to the communicative units that the students under investigation have learned.

Units for BA I year course: Introducing Yourself and Others, Talking about Personal Experience, Giving Directions and Instructions, Preparing a C. V. and Writing a Letter of Application, Telephonic and Email Communication and Note-Making. The Units prescribed for the BA II year course are: Presenting your Point of View, Notices and Agenda and Minutes, Information Transfer and Interpretation of Data, English for Journalistic Writing, Summarizing and Organizing Written Composition. For BA III, the following Units are prescribed: Understanding Organization of a Passage, Avoiding Errors in Written English, Developing Vocabulary and its Use, How to Take Part in a Group Discussion, How to Face an Interview and English for Official Letter Writing.

For the students of Sciences Faculty, there are only two papers based on this course, at I and III year of their graduation. The Units prescribed for them are: How to Express your Views and Opinions, Talking about Personal Experience, Writing a Letter of Application and C. V., Telephonic and E-mail Communication, Making Notes and Expanding Notes Taken, Information Transfer and Interpretation of Data, Avoiding Common Errors in Written English, Describing Objects and Processes, Organizing a Passage, Interacting in a Group-Discussion, Summarizing and How to Face an Interview. The Units prescribed for the students of Commerce Faculty at the I and II year of their graduation are: Business Communication I and II, Writing Business Letters, Preparing a C. V. and Writing a Letter of Application, Use of English in Consumer Advertising, Notice, Agenda, and Minutes, Information Transfer and Interpretation of Data, Interview for a Job, English for Marketing, English for Banking, English for Writing Business Reports, English for Public Relations Correspondence, Summarizing and Organizing Written Composition.
1.4 Work Already Done on the Topic

Since the construct selected in the present research is interdisciplinary, the studies based on the notions of Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance are being carried out in different branches of Applied Linguistics like Language Learning, Language Teaching and Language Testing. In Language Learning, the fundamental concern, as pointed out earlier, is with acquisition of the Communicative Competence and the ability for Communicative Performance. Language Teaching considers Communicative Competence as the ultimate objective to be achieved by the language learner and accordingly formulates teaching techniques in order that the learners may attain it in the classroom. Similarly, since the inception of the term Communicative Competence and particularly from the time language teachers and researchers in SLA have accepted it as the ultimate goal of language teaching and learning, the language testing researchers have shown their awareness of the phenomenon and have devised different techniques for the assessment of the construct. Thus, in Language Testing, the researchers are concerned with the different ways in which such a comprehensive construct can be assessed. The scholars working in this area are of the opinion that the earlier tests like Discrete Item Test cannot assess it correctly. Accordingly, they have tried to prepare different tests which can be used for the purpose. The type of data elicitation techniques they formulated are- Ethnographic Observation, Role-Play, DCT, MCDCT, Cloze Test, MCI, etc. In the present study, the researcher has employed some of these techniques. However, while discussing the earlier work on the constructs of Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance, the researcher will bring together the work carried out in these different branches of Applied Linguistics, because all of them have studied the construct and have tried to develop it in one way or the other. The following are some of the studies carried out in this area:

Savignon (1972: 41-49) is one of the earliest scholars who attempted to assess the Communicative Competence of students who are learning French as a foreign language. To assess the Communicative Competence of the beginning college French students at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, she consulted the model of Communicative Competence proposed by Hymes and his contemporaries and, in order to assess it, prepared an Oral Test of Communicative Competence. (1983: 67-80) The test was developed to measure the learners’ ability to communicate in four different
communicative contexts. The four contexts are treated as four parts of the test. She defines fluency as the effort made by the student to speak and comprehensibility as the extent to which the native speaker felt he understood what was said. Therefore, she emphasizes the ability of the students in getting their ideas across and making them understood rather than on speaking perfect French.

Savignon (1983) is of the opinion that Discrete Item Tests cannot assess the Communicative Competence of the students though it can assess their Linguistic Competence. She also asserts that a student who achieves quite good proficiency on such discrete items does not necessarily show such high proficiency in Communicative Competence. Evaluation of the Communicative Competence, therefore, has to include measures of both Communicative and Linguistic Competence (1983:22-23). As with many other scholars, she judged the appropriateness of the Performance of the students with reference to the native cultural norms of the target language. However, referring to Indian English and Kachru’s research, she maintains that this is one example of non-native variety of English which is distinct from the British English, the American English, the Canadian English, and the Australian English. In this context, therefore, the appropriateness of the Performance needs to be evaluated with reference to the Indian culture and not the native culture of the target language.

Following Savignon, Valdman and Moody (1979) set out to measure the Communicative ability of relatively low level students. They realized that the existing test techniques are inadequate to assess the ability. As a solution they prepared their own technique for assessing communicative ability. The technique consists of four sections: Part I, pictorially cued responses; Part II, Personal Questions; Part III, question formulations; and Part IV, situational responses.

Schmidt (1983) conducted a study to assess the Communicative Competence of the Japanese painter Wes. He used Schumann’s Acculturation model of Language Learning for the purpose. To analyze the interlanguage performance of Wes over a period of three years, Schmidt used the model of Communicative Competence proposed by Canale and Swain (1980). He found that during the three years of observation, Wes’s knowledge of morphology and syntax did not develop, rather he relied heavily on the formulaic expressions. Schmidt reports improvements in Wes’s Pragmatic and Sociolinguistic abilities. However, the persistence of non-target-like realizations of Speech Acts was found. He reports greatest progress in the oral abilities of Wes (Interactional Competence), which intersected with Pragmatic Competence. Schmidt
also found evidence of effective use of Strategic Competence in Wes’s L2 Performance. While analyzing the Discourse Competence of Wes, Schmidt proposed a new notion of Conversational or Interactional competence. According to Schmidt (1983:156), the notion of Interactional Competence is one of the important aspects of Communicative Competence, because “spoken discourse other than monologue is a cooperative effort by all parties to a conversation”. In all, Schmidt’s study of Wes is one of the most ‘prolonged longitudinal investigations’ in the developments of the theories of Communicative Competence.

McGroarty (1984) contends that Communicative Competence means different things to different people depending upon their requirements and goals. For some, it means the mastery of linguistic system, for other, it means fluency in speech, for some others, it means creating well-connected discourse. Thus, the definition of Communicative Competence is dependent upon the specific communicative needs of specific learners in terms of specific purposes for which the language is to be used.

In both of their studies, Eisenstein and Bodman (1986, 1993) studied the Communicative Competence of the students for employing various Speech Acts found that the advanced ESL learners provided pragmatically appropriate speech act strategies with ungrammatical forms. These studies suggest that the grammatical errors may make less effective the expression of the Illocutionary Force of the Speech Act but they are not pragmatic errors.

Koike (1989: 279) investigated the Pragmatic Competence in interlanguage of the adult US L2 speakers of Spanish. He used the following techniques for the collection of data: Identification of Speech Acts using listening comprehension; the production of Speech Acts in the Discourse Completion Test and also the production of Speech Acts in L1. Koike (1989: 286) found that unlike the Linguistic Competence, which develops conceptually form simple to elaborate to complex, the Pragmatic Competence develops by the principle of ‘restructuring’. Therefore, the production of Polite forms by the learner is based on the L1 notions of Politeness. Similarly, the Grammatical Competence in interlanguage also shapes the L2 Speech Act production. He asserts that since the Grammatical Competence cannot develop as quickly as the already present Pragmatic Competence, the learner expresses Pragmatic concepts with the help of whatever level of grammatical complexity s/he has acquired. This is clear in the subjects’ addition of the pragmatic information in the periphery to the basic Speech Act.
Harlow (1990: 328) asserts that Socio-pragmatic Competence in a language consists of more than linguistic and lexical knowledge and implies a learners’ ability to vary Speech Act strategies with respect to the situational or social variables present in the communicative situation. This Competence thus reflects the interdependence of the linguistic forms and the socio-cultural context. She studied the Speech Act realization pattern in French, with the basic question: What additional information besides linguistic knowledge and lexical knowledge must a learner of French know in order to communicate successfully? Using the Discourse Completion Test, she studied the realization of Request, Expressing Gratitude and Apologizing Speech Acts. She found that the age of the addressee influences requesting strategies, familiarity between the addressee and the addressee affected the length of the statement used to Request and also use of attention-getters. Subjects used more number of attention-getters in less-familiarity situations. In Expressing Gratitude, the age of the addressee determined the length of the statement, whereas Apologizing could not show any effect of these social variables.

Fatt (1991) studied the role of higher education in developing the Communicative Competence of the university students in Singapore. To judge the Communicative Competence of the students, he used a questionnaire of 59 items and asked the students to rate their own Communicative Competence on the task. He found that the structurally oriented English courses do not help students to communicate in L2. Therefore, language teaching should be based on the use of language for certain communicative purposes so that the students may not find themselves Communicatively Incompetent when they enter the job market.

Zuskin (1993) investigated the Sociolinguistic Competence of the L2 learners using the DCT. He found that the DCT can fruitfully be used to investigate the Sociolinguistic Competence as well as the Communicative Competence of the learner provided it elaborates information about contextual aspects like interlocutors’ status, age and other similar aspects.

Andrew Cohen (1996) studied the Sociolinguistic, Socio-cultural and Strategic Competences of the respondents. He used the Role-play Interview and Verbal Report as research tool to collect data for the study. He comes up with the view that the production of Speech Act or Speech Act Set requires Communicative Competence. Therefore, the realization of Speech Acts or Speech Act Sets can be studied fruitfully for the assessment of Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance.
Using both the cognitive and sociolinguistic perspectives, he has elaborated the process of the production of Speech Acts or Speech Act Sets. Cohen (1996: 34-38) reports the following processes in the realization of the Speech Acts:

1. Din in the head – the respondent has to search for the appropriate word or expression in the realization process.
2. Self-debate before selection: That the respondents involve in the self-debate regarding the appropriateness of one of the many alternative expressions with respects to the context of situation.
3. Afterthoughts: The responses of the respondents indicate afterthoughts in that after providing their response, they think that another item rather than the used one is appropriate.
4. Awareness of using the monitor: He shows that the respondents use monitor while giving their response.
5. Use of formulaic speech: That respondents use formulaic speech in their responses.
6. Omission, Avoidance, or Simplification: Cohen notes that respondents omit, avoid and simplify elements of language as they think fit.
7. Partial delivery of a thought: Cohen finds that the subjects display a tendency to deliver a thought partially and change it afterwards.
8. Delivery of a different thought: Sometimes, subjects change the thought they have used earlier and use another thought or expression.
9. Approximation: When it is not possible for the respondent to remember appropriate term, s/he uses a general term which is approximately the same in meaning.

Bardovi-Harling and Dornyei (1998) proposed that Communicative Competence minimally consists of Grammatical and Pragmatic Competence. For them, it seems, Pragmatic Competence includes Sociolinguistic, Socio-cultural, Interactional, and Discourse Competences. To investigate the relationship between the Grammatical and the Pragmatic Competences of ESL and EFL learners, they operationalized an Error Recognition and Severity Rating Task. As the instrument of the task, they used a set of 20 videotaped scenarios. In each of the scenarios, a female and a male student engaged in interaction at university. The respondents were first asked to assess the target utterances as appropriate/correct. If the answer of the student is negative, further they
were asked to assess the degree of severity of the error. They found that there are differences in the error recognition and rating dependent on ESL/EFL context. The ESL learners identified more pragmatic errors and judged them as more severe than grammatical errors. The EFL learners, on the other hand, identified more grammatical errors and rated them as more serious than the pragmatic errors. The study suggests that both the learning context and the proficiency of the students interact with their assessment. Among others, they concluded that the Pragmatic and Grammatical awareness of the students is largely independent. Therefore, what Bardovi-Harling (1999:686) says is acceptable: “high levels of Grammatical Competence do not guarantee concomitant high level of Pragmatic Competence”.

Weyers (1999) studied the increase of listening comprehension resulting in development of Communicative Competence by using the impact of authentic video on the language acquisition process. He reports statistically significant increase not only in the listening comprehension but also in the number of words the students used in discourse. The study thus suggests that authentic television programming provides high level of input and results in subsequent improvement in students’ output.

To address the Socio-cultural Competence of learners in the classroom, Lee and McChesney (2000) used Discourse Rating Tasks (DRT). With the help of the technique, they tried to develop the awareness of the students of the appropriate second language use. They found that the use of DRT and Role Plays help students to transform their Socio-cultural Competence into Socio-cultural Performance. They also found that the tasks provide students an opportunity to go beyond formulaic expressions and to use appropriate language to the communicative situation.

Rose (2000) studied the development of Pragmatic Competence of primary school students in Hong Kong in L2. She used Cartoon Oral Production Task (COPT) to elicit data to Request, Apology, and Compliment situations. It is reported that the students provide some evidence of Pragmatic development in that they show gradual tendency in the use of ‘direct’ to ‘indirect’ Speech Acts, and higher frequency in the use of Supportive Moves.

1. Though learners show knowledge of a particular grammatical structure or element, they do not exploit it to express the Illocutionary Force.
2. Learners know a grammatical structure and employ it to convey pragmatic functions in a ‘non-conventionalized target usage’.
3. The learners know a grammatical structure and the pragmatic function for which it is used, though they use it in non-target like fashion.

In ‘Pragmatics precedes Grammar’ scenario, the pragmatic abilities of the learner are superior to his/her grammatical abilities. Wes’s study supports this scenario in that it illustrates quite clearly the dissociation of grammatical from pragmatic/discourse ability. In this regard, Kasper (2001: 509) asserts, Wes “demonstrates that a restricted interlanguage grammar does not necessarily impose constraints on Pragmatic and Interactional Competence”. Koike (1989: 287) also asserts the same fact: “since the Grammatical Competence cannot develop as quickly as the already present pragmatic concepts require, the pragmatic concepts are expressed in ways conforming to the level of grammatical complexity acquired”.

Savignon and Sysoyev (2002:508) address the problem of lack of learner opportunity in beyond-the-classroom interaction in school setting. According to them, this lack of opportunity results in considerable disadvantages to the students and they confront with the inevitable psychological, linguistic and socio-cultural obstacles in second language communication. They report a study of the development of Socio-cultural Competence of the students by training the students in strategies for coping with certain social and cultural situations. They (2002: 21) found that the explicit teaching of Socio-cultural strategies in communication-based programme helped to improve the Socio-cultural Competence of the students.

Nelson et al. (2002: 163) have studied the Pragmalinguistic and Sociopragmatic Competence in the similarities and differences between Egyptian Arabic and American English Refusals using DCT. In all, 298 English and 250 Arabic Refusals are studied. Concentrating upon the ‘direct’ and the ‘indirect’ strategies, they examined the frequencies of the strategies and the effect of interlocutor status on strategy use across group. They found that both groups used similar strategies with similar frequencies in making request.

Tanck (2002) studied the production of Speech Act Sets of Refusals and Complaints by the native and the non-native speakers of English. She used DCT to
collect the required data. She is of the opinion that the Speech Acts of Refusals and Complaints consist of more than one Speech Act, because it is not possible for the speakers to convey appropriateness of the Speech Act without using more than one utterances. Following Murphy and Neu (1996) she uses the term ‘speech act sets’ to refer to such combinations. Moreover, she (2002: 1) uses the term Pragmatic Competence and Communicative Competence as equal in that the production of Speech Act Sets requires the knowledge of all the aspects of Communicative Competence.

To account for the relationship between L2 Pragmatic development, L2 proficiency and exposure to L2, Matsumura (2003) assessed the responses of 137 university-level Japanese learners of English to Advice-giving situations. The elicited responses were assessed with reference to the native Speech Act behaviour. It is found that exposure to L2 rather than L2 proficiency has greater potential to account for the Pragmatic development of the learners.

Using the Labovian framework of variationist approach, Bayley and Regan (2004: 327) assert that the variation in the speech of the learner is highly systematic and is subject to a range of linguistic and social constraints. They propose that the methods of Conversational Analysis be used to study the Sociolinguistic Competence of the L2 learner.

Zareva et al. (2005) investigated the relationship between the Lexical Competence and language proficiency. They hypothesized that the features of Lexical Competence vary with the increase in the L2 proficiency. Sixty four participants were asked to self-rate their familiarity with 73 lexical items and were also asked to negate a word associated with the identified word. It was found that the quantity and quality of L2 Lexical Competence develop with the increase in L2 proficiency.

Littlemore and Low (2006) argue that the learner’s ability to use metaphor is central to the construct of Communicative Competence. They suggest that Metaphoric Competence has an important role to play in all areas of Communicative Competence. Therefore, they assert that metaphor should be at the centre in second language learning, teaching and testing from the earlier to the advanced stages of learning.

that Pragmatic Competence precedes Grammatical Competence and also that L1 pragmatic system plays a role both in interpreting and processing L2 data in production.

Geyer (2007: 360) found that there is a close relationship between the Pragmatic, Grammatical and Discourse Competences in the Japanese L2 learner language used for the realization of Speech Acts.

Leske (2009) reports a pilot study in which the Apologies of the nursing college students are studied. Using the DCT, Lieske asked the students to write what they would say both in the L1 and the L2. She found that when students realized the different cultures involved in the communication, they change not only their language but the Speech Act realization strategies as well.

Considering the current interest in Communicative Competence of second and foreign language learning, Maria Piotrowska (n. d.) studied the pragmatic rules determining Speech Act components. She specifically focused on the Sociolinguistic rules that affect the choices open to a speaker when producing these Speech Acts in different social contexts. She thus assessed the Sociolinguistic Competence of the Hong Kong university students and their ability to communicate effectively in a Complaint situation. She asserts that since in all Speech Act situations, the role and relative status of interlocutors constrain the selection of different surface structures in particular social contexts, the learner must be aware of the underlying values in order to communicate effectively. She used Oral Role-plays as a data collection method.

On the basis of the discussion of the work already done on the topic, the researcher has proposed the following research:

1.5 The Present Research:

This part discusses the issues that lead to the present research, the aims and the objectives, the hypotheses and the limitations of the research. The basic concern of this research is to assess the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance of the post-graduate students. Further, on the basis of the elicited data, the researcher intends to elaborate the theoretical, the methodological and the practical aspects of the notions of Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance.
1.5.1 Research Topic

1. The second half of the 20th century is marked with the emergence and growth of globalization and English emerged as the most widely used language of international communication. India was no exception to this process of globalization and the Indian Government accepted it whole-heartedly. As an outcome, more and more foreign companies came in India and established their business centers. The Indian youths looked to these establishments as an opportunity to secure jobs. The companies were looking for man-power which is adept in their respective skills and fluent in English. The Indian youths came to realize the importance of English and fluency in Communication. Thus, mastery over and fluency in English language has been regarded as an entry-pass to acquire a good job. It turned out to be ‘a language of opportunity’.

Realizing this phenomenon, the Union and the State Governments accepted the Three Language Formula in which English is treated as the Second Compulsory Language. It was introduced at the 5th standard. Accordingly, through the Secondary and Higher-Secondary levels, the student has to learn English as the Second Compulsory Language. During the 1980s, most of the universities in India introduced ‘English for Communication’ as a compulsory course. From the perspective of English language teaching, the late 1990s proved to be very important in Maharashtra, because in this period the Government introduced English language at the 1st standard itself. The output of this decision will be visible in the near future, strengthening considerably the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance of the students.

2. The term ‘Communicative Competence’ is constantly used in the context of English language teaching in India. However, it seems that most of the students, even the teachers are unaware of the exact meaning of the term. Most of the time, Grammatical Competence is confused with Communicative Competence. The present research intends to reassess the well-established distinction between Grammatical or Linguistic Competence and Communicative Competence. Moreover, the researcher intends to elaborate the interrelation between these two competences.

3. It was Dell Hymes who, by relying upon the practical aspects of the use of language in actual situations, realized the inadequacy of the model of Linguistic Competence proposed by Chomsky and introduced the notion of Communicative Competence for the first time in Linguistics. He used the term as a reaction, showing his dissatisfaction with Chomsky’s notions of Competence or Linguistic Competence and Performance.
For Chomsky (1965), Linguistic Competence refers to the ‘ideal native speaker-hearer’s underlying abstract knowledge of language system’, whereas Performance is the actual production of language in concrete situations. Hymes (1972), however, maintains that to use language appropriately, the mastery of Linguistic Competence is almost always insufficient. Besides the knowledge of grammaticality, the speaker-hearer also needs the knowledge of appropriateness and feasibility for successful communication. Thus, he uses the term Communicative Competence to refer to the ability of ‘what to say, when, where and how’. He also refers to the way in which such a competence is acquired. At almost the same time, Halliday (1973, 1978) also evolved his Systemic-Functional Grammar out of the socio-cultural perspective. He defines Communicative Competence in terms of the functions that language needs to serve in the society. From the educational point of view, Widdowson (1978) accepted Communicative Competence as the ultimate goal of language teaching.

It is interesting to note that both Hymes and Halliday defined and described Communicative Competence with reference to the acquisition of the first language. Suddenly, scholars working in the field of Language Teaching and Learning rushed to apply these models to second and foreign language teaching and learning situation. The model was thus transported to the bilingual and multilingual situations. Munby (1978), Canale and Swain (1980), Canale (1983), Bachman (1990), Bachman and Palmer (1997), Van Ek (1986), Celce-Murcia et al. (1995), Celce-Murcia (2007) offer some of the important theoretical models of Communicative Competence. A cursory look at these models shows that there is no agreement on the number of components that a theory of Communicative Competence should include. Again, the interrelation among the different components has scarcely been discussed, and, if discussed at all, one or the other of the components is left outside the discussion.

The idea of Communicative Competence has at least three aspects: Theoretical, Methodological and Practical. Though these aspects cannot be separated from each other, it seems that the lack of agreement in the theoretical models presented by the above mentioned scholars will have devastative effects on its methodological and practical aspects. The present research, therefore, proposes to assess these theoretical models, to determine the most appropriate model(s) with supporting reasons and also to investigate the interrelationship of different components of Communicative Competence in detail.
4. All these models of Communicative Competence are prepared and used in American and European contexts. Therefore, it cannot be definitely claimed whether any of these models can be applied fruitfully to the Indian multilingual and pluricultural scenario. As Cook (1991) appropriately points out, the SLA theories and the models of Language Competence they advocate are based on the monolingual bias, and there has been no consideration of the cognitive aspects of the multilingual speaker. Similarly, Indian English, as S. K. Verma (1994), Braj Kachru (1983, 1997) and other Indian linguists contend, is now detached from its native speakers and native culture. It is now used in the new socio-cultural context which is Indian in nature. Therefore, there may be certain methodological and practical constraints on the use of these models in Indian situations. For these reasons, in the present study, the researcher intends to find out, and if required, evolve, a model of Communicative Competence sensitive to the Indian socio-cultural context.

5. As pointed out earlier, the governmental bodies on both the National and the State levels and the Indian universities have implemented English as a Compulsory language with the view of developing mastery over and fluency in English among the Indian youths. For that reason, textbooks are prepared and introduced. The present University as well, with the same objective, introduced a compulsory paper in Communicative English. The major objective of the introduction of such books is that the students should acquire Communicative Competence. Therefore, it will be essential here to find out if these books have helped the students in the acquisition of Communicative Competence and how far the students have achieved the ability of Communicative Performance.

1.5.2 Aims and Objectives

As the title of the research indicates, the researcher intends to examine communicative abilities of the PG students of Shivaji University. It has been all the time complained that the students, even though they have competence, are not able to communicate decently. The globalizing market needs young men and women fluent in communication in English. It has been, now-a-days, the first and the foremost job of the English language teacher to make the students communicate in English effectively and appropriately. There are various reasons for the communicative incompetence of the Post-graduate Students and the researcher intends to probe into these reasons. The following may be pointed as the Aims and Objectives of the study:
1. To assess Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance of the Post-Graduate students of Shivaji University.
2. To explore the problems the students face in communicating effectively, appropriately and successfully.
3. To investigate the impact of Indian socio-cultural context on the Communicative Performance of these students.
4. To provide a theoretical framework to the notions of Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance on the basis of the assessment of the students’ responses.
5. To provide the remedial guidelines regarding the improvement of the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance of the Postgraduate students of different faculties of Shivaji University in particular and all universities in Maharashtra in general, on the basis of the assessment and the conclusions arrived at.

1.5.3 Hypotheses of the Research

I. Considering the nature of Communicative Competence presented by Hymes and his assertion of the inadequacy of Linguistic Competence, the first and primary hypothesis of the present research is:

Linguistic or Grammatical Competence is not sufficient for successful communication; it needs something more.

II. English language in India is taught as the second compulsory language from Vth (from 1st standard, in case of Maharashtra) standard onwards to the Final Year of the Undergraduate level. Moreover, teachers use different approaches and methods to teach English language. However, unfortunately enough, the stress is, consciously or unconsciously, laid on the development of Grammatical Competence of the learners. Nonetheless, as Hymes (1972) says, Communicative Competence develops in the same developmental matrix wherein the Grammatical Competence develops. This assertion of Hymes leads the researcher to hypothesize that

The development of the Grammatical Competence of the PG students of Shivaji University entails the development of their Communicative Competence.
III. In his essay “On Communicative Competence”, Hymes (1972) has referred to the dichotomy between Competence and Performance presented by Chomsky and his school. Hymes contends that the relation between them is never the direct one: Performance is shaped by the Competence of the speaker, the Competence of the other participants, and the Speech Event. Accordingly, the researcher hypothesizes that

The Communicative Performance of the PG students of Shivaji University does not directly correspond to their Communicative Competence.

IV. Right from the 1950s and the 1960s, linguists have been engaged with the investigation of the impact of the Mother Tongue (L1) on the Second Language (L2) acquisition and production. In the present scenario, English is learned as a second language. The first language of most of the students is Marathi; and it is in the socio-cultural background of Marathi language that they learn English. Linguists like T. Takahashi and Beebe (1987), Hill (1997), Maeshiba et al. (1996), Kellerman (1983), Olshtain (1983), Robinson (1992) and Sarwade (2010) are of the view that the major influence of the L1 is seen in the interlanguage pragmatic abilities of these learners. Moreover, the learners use Communicative Strategies when they face certain problem in achieving a communicative goal. In such situations, the learners use whatever knowledge they have of L2 and general knowledge of communication process from their L1 (Fraech and Kasper, 1983: xx). As a result, the researcher hypothesizes:

The Communicative Performance, particularly in the context of the Communicative strategies used in the performance, reflects the influence of the Mother Tongue of these students.

V. The researcher proposes to study the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance of the PG students of Arts, Commerce and Sciences faculties. Considering the admission process of the University PG Departments, admission on the basis of either marks obtained at the undergraduate level (in terms of Arts and Commerce faculties) or in the Entrance Test and also the marks obtained at the undergraduate level (for Science faculty), the researcher hypothesizes that

i. The Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance of the PG students of English are better than that of the students of other Departments.

ii. Since English is the medium of instruction for Science faculty students from their XIth class onwards, their Communicative Competence and Communicative
Performance are better than that of the students of other faculties, except the students of English.

1.5.4 Delimitation of the Study

The present research intends to study the Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance of the Post-graduate students of Shivaji University. However, there are certain methodological and practical problems. Firstly, how to assess the Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance is the major problem. Since it has been maintained that the earlier techniques like the Discrete Item Tests are not sufficient to assess the Communicative Performance, the researcher has used Written Discourse Completion Test (Written DCT). Moreover, the researcher intends to assess the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance of about 150 representative students. Such a big number imposes certain restriction on the time required for and the amount of elicited data. Therefore, it is not possible to use all the four skills in the measurement process. Basically, the focus of the research will be on the writing and the reading skills.