CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE AND PERFORMANCE

2.0 Preview

The chapter is divided into four parts. In Part I, the researcher considers some of the models of Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance. The following models are discussed: Dell Hymes’ (1972) model of Communicative Competence and Performance, M. A. K. Halliday’s contribution to and opinions regarding the concept of Communicative Competence and Performance, Munby’s (1978) Model of Communicative Competence for Syllabus Design, Widdowson’s (1978) elaborations of the Communicative Competence, Canale and Swain’s (1980) model of Communicative Competence, Canale’s (1983) adaptations of Canale and Swain model, Van Ek’s (1986) Model of Communicative Ability, Bachman’s (1990) model of Communicative Language Ability (CLA), Bachman and Palmer’s (1997) modifications in Bachman’s (1990) model, Celce-Murcia, Dornyei and Thurrell’s (1995) model of Communicative Competence, and Celce-Murcia’s (2007) advances in the previous model of Communicative Competence. The discussion of models is followed by the critique of these models with reference to the applicability and acceptability of these models in Indian situation. The critique constitutes Part II. In the light of the opinions of the scholars regarding the acceptability of the theoretical models of Communicative Competence, it is essential to investigate the practical aspects of the construct. Since the practice of CLT is based on such practical aspects of Communicative Competence, in order to prepare the account of the practical considerations of the construct, the CLT has been discussed to some details in Part III. In Part IV, the researcher has elaborated the practical aspects of the model of Communicative Competence accompanied by the units of analysis for the assessment of the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance.
2.1 American and European Models of Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance:

2.1.1 Dell Hymes’ model

As is pointed out earlier, it is Dell Hymes (1972) who introduced the theory of Communicative Competence for the first time to register his dissatisfaction with Chomsky’s (1965) terms: Competence and Performance. Chomsky uses the terms ‘grammaticality’ and ‘acceptability’ in order to elaborate his notions of Competence and Performance. For him, Competence is concerned with ‘grammaticality’ of language and ‘acceptability’ is the sole concern of Performance. While opposing Chomsky’s stand, Hymes (ibid) contend that the consideration of the socio-cultural aspects is imperative in any study of language use and accordingly increases the number of the parameters from two to four: Possibility, Feasibility, Appropriateness and Occurrence. He introduces them in the following way:

1. Whether (and to what degree) something is formally possible
2. Whether (and to what degree) something is feasible in virtue of the means of implementation available;
3. Whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate (adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated;
4. Whether (and to what degree) something is in fact done, actually performed, and what its doing entails.          (1972: 281)

These parameters need to be referred to in any investigation of the abilities of the language learner. Therefore, it will be proper here to discuss the four judgments elaborately:

1. **Whether (and to what degree) something is formally possible**

   By this formulation Hymes expresses the concern of the contemporary linguistic theory of the openness and potentiality of language and its generalization to cultural system. For Hymes, ‘grammaticality’ should be considered with reference to and as derived from the cultural systems.

2. **Whether (and to what degree) something is feasible in virtue of the means of implementation available**
This is predominantly a psychological factor. It includes factors such as ‘memory limitation, perceptual device, effects of properties such as nesting, embedding, branching and the like’.

3. Whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate (adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated

In Transformational Grammar, appropriateness is discussed under the heading of performance, and it corresponds to acceptability. But for Hymes (1972: 285-86), this property provides sense of relation to the contextual features. Therefore, this dimension should be controlled even also in competence. Since judgments of appropriateness employ tacit knowledge, Chomsky discusses the relation between sentences and situation in mentalist terms. Hymes, on the contrary, asks to refer to the general socio-cultural theory when this factor of appropriateness is discussed.

4. Whether (and to what degree) something is in fact done, actually performed, and what its doing entails

This formulation asserts that the study of Communicative Competence cannot restrict itself to occurrences, but it cannot ignore them for two reasons:
a. Structures of language seems to change due to its occurrences in real situations; and
b. The capabilities of language users do include some (perhaps unconscious) knowledge of properties of occurrences and shifts in them as indicators of style, response, etc.

Hymes (1972: 286) asserts that in the broad theory of Competence all these judgments are systematically linked to produce and interpret actually occurring cultural behaviour.

2.1.2 M. A. K. Halliday’s ‘Meaning Potential’

Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday is one of those scholars appearing in second half of the 20th Century who relied heavily on the socio-cultural context of language and devised their theories taking into consideration the socio-cultural aspects of language. Halliday is known for his ‘Scale and Category Grammar’ which gave way to ‘Systemic-Functional Grammar’. Influenced by Whorf, Malinowski and Firth (Kress, 1976), Halliday looks at language from ‘functional’ point of view. For him, learning a language is learning the ‘meaning potential’ of language. He maintains that the term ‘language acquisition’ is misleading in that nobody acquires language; what are acquired are the functions of language. Therefore, he prefers the term ‘language development’ to ‘language acquisition’.
Language, according to Halliday, is a product of social process. When child learns language, two simultaneous and inseparable processes occur: (1) he constructs a picture of the reality around him and inside him and (2) he constructs the semantic system. It is in this sense that Halliday says language is ‘shared meaning potential’, at once both ‘a part of experience of an individual and an inter-subjective interpretation of experience’ (Halliday 1978: 1). It explains the reasons of Halliday’s assertion that social reality or culture is itself an edifice of meaning, i.e. a ‘social semiotic’. Thus, for Halliday, we do not learn language, but the edifice of meanings which is itself a socio-cultural phenomenon.

There are two complementary perspectives in linguistics: intra-organism and inter-organism. 1960s witnessed the major emphasis on intra-organism perspective; but 1970s was dominated by the inter-organism perspective. Intra-organism study of language means the investigation of ‘language as knowledge’ of ‘what speaker knows’, whereas in inter-organism perspective language is studied as ‘social behaviour’ or language in relation to social man. Halliday accepts the inter-organism perspective and asserts that ‘language and social man’ is a unified concept. Therefore, it should be understood and investigated as a whole: There can be no social man without language and vice versa (1978: 12). Moreover, when it is said that one knows one’s mother tongue, it does not mean only the abstract linguistic system of the language but rather one knows how to use it, communicate with others by using it, and also the appropriateness of the language in a situation.

Halliday says that the acceptance of the inter-organism perspective entails the acceptance of the ‘Functional’ theory of language development. The ‘functional’ theory is not about the mental processes but the social processes involved in learning the mother tongue. Learning a language is learning ‘how to mean’:

If there is anything which the child can be said to acquiring, it is a range of potential, which we could refer to as his ‘meaning potential’. This consists in the mastery of a small number of elementary functions of language, and of a range of choices in meaning within each one.

(1978: 19)

Halliday conceives of language as encoding ‘behaviour potential’ into ‘meaning potential’ i.e. as a means of expressing what the human organism ‘can do’, in interaction with other human organisms, by turning it into what s/he ‘can mean’. What
s/he ‘can mean’ (the semantic system) is, in turn, encoded into what s/he ‘can say’ (the lexi-co-grammatical system). Halliday views language as tristratal system i.e. consisting of three branches: semantics, grammar and phonology. The grammatical is the system of ‘what the speaker can say’. Here it is unnecessary to talk about what the speaker knows. This grammatical system, ‘can say’ operates as the realization of semantic system i.e. what the speaker ‘can mean’. This semantic system is not the final goal. Going outside the language, ‘can mean’ is also the realization of ‘can do’, the ‘behaviour potential’:

... the semantic system, which is the meaning potential, embodied in language, is itself the realization of a higher-level semiotic which we may define as a behavioural system or more generally as a social semiotic. (1978: 39)

Thus, the functional picture of language system is ‘a culturally specific and situational sensitive range of meaning potential’ (1978: 34).

Referring to Hymes’ concept of ‘Communicative Competence’, Halliday (ibid) takes Hymes at task by saying that he is applying the intra-organism perspective to the things which are essentially inter-organism. He calls Hymes’ stand as something like ‘psychosociolinguistics’. As is already shown, there is no place for ‘what the speaker knows’ or ‘competence’ in ‘functional’ theory. In the intra-organism study, language (langue) is seen as pure and is contaminated when it is translated into speech (parole). Therefore, Halliday discards the boundaries between language and speech, langue and parole and competence and performance. On the contrary, by the ‘use’ of language, Halliday means ‘the selection of options within the linguistic system in the context of actual situation types’ (1978: 46). Contrary to Chomsky’s notion of ‘competence’, Halliday defines his notion of ‘Meaning potential’ in terms of culture and not of mind: what speakers ‘can do’ and ‘can mean’, not ‘what they know’. ‘can do’ is related to ‘does’ as ‘potential to actual’, whereas the relation between ‘knows’ and ‘does’ is complex and oblique. Therefore, Halliday says we must pay attention to what is ‘said’ and relate it systematically to ‘what might have been said but was not’. Whereas the ‘context of culture’ defines ‘the potential’ (can do), the range of possibilities; the ‘context of situation’ determines ‘the actual’ (does) the choice that ‘takes place’. Thus, ‘can do’, ‘can mean’ and ‘can say’ relate to language as a system, its actual occurrence is ‘does’.
Canale and Swain (1980:18) apply Halliday’s theory of ‘meaning potential’ to second language acquisition and point out that Halliday’s notion of ‘a socially constrained meaning potential’ ‘is not unlike’ Hymes’ notion of ‘Communicative Competence’. Though they accept the three level options in Halliday’s language system; they do not confirm the interrelation of these levels. They object to the relations between the grammatical options (can say) and semantic options (can mean) and also the relations between the semantic options and the social behaviour options (can do).

Considering the application of this theory to language learning and more particularly to second language acquisition, Canale and Swain (1980:18) maintain that ‘meaningful (verbal) communication is not possible without some knowledge of grammar’. They assert:

> It may be more realistic to view the normal process at the beginning of such learning as one in which what can be said (grammatical options) determines in some what can be meant (semantic options) in the second language. That is, the meanings (and perhaps some of the social behaviour options) that one is able to exploit through the second language are restricted by the grammatical means of expression that have been mastered. (1980:18)

But, they accept that the grammatical options (can say) may be the realization of the semantic options (can mean) at the later stage of language development. They also do not accept the relation between ‘can mean’ and ‘can do’ elaborated by Halliday. According to Halliday, the semantic options are the realization of the social behaviour options. They assert that such type of social behaviour options should be included into the theory of Communicative Competence, but they do not seem sufficient to account for the semantic options available to the language user.

Halliday is basically concerned with L1 acquisition. In the present context the question is: ‘Can these theories of ‘meaning potential’ be applied to the acquisition of English in Indian socio-cultural situation?’ As per Halliday’s theory, by the time the learner comes to acquire second language (L2), s/he has already acquired the ‘meaning potential’ of the social system (here, Indian and specifically the Maharashtrian). Following Halliday’s assertion, learning L2 means learning the expression of the already acquired functions in a new language system i.e. the learner already has ‘can do’ and ‘can mean’. What s/he has to learn is how to express the already acquired
‘meaning potential’ in the new language system i.e. ‘can say’. Here, the stand taken by Canale and Swain seems to be acceptable; which indicates that unless the learner has at least minimal knowledge of grammatical system of the new language, it is not possible for him/her to expresses the existing functions in the new language.

This argument also leads to another important fact related to English as it is used in Indian sub-continent. Since the learner is learning only the ‘language system’ i.e. ‘can say’, and also that he has already acquired ‘can do’ and ‘can mean’, the learner’s expression of ‘can mean’ (which is in turn the realization of the social semiotic) will be culture specific, because here English language will express the ‘meaning potential’ and ‘behaviour potential’ which are essentially Indian. This particular assertion will be important to study the language variation i.e. the way English is used by the ‘native’ speaker and the way it is used by the others like Indians. But still the Indian variety of English is not totally different from other verities of English and comprehensible for the non-Indians. There could be two reasons (1) as Halliday says there are functional universals in language, particularly the three functions of adult language system that he elaborates; and (2) the stand of Canale and Swain (which is discussed above). However, this particular explanation is important in the study of the Communicative Competence of Indian users of English. The Communicative Competence of Indian users of English is going to be highly localized variety of English in that the Indian user of English will use English language but will follow the Indian norms of appropriateness. Therefore, the mastery here will be to use English language to express the Indian functions, ‘meaning potential’, ‘can mean’ in culturally appropriate ways ‘behaviour potential’ or ‘can do’.

2.1.3 John Munby’s Theoretical Framework of Communicative Competence

Munby (1978: 22-27) is basically concerned with the preparation of teaching material for second and foreign language students. His framework of Communicative Competence is thus an attempt to provide rationale to the curriculum design on the basis of the current thinking about the construct of Communicative Competence. He reviews the contributions of different linguists and theoreticians to the model of Communicative Competence and elaborates his own framework. Considering the communicative purpose as the foundation, his framework of Communicative Competence consists of three major constituents, which are further divided into different parts.
1. Socio-cultural Orientation

According to Munby, Communicative Competence has socio-cultural orientation, in that language is essentially a socio-cultural phenomenon and as such this orientation should be kept in mind whenever language is used for any communicative purpose. This constituent consists of three parts:

a. Competence and the Community: Munby (ibid) suggests that it is wrong to think of speech community as homogenous with the perfect competence of every member. Rather it is heterogeneous and consists of people with varying degrees of competence. Therefore, the nature of Communicative Competence should be considered with reference to the communicative needs of the speech community and the relevant target level required for the fulfillment of the needs.

b. Contextual Appropriacy: Following Hymes, Munby (1978: 23) suggests that the knowledge of what is syntactically possible in a language is not sufficient for effective communication. He thinks that the rules of use along with the language features which are appropriate to the relevant social context should be taught to the learner. That is to say, Communicative Competence should also involve the knowledge of the varieties which are appropriate in specific situation. By ‘variety’, Munby means ‘the selection and use of linguistic forms for its constitutive communicative acts or functions’ (1978:24).

c. Communication Needs: The socio-cultural orientation of Communicative Competence emphasizes that language is used for social function. As such, the communicative requirements or needs of the language learner should be considered before the selection of the speech functions or communicative acts made to teach.

2. Sociosemantic Basis of Linguistic Knowledge

This constituent consists of two components:

a. Language as Semantic Options deriving from the Social Structure: Taking Halliday’s concept of ‘meaning potential’ as the starting point, Munby asserts that linguistic knowledge has sociosemantic basis which reflects in its meanings. Therefore, he advocates that the programme designers, materials producers, teachers and testers should give priority to the meaning of language rather than any other aspect.

b. A Communicative Approach: Munby praises the semantic or notional approach of Wilkins (1976), because it ensures the consideration of the communicative value of linguistic content. Therefore, he advocates that one should start from the notional
categories which the learner is required to handle and then select those elements which are appropriate to the level and the requirement of the learner. Thus, the communicative approach, according to Munby, is helpful for the acquisition of Communicative Competence.

3. Discourse Level of Operation

Munby proposes that Communicative Competence is essentially a matter of discourse, which is present in both the written and the spoken communication. Discourse is understood as ‘a level between grammar and non-linguistic organization’ (1978:25). The terms like Speech Act, Speech Event, and Speech Situation are the parameters of discourse. Referring to Speech Acts as a parameter of discourse, Munby writes:

Speech acts have formal features and rules of occurrence; so do exchanges, which consist of different types of moves and act, and rules of occurrence, state how the acts combine to form moves and how the moves combine to form exchanges. Whatever the terms used, the concern here is with units of communication, distinct from the generally above the level of the clause, units which have formal characteristics and are governed by rules of occurrence. (1978: 26)

Speech Acts are thus the realization of both the linguistic elements and their occurrence in the non-linguistic organization. Munby maintains that Communicative Competence includes the ‘ability to use linguistic forms to perform communicative acts and to understand the communicative functions of sentences and their relationships to other sentences’.

2.1.4 H. G. Widdowson’s Contribution to the Theory of Communicative Competence

Right from the inception of the theory of Communicative Competence, Widdowson has supported the theory and assessed its applicability to language teaching. He (1978) discourses the binary oppositions between such terms as ‘Usage’ vs. ‘Use’, ‘Cohesion’ vs. ‘Coherence’, ‘Knowledge’ vs. ‘Ability for Use’, etc. to register his position in accordance with the theories of Communicative Competence. He (1989: 130) maintains that Hymes’ theory of Communicative Competence consists of two parts: ‘knowledge’ and ‘ability for use’. He is of the opinion that Communicative
Competence is not a matter of knowing rules for the composition of sentences and being able to employ such rules to combine expressions when required. Rather, it is the ability to make necessary adjustments according to the contextual demands. Thus, for Widdowson, Communicative Competence is essentially a matter of adaptation to ‘contextual cues’.

2.1.5 Canale and Swain model of Communicative Competence

Unlike the models of Hymes and Halliday, Canale and Swain (1980) are basically concerned to prepare and apply their model to second language teaching and testing contexts. This model of Canale and Swain is specifically important and influential in the literature of second language teaching, testing and syllabus designing for two important reasons. First, they, for the first time, tried to distinguish between the ‘theories of basic communication skills’, the ‘sociolinguistic perspectives on Communication Competence’ and what they term as ‘integrative framework of Communicative Competence’ and secondly, for the first time, once again, they presented the integrative and elaborate model of Communicative Competence. This model seems to be accepted by almost all the subsequent theorists as the starting point of their respective elaborations. Influenced by Hymes (1972) and Campbell and Wales (1970) against what Campbell and Wales call stronger version of the theory of ‘Competence and Performance’ of Chomsky, Canale and Swain discuss in details the meanings of these terms in both stronger and weaker senses, and elaborate the importance of Sociolinguistic Competence in the study of Language Competence.

Canale and Swain give equal importance to both ‘Grammatical’ Competence and the ‘Socio-cultural’ Competence and both of them constitute the Communicative Competence. They write: “Just as Hymes (1972) was able to say that there are rules of grammar that would be useless without rules of language use, so we feel that there are rules of language use that would be useless without the rules of grammar” (1980: 5).

In this assertion, Canale and Swain are not opposing Hymes; rather, they want to suggest that the learner should have at least the minimal Grammatical Competence; and that in language teaching and testing this Grammatical Competence should not be ignored. Referring to the distinction between the Communicative Competence and the Communicative Performance, they maintain that ‘almost all researchers dealing with Communicative Competence do (at least implicitly) maintain this distinction’ (1980: 5). But there are two exceptions – Halliday and Kempson (1977). Kempson, accepting
Chomsky’s stronger position, says that Competence refers exclusively to rules of grammar and Communicative Competence is identified with the theory of performance i.e. for Kempson, Competence is Grammatical Competence and Performance is Communicative Competence. Canale and Swain strongly disagree with Kempson in that she has completely ignored the Sociolinguistic Competence. They maintain that there are ‘rule governed, universal and creative aspects of Sociolinguistic Competence just as there are of Grammatical Competence’ (1980: 6). That is to say, in the process of exploring the Communicative Competence, the study of the Sociolinguistic Competence is as essential as that of the Grammatical Competence. Referring to the relation between Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance, they observe:

> It is reasonable to assume then that regularities in both the user’s knowledge of language use can be abstracted from their actual realization in performance and studied independently of non-essential or non-specific features of performance.          (1980: 6)

Thus, Communicative Competence for them is the ‘relationships and interactions between Grammatical Competence and Sociolinguistic Competence’. By Communicative Performance they mean ‘the actual demonstration of this knowledge (Grammatical Competence and Sociolinguistic Competence) in real second language situations and for authentic communication purposes’. Canale and Swain do not include ‘ability for use’ in their theory of Communicative Competence i.e. they do not include the psychological factors like memory, perceptual strategies, etc. in their model of Communicative Competence, but include them in Communicative Performance because, according to them, such factors are constraints on the production and comprehension of sentences. They give importance to Grammatical and Sociolinguistic Competences in their relation to each other and say that they should be studied independently from each other.

Considering the sociolinguistic perspectives on Communicative Competence, Canale and Swain evaluate its contribution to the theory of Communicative Competence. They observe that Hymes’ two notions are specifically important in the theory of Communicative Competence: the notion of ‘Communicative Competence’ and of ‘Speech Event’. Canale and Swain observe:
Communicative Competence is …viewed by Hymes as the interaction of grammatical (what is formally possible), psycholinguistic (what is feasible in terms of human information processing), socio-cultural (what is social meaning or value of a given utterance), and probabilistic (what actually occurs) system of competence. (1980: 16)

As is already pointed out, Canale and Swain are of the opinion that Psycholinguistic Competence should not be included into Communicative Competence and put it in Communicative Performance. However, they explore the relatively ignored aspect of Hymes’ model i.e. ‘probabilistic rules of occurrence’. However, while dealing with this aspect of Communicative Competence, Canale and Swain fall prey to what is called ‘native fallacy’. Referring to the components of Speech Event that are specified by Hymes, Canale and Swain say that these components are essential for ‘the formulation of rules of language use’ and ‘to the analysis of the social meaning of the utterance’. Canale and Swain, however, are not sure of whether all of these components are always crucial in all Speech Events.

Canale and Swain study Halliday and his theory of ‘sociosemantics’. They consider the importance of Halliday for the theory of Communicative Competence. As mentioned above, however, Canale and Swain do not accept the relation between the grammatical options, semantic options and the social behaviour options as it is seen by Halliday. They say that in the theory of Communicative Competence reference should be made to the social behaviour options, but such social aspects are not adequate to explain the semantic options available to the language user.

For them, the integrative theory of Communicative Competence is:

[o]ne in which there is a synthesis of knowledge of basic grammatical principles, knowledge of how language is used in social contexts to perform communicative functions, and knowledge of how utterances and communicative functions can be combined according to the principles of discourse. (1980: 20)

Canale and Swain then go on elaborating their framework of Communicative Competence. While preparing the framework, Canale and Swain have accepted six general assumptions about the nature of communication and of a theory of Communicative Competence:
1. Communication is based in socio-cultural, interpersonal interaction, to involve unpredictability and creativity, to take place in a discourse and socio-cultural context, to be purposive behaviour, to be carried out under performance constraints, to involve use of authentic (as opposed to textbook-contrived) language, and to be judged as a successful or not on the basis of behavioural outcomes.

2. The relationship between a proposition (or the literal meaning of an utterance) and its social meaning is variable across different sociocultural and discourse contexts, and that communication involves the continuous evaluation and negotiation of social meaning on the part of the participants.

3. Genuine communication involves the ‘reduction of uncertainty’ on the part of the participants; for example, a speaker asking a question will not know the answer in advance, but this uncertainty will be reduced when the answer is provided.

4. Communication involves verbal and non-verbal symbols, oral and written modes, and production and comprehension skills.

5. A theory of Communicative Competence interacts with a theory of human action and with other systems of human knowledge.

6. Communicative Competence, or more precisely its interaction with other systems of knowledge, is observable indirectly in actual Communicative Performance. Their Framework of Communicative Competence consists of three basic competencies:

1) **Grammatical Competence**

   It includes knowledge of the lexical items and of the rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology. This knowledge helps the learners to determine and express the literal meaning of the utterances.

2) **Sociolinguistic Competence**

   It includes two types of rules: the socio-cultural rules of use and the rules of discourse. Both of these rules help the learner to interpret the social meaning of the utterances.

   a) Socio-cultural rules of use: These rules decide the appropriateness of utterances with reference to the components of Speech Event specified by Hymes (1967, 1968). The primary focus here is the appropriateness of proposition and communicative functions within a given socio-cultural context. The secondary focus is on the appropriate attitude and register or style which is conveyed by the grammatical forms used.
b) Rules of Discourse: Canale and Swain say that until the clear theory of discourse is evolved, such rules mean Cohesion (grammatical connections) and Coherence (socio-cultural rules) available in the utterances. Such rules of discourse refer to notions such as topic and comment.

3) Strategic Competence

There are verbal and non-verbal Communication Strategies. These strategies are used to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence. There are two main types of such strategies – those relate primarily to Grammatical Competence (how to paraphrase grammatical forms that one has not mastered or cannot recall momentarily) and those that relate more to Sociolinguistic Competence (e.g. various role-playing strategies, how to address strangers when unsure of their social status). Such strategies are acquired thorough experience in real-life communication situations.

In each of these components of Communicative Competence, Canale and Swain assume that there will be a subcomponent of ‘probability rules of occurrence’ (specified by Hymes in ‘something is done’). However, there is no clear knowledge of the forms of such probability rules or the manner in which they are to be acquired. Still Canale and Swain maintain that ‘the second language learner cannot be expected to have achieved a sufficient level of Communicative Competence in the second language if no knowledge of probability of rules is developed in the three components of Communicative Competence’ (1980: 31).

2.1.6 Canale’s Adaptations of Canale and Swain Model

In ‘Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approach to Language Teaching and Testing’, Canale and Swain have claimed that it is almost impossible to prepare a theory of Communicative Performance because ‘it contains all the variables unrelated to linguistic knowledge’. Canale (1983), however, was trying to create such a theory of Performance but he prefers the phrase ‘actual communication’ to ‘performance’. Canale clearly states that ‘Communicative Competence refers to both knowledge and skill in using this knowledge when interacting in actual communication’ (1983: 5). Thus, the framework of Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance should take into account not only the contextual variables but also the psychological factors that influence ‘actual communication’.
Canale, thus, conceives of Communicative Competence as different from ‘actual communication’, and as consisting of knowledge (whether conscious or unconscious) and the skills needed to use this knowledge in actual communication. Thus, this knowledge and the skills to use it are the underlying factors that will be manifested in the ‘actual communication’. This relation of Communicative Competence and ‘actual communication’ is viewed by Fulcher and Davidson (2007:41) as per the following diagram:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicative Competence</th>
<th>Actual communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>..........................................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and skills</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical Competence</td>
<td>Sociolinguistic Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instances of Language use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.1: Canale’s representation of Communicative Competence and Performance**

As for the components of Communicative Competence, with certain changes, they remain the same as they are presented in Canale and Swain (1980). However, the differences in the model are important. Unlike the previous model, Canale here introduces fourth component: Discourse Competence.

The components in the framework are:

1. **Grammatical Competence**

   This competence remains the same as it is defined and elaborated in Canale and Swain model.

2. **Sociolinguistic Competence**

   Unlike the previous model, in this model Sociolinguistic Competence refers only to the socio-cultural rules. It is the appropriateness of meaning (whether functions, attitudes and ideas are appropriate to context) and form (how appropriate the realizations of function, attitudes and ideas are in specific context). Thus, this aspect includes the pragmatic knowledge. Canale does not include the knowledge of discourse in this competence; and creates a separate competence for this knowledge.

3. **Strategic Competence**

   As mentioned earlier, for Canale and Swain (1980) Strategic Competence is essentially compensatory in nature and it helps to overcome the breakdowns in
communication. Here, however, Canale expands the scope of the definition to include strategies that ‘enhance the effectiveness of communication’ such as changing the speed or pitch of delivery for rhetorical effects.

4. Discourse Competence

It is defined here as the ability to produce ‘a unified spoken or written text in different genres’ (1983: 9) using Cohesion with respect to form and Coherence with respect to meaning. The definition of this competence does not differ in any way from that provided by Canale and Swain (1980); but creating a separate category for this competence highlights the greater importance allotted to this competence.

As is already seen, Canale and Swain do not consider Hymes’ notion of ‘ability for use’ while referring to Communicative Competence. Canale (1983) however, introduced another term ‘skill’ to refer to the skills in using the knowledge of Communicative Competence. Thus, it could be seen that Canale in introducing this term follows Hymes more closely than he is doing so in the previous model.

2.1.7 Van Ek’s Model of Communicative Ability

While Canale and Swain are working on the theory of Communicative Competence in North America, Van Ek is working in the Council of Europe on the same topic. Van Ek (1986: 33-65), quoted by Byram (1997: 9), argued that the Foreign Language Teaching is not merely concerned with training the learners in communication skills but it should also aim at the personal and social development of the learner as an individual. To meet the goal, he presented ‘a framework for comprehensive foreign language teaching objectives’ which includes the following six dimensions of Communicative Competence:

1. Linguistic Competence

It is the ability to produce and interpret meaningful utterances formed in accordance with the rules of the language. It is also concerned with the understanding of the conventional meaning of the utterances.

2. Sociolinguistic Competence

It is concerned with the ability of the learner to choose a form of language with respect to such conditions as setting, relationship between communication partners, communicative intention, etc. Thus, it consists of the relation between the linguistic forms and their contextual and situational meaning.
3. Discourse Competence

It refers to the ability to use appropriate strategies in the construction and interpretation of texts.

4. Strategic Competence

In the face of the difficulties in communication, in order to get the meaning across, certain strategies are used. Such strategies are referred to under this component.

5. Socio-cultural Competence

Accepting that every language is situated in a socio-cultural context, Van Ek asserts that the second language learner is expected to have familiarity with such socio-cultural context of the language.

6. Social competence

It involves both the will and the skill to interact with others, involving motivation, attitude, self confidence, empathy and the ability to handle social situations. (Byram, 1997: 9-11)

2.1.8 Bachman’s (1990) Communicative Language Ability (CLA)

Lyle F. Bachman is concerned with language testing and his present framework of Communicative Language Ability directly comes out of his theoretical and empirical works that he has undertaken either himself or with collaboration. Bachman’s model registers its difference from and expansion of the previous models that have been discussed in this chapter. The model is different in two ways. First, Bachman clearly distinguishes between ‘knowledge’ and ‘skills’. Such distinction is not found in the previous models. Second, it explicitly ‘attempts to characterize the processes by which the various components interact with each other and with the context in which language use occurs’ (Bachman, 1990: 81). He frankly accepts that his model is based on the present thinking of the phenomenon of Communicative Competence and Performance. Again for the first time, Bachman has separated ‘Strategic Competence’ as pertaining to all the competences of ‘Language Competence’. His model of Communicative Language Ability is shown in Figure 2.2.

For Bachman there are four components of Communicative Language Ability:

I. Language Competence (Knowledge)
II. Strategic Competence (‘the capacity for implementing the components of language competence in contextualized communicative language use’)
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III. Psycho-physiological Mechanisms (which enable ‘the actual execution of language as a physical phenomenon’)

IV. World Knowledge: Bachman conceives that the ‘Strategic Competence’ is also affected by the knowledge structures of the world i.e. the world knowledge of the language user.

Figure 2.2 Components of Communicative Language Ability (Bachman, 1990:85)

I. Language Competence

Bachman classifies the component called ‘Language Competence’ in two divisions:

1. Organizational Competence and
2. Pragmatic Competence

Each of these components is still further subdivided into more divisions. According to him, language use is nothing but this interaction between different components.

1. Organizational Competence

This competence consists of different abilities concerned with both the production and the comprehension of formal structures of language with respect to grammaticality, their propositional content and ordering into a text. This competence, therefore, is concerned with the relationships among signs and their referents. Bachman classifies this component into two different competences:
Grammatical Competence

It consists of the abilities like knowledge of vocabulary, morphology, syntax, and phonology/graphology and it governs the choice of words to express specific significations, their forms, their arrangements in utterances to express propositions, and their physical realizations, either as sounds or as written symbols.

Textual Competence

This competence includes the knowledge of the conventions for joining utterances together to form a text, which is essentially a unit of language—spoken or written. Text consists of two or more utterances or sentences that are structured according to the rules of Cohesion and rhetorical organization. Cohesion is the explicit way of marking semantic relationships such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. Conventions of rhetorical organization involve common methods of development such as narration, description, comparison, classification, process analysis. Such type of Textual Competence is also believed to be involved in conversational language use.

2. Pragmatic Competence

In language use, the relation between the user of the language and the context of communication is also important. This relationship is considered in Pragmatic Competence. Pragmatics, according to Bachman, ‘is concerned with the relationship between utterances and the acts or functions that speakers (or writers) intend to perform through these utterances, which can be called Illocutionary Force of utterances, and the characteristics of the context of language use that determine the appropriateness of utterances’ (1990: 89-90). The notion of Pragmatic Competence, therefore, includes illocutionary competence, or the knowledge of the pragmatic conventions for performing acceptable language functions, and sociolinguistic competence, or knowledge of the sociolinguistic conventions for performing language functions appropriately in a given context.

Illocutionary Competence

Bachman borrows this term from the Speech Act Theories of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). In Speech Act Theory, Illocutionary Force means the intention of the speaker in uttering an utterance. Thus, it refers to the intention of the language user in producing a specific type of utterance. There are both direct and indirect ways of expressing intention. The direct ways are simply using the medium explicitly so that the
listener (or reader) can understand the intention of the speaker (or writer). There are indirect or less direct ways also to express the intention. However, the interpretation of the intention of such indirect or less direct ways is largely dependent upon the context in which it is said. Thus, the Illocutionary Competence entails the ability to choose among several alternative utterances of different degrees of directness to suit the specific context. Bachman selects the broader framework of functions to refer to the Illocutionary Competence. Accepting Halliday and his notion of functions, he adopts the following four functions of adult language:

- **Ideational**: expressing propositions, information or feelings
- **Manipulative**: affecting the world around us, including
  - **Instrumental**: getting things done through the use of Speech Acts
  - **Regulatory**: controlling the behaviour of others
  - **Interactional**: managing interpersonal relationships
- **Heuristic**: extending our knowledge of the world
- **Imaginative**: the humorous or aesthetic use of language.

**Sociolinguistic Competence**

Sociolinguistic Competence is defined as ‘the sensitivity to, or control of the conventions of language use that are determined by the features of the specific language use context; it enables us to perform language functions in ways that are appropriate to that context’ (Bachman, 1990: 94). The components that are identified as being relevant are: dialect or variety of language; differences in register of discourse in terms of field, mode and style; sensitivity to naturalness; and cultural references and figures of speech.

**II. Strategic Competence**

Bachman sees this competence outside of the Language Competence but it interacts with almost all the aspects of the Language Competence. There are two ways in which the Strategic Competence is defined: Interactional view (Tarone, 1981) and the psycholinguistic view elaborated by Færch and Kasper (1984). Bachman says that the discussions of Strategic Competence provided by Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) do not describe the mechanisms by which it operates. Therefore, he accepts the psychological view of Strategic Competence which visualizes its operation. For him, this competence consists of three components:
1. Assessment component
   - Identify information needed for realizing a communicative goal in a particular context.
   - Decide which language competences we have to achieve the goal.
   - Decide which abilities and knowledge we share with our interlocutor.
   - Evaluate the extent to which communication is successful.

2. Planning component
   - Retrieve information from Language Competence.
   - Select modality or channel.
   - Assemble an utterance.

3. Execution component
   - Use psychophysical mechanisms to realize the utterance.

(Bachman, 1990: 84-108)

This model of Communicative Language Ability proposed by Bachman is slightly amended and changed in Bachman and Palmer (1997). Like the 1990 model, this model also assigns central role to the Strategic Competence, however, it contains a new element: Affective schemata. For Bachman and Palmer, Affective Schemata are the “affective or emotional correlates of topical knowledge”, or the memories or past experiences that determine whether an individual will engage with a particular task and, if they do, the level of linguistic flexibility they will bring to it” (Fulcher and Davidson, 2007:45). This ‘Affective Schemata’ is discussed in two situations. First, people from certain cultures or backgrounds will not interact on some highly charged topics and secondly, if a test taker feels strongly about a topic they may be motivated to engage more energetically with it. In such situations, ‘Affective Schemata’ interacts with the topical knowledge (which was previously referred to as knowledge structures of the world). Except the introduction of this ‘Affective Schemata’, the other changes in the model are not important. This addition is treated as a major step forward in making the model much more complex’ (Fulcher and Davidson, 2007:45). Another change in the 1997 model is related to the definition of Strategic Competence. Fulcher and Davidson assert:

Now it is defined as a set of metacognitive strategies, or ‘higher-order processes’ that explain the interaction of knowledge and affective components of language use. (2007:45)
2.1.9 Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) model of Communicative Competence

Celce-Murcia et al. (1995:4) contend that from the time Canale and Swain created the model of Communicative Competence, no serious attempt has been made to specify the content of the model of Communicative Competence to suit the CLT requirements. They criticize the Bachman’s (1990) model of Communicative Language Ability on two grounds: (1) the model is primarily concerned with language testing context i.e. it is viewed as mere tools for language testing rather than the general model of Communicative Competence; and (2) the content specification in the model is developed on ad hoc basis for syllabus design. As a result, Celce-Murcia et al. attempt to produce a model of Communicative Competence which can be used as a content base for syllabus design (1995:6).

The present model, however, differs in certain respects from the Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983, 1984) models. This model consists of five components: Like Canale (ibid), Discourse Competence is conceptualized as a separate component; while the component called Actional Competence is introduced for the first time. By Actional Competence they mean the knowledge required to understand ‘communicative intent by performing and interpreting speech acts and speech act sets’ (1995: 9). Canale and Swain and Canale have viewed this ability as belonging to Sociolinguistic Competence.

Again Sociolinguistic Competence of Canale and Swain has been relabelled as Socio-cultural Competence ‘to better distinguish it from Actional Competence’. The Grammatical Competence is called Linguistic Competence, because it consists of lexis and phonology as well as syntax and morphology. Strategic Competence, unlike Bachman and Palmer, is conceived to be a set of skills for overcoming communication problems or deficiencies.

Discourse Competence

For Celce-Murcia et al. this competence is at the centre and consists of the union of Cohesion and Coherence, which was separated by Bachman and Palmer. Like Bachman and Palmer, there is no discussion of topical knowledge or affective factors.

Actional Competence

It is viewed as the knowledge of speech acts needed (1) to engage in interpersonal exchange; (2) to impart information; and (3) to express information and feelings.
Socio-cultural Competence

It refers to the knowledge of context that decides what is said, and how it is said. The contextual factors include the participants and the situational variables. Stylistic appropriateness relates to Politeness conventions and stylistic variation of register and formality. It also includes the knowledge of social conventions and awareness of values, beliefs and living conditions of the target language community. At last the model includes non-verbal or paralinguistic communication including body language, proxemics and the use of the silence.

Strategic Competence

It consists of avoiding strategies, achievement strategies, stalling strategies, self-monitoring strategies, and most importantly, interactional strategies.

Celce-Murcia et al. say that the interaction of all these competencies takes place in the Strategic Competence. Moreover the model contains both the ‘knowledge’ and ‘ability for use’ component elaborated by Hymes. The authors finally stress that:

\[
[\text{a}]\text{s McGroarty points out, ‘communicative competence’ can have different meanings depending on the learners and learning objectives inherent in a given context. Some components (or sub-components) may be more heavily weighted in some teaching-learning situations than in others. Therefore, during the course of a thorough needs analysis, a model such as ours may be adapted and/or reinterpreted according to the communicative needs of the specific learner group to which it is being applied.}\] (1995: 30)

2.1.10 Celce-Murcia (2007) model of Communicative Competence

The model presented here is a revised and updated framework of Communicative Competence which synthesizes and elaborates the previous model: Celce-Murcia et al. (1995). The model is prepared in the context of language teaching activities. Celce-Murcia asserts that there are certain perceived gaps in the previous model. Therefore she provides an elaborated and more advanced model of Communicative Competence which gives ‘central role to formulaic language (as opposed to language as system) and to the paralinguistic aspects of face-to-face oral communication’ (2007:45). The model has the following six components:
1. Socio-cultural Competence

This competence has been given the top-down role in this model. It refers to the pragmatic knowledge of the speaker. That is to say, it consists of the knowledge of appropriateness of language use with reference to the social and the cultural context and also the knowledge of the varieties of language (2007:46). According to her, the social or the cultural blunder is far more serious than the grammatical one. In this regard Celce-Murcia discusses the challenge- that in second and foreign language teaching, the teachers are more aware of the linguistic rules than the socio-cultural rules of the target language. She discusses three most crucial socio-cultural variables:

1. Social contextual factors: the participants’ age, gender, status, social distance and their relation to each other.
2. Stylistic appropriateness: Politeness Strategies, a sense of genres and registers
3. Cultural factors: background knowledge of the target language group, major dialects/regional differences, and cross-cultural awareness.

Partial knowledge of such competencies can be acquired from the knowledge of the life and traditions and history and literature of target language community. According to Celce-Murcia, the ‘extended living experience’ in the target language community is best to acquire such competencies.
2. Discourse Competence

Celce-Murcia gives, as in the previous model, central role to this competence. It refers to the selection and arrangements of words and utterances into a unified discourse to achieve intended communicative effect (2007: 46). The sub-areas of Discourse Competence are:

- **Cohesion**: overt grammatical and lexical connectors
- **Deixis**: situational grounding achieved through use of personal pronouns, spatial terms (*here/there; this/that*), temporal terms (*now/then; before/after*), and textual reference (e.g. *the following table, the figure above*).
- **Coherence**: covert link in the content of the discourse.
- **Generic Structure**: formal schemata that allow the user to identify an oral discourse segment as a conversation, narrative, interview, service encounter, report, lecture, sermon, etc.

3. Linguistic Competence

The left and the right sides of the triangle (Figure 2.5) refer to the Linguistic Competence and the Formulaic Competence respectively. For her, Linguistic Competence consists of four types of knowledge: phonological, lexical, morphological and syntactic.

4. Formulaic Competence

It refers to ‘those fixed and pre-fabricated chunks of language that speakers use heavily in everyday interaction’ (2007: 48). This competence has the following manifestations:

- **Routines**: fixed phrases like *of course, all of a sudden* and formulaic chunks like *How do you do? I’m fine, thanks; how are you?*
- **Collocations**: verb-object: *spend money, play the piano* adverb-adjective: *statistically significant, mutually intelligible* adjective-noun: *tall building, legible handwriting*
- **Idioms**: e.g., *to kick the bucket = to die; to get the ax = to be fired/terminated*
- **Lexical frames**: e.g., *I’m looking for_____. See you (later/tomorrow/next week, etc)*

Supporting her introduction of Formulaic Competence, Celce-Murcia maintains that ‘fluent speakers of a language draw on formulaic knowledge of the target language as often as they use systematic linguistic knowledge’ (2007: 48).
5. Interactional Competence

It is the bottom-up component and has at least three sub-components:

1. **Actional Competence**: knowledge of how to perform common Speech Acts and Speech Act Sets in the target language involving interactions such as information exchanges, interpersonal exchanges, expression of opinions and feelings, etc.

2. **Conversational Competence**: It consists of skills like opening and closing conversation, changing topics in conversation, etc.

3. **Non-verbal/paralinguistic Competence** includes the kinesics behaviour, proxemics, haptic behaviour and non-linguistic utterances with interactional import.

According to Celce-Murcia (ibid), the Interactional Competence is extremely important since the performance of speech acts or speech act sets can differ considerably from language to language. For example, the second and foreign language students have to understand ‘how to manage social introductions, how to complain, how to apologize, and so forth’ in the target language. This actional competence should be supported by the Conversational Competence related to turn-taking in the target language. This is important because normal conversational practices in one culture are taken to be rude behaviour in another. Therefore, the awareness of both L1 and L2 conversational norms is essential in the discussion of Communicative Competence.

6. Strategic Competence

Following Oxford (2001:362), Celce-Murcia discusses three most important strategies: Cognitive Strategies, consisting of logical and analytical methods in language learning and production; Meta-cognitive Strategies, which are specifically related to monitoring function; and Memory-related Strategies, which are concerned with the limitations of memory in the retrieval process. Celce-Murcia thinks that her model (2007) is comprehensive and accurate in that:

… [i]t suggests a number of principles for the design and implementation of language courses that aim at giving learners the knowledge and skills they need to be linguistically and culturally competent in second and foreign languages. (2007:51)

Moreover, the writer herself goes on giving some of the limitations of the model that she has presented: The model is not dynamic and organic as it should be. But she asks the readers to apply the model as per the needs of their own pedagogical situation and the native culture of the learners. The model is important not only because it is said to
be comprehensive and accurate by the writer herself, but the writer goes on explaining in detail the rationale behind the selection of each of these components and their interaction with each other. However, it should be pointed out that, like the other linguists before her, she falls prey to the target culture and target language norms.

Of all these models, the 2007 model of Communicative Competence elaborated by Celce-Murcia seems to be the most promising one. Though the model is not drastically different from that of the earlier models, still it is more sophisticated in that it covers almost all the aspects that need to be covered in any discussion of communication, and also because it tries to crystallize the relationships between and among the identified components of the model.

The above discussion of the models of Communicative Competence is indicative of the interest and enthusiasm of the scholars who proposed them. It also indicates the popularity and the requirement of the model of Communicative Competence. The discussion also underlines the need of a model of Communicative Competence to assess the linguistic achievement of the learner because from last 40 years or so Communicative Competence has been set as the ultimate goal of language learning and teaching all over the world. It is interesting to note that these and such models of Communicative Competence help educational institutions world-over to test the abilities of the learners. The tests like TOEFL and others are explicitly based on the principles of such models.

2.2 Critique:

Though recognized and established worldwide, we need to be very inquisitive while accepting these models in the Indian situation. Therefore, we need to ask the question:

How far are these models suitable and appropriate to assess the Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance of Indian students who use English language in the Indian setting as opposed the American and European setting?

It will be appropriate here to examine the above question in the light of the following issues raised in the literature:
2.2.1 Native Speaker Fallacy

It is interesting to note that all the above models are based upon what is called ‘native-speaker fallacy’. It has been expected that the second language learner should acquire not only the Target Language but also the Target Culture. Moreover, it is observed that if a learner commits a grammatical mistake, s/he will be called less proficient but if s/he commits mistake due to lack of the knowledge of the Target culture, his/her very use of the Target Language is questioned. In this regard Aguilar asserts:

The native speaker (NS) as a model is implicit in both the linguistic and the sociolinguistic competence and the idea that the language presented in the classroom should be as authentic as possible, so as to represent the reality of NS language use, has been one of the tenets of the Communicative approach. (2007: 61)

However, Aguilar (ibid) refers to the following problems associated with accepting NS as a model in non-native context:

1. Native-speaker Communicative Competence is almost impossible target for L2 learner and the learner will inevitably end up frustrated. Acquisition of such competence for L2 learners is what Cook (1999:185) calls the ‘unattainable goal’.
2. As per this view, acquiring the Communicative Competence means abandoning one’s language ‘in order to blend into another linguistic environment, thus becoming linguistically schizophrenic’ (Aguilar, 2007:61).
3. Such native-speaker Communicative Competence also entails putting learners’ L1 aside, when this L1 could be introduced to give confidence to the students and trigger interest in some topics or aspects to be dealt with in the classroom.
4. Accepting NS as a model for Sociolinguistic and Socio-cultural Competences means taking into account L2 culture and putting learners’ culture in peripheral position or even ignoring it completely.
5. On growing up we all are subject to socialization i.e. the process of acquiring adult roles, internalizing the beliefs and values of a specific society or group. This socialization is related to cultural transmission which mostly takes place through language. In this process of socialization, we learn the ways of using language. That is to say, by the time we come to learn L2 we have already acquired certain framework of assumptions, ideas, beliefs that are used to interpret the behaviour of the other people.
The first culture is so rooted in our behaviour that we are unconscious of its existence until we investigate it.

6. The clash between the two cultures, the culture of the learner and the culture related to the target language may result in different manifestations— from total acceptance or assimilation to complete rejection.

2.2.2 Indian English as ‘Transplanted’ variety of English

As discussed in the first chapter, Indian English is the outcome of colonial encounter. English language is transplanted in India. Therefore, it is a ‘transplanted’ variety of English. English is used in India to serve Indian socio-cultural functions as opposed to British or American socio-cultural functions. As has been pointed out by different scholars like Halliday, Firth, Malinowski, the nature and the functions of a language is determined by the functions that it serves in any socio-cultural context. Moreover, the ethnographers and anthropologists are of the opinion that the functions of a language in any given society are determined by its cultural context. Halliday, no doubt, elaborates the universal functions of language but he admits that the linguistic realization of these functions in different speech communities differs due to different cultural context. Accepting this proposition, it needs to be assumed that Indian English is different from the other varieties of English like British or American varieties. Since the cultural context which determines the linguistic realization of these functions is different in India, Indian English is a different variety in its own right with its own features and characteristics.

In the theories of language learning, it has been suggested that second language can be learned most fruitfully when the learner is exposed to both L2 and C2. C2 here means the target culture. Applying the same principle to language teaching activities, it is suggested that the target language should be taught in association with the target culture directly. Accepting this stand, and, if accepted that English language represents the British culture, the question remains— ‘how can English language be taught in India accompanied by British/American culture?’ and ‘who can teach it in India?’ These questions need to be seen in the light of the following facts:

1. That Indian learners of English do not receive any input so far as C2 is concerned. The learners have never visited the places where English is used as Native language so that they can get direct exposure to C2. In this context, how can it be expected that Indian learners of English will get exposure to C2.
ii. The teachers who teach English language in India also might not have visited the same places and might not have acquired C2 themselves. In such a case, how can they teach C2 to their Indian students?

iii. The English language which is taught in the classroom and to which the learners are exposed is what has been called ‘highly fossilized’ variety of ‘interlanguage’.

In this connection, Kachru and Nelson observe:

In any case, most learners of English in Outer Circle and Expanding Circle context never have any serious contact with an Inner Circle speaker; and, as anyone who has ever tried it can testify, it is not possible, in any complete and active sense, to learn a language from a book. (1996: 89)

Since there is a close connection between the input received by the learner and his/her output, how can it be expected that the learners will acquire Communicative Competence like the native speakers of the target language? Moreover, the rules of appropriateness are highly culture dependent, it can be expected that the Indian learners acquire such norms which are based on Indian culture rather than the British or American culture. Therefore, it seems that the Indian cultural norms of appropriateness should be accepted and appropriate changes need to be introduced in the model of Communicative Competence. In this regard what Kachru and Nelson maintain is to be accepted:

The concept of a monolithic English as the exponent of culture and communication in all-English-using countries has been a convenient working fiction that is now becoming harder and harder to maintain. What we now have in reality is English languages… (1996: 76-77)

These English languages are different from the native variety in that each has its own rules of appropriateness.

Accepting a much broader perspective, Schneider (2003) explains the emergence of New Englishes both native and nonnative. He refers to them as ‘transplanted’ varieties of English. He contends that the emergence and evolution of the New Englishes is the result of two specific processes:
1. Construction and Reconstruction of Social Identity; and 
2. Language Contact Situation

The first of these, construction and reconstruction of social identity refers to a process in which one’s attitude and values of one’s community are created and recreated. The difference between ‘us’ and ‘others’ is appropriated constantly. Therefore, he says that the process of appropriation is not static but rather constant and dynamic. Referring to psychological theories, he maintains that social identity is never clear cut and stable, rather it goes on changing and the result is the overlapping, hybrid and at times conflicting identities. Such identities led to the evolution of New Englishes. The second process involved is Language Contact Situation. In any language contact situation it is important to know the precise nature of communication situation- the participants and demographic factors, social relationships and mutual attitudes, the types of communicative events, the nature of linguistic input elements, etc. The nature of linguistic output, according to him, is constrained by the nature of input: the forms and structures provided by all the parties’ native tongues create a pool of possible choices which result in a ‘competition of features’. Thus, the output consists of both ‘diffusion’ from the English input and ‘selection’ from an indigenous language form. That is to say, the resultant output is the mixture of the varieties. It is interesting to note here that as far as the communicative situation and communicative event are concerned, in the present case, both of them are Indian and therefore they may constrain the selection of forms and structures and also the measure of appropriateness judgment. It is exactly for these reasons that Schneider contends that English language is appropriated in the new context; it is no longer the same English as it is used in the mother countries. Referring to the process, he observes:

To a considerable extent the emergence of New Englishes is a process of linguistic convergence, followed by renewed divergence only later, once a certain level of homogeneity has been reached. (2003:236)

Thus, the new varieties of English have both the elements of similarities and elements of difference, of homogeneity and of heterogeneity. The elements of similarities are the formal aspects of the language but since the language is used in ‘transplanted’ context, its appropriateness is determined by the local communicative situation and communicative event.
2.2.3 SLA Theory and Indian English

According to various linguists from India, the SLA theory does not suite in the Indian context. Linguists like S. N. Sridhar and Kamal K. Sridhar (1994) have contended that the SLA theories have been developed and tested primarily with reference to the acquisition of English and European languages in the U. S. A. and European contexts, and that there has been no serious input or reference to data from the acquisition of English in those setting where indigenous varieties of English (IVEs) such as Indian English, Singapore English, Nigerian English, and Filipino English are used. This neglect of IVEs is surprising in that the SLA theories are claimed to be universal and applicable to the IVE settings as well.

The literature on IVEs produced in last four decades demonstrates that the settings where IVEs are acquired and used are markedly different from those assumed or presupposed in the theoretical literature on SLA. Therefore, the theoretical framework of SLA turns out to be ‘too parochial and of limited value’ in the context of IVEs. Sridhar and Sridhar (ibid) refer to the following facts of SLA theories that make it irrelevant to Indian setting:

1. It is assumed that the learner's target in SLA is, or ought to be, to achieve native-speaker like competence in the target language. This assumption specifies the criteria for judging the success of the learner's acquisition.
2. It is assumed that the learners are exposed to enough extensive and intensive input so that they acquire the full range of active competence in the target language.
3. The process of SLA is studied without reference to the functions that the second language is expected to perform for the learner and the learner's community.
4. Learners’ L1 is assumed to have only the role of interference and no reference is made to the facilitative nature of the L1.
5. It is assumed that the ideal motivation for success in SLA is what is called 'integrative' motivation.
6. SLA research is primarily concerned with the acquisition of phonology and syntax at the expenses of the study of the acquisition of the morphology, lexicon, and until recently, pragmatics and discourse.

(Sridhar and Sridhar 1994: 42-52)
Perhaps, the most important difference, according to Sridhar and Sridhar (ibid) between Indian IVE setting and that of SLA setting lies in the fact that the target language is learnt in relation to other languages in the individual learners' and the community's repertoires, whereas SLA generally involves monolinguals. Moreover, English is not exploited to serve all the functions that it may serve for a monolingual English speaker. And, hence, it is wrong to test the IVE learner with reference to the same range of Communicative Competence as the learner in the target language environment. As for the motivation of learning English language in Indian context, it is so called inferior instrumental motivation. Moreover, the input available to Indians learning English is an 'interlanguage', that is, the hybridized or 'fossilized' variety of English. Therefore, for the majority of speakers of Indian English, the so called 'fossilized' structures are the 'normal', 'habitual' productive structures and they have none others in their competence. In this context, we need to ask whether the models of Communicative Competence proposed with reference to the ‘Inner Circle’ will assess correctly the language ability of Indian learners of English language.

2.2.4 Multicompetence and Indian English

Cook (1991) introduced his theory of Multicompetence in which he proposed that the target of acquisition in SLA is not the native speaker competence but what he calls “multicompetence”. He defines it as ‘the compound state of mind with two grammars’ (1991:112). For him, this competence is a ‘language supersystem’ that differs considerably from the language knowledge of monolinguals. According to him, the grammar of L2 in a multicompetent speaker cannot be the same as the apparently equivalent grammar in a monolingual. It does not make, therefore, much sense to expect the L2 or FL learner to develop the same kind of competence that adult native speakers have because the bidirectional influence between L1 and L2 results in a unique competence which shows both similarities and differences to the native monolingual competence. He is of the opinion that the L2 learners should not be seen as deficient communicators or failed native speakers but should be looked upon as ‘successful multicompetent speaker’. The differences in the language knowledge of monolinguals and multilinguals are dependent upon the amount and quality of exposure to variable linguistic forms and also the communicative activities in which the learners participate. Multicompetence, moreover, is not the sum of two or more well developed systems but is a system on its own right. As a result, linguists like Cook (1991), Coppetiers (1987),
Gass (1990), Schachter (1988) come to the conclusion that L2 or FL learner cannot be expected to develop native-like competence. Therefore, in any SLA and multilingual development research, the proper question to be asked is—‘What constitutes the knowledge of languages?’ and not ‘What constitutes knowledge of a language?’ The latter question is typically associated with the monolingual view. Cook also hints at the idea that all language knowledge is essentially socially contingent and dynamic irrespective of the number of languages one has access to.

Kecskes and Papp (2000) accept the theory of Multicompetence in elaborating their views on the relation between L1 and L2. Based on the above observations of Cook regarding Multicompetence, they argue:

[The primary difference between the monolingual and multilingual Language Processing Device (LPD) is conceptual rather than grammatical, and the unique multilingual system is not the exact equivalent of either monolingual system but is the essential consequence of the conceptual development of multilinguals. (2000: 39)]

According to Kecskes and Papp (ibid), the multilingual LPD consists of two (or more) Constantly Available Interacting Systems (CAIS) (i.e. two or more formal systems of language) and has a Common Underlying Conceptual Base (CUCB), whereas in the monolingual LPD, only one language system is associated with the conceptual base.

Considering the above difference between the monolingual and the multilingual LPD, three basic points of difference between the nature of the monolingual and the multilingual LPD can be elaborated. First, unlike the monolingual LPD, the multilingual LPD is a constantly changing system i.e. the proficiency in dual language system is not constant but goes on changing, and the two languages are not equally valorized. Therefore, the ‘balanced-bilingual’ view is faulty in that the bilingual LPD is ‘generally dominated by one of the languages at a certain point of development use or in certain period of time’. Second, the monolingual LPD is mostly automatic and conscious efforts are needed only for message generation and monitoring. More conscious attention at each level, on the contrary, is required in the multilingual LPD because they have to make a choice at each level. Moreover, the process is not continuous and uninterrupted as that of the monolinguals. Third, in the multilingual LPD, all language channels are constantly available no matter in which language the
actual production occurs. The language channels constantly interact during production, which may result in mixing, switching, modification, and a temporary dominance of either language (Kecskes and Papp, 2000: 44-47).

Kecskes and Papp (ibid) are of the opinion that the conceptual base of a Foreign Language (FL) learner is dominated by L1, for the development of FL is not sufficient enough to function as a channel through which knowledge and skills may be fed into the conceptual base. Moreover, words learned in the FL do not have their direct representation in the conceptual base but are connected to L1 concepts through their L1 equivalents. Considering these differences between the monolingual and multilingual LPD, we once again have to think the applicability of the models of Communicative Competence presented at the beginning of this chapter.

2.2.5 ‘Knowledge’ and ‘Control’ and the Indian Scenario

Ellen Bialystok (1993: 43-58) in her models of language knowledge and production makes a distinction between ‘Knowledge’ and ‘Control’. She uses the term ‘Knowledge’ to refer to the knowledge of the second language learner of the target language and other essential knowledge important for communication in the target language. Thus, her concept of language knowledge is almost similar to Hymes’ notion of ‘Communicative Competence’ rather than to Chomsky’s ‘Grammatical Competence’. By ‘Control’, she means the L2 learners’ ability for the retrieval of the ‘language knowledge’ in communicative situations. Such retrieval needs to be appropriate to the nature of the speech event and speech situation.

Ringbom (1987) borrows these two terms and applies them in ESL and EFL contexts. He distinguishes between ESL and EFL context of language learning. According to him, as far as ‘language knowledge’ component is concerned, it is almost the same for the L2 learners in both ESL and EFL contexts. However, the inadequate exposure (both receptive and productive) to the target language in EFL context leads to lack of opportunities to practice this knowledge. As a result, the foreign language learner may have almost the same degree of ‘Language Knowledge’ of the target language but the appropriate retrieval may not be the same. That is to say, the foreign language learners do not acquire sufficient ‘Control’ over the target language.

Applying this discussion to the Indian context, English in India is studied as a Second language, but many of the features of EFL are also to be discerned in the Indian scenario. As a result, the ‘control’ aspect of the students under investigation may not be
up to the mark for the models of Communicative Competence discussed above. The need, therefore, emerges to appropriate the models of Communicative Competence taking into account the Indian scenario.

2.2.6 World Englishes and Communicative Competence

Linguists (like Braj Kachru, Yamuna Kachru, S. N. Sridhar, Kamal K Sridhar, Pandhripande, Berns, and others) working in World Englishes paradigm observe that the Anglocentric interpretation of standards, norms and models proposed by the Inner Circle linguists is no longer tenable in the Outer and the Expanding Circle contexts like that of India, Nigeria, Singapore because such models cannot explain the formal and functional variation in these contexts. This stand decentered the Inner Circle ideas of standard, norms and models. These scholars focused their attention on the pluricentric realities of English in the Outer Circle and correspondingly proposed that the models of Communicative Competence should be created with reference to the potential purposes, roles, and situations encountered in these contexts.

These linguists emphasized that the concept of Communicative Competence is not a monolithic notion. The issue of acceptability, appropriateness and intelligibility are closely associated to the context of situation. Therefore, while using these notions (which are basic components of Communicative Competence) they cannot be applied independent of the context of situation. Such context-bound nature of these notions results in multiple norms of use of language. This interdependence of context of situation and the components of Communicative Competence can also be observed in the realization of Speech Acts. Speech Acts will not necessarily convey the intended meaning unless the participants share the socio-cultural norms. In this connection Berns asserts:

As each setting is shaped by local cultural and social values, local norms of use develop consistent with these values, norms that specify what, when, where and how something can be said at all linguistic levels from the phonological to the pragmatic. The determination of what is or is not ‘normal’ cannot be made without accounting for local norms of the users of English in a particular socio-cultural setting. (2006: 718)

Therefore, while accepting the model of Communicative Competence we need to ask the following questions:
1. Whose Communicative Competence should be the reference point for evaluating whether or not a use of English is appropriate and acceptable?

2. Are the variations in the use of English by the non-native speakers as legitimatized and acceptable as the variation of the native speakers of the language?

3. Is the native speaker norm, native speaker Communicative Competence the only acceptable way of using language?

Berns (ibid) contends that the local users of English can best determine what is appropriate and acceptable in their own context of use. Kachru (1983) also rejects the monolithic, monolingual native-speaker model of Communicative Competence with the questions: ‘Acceptable to whom?’ ‘Appropriate to whom?’ and ‘Intelligible to whom?’.

Such opinions emerged with the growing realization that the judgments of acceptability, appropriateness and intelligibility are relative concepts and that the native-speaker model of Communicative Competence is no longer adequate for non-native contexts. Similarly, according to Shinde (1991:17) English is blended in Indian cultural and social complex of the country. Thus it became ‘culture-bound’ in India. Therefore appropriateness of English in India should be assessed with reference to the situational context which is essentially Indian.

Muriel Saville-Troike (1996) refers to Indian English as an Auxiliary language situation and maintains that English language has ceased to serve the original functions that it serves for the NS of English language. English in Indian context has been adapted to serve the ‘postcolonial needs of the groups who have adopted it’. That is to say, the structure and vocabulary of English language is manipulated by Indian speech communities to express the specific culture of the communities in accordance with the rules of appropriateness of their own culture. That is why, she asserts that in Indian, and for that matter, for any postcolonial speech community, “the culture of its native speech community is largely irrelevant and is likely to be unwanted as well. Failure to recognize this fact can foster cultural imperialism and mask important issues of ethnic identity” (1996: 362).

In this context, we need to ask which model should be selected and used for assessing the Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance of the Indian students. Here again Berns suggests:

Choice of a particular model depends upon the Communicative Competence learners are to develop in order for their use of language to
be acceptable, appropriate, and intelligible in a specified speech community. (ibid: 725)

Thus, the choice of the model is dependent upon the following questions:
1. Which functions does the language serve for the learner?
2. Who are the users of the language?
3. Whether the language is required to be used in interaction with native-speakers/ other non-native speakers/ or both?
4. Which culture should the language represent?

Since the first three questions have already been discussed in the first chapter, here the researcher will concentrate on the fourth question. To answer the question we need the help of both the cognitive and social perspectives in the study of language. From the cognitive perspective, as Kecskes and Papp (2000) point out, all the language systems in multilingual are dependent upon only one conceptual base, which is most possibly prepared dependent upon the Mother Tongue of the learner and its culture. Even the linguistic elements of second language are internalized with reference to the same conceptual system. Therefore, second language use in non-native context should represent the culture of the Mother Tongue of the learner. From the socio-cultural perspective, since the use of language and the judgment of acceptability, appropriateness and intelligibility are dependent upon the local culture, it seems the same should be represented by the second language as well.

In the light of the discussion of the theoretical and methodological considerations of the models of Communicative Competence and their critique, it seems better to analyze the model of Communicative Competence in terms of practical aspects like the units of analysis of and practical guidelines for the investigation of Communicative Competence.

The language teaching practice based on the notion of Communicative Competence, Communicative Language Teaching, is basically concerned with the inculcation of the construct among the learners. Therefore, the literature on Communicative Language Teaching, particularly, its principles, will help in the process of the specification of the practical aspects of Communicative Competence. From this point of view, the following part is devoted to the consideration of the Communicative Language Teaching as an approach:
2.3 Principles of Communicative Language Teaching and Learning:

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emerged as a method of teaching English language in 1970s as a reaction against the earlier established methods of language teaching, particularly Audio-lingual and Structural-situational approaches. It is said that the new understanding in the nature of language and language learning processes has contributed to the emergence of CLT. Though, no precise principles or tenets of CLT have been given; its practitioners and theoreticians behave as if there is unanimity regarding the same. The method is popular and claimed to be the ideal method for teaching Second and Foreign language. Its main attraction lies in its emphasis and focus on form and meaning simultaneously, whereas the previous methods are concerned only with one or the other of them. That is to say, CLT is basically concerned with the teaching of Communicative Competence rather than only Grammatical or Linguistic Competence. Such type of reformulation of the concept represents a considerable broadening of the conceptual base of second language curriculum and pedagogy. This theoretical framework quickly acquired the status of a central doctrine for ELT. Thus, it could be seen that the concept of Communicative Competence has profound influence on ELT and that the movement of Communicative Language Teaching emerged around the same period in which emphasis is laid on ‘language in use’ rather than only on grammar of the language. Various scholars like H. G. Widdowson, Brumfit, Johnson, Savignon, Canale, Canale and Swain, Littlewood, etc. have supported and advocated this method. Jack C. Richards (2004) observes and defines CLT:

CLT can be understood as a set of principles about the goals of language teaching, how learners learn a language, the kinds of classroom activities that best facilitates learning, and the roles of teachers and learners in the classroom.

This definition of Communicative Language Teaching offered by one of the scholars in the field refers to four aspects of CLT – its goals, understanding of the way language is learned, classroom activities used for language learning, and the roles of teachers and students in the learning process. Each of these issues will be discussed in the following pages followed by the suitability of CLT in Indian socio-cultural context so that the discussion may help the formulation of the practical aspects of the construct of Communicative Competence.
2.3.1 Goals of CLT

According to the advocates and practitioners of CLT, the ultimate goal of language teaching and learning is Communicative Competence. As a result, emphasis is laid on teaching language in such a way that the students acquire Communicative Competence. The following aspects determine what these scholars mean by Communicative Competence:

1. Ability to use language for a range of different purposes and functions. That is to say the learner should acquire adequate command over the system of language to put it to use for different communicative purposes.

2. Knowing how to vary use of language according to the setting and the participants. It refers to the knowledge of the learner regarding the use of different varieties of language at different social situations such as when to use formal and informal speech or when to use language appropriately for written as opposed to spoken communication.

3. Knowing how to produce and understand different types of texts (e.g. narratives, reports, interviews, conversations, etc). Such knowledge entails not only the knowledge of what counts a particular genre as a genre but also the knowledge of the way the genre is considered text – an unit in itself.

4. Knowing how to maintain communication despite having limitations in one’s language knowledge (e.g. through using different kinds of communicative strategies)

2.3.2 Understanding of Language Learning Process

During the last 40 years, due to different approaches to language acquisition- both first and second language- the understanding of the ways in which a language is learned is changed considerably and CLT is partly a response to these changes. In earlier theories of language learning, the acquisition of Grammatical Competence is emphasized. It is the sole aim of the process and it is seen essentially as habit formation. The earlier theorists have emphasized the formation of habit by making the student produce grammatical sentences and advocated that errors should be avoided through controlled opportunities for production. Such controlled opportunities, it is believed, would minimize the mistakes. Therefore, controlled opportunities like ‘memorizing dialogue’ or ‘performing drills’ are used in the classroom. Most importantly, in this
theory, the teacher is in the charge of the classroom and learning is seen as under the control of the teacher.

In recent times, the understanding of learning process changed to a considerable extent. As a result, Richards (2004) thinks of Learning as involving the following processes:

1. It is believed that the interaction between the learner and the other users of the language (including the teacher) will help the learning process. Such interaction is said to provide the required exposure to the learner in which s/he will use language ‘with purpose’.

2. Since communication is considered to be the exchange of meaning which is essentially embedded in the context, the learner needs to understand that construction of meaning is a collaborative process in which the speaker, the hearer and the context play important roles. This realization results in the overall emphasis on the ‘learner’ in the classroom.

3. Learning is also believed to be the outcome of the creation of meaningful and purposeful interaction through language. The use of the classroom drill and memorization of dialogues practiced in the earlier methods are not useful here, because such methods create artificial communication in the sense that the communication made available is not purposeful. That is to say, they emphasize the importance of the goals of communication.

4. It is believed that meaning of language is not given at any point of use. Rather the meaning of language needs to be discovered, reached at by both the speaker and the listener. As a result, the learner is expected to realize this fact in which communication is seen as ‘negotiation of meaning’ on the part of those who are involved in the process.

5. Learning is also seen as a process resulting from learners’ attending the feedback that they get from listener on their use of the language. Such feedback helps learners to monitor the process of language use.

6. Learning is believed to be the outcome of ‘paying attention to the language one hears (the input) and trying to incorporate new forms into one’s developing Communicative Competence’. Thus, the role of input is underlined in language learning and great importance is attached to the kind of Input one receives in learning process. The input one receives decides the possible output. This relation between Input-Output is stressed in CLT.
7. CLT believes in the experimental nature of language learning process, in the sense that, in the process of communication, the learner tries various ways of saying the same thing. Such type of experimenting helps the learning process. This assertion is somewhat closer to Michael Swain’s Output Hypothesis in which it is asserted that not only the Input but the Output can also help the learning process because the output, it in turn, becomes Intake for further process of language learning.

2.3.3 Classroom Activities

The classroom activities generally used in the communicative classroom reflect the above theories of language learning. It is believed that the activities associated with earlier approaches to language teaching are not useful, because they do not provide the opportunity of real communication. As a result, they thought that the beneficial classroom activities will be those that provide an opportunity for genuine communication. Such activities are pair work activities like role plays, group work activities, and project work activities.

2.3.4 Teacher-Student Roles in CLT

In the communicative classroom, the learner is responsible for his/her language development. S/he needs to participate in the classroom activities. Such activities are cooperative rather than individualistic in the sense that they are to be performed in groups or pairs. Unlike the earlier approach, in this approach teacher is not seen as the only model available to the students, the other models available are the peers and groups. The role of the teacher is perceived only as a facilitator and s/he is expected to monitor the learning process in the classroom. Again the teacher is not assumed to be the model of correct speech. As a result his/her responsibility is not to cause students produce error-free sentences and s/he is expected to interpret the errors of students from different perspective.

2.3.5 CLT in Outer and Expanding Circles

Soon after its introduction as a useful and dominant language teaching method, CLT is borrowed in what Kachru calls ‘Outer and Expanding Circles’. Questions are asked regarding its applicability to the new cultural and socio-political realities. One group asserts, quite contrary to what Hymes and Halliday have said, that CLT is acontextual and universal in its application and that there is no need for the teaching
method to be socio-culturally sensitive. Such view is referred to as ‘Anglo-Saxon attitude of language teaching method’ (Hiep, 2007). Another group, however, is of the opinion that CLT is not context sensitive and therefore should be abandoned (Bax 2003). However it is essential to look for a middle ground where CLT will be seen not as a prescriptive method but as an approach. In this matter, Richards and Rogers assert:

Communicative Language Teaching is best considered as an approach rather than a method. Thus although a reasonable degree of theoretical consistency can be discerned at the level of language and learning theory, at levels of design and procedure there is much greater room for individual interpretation and variation than most methods permit.

(1986: 83)

That is to say, when looked as an approach, CLT can be altered in its procedures to suit the local socio-cultural and political environment, whereas the central tenets will remain intact. In this way, CLT can be made useful to the ‘Outer and Expanding Circles’: which is already done by various scholars in different parts of the world. In India the work of Prabhu (1987) and others is important in this respect. Definitely as Hiep (2007) says there are great difficulties in the implementation of CLT in the contexts like India, but such difficulties can be removed. It means that, though difficult, CLT can be practiced with appropriate changes and by making it suit the local needs.

2.4 Practical Implications of the Models of Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance:

On the basis of the discussion of the models of Communicative Competence, their critique, and the Communicative Language Teaching, in this Part, the researcher considers the units of analysis for Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance, followed by the practical aspects of the models of Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance.

2.4.1 Units of Analysis for Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance:

Hymes argues that all of his four judgments can be fruitfully discerned in the functional unit of language, i.e. Speech Act, because the ‘rules of Speech Acts enter as a controlling factor for linguistic form as a whole’ (1972: 278). Therefore, he contends that in the analysis of Communicative Competence, Speech Act should be taken as the
basic unit of analysis and that the grammatical unit, i.e. Sentence, is not the appropriate unit for the purpose. Similarly, Saville-Troike (1996: 369-72) has advocated for the use of three hierarchical units in the functional system of language: Communicative Situation, Communicative Event and Communicative Act. Her description and definition of all the three units above is quite similar to that of Speech Situation, Speech Event and Speech Act elaborated by Hymes (1974: 51-65). Therefore, in the foregoing discussion, the latter terms will be used.

2.4.1.1 Speech Situation

By Speech Situation, Hymes (1974: 51-52) means the situations associated with speech in a speech community. He refers to them as the ‘context of situation’. Speech Events and Speech Acts are embedded within a Speech Situation— the context of situation. Hymes maintains that though the Speech Situations are the sources of the rules for the production and interpretation of both Speech Act and Speech Events, they themselves are not governed by such rules. In fact, they are non-verbal in nature in that the verbal rules used in the interpretation of Speech Events and Speech Acts cannot be applied to them. Speech Situations, moreover, are not homogenous for they may contain both the verbal and the non-verbal Speech Events. Furthermore, the verbal events may be of more than one type. Saville-Troike (1996) maintains that Speech Situation is the context in which the interaction takes place. For her, the examples of Speech Situation are ‘a church service, a trial, a cocktail party, or a class in a school (1996: 369). She asserts that though there is a great deal of diversity in the kinds of interaction that occur in a Situation, there is consistently a general ‘configuration of activities’.

2.4.1.2 Speech Event

Saville-Troike maintains that Speech Event is the basic unit for the purpose of the description of Communicative Competence. She defines A Speech Event by:

[a] unified set of components throughout, beginning with the same general purpose of communication, the same general topic, and the same participants, generally using the same language variety, maintaining the same tone or key, and using the same rules of interaction, in the same setting. (1996: 370)
As soon as there is a change in participants, their role relations, or the focus of attention, the event terminates. Other markers that suggest the change in Speech Event are the period of silence or change of body position.

Hymes (Coulthard, 1977: 39-42) is of the opinion that both the Speech Events and the Speech Acts are embedded in the Speech Situation, the context. The Speech Events occur in the non-verbal context, the Speech Situation. It is to be remembered here that Speech Situation is not verbal; but both the Speech Event and the Speech Acts are verbal in nature. And elaboration of formal rules regarding the occurrence and characteristics is possible only for the verbal entities. According to him, thus, the Speech Events are the largest units for which rules regarding verbal structure can be discovered. Moreover, Hymes (1974: 52) maintains that the relation between the Speech Event and the Speech Act is hierarchical. That is to say, a Speech Event may consist of a single Speech Act but will often comprise several. Hymes (Coulthard, 1977: 41-47) elaborates the following components of Speech Event:

**Setting:** Every Speech Event must necessarily occur in time and space. This dimension of time and space of occurrence provides the setting for the Speech Event. The setting of the Event needs to be considered in the view that it affects the variety and quality of language used. Hymes (Coulthard, 1977: 42), moreover, stresses that the ‘psychological setting’ of an Event must be taken note of because it consists of the cultural definitions of an occasion as ‘formal’ or ‘informal’.

**Participants:** Generally, it is assumed that in a Speech Event there are two participants, the speaker, who transmits the message, and the listener who receives it. However, Hymes specifies four participant roles: the addressor, the speaker, the addressee and the hearer or audience. There are differences in Speech Events as for the requirement of the number of the participant roles. The number and the roles of participants may vary from event to event. In some events, only one participant is required, whereas in some others, not less than nine are essential (Coulthard, 1977: 43). This consideration of the nature and the roles of the participants are important because they directly condition the choice of linguistic items in speech.

**Purpose:** Hymes (ibid) is of the opinion that every Speech Event and Speech Act has a purpose, even if it is phatic. By purpose, Hymes here means the function the Event serves for the speaker. Hymes talks of the differences in the purpose of Speech Event from the perspectives of both the community and the participants. That is to say, the
same Speech Event may have different purpose for the community which may not be that of the participants involved in it.

**Key:** By key of the Speech Event, Hymes means the ‘tone, manner or spirit’ in which the Event is performed. There are different keys like mock, serious, perfunctory and painstaking. The first question one must ask regarding the Speech Event is whether it is performed seriously or not. The question underlines the importance of the Key factor.

**Manner:** Manner of Speech Event corresponds to the medium used in communication – oral, written, telegraphic, or other mediums of communication. Most Speech Events are associated with one or the other of these medium.

**Message Content:** As soon as the topic of the Event is considered, one considers the message content of the Speech Event. For many Speech Events, the topic is predetermined and invariable. That is to say, it concerns with what to be said, with whom, how, and where. Most of the time, such rules of message content are bound up with the setting and the participants of the Speech Events.

### 2.4.1.3 Speech Act

Hymes (Coulthard, 1977: 40) asserts that Speech Acts consist, at the grammatical level, of single sentences but they are not equivalent to the grammatical sentence. Rather, Speech Acts are functional units and they derive their meaning or value not from the grammatical form but from the speech community’s rules of interpretation. That is to say, in the interpretation of Speech Act, the grammatical form alone is not essential but the rules of the speech community are also important. Saville-Troike (1982: 29-30) asserts that a Speech Act corresponds to a single interactional function like ‘a referential statement, a request, or a command’. She further maintains that the Speech Act is the basic level of analysis in linguistic theory.

Yule (1996: 47) defines Speech Act as ‘actions performed via utterances’. Thus, Speech Acts have behavioural potential and are considered as ‘verbal behaviour’. Speech Acts, according to Austin (1962: 94-108) have three dimensions – Locutionary Act, Illocutionary Act and Perlocutionary Act. All these three dimensions are separated in order to study Speech Act; but essentially all these dimensions are performed simultaneously in any utterance.

**Locutionary Act:** By Locutionary Act is meant the meaning of the utterance and it is concerned with the propositional content of language. Speech Acts will not be fulfilled unless the propositional meaning of the utterance is clear to the listener. Thus, the
Locutionary Act deals with the transmission of the propositional meaning of the utterance. However, in order that the listener could understand the complete meaning of the utterance, the mastery of the linguistic system is almost always insufficient. Therefore, Coulthard wants to see meaning as ‘an amalgam of grammatical, lexical and extra-textual information’ (1977: 18). The function of the Locutionary Act is to transfer this type of meaning from the speaker to the listener.

**Illocutionary Act:** It basically deals with the intention of the speaker in uttering the utterance. Thus, it is the basic and the fundamental act in Speech Act because, in its narrower sense, Speech Acts are equated with the purpose of the utterance that the speaker has while using the utterance. However, there is a controversy regarding the nature of this act. Searle (1969) for example, takes the intended meaning as that which is comprehended by the listener. For him, Illocutionary Act is concerned with the listener's perception of the intention of the speaker. However, Austin seems to disagree with Searle and maintains that always it refers to the intention of the speaker. He wants to suggest that while choosing language, the speaker will choose and arrange it in such a way that his/her intention(s) become clear to the listener. However, the fact remains that the Illocutionary Act basically deals with the intention of the speaker in using the utterance.

**Perlocutionary Act:** It refers to the change in the mind of the listener caused by the utterance of the speaker. Thus, it refers to the effect the utterance has upon the listener. Austin (ibid) makes a distinction between Perlocutionary Object and Perlocutionary Sequel. The former refers to the speaker’s intended effect on the mind of the listener, whereas the latter is the unintended effect caused by the utterance.

As has been pointed out earlier, the division of Speech Act in terms of the three acts or dimensions is for the sake of the convenience of the study and that all the acts are simultaneous with each other. Thus, the basic unit of analysis for the investigation of Communicative Competence is Speech Act in the context of the Speech Event and the Speech Situation.

**2.4.2 Practical Aspects of Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance:**

The following are some of the important preconditions that the user of the language must possess in order that s/he may be recognized as having Communicative Competence and the ability for Communicative Performance. Moreover, the researcher
thinks that the consideration of the practical abilities will also provide a trajectory for the analysis of the data received from the students in the subsequent chapters. Once Speech Act as the unit of analysis for Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance is established, it is easy to elaborate what is expected from the user of the language having Communicative Competence. Unlike the models discussed above, which are essentially theoretical and methodological in orientation, the discussion of the practical aspects of the Communicative Competence will help for both the assessment of, and teaching a language for, the acquisition of Communicative Competence. However, while discussing the practical aspects, the researcher concerns himself with the work at hand. Moreover, most of these practical considerations are based upon the earlier discussion of the models of the Communicative Competence.

The following consideration of the practical aspects of Communicative Competence will be in the context of the abilities of the language user.

2.4.2.1 Identification of the Discourse (Speech Acts)

There are different specific concerns involved in the identification of the discourse. Firstly, whenever the user of the language has to participate in a discourse, s/he must know the types of the discourse present in the situation in which s/he is about to involve. These types of the discourse are associated with the Speech Events or what Hymes (1974) calls ‘complex genres’. For Hymes, Speech Acts are the minimal genres and Speech Events, the complex genre. The complex genres consist of more than one Speech Acts in a Speech Event. Thus, the user of the language is expected to know these different types of Speech Events available to the language user. It is interesting to know that these types of discourse are culture-specific. Thus, there are cross-cultural differences in the identification of an act as a request, an order or a threat.

Secondly, in order to identify the type of the discourse, the user should not only know the Sentence Meaning but also the Utterance Meaning (Lyons, 1981: 163-175). The specification of Sentence Meaning and the Utterance Meaning is further extended to Semantic Meaning and Pragmatic Meaning. The Semantic Meaning is associated with the Sentence Meaning, whereas the Pragmatic Meaning is associated with the Utterance Meaning. The distinction between the two can be exemplified by the following illustration:

What does X mean?
Here ‘X’ stands for a linguistic item (a word, phrase, clause, sentence, etc.). When the meaning of the ‘X’ is sought independent of any of the other considerations, it is Semantic Meaning. When the interpretation of the meaning includes the consideration of the participants and the context, it becomes Pragmatic Meaning. The corresponding question for the Pragmatic Meaning can be:

What does the speaker mean by X in a specific context?

In fact, whenever the speaker’s meaning is investigated it is imperative to investigate the contextual elements as well.

The culture-bound nature of language is also evident in the interpretation of meaning. It has been suggested that the Semantic Meaning of a linguistic element might be context-free and universal but the Pragmatic Meaning is governed by the ‘rules of interpretation’ of a speech community. Thus, the user of the language must be able to interpret the discourse and the Speech Act or Speech Act Sets in culturally appropriate ways in order that s/he may be said to have Communicative Competence. This ability of interpretation is also related to the Discourse Competence: if the user is able to identify the relevant meaning s/he may be said to have the ability to identify the coherent discourse.

2.4.2.2 Production of Grammatical Sentences and Utterances

The communicatively competent language user should not only be able to interpret the discourse in culturally appropriate ways, but is also expected to form and use the grammatical sentences. In fact, in the literature dealing with the Communicative Competence, the production of grammatical sentences has been a debatable issue in that different theoreticians seem to offer their respective judgments regarding the issue. Basically, the debate is said to start with Hymes’ (1972) claim that the rules of grammar are useless without the rules of language use. This stand of Hymes seems to be misinterpreted by the subsequent theoreticians. These theoreticians claim that for Hymes, rules of grammar are not important. Quite the contrary, Hymes appears to allot equal importance to both the rules of grammar and the rules of the use of the language. None of them, Hymes asserts, is useful in the absence of the other.

Canale and Swain (1980), for example, have tried to refute the misinterpreted claim of Hymes. They maintain that as Hymes is able to say that the rules of grammar are useless without the rules of language use, so also the rules of the language use are useless without the rules of grammar. This debate, it seems, can be solved with
reference to Widdowson’s (1978) terms ‘Use’ and ‘Usage’. For Widdowson, ‘Usage’ is
the concentration only on the grammar rules for their own sake. On the contrary, ‘Use’,
refers to the use of grammatically well-formed utterances for specific social purposes.
Adapting this analogy, it appears that both Hymes and Canale and Swain are referring
to ‘Use’ and not to ‘Usage’. Nonetheless, the discussion provides an important practical
aspect of the Communicative Competence in that the competent language user should
have the ability to produce grammatical sentences, not only for its own sake i.e. as
‘Usage’ but also in discourse i.e. as ‘Use’.

Another claim regarding the grammatical use of language is that the
grammaticality judgments are culture and language specific. By this is meant that if
something is grammatical or not in a language is determined by the specific cultures.
For example, both Hymes and Halliday, support this culture-dependency of
grammatical rules of language. It is using the same theoretical point in terms of Indian
English; Kachru (1983) differentiates between ‘Mistakes’ and ‘Deviations’. What
requires to be considered here is that the grammaticality is not to be considered in void,
but its judgment must be context specific.

2.4.2.3 Production of Coherent and Cohesive Language

While using the language, it is not sufficient for the communicatively competent
user to produce only the grammatical sentences. Rather, s/he is expected to follow the
rules of Cohesion and Coherence (Halliday and Hasan, 1976) so that the discourse is
created. By Cohesion, is meant the inter-sentence and intra-sentence grammatical and
lexical linkages. Halliday and Hasan (ibid) have provided a detailed discussion of
different devices used to create Cohesion in discourse such as Reference, Substitution,
Ellipsis, Repetition, Conjunction, etc. On the other hand, Coherence means the semantic
links among and within the sentences of the discourse. In fact, the distinction between
‘Usage’ and ‘Use’ elaborated by Widdowson (1978) is based on this principle. Among
other things, if the grammatical language is used accompanied by Cohesion and
Coherence, it is ‘Use’; and grammatical language without these devices is ‘Usage’.
Communicative Competence requires ‘Use’.

2.4.2.4 Production of Comprehensible Language

The production of language which is comprehensible to the listener is yet
another practical aspect of the Communicative Competence. It has been argued that a
sentence may be grammatical and may contain the devices of Cohesion and Coherence, yet it may not be comprehensible to the listener or reader. There are different reasons for this type of incomprehensibility. The user of the language should know the distinction between the Semantic and Pragmatic Meaning of language. It may happen that a speaker may use an utterance with pragmatic intent and the listener might take it on its semantic face value. Such confusion may result from the inaccurate assessment of the different contexts like – Situational context, Cultural context, Interpersonal Context, and Co-textual Context (Cutting, 2008).

Secondly, the user of the language is expected to take into consideration the possible listener/reader and his/her identity. This is important from the point of the communication of the intended Illocutionary Force of the utterance. Austin (1962) says that while using the utterance, the speaker will select and arrange the linguistic elements in such a way that his/her intention will be clear to the listener. Thus, the communicatively competent user will use language accordingly. However, it does not mean that the communication of the Semantic Meaning is not essential. Quite the contrary, unless the semantic meaning is communicated, no Locutionary Act will occur leading to the failure of the Speech Act. Thus, the user should know and use both the Semantic and Pragmatic Meanings by selecting and arranging language appropriately with reference to the listener in the context of situation.

2.4.2.5 Communication of Effective, Appropriate and Sufficient Information

In order to bring home the desired effect of the Speech Act, the user of the language should provide effective, appropriate and sufficient information. This aspect is essentially based on Grice’s Co-operative Principles. While using language, the language user is expected to know the distinction between the effective and the relatively ineffective language and accordingly select the effective language so that the Speech Act is fulfilled. Some scholars, like Bachman (1990), have asserted that the use of effective language is one of the Communicative Strategies employed by the speaker. Whatever it may be, but the partial success of the Speech Act lies in the Communication of effective information. By appropriate information, the researcher means the information appropriate to the purpose, the listener and the context of the Speech Act. Moreover, unless the information communicated is sufficient, the user cannot hope for the correct behaviour of the addressee. Therefore, communication of the sufficient information is also important. In fact, it has been suggested that if the
communicated information in utterance is not effective, appropriate and sufficient, it will result into Conversational Implicature.

**2.4.2.6 Appropriate Use of Language**

It has been accepted by all the linguists that the use of language should not be judged simply as grammatical; the consideration of appropriateness of language use is equally important. The consideration of the appropriateness of language is based on two levels—socio-cultural and linguistic— and both of them are reflected in the variety of language used. The socio-cultural dimension of appropriateness is reflected in the use of Politeness Strategies in the utterance, whereas the linguistic realization of appropriateness is evaluated in terms of the Register of language like- colloquial, familiar, informal, formal, technical, etc. Both the socio-cultural and linguistic dimensions are dependent upon P, D and R factors. P here means the relative Power of the addressee over the addressee, D stands for the Distance between them and R indicates the Imposition involved in the Speech Act. The choice of the appropriate Register is dependent upon all the three factors. However, to a large extent there are cross-cultural variations in the identification, realization and expectation of the three factors involved– P, D, and R. Nonetheless, the user of the language is expected to use appropriate variety of language in accordance with these factors.

**2.4.2.7 Use of Politeness Strategies**

The meaning of the term ‘politeness’ in the above phrase is similar to its ordinary meaning, but in the present context, it specifically refers to the strategies used by the language user so that the language used might not cause any damage to the social relations between the addressee and the addressee. In the literature, there are two distinct but related sources of the Politeness phenomenon. The first of them is Brown and Levinson (1978) and the other is Leech (1983). However, both of them take ‘face’ as the starting point of their discussion. ‘Face’ here means the public self image. While using language, particularly for the Face-threatening Acts (FTAs) the user must be careful that the language used might not threaten the face of the others involved in the discourse. As pointed out earlier, the use of Politeness Strategies is based upon the P, D, and R factors elaborated earlier. Since all these factors are culture-sensitive, there are differences among societies regarding the question – ‘What counts as polite behaviour?’
That is to say, what is Polite in one speech community might not be Polite or might even be considered Impolite in another.

Pandhripande (1992) has considered the Politeness in Maharashtrian societies. She has used the term ‘Maryada’ to refer to Politeness in Marathi language. Similarly, realizing the potential of impoliteness in cross-cultural communication, Kachru and Smith (2008: 41-54) have provided both the Parameters and Instruments of Politeness. For them, the Parameters of Politeness are Cultural Values, Face, Status, Rank, Role, Power, Age, Sex, Social Distance, Intimacy, Kinship, and Group Membership. Under the Instruments of Politeness, they consider – Pronouns of Address, Honorifics, Kinship Terms, Set Formulas, Plurals, Questions, Indirect Speech Acts, Topicalization and Focus, Effort, Use of ‘a little’, Hedges, and Gaze, Gestures and Body Postures. However, they do not claim that Politeness is implied only by these devices. Rather, they argue that Politeness is not related only to one of these devices but it is derived from the total of the utterance. Thus, the communicatively competent user of the language should also know and employ the Parameters and Instruments of Politeness while using the language.

2.4.2.8 The Role of the Mother Tongue

Since the students under investigation are all multilingual, it is essential to consider a few facts about the implications of the role of their earlier learned language. Unlike the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, in recent years, it is not accepted that the L1 of the students is a hindrance in learning the L2. Rather, its beneficial nature has been considered (Sarwade, 2010). Similarly, the researcher here argues that the L1 of the students help them in using their second language, more particularly, whenever the user finds his knowledge of the L2 as insufficient to cope with the situation, s/he will fall back on the L1 for relevant material resulting in Code-Mixing, Code-Switching, Code-Borrowing and L1 Transfer. These are considered as the Communicative Strategies (Fræch and Kasper, 1984). Such types of Communicative Strategies will be available in the selection of both the linguistic elements and also the assessment of P, D, and R factors leading to the differences in the judgments regarding the appropriateness of language.