COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE FOR TEACHING EIL (ENGLISH AS AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE)

Oleh:
Zainuddin, M Hum.[1]

Abstract:

Roger Nunn berpendapat bahwa ada beberapa jenis kompetensi dalam pengajaran bahasa Inggis sebagai bahasa internasional. Pada tulisan ini, penulis membahas tentang kompetensi komunikatif dan kompetensi linguistik yang relevan bagi pengajaran bahasa Inggis sebagai bahasa internasional.

Disini, penulis menggambarkan demografis penggunaan bahasa Inggris berdasar kompetensi yang digunakan untuk memperkaya materi pembelajaran. Simpulan, bahwa pembahasan pada tulisan ini adalah kompetensi pada pengajaran bahasa Inggis sebagai bahasa internasional.

[1] Penulis adalah dosen pada Jurusan Tarbiyah Prodi Tadris Bahasa Inggris, alumni S-2 Sekolah Pascasarjana USU Medan

Key Words: kompetensi linguistik, kompetensi komunikatif, , English as an International Language (EIL).

I Introduction

For English language educationists, the most problematic aspect of defining English as an international language remains the notion of competence. This paper, proposed as an introduction to a long term project aiming at defining competence for EIL more fully. Will attempt to introduce the issues in order to stimulate debate about competence in EIL education.

On the one hand, "international" communication seems to require multiple competences. Studies of pragmatic and discourse competences, that focus on the process of achieving mutual intelligibility in whole spoken or written texts, are assuming increasing significance.[2]. In addition, developing the kind of strategic competence that has already been highlighted as an important aspect of "communicative competence" [3] is also inevitably worthy of renewed attention, as international communication seems to require the ability to adjust to almost infinitely diverse Issue 3 intercultural communication situations. Traditionally, however, "communicative competence"[4] has been used to refer to the adaptation to single and well established speech communities. Preparing for communication between people from a broad range of backgrounds, who will often communicate beyond their own or their interlocutors' speech communities in some kind of ill-defined third zone, implies the need to have a highly developed repertoire of communication strategies.

Although an increased focus on multiple competences is both necessary and inevitable, a related concern is that there is a danger of

[2] McKay, S. *Teaching English as an international language.(* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) p.49-76

[3] Kasper, G. & Kellerman, E. *Communication Strategies*, (Harlow: Longman, 1997)

[4] Hymes, D. *On communicative competence.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972)

"international" becoming a byword for reduced *linguistic* competence. For language teachers, "knowing" a language has not commonly been a question of pragmatic or strategic competence, yet linguistic competence has still to be adequately addressed in discussions of so-called "International English".

Indeed, some would argue that it has never been adequately addressed throughout the so-called "communicative" era.[5] Considering English as a language increasingly used for international communication is not the same as defining English as an "International Language". To become competent in a language, it has always been assumed that there is a body of linguistic knowledge that needs to be learned, whether this is phonological, grammatical or lexical, and often in relation to particular speech communities.

II. Communicative Competence for International Communication

In applied linguistics, models of communicative competence serve as goal specifications for L2 teaching and testing.[6] The notion of 'communicative competence' as applied to language teaching theory needs to be reconsidered for the teaching of English for international communication.[7] A communicative approach for fronted "communicative competence" as "the goal of language teaching".[8] Working from an ethnographic perspective, Hymes emphasized the way language was used in speech communities, arguing that there were, "rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless."[9].

---

[5] Acar, A. *The communicative competence controversy*. (*Asian EFL*. 2005)
[6] Kasper, G. & Kellerman, E. *Communication Strategies*, (Harlow: Longman, 1997), p.345
[7] Hymes, D. *On communicative competence.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972)
[8] Richards, J., Platt, J. & Weber, H. *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. (Harlow: Longman, 1985).p.48
[9] Hymes, D. *On communicative competence.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972) p.14

The change of emphasis in language teaching theory, while not always followed in practice, towards a more "communicative" approach was partly dependent on the influence of this view of language.

An important notion of communicative competence is "appropriateness". "Appropriateness" was a "universal of speech", related to the social codes of speech communities, as "shared understandings of rights and duties, norms of interactions, grounds of authority, and the like.[10]" Communication is "pre-structured by the history and ways of those among whom one inquires." Learning to communicate "appropriately" has sometimes been taken to imply learning to fit into a particular way of communicating in a target community.[11]

Learning might, for example, have focused among other things on the appropriate use of speech acts as social functions used in particular speech communities, such as how to give and receive invitations or how to apologize. Students' own norms would then be seen as inappropriate, interfering with successful communication in a target culture.

It is not new for teachers to challenge this view when carried to extremes, resulting in unconscious cultural imperialism in the very situations where the opposite is intended. In 1984, for example, I found myself in the unreal situation of being required to teach the kind of indirect requests to Bedouin Arab students I could never remember using myself during my Northern English upbringing, but which we British were thought to use, such as, "I wonder if you could direct me to the station?" This approach may have been and may still be justifiable, for example, in language schools where students are learning English in Britain to use in Britain or for professional training.

---

[10] Hymes, D. *Language & education: Ethnolinguistic essays,* (Washington, D.C.: Centre for Applied Linguistics. 1980), p.49

[11] Hymes, D. *Language & education: Ethnolinguistic essays,* (Washington, D.C.: Centre for Applied Linguistics. 1980), p.74

However, in the more varied and unpredictable contexts in which many students will use English in this new century, it is clearly inappropriate to teach language that is only appropriate in limited situations in a target culture that may never be visited by the students. What constitutes making an "appropriate" contribution in international communication cannot be defined in terms of a single speech community and there is no such thing as a global speech community in any definable sense.

Work already available for more than twenty years has not neglected the kind of competences needed for international communication. There are four-parts of framework included linguistic, socio-linguistic, discourse and strategic competences.[12] Bachman (1990) and Bachman and Palmer (1996) include grammatical competence, which encompasses vocabulary, syntax morphology and phonemes/ graphemes.[13] In this discussion we can identify an important distinction between what we could term linguistic knowledge and abilities which enable us to better apply or compensate for lacunae in linguistic abilities. [14]

Applying linguistic competence involves the activation of a body of knowledge that has been learned and stored in memory for retrieval. Performance will never reflect the full body of knowledge available to a language user, because many other factors from the situation will intervene, whether they are psychological (e.g., stress). Physiological (fatigue), social (group dynamics or power dynamics), situational or genre related requiring specialized situational knowledge or non-standard language, (hospital appointments, business meetings), cultural (valuing reduced communication, such as silence or understatement) or task-related (complexity, difficulty).

---

[12] Canale, M. & Swain, M. *Theoretical basis of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing, Applied Linguistics 1*, 1980), p.1-47.

[13] Skehan, P. *A cognitive approach to language learning,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1998), p. 157-164

[14] Kasper, G. & Kellerman, E. *Communication Strategies*, (Harlow: Longman, 1997), p.350

Nevertheless, acquiring a body of linguistic knowledge for use is an essential part of any language learning. In this early stage of the development of our understanding of international English, there is unity in diversity in that there can be no agreed body of Standard English available to be taught or learnt. Very diverse arguments about what should be learnt are available.

Usable descriptions whether in the form of corpora, grammars, dictionaries are increasingly well-developed for native varieties of English (inner-circle), but there is as yet no notion of how to develop a body of standard grammatical English in the expanding circle countries. Yet competence in a language, whether labeled international or not, does require linguistic competence.

II.1 Predicting the Future

The inevitability of changes that will naturally occur in "English" as a result of its international role, stating, "those changes that do not impede intelligibility should be recognized as one of the natural consequences of the use of English as an international language."[15] But, there can be no "academy" acting as a "big brother" to regulate and to impose a unified notion of competence on the world's English speakers. A pluralistic notion of "World Englishes" is easier to justify and valuable work is being done to describe different varieties in works.

It is important to note that broad non-commercial endeavors need to remain extremely modest in the face of the enormity of the descriptive task. Melchers and Shaw readily acknowledge that "although we have found all varieties rich and fascinating, it is inevitable that our personal knowledge and experience is not evenly distributed." Importantly, global-minded scholars such as Melchers and Shaw are the first to recognize, as we all must, that in any cross-cultural Endeavour we remain "prisoners of our prejudices".

---

[15] McKay, S. *Teaching English as an international language.*(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) p.127

The development of "English" and "Englishes" is more easily seen as a natural organic development, both difficult to predict and impossible to control. For educators, however, the relationship between "intelligibility" and linguistic "competence" remains problematic.

Achieving "intelligibility" in particular intercultural speech events depends on important pragmatic and intercultural abilities and is sometimes possible between people using not only different linguistic norms, but also between people with widely different levels of linguistic competence. Pragmatic failure is also regularly observed between people who have excellent linguistic knowledge.

Linguistic competence can actually impede pragmatic understanding in intercultural situations.[16] Furthermore, it is difficult to see linguistic competence as just knowledge of an impervious, independent linguistic system when it is applied to use. It is far from easy to dissociate many features of linguistic competence from pragmatic, discourse and even strategic competences.

Interlocutors are constantly called upon to make appropriate linguistic choices that are sensitive to the dynamic aspects of context as their communication progresses. An utterance may embody an inappropriate linguistic choice of, for example, article use or modality, without there being any internal structural linguistic problem.

A further aspect of linguistic competence to consider is bilingual and multilingual competence. More than half the world's population is not monolingual. Bilingual competence is something *less,* rather than something *more,* than monolingual ability.[17]

Definitions of bilingualism reflect assumptions about the degree of proficiency people must achieve before they qualify as bilingual (whether comparable to a monolingual native speaker, or something less than this, even to the extent of minimal knowledge of a second language).

---

[16] Moeschler, J. *Intercultural pragmatics: a cognitive approach, Intercultural Pragmatics,* 2004), p.57

[17] Crystal, D. *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics,* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 2003),p.51

Native competence is inappropriate as a goal of EIL, but does not define native, bilingual or EIL competence.[18] Transitional views of competence are inappropriate in so far as they imply replacing one monolingual competence with another, whereas SL, FL and IL learners are adding to and maintaining existing competences. For educational settings, he makes a useful distinction between BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (Cognitive/ Academic Language Proficiency).[19]

To counter the negative impact of the dominance of English on other languages it is becoming increasingly important to think of trilingual competence as an aim. Paradoxically, however, EIL *use* is almost always in monolingual situations, between people who have no other *lingua franca*. The implication is that a learning process is needed that develops bilingualism or multilingualism at the same time as maximizing monolingual input and output.

EIL competence, then, cannot be reduced to a single, limited, monolingual or mono cultural concept. It is composed of a set of interlocking and interdependent competences that sometimes compensate for each other, sometimes counteract each other and sometimes reinforce each other. A normal human being and even a gifted communicator and linguist cannot expect to possess it totally. However, while acknowledging this reality, *linguistic* competence is in danger of being sidelined in considerations of EIL pedagogy.

II.2 Statistics and EIL Competence

While demographic statistics provide the evidence for redefining English as an International language, broad demographic surveys do not provide clear information about competence. The status of English as a "Language of International Communication" is no longer in dispute and

[18]McKay, S. *Teaching English as an international language,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) p.34-47

[19]Baker, C. *The care and education of young bilinguals.* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2000) p. 78

rarely attracts the kind of critical scrutiny that an emerging field of inquiry requires.

Important conceptualizations are in three concentric circles, ('inner', where English is used as a first language, 'outer', where it is used as a second official language and 'expanding', where it is still classified as a foreign language) also require further scrutiny in relation to competence.[20]

Kachru's circles appear to predetermine competence according to nationality and argue that competence should be determined independently of origin. [21] The key factor is the increase of the relative use of English across non-native settings compared to its use within native settings or between native and non-native settings.

The speed with which a global language scenario has arisen is truly remarkable.[22] The so-called "expanding circle" of foreign language speakers was said to include more than 750 million EFL speakers in 1997, compared to 375 million first-language speakers and 375 million second language speakers. A critical point of no return has been reached in that the number of English users is developing at a faster rate as a language of international communication than as a language of intra-national communication.

The extent to which intra-cultural use has been surpassed by intercultural use is difficult to estimate exactly on the methods and difficulties of interpreting global statistics. [23] A more recent IATEFL publication even suggests that communication between non-native speakers now represents 80% of global English use. [24]

The global dimensions of English, both insist that available statistics represent no more than estimates and that figures alone do not

---

[20]Kachru, B. *Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle,* 1985), p. 11-30

[21] Modiano, M. *International English in the global village,* 1999), p.43

[22] Crystal, D. *English as a global language,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1997), p.22

[23] Crystal, D. *The language revolution.* (Cambridge: Polity. 2004), p.7-10

[24] Finster, G. *What English do we teach our students?* (Canterbury: IATEFL, 2004), p.9

provide a full or clear picture.[25] Melchers and The EFL category is particularly difficult to pinpoint: it really depends on what level of proficiency a person should have to qualify as a speaker of English".

The outcome of both Crystal and Graddol's discussions is that Kachru's three-way classification of inner circle, outer circle and expanding circle countries can only be a starting point in considerations of competence. Although linguists tend to favor acceptance of the notion of competence in relation to varieties of English, of world "Englishes" that extend far beyond an 'inner circle', competence cannot easily be related to linguistic demographics. Within the "outer" circle, there are a wide variety of situations, in which competence is difficult to estimate.

Even the amount of English used within multilingual settings is difficult to pin down. In India, for example, a Malayalam speaker from the south may not speak the official Hindi tongue so may use English as a *lingua franca* with speakers of one of the other sixteen Indian languages. A colonial past may provide hostility towards the language of the former colonialists, but pragmatism often prevails, with English being the most useful tool as a kind of *lingua franca*.[26] There are huge variations in the role of English and the number of competent speakers between the fifty or so countries that are classified for convenience in this category.

Most significant for this discussion is the third group of the so-called "expanding circle" of countries, in which English is a *foreign* language, but with a difference. In many such countries, it is unrealistic to consider that international communication can be conducted only in the national language.

Some of these countries have come to accept just one foreign language, English, as the most convenient means of international communication. Kachru's three concentric circles, while representing a

---

[25] Crystal, D. *English as a global language,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1997), p.15

[26] Finster, G. *What English do we teach our students?* (Canterbury: IATEFL, 2004), p.14

breakthrough in our conception of global English use, can mask some important realities if the notion of competence is invoked.

Northern European countries, such as the Netherlands and Scandinavian countries are classified as expanding circle countries.[27] "There is much more use of English nowadays in some countries of the expanding circle, where it is 'only' a foreign language …, than in some of the countries where it has traditionally held a special place". In an Asian context too, it makes more sense to refer simply to "learning English" than to EFL or ESL. [28]

The dangers of "hidden assumptions" and underlines the difficulty of drawing firm conclusions from the diverse statistical estimates available.[29] How do compilers of linguistic demographics consider the notion of "competence"? For outer circle countries where English has an official status, we have noted that Crystal considers that those who have completed secondary education will have "a reasonable level of attainment". While useful as a starting point for global estimates, it is still necessary to underline the fact that competence is not rigorously defined in estimates of global English use.

The difficulty of acquiring accurate estimates. Careful use of modality is of the essence: "Even a small percentage increase in the number of speakers *thought to have* a reasonable (rather than a fluent) command of English would considerably expand the L2 grand total. A figure of 350 million is in fact *widely cited as a likely total* for this category". "Why a language becomes a global language has little to do with the number of people who speak it. It is much more to do with who those speakers are." If all English speakers were located on one continent

[27] Crystal, D. *English as a global language,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1997), p. 56

[28] Nunan, D. *Important tasks of English education: Asia-wide and beyond, English Language Learning in the Asian Context* (Pusan: The Asian EFL Press, 2005), p. 8

[29] Crystal, D. *English as a global language,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1997), p.55

or in only one geographical area for example, this would reduce the importance of the figures.[30]

Only French and English are spoken as native languages on five continents. As stated above, the main factor in according a 'global' status to English is also highly significant for the notion of competence. This is the fact that non-native use of English appears to be rivaling if not overtaking native use in terms of quantity.

Again the statistical evidence needs to be considered with caution. It is not possible to estimate accurately the quantity of English spoken by any particular group of speakers or between any particular groups. Another factor not taken into account is the proportion of nonnative English that speakers are routinely exposed to in terms of listening and reading.

Here we must consider films, television, books, newspapers and other media sources. Much is made of the number of non-natives using English surpassing the number of native users, but this masks another reality which is rarely expressed because, while it could be seen as a professional duty to expose local realities as a basis for meaningful curriculum development, it is not considered politically correct to do so.

Many nationals of many expanding circle countries still do not possess competence or confidence to communicate in English and are unlikely ever to do so. For the majority, global communication is a potential that is never realized.

There is little that can be done to confront global estimates critically without resorting to anecdotal local experience. However inadequate anecdotal or incomplete local experiential 'evidence' might be, it does help put global figures in perspective. While 'completing high school' is not a criterion for even basic estimates of competence in expanding circle countries, we might expect that a large proportion of those high school students who gain acceptance to university would all

[30] Crystal, D. *English as a global language,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1997), p. 5

have "reasonable" competence in economically developed countries such as Japan.

However, a placement test at the author's own university given to all new entrants to assess their ability to take part in a basic conversation indicates that around 30% of such students can demonstrate no ability to participate in a simple small-group conversation on everyday topics and only around 25% possess usable competence at lower intermediate level or above.[31]

While wider scale investigation is needed and we can in no way generalize such findings to the population of the world's expanding circle countries, it is hard to imagine that the figures are unique to one situation to the extent that all other Japanese high school graduates possess basic communication ability in English.

The implications of English as an International Language are extremely varied and have only just started to be seriously considered un-polemically. The emerging reality is that English 'no longer belongs to its natives'. It is not so much that natives are suddenly being dispossessed, but more that non-natives are increasingly becoming 'possessed'.[32]

No language *per se* belongs exclusively to anyone unless political restrictions are imposed on who may use it. A language is part of the identity of anyone who is able to use it and competence also reflects the degree to which we "possess" a language. It still belongs in an essential way to its natives and they belong to it, to the extent that it is their main and inescapable means of communication and a deep and basic part of their cultural identity. However, ''Native" use of English is declining statistically and norms of use can no longer be codified as independent mono-cultural or mono-linguistic units.[33]

---

[31] Baker, C. *The care and education of young bilinguals.* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2000) p. 79

[32] Phan Le Ha. *A critical notion of English as an international language*, (Pusan: The Asian EFL Press, 2005)

[33] Graddol, D., McArthur, T., Flack, D. & Amey, J. *English around the World*, 1999), p. 40

Bewildering diversity inevitably leads towards a consideration of what constitutes a teachable standard. The dilemma stating, "We all use it in different ways; we all approximate to something which isn't there, but which we idealize about, negotiate and compromise." McArthur identifies East Asia as an example of an area where "the entire middle class seems to want English for their children as an international vehicle which they can use with the rest of the world – it's not a British or an American thing.[34]" old Standard Spoken English (WSSE) which is still so much in "its infancy", conceding that it is impossible to predict how or even if a standard will develop or whether fragmentation will become the norm.[35]

McArthur suggests that a move towards "hybridization" represents a normal process of world languages. For McArthur hybridization is "infinitely varied" but "the idea of hybrids is stable" in the sense that it is a normal and verifiable phenomenon. Native norms may still dominate but they will also internationalize and blend with the varieties of new Englishes.[36]

No "regional social movement, such as the purist societies which try to prevent language change or restore a past period of imagined linguistic excellence, can influence the global outcome."[37] Competence needs to be considered on different levels. Local varieties "full of casual pronunciation, colloquial grammar and local turn of phrase", which are opposed to formal varieties for wider intelligibility, "full of careful pronunciation, conventional grammar, and standard vocabulary". to a continuing presence of standard written English, in the form of newspapers, textbooks, and other printed materials," suggesting that

[34] Graddol, D., McArthur, T., Flack, D. & Amey, J. *English around the World*, 1999), p. 4
[35] Crystal, D. *English as a global language,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1997), p. 137
[36] McArthur, T. *Oxford guide to world English.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p.8
[37] Crystal, D. *English as a global language,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1997), p. 130

these show "very little variation in the different English-speaking countries".[38]

To avoid polemics between native and non-native perspectives, we need to consider a user's "scope of proficiency" as an alternative to inclusive or exclusive notions such as "native" or "non-native". [39]

Internationally Effective Able to use communication strategies and a linguistic variety that is comprehensible to interlocutors from a wide range of national and cultural backgrounds Nationally effective What a South African would need to communicate with other South Africans Local Proficiency The proficiency someone needs to deal with people in his or her area Ineffective The level of the language learner who knows some English but cannot communicate in it Such categories are an invaluable first step in that they allow a speaker of any background access to the highest level. However, they would need considerable refining to be made operational for teachers interested in assessing competence.

II.3 Competence

The question for EIL teachers still arises as to what exactly should be learnt in terms of bodies of linguistic knowledge for use. Graddol suggests there is a growing demand for "authoritative norms of usage" and for teachers, dictionaries and grammars to provide reliable sources of linguistic knowledge. The wish for fixed, codified norms of a standard world English reflects an understandable desire for stability, but is it a desire that can or should ever be fulfilled?

At the same time that English is being rather vaguely defined as 'international', some progress is being made in providing more reliable descriptions of linguistic knowledge drawing on large samples of actual

[38] Crystal, D. *The language revolution.* (Cambridge: Polity. 2004), p.137
[39] Melchers, G. & Shaw, P. *World Englishes. (*London: Arnold, 2003), p.39

use. The "Bank of English" is an ever-expanding data-base that draws on "contemporary British, American, and international sources:

Newspapers, magazines, books, TV, radio, and real conversations – the language as it is written and spoken today". At first site, corpora, such as "the Bank of English", seem to provide an excellent opportunity to draw up norms of international use based on the codification of the output of educated users of English. However, a closer scrutiny of the sources used indicates a very broad range of sources, but non-British and American sources are not strongly represented.[40]

It is difficult to see at this stage how or when an equivalent corpus with a sufficient level of authority could be collected from a wider variety of international sources, although the challenge to do so has already been taken up. One example, the "International Corpus of English" (ICE) is "the 71 most ambitious projects for the comparative study of English worldwide."[41] Compilers of such corpora feel the need to protect the quality of their product by selecting the informants. A full website is available outlining the ICE project.

The corpus includes countries in which English is a second language such as India, Nigeria and Singapore, but does not include competent speakers from 'expanding circle' countries. The corpus design page of the website outlines the criteria for inclusion in a particular sample. "The authors and speakers of the texts are aged 18 or over, were educated through the medium of English, and were either born in the country in whose corpus they are included, or moved there at an early age and received their education through the medium of English in the country concerned."

---

[40] Sinclair, J. *Collins Cobuild English grammar*. (Glasgow: HarperCollins, 2002)

[41] Kennedy, G. *An introduction to corpus linguistic,*. (Harlow: Pearson Education, 1999), p.54

We might characterize these users as monolingual or bilingual, native or near-native educated users of the language. The aim is to compile 20 national corpora of a million words to enable comparative studies. Kennedy points out, however, that the samples will be too small for detailed analysis of any but the most frequently occurring lexis and those larger mega-corpora are not likely to be available in the foreseeable future.

Meanwhile, extensive grammars and exercises are already available using the extensive, if less international, Bank of English. There is also a growing consensus that some kind of corpus will be needed that highlights language use between members of the "expanding" circle speakers of English.

One such corpus, VOICE (Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English) for ELF, English as a *Lingua Franca*, aims at codifying the language use of competent users of the "expanding circle". Its focus is on unscripted, largely face-to-face communication among fairly fluent speakers from a wide range of first language backgrounds that's primary and secondary education and socialization did not take place in English.[42]

Inevitably, compilers of such a corpus have to give serious consideration to the notion of competence: the expression, "fairly fluent speakers", raises questions as to how speakers might qualify for inclusion in the corpus in relation to competence. We should relinquish "the elusive goal of native-speaker competence" and embrace "the emergent realistic goal of intercultural competence achieved through a plurilingualism that integrates rather than ostracizes EIL".

"The-sounds and the 'dark l' as "non-core". So-called 'errors' in the area of syntax that occupy a great deal of teaching time, often too

[42] Seidlhofer, B. *A concept of international English and related issues: from "real English" to "realistic English"*., (Strasbourg: Council of Europe. 2003)

little effect such as "'dropping' the third person present tense –s" are also considered unproblematic for *lingua franca* communication.[43]

III. Conclusion

This paper has attempted to raise some of the key issues in relation to competence and the emerging field of EIL as a stimulus for further debate in the pages of this journal. Proposing what to include rather than what to exclude might prove to be the most helpful approach for promoting the potentially invaluable insights that corpora can provide. Otherwise, a option of competence that emphasizes "less" rather than "more" might filter down into the world's classrooms as a justification that "anything goes" providing that it 'communicates': a position that has frequently been described to misrepresent communicative teaching in the past.

In spite of concerns about standards that such notions of a reduced "core" might appear to embody, projects that aim at gathering corpora of ELF among expanding circle speakers have an enormous long-term potential for providing invaluable data in several areas. They can enhance our knowledge of intercultural communication by allowing us to examine the operation of intercultural communication in a real-life situation of linguistic equality between participants.

They can also provide invaluable linguistic knowledge to draw on for syllabus designers. The problem for most syllabus designers is not what to *exclude*, but what to *include* and it is by emphasizing what we can most usefully *include* that such corpora are likely to provide the most long-term benefits.

It has taken many years for now established corpora such as the Bank of English to produce tangible pedagogical results in the form of user-friendly materials designed at improving competence in real language use based on the notion of native-like competence. English

[43] Jenkins, J. *The phonology of English as an international language: New models, new norms, new goals.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2000), p.18

used for International Communication involves multiple competences, "more" rather than "less", and English as a *Lingua Franca* is a reality that is as yet under-researched and merits increased attention in a supportive and non-polemic atmosphere.

At the same time, it is becoming increasingly urgent to consider in more depth what exactly we mean when we refer to competence in relation to EIL education. The long debate over the last thirty years about the role of linguistic competence in so-called communicative teaching has often concluded that *linguistic* competence has been neglected. This paper has contended that there is an increased potential for neglecting *linguistic competence* to an even greater extent in the field of EIL.

REFERENCES

Acar, A. (2005). The "communicative competence" controversy. *Asian EFL*

Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L. & Palmer, A. (1996). *Language testing in practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baker, C. (2000). *The care and education of young bilinguals.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2002). Bilingual education. In R. Kaplan., *the Oxford hand book of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brumfit, C. & Johnson, K... (1979). *the communicative approach to language teaching.* London: Oxford University Press.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical basis of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*

Canale, M. (1983). On some dimensions of language proficiency. In J.W. Oller, *Issues in language testing research*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Crystal, D. (2004). *The language revolution.* Cambridge: Polity.

Crystal, D. (2003). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Finster, G. (2004). What English do we teach our students? Canterbury: IATEFL.

Graddol, D., McArthur, T., Flack, D. & Amey, J. (1999) *English around the World*.

Guildford: Gupta, D. (2005). ELT in India: *A brief historical and current overview*. Pusan: The Asian EFL Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). *On communicative competence. The communicative approach to language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hymes, D. (1980). *Language & education: Ethnolinguistic essays.* Washington, D.C.: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language: New models, new norms, new goals.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B. (1985). *Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaplan, R. (2002). *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kasper, G. & Kellerman, E. (1997). *Communication Strategies*. Harlow: Longman.

Kasper, G. (1997). Beyond reference. In G. Kasper & E. Keller man, *Communication strategies*. Harlow: Longman.

Kennedy, G. (1999). *An introduction to corpus linguistics.* Harlow: Pearson Education.

McArthur, T. (2002). *Oxford guide to world English.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McCarthy, M. (2005). *ELT news e-mail interview.*

McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Melchers, G. & Shaw, P. (2003). *World Englishes.* London: Arnold.

Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics. An introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Modiano, M. (1999). International English in the global village.

Moeschler, J. (2004). *Intercultural pragmatics: a cognitive approach. Intercultural Pragmatics,*

Nelson, G. (2005). *International corpus of English homepage*. Department of English Language & Literature, University College London.

Nunan, D. (2005). *Important tasks of English education: Asia-wide and beyond*. Pusan: The Asian EFL Press.