Introduction

As a language researcher and teacher, reflecting on the ultimate goal of language

instruction is a valuable engagement. Since the 1970's, the concept of communicative

competence (Gumperz, 1982; Hymes, 1972) has been taken up and adapted by researchers in

sociolinguistics, language socialization, education, second language acquisition, and

communications. For second language speakers—learners of a language other than their native

language—it is important to understand what, in addition to language knowledge and ability, is

needed to be able to communicate with a member of the second language culture. The Modern

Language Association (2007) report on language teaching in higher education states that the

"language major should be structured to produce a specific outcome: educated speakers who

have deep translingual and transcultural competence" (The Goal section, para. 1).

Communicative competence, strategic competence, symbolic competence, intercultural

competence, and translingual competence are constructs that have been developed by research in

second language learning and teaching (Byram, 1997; Canale, 1996; Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1991;

Kramsch, 2006; Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008), on conflict in intercultural communication

(Gumperz, 1982; Ting-Toomey, 2012), and on international communications (Deardorff, 2006;

Spitzberg & Chagnon, 2009). This paper will review theoretical and applied research related to

competence in intercultural communication, highlighting key interdisciplinary developments in

the conceptualization of competence and critical areas or types of competence needed by

language learners and multilingual speakers.

Communicative Competence

In 1972, Dell Hymes proposed a new taxonomy for describing and approaching language

research, specifically as a reaction to Chomskian transformational generative grammar and the

current emphasis on grammatical competence as the barometer for language competence. He proposed three categories that can be used to judge an utterance as acceptable or unacceptable, and a fourth category that relates to whether or not the utterance follows conventional norms. This study came about as Hymes was attempting to understand and analyze communication among children and searching for "a theory that can deal with a heterogeneous speech community, [and] differential competence, the constitutive role of sociocultural features" (p. 277). In addition to an understanding of the ability to create grammatically accurate sentences, Hymes focused on the need in research to be able to understand and explain how learners acquire knowledge of the appropriateness of their grammatical sentences. There is an additional competence involved in terms of when to talk or not, and in terms of who to talk to, when, where, how, and about what. In developing this idea of communicative competence Hymes identified four aspects to a communicative system, such as a language. Analysis of whether or not something fits within the communicative system is based on whether, and to what degree, something is (1) formally possible according to the system in which it operates (e.g. the grammatical system), (2) feasible based on the psycholinguistic resources available to the speaker, (3) contextually appropriate, and (4) done. The final category relates to performance; it is possible for something to fit the first three categories and still not take place in naturally-occurring interaction, and it is possible for something that takes place in naturally-occurring interaction not to fit with one or more of the first three aspects. These four aspects of a communicative system are the basis of Hymes's *theory of competence*, which shows "*the ways in which the systemically possible, the feasible, and the appropriate are linked to produce and interpret actually occurring cultural behavior*" (p. 286, emphasis in original). Like Chomsky before him, Hymes kept competence separate from performance, stating that "there are rules of

use without which the rules of grammar would be useless" (p. 278). Hymes also separates the construct of competence into knowledge and ability to use the knowledge, and both of these attach to each of the four aspects of the communicative system.

In sum, Hymes's (1972) *communicative competence* includes knowledge of and ability to use the communicative system according to the four aspects (whether or not something is possible, feasible, appropriate, and performed or done). According to Hymes, community members have knowledge about each aspect of the communicative system, and "will interpret or assess the conduct of others and [themselves] in ways that reflect a knowledge of each" (p. 282). Hymes's theory of communicative competence is the first step to understanding the ways in which this competence develops or is socialized in children and in other novices in a community. It also provides a foundation for the types of knowledge and abilities that must be mastered in order to be interpreted by members of the target community as being appropriate and effective speakers of a second language. While this construct has continued to be developed over the past 45 years, Hymes's definition remains seminal as a basis for understanding the reasons for assessing competence beyond the level of grammar.

Michael Canale and Merrill Swain's (1980) theory of communicative competence followed close on the heels of the work done by Hymes and other researchers. Their conceptualization includes three sub-competences: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence. *Grammatical competence* includes "knowledge of lexical items and rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology" (p. 29). *Sociolinguistic competence* includes "sociocultural rules of use and rules of discourse" (p. 30). According to Canale and Swain (1980), "[s]ociocultural rules of use […] specify the ways in which utterances are produced and understood *appropriately*" (p. 30). These rules govern what

can appropriately be said and done according to the sociocultural context, including the "topic, role of participants, setting, and norms of interaction" (p. 30). Rules of discourse are concerned with the use of the appropriate attitude and register within a sociocultural context. *Strategic competence* is "verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence" (p. 30). This competence is an essential addition to the conceptualization of communicative competence, and is broken down into grammatical strategies and sociolinguistic strategies. Grammatical strategies include circumlocution, paraphrasing, etc., and sociolinguistic competence include strategies for addressing strangers. This final category is examined separately in the following section.

Canale and Swain (1980) include a component of *rules of occurrence* for each of these three categories, similar to Hymes's (1972) fourth aspect of a communicative system. This component is an essential part of any theory of communicative competence, as it allows researchers to understand and begin to analyze what appear to be idiosyncratic behaviors in interaction. Analyses of naturally occurring interaction may challenge or subvert what researchers know (or believe they know) about what is socioculturally acceptable in a given environment. Additionally, this component of "occurrence" (Canale & Swain, 1980) or "performance" (Hymes, 1972) highlights the potential of learners to display their agency through intentionally transgressing the sociocultural or discourse norms of their target language community. This component also allows researchers to characterize language based on how frequently certain grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic practices are used. Canale and Swain's removal of what they term "psycholinguistic competence" (1980, p. 16), Hymes's second aspect of communicative systems, is based on its relevance to the performance over

competence. The psycholinguistic factors are believed to relate more strongly to communicative performance than communicative competence. "[T]hey are normally thought of as general psychological constraints on, among other things, the actual production and comprehension of sentences […], and we can find no compelling reason for including them in a model of communicative competence" (p. 8).

A final distinction from Hymes's (1972) work is that, while Hymes included both knowledge and ability to use that knowledge as part of communicative competence, Canale and Swain (1980) do not include ability in their definition. They separate communicative competence (essentially, knowledge) from communicative performance (use), but do not include "ability for use" as a component of the knowledge that must be acquired. This difference may be contributable in part to a difference in orientation of the researchers. The purpose of Canale and Swain's article is an understanding of "determine the feasibility and practicality of measuring […] the 'communicative competence'" (p. 1) of elementary and secondary school second language students. Hymes (1972) is concerned with the competence that is necessary for speakers to communicate within heterogenous speech communities. Canale and Swain also state that the aspect of ability has not been "pursued rigorously in any research on communicative competence" (p. 8), that theories of human action are not likely to be able to explain this aspect or to aid in designing a syllabus meant to address this, and that it is possible that including this aspect would lead to political and philosophical problems related to labeling learners as having "communicative deficits" (p. 8). Ability for use was therefore removed because it was believed to have no "practical applications for communicative syllabus design" (p. 8). Overall, Canale and Swain's (1980) interpretation of communicative competence has been widely accepted by second language teachers and led to the development of Communicative Language Teaching

(often, CLT) in second language as a pedagogical approach meant to develop learners'
communicative competence.

Zoltán Dörnyei and Sarah Thurrell's (1991) article focuses on *strategic competence*, the
"component of communicative competence most neglected by language course books and
teachers" (p. 17). Canale and Swain's (1980) definition of this concept (see above) is
summarized by Dörnyei and Thurrell as "the ability to get one's meaning across successfully to
communicative partners, especially when problems arise in the communication process" (1991,
p. 17). Strategic competence operates somewhat independently of the other aspects of
communicative competence, and research has shown that first language strategic competence is
transferrable to second language contexts and interactions. Second language learners, therefore,
invariably begin their language learning process with some level of strategic competence.
Strategic competence is essential to communicative competence, as it involves strategies to fall
back on during problematic conversation or miscommunications. These strategies include
"*message adjustment strategies* and *resource expansion strategies*" (p. 18, emphasis in original).
The first category includes strategies which allow the speaker to alter their message based on the
resources available to them. Simplification is a common message adjustment strategy. Resource
expansion strategies are also called achievement strategies, and they involve altering the
resources available in order to be able to communicate the message to their interlocutors.
Circumlocution, non-linguistic communication, borrowed words, requests for help, and indirect
strategies (pausing, using hesitation makers) are resource expansion strategies. The authors'
focus in this article is on ways in which to develop this strategic competence in second language
learners, which will be discussed in the final section.

Intercultural Communicative Competence

Michael Byram's (1997) book on intercultural communicative competence first destabilized the native-speaker-as-model approach to language learning and recommended that learners develop "an intercultural style, and tact, to overcome divergence rather than accept the norm of the monolingual" (p. 32). Byram claimed that using the native speaker—a concept which in and of itself is problematic and imprecise—as a model of what language learners should aim for in their competence (1) creates an "impossible target" for the language learner, resulting in their eventual failure (p. 11) and (2) emphasizes the "wrong kind of competence" (p. 11). The goal of language learning would be to divide the learner into two completely separate people: native speaker of a first language and native speaker of the second language. Rather than aiming for students to become a native speaker, shedding the original language and culture in order to fully do being a speaker of the new language, Byram suggests that learners need to become aware of the similarities and differences between communication in their own language and in another language. Learners need to aim for becoming an "intercultural speaker" (p. 32), which he uses to describe speakers involved in these interactions across cultures and languages. This is this a more attainable goal for language learners, and it highlights the impossibility of selecting one native speaker ideal per language, emphasizing the diversity across languages and cultures rather than essentializing them into one standardized form. Learners do need to understand the culture of the dominant national group of their target language in order to more clearly understand international communication; however, Byram posits that learners should learn to approach culture less as an object and more as a method, as "the means to analyse [sic] and thereby understand and relate to, whatever social world their interlocutors inhabit" (p. 20). This will not only emphasize linguistic and cultural diversity as previously stated, but will also

allow learners to become capable of understanding practices that they were not taught in class. It also transforms language learners from "imitators of native speakers" into "social actors engaging with other social actors" (p. 21) in a way that may differ from the interactions between native speakers. In order for an interaction between two intercultural speakers to be considered to be successful, (1) information must effectively be exchanged, and (2) the interaction must contribute to creating and maintaining relationships among the speakers. Byram identified five aspects of successful intercultural interaction that allow speakers to effectively exchange information and to build intercultural relationships (pp. 50-54). These are the five dimensions of intercultural competence, which Byram related to *the five savoirs*. The use of *savoirs* is particularly productive in understanding intercultural communicative competence because it implies that competence includes not only behavioral changes but also some unobservable qualities. It therefore highlights the inadequacy of "the distinction of competence and performance introduced by Chomsky and developed by Hymes" (p. 89). The first dimension is cultural knowledge (including knowledge of social groups, cultures, and practices), or *savoirs* (knowledges), and is a component across many models of competence. This includes both knowledge related to the learner's own country and to the country of the learner's interlocutors. The second dimension is the speaker's attitudes, or *savoir être* (to know how to be), which includes an openness to decentering the self in order to take on the perspective of the other. The third dimension is the skill of interpreting and relating, or *savoir comprendre* (to know how to understand). The fourth dimension includes the skills of discovering and interacting, or *savoir apprendre/savoir faire* (to know how to learn/to know how to do). The fifth dimension is critical cultural awareness and political education, or *savoir s'engager* (to know how to become engaged), and it includes an ability to critically analyze the practices and products of the

learner's own culture and those of the learner's interactants. These dimensions are interdependent. For example, attitudes of openness and curiosity are necessary to be able to fairly interpret the behaviors of others, and skills of discovery are necessary to be able to learn and understand the practices and products of others.

According to Byram's (1997) model, it is possible for a learner to be fully interculturally competent without being interculturally *communicatively* competent. Learners may interact in culturally appropriate and effective ways with members of another culture in the learner's own language (intercultural competence). Learners may also interact in the language of the other culture (intercultural communicative competence), negotiating "a mode of communication and interaction which is satisfactory to themselves and the other and [being able to] act as a mediator between people of different cultural origins" (p. 71). *Intercultural communicative competence* includes not only intercultural competence, but also linguistic competence (comparable to Canale and Swain's [1980] grammatical competence) and sociolinguistic and discourse competence (comparable when combined to Canale and Swain's sociolinguistic competence). The intercultural communicative competence model is unique in its multidimensionality, its use of the five *savoirs* and its proposal of the intercultural speaker as the model for language learners.

Darla Deardorff (2006) took another approach to creating a definition of intercultural communicative competence, which she terms "intercultural competence." She highlights the need for a consensus on the definition of this term, which has been defined in a number of ways. She analyses a questionnaire completed by administrators in 24 postsecondary institutions, and a Delphi study completed by 23 scholars whose research is related to intercultural issues. The questionnaire results showed that Byram's (1997) definition of intercultural competence was the most acceptable among the administrators. The Delphi study allowed Deardorff (2006) to

essentially crowd-source from among the intercultural scholars a definition of intercultural

competence. This was the first phase of the Delphi study. The second and third phases required

the scholars to rate all of the definitions on a 4-point Likert-scale, and then to either accept or

reject the definitions. Scholars were also asked to suggest individual components of intercultural

competence, following the same 3-phase Delphi process as for the definition of intercultural

competence. Deardorff analyzed the accepted responses and included all responses with 80% to

100% among scholars in her paper. The definition with the highest rating (which received 19 out

of 20 acceptances by scholars during round 3 and 3.8 out of 4 as an average on the Likert-scale

rating by scholars during round 2) stated that *intercultural competence* is the "[a]bility to

communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one's intercultural

knowledge, skills, and attitudes" (p. 249). From Byram's (1997) dimensions of intercultural

communicative competence, this definition is only missing the critical component, the *savoir

s'engager*, which may reflect the emphasis in Byram's work on the teaching of intercultural

communicative competence. The second-highest rated definition in Deardorff's (2006) study

(which received 19 out of 20 approvals and 3.6 out of 4 on the Likert-scale) stated that

intercultural competence is the "[a]bility to shift frame of reference appropriately and adapt

behavior to cultural context; adaptability, expandability, and flexibility of one's frame of

reference/filter" (p. 249). The second definition highlights the top responses in the specific

components of intercultural competence: "understanding others' worldviews; cultural awareness

and capacity for self-assessment; adaptability and adjustment to new cultural environment" (p.

249). Of the specific components, 22 were approved (with an 80% or higher acceptance rate) by

administrators and intercultural scholars. Most of these components "primarily involved

communication and behavior in intercultural contexts" (p. 254). Overall, this study showed that

both administrators and researchers preferred both definitions and specific components of intercultural competence that were broader in nature. Deardorff claimed that the definitions of intercultural competence have continued to change and evolve over time, and that some of the scholars do not consider definitions they previous had written as still being valid. "It is important for research and practice to stay current with scholars' research and thought processes on this construct" (p. 258).

Brian Spitzberg and Gabrielle Chagnon (2009) review recent models of intercultural communication competence. They define intercultural communication competence as "the appropriate and effective management of interaction between people who, to some degree or another, represent different or divergent affective, cognitive, and behavioral orientations to the world" (p. 7). It is important to note that even among native speakers of a common language, these different orientations may be in play, and speakers may need intercultural competence in order to communicate with other speakers of their own native language. The authors define recent conceptualizations of intercultural communicative competence based on five types. While these categories are not discrete, they provide a frame for analyzing the differences between the various conceptualizations of this construct. Compositional models provide an "analytic scheme" of intercultural communicative competence (p. 10). These models are useful in that they are able to provide an overview of the various aspects relevant to a theory of intercultural communicative competence; however, they often leave undefined both the relationship among the components and "the precise criteria by which competence itself is defined" (p. 15). Developmental models emphasize changes in interaction and relationships over time, often including stages or steps toward intercultural communicative competence. This emphasis in changes over developmental time is an important and often overlooked aspect of intercultural communicative competence;

however, these models often overlook the specific aspects of intercultural competence that would motivate such changes. Adaptational models usually include two members in the process and emphasize the interdependence of these members. While the emphasis on adaptability is crucial to any model of intercultural communicative competence, centering an entire model on adaptation seems "questionable" in a model of competence (p. 29). Causal process or causal path models are models which lend themselves the most easily to assessment, as they include "an identifiable set of distal-to-proximal concepts leading to a downstream set of outcomes that mark or provide a criterion of competence" (p. 10). The ease of adaptation for research or educational assessment is the main advantage of these models; however, it is alos their main weakness. "[T]o the extent they build too many feedback loops or two-way arrows (causal paths), they reduce their value as guides to explicit theory testing through hypothesis verification" (p. 33). Finally, co-orientational models focus on "communicative mutuality and shared meanings" (p. 10), meaning that they are concerned with speakers' compatible and similar orientations in communication. Byram's (1997) model could be considered a type of co-orientational model, in that it is concerned with understanding the world as oriented to by intercultural speakers in interaction. Byram's model is unique in that it is also concerned with the development of identity or habitus within and across cultures, and that it differentiates between a second language or bilingual speaker and an intercultural speaker. His model, as well as other co-orientational models, effectively concentrate on "the foundational importance of achieving some minimal level of common reference through interaction" (Spitzberg & Chagnon, 2009). One of the main challenges to a co-orientational model is that much of naturally-occurring interaction relies on "ambiguity, indirectness, misunderstanding, and disparity in comprehension" (p. 20). According to Spitzberg and Chagnon, the concentration on co-orienting and shared meanings in this model

means that the model is unable to deal with these unclear aspects of human communication. Spitzberg and Chagnon specifically cite politeness, which necessitates a degree of "ambiguity, indirectness, and even legerdemain in its competent achievement" (p. 20). They claim that maintaining intercultural relationships is partly dependent on "the deft management and balancing of directness and indirectness, understanding and misunderstanding, clarity and ambiguity" (p. 20). In other words, co-orientational models need to be developed in order to include a way to discuss this balance. However, it should be noted that Byram's (1997) model of intercultural communicative competence draws on communicative competence, which is easily able to incorporate practices that allow ambiguity in interaction.

Symbolic Competence

Claire Kramsch (2006; Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008) discussed the transferal of communicative competence à la Hymes (1972) to the language classroom in the form of Communicative Language Teaching, or CLT. According to Kramsch (2006), the intended focus of CLT is on "what language can do to perform conversational tasks through symmetrical turns-at-talk, where speakers' intentions are expressed and clarified in a rational manner, and where the meanings of words are actively interpreted and negotiated between interlocutors" (pp. 249-250). The goal of communicative language teaching is communicatively competent second language speakers, speakers who are able to synthesize "ideational, interpersonal, and textual knowledge—and the affects which are part of such knowledge" (Breen & Candlin, 1980, p. 91, as cited in Kramsch, 2006, p. 250). However, actual communicative language teaching practices have drastically simplified the process since the introduction of this pedagogical approach in the 1970's. Communicative competence has "become reduced to its spoken modality" (p. 250), doing away with other communication systems (e.g. text, non-verbal communication).

Additionally, teaching communicative competence "has often been taken as an excuse largely to do away with grammar and to remove much of the instructional responsibility from the teacher" (p. 250). In these worst-practices classrooms, the teacher is responsible only for managing students' group activities. Kramsch (2006; Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008) also draws attention to the changes in communication since communicative competence was adopted into second language teaching, particularly the mixing and blending of cultures. Second language learners today are more likely to encounter multilingual speakers with diverse national, cultural, ethnic, and social experiences, rather than the idealized native speaker of the "pure" target language. Language exchanges in an era of multilingualism are less predictable, and speakers may use different languages and language practices for different identification purposes. Additionally, speakers need to "mediate complex encounters" with interlocutors of "different language capacities and cultural imaginations, […] different social and political memories" (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008, p. 646) and possibly different understandings of reality. Because of these changes, Kramsch (2006) claims that "it is not sufficient for learners to know how to communicate meanings; they have to understand the practice of meaning making itself" (p. 251). Symbolic competence returns to the essence of communicative competence—which Kramsch summarizes as "the ability to express, interpret, and negotiate meanings in dialogue with others" (p. 251)—and extends that competence to include "the ability to produce and exchange symbolic goods" (p. 251). This is important because communicative competence is derived "from the symbolic power that comes with the interpretation of signs and their multiple relations to other signs" (p. 252).

Kramsch and Whiteside (2008) use an ecological analysis of interactions in a mix of English, Chinese, and Spanish to examine "interactions in multilingual environments as complex

dynamic systems" (p. 667). They illustrate the ways in which speakers in multilingual go beyond the use of communicative competence—communicating "accurately, effectively, and appropriately" (p. 664)—to additionally display symbolic competence, which they define as "a particularly acute ability to play with various linguistic codes and with the various spatial and temporal resonances of these codes" (p. 664). Symbolic competence can be seen (1) when speakers take on different subject positions—"ways of being an individual" (Weedon, 1987, p. 3)—through their language choice, capitalizing on the potential of one language over another in a given context; (2) when speakers create historicities in interaction by calling up an archetype of social memory; (3) when speakers contest realities or create alternate realities; (4) when speakers reframe aspects of interaction. Kramsch and Whiteside define *symbolic competence* as "the ability to shape the multilingual game in which one invests—the ability to manipulate the conventional categories and societal norms of truthfulness, legitimacy, seriousness, originality— and to reframe human thought and action" (p. 667). This approach to competence focuses less on speakers' ability to "master" knowledges and abilities, and more on the ways in which speakers can access and negotiate the power relations of the interaction through these knowledges and abilities.

Transcultural Communicative Competence

Kramsch's (2010) article analyzes the problem of transcultural communicative competence in a globalized educational landscape through a discussion of the stated goals of second language learning for university students (MLA, 2007). As the MLA Report stated, the goal of language learning at this level is the development of translingualism and transculturalism. This drastically contrasts with the historically proposed goals of language learning, which, as discussed in Byram (1997), emphasize the native speaker as model for language learners.

Instead, the emphasis in the current MLA Report (2007) is the ability to "operate between languages" (The Goal section, para. 1). Language learners, according to Kramsch, are not simply attempting to communicate their own ideas through the vehicle of a second language; they are able to engage in meaning-making processes that allow them to view events differently based on the language used. This interpretation of competence requires a theory of language as practice, as historically-contingent, as co-constructed, and as a site of struggle "for the control of social power and cultural memory" (Kramsch, 2005, as cited in Kramsch, 2010, p. 20). Ethnographic approaches to language, including language socialization, view "communicative competence [as] not so much a matter of exchanging objective information in a task-based or performance-based environment as a matter of indexing various subjective values and evoking historical memories through one's stylistic choices" (p. 20). Transcultural competence is then more than the translation of thoughts from one language to another; it is "an awareness of the symbolic value of language and a willingness and ability to engage in the difficult task of cultural translation" (p. 29). This definition of competence—from the perspective of language education—emphasizes the importance of cultural awareness and understanding in any conceptualization of competence for the language learner.

Other Forms of Competence

Stella Ting-Toomey (2012) examines key constructs in intercultural conflict competence, drawing on her cross-cultural conflict theory (Ting-Toomey, 1988), which provided a response to the lack of research in intercultural communicative competence on perspectives outside of Western-based theories. Canary and Lakey (2006, as cited in Ting-Toomey, 2012) push for including both appropriateness and effectiveness when assessing intercultural conflict competence. Appropriateness "refers to the degree to which the exchanged behaviors are

regarded as proper and match the expectations generated by the insiders of the culture" (p. 19),

whereas effectiveness "refers to the degree to which communicators achieve mutually shared

meaning and integrative goal-related outcomes through skillful interactional strategies in the

various intercultural negotiation phases" (p. 20). Appropriateness and effectiveness are related;

an increase in one of the two during an interaction is likely to result in an increase in the other.

Ting-Toomey (2012) suggests the addition of as a third component of assessment,

communication adaptability, or the "ability to change our interaction behaviors and goals to meet

the specific needs of the situation" (p. 21). The essential components of intercultural conflict

competence are "culture-sensitive knowledge, mindfulness, and constructive communication

skills" (pp. 21-22). Culture-sensitive knowledge is considered the most important aspect of this

competence, as speakers can decentre (Kohlberg et al., 1983, as cited in Byram, 1997, p. 34)

themselves and learn to evaluate culture-specific practices with less bias. Mindfulness refers to

the speaker's willingness to be aware of her/his own assumptions, knowledge, and emotions as

well as those of their interlocutors. Constructive communication skills include the speaker's

communicative ability, including verbal and non-verbal skills and practices.

A major contribution of Ting-Toomey's (2012) research is its attention to the Eastern and

Western orientations to the role of various aspects of intercultural interactions. For example,

Ting-Toomey draws attention to the importance of face—"a claimed sense of desired social self-

image in a relational or international setting" (p. 15)—in "a collectivistic, Asian-oriented

perspective" (p. 17). Orientations to face maintenance and negotiation practices differ between

cultures valuing individualism and collectivism to various degrees, and so an understanding of

the target culture's facework practices can be critical for intercultural communicative

competence. Intercultural facework competence is defined by Ting-Toomey as "the optimal

integration of knowledge, mindfulness, and communication skills in managing vulnerable identity-based conflict situations appropriately, effectively, and adaptively" (p. 18). According to this theory, facework significantly influences intercultural communication. Ting-Toomey also discusses mindfulness as an essential component to intercultural conflict competence. From a Western perspective, this construct shows a "readiness to shift one's frame of reference from an ethnocentric lens to an ethnorelative lens" (p. 24). From an Eastern perspective, mindfulness "means 'emptying our mindset' and learning to listen deeply without preconceived notions, judgments, and assumptions […] being fully present—attending fully to our own arising emotions and the cultural disputants' conflict assumptions, worldviews, positions, interests, and arising emotions" (p. 24). Ting-Toomey's emphasis on facework as an important factor in intercultural conflict competence demonstrates the potential benefits of analyzing communicative competence from the perspective of conflict management and from other perspectives. Additionally, her discussion of facework and on the differences in the two perspectives of mindfulness highlight the need for further research in intercultural communication in non-Western contexts and from non-Western perspectives. These additional perspectives would add depth to any conceptualization of and measures of assessment for intercultural communicative competence.

Measuring Competence

Many researchers discuss ways in which to assess competence (e.g. Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2006; Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1991), and tend to agree that the components of competence can be measured independently. Deardorff's (2006) study analyzed common instruments of assessment based on the preferences of administrators and of intercultural scholars. Her study showed that administrators preferred to use pre- and post-test measures (90%

approval rate), while intercultural scholars concurred that the best ways to measure intercultural competence was included the use of case studies, interviews, mixed methods, narrative analysis, self-report instruments, observations by others or the host culture, and judgement by self and others. Scholars also agreed (19 out of 20 scholars, 3.6 out of 4) that assessing intercultural competence "involves more than just observable performance" (p. 252), implying that the use of pre- and post-tests alone would not be sufficient to determine whether or not a student has increased in intercultural competence. Methods approved by the scholars in this study include a range of qualitative methods (including case studies, interviews, observation, and diary studies) in addition to "standardized competency instruments" (p. 258). Additionally, administrators and scholars agreed that it is possible to assess the individual components of intercultural competence separately. Deardorff's study concluded that there are a variety of definitions of this construct in use in postsecondary institutions. In order for these institutions to assess their students' intercultural competence development, it is essential for the institution to construct a definition based on current research and definitions in use in the field. Additionally, institutions must be able to use multiple assessment measures that (1) assess intercultural competence over time, rather than using the common pre- and post-tests, (2) address the multiple components of intercultural competence, and (3) clearly define the definition and components of intercultural competence at the institution.

Comparing Models of Intercultural Communicative Competence

Spitzberg and Chagnon (2009) conclude that the myriad models of intercultural communicative competence include many overarching similarities while differing significantly in terms of the distinct categorizations, and determine that "the more a model incorporates specific conceptualization of interactants' motivation, knowledge, skills, context, and outcomes,

in the context of an ongoing relationship over time, the more advanced the model" (p. 44). The use of the words "motivation" and "outcomes" here seem problematic, though this may simply be indicative of the authors' orientation to describing a model that can be adapted in order to assess levels and degrees of intercultural communicative competence. For research on language learning from a language socialization or sociocultural perspective, "motivation" would be better conceptualized as "investment" (e.g. Norton, 2013), as this would allow for more nuanced and less strictly psychological understandings of the intercultural speaker. Based on the authors' table, this category seems also to include "attitudes," so the new category could be "investments and attitudes." The inclusion of "outcomes" is unclear. If it is to be interpreted in relation to the "outcomes" of learners' competence, it implies a linear, unidirectional path to becoming an intercultural speaker, and implies that learners will one day arrive at a level of intercultural competence enlightenment. In reality, intercultural speakers in may frequently waver between competent (effective and appropriate) communication and problematic communication in their intercultural interactions. Models of intercultural communicative competence should instead include an understanding of the speakers' goals—which could be conceptualized as a part of their investment—and of their development over time on the path towards these goals. However, it is possible that "outcomes" here is used to refer to the results of individual intercultural interactions, such as whether or not the interaction contributes to the building of the relationship between intercultural speakers. The five aspects necessary to a model of intercultural communicative competence then include: investment and attitudes, knowledge, skills, context, and development over time.

An Integrated Model of Intercultural Communicative Competence

One of the main contributions of Spitzberg and Chagnon's (2009) article is the identification of commonalities across models, the discussion of theoretical underpinnings of the five types of model, and the ways in which each type can inform research on intercultural communicative competence. Researchers and other assessors must be able to justify their choice of model for their context and to adapt where necessary in order to effectively understand the intercultural communicative competence of their participants. This final section will be dedicated to such an adaptation.

Drawing on the definition of communicative competence that was most positively viewed by intercultural scholars in Deardorff's (2006) study, intercultural competence is the "[a]bility to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one's intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes" (p. 249). This definition is adapted from Byram's (1997) conceptualization of intercultural communicative competence, which seems to be the approach that can most effectively be adapted to research on second language learners. As discussed above, Byram's intercultural communicative competence model includes intercultural competence, linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, and discourse competence. Adopting Canale and Swain's (1980) definition of sociolinguistic competence, which includes discourse rules and sociocultural rules, logically reduces these categories to, in order of concreteness, (1) linguistic competence, (2) sociolinguistic competence, and (3) intercultural competence. Strategic competence (Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1991), can be included as a fourth element, thought it could also be included in the intercultural competence category *savoir faire*. These four components are not discrete, as each will be effected by the learner's competence in each of the other components. Additionally, "intercultural" here is a misnomer, as it implies that

cultures can be distinctly separated and that this type of competence is unnecessary in communicating with people of the same cultural group. In reality, "intercultural" competence is as important in speaking with members of the same culture as to speaking with members of other cultures; however, in order to emphasize the use of this conceptualization for research on interactions across cultures, "intercultural" remains an effective term.

Symbolic competence is "a mindset that can create 'relationships of possibility'" (Kramsch &Whiteside, 2008, p. 668) for language learners. However, this can only occur "if the individual learns to see him/herself through his/her own embodied history and subjectivity and through the history and subjectivity of others" (p. 668). This prerequisite of symbolic competence relates to Byram's (1997) dimension of intercultural competence, *savoir être*, or attitudes toward others and towards oneself. Symbolic competence is an approach to communication that can provide language learners with an awareness of the meaning-making practices (as constrained by the power relationships implicit) in everyday interactions, and the ability to use that knowledge to create and manipulate meanings themselves. As such, it can be seen as an additional layer to intercultural communicative competence, which permeates all of the other knowledges. Learners must understand how aspects of their linguistic competence, their strategic competence, their discourse competence, etc., can be used to shape the context of their learning and speaking.

Using Hymes's (1972) theory of communicative competence as a type of base layer for competence, speakers' interactions can be examined on the basis of their possibility, feasibility, appropriateness, and normativity according to rules of occurrence (Canale & Swain, 1980). Byram adds an additional category for the examination of interactions: whether, and to what degree, the interactions contribute to relationship-building between speakers. This relational

component, while difficult to examine in an assessment situation, allows researchers to examine

the social import of interactions. An outline of the components of this adapted conceptualization

of intercultural communicative competence is below. The "permeating layers" include

competences and contexts through which the individual components and the system as a whole

can and should be viewed.

1. Permeating layers
   a. Theory of competence (Hymes, 1972)
   b. Symbolic competence (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008)
   c. Relationship-building (Byram, 1997)
   d. Context (Spitzberg & Chagnon, 2009)
   e. Development over time (Spitzberg & Chagnon, 2009)
2. Components of intercultural communicative competence
   a. Linguistic competence
   b. Sociolinguistic competence
      i. Discourse rules
      ii. Sociocultural rules
   c. "Intercultural" competence: or, the five *savoirs*
      i. *Savoirs* – knowledge
      ii. *Savoir être* – attitudes and orientations
      iii. *Savoir comprendre* – skills of interpreting and relating
      iv. *Savoir apprendre/savoir faire* – skills of discovering and interacting
      v. *Savoir s'engager* – critical cultural awareness
   d. Strategic competence

While this outline includes aspects of intercultural communicative competence drawn from

influential scholars in intercultural communication, it is important to note that all of these

scholars approach their research from a Western perspective. As Ting-Toomey (2012) claims, it

is important for intercultural communication research to include a more diverse array of

perspectives in order to be appropriate for research across cultures.

The language socialization paradigm brings to SLA a focus on aspects of language

learning that go beyond linguistic competence. For research in second language socialization, the

focus is the process of becoming a culturally intelligible speaker of a second language, of

developing habitus in a new community. Language socialization has historically focused on the

development of communicative competence (e.g., Gumperz, 1982; Hymes, 1972), but with

second language socialization, a deeper understanding of the ways speakers interact *across* and

between languages is necessary. This integrated model of intercultural communicative

competence can provide a basis for this type of research. As Byram (1997) said of his own work,

models of intercultural communicative competence will not always be generalizable for all

contexts. While the outline above provides a starting point for understanding the development of

competence of newcomers to a second language community, researchers must continue to

develop and evaluate the relevance of existing models based on their appropriateness for the

researcher's theoretical framework, research context, research purpose, and the researcher's

epistemological and ontological assumptions.

References

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Canale, M. (1996). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt. (Eds.), *Language and communication* (7th ed., pp. 2-28). London: Longman.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, *1*, 1-47.

Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *10*(3), 241-266.

Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1991). Strategic competence and how to teach it. *English Language Teaching Journal*, *45*(1), 16-23.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics. Selected readings* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Kramsch, C. (2006). From communicative competence to symbolic competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, *90*(2), 249-252.

Kramsch, C. (2010). Theorizing translingual/transcultural competence. In G. S. Levine & A. Phipps (Eds.), *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy* (pp. 15-31). Boston: Heinle.

Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2008). Language ecology in multilingual settings: Toward a theory of symbolic competence. *Applied Linguistics*, *29*(4), 645-671.

Modern Language Association (2007). *Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world*. Retrieved from https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Foreign-Languages-and-Higher-Education-New-Structures-for-a-Changed-World

Spitzberg, B. H., & Chagnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing intercultural communication competence. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 2-52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S. (2012). Understanding intercultural conflict: Multiple theoretical insights. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 279-295). New York: Routledge.