Efficacy of Family Communication Pattern on Communicative Competence among Secondary School Students: An Explorative Study

Vijaykumar R[a], Debani Deb[b], Thamizhiniyan K[c]

[a]Assistant Professor, School of Education, Pondicherry University, India
[b]Research Scholar, School of Education, Central University of Kerala, India
[c]Post-Doctoral Fellow, Centre for Adult & Continuing Education, Pondicherry University

Abstract

Family is an integral part, which has an exclusive control on the child's communication and it is the first place where the communication begins and continues till mastery. This study aims to analyze the influence of family communication patterns on the Communicative Competence of secondary school students. Family communication pattern involves more liberal conversation, sharing of thoughts, ideas, and emotions, respecting and valuing of even a child's opinion for any family-oriented decisions, significantly influence children's linguistic competence in a language other than the mother tongue. The data for this quantitative study has been analyzed for both descriptive and differential statistics and the results reveal that the language spoken at home does not have any effect on family communication but it has a significant effect on communication. Moreover, interview results reveal that communication patterns significantly influenced student's personal and professional development.

Keywords: *Family Communication Pattern, Communicative Competence, Language Skills, Students, Explorative Study.*

1. Introduction

The world we live in primarily depends on the communication that one tries to understand another, who could be next door or in the next country. Today's world is essentially dominated by technology and communication with one and another is more through those technologies rather than personal. Ascan Koerner created a family communication model based on a broad theory of relational schemas that establishes explicit links between relational schemas and communication behaviors, and the model accounts for both intersubjectivity and interactivity in the family. To have a comprehensive scientific knowledge of communication, we must first understand how communications are assigned meaning and how we affect one another. This model has heuristic strength and will lead to the development of a variety of novel family communication tests and techniques**(F. A. Koerner & Mary Anne, 2002)**.

Fitzpatrick & Ritchie (1994)studied 169 households at random and discovered a strong link between Fitzpatrick's typology and family communication settings defined by conformity and discussion **(Chaffee et al., 1971)**. Consensual families have a high level of both dialogue and compliance-oriented. Their communication is marked by a desire to reach an agreement and an interest in fresh ideas without upsetting the family's power structure. In these families, children may either accept their parents' beliefs or escape into fantasy. Parents who fit under Fitzpatrick's Traditional group are more likely to lead these households. Pluralistic households are those with a strong discussion orientation but a low conformity orientation. These families' communication is characterized by open, unrestricted talks including all family members, which develop communicative competency and independent thought in their children.

Personal interactions and meetings of today happen more in the virtual world and most of all communication is web-based computer-mediated communication. The pattern of communication is more device-oriented that is human to a device and device to human. Gone are the days of human-to-human communication **(Méndez et al., 2014)**. Some of the virtual communications are through Facebook, WhatsApp, Skype, and many more which frees people from physical limitations of personal communication (Face to Face) even within the family invariably. Today so many families including parents and children communicate through CMC through various applications. The communication pattern of the youth of today has been found to affect the way that they perceive themselves and how they want to portray themselves. Family is an integral part of the society, which has an exclusive control on the child's communication **(Sümen & Çalışıcı, 2016)**and the first place where communication begins. This study is an attempt to evaluate the influence of family communication patterns on communication competency among secondary school students in the West Bengal region.

2.   Literature Review

Family communication is a fundamental process of socialization that directly contributes to the communication competency of the children. The way a child communicates in the family is vital to how the child communicates to the world when it grows **(Schumacher & Camp, 2010)**and this has a continuous effect till it reaches adulthood. Young adults use different types of communication technology to connect with their family and this influences the life of the youth when they move to college.

Newcomb (1953)opined communication as a co orientation between any two persons on some topic or issue. Family (Parent-child) communication includes "socio-oriented" and "concept-oriented" formation **(Chaffee et al., 1971)**. **Chaffee et al., (1971)**on family communication opined that the power system in the family is mostly "autocratic-democratic," "controlling-permissive" and "traditional-modern" and they had found two uncorrelated aspects of family communication. The first is called Social orientation, measuring vertical or relationship-oriented patterns **(Rose et al., 1998)**, which is similar to a social structure where communication is intended to produce differences and cultivate harmony and pleasant family relationship at home.

Efficacy of Family Communication Pattern on Communicative Competence among Secondary School Students: An Explorative Study

A child in such an environment avoids discussions on controversial topics for discussion and suppresses his or her feelings by not arguing with elders thereby not offending others **(Moschis, 1985)**and it fosters control and respect to authority. The second type of communication is called Concept Orientated, measuring issue-oriented pattern **(Rose et al., 1998)**where the communication pattern helps the child to develop an individual view about worldly things and it encourages children to be independent and evaluate issues on their own.

Parents of this type normally encourage evaluating alternatives before coming to any decision on any issue. They expose the child to the controversy by opening contradicting on issues or by discussing with guests **(Chaffee et al., 1971)**. **Braun et al., (2010)** state that Family communication practice is of two types, Conversation Orientation, and Conformity Orientation. Conversation Orientation is an open type of communication climate where the child is free to communicate on any topic and has no restriction **(F. A. Koerner & Mary Anne, 2002)**. On the other hand Conformity Orientation is an environment where the family is focused on similarity in attitude, belief, and values in communication and there is a clear hierarchy of family structure between members **(Koesten, 2004)**.

Children from Conversation Orientation backgrounds are said to be more open in their communication and are more socializing but Children from Conformity Orientation are restrictive, socialize less, and communicate only on few topics of comfort. They also tend to be less in interpersonal skills and are more hesitant and stressed **(Schrodt et al., 2007)**. Conformity oriented environment will discourage skill development and innovation and force people to accept and adapt to the given environment. They tend to stick to rules and cultural orientation by limiting their expressions and needs **(Avtgis, 1999)**. Whereas children from conservation family communication tend to be more conservation-friendly, interact more, and look at them as a rewarding trait **(Avtgis, 1999)**. Children from this background are more likely to discuss and be vocal on personal issues **(Huang, 1999)**and sensitive topics **(Booth-Butterfield & Sidelinger, 1998).** They are better at maintaining relationships **(Koesten, 2004)**and predicting others' interpersonal skills **(Ledbetter, 2009)**.

Family communication is a pivotal process of transition and plays an important role in interaction within and across families. Day-to-day communication aids in the interaction and socialization process of social cognitive schemas **(Burleson & Kunkel, 2002)**. The importance of family communication on the development and education of a child **(Bronfenbrenner, 1979)**. A child's Social communication and competence is primarily through family communication **(Bridge & Schrodt, 2013)**. This happens from the way family members act and communication with children **(Fitzpatrick, 2004)**. Family communication, over time, aids in developing behavior by observing the family environment and learning from the family members on how they communicate with each other and interact **(Schrodt et al., 2007)**. This learning helps the children to communicate effectively with partners and friends better.**A. F. Koerner & Cvancara (2002)**opined that parental behavior and communication helps in developing comforting skills among children. Family communication also helps in mode or preference of communication viz a viz private or public mode of communication **(Bridge & Schrodt, 2013)**. Researchers have studied Family

communication with communicative competence **(Schrodt et al., 2008)**study focused on conservation and conformity family communication.

3. Objectives

a) To evaluate the Family Communication Pattern and Communicative Competenceamong Secondary School Students
b) To analysis the influence of Gender and Language Spoken on Family Communication Pattern and Communicative Competence among Secondary School Students
c) To analysis the influence of Type of School and Father's Occupation on Family Communication Pattern and Communicative Competence among Secondary School Students
d) To analysis the influence of Residence and Mother's Occupation on Family Communication Pattern and Communicative Competence among Secondary School Students

4. Hypotheses

a) The Family Communication Pattern influences Communicative Competence among Secondary School Students
b) There is no significant difference between the Family Communication Pattern and Communicative Competence based on Male and Female and English and Regional language spoken at home (Bengali)
c) There is no significant difference between the Family Communication Pattern and Communicative Competence based on Government, Aided and Private Schools and Government Service, Business and Others.
d) There is no significant difference between the Family Communication Pattern and Communicative Competence based on Rural, Semiurban and Urban and Government Service, Housewife, Business and Others.

5. Methodology

The study evaluates the efficacy of Family Communication patterns on Communicative Competency and also examines the effect of profiling variables under the study. The school children of West Bengal state are the sample of the study from Public, Private and Aided Schools from Kolkata were selected at random from the list of schools from the Ministry of Education, Govt. of West Bengal. Ten schools were selected at random under each category and 9[th]standard students were selected based on convenience from each school. The questionnaire consists of three parts: first on profiling the students, second on the Family Communication which is measured using Revised Family Communication Pattern Scale was originally developed by **(Chaffee et al., 1971)**and was revised by **(Fitzpatrick & Ritchie, 1994)**.

The scale had a reliability of 0.83 which has two constructs namely Conservation Orientation and Conformity Orientation. The third part of the Communication Competency is a five-point Likert scale developed based on the five constructs which are as follows;

a. General Language Proficiency,

Efficacy of Family Communication Pattern on Communicative Competence among Secondary School Students: An Explorative Study

b. Formal Verbal Communicative Proficiency,
c. Informal, Verbal Communicative Proficiency,
d. Receptive Comprehension Proficiency, and
e. Instinctive Comprehension Proficiency.

This scale was tested for face validity from 5 experts (Teachers and professors from 5 State Universities of West Bengal) and Reliability using Cronbach's alpha and the reliability score is 0.869. The questionnaire was administered to 360 secondary school students.

6.   Findings

Hypothesis 1: The Family Communication Pattern influences Communicative Competence among Secondary School Students

Table 1. Influence of Family Communication pattern on Communicative Competence

Communication				General			Formal			Informal			Receptive			Instinctive		
	B	T	Sig.	B	t	Sig.	B	t	Sig.	B	T	Sig.	B	t	Sig.	B	t	Sig.
(Constant)	64.58	9.41	0.00	21.09	7.51	0.00	16.06	7.31	0.00	9.08	8.57	0.00	13.35	6.33	0.00	5.01	7.15	0.00
Conversation Orientation	0.48	4.95	*0.00*	0.20	5.19	*0.00*	0.06	1.92	*0.06*	0.03	1.90	*0.06*	0.16	5.30	*0.00*	0.03	2.87	*0.00*
Conformity Orientation	0.03	0.22	0.82	0.01	0.25	0.80	-0.03	-0.90	0.37	0.02	1.30	0.19	0.01	0.30	0.76	0.01	1.10	0.27
Dependent Variable: Communication																		

Table 1, presents the influence of Family Communication on Communicative Competence. İt presents, the primary objective of the present study which is to investigate the effect of family communication on the communication competency of school students. Findings inferred that the Conversation Orientation has a significant (5%) effect on Communication as a whole and another related construct. When Conversation Orientation increases by one unit of measure communication competency will increase by 0.48 units. All the constructs of communication also individually influence the Conversation orientation significantly with Receptive Comprehension Proficiency influencing the more strongly (Magnitude of Influence) followed by General language Proficiency, Instinctive Comprehension, and Formal and Informal verbal communication. Conformity Orientation does not have any influence on communication competency. Hence, for children to have better communication conservational orientation has to be encouraged by giving freedom to the children to talk and express themselves at home. Therefore, it is recommended that the freedom of students at home is essential to communicate freely with the family members and not restrict them or make them conform to extreme rules and regulations of speech and behavior. This will aid them to be better communicators in the outside world and the future.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the Family Communication Pattern and Communicative Competence based on Male and Female and English and Regional language spoken at home (Bengali)

Table 2. Influence of Gender and Language spoke Family communication pattern and Communicative   competence

Construct	Gender	N	Mean	F	Sig	Language	N	Mean	F	Sig
Conservation Orientation	Male	251	52.43			English	120	51.97		
	Female	109	54.15	**2.86**	*0.09*	Local/Vernacular	240	53.44	**2.20**	**0.14**
	Total	360	52.95			Total	360	52.95		
Conformity Orientation	Male	251	35.39			English	120	36.21		
	Female	109	36.61	**2.18**	**0.14**	Local/Vernacular	240	35.54	**0.70**	**0.40**
	Total	360	35.76			Total	360	35.76		
Family Communication	Male	251	87.82			English	120	88.18		
	Female	109	90.75	**5.37**	*0.02*	Local/Vernacular	240	88.98	**0.42**	**0.52**
	Total	360	88.71			Total	360	88.71		
General Language Proficiency	Male	251	33.73			English	120	34.77		
	Female	109	29.06	**39.41**	*0.00*	Local/Vernacular	240	31.09	**24.76**	*0.00*
	Total	360	32.31			Total	360	32.31		
Formal Verbal Communicative Proficiency	Male	251	18.62			English	120	21.57		
	Female	109	16.44	**13.93**	*0.00*	Local/Vernacular	240	16.16	**114.55**	*0.00*
	Total	360	17.96			Total	360	17.96		
Informal Verbal Communicative Proficiency	Male	251	11.22			English	120	12.63		
	Female	109	11.91	**5.77**	*0.02*	Local/Vernacular	240	10.83	**46.90**	*0.00*
	Total	360	11.43			Total	360	11.43		
Receptive Comprehension Proficiency	Male	251	22.26			English	120	24.44		
	Female	109	21.42	**2.01**	**0.16**	Local/Vernacular	240	20.78	**45.75**	*0.00*
	Total	360	22.00			Total	360	22.00		
Instinctive	Male	251	7.03	**1.03**	**0.3**	English	12	7.44	**15.12**	*0.00*

Comprehensio n Proficiency					1		0			
	Female	109	6.83			Local/Vernacular	24 0	6.73		
	Total	360	6.97			Total	36 0	6.97		
Communicati on	Male	251	92.86	**14.7 7**	*0.0 0*	English	12 0	100.8 5	**82.62**	*0.00*
	Female	109	85.66			Local/Vernacular	24 0	85.59		
	Total	360	90.68			Total	36 0	90.68		

Table 2, reveals that gender has a significant (5%) effect on Conservation Orientation and Family Communication as a whole where girls possess better Conservation Orientation and Family Communication than of boys. Gender seems to also have a significant (5%) effect on communication competency however boys are better Communicators as a whole and also in General, Informal and Formal Proficiency. Language spoken at home does not have any effect on Family communication but it has a significant effect on Communication competency as a whole and all its five constructs. Students who speak English at home are better at communication than non-English speakers. Boy students found better in their communication that is mostly outside the family and girl students do better inside the family due to Indian culture and the way boys and girls are brought up including different treatments at home by their parents. The language spoken at home has a huge effect on communication as the communication at home is in the same language as it is in the outside world, therefore; they feel more comfortable and confident in both places. However, the local language spoken at home has a significant difference because what is spoken at home is different from what is spoken outside. The children feel like fish out of a pond as the language is new and something that they are not familiar with.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the Family Communication Pattern and Communicative Competence based on Government, Aided and Private Schools and Government Service, Business and Others.

Table 3. Influence of Type of School and Father's Occupation on Family communication pattern and   Communicative competence

Particulars	Type ofScho ol	N	Mean	F	Sig	Father's Occupati on	N	Me an	F	Sig
Conservatio n Orientation	Govt.	120	52.45			Service	190.0 0	53.5 4		
	Aided	120	54.43	2.60	*0.08*	Business	129.0 0	52.9 1	2. 27	0.11
	Private	120	51.97			Others	41.00	50.2 9		

	Total	360	52.95			Total	360.00	52.95		
Conformity Orientation	Govt.	120	35.33			Service	190.00	34.74		
	Aided	120	35.74			Business	129.00	36.78		
	Private	120	36.21	0.45	0.64	Others	41.00	37.29	4.27	*0.02*
	Total	360	35.76			Total	360.00	35.76		
Family Communication	Govt.	120	87.78			Service	190.00	88.28		
	Aided	120	90.17			Business	129.00	89.70		
	Private	120	88.18	1.60	0.20	Others	41.00	87.59	0.86	0.42
	Total	360	88.71			Total	360.00	88.71		
General Language Proficiency	Govt.	120	32.36			Service	190.00	33.42		
	Aided	120	29.82			Business	129.00	31.80		
	Private	120	34.77	17.19	*0.00*	Others	41.00	28.83	8.52	*0.00*
	Total	360	32.31			Total	360.00	32.31		
Formal Verbal Communicative Proficiency	Govt.	120	16.26			Service	190.00	18.46		
	Aided	120	16.06			Business	129.00	18.12		
	Private	120	21.57	57.19	*0.00*	Others	41.00	15.15	7.23	*0.00*
	Total	360	17.96			Total	360.00	17.96		
Informal Verbal Communicative Proficiency	Govt.	120	10.12			Service	190.00	11.45		
	Aided	120	11.54			Business	129.00	11.43		
	Private	120	12.63	36.56	*0.00*	Others	41.00	11.34	0.03	0.97
	Total	360	11.43			Total	360.00	11.43		
Receptive	Govt.	120	20.09	25.6	*0.00*	Service	190.0	22.3	1.	0.24

Efficacy of Family Communication Pattern on Communicative Competence among Secondary School Students: An Explorative Study

Construct	School	N	Mean	F	p	Occupation	N	Mean	F	p
Comprehension Proficiency				1			0	2	45	
	Aided	120	21.48			Business	129.00	21.91		
	Private	120	24.44			Others	41.00	20.83		
	Total	360	22.00			Total	360.00	22.00		
Instinctive Comprehension Proficiency	Govt.	120	6.56	8.99	*0.00*	Service	190.00	6.98	0.04	0.96
	Aided	120	6.91			Business	129.00	6.98		
	Private	120	7.44			Others	41.00	6.90		
	Total	360	6.97			Total	360.00	6.97		
Communication	Govt.	120	85.38	41.22	*0.00*	Service	190.00	92.62	5.81	*0.00*
	Aided	120	85.80			Business	129.00	90.24		
	Private	120	100.85			Others	41.00	83.05		
	Total	360	90.68			Total	360.00	90.68		

Table 3, infers that Type of School and father's occupation has a significant (5%) effect on Conversation Orientation and Communication competency and all 5 constructs. Aided school students are freer in expressing themselves at home on Conversation Orientation, but the communication competency of Private school students is much better in communication as a whole and on all its components. Father's occupation has an effect on Conformity Orientation and General, Formal and overall communication. The children of Service professionals are better at overall communication and specifically in General and Formal Proficiency. Service professionals' children are less conditioned at home for communication whereas children of business and others are more conditioned to Conformity. Hence, it is concluded that less conformity at home, and the children are better communicators in the outside world.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the Family Communication Pattern and Communicative Competence based on Rural, Semiurban and Urban and Government Service, Housewife, Business and Others.

Table 3. Influence of Residence and Mother's Occupation on Family Communicationpattern and   Communicative Competence

Particulars	Mother's Occupation	N	Mean	F	Sig	Residence	N	Mean	F	Sig
Conversation Orientation	Service	33	52.76			Rural	6	54.67		
	Housewife	294	53.31			Semiurban	42	56.33		
	Business	9	47.33	1.81	0.15	Urban	312	52.46	3.68	*0.03*
	Others	24	50.88			Total	360	52.95		
	Total	360	52.95							
Conformity Orientation	Service	33	36.42			Rural	6	32.67		
	Housewife	294	35.70			Semiurban	42	35.24		
	Business	9	33.67	0.41	0.74	Urban	312	35.89	0.72	0.49
	Others	24	36.38			Total	360	35.76		
	Total	360	35.76							
Family Communication	Service	33	89.18			Rural	6	87.33		
	Housewife	294	89.01			Semiurban	42	91.57		
	Business	9	81.00	1.69	0.17	Urban	312	88.35	1.61	0.20
	Others	24	87.25			Total	360	88.71		
	Total	360	88.71							
General Language Proficiency	Service	33	32.42			Rural	6	30.50		
	Housewife	294	32.27			Semiurban	42	33.14		
	Business	9	32.11	0.04	0.99	Urban	312	32.24	0.54	0.58
	Others	24	32.75			Total	360	32.31		
	Total	360	32.31							
Formal Verbal Communicative Proficiency	Service	33	18.82			Rural	6	17.67		
	Housewife	294	17.85	0.36	0.78	Semiurban	42	18.12	0.03	0.97
	Business	9	18.11			Urban	312	17.95		

Efficacy of Family Communication Pattern on Communicative Competence among Secondary School Students: An Explorative Study

	Others	24	18.13			Total	360	17.96		
	Total	360	17.96							
Informal Verbal Communicative Proficiency	Service	33	11.52			Rural	6	9.83		
	Housewife	294	11.38			Semiurban	42	11.07		
	Business	9	11.22	0.55	0.65	Urban	312	11.51	1.82	0.16
	Others	24	12.04			Total	360	11.43		
	Total	360	11.43							
Receptive Comprehension Proficiency	Service	33	22.97			Rural	6	19.17		
	Housewife	294	21.92			Semiurban	42	22.38		
	Business	9	20.78	0.59	0.62	Urban	312	22.01	1.03	0.36
	Others	24	22.13			Total	360	22.00		
	Total	360	22.00							
Instinctive Comprehension Proficiency	Service	33	7.18			Rural	6	6.33		
	Housewife	294	6.98			Semiurban	42	7.17		
	Business	9	6.78	0.57	0.64	Urban	312	6.96	0.75	0.48
	Others	24	6.63			Total	360	6.97		
	Total	360	6.97							
Communication	Service	33	92.91			Rural	6	83.50		
	Housewife	294	90.40			Semiurban	42	91.88		
	Business	9	89.00	0.28	0.84	Urban	312	90.65	0.67	0.51
	Others	24	91.67			Total	360	90.68		
	Total	360	90.68							

Table4, reveals that the Mother's Occupation does not have any effect on family communication or communication competency it is evident that, Bengali mothers do not have any influence on children's communication in or outside the family. Area of residence does not have any influence on communication competency but has an effect on Conversation Orientation where Semi-Urban and Rural children communicate more in the family than urban children. Urban children are more into other activities as they happen to spend less

time at home and even at home, they are more on to gadgets than communicating to family members when compared to that of rural children.

The interesting finding and a new contribution from the present study are that family communication pattern involves more liberal conversation, sharing of thoughts, ideas, and emotions, respecting and valuing of even a child's opinion for any family-oriented decisions, significantly influence children's linguistic competence in a language other than the mother tongue, in this case, the same is the English language. If the communication is restricted, and sharing of natural thoughts or expressing oneself freely through a language is threatened by strict norms within the family which are supposed to be the most feasible zone of social interaction for children in the adolescent period.

7.   Discussion

The primary goal of the research is to investigate the effect of family communication on the communication competency of school students. More specifically this study is designed to examine the secondary school student's views on General Language Proficiency, Formal Verbal Communicative Proficiency, Informal, Verbal Communicative Proficiency, Receptive Comprehension Proficiency and Instinctive Comprehension Proficiency influencing the communicative competence of school students.

Various studies suggested that the Family is an integral part of the society, which has an exclusive control on the child's communication and the home is the first place that the communication begins, therefore, it is essential to study family communication and it affects communication competency. Language spoken at home does not have any effect on family communication but it has a significant effect on communication competency as a whole; however, over time family communication develops certain behavioral patterns and learning from the family members on how they communicate with each other and interact **(Bridge & Schrodt, 2013)**. Students who speak English at home are far better at communication than non-English speakers. Male students are found better in their communication mostly outside the family and female students do better inside the family.

For many years in the 1970s and 1980s, the Family Communication Patterns Instrument dominated the research of media and family. David Ritchie later defined and modified these characteristics, renaming them conformity orientation and dialogue orientation **(Fitzpatrick & Ritchie, 1994)**. The degree to which families foster an atmosphere that emphasizes shared attitudes, values, and beliefs is referred to as conformity orientation. Families at the top of this scale have a lot of consistency in their ideas and attitudes, as well as relationships that are centered on harmony and frequent obedience to the parents.

Locality does not have any influence on communication competency but has a significant effect on conversation orientation whereas the Semi-urban and rural children communicate more in the family than of urban children. Urban children are more into other activities as they happen to spend less time at home. Family communication pattern which involves more liberal conversation, sharing of thoughts, ideas, and emotions, respecting and valuing of even

a child's opinion for any family-oriented decisions, significantly influence children's linguistic competence in a language other than the mother tongue.

The objective of the present study is to evaluate the influence of family communication on communication competency among school students. Results found that Conversation Orientation has a significant (5%) effect on Communication as a whole and another related construct. When Conversation Orientation increases by one unit of measure communication competency will increase by 0.48 units. All the constructs of communication also individually influence the Conversation orientation significantly with Receptive Comprehension Proficiency influencing the more strongly (Magnitude of Influence) followed by General language Proficiency, Instinctive Comprehension, and Formal and Informal verbal communication.

Language Competency and training essentially includes language, speech, socio-cultural knowledge, and abilities, etc., which provides a clear development of communicative competence serves as a development of specific knowledge and abilities in language development in turn communication pattern of an individual which aids in a continues development of language competency, to a certain degree in future.

8.   Conclusion

Competence is a natural ability to acquire certain skills and it cannot be fully determined by formal language syllabi in schools. It is said, charity begins at home. The same should be true in the case of acquiring English Language or any second or foreign language. The liberal conversations and openness in expression amidst the family environment can therefore provide unconscious and natural competence in acquiring a new language. The most important thing is communication learned through early imitation or repetition, social interaction, and enculturation, through which children can obtain the rules of speaking in their speech community and thus become a member of the larger society. The present study has shown the importance of such conversation-oriented family communications in influencing the communicative competence among secondary school students who are adolescents and need open family communication patterns for overcoming barriers of communication. The study was carried out in one state of India, if it could be extended to a few more states a more predominant and holistic understanding of family communication can be obtained.

References

1. Avtgis, T. A. (1999). The relationship between unwillingness to communicate and family communication patterns. International Journal of Phytoremediation, 16(4), 333–338. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824099909388734
2. Booth-Butterfield, M., & Sidelinger, R. (1998). The influence of family communication on the college-aged child: Openness, attitudes and actions about sex and alcohol. Communication Quarterly, 46(3), 295–308. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463379809370103
3. Braun, A., Maguire, M., & Ball, S. J. (2010). Policy enactments in the UK secondary school : examining policy , practice and school positioning. 0939. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680931003698544
4. Bridge, M. C., & Schrodt, P. (2013). Privacy Orientations as a Function of Family Communication Patterns. Communication Reports, 26(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/08934215.2013.773054

5. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). Contexts of child rearing: Problems and prospects. American Psychologist, 34(10), 844–850. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.844

6. Burleson, B. R., & Kunkel, A. (2002). Parental and Peer Contributions to the Emotional Support Skills of the Child: From Whom Do Children Learn to Express Support? Journal of Family Communication, 2(2), 81–97. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327698jfc0202_02

7. Chaffee, S. H., Mcleod, J. M., & Atkin, C. K. (1971). Parental Influences On Adolescent Media Use. American Behavioral Scientist, 14(3), 323–340. https://doi.org/10.1177/000276427101400304

8. Fitzpatrick, M. A. (2004). Family Communication Patterns Theory: Observations on Its Development and Application. Journal of Family Communication, 4(3–4), 167–179. https://doi.org/10.1080/15267431.2004.9670129

9. Fitzpatrick, M. A., & Ritchie, L. D. (1994). Communication Schemata. Human Communication Research, 20(3), 275–301.

10. Huang, L. N. (1999). Family communication patterns and personality characteristics. Communication Quarterly, 47(2), 230–243. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463379909370136

11. Koerner, A. F., & Cvancara, K. E. (2002). The Influence of Conformity Orientation on Communication Patterns in Family Conversations. Journal of Family Communication, 2(3), 133–152. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327698jfc0203_2

12. Koerner, F. A., & Mary Anne, F. (2002). Understanding Family Communication Patterns and Family Functioning: The Roles of Conversation Orientation and Conformity Orientation. Annals of the International Communication Association, 26(1), 36–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2002.11679010

13. Koesten, J. (2004). Family communication patterns, sex of subject, and communication competence. Communication Monographs, 71(2), 226–244. https://doi.org/10.1080/0363775052000343417

14. Ledbetter, A. M. (2009). Family communication patterns and relational maintenance behavior: Direct and mediated associations with friendship closeness. Human Communication Research, 35(1), 130–147. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2008.01341.x

15. Méndez, N. A., Qureshi, M. E., Carnerio, R., & Hort, F. (2014). The Intersection of Facebook and Structural Family Therapy Volume 1. American Journal of Family Therapy, 42(2), 167–174. https://doi.org/10.1080/01926187.2013.794046

16. Moschis, G. P. (1985). The Role of Family Communication in Consumer Socialization of Children and Adolescents. Journal of Consumer Research, 11(4), 898. https://doi.org/10.1086/209025

17. Newcomb, T. M. (1953). An approach to the study of communicative acts. Psychological Review, 60(6), 393–404. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0063098

18. Rose, G. M., Bush, V. D., & Kahle, L. (1998). The Influence of Family Communication Patterns on Parental Reactions toward Advertising: A Cross-National Examination. Journal of Advertising, 27(4), 71–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1998.10673570

19. Schrodt, P., Ledbetter, A. M., & Ohrt, J. K. (2007). Parental Confirmation and Affection as Mediators of Family Communication Patterns and Children's Mental Well-Being. Journal of Family Communication, 7(1), 23–46. https://doi.org/10.1080/15267430709336667

20. Schrodt, P., Witt, P. L., & Messersmith, A. S. (2008). A meta-analytical review of family communication patterns and their associations with information processing, behavioral, and psychosocial outcomes. Communication Monographs, 75(3), 248–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750802256318

21. Schumacher, J. A., & Camp, L. L. (2010). The Relation Between Family Functioning, Ego Identity, and Self-Esteem in Young Adults. Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research, 15(4), 179–185. https://doi.org/10.24839/1089-4136.jn15.4.179

22. Sümen, Ö. Ö., & Çalışıcı, H. (2016). Pre-service teachers' mind maps and opinions on STEM education implemented in an environmental literacy course. Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri, 16(2), 459–476. https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2016.2.0166