ANOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON SYMBOLIC COMPETENCE


- Compares intercultural communicative competence (Byram, Risager) and symbolic competence (Kramsch). “While Byram and Risager’s ICC remains narrowly linked to national cultures, Kramsch’s SC moves us beyond a competence associated with knowledge of the cultural and communicative practices of particular groups and into more emergent terrain, in which competence involves a reflexive stance towards the communication at hand and a critical awareness of the symbolic systems used to construct any representation of culture.”


- A pre- “symbolic competence” paper, raises many of the issues dealt with by Kramsch & Whiteside 2008. Examines the complexity of socially situated activities and selves, using a “social realist” perspective (from sociology) to describe interactions, focusing on the play between macro context, setting and micro-interactions in the collaborative process.


- SC is used here to characterize the symbolic power games that pre-schoolers engage in to include or exclude peers from certain activities, e.g., speaking for another or pretending to misunderstand another child’s utterance in order to gain symbolic distinction vis a vis the teacher and peers.


- Intercultural competence as greetings and leave takings (surface) demands training in savoir-faire. Intercultural competence as critical discourse analysis (depth) demands education in savoir s’engager. Byram equates “symbolic competence for post-modern society – California” with reflection and critical cultural awareness (savoir s’engager).


- Based on a study similar to Kramsch & Whiteside 2008, but with 65 migrants from different countries, Canagarajah identifies what he calls a procedural knowledge or “performative competence” that enables his participants to “negotiate the diverse, unpredictable, and changing language norms in the contact zone.” - Does not reference Kramsch nor Whiteside and does not mention symbolic competence.

Clark, J. B. and S. Stratilaki. (2013). Complex and symbolic discursive encounters for intercultural education in plurilingual times. Linguistics for Intercultural Education. Edited by

Refers to our symbolic competence in its second section “Symbolic competence as a way of understanding intercultural competence”.


Discussion of third place, also called symbolic competence, as “part of intercultural competence”.


Looks at NS NNS interactions, the analysis focuses on how individuals “experience” symbolic competence as a product of language awareness and introspection. Absent is a discussion of power dynamics and historicity of the macro socio-cultural field and how they play out in micro-interaction.


Ch 6 discussion of symbolic competence or “the ability to actively manipulate and shape one’s environment on multiple scales of time and space” (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008, p. 667) expands embodied notions of symbolic competence in its application to preschoolers. Deaf 3 year-old Beto deftly contests his teacher’s interpretation of his signing; Andrew, son of teacher, is both hearing and knows sign language but pretends to be deaf or hearing, as it suits his interests vis a vis other students. Symbolic competence as a question of positioning.


How to use the concept of symbolic competence to teach film p.2. SC here is understood as noticing patterns, relationships between events, people and situations; interpreting frames; reframing scenes and identifying symbolic power games.


Uses Kramsch’s (2006) formulation of SC to propose a narrative approach to cultural immersion in the classroom. Students are exposed to cultural narratives that “gradually build a network of cultural references” which help students both analyse and interpret texts and write their own from a range of different perspectives.


Discussion of symbolic competence on p.60-62. Redefined as critical literacy, i.e. meaning-making and perspective-taking practices in the analysis of cultural/ historical narratives).

Discusses Byram’s intercultural competence and Kramsch’s symbolic competence and decries the lack of empirical research into how teaching and learning interactions might facilitate the development of symbolic competence.


Discusses symbolic competence as one of four new goals for teacher education: literacy-based language teaching, translingual/transcultural competence, plurilingualism/ pluriculturalism, and symbolic competence. It is not clear how symbolic competence contributes to the other three goals.


Discussion of symbolic competence using analysis of Japanese exchanges based on Kramsch/Whiteside 2008.

A first attempt to define SC as the ability to manipulate symbolic systems, to interpret signs and their multiple relations to other signs, to use semiotic practices to make and convey meaning, and to position oneself to one’s benefit in the symbolic power game. SC is nourished by a literary imagination.

Based on the Kramsch&Whiteside (2008) data, SC is defined within a complexity theoretical framework as the ability to position oneself advantageously, to be aware of the historicity of words, to reframe and change the context of the interaction.


Offers a critique of intercultural competence as not based enough in language as discourse. Uses an interview with two Jesuit priests on the visit to the U.S. of Pope Benedict in 2008 to show what symbolic competence looks like.

Kramsch, Claire (2009b) The Multilingual Subject. Oxford: OUP Ch.6
Ch.6 reframes third place, seen as too static and used by bilingual educators as the intrinsic in-between place of immigrants. Prefers instead symbolic competence - a dynamic, flexible and locally contingent kind of competence that enables language users to manipulate symbolic systems to their benefit.

Three aspects of symbolic systems: symbolic representation, symbolic action, symbolic power and implications for teaching language as a symbolic system. Shows through concrete classroom transcriptions how the teacher can model symbolic competence by recognizing and grasping at affordances in the on-going classroom discourse.

Kramsch, Claire (2011b) Symbolische Kompetenz durch literarische Texte. *Fremdsprache Deutsch* 44

How to use symbolic competence to analyse and interpret literary texts in the language classroom, e.g., German as a foreign language. See above Kaiser and Shibahara


By moving from a concern with identity to a concern with legitimacy, SLA research is refocusing its attention to the workings of symbolic power in L2 interactions, and leads naturally to consider symbolic competence as the very foundation of SLA.


This special issue contains six articles that each illuminate the workings of symbolic power and of symbolic competence in conversations between members of different cultures in asymmetrical relations of power (e.g., NS/NNS, English/Korean, native/foreigner). See Bernstein above.


Shows how inadequately the prototype of communicative exchange commonly used by researchers deals with late modern encounters, and proposes the notion of symbolic competence to capture interlocutors’ ability to play with elements an exchange using all available semiotic resources including the real and the imagined to bend the activity in ways favorable to their position.


Discusses symbolic competence on pp.140-41 as the ability not just to reproduce what has been learned, but to define and shape new and different uses, “challenging established meanings and redefining the real” (Kramsch 2011a). Associates it with Blommaert’s view of speech as “an active notion and one that deeply situates language in a web of relations of power, a dynamics of availability and accessibility, a situatedness of single acts vis-à-vis larger social and historical patterns such as genres and traditions (Blommaert 2009p.264)”. Leung points out that Kramsch’s (2011a) symbolic competence, that is a “distributed competence” (144), is conceptualized quite differently from the “personality-based competence” of the Common European Framework of Reference.

Li, Wei. (2014). ‘Negotiating funds of knowledge and symbolic competence in the complementary school classrooms’ *Language and Education*, vol 28, no. 2, pp. 161-180
Using the theoretical concepts of funds of knowledge, symbolic competence, and translanguaging, this article investigates how teachers and pupils in the complementary schools for Chinese children in Britain utilise and negotiate the discrepancies in their linguistic knowledge and socio-cultural experience in the learning and construction of language, cultural values and practices, and identity through co-learning.


Offers a discussion of the concept of symbolic competence p.171 that can enable learners to “play a game of distinction on the margins of established patrimonies” (Kramsch & Whiteside 2008:664). In Li Wei’s view, both teacher and learners can engage in “playing with various linguistic codes and with the various spatial and temporal resonances of these codes” (ibidem). He asks: ‘What and how do the teachers and learners co-learn in the multilingual and multicultural classroom?’


In this study of schoolchildren in Guanzhou navigating between the exclusively monolingual Putonghua of the school and the Cantonese of their family and their environment, symbolic competence is associated with Li Wei’s and Cook’s notion of *multicompetence* and Blommaert’s notion of *heteroglossic repertoire* (see p.75 and p.87). These kids’ symbolic competence is not recognized by the monolingual school.


SC is characterized here as a non-native speaker’s ability to redirect the conversation if the NS shifts the topic from the content of the conversation to the linguistic form of the NNS’ utterances.


The increasing demands that learners face due to the spread of globalization have called into question the appropriateness of the goals and methods of communicative language teaching. Instead, a literacy-based curriculum will deliver what Kramsch (2008) has called “symbolic competence”.


Author from Universidad Autonoma de Madrid links symbolic competence to language ecology as in Kramsch 2008.


This empirical study describes how foreign language teachers negotiate intercultural encounters and symbolic competence while abroad, at the art museum. It analyzes emerging 3d places by examining teachers’ discourse in interaction at the museum, using post-structuralist methods of discourse analysis (Kramsch & Whiteside 2008).
Symbolic competence is defined here as the ability to play with language.


A thorough discussion of SC, understood as „the ability to produce and exchange symbolic goods in the global context in which we live today” (Kramsch 2006: 251) and of its ability to bridge the teaching of language, literature and culture in language study.


Ch.2 offers an excellent discussion of symbolic competence based on the concrete examples in Kramsch/Whiteside 2008 and applied to translation. “Translators do not simply transfer meaning between words, texts or cultures; they embody a relation to the languages and cultures they are translating, just as multilinguals do in code-switching, performing identities, and symbolically identifying with different linguistic and cultural meanings. A working definition of translators’ symbolic competence is proposed as a framework for analysing students’ interests in, attitudes about, and approaches to translating and for considering how translators, especially translation students, can potentially develop their SC.”


Refers to symbolic competence in Kramsch 2008 but chooses to call it “metacultural” competence.


SC is used here to characterize the way a foreign bride from the Philippines in Korea, despite the fact that she can’t speak Korean and is therefore stigmatized, manages to gain a symbolic profit of distinction because she knows English. Her symbolic competence consists in using English to her advantage.


Basing the notion of symbolic competence on the triad: historicity, subjectivity, performativity, Vinall supplements the usual notion of communicative competence by adding to it semiotic awareness and social agency. She defines symbolic competence as “an ability to recognize and transgress the multiple borders of the contact zone, between not just linguistic codes, but other symbolic systems, the self and the other, various timescales and contexts, and ultimately power structures”.


Pedagogy for developing symbolic competence in the teaching of history in the FL classroom

Concrete application of SC to the teaching of a text *La Llorona* in a Spanish class with full lesson plan on how to teach the three aspects of SC: relationality, transgression, creation of new meaning.


Discusses the myth that intercultural competence operates in a “mono-symbolic world” and why we need a concept like symbolic competence.


Excellent discussion and application of symbolic competence to the analysis of narratives of women refugees in ESL programs.


SC is defined as the ability to fend off the ever recurring question “Where are you from?” if you don’t look or sound like a member of the dominant group.