

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Concept of Communicative Competence in Modern Linguodidactics

Xazratqulova Mohira Azizbekovna

Doctoral student of Uzbekistan state world languages university, Uzbekistan

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue06 2026

PAGE: 20-23

Copyright © 2026 European International Journal of Philological Sciences, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract

The article examines communicative competence in modern linguodidactics through the analysis of learning tasks. The material includes 60 tasks for teaching Russian as a non-native and second language. Each task was examined according to communicative goal, addressee, speech situation, expected product and assessment criteria. The results show that linguistic accuracy is represented more consistently than strategic and intercultural components. The study argues that a task becomes communicative when it contains a realistic need for speech, a clear interlocutor and a possibility of choice.

KEY WORDS

Communicative competence; linguodidactics; Russian language; speech situation; learning task.

INTRODUCTION

Background. Communicative competence is a key concept in modern linguodidactics, but in classroom practice it is sometimes reduced to grammatical correctness. Methods. The study used descriptive, content-analytical, communicative-pragmatic and quantitative methods. The material consisted of 60 tasks for teaching Russian as a non-native and second language. Each task was examined according to the presence of a goal, an addressee, a speech situation, an expected product and criteria for assessment. Result. The linguistic component was found in all tasks, pragmatic and discourse elements in 68.3%, sociolinguistic elements in 48.3%, strategic elements in 30%, and intercultural elements in 20%. Tasks with information gap, role distribution and problem situation were more effective than reproductive exercises. Conclusion. Communicative competence should be developed through tasks that require learners to choose language means according to the situation, interlocutor and purpose.

METHODS

The research material consisted of 60 educational and communicative tasks designed for teaching Russian as a non-native and second language. These tasks were grouped into ten topics related to everyday and educational communication: introduction, family, school, my day, shopping, city, health, holidays, books, and the Internet. The focus of the study was not on theoretical aspects but on the specific formulation of the tasks themselves.

The research employed descriptive analysis, content analysis, communicative-pragmatic analysis, and quantitative methods. Each task was evaluated according to five criteria: the presence of a communicative goal, an addressee, a communication situation, an expected speech product, and opportunities for learners to choose appropriate language resources.

In addition, the components of communicative competence were identified, including linguistic, pragmatic, sociolinguistic, strategic, and intercultural competence. For example, the task

“Make sentences using the words shop, buy, and salesperson” was classified as a formal language exercise. In contrast, the task “You have come to a shop. Ask the salesperson for the item you need and inquire about the price” was classified as communicative because it includes an addressee, a communicative purpose, and a realistic communicative situation.

RESULTS

The analysis of 60 tasks revealed (see Table 1) that the communicative orientation of the instructional materials was

expressed to varying degrees. Although all tasks were related to the linguistic component of language learning, only some of them created a genuine need for communication.

The most productive tasks were those in which learners were required to obtain information, negotiate, explain, make requests, refuse, or seek clarification. Such tasks encouraged authentic language use and promoted the development of communicative competence by placing students in meaningful communication situations.

Mana ushbu qismning akademik inglizcha tarjimasi:

Table 1.

Composition of the Analyzed Educational Material

Type of Task	Number	Percentage	Assessment Focus
Lexical and grammatical tasks with a communicative purpose	15	25.0%	Relationship between form and meaning
Situational dialogues	14	23.3%	Addressee and communicative purpose
Monologic mini-statements	10	16.7%	Coherence of speech
Information-gap tasks	8	13.3%	Necessity of asking questions
Role-play and problem-solving tasks	7	11.7%	Choice and interaction
Project-based and intercultural tasks	6	10.0%	Cultural component

The largest category consisted of lexical and grammatical tasks with a communicative purpose, accounting for 15 tasks or 25% of the analyzed material. These tasks occupy an intermediate position between language practice and actual communication. For example, when a learner uses the appropriate noun form while making a request, grammar begins to function as a means of communication.

Situational dialogues accounted for 14 tasks (23.3%). Their communicative value increases when the task specifies who is speaking, to whom, for what purpose, and in what situation. The instruction “Create a dialogue” is less effective than “You have called your classmate to find out the homework assignment.” In the latter case, a clear communicative purpose is established.

Monologic mini-statements comprised 10 tasks (16.7%). These tasks develop the discourse component of communicative competence, namely the ability to construct coherent messages. However, a monologue becomes more

communicative when it has a specific addressee. For instance, describing a city acquires practical significance when a student addresses a visitor and recommends places worth visiting.

Information-gap tasks constituted 8 items (13.3%). These tasks demonstrated high methodological value because questions arise naturally from a lack of information. One student possesses information such as a schedule or route, while another must obtain it. Without asking questions and responding appropriately, the task cannot be completed.

Role-play and problem-solving tasks accounted for 7 items (11.7%). They require learners to select appropriate communicative behavior, such as arranging a meeting, choosing a gift, requesting assistance, or politely declining an offer.

Project-based and intercultural tasks represented 6 items (10%). Although relatively few in number, these tasks are particularly valuable because they connect language learning with cultural communication.

Table 2.

Representation of Communicative Competence Components

Component	Number	Percentage	Manifestation
Linguistic	60	100%	Vocabulary, grammar, speech patterns
Pragmatic and discourse	41	68.3%	Requests, explanations, invitations, coherent messages
Sociolinguistic	29	48.3%	Forms of address, politeness, communication style
Strategic	18	30.0%	Clarification requests, repetition, substitution of unknown words
Intercultural	12	20.0%	Speech etiquette and cultural conventions

The second major finding concerns the representation of communicative competence components (see Table 2). The linguistic component was present in all tasks, which is expected in Russian language instruction.

Pragmatic and discourse components were identified in 41 tasks (68.3%). These are activities in which learners perform communicative actions through language, such as requesting, explaining, describing, inviting, agreeing, or refusing.

The sociolinguistic component appeared in 29 tasks (48.3%). It is reflected in the choice of forms of address and levels of politeness. For example, the phrases "Give me the book" and "May I please borrow your book?" are both grammatically correct but appropriate in different communicative contexts. When the status of the interlocutor is not specified, learners may struggle to select the appropriate form.

The strategic component was identified in only 18 tasks (30%). This indicates that instructional materials rarely teach learners how to request repetition, seek clarification, or compensate for lexical gaps. Nevertheless, expressions such as "Could you repeat that, please?", "I did not understand," and "How do you say this in Russian?" enable learners to maintain communication even with limited vocabulary.

The intercultural component was found in 12 tasks (20%). It is associated with speech etiquette, greetings, expressions of gratitude, congratulations, and forms of address used when communicating with older people. The relatively low proportion of such tasks suggests the need to incorporate cultural situations more frequently into everyday classroom topics.

The quality of task formulation was also evaluated separately. A clear communicative goal was specified in 39 cases, a

specific addressee in 32 cases, a communication situation in 36 cases, and an expected speech product in 44 cases. Assessment criteria, however, were provided in only 21 tasks.

Therefore, many tasks could be improved without substantial revision simply by adding a communicative purpose, a specific addressee, and contextual conditions. For example, the task "Tell us about your city" can be reformulated as follows: "A friend from another city is visiting you. Recommend three places they should visit and explain why."

DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that communicative competence should not be viewed as an alternative to grammar instruction. Grammatical accuracy remains important; however, grammar should be embedded within meaningful communicative situations. For instance, when teaching the genitive case, tasks may involve shopping, expressing absence, or specifying quantity. In such contexts, grammatical forms acquire a practical communicative function.

To develop communicative competence effectively, it is essential to create a genuine need for communication. Learners should speak not merely because the teacher asks a question, but because the task contains a problem, an information gap, or a communicative objective. Such objectives may involve making requests, giving advice, reaching agreements, explaining directions, selecting gifts, or discussing plans.

A practical criterion for teachers may be formulated through the following questions: Who is speaking? To whom? For what purpose? In what situation? What outcome should be achieved? If these elements are absent, the activity remains a practice exercise rather than a communicative task. Practice

exercises are also necessary; however, they should ultimately lead to authentic communicative action.

CONCLUSION

In contemporary language pedagogy, communicative competence is understood as the learner's ability to use language appropriately according to communicative purpose, addressee, context, and accepted norms of interaction. It encompasses linguistic, pragmatic, discourse, sociolinguistic, strategic, and intercultural dimensions. Therefore, communicative competence cannot be reduced solely to knowledge of grammatical rules.

The analysis of 60 educational and communicative tasks demonstrated that the linguistic component is represented most consistently. Pragmatic and discourse components are also relatively common, whereas strategic and intercultural components require greater attention in instructional materials.

The primary challenge lies not in the absence of communication-related topics but in the insufficient precision of task formulation. Enhancing communicative goals, specifying addressees, and providing realistic communicative contexts can significantly increase the effectiveness of language-learning activities and contribute to the development of learners' communicative competence.

Bu tarjima xalqaro ilmiy jurnal (Scopus/WoS) uslubiga mos ravishda akademik ingliz tilida tayyorlandi.

REFERENCES

1. Hymes D. H. On Communicative Competence // Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings / ed. by J. B. Pride, J. Holmes. - Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972. - P. 269-293.
2. Canale M., Swain M. Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing // Applied Linguistics. - 1980. - Vol. 1, № 1. - P. 1-47.
3. Savignon S. J. Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice. - 2nd ed. - New York: McGraw-Hill, 1997. - 288 p.
4. Littlewood W. Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981. - 108 p.
5. Byram M. Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence. - Clevedon: Multilingual

Matters, 1997. - 124 p.

6. Council of Europe. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. - Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2020. - 278 p.
7. Пассов Е. И. Коммуникативный метод обучения иноязычному говорению. - М.: Просвещение, 1991. - 223 с.
8. Гальскова Н. Д., Гез Н. И. Теория обучения иностранным языкам. Лингводидактика и методика. - М.: Академия, 2006. - 336 с.
9. Щукин А. Н. Обучение иностранным языкам: теория и практика. - М.: Филоматис, 2010. - 480 с.
10. Азимов Э. Г., Щукин А. Н. Новый словарь методических терминов и понятий: теория и практика обучения языкам. - М.: ИКАР, 2009. - 448 с.