

# THE CURRENT STATE OF FORMING COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE BASED ON CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES

Mirzayeva Gulshan Azamatovna

2<sup>nd</sup> Grade PhD Student Gulistan State University

m.gulshan234@gmail.com

## Abstract

The thesis examines the current state of forming communicative competence through contemporary approaches in language education. It clarifies conceptual and methodological trends and assessment practices using analytical review and comparative synthesis. Scientific novelty lies in identifying key implementation gaps between competency-based standards and classroom realities and outlining integrative directions for method selection and evaluation.

**Keywords.** Communicative competence, competency-based education, task-based learning, discourse, interaction, formative assessment, methodological integration.

## Introduction

**Annotatsiya.** Mazkur maqola til ta'limidagi zamonaviy yondashuvlar orqali o'rganuvchilarning kommunikativ kompetensiyasini shakllantirishning mavjud holatini tahlil qiladi. Unda konseptual asoslar, metodik tendensiyalar va baholash amaliyotlari yoritib beriladi. Tadqiqotda pedagogik manbalarning tahlilii sharhi va qiyosiy sintezi qo'llanilgan bo'lib, kompetensiyaga asoslangan talablar hamda ularning amaliyotga tatbiq etilishi o'rtasidagi tafovutlar aniqlangan, shuningdek, integrativ metodik yo'nalishlar taklif etilgan

**Keywords.** muloqotchanlik, kommunikativ kompetensiya, kompetensiyaga yo'naltirilgan ta'lim, vazifaga asoslangan yondashuv, diskurs, formatif baholash, metodik integratsiya

## Introduction

The contemporary state of research on forming communicative competence in education, particularly within specialty code 13.00.02, is characterized by an intensified search for methodological solutions that can approve normative expectations of competency-based outcomes with the complex realities of classroom interaction. In many educational systems, including those influenced by post-Soviet traditions, communicative goals were declared earlier than they were operationalized: curricula often articulated the need to develop speaking, listening, reading, and writing in an integrated manner, yet instructional design and assessment continued to privilege reproductive knowledge and linguistic accuracy detached from meaningful contexts. The present state of the field therefore requires not only the restating of communicative principles but a clarification of what counts as communicative competence, which pedagogical approaches demonstrably support it, and which institutional conditions



enable sustainable implementation. Within modern research, communicative competence is treated not as a single skill but as a multidimensional construct that includes linguistic resources, sociolinguistic appropriateness, discourse organization, strategic behavior, and pragmatic sensitivity that emerges through interaction rather than through isolated drilling [1]. This understanding moves the discussion beyond the earlier reduction of “communication” to fluent speaking and instead frames it as the ability to participate in socially situated meaning-making across genres, roles, and modalities.

A central tendency in contemporary approaches is the shift from method as a fixed set of techniques toward an evidence-informed selection of principles responsive to context. The communicative approach, while still foundational, is increasingly interpreted through the lenses of action-oriented pedagogy, task-based learning, and discourse-based instruction. The action-oriented perspective emphasizes that learners are social agents who use language to accomplish goals in specific situations, thereby requiring instruction to simulate or authentically engage in purposeful activity rather than merely practice forms [2]. Task-based learning aligns with this view by organizing lessons around tasks that require negotiation of meaning and result in a communicative outcome, with language forms emerging as resources needed to complete the task [3]. Discourse-based instruction adds an important corrective: it highlights that communicative competence also involves control over textual and interactional patterns, including cohesion, coherence, turn-taking, genre conventions, and stance, which cannot be reliably developed if language is taught only at the sentence level. The state of the field thus shows a convergence: contemporary approaches share a commitment to meaning, interaction, and contextualization, yet they differ in how they sequence learning, how explicitly they treat form, and how they operationalize assessment.

### **Methodology**

In Uzbekistan’s educational context, communicative competence is increasingly linked to competency-based standards and learning outcomes, but a persistent challenge is the methodological translation of standards into classroom practices. Research indicates that teachers often face a dual pressure: on the one hand, they must show measurable progress aligned with official requirements; on the other hand, they work within constraints of time, class size, textbook structure, and assessment regimes that may incentivize grammar-centered instruction. The contemporary state can be described as transitional: a growing body of methodological literature supports communicative and competency-based principles, yet classroom enactment often remains hybrid, with communicative activities appended to structurally organized lessons rather than serving as the organizing core [6]. This hybridization is not inherently negative; indeed, modern scholarship argues for principled eclecticism where techniques are selected according to learning objectives, learner needs, and available resources. However, the problem arises when hybridization becomes unprincipled, producing lessons in which communicative tasks are not aligned with assessment criteria, feedback practices, or progression logic, leading to superficial “activity” without stable competence growth.



### Results and Discussions

The literature also demonstrates that contemporary approaches increasingly integrate cognitive, sociocultural, and formative assessment perspectives. From a cognitive viewpoint, communicative competence develops when learners have repeated opportunities to process input, notice gaps in their interlanguage, and practice retrieval and restructuring under communicative pressure. From a sociocultural viewpoint, competence is mediated by interaction, scaffolding, and participation in practices of a learning community; meaning and form co-develop as learners engage in collaborative activity. These perspectives influence contemporary teaching designs that emphasize interactional routines, guided dialogue, and collaborative problem-solving. Crucially, formative assessment becomes the mechanism that connects these designs to sustainable learning: without ongoing feedback tied to clear descriptors of performance, communicative activities risk remaining motivational but pedagogically diffuse. International scholarship underlines that formative assessment in communicative classrooms should focus on both meaning and form, providing feedback that supports intelligibility, appropriateness, and discourse effectiveness without reverting to punitive error counting [4]. In the current state of the field, this balance is one of the most debated issues, because it directly affects teachers' confidence and learners' perceptions of fairness.

Another prominent issue concerns the measurement and verification of communicative competence. In many institutions, high-stakes tests still emphasize discrete-point grammar and vocabulary, while speaking and writing are assessed with limited reliability due to time constraints and insufficient rater training. Contemporary methodological work therefore prioritizes performance-based assessment, analytic rubrics, and criterion-referenced descriptors that articulate expected levels of interactional and textual competence. The Common European Framework-inspired descriptors, while not universally adopted, have influenced how researchers conceptualize progression from basic transactional communication to more complex academic and professional discourse. Yet the modern state also reveals an important methodological caveat: importing descriptors without local validation may cause misalignment with learners' communicative needs and with the linguistic ecology of the classroom. Therefore, current research increasingly emphasizes localized descriptor development, piloting, and moderation procedures, alongside teacher professional development aimed at increasing assessment literacy. The practical implication is that communicative competence cannot be treated as a purely instructional issue; it is equally an assessment and institutional culture issue.

Within specialty 13.00.02, which emphasizes methods of teaching languages and related disciplines, contemporary approaches also address the digital transformation of communicative practice. Communication is now multimodal, mediated by platforms, and shaped by new genres such as short messages, online discussions, and collaborative documents. The modern state of the problem includes determining how digital tools can enhance interaction rather than merely deliver content. Research suggests that digital environments can broaden participation, provide richer feedback cycles, and create authentic audiences, but only if tasks are designed with clear communicative purposes and if digital discourse norms are explicitly taught. At the same time, scholars caution that technology does not automatically produce communicative competence;



without methodological framing, it can amplify passivity or fragment attention. Thus, contemporary approaches treat technology as an instrument within task design, feedback systems, and learner autonomy development, not as a substitute for pedagogical reasoning.

A further current issue concerns teacher competencies and the sustainability of methodological change. Teachers educated in traditions that prioritized linguistic knowledge may experience difficulty orchestrating interaction, managing unpredictable language, and assessing open-ended performance. Contemporary research points to the necessity of practice-based teacher education, including microteaching, reflective analysis of classroom discourse, and mentoring. Russian methodological scholarship has long emphasized the unity of objectives, content, methods, and control in language teaching; this systemic perspective remains relevant because it frames communicative competence as a planned outcome requiring coherent alignment across curriculum, instruction, and assessment [2]. At the same time, international perspectives highlight the teacher's role as a designer of tasks and a facilitator of interaction, requiring not only knowledge of methods but the ability to diagnose learners' communicative needs and to adjust support dynamically [3; 4]. Uzbek scholarship contributes by focusing on contextual constraints and by proposing models of competence formation aligned with national standards and the realities of multilingual educational settings [5; 6]. The current state of the field therefore demonstrates that methodological modernization is not achieved by adopting a single "best method," but by building institutional conditions for teacher learning, resource development, and assessment reform.

Scientific novelty in the present synthesis is expressed in the analytical identification of implementation gaps that persist despite broad acceptance of communicative and competency-based principles. The first gap is the objectives-assessment gap: communicative competence is declared as a goal, yet assessment instruments often measure non-communicative knowledge, prompting teachers to teach to the test. The second gap is the task-authenticity gap: tasks are introduced, but their communicative purpose is weak or artificial, limiting opportunities for negotiation of meaning and strategic language use. The third gap is the feedback gap: error correction is either overemphasized in a way that suppresses interaction or underemphasized such that fossilization risks increase. The fourth gap is the discourse gap: instruction targets sentence-level accuracy more than discourse-level competence, reducing learners' ability to sustain interaction and produce coherent texts. Addressing these gaps requires integrative methodological decisions: tasks should be selected and sequenced to build discourse complexity; assessment should be criterion-referenced and performance-based; feedback should be formative and targeted; and teacher education should cultivate interactional management and assessment literacy.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the modern state of issues in forming communicative competence based on contemporary approaches can be characterized by conceptual maturity and practical inconsistency. Research converges on the view that communicative competence is multidimensional and develops through meaningful interaction, task accomplishment, discourse engagement, and formative feedback within coherent instructional systems. At the same time, persistent gaps between declared outcomes and assessment regimes, between



communicative activities and authentic purposes, and between digital possibilities and pedagogical design continue to limit effectiveness. The most productive direction is integrative: aligning curriculum goals, task design, classroom discourse practices, and assessment criteria so that communication becomes both the means and the measured outcome of learning, while supporting teachers with practice-oriented professional development and locally validated evaluation tools.

### References

1. Hymes D. H. On communicative competence. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972. 64 p.
2. Passov E. I. Kommunikativnyy metod obucheniya inostrannomu govoreniyu. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1991. 223 p.
3. Ellis R. Task-based language learning and teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. 387 p.
4. Brown H. D. Principles of language learning and teaching. White Plains: Pearson Education, 2007. 410 p.
5. Jalolov J. J. Chet til o'qitish metodikasi. Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 2012. 320 b.
6. Saidova M. M. Kommunikativ kompetensiyani shakllantirishning metodik asoslari. Toshkent: Fan, 2019. 180 b.

