



FORMATION OF DISCOURSE COMPETENCE IN THE SPHERE OF ORAL COMMUNICATION

Mamadaliyev Elyor Akhmadzhanovnich
NamSU

Annotation

The place of discursive competence in the structure of communicative competence is determined by summarizing the results of the analysis of scientific and methodological literature. The definition of the concepts of "discourse" and "discursive competence" is given. The novelty of the study lies in the fact that it presents the component composition of the content of discursive competence, which is formed when teaching a foreign language through an educational forum. The main characteristics of the educational forum are described. The results can be applied when using electronic courses in the educational process.

Keywords: communicative competence, discursive competence: component, content, discourse, learning forum, foreign language teaching process.

Introduction

The social order of the modern information and multicultural society requires that higher educational institutions provide the creation of optimal conditions for teaching students foreign language communication in order to solve the problems of intercultural interaction at the world level. The ability to communicate becomes a necessary component in the preparation of highly qualified specialists. The need to improve the quality of language training in higher professional education is urgent.

The modern model of education forms a high level of professional competence among students, one of the components of which is communicative competence. The ability to carry out effective speech interaction in a foreign language is included in the content of foreign language communicative competence, which allows university graduates to communicate freely in a multilingual environment. Communicative competence is the basis of vocational education when it comes to specialties whose main activity is communication in the professional field.

Recently, studies have appeared that are devoted to the consideration of individual components of communicative competence. However, not all components receive equal attention. Due to the growing interest of theorists and practitioners in various aspects of intercultural communication, the bulk of research is aimed at solving issues related to the social and cultural parameters of communication [1:53]. A significant





number of works are devoted to the problems of socio-cultural competence (Baranova N.A.).

In this article, we will determine the place of discursive competence as part of communicative competence by reviewing the scientific and methodological literature on this topic. The purpose of our study is to determine the content of discursive competence, formed when teaching a foreign language to students of a language university through an educational forum.

In the science and practice of teaching foreign languages, not enough attention is paid to the concept of "discourse", which is extremely important for the formation of discursive competence [2:161; 5:140]. Most of the existing studies are devoted to the linguistic aspect of the problem of discourses or discourse analysis: "Structure and semantics of argumentative discourse" (1995) E.N. Belova; "Lyrical discourse as an object of linguo-aesthetic interpretation" (1995) A.V. Flory and others.

There are many definitions of the concept of "discourse" in the scientific literature. At different times, various scientists offered their interpretations of this concept (T.A. van Dyck, P. Serio, N.D. Arutyunova, V.I. Karasik, A.A. Kibrik, E.S. Kubryakova, Yu.S. Stepanov, G. G. Slyshkin, V. E. Chernyavskaya and others). But in general, they do not contradict each other, but complement and give a more complete description of this concept from the point of view of different sciences. T.A. van Dijk is one of the founders of the theory of discourse. The scientist proposed a definition of discourse, which began to be actively used in the scientific community and served as the basis for more detailed definitions of this term and the creation of classifications of the main characteristics of discourse. The value of the definition proposed by T.A. van Dijk, is to identify the "communicative event" as a complex unity of linguistic form, meaning and action [8:70-98].

It is proposed to consider discourse from the standpoint of a functional approach as a communicative event that occurs between the speaker and listener (observer, etc.) in the process of communicative action in a certain temporal, spatial and other contexts [8:70-98]. We also note that discourse as a communicative event can be speech (written or oral) and have verbal and non-verbal components. Following the doctrine of discourse proposed by T.A. van Dyck, A.A. Kibrik creates a qualification of the system characteristics of discourse, according to which the following is indicated when characterizing discourse: genre; register (gaming, business or institutional); type or channel of information transmission (oral, written, mental, gestural and electronic submodus); functional style; formality [15:3-21].

As for the discursive competence of students of a language university, here we define it as a set of knowledge and skills that students who study a foreign language must





have in order to logically express thoughts, creating a grammatically and lexically correct text, adequate to the communicative situation, as well as for the correct interpretation of the text. Undoubtedly, the concept of "discourse" is not the last in importance in the definition of discursive competence. This is due to the recent change in attitudes towards "discourse" and "text". Previously, these two terms in the linguistic literature were equivalent and were used in parallel. Currently, linguists distinguish between these two concepts and define the text as a product of speech activity, expressed in oral or written form, which is integral and coherent. Discourse is perceived as a complex communicative phenomenon, as "the totality of everything spoken and understood in a certain specific situation in one or another era of the life of a given social group" [6], or, as a text immersed in life, according to the definition of N.D. Aratyunova[1].

One of the key knowledge that students of a foreign language should have is knowledge about the types and categories of discourse. IN AND. Karasik defines the following categories of discourse: 1) participants in communication (a category that includes status-role and situational-communicative characteristics); 2) conditions of communication (a category that determines the scope of communication, the communicative environment); 3) organization of communication (a category that determines the motives, goals and strategies of communication, control of communication and variability of communication means); 4) ways of communication (a category that defines style and genre) [14]. V.I. Karasik also defines two types of discourse - person-oriented and status-oriented. The first exists in the form of everyday (everyday) and existential (philosophical and artistic dialogue) communication, and the second - in the form of role-playing communication in accordance with the areas of activity, for example, mass information, political, business, scientific, pedagogical, military, sports, religious, legal and other types of status-oriented discourse [14].

The more methodological solutions, the more effective the search for new ways of learning. Recently, the communicative orientation in teaching a foreign language has been intensifying, which results in a number of cardinal changes in the goals and content of teaching a foreign language. It is necessary not only to know the language, but to be able to use it adequately in real communicative situations. Thus, there is a need to develop "discursive competence". Before talking about discursive competence, one should first analyze the basic concepts that are directly related to this term. First of all, it is necessary to distinguish between the concepts of "competence" and competence and consider communicative competence as a basic structure, which includes discursive competence. The most important in this work is





the concept of discourse, its nature and structure. Speaking of competence, it is worth noting that scientists often equate this term with competence. I.A. Zimnyaya identifies two options for the relationship of these concepts, scientists either differentiate them or identify them, which happens much more often [13].

Let's follow the main milestones in the formation of the concept of "communicative competence" from the moment of its initiation to the present day. From the very beginning of the development of the concept of "communicative competence", there has been a contradiction between the supporters of a narrow and broad understanding of the knowledge and skills necessary to communicate in a foreign language.

In the scientific world, there has always been a distinction between knowledge and its implementation, so the very concept of "competence" cannot be called new. The term "competence" was first introduced by the American linguist N. Chomsky in 1965 in relation to knowledge of the language system, linguistic signs, lexical and grammatical forms, and not in relation to the use of this knowledge in situations of real communication [20]. If N. Chomsky, who proposed in the 1960s. of the last century, the concept of "linguistic competence", considered the mental ("knowledge") model of language competence in the form of universal rules to be necessary and sufficient for communication, then already at that period D. Hymes and S. Savignon defended the idea of not linguistic, but communicative competence. Soon, the concept of "communicative ability" also appeared - ability / capacity, which was written about by L. Bachman, S. Savignon, H. Widdowson.

N. Chomsky continued the ideas of grammar developed by F. de Saussure. Gradually, the methodological term "communicative competence" appeared in the domestic and foreign methodology as opposed to the "lexical competence" of N. Chomsky. Another American linguist, D. Hymes, argued that for a full-fledged communication (communicative act) it is not enough to have only knowledge about the language system, lexical and grammatical rules [24].

In the domestic science of language, the term "communicative competence" was introduced into scientific use by M.N. Vyatutnev. He proposed to understand communicative competence "as the choice and implementation of programs of speech behavior depending on the ability of a person to navigate in a particular environment of communication; the ability to classify situations depending on the topic, tasks, communicative attitudes, skills that arise in students before the conversation, as well as during the conversation in the process of mutual adaptation" [24].

An important practical step in the study of communicative competence was the study of the speech functions necessary for students to communicate and request



information, coordinate actions, influence others, be surprised, apologize (M. Halliday). In connection with the study of speech functions, the problems of the authenticity of speech forms and methods of speech activity came to the attention of linguists (H. Widdowson). Understanding the essence of communicative competence has been significantly supplemented by sociolinguistic, discursive and strategic components (M. Canale, M. Swain). Let us clarify that initially the cultural component of the communicative competence of students was limited to knowledge about the diversity of the English language in different cultures. Studies of communicative competence have been significantly supplemented by linguistic data on how the speech interaction of communication participants is carried out (S. Savignon). A logical step in the study of communicative competence was the analysis of the organization of the utterance, including its logical construction. The need to study communicative pragmatics was emphasized, i.e. correlation between planned and achieved communicative result (L. Bachman). As the English language became a global means of intercultural communication, the need to purposefully teach not only the language, but also the cultural code of communication and behavior of representatives of different social groups was increasingly recognized. An actual direction in the study of the socio-cultural component has emerged, which complemented the general structure of students' communicative competence [9].

The gradual formation of the concept of communicative competence resulted in a construct that includes the following components (subcompetencies): linguistic, sociolinguistic, sociocultural, strategic, discursive and social [10].

Linguistic competence provides correct speech constructions from the point of view of grammar, vocabulary and phonetics. Sociolinguistic competence determines the choice of an adequate register of utterance, taking into account the social situation. Sociocultural competence is manifested in the ability to follow the rules of participation in the life of another culture and effectively build intercultural dialogue. Strategic competence allows you to compensate for the lack of language means and prevent cases of misunderstanding. Discursive competence is needed to build coherent texts. Finally, social competence helps to establish contact, initiate, maintain and develop interpersonal communication. To the list of components of communicative competence, it is also necessary to add pragmatic competence as the ability to obtain the required result of speech activity in the form of a transformed situation, the necessary response, ending the conflict, more complete mutual understanding, etc. If the formation of the pragmatic component of communicative competence is underestimated, the proposals made are not supported, attempts to convince give rise to resistance, innocent phrases cause offense, criticism is perceived





as personal hostility, humor remains incomprehensible, replicas expressing sincere feelings sound formal and cold [11]. A shorter list of components of communicative competence includes only four components: language, speech, sociocultural and compensatory [12].

The nature of communication barriers shows that the reason for failures in communication is not only insufficient command of the language, but also the unwillingness of communication participants to overcome communication barriers due to their intellectual and personal qualities. Studies show that communication barriers can be social, semantic, and psychosocial in nature [Ibid.]. Social barriers as “relationship barriers” arise if participants do not care enough about the convergence of personal positions in communication, ignore aspects of mutual understanding in communication, are concerned about achieving results “for themselves”, or even throw an inappropriate challenge to a partner. Semantic barriers arise if the two sides of communication see a different meaning of the language signs used, interpret speech and other actions of each other in different ways, have insufficient knowledge about the features of communication in different cultures, and have different knowledge about the subject of conversation. This shows the weakness of their pragmatic competence. Psychosocial barriers are equivalent to social distance between participants in communication - the farther the social distance, the higher the communication barrier. The social position converges, and the communication barrier decreases if the participants show sincere sympathy for each other, empathize in difficult situations, and demonstrate mutual tolerance. The effectiveness of communication depends on the ability to maintain a positive image of each other, even in the event of complications in the relationship. Active listening without intentional distortion of perceived information and confirmation of mutual understanding is of great importance.

When organizing the educational process through a learning forum, the teacher's attention should be focused on the structural components of discursive competence. Taking into account all of the above, as well as analyzing the points of view of researchers (A.G. Gorbunov, I.A. Evstigneeva, O.V. Lushchinskaya, R.A. Cheremisinova), five components of the content of discursive competence formed through the educational forum [12: 76-81]:

1. Strategic component (the ability to analyze the socio-cultural situation, the characteristics of the intended addressee and plan a communicative event).
2. Tactical component (the ability to analyze the communicative situation and choose the means of foreign language communication, taking into account one's speech experience and the personality characteristics of the intended addressee).





3. Genre component (the ability to choose the right type of discourse depending on the socio-cultural situation and arrange it in accordance with the genre-stylistic norms and stereotypes adopted in the country of the language being studied).
4. Text component (the ability to organize a sequence of sentences in a foreign language so that they represent a coherent text with its inherent properties).
5. Language component (the ability to create and interpret discourse in accordance with the lexical and grammatical norms of the language being studied).

Thus, we can conclude that the learning forum serves as an educational context for the formation of discursive foreign language competence, which predetermines the knowledge and understanding of the system characteristics of discourse by students and the ability to apply them in appropriate situations of communication as a way to implement speech intentions. The formation of discursive competence through a learning forum must be considered in close connection with the emergence of the need and motive for the statement. Such techniques should be used that enrich the speech of students with new speech clichés, form communication skills, in particular in relation to different writing formats, and develop the ability of students to extract information from the text. With regard to the conditions of the forum, namely communication in a virtual environment, the ability to logically build a statement acquires special importance, which is actually the content of discursive competence.

References

1. Arutyunova N.D. Discourse // Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary / ch. ed. V.N. Yartsev. – M., 1990. – S. 136-137.
2. Aleshchanova I.V., Frolova N.A. Development Of Discourse Competence In Foreign Language Lessons At The University // Successes of Modern Natural Science. –M.: 2014. – No. 11-1. – P. 92-94.
3. Apalkov V.G. Methodology for the formation of intercultural competence by means of an e-mail group (English, profile level): Dis ... cand. ped. Sciences. – Tambov, 2008. – 157 p.
4. Bagdasaryan M.E. Teaching professionally-oriented communication based on popular science texts (English, non-linguistic university): Diss ... cand. ped. sciences. – M., 1990. – 148 p.
5. Baranova N.A. Fundamentals of the formation of discursive competence of students in teaching foreign language professionally oriented communication: author. diss. ... cand. ped. sciences. – St. Petersburg: 2008. – 244 p.
6. Bart R. Text linguistics // New in foreign linguistics. – M., 1978. Issue. 8: Linguistics of the text.





7. Bell R.T. Sociolinguistics: goals, methods, problems / Ed. Schweitzer. – Moscow: International relations, 1980. – 369 p.
8. Van Dyck T.A. Language. Cognition. Communication. – M.: Progress, 1989. – 307 p.
9. Vyatutnev M.N. Communicative orientation of teaching the Russian language in foreign schools // Russian language abroad. –No. 6.
10. Golubovskaya E.A. The role of the text genre in the primary memorization of the meanings of foreign lexical units: an introduction to the problem // Vestn. Tver. state university Ser. Pedagogy and psychology. 2017. Issue. 4. – S. 173–177.
11. Gorbunov A.G. Discursive foreign language competence: an ontological approach // Vestn. TSPU. 2014. –No. 6 (147). pp. 167–171.
12. Gorbunov A.G. Pedagogical conditions for the formation of discursive foreign language competence of non-philological students: diss. ... cand. ped. Sciences. – Izhevsk, 2016. – 288 p.
13. Zimnyaya I. A. Key competencies a new paradigm of the result of education // Higher education today. 2003. – No. 5. – S. 34-42.
14. Karasik V.I. Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse. M., 2004. DEVELOPMENT OF HIGH LANGUAGE SCHOOL STUDENTS' DISCURSIVE SKILLS
15. Kibrik A.A. Modus, genres and other parameters of the classification of discourses // Questions of Linguistics. – M.: 2009. – No. 2. – S. 3–21.
16. Kovalenko N.A. The use of an educational forum in the process of teaching a foreign language // Modern studies of social problems: electron. scientific magazine 2017. V. 8, – No. 10–2. –P. 45–49.
17. Kudryavtseva L.B. The use of telecommunication projects for the formation of foreign language socio-cultural competence^ of high school students (on the example of the USA and Russia) // Inostr. languages at school. 2007.–No.4. – S. 49-53.
18. Evstigneeva I.A. Formation of discursive competence of students of language universities based on modern Internet technologies // Language and Culture. 2013. – No. 1 (21). –P. 74–82.
19. Safonova V.V. The study of languages of international communication in the context of the dialogue of cultures and civilizations. Voronezh: Origins, 1996. 237 p.
20. Chomsky N. Language and thinking. Language and problems of knowledge. Blagoveshchensk: BGK Im. I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, 1999.254 p.
21. Khutorskoy A.V. Modern didactics. M.,2014.



22. Shcherba L.V. On the triple aspect of linguistic phenomena and on the experiment in linguistics // Language system and speech activity. L.,
23. Cherkasov A.K. Methodology for the development of sociocultural skills of students through a web forum (English language, language university): Dis. ... Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences. -Moscow: Moscow State University named after M.A. Sholokhov, 2012.
24. Hall G. The Routledge Handbook of English Language Teaching.–London :Routledge, 2016. – 590 p.
25. Hymes D. On Communicative Competence Sociolinguistics / ed. by J.B. Pride, J. Holmes.N. Y., 1972. P. 269-293.
26. Kodirov N. M. Transformation and globalization of information media //Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University. – 2019. – T. 1. – №. 12. – C. 83-93.
27. Nodirbek Kodirov Mamasoliyevich. (2021). Current issues of formation of information culture in youth. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5770626>
28. Kodirov N. M. TRANSFORMATION AND GLOBALIZATION OF INFORMATION MEDIA //Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University. – 2019. – T. 1. – №. 12. – C. 83-93.

