E-ISSN: 2997-9439

American Journal of Education and Evaluation Studies

https://semantjournals.org/index.php/ AJEES

| Research Article

Check for updates

The Study of the Problem of Developing Communicative Culture in Future Teachers in Scientific Research

Izbosarova Zukhro Anatoliy kizi

Lecturer, Termez State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract: This article discusses the importance of the competency-based approach in developing the communicative culture of future teachers and the work of pedagogical staff in line with the requirements of the times, and the transition from traditional teaching methods to technological, creative and research methods of updated pedagogical ideas.

Keywords: Communicative, competency, competence, qualification, discourse, intention, content.

This is an open-access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

The Republic of Uzbekistan's efforts to reform the education system prioritize ensuring that pedagogical personnel work in accordance with modern requirements and possess deep knowledge, skills, competencies, and cultural awareness necessary for educating a well-rounded and morally mature individual. This, in turn, has introduced the concepts of "competence" and "competency" into the pedagogical sciences, which study the laws of teaching and upbringing. Consequently, the impact of a competency-based approach—particularly in developing students' communicative culture—on the advancement of the individual, society, and the state requires thorough scientific and pedagogical investigation.

The development of communicative culture among future teachers directly necessitates a competency-based approach. The concept of competence entered the field of education through the scholarly research of pedagogues and psychologists. From a psychological standpoint, competence refers to a specialist's ability to act appropriately in non-standard situations, to apply new methods in interactions with colleagues, to handle ambiguous tasks, to make use of contradictory information, and to possess a plan of action for navigating consistently evolving and complex processes.

In Presidential Decree PQ-4884 dated November 6, 2020, "On Measures to Develop Education, Upbringing, and Science in the New Period of Development of Uzbekistan," the need to study the experience of advanced countries—particularly their methodologies that encourage reasoning and critical thinking in the teaching of general education subjects—was emphasized. It is well known that renewed pedagogical perspectives have enabled a transition from traditional teaching methods to technological, creative, and inquiry-based approaches. In this context, many developed countries today define learners' communicative competence as the key factor ensuring the effectiveness of the educational process.

In our view, the numerous theoretical approaches, definitions, and interpretations presented in scientific literature concerning communicative processes provide a rich foundation for identifying the characteristics of communicative competence that correspond to modern pedagogical theory. However, our observations show that this process is at times complicated by important issues and contradictions.

First, there is the persistent problem of education that is oriented toward competencies versus education based on traditional knowledge. In many respects, the traditional school system prioritizes linguistic knowledge—such as the older concept of "speech development"—which has created a conceptual gap during the ongoing transition toward the more practical and contemporary notion of "communicative competence."

Second, there is the problem related to the scientific and theoretical context of communication theory itself. Up to now, various aspects of communicative ability—though inherently interconnected—have been studied sporadically within separate scientific fields. Russian sociologists such as V.B. Kashkin, G.G. Pocheptsov, and V.A. Yadov have explored communicative processes; meanwhile, linguists including G.I. Bogin, V.A. Zvegintsev, G.A. Zolotova, Yu.N. Karaulov, A.A. Leontiev, L.V. Shcherba, and R.O. Jakobson have focused on problems of human communication.

In Uzbekistan, issues of social and communicative activity have been examined by O. Musurmonova and N. Egamberdiyeva; strategies for developing cooperation skills among students based on friendly interpersonal relations, as well as pedagogical opportunities for increasing the social activity of youth, have been discussed by R. Safarova, B. Khodjayev, K. Inoqov, and M. Abdullayeva.

Russian psychologists L.S. Vygotsky, V.P. Zinchenko, I.R. Rumyantseva, and V.F. Petrenko have studied the ethical qualities associated with communicative competence. Researchers such as M.M. Bakhtin, Karl Jaspers, and Jürgen Habermas have actively explored issues related to philosophy, language, society, and human individuality.

Finally, thirdly, there is the problem of the didactic structure of communicative competence. During the gradual transition from a content-memorization–based model of education to a competence-oriented approach, the higher education system has not yet fully developed didactic mechanisms for cultivating communicative culture. Moreover, because there is no universally accepted definition of the term *"communicative culture"*, its criteria and didactic foundations remain largely hypothetical.

We begin our scientific analysis of communication theory with the term *"communication."* The word derives from the Latin *"communico"* — meaning "to make common," "to connect." In many languages, the word *communication* is used as a synonym for *interaction* or *dialogue*. However, beyond linguistic semantics, communication as a concept is much broader and encompasses a range of synonymous and semantically equivalent notions.

R.O. Jakobson writes: *"The general sciences of communication, naturally, merge with semiotics in order to study the exchange of messages and the internal signs contained within those messages. In one way or another, semiotics occupies a central place within the domain of communication sciences and serves as the foundation for all other branches of this field."*

As a result of the interdisciplinary nature of this concept, a concentric structure emerges:

1. The study of communication through speech messages — linguistics.
2. The study of communication through all types of messages — semiotics (which includes communication by means of speech messages).

3. The study of communications — together with social anthropology and economics (which encompasses communication through any type of message).

The philosophical interpretations presented above allow us to highlight two essential functions of language that are significant for our research:

- assisting an individual in finding their social position, that is, adapting to a changing world;
- enabling a person to become an individual while preserving inner independence.

The universally recognized influence of language on consciousness, behavior, and human activity leads us to the concept of *discourse*.

In modern linguistics, over the past decade, the polysemous term discourse (French *discours*, English *discourse*, Latin *discursus* — "to run back and forth," "movement," "circulation," "conversation," "speech," i.e., speech, speech activity, manner of speaking) has been widely used. Initially, the term denoted the concept of a "coherent text," but later it also began to be used as a synonym for "dialogue" and "conversation."

Researcher M.Yu. Mamajonov, defining the term *discourse*, explains that:

- in a broad sense, it refers to interaction between the speaker and the listener in communicative activity using verbal and non-verbal means;
- in a narrow sense, it is the context in oral or written form — that is, the completed or ongoing outcome of a communicative process.

According to L. Raupova, *"Discourse is the process of expressing thought, the material realization of linguistic possibilities in written or oral form, and the combined use of linguistic and non-linguistic means."*

A more comprehensive definition of discourse is provided in G. Toirova's *Pragmalinguistics Dictionary*: *"Discourse (exchange of ideas, verbal communication) is the interaction between a speaker and a listener, providing appropriate responses to questions. In the communication process, the speaker (called the communicator in discourse theory) introduces themselves to the listener (addressee) through their speech or communicative behavior. Discourse is the process of expressing thought, the material realization of linguistic possibilities in written or oral form, the combined use of linguistic and non-linguistic means, and the totality of linguistic–ethnopsychological–situational factors. Discourse is a specific, complex system formed from the unity of various linguistic and non-linguistic elements. Discourse is a creative domain of language (its manifestation) and, at the same time, the outcome of an emerging idea and communicative intent. Discourse is considered an immaterial entity in relation to text."*

In our view, discourse is a communicative phenomenon that emerges between the speaker and the listener during the process of communicative activity over a certain period, represented as an interconnected sequence of speech acts. In discourse, the psychological state of both the speaker and the addressee influences the entire speech process as well as all verbal and non-verbal means employed within it.

The concept of *discourse* is interpreted in a broader sense compared to *text*. In fields that study communicative systems and human cognitive activity—such as philosophy, sociology, psychology, cybernetics, and others—the broader, generalized understanding of discourse has long been acknowledged.

It is essential to model communicative tactics within discourse and to implement them in accordance with the real-life context that shapes the communicative situation. In discourse, communication functions as a continuous sequence of contributions in speech, serving as a

habitual form of information exchange. By constructing discourse, the speaker aims to ensure that the listener understands not only what is being said but also why it is being said.

According to V.S. Grigorieva, *"In interpreting the speaker's message, the addressee may alter their ideas (information) about the surrounding world or provide the changes the speaker requires in this world (a request or command), or influence future events or actions (a promise or warning), or prompt the listener to expect something."*

Thus, as every type of activity is valued for its practical significance, the interaction between the speaker and the addressee, as well as the extent to which communicative goals are achieved, represents the outcome of the communicative process and is characterized by its pragmatic value.

References

1. Mamajonov M.Yu. *Anthroponyms as Discourse-Relevant Units*. Abstract of the PhD dissertation in Uzbek Philology (10.00.01). Fergana, 2020. p.14.
2. Raupova L. *Socio-pragmatic Study of Polypredicative Units in Dialogic Discourse*. Doctoral dissertation in Philology. Tashkent, 2012. 220 p., p.14.
3. Grigorieva V.S. *Discourse as an Element of the Communicative Process: Pragmatic and Cognitive Aspects*. Monograph. TGTU, 2007. 24 p.