DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNICATIVE DIDACTIC COMPETENCE OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

KUCHIMOVA NILYUFAR TURANBAYEVNA
Teachers of English Languages, Russian Faculty English Languages Department
Samarkand State University

TOKHIROVA SARVINOZ XUSENOVNA
Teachers of English Languages, Russian Faculty English Languages Department
Samarkand State University

ABSTRACT
Communicative competence is defined as the ability to interact effectively with others. At its most basic, competence is seen as a combination of language aptitudes an individual has for learning a foreign language. Such potential contributes to his/her attaining high levels of performance. This paper considers the following: the nature of communicative competence and some of its models; the importance of developing communicative competence among students; and the implications of communicative competence in English language teaching and learning.
KEYWORDS: didactic competence, Communicative Competence and it Implications for Teaching and Learning

INTRODUCTION
Communicative competence is improved through experience, which is acquired not only in the process of direct interaction, but also indirectly, including through literature, theater, cinema, the Internet, from which a person receives information about the nature of communicative situations, peculiarities of interpersonal interaction and means of their solutions. A number of factors influence the formation of communicative competence. Internal and external factors determine. Internal include: motivational sphere; the inner position of the individual, development and formation"I" and sense of personal identity. External factors include social conditions: a society in which a specific speech is used, its social structure, differences between native speakers in age, social status, level of culture and education, place of residence, as well as the difference in their speech behavior depending on the communication situation.

The development of communicative competence is proposed to be considered in two aspects:

☐ In the process of socialization and education, where a person absorbs from the cultural environment the means of analyzing communicative situations in the form of verbal and visual forms, both symbolic and figurative, which makes it possible for him to synthesize, classify various episodes of social interaction;

☐ By means of specially organized social and psychological training, where knowledge, social attitudes, skills and experience in the field of interpersonal interaction are assimilated, practiced and trained.

Therefore, the formation and development of the communicative competence of high school students occurs thanks to active teaching methods. This is considered the use of socio-psychological and psychological communication training. Training should be used if the desired result is not only getting a new information, but also the application of the knowledge gained in practice.

Therefore, the training is considered with points of view of different paradigms:

• Training as a kind of training, in which, with the help of a positive reinforcement, the necessary patterns of behavior are formed, and with the help of negative ones, they are "erased"unwanted;

• Training as training, as a result of which the formation and development of skills and skills;

• Training as a form of active learning, the purpose of which is to transfer knowledge, develop some skills and abilities;

• Training as a method of creating conditions for self-disclosure of participants and their independent search ways to solve their own psychological problems.

COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

In relation to language study and language teaching, it is worthy of mention that Chomsky's views of linguistic competence paved the way for two major theoretical developments; communicative competence and communicative language teaching. Harmer, who has studied Chomsky's theories and how they influenced language teaching, asserts that "Language teaching has never adopted a methodology based on Chomsky's work. But the idea that language is not a set of habits has informed many teaching techniques and methodologies." (Harmer, 1991, p. 33). With regard to this last argument, many scholars including Widdowson (1971) stressed the importance of making a clear-cut distinction between linguistic competence and communicative competence. To the question 'how often are we faced with students learning the English language who "know the grammar but just can't use the language"?', the answer is unfortunately very often if not always. Students studying English as a foreign language almost unanimously claim that the six or seven period of studying the language at school has been a total waste of time. They claim that the English language courses they have been introduced to do not equip them with the necessary tools that should enable them to take part in a two-way dialogue in English. They further claim that they often find themselves quite incapable of expressing their emotions, feelings, their agreement, disagreement, likes, dislikes, etc., in an English social context. They often identify their difficulty with English as 'not knowing enough words'. But the main problem, however, is that they don't know the right words to use in a sentence or utterance in order to be communicative. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that instead of acquiring ways of using the language in meaningful situations to produce meaningful acts of communication, they have mastered the formation rules of the language. In short, they have mastered the one, language usage, without the other, language use. Or according to Light (1997) communicative competence should achieve four main purposes: expressing wants and needs, developing social closeness, exchanging information, and fulfilling social etiquette routines. From the above statements, it appears that students learning English as a foreign language are still being exposed to the problem of not being able to actually use the language in normal communicative settings in both the spoken and the written modes. This is surely a result of the deficiency of the traditional teaching and learning strategies being employed and which have dominated the teaching of English as a foreign language in many parts of the non-Anglophone world throughout the years. Allen argue that "the difficulties which students encounter arise not so much from a defective knowledge of the system of English but from unfamiliarity with English use and consequently their needs must be met by a course which develops a knowledge of how sentences are used in the performance of different communicative acts." The purpose of the classroom teacher, however, does not simply imply arming his/her learners with tacit knowledge of language structures, but it also entails teaching them ways that enable them to use language in real life situations. That is, the teacher's interest should not just be in the fact that the learners get to know the language but that they get to know how to use it. Therefore, the teacher's concern ought to not be merely with linguistic competence but with what is termed communicative competence or the ability to use language in real communicative settings. This, of course, does not mean that language usage is to be forever stored in the dark corner of language teaching. Contrary, it should be made a 'stock' from which use is to be fed because we cannot achieve communicative competence by divorcing use from usage. Widdowson (1979) put it: "knowing a language is often taken to mean a knowledge of correct usage but this knowledge is of little utility on its own. It has to be complemented by a knowledge of appropriate use. A knowledge of use must of necessity include a knowledge of usage but the reverse is not the case." (p. 8) Widdowson (1979) further states that there are teachers who have actually realized that the knowledge of the structures of a language does not necessarily result in their learners acquiring an effective way to put language into communication or succeeding to create coherent passages of discourse. Corder (1973) supports this claim by saying that "It is one of the great virtues of modern language teaching that it adopts a more social approach to language teaching, and is concerned with the problems of its communicative function in different social situations". (p. 29). The increasing concern about the actual use of language in different social settings has led to the investigators of language to realize that communicative competence goes deeper than linguistic competence. This is true in the sense that communicative competence does not ignore the

socio-cultural aspect of language but combines it with the knowledge of the formation rules of the language.

REFERENCES

1) Allen, J.P.B. & Widdowson, H.G. 1974. Teaching the communicative use of English. Iral 12/1:1-21.
2) Chomsky, Noam. 1965. Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
3) Corder, S. P. 1973 Introducing Applied Linguistics. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
4) Halliday, M.A.K. 1970. Language structure and language function. In John Lyons (ed), New Horizons in
5) Linguistics. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
6) Halliday, M.A.K. 1973 Explorations in the Functions of Language. London:Edward Arnold.
7) Halliday, M. A. K. 1975. Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language. London:
8) Arnold.
9) Halliday, M.A.K. 1978 Language as social semiotic. The social interpretation of language and meaning.
10) London: Edward Arnold.
11) Halliday, M.A.K. 1979. Towards a Sociological Semantics. The Communicative Approach to Language
12) Teaching. Eds. Brumfit, C. J. and Johnson, K.. Oxford : Oxford University Press. pp. 27-45.