PEDAGOGIK TADQIQOTLAR JURNALI
ISSN: 3060-4923 Impact Factor –7,212

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNICATION SKILLS OF PHILOLOGY STUDENTS

Donoboeva Zarnigor Otabekovna
Tashkent International University of Education
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24081991

Abstract the article considers the ways of forming the communication skills of philology students while undergoing university education. We outline what skills a future philologist needs based on the theory of communicative competence (Hymes, 1972; Canale & Swain, 1980; Bachman, 1990) and the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001, 2020). The main problems that we talk about are anxiety, lack of speaking practice and the lecture-based teaching. Then we talk about things that work in practice. Task based learning, debates, role plays, project work, mediation tasks and micro teaching. We conclude that students develop communication skills when communication is an integral part of every course, not just of practical language classes.

Key words: communicative competence; communication skills; philology students; interactive methods; mediation; assessment.

1. Introduction

For a philologist language is both the object of study and the principal instrument of work. Teachers, translators, editors and researchers must know how to speak correctly, write correctly, explain clearly and adapt to different listeners.

However, many graduates have a lot of theory but find it difficult to use it in real communication. A student can evaluate the style of a novel well enough, but she is helpless when she has to lead a discussion or answer an unexpected question at a seminar. We take this problem as a point of departure.

The article is aimed at describing the communication skills philology students should have and the ways of developing them by teachers. To achieve this aim we do this:

1. to consider the basic models of communicative competence;
2. list the most important skills for philology students
3. investigate the factors that make their development difficult;
4. describe useful assessment forms and methods.

We used analysis of literature on applied linguistics and language teaching, comparison of competence models and generalisation of university teaching practice.

2. Theoretical Background

The notion of communicative competence is attributed to Hymes (1972). Chomsky (1965) defined competence as simply knowledge of the language system, a position which he himself rejected. For Hymes, understanding a language also means understanding what is appropriate to say in a given situation.

Canale and Swain (1980) and later Canale (1983) separated communicative competence into four parts. This model is still the most common in language teaching. The model was further elaborated by Bachman (1990), Bachman and Palmer (1996), Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei and Thurrell (1995) and Celce-Murcia (2007) who added actional, formulaic and interactional competence.

Table 1. Components of communicative competence (based on Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983)

Component	What it means	Why it matters for philology students
Grammatical	vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, spelling	they must be accurate, because later others will learn from them
Sociolinguistic	choosing words and style that fit the situation	needed in teaching, translation and editing
Discourse	connecting sentences into a logical text	essays, reports, lectures, text analysis
Strategic	ways to keep communication going when something goes wrong	answering unexpected questions, interpreting

The CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001) identifies four modes of language use: reception, production, interaction and mediation. The Companion Volume

Byram (1997) added the intercultural side: curiosity and openness, knowledge about other cultures and the ability to compare them with one's own. Two other authors are important to us. We learn through interaction with other people, Vygotsky (1978) demonstrated. As Bakhtin (1986) has shown, every utterance is of a genre and is addressed to someone, so genres have to be taught as well.

3. What Communication Skills Philology Students Need

Philology students need the same communication skills as other professionals plus some special ones. They will teach, translate and edit. The demands on accuracy are higher.

Table 2. Communication skills of philology students

Skill group	Examples	Where it is used
Accuracy and range	correct grammar, rich vocabulary, clear pronunciation	teaching, editing
Interaction	turn-taking, listening, asking questions, disagreeing politely	seminars, meetings
Public speaking	structuring a talk, answering questions	conferences, thesis defence
Academic writing	abstracts, essays, reviews, articles	publications, reports
Argumentation	supporting an interpretation of a text with evidence	literary and linguistic research
Mediation and translation	summarising, paraphrasing, explaining for another audience	translation, teaching
Intercultural competence	understanding cultural norms, avoiding stereotypes	international contacts
Pedagogical communication	explaining, giving instructions and feedback	school and university teaching
Digital communication	e-mail, online discussions, shared documents	remote work, online teaching

In reality these skills are interdependent. For example, a seminar presentation about a poem needs accuracy, a clear structure, arguments and the ability to answer questions. And that's why it makes sense to train them in combined tasks.

4. What Makes It Difficult

We can name several factors from the literature and from teaching practice.

• Nervousness. Foreign language anxiety as fear of negative evaluation, tests and speaking in front of others. This is acutely felt by philology students, because an error is a professional failure for them.

• Willingness to communicate low Students with a good level may even prefer to keep silent when they do not feel confident.

• Limited speaking time. A 90 minute class with 15 students where the teacher talks half the time gives each student about three minutes.

• Lectures in theory classes. They normally lecture only in the theory of language and literature , leaving the talking to the language classes .

• Over-correction. The teacher interrupts the student after every mistake. The student starts speaking only when sure the sentence is correct.

• Memory-based examinations. If exams only test facts, students don't see why they should work on communication.

• Little actual contact with native speakers and few occasions to use the language outside of class.

The teacher can fix most of these: a friendly atmosphere, more time for the students to talk and assessment that counts interaction.

5. Methods

The basic idea is simple: Students learn to communicate by communicating for a real purpose. It is grounded in communicative language teaching. Why is it so effective? The interaction hypothesis (Long, 1996) and the output hypothesis (Swain, 1985) offer explanations. When learners are negotiating meaning and trying to say something, they notice what they still don't know.

8. Conclusion

The communicative skills of philology students consist of linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse, strategic, intercultural and mediation components. For a philologist they are not an addition; they are the chief result of education.

Our analysis shows that these skills are better developed when:

1. communication is included in all courses including theoretical courses;
2. teachers use interactive and task-based methods, from controlled speaking to free speaking;
3. students feel safe to fail;
4. students are in contact with real communication e.g. through virtual exchange;
5. assessment tests interaction and mediation not knowledge alone.

The next step is to experimentally verify the effect of these methods on the students' results.

References

1. Bachman, L. F. (1990). Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford University Press.
2. Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). Speech genres and other late essays (V. W. McGee, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
3. Byram, M. (1997). Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence. Multilingual Matters.
4. Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), Language and communication (pp. 2–27). Longman.
5. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics, 1(1), 1–47.
6. Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In E. Alcón Soler & M. P. Safont Jordà (Eds.), Intercultural language use and language learning (pp. 41–57). Springer.
7. Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6(2), 5–35.
8. Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the theory of syntax. MIT Press.
9. Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Cambridge University Press.
10. Dudeney, G., Hockly, N., & Pegrum, M. (2013). Digital literacies. Pearson.
11. Ellis, R. (2003). Task-based language learning and teaching. Oxford University Press.
12. Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics: Selected readings (pp. 269–293). Penguin.
13. Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), Handbook of second language acquisition (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.
14. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
15. Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), Input in second language acquisition (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.
16. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.