RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Functions of Communicative Competence and Its Relevance in English Language Teaching

Turopova Firuza Murodqobilovna

A teacher of CSPU, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The present article examines the concept of communicative competence and its core functions within the context of contemporary English language teaching (ELT). Drawing on a qualitative analysis of foundational and recent scholarly literature, the study identifies five interrelated functions of communicative competence: informational, interpersonal, sociocultural, strategic, and developmental. The findings demonstrate that communicative competence extends beyond grammatical accuracy and serves as a fundamental framework for effective language use in real-life communicative contexts. The article further argues that prioritizing communicative competence in ELT enhances learners' ability to interact meaningfully, fosters intercultural awareness, and supports learner autonomy. The study concludes that communicative competence should be regarded as the central objective of modern English language education and systematically integrated into curriculum design, classroom practice, and assessment.

Keywords: Communicative competence, English language teaching, communicative approach, language education, intercultural communication.

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, English language teaching has undergone a significant methodological transformation, shifting its primary focus from the acquisition of grammatical structures to the development of learners' communicative ability. This shift is closely associated with the emergence of the concept of communicative competence, which emphasizes the functional and contextual use of language rather than the mere knowledge of linguistic forms. As English has become a global means of communication in education, science, and professional domains, the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately has become a key educational objective.

Traditional grammar-oriented approaches have often failed to prepare learners for authentic communicative situations, as they prioritize accuracy over meaning and interaction. In response, communicative language teaching frameworks have highlighted the importance of developing learners' capacity to use language in socially and culturally appropriate ways. International standards such as the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) further reinforce communicative competence as the primary outcome of language education. Against this background, the present article aims to explore the main functions of communicative competence and to examine its relevance in modern English language teaching.

METHODS

This study employs a qualitative literature review methodology. A systematic analysis of theoretical and empirical studies related to communicative competence and English language teaching was conducted. Key academic databases, including ERIC, Scopus, and Google Scholar, were used to identify relevant sources.

The selection criteria focused on:

1.   seminal theoretical works defining communicative competence;

2.   empirical studies investigating communicative and

task-based language teaching;

3. policy documents and frameworks addressing communicative outcomes in language education.

The collected data were analyzed thematically to identify recurring functional categories of communicative competence and their pedagogical implications. This approach allows for an in-depth conceptual synthesis and ensures theoretical consistency.

RESULTS

The analysis reveals that communicative competence performs several essential and interdependent functions in language use and instruction.

First, communicative competence fulfills an informational function, enabling learners to express ideas, exchange information, and comprehend messages effectively in both spoken and written forms. This function relies on grammatical and discourse knowledge and underpins the development of the four language skills.

Second, an interpersonal function emerges as a core element of communication. Through language, learners establish social relationships, negotiate meaning, express attitudes, and participate in interaction. Interactive classroom practices such as discussions, role-plays, and collaborative tasks are shown to support this function.

Third, communicative competence serves a sociocultural function, which involves understanding and applying culturally appropriate norms, registers, and conventions. In English language teaching, this function is crucial for preventing pragmatic failure and fostering intercultural communicative awareness.

Fourth, a strategic function enables learners to overcome communicative difficulties by employing compensatory strategies such as paraphrasing, clarification requests, and self-repair. Strategic competence allows learners to maintain communication despite linguistic limitations.

Finally, communicative competence has a developmental function, contributing to learners' personal growth, self-confidence, and autonomy. Active participation in communicative activities promotes reflective thinking and learner engagement.

DISCUSSION

The identified functions of communicative competence have significant implications for English language teaching methodology. Instructional approaches that prioritize meaningful interaction and real-life communication are more effective in developing learners' overall language ability than form-focused instruction alone (Ellis, 2003). Task-based and communicative activities allow learners to integrate accuracy, fluency, and appropriateness.

Assessment practices must also reflect communicative objectives. Performance-based assessment tools, including oral presentations, interactive tasks, and portfolios, are better aligned with communicative competence than traditional grammar tests (Bachman, 1990). Additionally, technology-enhanced and flipped learning environments provide increased opportunities for interaction and collaborative learning, thereby supporting communicative development.

However, the implementation of communicative competence-oriented instruction requires systematic teacher training and curriculum alignment. Without institutional support, communicative goals may remain theoretical rather than practical.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, communicative competence represents the central goal of contemporary English language teaching. Its informational, interpersonal, sociocultural, strategic, and developmental functions collectively enable learners to use English effectively and appropriately in diverse communicative contexts. Integrating communicative competence into curriculum design, teaching practices, and assessment not only improves language proficiency but also prepares learners for active participation in global communication. Therefore, communicative competence should remain a priority in both theoretical and practical dimensions of English language education.

REFERENCES

1. Bachman, L. F., Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford University Press, 1990.

2. Bialystok, E. Communication strategies: A psychological analysis of second language use.

Blackwell, 1990.

3. Bishop, J. L., & Verleger, M. A. The flipped classroom: A survey of the research. Proceedings of the ASEE Annual Conference, 2013.

4. Canale, M., & Swain, M., Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics, 1(1), 1980, 1–47. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.1.1

5. Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S., Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6(2), 1995, 5–35. Council of Europe, Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

6. Ellis, R. Task-based language learning and teaching. Oxford University Press, 2003.

7. Hymes, D., On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics 1972, (pp. 269–293). Penguin.

8. Littlewood, W., The task-based approach: Some questions and suggestions. ELT Journal, 58(4), 2004, 319–326. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/58.4.319