

INTEGRATING TECHNOLOGICAL, PEDAGOGICAL, AND CONTENT KNOWLEDGE TO ENHANCE STUDENTS' ENGLISH WRITING COMPETENCE

Omonova Maftuna Shermatovna,
Guliston davlat universiteti mustaqil tadqiqotchisi
Pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

Annotation. This article examines the development of foreign language communicative competence, encompassing the full range of its constituent components, constitutes the primary objective of foreign language education at language-oriented higher education institutions. This concept reflects the evolution of scholarly thought in the field, within which several key figures and theoretical contributions can be identified.

Keywords: integrating, technological, pedagogical, content knowledge, enhance, students, English writing competence, theoretical contributions.

Introduction. The foundations of the communicative approach are commonly associated with the American sociolinguist Dell Hymes, who introduced the concept of communicative competence and elaborated its theoretical foundations during the 1960s and 1970s. Hymes [3] proposed this concept as an extension of the theory advanced by his predecessor, Noam Chomsky [3], who conceptualized linguistic competence primarily as an idealized knowledge of language, involving mastery of its phonological, lexical, and grammatical rules. In his seminal work *On Communicative Competence*, Hymes [4] argued that successful communication requires more than the ability to construct grammatically and lexically correct sentences. Language users must also possess knowledge of the rules governing the appropriate use of language in particular communicative situations. Accordingly, communicative competence entails consideration of the social and cultural dimensions of communication.

The concept of the communicative approach was subsequently developed in the works of Canadian scholars Michael Canale and Merrill Swain, who in 1980 proposed a structural model of foreign language communicative competence. Their model distinguished several interrelated components, including grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence [5]. This conceptual framework subsequently provided an important theoretical basis for the development of numerous contemporary communicative approaches and methodologies in foreign language teaching. Scholarly interest in the communicative methodology of foreign language teaching continued to increase, as evidenced by a substantial body of research proposing various structural models of foreign language communicative competence and describing strategies for its development [1]; [2].

Literature review. Table 1 presents the most significant scholarly works that have contributed to the development and conceptualization of the broader framework of communicative foreign language teaching methodology.

Table 1.

Genesis and Variability of the Concept of “Foreign Language Communicative Competence” (FLCC) in Researchers’ Works

Author	Year	Structure of Competence	Contribution to Foreign Language Teaching Methodology
--------	------	-------------------------	---

D. Hymes	1962	No formalized structure was proposed; however, four criteria for assessing foreign language use were identified: grammatical feasibility (compliance with the rules of the language system); psycholinguistic feasibility (the ability to process and produce language	
----------	------	--	--

in the process of communication); sociocultural appropriateness; frequency of use in speech. Indicated the inadequacy of relying exclusively on grammatical competence and developed the conceptual foundations for the future communicative approach.

Table 1.

Genesis and Variability of the Concept of “Foreign Language Communicative Competence” (FLCC) in Researchers’ Works			
Author	Year	Structure of Competence	Contribution to Foreign Language Teaching Methodology
D. Hymes	1962	No formalized structure was proposed; however, four criteria for assessing foreign language use were identified: grammatical feasibility (compliance with the rules of the language system); psycholinguistic feasibility (the ability to process and produce language in the process of communication); sociocultural appropriateness; frequency of use in speech.	Indicated the inadequacy of relying exclusively on grammatical competence and developed the conceptual foundations for the future communicative approach.

Table 1. Genesis and Variability of the Concept of “Foreign Language Communicative Competence” (FLCC) in Researchers’ Works — Continued

Author	Year	Structure of Competence	Contribution to Foreign Language Teaching Methodology
M. Canale, M. Swain	1980	4 components of FLCC: grammatical competence; sociolinguistic competence; discourse competence; strategic competence.	Developed a practical model of FLCC, which became a standard framework for designing foreign language teaching programs and assessment procedures.
S. J. Savignon	1983	4 components of FLCC: grammatical competence; discourse competence; sociocultural competence; strategic competence.	Viewed FLCC as developing through the practice of authentic communication and emphasized the empirical validity of the communicative approach.
J. A. van Ek	1986	6 components of FLCC: linguistic competence; sociolinguistic competence; discourse competence; strategic competence; sociocultural competence; social competence.	Expanded the FLCC model within the framework of the Council of Europe. Emphasized social readiness for communication and consideration of the cultural background of communication; contributed

L. F. Bachman 1990	3 components of FLCC: organizational competence (grammatical and textual competence); pragmatic competence (illocutionary and sociolinguistic competence); language ability (strategic competence and psychophysiological mechanisms). In a later version, the content of the language ability component was modified and expanded (Bachman & Palmer, 1996).	to the development of threshold levels (<i>Threshold</i>) for Council of Europe documents. Emphasized the functions and intentions of speakers; the findings of his research influenced the development of standardized language proficiency tests, including TOEFL, and other standardized foreign language examinations.
I. L. Bim 1988	5 components of FLCC: linguistic competence; speech competence; sociocultural competence; compensatory competence; learning and cognitive competence.	Incorporated the learning and cognitive component into the structure of FLCC, understood as the ability to learn; adapted the FLCC structure to the national educational system and the independent learning activities of students.
E. I. Passov 1991	Did not distinguish specific components of FLCC, but identified the mechanisms underlying its development, including speech skills and speech abilities.	Developed the functional model of FLCC; communicative competence is regarded as an individual's ability to engage effectively in foreign language communication.
Author	Year Structure of Competence	Contribution to Foreign Language Teaching Methodology
E. I. Passov (continued)	1991	Did not distinguish specific components of FLCC, but identified the mechanisms underlying its development: speech skills; speech abilities; situational conditioning of communicative tasks by

V. Safonova V. 2004	speech, viewed as a means of a foreign language. communicative situation; The model also incorporates functional strategy of an educational dimension into communication, aimed at the structure of competence. solving communicative tasks; moral dimension, understood as education and personal development through communication. Multilevel model of FLCC: Level 1 – communicative component; Level 2 – speech/language and sociocultural components; Level 3 – linguo-ethnographic, sociolinguistic, and cultural studies components. Developed a hierarchy of FLCC components and proposed a transition from a linguo-cultural approach toward a broader sociocultural approach. The model contributed to the development of the Russian academic tradition by expanding the understanding of foreign language communicative competence beyond the framework of dialogue between two cultures.
-----------------------------------	--

The analysis of the structural models of foreign language communicative competence presented in Table 1 demonstrates that contemporary language pedagogy has moved decisively away from viewing a foreign language as merely a collection of isolated lexical and grammatical knowledge. Instead, the focus has shifted towards the learner as an active participant in communication and towards the development of their ability to address authentic communicative tasks. Within the framework of the communicative approach, it would therefore be reasonable to assume that all types of language activity should be developed on an equal basis. Historically, however, the development of these skills has followed a somewhat different trajectory.

A retrospective analysis of the relevant scholarly and methodological literature indicates that research attention has predominantly focused on oral forms of communication. Among the major types of language activity, writing remained relatively marginalized within the communicative approach for a considerable period, giving rise to certain methodological contradictions. On the one hand, virtually all of the structural models of foreign language communicative competence discussed above recognize writing as a fully developed type of language activity alongside speaking, listening, and reading. For example, in I.L.Bim's model [1], language competence encompasses the development of learners' ability to produce written texts. Similarly, V.V.Safonova's model [2] emphasizes the importance of developing the ability to record and convey sociocultural information in written form.

On the other hand, in actual teaching practice, writing instruction has frequently been reduced

either to substitution-based exercises or to traditional activities such as dictation and written reproduction of texts. Such practices fundamentally contradict the underlying principles of the communicative approach, according to which writing should function as a purposeful means of communication rather than merely as an instrument for reinforcing linguistic forms.

Consequently, at different stages in the historical development of foreign language teaching methodology, two interrelated issues emerged as particularly significant: first, recognition of the necessity to teach writing as an independent and fully developed type of language activity; and second, the development of effective strategies for fostering and assessing learners' writing skills within the framework of the communicative approach.

Discussion. Writing in the narrow sense is understood exclusively as a technical skill encompassing calligraphic, orthographic, and punctuation-related operations. The content of instruction in writing involves encoding speech sounds into graphic symbols, i.e., letters, ensuring the graphically correct representation of words, observing spelling conventions, and using punctuation appropriately. The primary aim of writing instruction is the accurate reproduction of linguistic material in written form, while the nature of this activity is predominantly reproductive, that is, mechanical. The outcome of writing is generally regarded as a graphically and orthographically correct word, phrase, or sentence. Within the foreign language teaching system, writing serves primarily as an instrument for reinforcing vocabulary and grammatical structures, as well as for administering written assessments and dictations. In terms of the previously discussed models of foreign-language communicative competence, writing in this narrow sense should be attributed to language, or linguistic, competence.

Written discourse, by contrast, constitutes a productive form of speech activity and presupposes a conscious ability to generate coherent and meaningful utterances in written form. In terms of its content, written discourse involves constructing new meanings, organizing and structuring ideas, and selecting appropriate linguistic resources with due consideration of the intended audience, genre, and communicative situation. The aim of teaching written discourse is to enable learners to produce messages or texts that fulfil a particular pragmatic purpose, whether to convey information, persuade, make a request, or express emotions. This type of activity is productive and creative in nature and, consequently, is characterized by a high degree of learner motivation.

The outcome of written discourse is a coherent and complete written text—such as a personal letter, essay, article, questionnaire, or other genre—that possesses semantic value and structural completeness. Within the framework of foreign-language education, written discourse is associated with communicative, discourse, sociocultural, and compensatory competences, since it requires learners to develop the ability to establish coherence and cohesion between events, ideas, and phenomena; construct logical relationships; take into account the sociocultural conventions of the target language; anticipate potential responses to written messages; and observe the formal conventions governing the organization and presentation of written texts.

Conclusion. Thus, according to instructional and methodological literature, the content of teaching written communication should be aimed at developing communicative strategies and fostering the skills that enable learners to become active participants in written communication. Accordingly, at the initial stage, the instructional process involves the development of fundamental technical writing skills, including handwriting, spelling, and punctuation. At subsequent stages, instruction should focus primarily on developing learners' written communicative competence and their ability to produce coherent and meaningful written discourse.

Thus, effective English writing instruction should progress from the acquisition of fundamental technical writing skills to the systematic development of written communicative competence.

Particular emphasis should be placed on communicative strategies that enable students to produce coherent, accurate, and contextually appropriate written texts and to participate actively in written communication.

References:

1. Бим И.Л. Теория и практика обучения немецкому языку. М.: Просвещение, 1988. – 256 с.
2. Сафонова В.В. Коммуникативная компетенция: современные подходы к многоуровневому описанию в методических целях. – М.: Еврошкола, 2004. – 236 с.
3. Chomsky N. Syntactic Structures. The Hague / Paris: Mouton, 1957. –117 p.
4. Hymes D. On Communicative Competence. In Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings. John B. Pride and Janet Holmes, eds. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972. – Pp. 269-293.
5. Canale M., Swain M. Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing // Applied Linguistics. – 1980. – № 1. – Pp. 1-47.
6. Сарсенбаева З. Analysis of images and symbols in english non-realistic works //Ренессанс в парадигме новаций образования и технологий в XXI веке. – 2023. – Т. 1. – №. 1. – С. 229-232.
7. Сарсенбаева З. Модернизм в узбекской литературе и интерпретация образов // Зарубежная лингвистика и лингводидактика. – 2024. – Т. 2. – №. 1. – С. 193-199.
8. Zoya S. LITERARY ANALYSIS OF DAVID MITCHELL'S WORKS IN ENGLISH LITERATURE //Talqin va tadqiqotlar ilmiy-uslubiy jurnali. – 2024. – Т. 2. – №. 41. – С. 11-19.
9. Zoya S. LITERARY ANALYSIS OF ULUGBEK HAMDAMOV'S WORKS IN UZBEK LITERATURE //Talqin va tadqiqotlar ilmiy-uslubiy jurnali. – 2024. – Т. 2. – №. 41. – С. 20-25.
10. Sarsenbaeva Z. MODERN APPROACHES TO TEACHING LITERARY TERMS IN COMPARATIVE LITERATURE //Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal. – 2026. – Т. 7. – №. 02. – С. 198-209.
11. Belgibayeva G., Sarsenbaeva Z., Zhumagulova K. MAG 'JAN JUMABAYEV IJODIDA OZODLIK G 'OYASI //Ijtimoiy-gumanitar sohada ilmiy-innovatsion tadqiqotlar. – 2026. – Т. 3. – №. 1. – С. 159-165.
12. Sarsenbayeva Z., Zillolova G. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TWO TRANSLATED VERSIONS OF A LITERARY TEXT //Ijtimoiy-gumanitar sohada ilmiy-innovatsion tadqiqotlar. – 2025. – Т. 2. – №. 4. – С. 183-188.
13. Sarsenbayeva Z., Zillolova G. СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ДВУХ ПЕРЕВОДНЫХ ВЕРСИЙ ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННОГО ТЕКСТА //Scientific and innovative research in the social and humanitarian sphere. – 2025. – Т. 2. – №. 4. – С. 183-188.