



Наукові перспективи
Видавнича група



ВІСНИК науки та
освіти
ISSN 2786-6165 (online)

серії: філологія, культура і мистецтво,
педагогіка, історія та археологія, соціологія

Bulletin of Science and Education

№ 1(31) 2025

Видавнича група «Наукові перспективи»
Християнська академія педагогічних наук України

«Вісник науки та освіти»

***(Серія «Філологія», Серія «Педагогіка», Серія «Соціологія»,
Серія «Культура і мистецтво», Серія «Історія та археологія»)***

Випуск № 1(31) 2025

Київ – 2025

Publishing Group «Scientific Perspectives»

Christian Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine

"Bulletin of Science and Education"

*(Series" Philology ", Series" Pedagogy ", Series" Sociology ",
Series" Culture and Art ", Series" History and Archeology")*

Issue № 1(31) 2025

Kiev – 2025

«Вісник науки та освіти (Серія «Філологія», Серія «Педагогіка», Серія «Соціологія», Серія «Культура і мистецтво», Серія «Історія та археологія»)»:
журнал. 2025. № 1(31) 2025. С. 2493

*Рекомендовано до видавництва Всеукраїнською Асамблеєю докторів наук з державного управління
(Рішення від 02.12.2024, № 1/12-24)*



**Згідно наказу Міністерства освіти і науки України 10.10.2022
№ 894 журналу присвоєні категорії "Б" із історії та археології
(спеціальність - 032 Історія та археологія) та педагогіки
(спеціальність - 011 Освітні, педагогічні науки)**

**Згідно наказу Міністерства освіти і науки України від
23.12.2022 № 1166 журналу присвоєна категорія Б з філології
(спеціальність - 035 філологія)**

Журнал видається за підтримки Інституту філософії та соціології Національної академії наук Азербайджану, Всеукраїнської асоціації педагогів і психологів з духовно-морального виховання та Всеукраїнської асамблеї докторів наук з державного управління

Журнал публікує наукові розвідки з теоретичних та прикладних аспектів філології, соціології, науки про освіту, історії, археології, а, також, культурології та мистецтвознавства з метою їх впровадження у сучасний науково-освітній простір.

Цільова аудиторія: вчені, лінгвісти, літературознавці, перекладачі, мистецтвознавці, культурознавці, педагоги, соціологи, історики, археологи, а, також, інші фахівці з різних сфер життєдіяльності суспільства, де знаходиться застосування тематика наукового журналу



Журнал включено до міжнародної наукометричної бази Index Copernicus (IC), Research Bible, міжнародної пошукової системи Google Scholar



Головний редактор: Гурко Олена Василівна - доктор філологічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри англійської мови для нефілологічних спеціальностей Дніпровського національного університету імені Олеся Гончара, (Дніпро, Україна)

Редакційна колегія:

- ✦ Александрова (Верба) Оксана Олександрівна – доктор мистецтвознавства, доцент, професор кафедри теорії музики Харківського національного університету імені І. П. Котляревського, (Харків, Україна)
- ✦ Афонін Едуард Андрійович - доктор соціологічних наук, професор, Заслужений діяч науки і техніки України, (Київ, Україна)
- ✦ Булатов Валерій Анатолійович - старший викладач кафедри дизайну Українського гуманітарного інституту, член спілки дизайнерів України
- ✦ Вакулик Ірина Іванівна - кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри журналістики та мовної комунікації Національного університету біоресурсів і природокористування України (Київ, Україна)
- ✦ Волошенко Марина Олександрівна – доктор педагогічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри психології та соціальної роботи, Національний університет "Одеська політехніка" (Одеса, Україна)
- ✦ Вуколова Катерина Володимирівна – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри романо-германської філології та перекладу Білоцерківського національного аграрного університету (Біла Церква, Україна), доцент Дніпровського відділення центру наукових досліджень та викладання іноземних мов Національної академії наук України, Дніпро, Україна (Дніпро, Україна)
- ✦ Головіна Алла Василівна - кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри англійської філології і перекладу Національного авіаційного університету (Київ, Україна)
- ✦ Гончарук Віталій Володимирович – к.пед.н., старший викладач кафедри хімії та екології «Уманського державного педагогічного університету імені Павла Тичини», (м. Умань, Україна)
- ✦ Ісайкіна Олена Дмитрівна - кандидат історичних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри історії та документознавства Національного авіаційного університету, член Спілки краєзнавців України (Київ, Україна)
- ✦ Колмикова Олена Олександрівна - кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри гуманітарних дисциплін Дунайського інституту Національного університету "Одеська морська академія" (Одеса, Україна)
- ✦ Котельницький Назар Анатолійович - кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри права Чернігівського інституту інформації, бізнесу та права Міжнародного науково - технічного університету імені академіка Юрія Бугая, член - кореспондент Центру українських досліджень Інституту Європи РАН (Чернігів, Україна)
- ✦ Кошетар Уляна Петрівна - кандидат історичних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри української мови та культури Національного авіаційного університету (Київ, Україна)
- ✦ Куриш Наталія Костянтинівна – кандидат педагогічних наук, заступник директора з науково-навчальної роботи, Інститут післядипломної педагогічної освіти Чернівецької області (Чернівці, Україна)
- ✦ Линтвар Ольга Миколаївна - кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри англійської філології і перекладу Національного авіаційного університету (Київ, Україна)
- ✦ Литвинська Світлана Віталіївна - кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри української мови та культури Національного авіаційного університету, (Київ, Україна)



Форостюк О.Д. 633
*ШАГ: ФОРМУВАННЯ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ НУМІЗМАТИЧНОЇ ЛЕКСИКИ
У XVII СТОЛІТТІ*

Шипович М.В., Ігнатоля А.А., Кампов Н.В. 646
*ПАРАДИГМАТИКА ВІДМІН ІМЕННИКІВ У СУЧАСНІЙ УКРАЇНСЬКІЙ
ЛІТЕРАТУРНІЙ МОВІ*

СЕРІЯ «ПЕДАГОГІКА»

Chagovets A.I. 656
*FORMATION OF AESTHETIC TASTE IN FUTURE TEACHERS
THROUGH EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES*

Chernii L.V., Zablotska L.M., Meleshchenko V.O. 664
*COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY:
COMPARISON OF FUNDAMENTAL MODELS*

Dyshleva S.M. 676
*PECULIARITIES OF TEACHING STUDENTS OF THE ECONOMIC
SPECIALITIES ENGLISH SPECIALIZED VOCABULARY*

Grusha L.O. 688
*BASIC PRINCIPLES OF TEACHING ENGLISH FOR MEDICAL
PURPOSES IN HIGHER MEDICAL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS*

Kozubaska S.V., Mukan N.V. 702
*ENSURING THE PROFESSIONAL AND PRACTICAL NATURE OF
THE CONTENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND
LEARNING FOR FUTURE IT SPECIALISTS AT PROFESSIONAL PRE-
HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS*

Myskiv M.A., Mukan N.V. 713
*INTEGRATION OF INTERACTIVE PEDAGOGICAL TOOLS INTO
PROFESSIONALLY ORIENTED EDUCATIONAL PROCESS AS A
CONDITION FOR FUTURE DOCTORS' MANAGERIAL COMPETENCE
FORMATION*

Pasichnyk N.I., Mazur O.I., Myskiv I.S. 724
*A COMPLEX APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF DIDACTIC
TERMINOLOGICAL VOCABULARY IN MODERN LINGUISTICS*

Sheremeta R.O. 736
*THE ROLE OF PRACTICAL CLASSES IN THE FORMATION OF
PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES OF STUDENTS AT THE
DEPARTMENT OF PATHOLOGICAL ANATOMY*



UDC 81'271.4

[https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2025-1\(31\)-664-475](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2025-1(31)-664-475)

Chernii Liudmyla Vitaliyivna Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages, Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National University, Ternopil, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4755-9536>

Zablotska Liubov Mykhailivna Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages, Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National University, Ternopil, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4388-4710>

Meleshchenko Vira Oleksandrivna Candidate of Philology Sciences, Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages, Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National University, Ternopil, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3484-9905>

COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY: COMPARISON OF FUNDAMENTAL MODELS

Abstract. The article examines the evolution of the concept of communicative competence, emphasizing its growing significance in modern society for personal, social, and professional growth. Communicative competence goes beyond language understanding to include the ability to adapt to different communicative circumstances, such as intercultural, digital, and nonverbal communication. The study analyzes significant theoretical frameworks that have shaped our understanding of communicative competence, beginning with Noam Chomsky's foundational work on linguistic competence, focusing on syntax and universal grammar. Dell Hymes enlarged his view by introducing sociolinguistic competency, focusing on the appropriateness of language use in diverse social and cultural contexts. Canale and Swain's model (1980) further developed this concept by categorizing communicative competence into grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic competencies, providing a more comprehensive approach to language teaching. Later models, such as those by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995), incorporated action competence, emphasizing not only verbal but also non-verbal communication skills.

The article critically examines the strengths and limitations of these models, pointing out that many traditional frameworks have missed the importance of emotional intelligence, digital communication, and cultural awareness. It argues for the need to integrate these modern dimensions into communicative competence models to better reflect the complexities of



communication in today's globalized and technologically advanced world. The article concludes by advocating for the development of more adaptable models of contemporary communication, offering insights for both educational practice and language assessment.

Keywords: communicative competence, discourse, linguistic competence, models, sociolinguistic competence.

Черній Людмила Віталіївна кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет імені Володимира Гнатюка, м. Тернопіль, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4755-9536>

Заблоцька Любов Михайлівна кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет імені Володимира Гнатюка, м. Тернопіль, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3484-9905>

Мелешенко Віра Олександрівна кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет імені Володимира Гнатюка, м. Тернопіль, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4388-4710>

КОМУНІКАТИВНА КОМПЕТЕНТНІСТЬ У СУЧАСНОМУ СУСПІЛЬСТВІ: ПОРІВНЯННЯ ОСНОВНИХ МОДЕЛЕЙ

Анотація. Стаття досліджує еволюцію концепції комунікативної компетенції, акцентуючи увагу на її зростаючому значенні в сучасному суспільстві для особистісного, соціального та професійного розвитку. Комунікативна компетенція виходить за межі розуміння мови, включаючи здатність адаптуватися до різних комунікативних обставин, таких як міжкультурна, цифрова та невербальна комунікація. У дослідженні аналізуються основні теоретичні підходи, які формували наше розуміння комунікативної компетенції, починаючи з фундаментальної роботи Ноама Холського щодо лінгвістичної компетенції, з акцентом на синтаксисі та універсальній граматиці. Д. Хаймс розширив цю концепцію, ввівши поняття соціолінгвістичної компетенції, що зосереджує увагу на доречності використання мови в різних соціальних і культурних контекстах. Модель М. Канейла і М. Свейна (1980) далі розвинула цю ідею, поділяючи комунікативну компетенцію на граматичну, соціолінгвістичну та стратегічну компетенції, що забезпечило більш комплексний підхід до викладання мови. Пізніші моделі, такі як модель М. Целце-Мурсія та співавторів (1995), включили компетенцію дій, акцентуючи увагу не лише на вербальних, але й на невербальних комунікативних навичках.



У статті критично розглядаються сильні та слабкі сторони цих моделей, зазначаючи, що багато традиційних підходів не враховують важливості емоційного інтелекту, цифрової комунікації та культурної обізнаності. Обґрунтовано необхідність інтеграції цих сучасних аспектів у моделі комунікативної компетенції, щоб краще відображати складність комунікації в умовах глобалізованого та технологічно розвиненого світу. У висновку статті йдеться про необхідність розробки більш адаптивних моделей, які відповідатимуть реаліям сучасної комунікації, пропонуючи цінні ідеї для освітньої практики та оцінювання мовних навичок.

Ключові слова: комунікативна компетенція, дискурс, лінгвістична компетенція, моделі, соціолінгвістична компетенція.

Problem statement. In the modern world, communicative competence has become one of the main skills for successful adaptation and development in various spheres of life. Communicating effectively has become important in a professional environment and personal and social life. Communicative competence includes understanding and using language, listening and showing empathy, adaptability to different situations, expressing one's opinion clearly and logically, using non-verbal communication, and cultural aspects of communication in a foreign language environment.

Communicative competence is fundamentally multidisciplinary, encompassing linguistics, psychology, education, sociolinguistics, and computer-mediated communication. Every field of study has its perspective and priorities, which might result in fragmented approaches. Let us consider some of them:

Linguists frequently emphasize grammatical and pragmatic competence, or the ability to use language correctly and responsibly in various settings. Pure language models may neglect social and psychological factors, such as emotional intelligence or cultural knowledge, essential for efficient communication.

Psychology is concerned with the cognitive and affective aspects of communication, including perception, memory, empathy, and interpersonal skills. Although this viewpoint sheds light on individual behavior, it may not adequately take into consideration linguistic and cultural quirks as well as the structural elements of language use.

The ability to attain linguistic competency is frequently considered communicative competence in education, especially while studying a second language (e.g., Canale and Swain's approach). Educational approaches may overlook more general interpersonal and cultural competencies favoring quantifiable results (such as test scores or fluency).



Sociolinguists focus on sociocultural competence, register, and context-appropriate language use as they study how communication differs among social groups and situations.

The ability to communicate across cultural boundaries is addressed by an intercultural perspective, which emphasizes sensitivity, flexibility, and cultural knowledge. It is often underrepresented in traditional models of communicative competence, making it harder to integrate into broader frameworks.

In the digital age, communicative competence includes the ability to effectively use technology (e.g., social media, email) and interpret non-verbal cues like emojis or GIFs. Traditional models rarely account for these modern communication modalities, leading to gaps in understanding how communicative competence operates in online environments.

A large amount of communicative competence research proposes multi-dimensional models in an attempt to address these integration issues. One of the most prominent models, for instance, was presented by Canale and Swain (1980) and included discourse, sociolinguistic, grammatical, and strategic competence. Later studies expand upon these fundamental ideas to account for additional dimensions like cultural and digital competence.

The purpose of the article is to analyze and evaluate various theoretical frameworks that define and explain the concept of communicative competence. The article seeks to trace the evolution of these models, from foundational theories, such as Noam Chomsky's linguistic competence, to more contemporary approaches that address the pragmatic, intercultural, and digital dimensions of communication.

Theoretical framework and discussion. Communicative competence is the main condition for effective communication. The concept of communication skills appeared in the 1970s and aimed to distinguish between human cognitive (academic) and basic interpersonal communication skills. This concept was reflected in various language models. At first, it was proposed by the American anthropological linguist D. Hymes (1972), who believed that language learners should not only acquire language skills but also use language correctly in modern society. [1]

The concept of 'communication' is a process of exchanging information (facts, views, emotions, etc.) between two or more persons, communication using verbal and non-verbal means to transmit and receive information. In a broad sense, communication is communication between individuals using a system of symbols.

The use of language provides verbal communication that is often accompanied by non-verbal (visual contact, facial expressions, sign language, posture, etc.). Verbal communication includes: 1) contact of masks — official



communication, when the peculiarities of the interlocutor are not taken into account, but generally accepted masks of behavior (politeness, politeness, indifference, sympathy, etc.) are used, which allow you to hide your true feelings and attitude towards the interlocutor; 2) secular interaction, during which people say not what they think, but what they should say in a given situation; 3) formal-role communication, which depends on the performance of social roles (for example, teacher-student, worker-boss, father-teacher, etc.); 4) business communication is a process of purposeful communication that facilitates the exchange of information to achieve a specific goal and a specific result. During business communication, the peculiarities of the interlocutor, his character, interests, and mood are also taken into account to avoid possible disagreements and misunderstandings; 5) spiritual interpersonal communication, which reflects a deep, meaningful interactive process between individuals and is aimed at the exchange of spiritual values, ideas, and experiences. [2]

Any communication without the use of words, conversations, and writing is considered non-verbal. It takes place with the help of signs, symbols, colors, gestures, body language, or facial expressions. Non-verbal communication helps to understand the thoughts and feelings of the interlocutor. For example, crossed arms or legs can mean anxiety, anger, or nervousness; feet on the floor and hands next to the body or on the table are probably a manifestation of positive emotions and openness. For effective communication, some conditions must be met, namely: the presence of at least two persons: the sender — the person who generates the information intended for transmission; and the recipient — the person for whom the transmitted information is intended; the presence of a message (information) intended for transmission; availability of a communication channel through which information is transmitted; availability of feedback: from the recipient to the sender. Such a message contains information about the degree of perception and intelligibility of the received message.

An indicator of the formation of a certain level of communication is communicative competence. The concept of means a set of knowledge about the norms and rules of conducting natural communication — dialogue, dispute, conversation, negotiations, etc. This is the ability of an individual to consolidate, apply, and maintain knowledge of the language in specific communication, methods of interaction, and necessary contacts with others, as well as certain knowledge, abilities, and skills for working in groups that ensure effective interaction, the ability to change the depth and circle of communication, to understand and be understood, to accept different social roles [3]. It is formed in conditions of direct interaction and is an acquired phenomenon. It is worth noting that the experience of communication can be obtained through direct communication and indirectly through mass media and works of art (cinema, dramas, music, literature, etc.).



So, communicative competence refers to language knowledge and the ability to use it. It is considered the key to the process of socialization of a person and is characterized by certain features: 1) speech skill, which provides the ability and skill to accurately and clearly express one's thoughts and ideas, to use different styles and registers of speech depending on the context; 2) listening skills that form the ability to listen carefully and understand others, ask questions, and show interest in other people's opinions; 3) non-verbal communication, which allows you to effectively use facial expressions, gestures, postures, and eye contact to strengthen intonation and express emotions; 4) adapting the communication style to the needs and characteristics of the audience, and understanding cultural and social differences in communication; 5) ability to resolve conflicts and use mediation and negotiation skills; 6) empathy, which allows you to feel and understand the feelings of others, considers the emotional state of others in the process of communication; 7) critical thinking. Ability to analyze information, distinguish fact from opinion, and express informed opinions; 8) ability to use communication technologies such as e-mail, social networks, video conferencing, etc; 9) ability to self-correct. Willingness to take responsibility for one's own words and actions and readiness for self-improvement in the communicative process.

The study of communicative competence and its structural elements began in the second half of the 20th century from the scientific works of N. Chomsky and was later continued in the works of other scientists (D. Hymes, M. Canale, M. Swain, L. Bachman, M. Celtze-Murcia, M. Flor, etc.) Let's consider some of them.

Noam Chomsky's groundbreaking work “Syntactic Structures” (1957) is fundamental to modern linguistics and symbolizes a change toward a formal, scientific approach to language analysis. His scientific work laid out the theory of transformational-generative grammar for analyzing language. He used generative grammar, namely phrase-structure rules, and transformational grammar to develop a system capable of producing all and only grammatical sentences in a language. Chomsky's scientific technique prioritized simplicity and explanatory power. The idea was to create models that could explain complicated linguistic events using a few principles and rules. [4]

The concept assumed a universal underlying structure shared by all human languages. Chomsky argued that the ability to learn language is innate and guided by a set of universal rules imprinted genetically in the human brain. This model generates sentences in two stages: 1) deep structure (an abstract representation of a sentence's meaning and grammatical relationships); 2) surface structure (the actual sentence as spoken or written, resulting from modifications to the deep structure). [4]



Chomsky's model revolutionized linguistics by treating language as a formal system governed by internal rules and laying the groundwork for decades of further research in linguistics and cognitive science. According to statistics, more than 60% of linguists incorporate elements of Chomsky's theory into their research, demonstrating its importance and influence: "Language is not a cultural artifact that we study in the same way that we study a clock or how a state government functions. Rather, it is a distinct component of our brain's basic structure.

Dell Hymes' Communicative Competence model (1972) responded to and supplemented Noam Chomsky's difference between linguistic competence and performance. Hymes argued that Chomsky's focus on grammatical competence was too narrow and did not fully capture how language is used in real social contexts. His concept emphasized the social, cultural, and pragmatic aspects of language use, broadening the study of language research beyond formal syntax and grammar. Hymes underlined that language use is intimately embedded in social and cultural contexts. According to him, communicative competence implies the understanding of how to use language effectively in specific social contexts. Language users must know not just what is grammatically right, but also what is socially and culturally acceptable. Hymes proposed a research framework known as the ethnography of communication, which investigates how communication varies across communities and how linguistic practices are embedded in cultural contexts. He believed that knowledge of language and sociocultural rules is important for communication. Therefore, in addition to language competence, the way people communicate with each other largely depends on communicative competence. This new position marked a new milestone in linguistics by recognizing the dependence of competence on "existing knowledge as well as the ability to use it". [5]

Hymes proposed to integrate linguistic theory with the theory of communication and culture and formulated four basic levels on which it is built: 1) Whether (and to what extent) something is formally possible; 2) Whether (and to what extent) something is feasible through the available means of implementation; 3) Whether (and to what extent) something is acceptable concerning the context in which it is used and evaluated; 4) Whether (and to what extent) something is done, actually performed, and what it is supposed to do. The first level conveys an idea using existing linguistic knowledge. The second level examines what the speaker can produce in a limited amount of time. The purpose of the third level is to study how language is related to the context in which it is used. At the final level, the real aspect of language use is investigated.

Canale & Swain's Model of Communicative Competence. The model of communicative competence proposed by Canale & Swain (1980, 1983)



initially consisted of three main components: grammatical (knowledge of the language code, including vocabulary, rules of spelling and pronunciation, word formation and sentence construction), sociolinguistic (knowledge and use of sociocultural rules to perform communicative functions) and strategic (use communication strategies to solve communication problems) competencies. Subsequently, some components of sociolinguistic competence were transferred to a separate block - the fourth component called discourse competence.

Later, the above model was refined by Canale (1983), who added discourse competence in his more recent assessment of communicative competence, breaking it down into two major categories: "organizational competence" which includes both grammatical and discourse, and "pragmatic competence" which includes both sociolinguistic and illocutionary competence. [6] The ability of the interlocutors to use communication strategies is linked to strategic competence.

Canale and Swain's model has gained popularity due to its practical applications in syllabus design, instructional methodology, teacher education, and teaching materials. This methodology aimed to improve communicative skills by organizing the course and emphasizing meaningful communication. [7]

In their research works, grammatical competence resonates with Chomsky's linguistic competence. That is why, for some scientists, the terms "linguistic competence" and "grammatical competence" are identical.

Bachman's Communicative Language Ability Model (1990). The structure of Bachman's model of communicative language ability was developed in response to the calls of scientists to combine the theoretical model of language training with the means and technologies of its assessment. His model combines three main components: linguistic competence (i.e. items related to knowledge), strategic competence (i.e. the ability to apply these elements in communication), and psychophysiological factors (i.e. mental processes that influence actual implementation) that interact among themselves.

While grammatical competence (vocabulary, morphology, syntax, orthography) and textual competence (the ability to combine utterances to form a text according to the rules of coherence and rhetorical organization) belong to organizational competence (mainly related to form), illocutionary competence (knowledge of pragmatic conventions for the performance of language functions) and sociolinguistic competence (reflects sensitivity to dialectal and stylistic differences of languages, authentic use of language, understanding of cultural features) are parts of pragmatic competence (mostly function-related). However, it should be noted that language competence is not sufficient to engage in communication, as strategic competence encompasses specific linguistic systems used to evaluate, plan, and perform an assigned function, taking into account many contextual and psychophysiological factors. Therefore, the communicative



abilities of the speaker are the result of the interaction between the knowledge of "what" and "how".

Strategic competence combines three components. The assessment component includes determining the information necessary to achieve the communicative goal of the context, determining language competencies, ensuring the capabilities and knowledge of the interlocutor, and assessing the degree of achievement of the communicative goal. The planning component selects the necessary elements from the language competence and develops a plan to achieve the communicative goal. The implementation component implements the plan using psychophysiological mechanisms in accordance with the context and communicative purpose.

Celce-Murcia, Dornyei and Thurrell's Communicative Model. Scientists divided communicative competence into linguistic, sociocultural, strategic, discursive, and action competence. At its core, they placed discursive competence, which refers to the selection and sequence of linguistic elements (words, structures, sentences, or utterances) to achieve a single oral or written text. According to the model, this competence is placed in a position where linguistic, sociocultural, and action competence form a discursive competence, which in turn also forms each of the three components. Linguistic competence includes the basic elements of communication, such as sentence patterns, morphological turns, phonological and orthographic systems, and lexical resources. Sociocultural competence refers to the speaker's knowledge of how to express appropriate messages in the social and cultural context of communication in which they are produced. Action competence involves understanding the speaker's communicative intent by performing and interpreting sets of speech acts. These four components are influenced by the last, strategic competence, which is related to the knowledge of communication strategies and how to use them. Thus, this model provides a clear view of the relationship between all components of the communicative model.

As we can see, the abovementioned models reflect an evolution in the understanding of communicative competence, from theoretical linguistics to pragmatic, social, and pedagogical perspectives. For comparative analysis of the given model see Table 1.



Table 1

Key Contributions of the Communicative Models

Model	Core focus	Key contribution	Strengths	Weaknesses
Chomsky (1957)	Grammatical competence: syntax and universal grammar.	Provided a formal foundation for linguistic theory, focusing on the mental capacity for language.	Clear and rigorous theoretical foundation for syntax and grammar.	Ignores context, social factors, and pragmatic use of language.
Hymes (1972)	Sociolinguistic competence: appropriateness of language in social contexts.	Broadened the scope to include the social and cultural dimensions of language use.	Highlighted the importance of sociocultural and contextual appropriateness	Lacked clear operationalization for teaching or assessment.
Canale & Swain (1980)	Multidimensional framework: grammar, discourse, sociolinguistic, and strategic competencies.	Operationalized communicative competence for language teaching and assessment.	Defined communicative competence in a structured way, combining theory and pedagogy	Did not fully address non-verbal communication or broader cultural nuances
Celce-Murcia et al. (1995)	Comprehensive and pedagogical model: dynamic, skill-based, and interactive components.	Expanded on prior models with actional competence and non-verbal elements, tailoring it to pedagogy.	Comprehensive, dynamic, and tailored to teaching; integrates verbal, non-verbal, and pragmatic dimensions.	Complex to implement due to the number of components and their interrelations.

Conclusion. The models of Chomsky, Hymes, Canale & Swain, and Celce-Murcia et al. reflect a shift from abstract linguistic theory to practical, pedagogically oriented frameworks. Each model builds upon its predecessors, progressively broadening the understanding of communicative competence. While Chomsky laid the theoretical groundwork with his focus on linguistic competence, Hymes introduced the social dimension, emphasizing the ability to use language appropriately within a given cultural and social context. Canale and Swain operationalized the concept for language teaching, breaking it down into grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic competence, which provided a clearer



framework for instruction. Celce-Murcia et al. expanded on these foundations by integrating discourse competence and addressing both verbal and non-verbal communication, emphasizing sociocultural nuances and contextual adaptation in pedagogy.

By adding pragmatic and strategic competence and highlighting the dynamic interaction between language knowledge, context, and communication tactics, Bachman and Palmer expanded on the idea. Their model is particularly useful for language assessment and practical applications since it not only took into account linguistic and sociolinguistic aspects but also emphasized the importance of adaptability and cultural awareness in accomplishing communicative objectives.

References:

1. Hymes, D. (1972). On Communicative Competence. *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. Pp. 269-293).
2. Buck, R., VanLear, A. (2002). Verbal and Nonverbal Communication: Distinguishing Symbolic, Spontaneous, and Pseudo-Spontaneous Nonverbal Behavior. *Journal of Communication*. 52(3):522 – 541. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2002.tb02560.x
3. Dara, D., Soomro, A. Sun, N. et al. (2024). Exploring Communicative Competence: Definitions, Advancements, and Implementations across Disciplines. *AITU Scientific Research Journal*. V. 2. Issue. 2. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379901571_Exploring_Communicative_Competence_Definitions_Advancements_and_Implementations_across_Disciplines
4. Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton. 117 p. Available at: https://tallinzen.net/media/readings/chomsky_syntactic_structures.pdf
5. Seyyed, M., Hamid, H., Qotboddin, J. (2017). Critical Analysis of the Models of Language Proficiency with a Focus on Communicative Models. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. Vol. 7, No. 5, pp. 400-407. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0705.11>
6. Sabri Thabit, Dr. Sunil V. Pawar (2018). Communicative Competence in English as a Foreign Language: Its Meaning and the Pedagogical Considerations for its Development. *The Creative Launcher*. Vol. II. Issue VI. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53032/tcl.2018.2.6.41>
7. On the Models of Communicative Competence. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344476391_On_the_Models_of_Communicative_Competence

Література:

1. Hymes, D. (1972). On Communicative Competence. *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. Pp. 269-293).
2. Buck, R., VanLear, A. (2002). Verbal and Nonverbal Communication: Distinguishing Symbolic, Spontaneous, and Pseudo-Spontaneous Nonverbal Behavior. *Journal of Communication*. 52(3):522 – 541. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2002.tb02560.x
3. Dara, D., Soomro, A. Sun, N. et al. (2024). Exploring Communicative Competence: Definitions, Advancements, and Implementations across Disciplines. *AITU Scientific Research Journal*. V. 2. Issue. 2. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379901571_Exploring_Communicative_Competence_Definitions_Advancements_and_Implementations_across_Disciplines



4. Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton. 117 p. Available at: https://tallinzen.net/media/readings/chomsky_syntactic_structures.pdf

5. Seyyed, M., Hamid, H., Qotboddin, J. (2017). Critical Analysis of the Models of Language Proficiency with a Focus on Communicative Models. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. Vol. 7, No. 5, pp. 400-407. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpsl.0705.11>

6. Sabri Thabit, Dr. Sunil V. Pawar (2018). Communicative Competence in English as a Foreign Language: Its Meaning and the Pedagogical Considerations for its Development. *The Creative Launcher*. Vol. II. Issue VI. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53032/tcl.2018.2.6.41>

7. On the Models of Communicative Competence. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344476391_On_the_Models_of_Communicative_Competence