

Organizational and Pedagogical Conditions for Developing Communicative Competence of Students Based on English Language Teaching

 Yusupova Shirinoy Ortikali kizi

Faculty of Tourism, Department of Foreign Languages for Other Faculties, Chirchik State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Received: 03 March 2026; **Accepted:** 28 March 2026; **Published:** 21 April 2026

Abstract: This article examines the organizational and pedagogical conditions necessary for effectively developing communicative competence in students within the framework of English language teaching. Drawing on contemporary theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence, the study identifies key environmental, methodological, and instructional factors that facilitate the formation of communicative skills in higher education contexts. The research employs a mixed-methods approach combining systematic literature review, observational analysis, and pedagogical experiment involving 120 university students over one academic year. Findings indicate that purposefully structured communicative environments, task-based instructional design, integrative use of authentic materials, and formative assessment practices collectively constitute the optimal pedagogical conditions for competence development. The study contributes to the growing body of literature on communicative language teaching (CLT) and offers practical recommendations for educators and curriculum designers seeking to foster genuine communicative ability in EFL/ESL learners.

Keywords: Communicative competence, English language teaching, organizational-pedagogical conditions, communicative language teaching, task-based learning, higher education, EFL/ESL.

Introduction: The development of communicative competence has become one of the central imperatives in modern foreign language education. As globalization continues to reshape academic, professional, and social landscapes, the demand for learners who can engage meaningfully, accurately, and appropriately in English across diverse communicative contexts has never been greater (Hymes, 1972; Canale & Swain, 1980). Yet despite decades of theoretical refinement and methodological innovation, a significant gap persists between the aspirational goals of language curricula and the actual communicative abilities graduates demonstrate in real-world interactions.

The concept of communicative competence, first articulated by Hymes (1972) as a critique of Chomsky's purely formal notion of linguistic competence, encompasses not only grammatical knowledge but also

the sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic dimensions of language use. Subsequent scholars—most notably Canale and Swain (1980) and later Bachman (1990)—elaborated this framework into a multidimensional construct that continues to guide contemporary language pedagogy. The communicative language teaching (CLT) movement that emerged in the 1970s and 1980s sought to operationalize these insights in classroom practice, emphasizing meaning over form, interaction over recitation, and authentic communication over mechanical drills.

However, the implementation of CLT principles—particularly in Central Asian and post-Soviet educational contexts—remains uneven and frequently superficial (Nunan, 2004; Kramsch, 2006). Structural constraints, pedagogical traditions, resource limitations, and assessment pressures often conspire to undermine

genuinely communicative instruction even when it is nominally mandated by curriculum frameworks. In Uzbekistan and neighboring countries, the reform of English language education has been a policy priority for over two decades, yet empirical research on the specific organizational and pedagogical conditions that enable communicative competence development in these contexts remains sparse.

This article addresses that gap by investigating the question: What organizational and pedagogical conditions most effectively support the development of communicative competence among university students in English language teaching programs? The study combines theoretical analysis with data from a pedagogical experiment conducted across two academic groups at a university setting, comparing outcomes under conventional instructional conditions with those under purposefully designed communicative environments. The significance of the study lies not only in its contribution to theoretical understanding but in its practical implications for curriculum developers, language teachers, and educational administrators working to align instructional practice with contemporary communicative goals.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1 Theoretical Foundations of Communicative Competence

The conceptual lineage of communicative competence traces from Hymes's (1972) foundational observation that speakers must know not only whether a sentence is grammatically possible but also whether it is "feasible," "appropriate," and "actually performed." This pragmatic turn in linguistics laid the groundwork for pedagogical approaches that treat language as fundamentally social action rather than abstract formal system.

Canale and Swain's (1980) landmark framework proposed four interrelated components: grammatical competence (knowledge of linguistic code), sociolinguistic competence (appropriate use in social contexts), discourse competence (coherence and cohesion across utterances), and strategic competence (ability to manage communication breakdowns). This framework was subsequently refined by Bachman (1990), who restructured the components into organizational and pragmatic competence, and by the

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe, 2001), which operationalized communicative competence as a set of descriptors across proficiency levels. Contemporary scholarship has further enriched the construct by emphasizing intercultural communicative competence (Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2006), recognizing that effective communication across linguistic boundaries requires not only linguistic and pragmatic knowledge but also cultural awareness, attitudes of openness, and interpretive skills. This intercultural dimension is particularly salient in the English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) paradigm (Seidlhofer, 2011; Jenkins, 2007), which reconceptualizes English not as the property of native-speaking communities but as a global resource co-constructed by its many users.

2 Communicative Language Teaching: Principles and Challenges

CLT represents the dominant methodological paradigm in language education today, though its implementation varies substantially across contexts. At its core, CLT holds that language is learned through meaningful use rather than formal study, and that classroom activities should simulate or replicate authentic communicative events (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Task-based language teaching (TBLT), one of the most theoretically robust variants of CLT, operationalizes this principle by organizing instruction around communicative tasks—purposeful activities that require learners to use language to achieve a non-linguistic outcome (Ellis, 2003; Willis, 1996). Research has consistently demonstrated the efficacy of communicative and task-based approaches for developing both linguistic accuracy and pragmatic competence (Norris & Ortega, 2000; Ellis, 2009). However, the conditions under which these approaches succeed are not uniform. Long (2015) emphasizes that task complexity, sequencing, and design parameters significantly mediate learning outcomes. Interaction, negotiation of meaning, and corrective feedback play crucial roles in pushing learners toward more accurate and appropriate language use (Gass & Mackey, 2007; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Implementation challenges are well-documented in the literature. Littlewood (2007) identifies a widespread tendency toward "communicative on the surface but traditional at the core" instruction in Asian educational contexts, where

institutional pressures, large class sizes, and examination cultures constrain genuine communicative practice. Similar dynamics have been observed in post-Soviet contexts, where grammar-translation traditions persist alongside nominally communicative curricula (Kurtán, 2001; Bygate, Skehan & Swain, 2001).

3 Organizational-Pedagogical Conditions: Conceptual Framework

The concept of “organizational-pedagogical conditions” (*organizatsionno-pedagogicheskie usloviya*) is widely employed in Russian-language educational research to denote the ensemble of environmental, structural, methodological, and relational factors that enable or constrain educational outcomes (Slavchenko et al., 2002; Zimnyaya, 2004). This framework is particularly useful for analyzing complex pedagogical phenomena that cannot be reduced to single variables but require systemic examination of interacting factors. For communicative competence development, organizational conditions include the physical and temporal arrangement of learning environments, the size and composition of student groups, the availability of authentic linguistic resources, and the institutional frameworks within which teaching occurs. Pedagogical conditions encompass instructional methodology, task design, assessment practices, teacher-student interaction patterns, and the motivational climate of the learning community. Previous research has identified several conditions as particularly influential: the provision of meaningful, authentic input (Krashen, 1985); opportunities for genuine communicative output and interaction (Swain, 1985); explicit instruction in pragmatic norms (Kasper & Rose, 2001); formative feedback that is both corrective and supportive (Hattie & Timperley, 2007); and the cultivation of learner autonomy and metacognitive awareness (Dörnyei, 2001; Little, 2007).

METHODOLOGY

1 Research Design

This study employed a mixed-methods research design combining a systematic literature review with a quasi-experimental pedagogical investigation. The quasi-experiment followed a pretest-posttest control group design, comparing outcomes between an experimental group receiving instruction under purposefully designed organizational-pedagogical conditions and a control

group receiving conventional instruction. Quantitative data were supplemented by qualitative analysis of classroom observations, student reflective journals, and semi-structured interviews.

2 Participants

Participants comprised 120 second-year university students enrolled in English language programs at a higher education institution. The sample was divided into two groups: an experimental group ($n = 60$) and a control group ($n = 60$), matched for baseline English proficiency as measured by a standardized pre-test based on the Cambridge Placement Test. The age range of participants was 18–22 years, with a roughly equal gender distribution (53% female, 47% male). All participants were non-native speakers of English for whom it represented a required academic subject.

3 Instrumentation

The study employed four primary instruments:

Pre/Post Communicative Competence Assessment: A validated instrument measuring the four components of communicative competence (grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic) through a combination of written tasks, oral interview, and role-play scenarios. Inter-rater reliability was established at $r = 0.87$.

Classroom Observation Protocol: A structured observation instrument adapted from the COLT (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching) scheme (Spada & Fröhlich, 1995) to document communicative activities, student participation patterns, and instructional focus.

Student Reflective Journals: Weekly journal prompts eliciting students' perceptions of their communicative development, challenges encountered, and strategies employed.

Semi-structured Teacher Interviews: Post-experiment interviews with instructors in both groups exploring their pedagogical decision-making and perceptions of student progress.

4 Experimental Conditions

The experimental group received instruction organized according to five principal conditions identified from the literature review as theoretically well-supported: (1) task-based instructional organization; (2) systematic integration of authentic materials; (3) structured

communicative interaction through pair and group work; (4) explicit pragmatic instruction embedded in communicative tasks; and (5) portfolio-based formative assessment. The control group received instruction following the standard curriculum, characterized primarily by textbook-based grammar instruction and teacher-fronted presentation.

The intervention lasted one academic year (32 weeks), with each group receiving four 90-minute sessions per week.

5 Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS 26.0. Pre-post differences within and between groups were assessed using paired-samples t-tests and independent-

samples t-tests, with effect sizes calculated using Cohen's *d*. Qualitative data from observations, journals, and interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), with codes developed inductively from the data and subsequently mapped against the conceptual framework.

RESULTS

1 Quantitative Outcomes

Pre-test scores confirmed the initial equivalence of the two groups across all four competence dimensions (all $p > .05$). Post-test analysis revealed statistically significant differences favoring the experimental group across all dimensions.

Table 1. Pre- and Post-Test Scores by Group and Competence Dimension (Mean $\pm$ SD)

Competence Dimension	Control Pre	Control Post	Exp. Pre	Exp. Post	Effect Size (<i>d</i>)
Grammatical	54.3 $\pm$ 8.1	61.2 $\pm$ 7.4	53.8 $\pm$ 7.9	72.6 $\pm$ 6.8	1.67
Sociolinguistic	48.7 $\pm$ 9.3	54.1 $\pm$ 8.6	49.2 $\pm$ 8.7	68.9 $\pm$ 7.2	1.91
Discourse	51.4 $\pm$ 8.8	58.3 $\pm$ 8.1	50.9 $\pm$ 8.5	70.4 $\pm$ 7.5	1.57
Strategic	46.2 $\pm$ 10.1	52.8 $\pm$ 9.4	45.7 $\pm$ 9.8	66.3 $\pm$ 8.2	1.44
Overall	50.2 $\pm$ 8.0	56.6 $\pm$ 7.5	49.9 $\pm$ 7.8	69.6 $\pm$ 6.8	1.77

All between-group post-test differences were statistically significant ($p < .001$). Effect sizes were large for all dimensions, indicating substantial practical significance of the experimental conditions.

2 Qualitative Findings

Thematic analysis of observation data, student journals, and teacher interviews yielded four principal themes that illuminate the mechanisms underlying the quantitative differences.

Theme 1: Authenticity and Relevance as Motivational Catalysts. Students in the experimental group consistently reported heightened engagement and intrinsic motivation associated with authentic materials and real-world tasks. Journal entries frequently referenced the relevance of activities to their perceived future communicative needs. One participant wrote: "For the first time, I feel that what I am learning in class is what I will actually need to use."

Theme 2: Structured Interaction as a Site of Competence Development. Observations revealed that purposefully designed pair and group tasks in the experimental condition generated substantially higher

rates of student-to-student interaction, negotiation of meaning, and self-correction than the control condition. Students reported developing greater strategic competence—particularly in managing communication breakdowns—through repeated practice in structured communicative tasks.

Theme 3: Feedback as Scaffolding. Experimental group instructors employed a range of targeted corrective feedback strategies (recasts, metalinguistic feedback, clarification requests) embedded within communicative contexts, which students perceived as supportive rather than punitive. In contrast, control group students reported that error correction often disrupted communicative flow and increased anxiety.

Theme 4: Portfolio Assessment as a Metacognitive Tool. Portfolio-based assessment in the experimental group fostered learner reflection and metacognitive awareness. Students reported developing greater capacity to monitor their own communicative performance and identify specific areas for improvement, contributing to the development of strategic competence.

DISCUSSION

1 Synthesis of Findings

The results of this study provide strong empirical support for the proposition that purposefully structured organizational and pedagogical conditions substantially enhance communicative competence development in English language learners. The large effect sizes observed—particularly for sociolinguistic and grammatical competence—suggest that the conditions implemented in the experimental program addressed critical weaknesses characteristic of conventional instruction. The primacy of sociolinguistic competence gains merits particular attention. This dimension—encompassing appropriateness of language use in social contexts, politeness conventions, register variation, and cultural pragmatics—is frequently neglected in grammar-focused instruction yet is central to effective real-world communication. The experimental conditions, particularly the integration of authentic materials and explicit pragmatic instruction embedded in communicative tasks, appear to have created conditions for the development of pragmatic awareness that conventional instruction rarely generates. These findings align with the predictions of interaction hypothesis (Long, 1996), output hypothesis (Swain, 1985), and noticing hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990), all of which emphasize the importance of meaningful communicative practice, productive output, and attentional focus on form within communicative contexts. The structured interaction conditions of the experimental program created the conditions posited by these theories as necessary for language development.

2 The Five Organizational-Pedagogical Conditions: A Refined Framework

Based on the synthesis of theoretical analysis and empirical findings, the study proposes a refined framework of five interrelated organizational-pedagogical conditions for communicative competence development:

Condition 1: Communicative Task Organization. The foundational condition is the organization of instruction around communicative tasks with genuine information gaps, real-world relevance, and authentic communicative outcomes. Tasks should be sequenced in accordance with psycholinguistic complexity

principles and provide opportunities for pre-task planning, task performance, and post-task reflection.

Condition 2: Authentic Input Integration. Systematic exposure to authentic spoken and written texts—news media, academic discourse, professional genres, interactive online content—provides the realistic input necessary for the development of sociolinguistic and discourse competence. Authenticity should be managed carefully to ensure appropriate challenge without overwhelming learners.

Condition 3: Structured Communicative Interaction. Deliberate organization of pair and group communicative activities ensures sufficient opportunities for student-to-student language use. Interaction structures should vary (information gap tasks, discussion activities, collaborative projects, role plays) to expose learners to diverse communicative genres and participation roles.

Condition 4: Embedded Pragmatic Instruction. Explicit attention to pragmatic dimensions of language use—speech acts, politeness strategies, discourse markers, register variation—should be integrated within communicative tasks rather than isolated in separate grammar exercises. Raised awareness of pragmatic norms accelerates the development of sociolinguistic and discourse competence.

Condition 5: Formative Portfolio Assessment. Assessment practices should be aligned with communicative competence goals, emphasizing growth over time, metacognitive reflection, and self-assessment alongside teacher evaluation. Portfolio-based assessment provides a mechanism for learner agency and supports the development of strategic competence.

These five conditions are not independent but mutually reinforcing: task organization creates the context for authentic interaction; authentic materials provide the input for pragmatic learning; structured interaction generates the output opportunities that portfolio assessment can capture and reflect on.

5.3 Implications for Educational Practice

The practical implications of this framework are substantial. For curriculum designers, the findings underscore the importance of organizing syllabi around communicative tasks rather than grammatical structures, and of systematically integrating authentic

materials appropriate to learners' proficiency and interests. For classroom teachers, the study highlights the value of diversifying interaction structures, developing explicit pragmatic instruction integrated into communicative activities, and adopting feedback strategies that support rather than suppress communicative risk-taking. For institutional administrators, the results suggest the importance of creating physical and temporal conditions conducive to communicative interaction—including flexible classroom arrangements, adequate technology access, and scheduling that allows for sustained communicative engagement.

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that purposefully designed organizational and pedagogical conditions can substantially enhance the development of communicative competence in university-level English language learners. The five-condition framework—communicative task organization, authentic input integration, structured communicative interaction, embedded pragmatic instruction, and formative portfolio assessment—represents a theoretically grounded and empirically supported model for communicative language instruction. The findings contribute to a growing body of evidence supporting CLT and TBLT approaches while extending that evidence base into a higher education context where such research has been underrepresented. Equally importantly, the study demonstrates that effective communicative instruction is not simply a matter of introducing communicative activities into the classroom but requires the systematic alignment of organizational structures, instructional design, materials selection, and assessment practices in service of communicative goals. Future research should examine the long-term durability of communicative competence gains, the transferability of skills across academic and professional contexts, and the role of digital and blended learning environments in creating conditions for communicative practice beyond the classroom. Longitudinal and cross-institutional designs would strengthen the generalizability of findings and contribute to a more robust evidence base for educational policy in this domain.

REFERENCES

1. Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.
2. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
3. Bygate, M., Skehan, P., & Swain, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing*. Longman.
4. Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Multilingual Matters.
5. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
6. Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 241–266.
8. Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
10. Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221–246.
11. Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2007). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 175–199). Lawrence Erlbaum.
12. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112.
13. Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Penguin.
14. Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.
15. Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 1–9).

Cambridge University Press.

16. Kramsch, C. (2006). From communicative competence to symbolic competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(2), 249–252.
17. Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.
18. Kurtán, Z. (2001). Idegén nyelvi tantervek [Foreign language curricula]. Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.
19. Little, D. (2007). Language learner autonomy: Some fundamental considerations revisited. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 14–29.
20. Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40(3), 243–249.
21. 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.
22. Long, M. H. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Wiley-Blackwell.
23. Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66.
24. Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50(3), 417–528.
25. Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
26. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
27. Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158.
28. Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford University Press.
29. Slastenin, V. A., Isaev, I. F., & Shiyanov, E. N. (2002). *Pedagogika* [Pedagogy]. Akademiya.
30. Spada, N., & Fröhlich, M. (1995). *COLT: Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
31. Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.
32. Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.
33. Zimnyaya, I. A. (2004). Klyuchevye kompetentnosti kak rezultativno-tselevaya osnova kompetentnostnogo podkhoda v obrazovanii [Key competencies as the result-oriented basis of the competency-based approach in education]. *Issledovatel'skiy tsentr problem kachestva podgotovki spetsialistov*.