

УДК 371.212

Olena Kulyk

ORCID iD: orcid.org/0000-0001-9116-4403

PhD in Pedagogy, Associate Professor, Associate Professor
at the chair for Ukrainian linguistics and methods of education,
SHEE «Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi Hryhorii Skovoroda
State Pedagogical University»,
30, Sukhomlynskyi Street, Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine
olenakulyk@gmail.com

COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE: APPROACHES TO DETERMINATION AND ITS EFFECTS IN FORMING A LANGUAGE PERSONALITY

У статті відстоюється думка про те, що досягнення високого рівня комунікативної компетентності – це найвища сходинка у формуванні мовної особистості, а відтак, і особливе завдання, що має виконуватися впродовж навчання української мови в закладах загальної середньої освіти. Автор наголошує, що сучасні дослідження застосовують термін «комунікативна компетентність» щодо реальних мовців й уточнюють, що існують інші типи компетентностей (прагматична, соціокультурна, стратегічна, комунікативна або предметна, культурна й комунікативна). У широкому розумінні всі ці типи стосуються комунікативної компетентності. Комунікативну компетентність школяра автор розглядає як здатність учнів ефективно використовувати мовні знання, сформовані вміння, навички та власний досвід з метою гармонізації всіх видів спілкування, досягнення комунікативної мети та бажаного прагматичного ефекту й наголошує на тому, що: під «комунікацією» розуміється процес обміну інформацією, уявленнями, думками, ідеями, поглядами, інтересами, почуттями, настроями, емоціями, настановами тощо; поняття «спілкування» не обмежується тільки процесом обміну інформацією, оскільки характеризується наявністю зворотного зв'язку, тому інформація не тільки передається, але й формується, уточнюється, розвивається, доповнюється, заперечується, спростовується, коригується тощо; «спілкування» розглядається як система відношень «суб'єкт-суб'єкт», а «комунікація» є системою «суб'єкт-об'єктних» відносин; спілкування – складний багатоплановий процес встановлення і розвитку контактів між людьми, породжуваний потребами спільної діяльності і включає в себе обмін інформацією, вироблення єдиної стратегії взаємодії, сприйняття і розуміння іншої людини; поняття «взаємодія» характеризує інший бік спілкування, що передбачає не тільки обмін інформацією, а й організацію спільних дій, що дають можливість комунікантам здійснити певну діяльність, при цьому вплив одного на

іншого з метою зміни його поведінки виступає як один зі складників комунікативного процесу, механізмами якого є навіювання, наслідування, переконання, ідентифікація; «комунікативна компетентність» як якість особистості трактується як сукупність властивостей, необхідних для успішного проведення комунікативної діяльності, тобто для здійснення перцептивних, власне-комунікативних і комунікативно-операційних дій.

Ключові слова: комунікативна компетентність, спілкування, комунікація, особистість, мовна особистість, учні.

В статье отстаивается мысль о том, что достижение высокого уровня коммуникативной компетентности – это самая высокая ступень в формировании языковой личности, а следовательно, и особое задание, которое должно выполняться в течение обучения украинскому языку в учреждениях общего среднего образования. Коммуникативную компетентность школьника автор рассматривает как способность учащихся эффективно использовать языковые и речевые знания, сформированные умения, навыки и собственный опыт с целью гармонизации всех видов общения, достижения коммуникативной цели и желаемого прагматического эффекта.

Ключевые слова: коммуникативная компетентность, общение, коммуникация, личность, языковая личность, ученики.

The article deals with a problem of achieving a high level of communicative competence as the uppermost stage in formation of a language personality, and hence, a special task to be completed when teaching Ukrainian in the secondary school system. The author sees a student's communicative competence as their ability to use effectively their linguistic knowledge and the skills they have formed, along with their own experience in order to harmonize all kinds of interaction, achieve their communicative goals and the desired pragmatic effect.

Key words: communicative competence, communication, interaction, personality, language personality, students.

Problem definition. Forming and developing students' communicative competence is an urgent task for the educational process in the modern school system. This is the goal set by the Law of Ukraine «On Education», the National Strategy for Development of Education in Ukraine in 2012–2021, the Concept for Development of Education in Ukraine in 2015–2025, the Concept for Implementation of the National Policy in Reforming Secondary Education «New Ukrainian School» for 2017–2029, the State Standard for Secondary School and High School Education, as well as Ukrainian language curricula.

Analysis of recent research works and publications. It should be noted that current Ukrainian linguistic didactics is engaged in active research of the

problem of forming communicative competence at the lessons of the Ukrainian language. For example, sociolinguistic foundations, methods and techniques, structural components of communicative competence have been substantiated in the works by N. Golub; the competence-based approach to formation of a language personality and speech development of schoolchildren has been analyzed by M. Pentyliuk and G. Shelekhova; the sociocultural aspect, communicative basis for teaching the mother tongue and forming communicative competence with the means of the mother tongue have been researched by L. Mamchur and T. Okunevych; the psychological and pedagogical foundations, methods of forming the value-related component of the communicative competence have been studied in the works by A. Yarmoliuk; the technology of cooperative learning in the course of forming students' communicative competence has been considered in the papers by V. Sydorenko and others.

Taking into account the growing interest of linguistic didactics and practicing teachers to forming students' communicative competence at the lessons of Ukrainian, we believe it necessary to find out the content-related characteristics and determinant features of this notion from the viewpoint of linguistic didactics and other sciences as well, and define the role of communicative competence in forming students' language personality. It is the **purpose** of our paper.

Presentation of the core material. At present, it is widely recognized that the notion of communicative competence is an interdisciplinary one as it reflects achievements in various areas of science as linguistics, pedagogics, psychology, philosophy and others.

The terms «communicativeness» and «communication», in their interrelation with the term «communicative competence» were first used by an American linguist Dell Hymes (Hymes D., 1972). He viewed communicative competence as an alternative to the existing notion of an ideal communication participant, an ideal communicator, in the theory of structural linguistics suggested by Noam Chomsky (Chomsky N., 1972). Today, communicative competence is seen as a system of a personality's internal resources required to build effective communicative acts in situations of interpersonal interaction. Some scientists see competence, within the body of the competency-based approach, as a certain «strong» quality of a personality.

Analysis of philosophical, psychological and pedagogical literature proves that the notions of «communication» and «interaction» are of key importance for many sciences but quite often they tend to be equated. That is usually explained by their being semantically similar.

The term «communication» is relatively new as it became frequently used in scientific works only in the XX century, despite the fact that even ancient philosophers and educators were engaged in dealing with problems related to communicative competence. For example, Aristotle created a scheme of interaction, singling out three necessary elements such as being the speaker,

the speech and the listener. Plato was the first to name the processes of exchanging information – speech and literature, giving his preference to the first one and defining speech as the «process of interaction with the wise». Plutarch believed communicative qualities were of primary importance for a statesperson (Plutarch, 1983). «It is the most important thing that your speech given before people should be planned carefully and not empty so you will be safe from failure; as you know, even Pericles asked the gods before giving a speech that his lips should not pronounce any unnecessary words» (Plutarch, 1983, p. 592). Socrates (ca. 470–399 BC) used suggestive questions to implement a truth searching method which was later known as «Socratic dialogues», there are no teachers or students or opponents and the judge is the prevailing majority of thoughts.

In our analysis of the literature, modern theoretical studies and research works on the issue of developing and forming communicative competence, we have come to the conclusion that the notion of «communicative competence» is partially absent from dictionaries and reference books / encyclopedias, and the notion of «communication» is equated, in some of its meanings, to the notions of «interaction» and «intercourse». For example, in the dictionary by S.I. Ozhegov, the adjective «communicative» is only seen as a derivative from the second meaning of «communication» which is defined as message or interaction (The explanatory dictionary of the Russian language, 1999, p. 232).

In social psychology, the notion of «communication» is used in two meanings: 1) to characterize the structure of business and interpersonal connections between patterns; 2) to characterize exchange of information in human interaction, generally (Andreeva G.M., 1996, p. 45).

In the encyclopedia (Ukrainian language: Encyclopedia, 2004) the terms «communicative competence», «communicative», «communication» do not have separate entries while there is much more interpretations of the term «interaction» are given, communication is defined as one of its aspects along with «social perception» (perception and understanding of one person by another person) and interaction (cooperation), while the actual communication by itself is seen as information exchange taking place between people (The Ukrainian language: Encyclopedia, 2004, p. 69).

In a psychological dictionary edited by V.P. Zinchenko, B.G. Meshcheriakov, «communication», «communicativeness», and «communicative» are not considered at all, even in the article on interaction (A psychological dictionary, 1999, p. 232). It is only in a psychological dictionary edited by A.V. Petrovskyi and M.G. Yaroshevsky we find the definition of communication as the «meaningful aspect of social interaction» (Psychology: A dictionary, 1999, p. 68). Meanwhile the notion of «interaction» is seen as a process of direct or indirect influence of objects (subjects) onto each other which results in their mutual causation and connection (Psychology: A dictionary, 1999, p. 51). However, such notions as communicative competence and communicative activity are not considered at all.

In spite of that, almost no modern textbook of pedagogics, psychology, pedagogical psychology, sociology, social pedagogics and similar methodological works can functionate without widely using these terms.

Some authors when talking about one of these phenomena tend to replace one notion with the other in the course of their analysis, thus equating the notions of communication and interaction. For example, N.V. Kazarinova defines interpersonal communication as interaction between a small number of communicators who are capable of establishing feedback, and treats the notion of «interaction» as an activity which results in a psychological contact (Kazarinova N.V., 2000, p. 5).

G. Bush in his work «Dialogism and creativity» refers to the definition of interaction suggested by O.O. Bodalev, the author of a series of works on interpersonal communication of people where people appear, in relation to each other, to be simultaneously (or consecutively) not only subjects but also objects, and claims that dialogic interaction, activity and communication of people can be characterized by subject-subject and subject-object relations as well. Hence, the author concludes that activity contains elements of communication, and communications contains those of activity. However, the author believes that activity is not a kind of communication, and communication is not a kind of activity (Bush G., 1985, p. 37).

Some believe that interaction is a kind of communication, which does extend the boundaries of what the notion of interaction means. For example, V.D. Shirshov, who studies the issue of pedagogical communication, keeps to the opinion that communication is a wide notion that encompasses interaction of living creatures, including people (Shirshov V.D., 1995, p. 79).

By contrast, others refer to the definition of communication as an act of interaction therefore narrowing this category, while presenting the structure of interaction as the set of three interconnected elements where communication, together with the interactive and perceptive elements, is only a part of interaction related to exchange of information, which places interaction to a primary position in regard to communication (Birshtein M.M., 1992, p. 56).

Interaction is not identical to communication. The essence of communication is exchanging information. Interaction is wider and it includes communication. Interaction suggests a connection between people, as a result of which one personality influences the other (mutual influence).

Taking into account the definition of communication as an act of interaction, or connection between two or more individuals based on mutual understanding, one person transmitting the information to another person or a group of persons, we can conclude that communication is primarily about exchanging various information (ideas, thoughts, beliefs, views, feelings, moods, emotions, instruction etc).

However, we believe that human interaction is not limited to exchange of information, as it is the case with communication. Due to the process of interaction also including the feedback component, the information is not only

transmitted but also formed, specified, developed, added, denied, contradicted, corrected and so on.

So while we view interaction as a system of subject-subject relationships, communication is built on the subject-object principle. To our mind, this is the difference to reveal the essence of the two abovesaid notions.

Interaction exists only between people, a person or a group of people. Meanwhile communication suggests a sort of connection between inanimate and animated nature systems that promotes exchange of information. However, if during this act of exchanging information (in the case of communication we mean one-direction connection only) information is transmitted by one or the other communicator, and vice versa, then interaction is characterized by the presence of feedback as well.

Communication is presented as action within the limits of which the sender encodes the ideas and feelings into a sort of message and then uses a certain channel – speech or writing, or another connection – to transmit it to the recipient. Communication is recognized as successful if the message is received by the recipient. Such model, in terms of N.V. Kazarinova, is a linear one. But in case of interaction, it is replaced with an interactive model that demonstrates a circular process of information exchange with changing roles all the time (the sender and the recipient changing these roles one after another) (Kazarinova N. V., 2000, p. 11).

G.G. Pocheptsov introduces the notion of a communication square reflecting a uniformly important role of both the communicator and the recipient of the information (Pocheptsov G.G., 2000, p. 334–335). The more information comes from the recipient, the more successful the result. There is no such rule for the communicator's side as large volumes of information do not necessarily result in positive outcomes. The information on the recipient should include, among other, its symbols and topics, both allowed and forbidden. The communicator is also in charge of the communicative situation – which cannot be said to apply to the recipient as well. One of the main tasks of communication is determining the beginning and the end of the process: the communicator should not let the recipient have the chance of disconnecting from the process before due time, or connect to the process later than necessary. In this case, we deal with managing the attention of the audience.

A person becomes an actual subject of the interaction process only when he / she shows active position in free and independent communicative activity.

V.D. Shyrshov understands communicative activity as «interaction of beings between themselves and their purposeful and active operations regarding phenomena and objects of the existing world based on the exchange of information» (Shyrshov V.D., 1995, p. 82).

O.O. Selivanova interprets communicative competence as the ability to mobilize various language-related knowledge, para-verbal means, situations, rules and standards of interaction, society and culture for effective performance of certain communicative tasks in corresponding contexts or situations.

Communicative competence suggests possession of not only knowledge but also skills and techniques of building an intentional and strategic communication program, complying with it, and controlling it in the course of interaction; focusing on the partner in conversation, predicting their reaction; choosing language and para-verbal means of communication and decoding; overcoming communicative obstacles, eliminating communicative noise, finding a way out of the communicative time handicap etc (Selivanova O.O., 2011, p. 546).

The notions of language competence and ability to use it in acts of interaction are differentiated in the works by N. Chomsky who distinguished linguistics competence (mental representations of language rules as internal grammar of ideal native speakers) and linguistics performance (production (outgoing communication) and comprehension (incoming communication) of speech) (quoted as in (Selivanova O.O., 2011, p. 547)).

Modern research works use the term «communicative competence» regarding real speakers and specify that there are other types of competence (pragmatic, socio-cultural, strategical, communicative or subjective, cultural and communicative). In a wider meaning of the term, all these types are concerned with communicative competence. Therefore, the following items are involved into communicative competence:

- linguistic communicative competence as an ability to produce and understand correct speech messages;
- discursive communicative competence as an ability to combine utterances into connected texts and involve them into corresponding discourses;
- sociolinguistic communicative competence as an ability to consider social aspects of the situation of interaction in the course of communicative activities;
- illocutionary communicative competence as an ability to form and implement communicative intentions in a message;
- strategic communicative competence as an ability to plan effectively the beginning, course and final of the communication, and succeed in interaction;
- linguistic cultural competence that determines the speaker's cultural identification, that is, how the speaker adheres to certain culturally conditioned rules and standards of communication;
- intercultural communicative competence which depends on the speaker's need for it and is oriented to two cultures (the native one and the foreign one) etc (Selivanova O.O., 2011, p. 548).

Therefore, while summarizing the abovesaid we should distinguish the following key elements:

- with the term «communication», we encompass the process of information exchange; the exchange of ideas, beliefs, thoughts, views, interests, feelings, moods, emotions, instruction etc;

- the notion of interaction is not limited to the process of information exchange, as it is characterized availability of the feedback component, because information is not only transmitted but also formed, specified, developed, added, denied, contradicted, corrected and so on;
- interaction is interpreted as a system of subject-subject relationships, and communication is built on the subject-object principle. Interaction is a complicated multidimensional process of establishing and developing contacts between people induced by the need for joint activity and including exchange of information, working out a unified cooperation strategy, accepting and understanding the other person;
- the notion of «cooperation» characterizes the other side of interaction that suggests not only exchanging information but also organizing joint activities that allow the communicators to perform certain activities; in doing so, the influence of one participant on the other intended to change the former's behavior acts as one of the components of the communicative process, the mechanisms of which include suggestion, imitation, persuasion and identification;
- we see «communicative competence» as a personal quality that is made up of an aggregate of properties required for successful conduct of communicative activities, that is, for perceptive, communicative, and communicative-operational actions.

Communicative activity is the basis of modern education and its final goal, and without doubt, the process of mastering the Ukrainian language in secondary schools should be organized on the communicative activity basis. A modern school teacher requires proper knowledge on the issue of forming communicative competence of a personality and should have a good understanding of innovative processes to comprehend the need for reforming the techniques applied in teaching the state language (Kulyk O.D., 2014, p. 78). It involves acquiring a number of new, communication-oriented linguistic and linguistic-didactic terms if the goal is to achieve the goals of language education at school. In our understanding, a student's communicative competence is their ability to use effectively their linguistic knowledge and the skills they have formed, along with their own experience in order to harmonize all kinds of interaction, achieve their communicative goals and the desired pragmatic effect. Communicative competence cannot be automated as people acquire it throughout all of their lives, in the process of varied speech acts.

Conclusions. Therefore, communicative competence is the highest stage in achieving cultural communicativeness of a personality, and knowledge of peculiarities and structure of the linguistic communication is necessary for development of a person's own language personality. A communicatively competent person always enjoys respect of other people, certain influence in the society and will reach their goals more quickly. Achieving a high level of communicative competence is a special task to be completed throughout the process of teaching Ukrainian in the secondary school system.

List of literature cited:

1. Andreeva G. M. (1996). Social psychology: A textbook. Moscow: Aspekt Press, 376 (rus.)
2. Birstein M. M. (1992). Main directions in development of business games. *Business games in the world*. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University of Trade and Economics, P. 6–11. (rus.)
3. Bodalev A. A. (1995). Personality and communication. Moscow: International pedagogic academy, 328 (rus).
4. Bush G. (1985). Dialogics and creativity. Riga: Avots, 1985, 318 (rus).
5. Gavra D. P. (2011). Essential theory of communication. St. Petersburg: Piter, 288. (rus).
6. Kazarinova N. V. (2000). Interpersonal communication: Compendium of lectures. St. Petersburg: V.A. Mikhailov's Publishing House, 64 (rus).
7. Kulyk O. D. (2014). Language and speech personality: the problem of definitions. *Theoretical and didactical philology: a collection of scientific papers*. Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi: Sole Proprietor Lukashevych, 17, 76–89. (ukr).
8. Plutarch (1983). *Moralia on the Government Matters*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 703. (rus).
9. Pocheptsov G. G. (2000). Communicative technologies of the XX century. Moscow: Refl-Buk, K.: Vakler, 352. (rus).
10. A psychological dictionary (1999). V. P. Zinchenko, B. G. Meshcheriakov (ed.) Moscow: Pedagogika-Press, 440. (rus).
11. Psychology: A dictionary (1990) / A. V. Petrovskiy, M. G. Yaroshevskiy (ed.) Moscow: Politizdat, 494. (rus).
12. Selivanova O.O. (2011). A linguistic encyclopedia. Poltava: Dovkillya-K, 844. (ukr.).
13. The explanatory dictionary of the Russian language: 80 000 words and phraseological expressions (1999) / S. I. Ozhegov, N. Yu. Shvedova (compiler). Moscow: Azbukovnik, 944. (rus).
14. The Ukrainian language: Encyclopedia (2004). Rusanivskiy V. M., Taranenko O. O., Ziabliuk M. P. et al (ed.). Kyiv: Ukrainska Entsiklopedia Publishers named after M. P. Bazhan, 824. (ukr.).
15. Chomsky N. (1972). Language and thinking. Moscow: The MGU (Moscow State University) Publishing House, 122. (rus).
16. Shirshov V. D. (1995). The essence and structure of the notion of “pedagogical communication”. *The notional apparatus of pedagogics and education: a collection of scientific papers*. Vol. 1. Ekaterinburg, 78–87. (rus).
17. Hymes D. H. (1972). On Communicative Competence in Sociolinguistics. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 269–293. (eng).
18. Plutarch (1983). *Moralia on the Government Matters*. Moscow: Fiction, 703. (eng).

*Статтю рекомендовано до друку
доктором педагогічних наук, професором
кафедри української мови
Київського університету імені Бориса Грінченка
Овсієнко Людмилою Миколаївною*

Стаття надійшла до редакції 20 вересня 2018 року

Елена Кулик

кандидат педагогических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры украинской
лингвистики и методики обучения
ГВУЗ «Переяслав-Хмельницкий государственный педагогический
университет имени Григория Сковороды»,
ул. Сухомлинского, 30, г. Переяслав-Хмельницкий, Украина, 08400
olenakulyk@gmail.com

**КОММУНИКАТИВНАЯ КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТЬ: ПОДХОДЫ
К ОПРЕДЕЛЕНИЮ И РОЛЬ В ФОРМИРОВАНИИ ЯЗЫКОВОЙ
ЛИЧНОСТИ**

Олена Кулик

кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри української
лінгвістики і методики навчання
ДВНЗ «Переяслав-Хмельницький державний педагогічний університет
імені Григорія Сковороди»,
вул. Сухомлинського, 30, м. Переяслав-Хмельницький, Україна, 08400
olenakulyk@gmail.com

**КОМУНІКАТИВНА КОМПЕТЕНТНІСТЬ:
ПІДХОДИ ДО ВИЗНАЧЕННЯ ТА РОЛЬ
У ФОРМУВАННІ МОВНОЇ ОСОБИСТОСТІ**