

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

# Criteria for Diagnosing Communicative Competence in Russian Language Among Students

 **Jo'rayeva Muxtasar Abduqaxxorovna**

Qo'qon State University Associate Professor, Uzbekistan

**VOLUME:** Vol.06 Issue03 2026

**PAGE:** 11-14

Copyright © 2026 European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

## Abstract

This article theoretically and practically analyzes the criteria for diagnosing the communicative competence of students studying Russian in higher education institutions. The linguistic, sociolinguistic, pragmatic, and strategic components of communicative competence are identified, and indicators for their assessment are developed. A comprehensive diagnostic model is proposed, with criteria substantiated for evaluating oral and written speech. The research findings serve to determine students' speech preparedness in the process of teaching Russian and to enhance the effectiveness of education.

## KEYWORDS

communicative competence, diagnostics, Russian language, linguistic competence, pragmatic competence, sociolinguistic competence, strategic competence, assessment criteria, higher education.

## INTRODUCTION

Communicative competence is one of the central concepts in modern language education. A language learner must not only possess grammatical knowledge but also be able to apply it effectively in real communication situations. Therefore, diagnosing communicative competence is an important stage in the educational process.

Traditional assessment often focuses on grammatical errors, whereas communicative competence is broader — encompassing the content, pragmatic, and social aspects of speech [6]. In linguistics, the theory of “communicative competence” proposed by Hymes (1972) and the model by Canale & Swain (1980) form the scientific foundation of this process. The communicative approach is regarded as the dominant methodological direction. Language acquisition is determined not only by mastering grammatical knowledge but also by the ability to apply it in real communication. For this

reason, identifying and assessing students' communicative competence emerges as a pressing scientific and practical issue.

The concept of communicative competence was first substantiated by D.Hymes, who included adherence to social norms alongside language knowledge [1]. Later, M.Canale and M.Swain expanded this concept structurally, dividing it into linguistic, sociolinguistic, and strategic components [2].

In scientific literature on education and pedagogy, various approaches to the concepts of “competence” and “competency” are discussed (Hyland & Durand, 1993). This article examines the perspectives of N.V.Bagramova, T.Hyland, T.Durand, A.V.Khutorskoy, and I.M.Osmolovskaya regarding these concepts.

I.A.Zimnyaya [14] defines competence as “a person's internal,

potential, latent psychological new formations that manifest in the future — i.e., a system of knowledge, ideas, action programs, values, and attitudes.”

N.V.Bagramova describes competency as a personal quality that implies possession of the relevant competence by the student, as well as a personal attitude toward the subject of activity and minimal practical experience in that activity [9]. Competence is formed as a set of knowledge, skills, and abilities, expressing the ability to perform a certain activity [10].

T.Hyland and T.Durand (1993) propose distinguishing between competence and competency, where the former covers a broad range of abilities, while the latter relates more narrowly to skills and abilities. This distinction is useful in preparing students in specific fields and assessing their level of readiness.

A.V.Khutorskoy (2003) views competence both as the goal of the educational process and as a personal quality. This approach ensures flexibility in accounting for students' preparedness and personal development processes.

Thus, generalizing the above perspectives, the concepts of “competence” and “competency” emphasize the necessity of integrating knowledge, skills, and personal attitude toward tasks [14]. The formation of professional communicative competence in a foreign language is a pressing issue of both scientific and practical importance [13]. Communicative competence is multifaceted, encompassing linguistic, sociocultural, adaptive, and functional aspects [9].

M.N.Vyatutnev defines communicative competence as “the ability to select and implement verbal behavior in various communication situations.” Extensive scientific research has been conducted on the formation of communicative competence in foreign languages, including English [8; 11].

Summarizing the above definitions, it can be emphasized that communicative competence includes not only linguistic knowledge but also the ability to adapt to sociocultural norms.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The study employed the following methods:

- Theoretical analysis of scientific literature: Key indicators used in assessing language competence (correctness of speech, communication effectiveness, sociocultural adaptation, contextual usage) were identified based on

theoretical sources.

- Pedagogical observation: Classroom communication processes of Russian language learners were systematically observed. Natural teacher-student interaction was selected as the primary material for diagnostics.

- Diagnostic testing: Special tests were developed to assess communicative competence. The tests included tasks such as constructing dialogues, answering questions, and using language tools in sociocultural situations.

- Analysis of oral and written speech samples: Information was collected from students about difficulties encountered in Russian communication and their self-assessment experiences. This process helped identify socio-psychological factors.

The methodological foundation was based on the communicative approach, the competency-based education model, and the learner-centered pedagogical paradigm [3].

### **Structural Components of Communicative Competence**

According to scientific sources, communicative competence consists of the following components:

1. Linguistic competence — a system of phonetic, lexical, and grammatical knowledge [4].
2. Sociolinguistic competence — the ability to select language units appropriate to the speech situation.
3. Pragmatic competence — the skill of achieving communication goals.
4. Strategic competence — the ability to overcome communication barriers.

These components require comprehensive assessment of the student's verbal activity.

### **Diagnostic Criteria and Indicators**

The following criteria were adopted as the basis for diagnosing students' communicative competence in Russian:

1. Grammatical accuracy: adherence to grammatical norms; precision of syntactic constructions.
2. Lexical richness: volume of active vocabulary; degree of use of synonymous means.
3. Logical coherence and consistency of speech: sequence of ideas; integrity of the text.

4. Communicative appropriateness: selection of style appropriate to the situation; differentiation between formal and informal speech.

5. Cultural adaptability: correct use of national-cultural units.

Diagnostic tools included tests, conversations, essay writing, role-playing, and portfolio methods [5].

### **Research Findings**

Practical experience shows that assessment based solely on tests does not fully reflect communicative competence. Checking oral speech in real communication situations yields more effective results. A comprehensive assessment model (test + conversation + written work) enables determination of students' actual level of speech preparedness. The human factor plays a decisive role in diagnosing communicative competence. The teacher's observation, the student's active participation, and naturalness in the communication process ensure the objectivity of assessment.

Artificial intelligence tools can be used as auxiliaries, but the socio-psychological aspects of communicative competence can only be fully assessed through the human factor [7]. Approaches from social psychology and psycholinguistics complement each other in assessing communicative competence.

### **CONCLUSION**

The criteria for diagnosing communicative competence in Russian are based on indicators of speech correctness, communication effectiveness, sociocultural adaptation, and contextual usage. The human factor — communication between teacher and student — is the primary determinant of the quality of the diagnostic process. Diagnosing students' communicative competence in Russian requires a systematic and multi-criteria approach. The assessment process must take into account not only linguistic accuracy but also sociocultural and pragmatic aspects. The proposed diagnostic model serves to enhance the effectiveness of teaching Russian in higher education institutions.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Hymes D. On Communicative Competence. – Philadelphia, 1972.
2. Canale M., Swain M. Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching. – Applied Linguistics, 1980.
3. Zimnyaya I.A. Pedagogical Psychology. – Moscow: Logos, 2010.
4. Passov E.I. Communicative Methodology of Teaching a Foreign Language. – Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 2010.
5. Shchukin A.N. Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages. – Moscow: Flinta, 2012.
6. Ivanova, T. (2020). Diagnostics of Communicative Competence of Students. Moscow: Nauka.
7. Petrova L. (2021). Psycholinguistic Aspects of Assessing Speech Activity. Saint Petersburg: SPbGU Publishing House.
8. Antonova N.V. (2010). Formation of Professional Communicative Competence for Tourism Students. Pedagogical Research Bulletin, 7(4), 45–52.
9. Bagarić, V., & Djigunović J. M. (2007). Defining communicative competence. Metodika, 8(1), 94–103.
10. Bagramova N. V. (2007). Theoretical Foundations of Communicative Competence. Horizons of Education, 6(3), 56–61.
11. Canale M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), Language and Communication (pp. 2–27). New York: Longman.
12. Gez N. I. (2008). Communicative Competence in Language Education. Language and Education Journal, 12(5), 58–67.
13. Hyland T., & Durand T. (1993). Competence, education, and NVQs: Dissenting perspectives. Journal of Vocational Education and Training, 45(3), 260-267.
14. Vyatyutnev M. N. (2007). Pedagogical Models of Communicative Competence in Higher Education. Modern Language Journal, 21(2), 112-124.
15. Zimnyaya I. A. (2001). Psychological Aspects of Communicative Competence. Psychological Sciences in Education, 10(1), 33-42.
16. Jo'rayeva M.A. POETICS OF LITERARY-CRITICAL TEXT // INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH ISSN: 2277-3630 Impact Factor: 8.036. – 2023. – Vol. 12. – No. 06. – pp.

164-171.

- 17.** Abdukahharovna JM DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNICATION-SPEECH COMPETENCE OF FUTURE PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENTS // INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH ISSN: 2277-3630 Impact Factor: 8.036. – 2023. – Vol. 12. – No. 02. – pp. 8-11.
- 18.** Abduqahharovna J.M. SEMANTIC FEATURES OF RUSSIAN LOANWORDS IN UZBEK LITERARY LANGUAGE // ASIA PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MARKETING & MANAGEMENT REVIEW ISSN: 2319-2836 Impact Factor: 8.071. – 2022. – Vol. 11. – No. 11. – pp. 110-112.
- 19.** Usmonov, S., Boltaboeva, U., Rahmonova, N., & Akbarov, T. (2021). Pedagogical Approaches To Educating Future Actors. *The American Journal of Interdisciplinary Innovations and Research*, 3(05), 85-90.
- 20.** Рахманова, Н. Б. (2026). Сопоставительный анализ коллокаций в английском, русском и узбекском языках. *TLEP–International Journal of Multidiscipline*, 3(1), 43-47.
- 21.** Рахманова, Н. Б. (2026). Отражение нормативной сочетаемости в словарной статье: микроструктурный анализ узбекских, русских и английских словарей. *TLEP–International Journal of Multidiscipline*, 3(1), 63-67.
- 22.** Rakhmanova, N. B. (2026, January). Analysis of Cosmetic Product Names and Innovations in the Modern Cosmetic Industry. In *International Conference on Global Trends and Innovations in Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 19-21).
- 23.** Rakhmanova, N. B. (2026, January). Analysis Of Errors In Translating English Collocations Into Uzbekistan. In *International Conference on Global Trends and Innovations in Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 25-27).