PEDAGOGICAL AND LINGUISTIC INTERPRETATION OF THE CONCEPT OF PROFESSION-ORIENTED COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

Rajapov Sulaymon

Basical doctoral student, senior lecturer at Tashkent State University of Economics, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Profession-oriented communicative competence (POCC) is increasingly treated as a core learning outcome in higher education because it links language proficiency with the ability to perform professional tasks through interaction. This article clarifies the concept of POCC through a combined pedagogical and linguistic lens. From pedagogy, POCC is interpreted as an integrative educational result that connects learning objectives, instructional design, and assessment with the communicative demands of a future profession. From linguistics, POCC is viewed as a functional system of language resources and discourse practices that enable goal-directed participation in professional communities. Using conceptual analysis and comparative synthesis of key competence-based and ESP frameworks, the paper proposes an operational definition and a componential model suitable for curriculum planning. The results show that POCC should be specified through professional situations, genres, and roles, and assessed via performance evidence rather than decontextualized language tests. The discussion highlights implications for English for Specific Purposes courses and suggests design principles for aligning content, interaction, and evaluation.

KEYWORDS: Profession-oriented communication, communicative competence, ESP, discourse, higher education, competency-based approach.

INTRODUCTION

Competency-based reforms in higher education have shifted language teaching from the accumulation of grammatical knowledge to the development of performative abilities needed for academic and workplace communication. In this context, the concept of profession-oriented communicative competence (POCC) has emerged as a key construct for English language instruction aimed at preparing future specialists. While "communicative competence" has a rich tradition in applied linguistics, the "profession-oriented" dimension introduces additional requirements: communication must be accurate, appropriate, efficient, and ethically grounded in the norms of a given professional field. As a result, POCC is not simply general communicative competence transferred to a work setting; it is a contextualized capacity shaped by occupational tasks, genres, institutional roles, and disciplinary knowledge.

Despite broad usage, POCC is often defined inconsistently across curricula: some descriptions reduce it to vocabulary for a specialty, whereas others equate it with general speaking skills. Such variation complicates program design and assessment because teachers may not share a common understanding of what constitutes evidence of competence. This article therefore aims to provide a pedagogical and linguistic interpretation of POCC and to articulate an operational definition that can inform IMRaD-aligned research and curriculum development in English for

NEXT SCIENTISTS CONFERENCES

Specific Purposes (ESP). The research question guiding the study is: how can POCC be conceptualized in a way that integrates educational outcomes with linguistic and discourse requirements of professional activity?

The study uses qualitative conceptual analysis. First, foundational models of communicative competence and language ability were reviewed to identify constructs relevant to professional communication. Second, ESP literature was analyzed to determine how professional needs, genres, and tasks are operationalized in teaching. Third, pedagogical sources on competence-based education were synthesized to connect linguistic constructs with measurable learning outcomes. The analytical procedure involved identifying recurring conceptual categories, comparing definitions across traditions, and then constructing an integrative model that preserves key distinctions between language knowledge, discourse practices, and professional action. To ensure applicability, the proposed definition is formulated in operational terms, specifying what a student should be able to do in professional contexts and what evidence can be collected through performance-based assessment.

The analysis indicates that POCC can be interpreted in two complementary ways. Pedagogically, POCC represents a planned educational result that emerges when instruction systematically models professional communication and provides scaffolded practice with feedback. In this view, competence is inseparable from curriculum goals, learning activities, and assessment criteria. POCC thus includes readiness to engage in professional communication, the ability to select strategies in uncertain situations, and the capacity to self-regulate and improve based on feedback.

Linguistically, POCC is best understood as functional language ability realized through discourse. It includes knowledge of linguistic forms, pragmatic norms, and genre conventions, but it is not limited to them. In professional settings, meaning is constructed collaboratively, and success depends on the management of turns, stance, politeness, and institutional roles. Consequently, POCC entails the ability to comprehend and produce professional genres such as emails, reports, presentations, meetings, and consultations, using appropriate register and terminology while maintaining coherence and persuasive force. It also includes the ability to negotiate misunderstandings, reframe problems, and align one's speech with the expectations of a professional community.

On the basis of synthesis, POCC is defined as an integrative ability of a future specialist to perform profession-specific communicative actions in a foreign language by mobilizing linguistic resources, discourse-genre knowledge, pragmatic and intercultural norms, and strategic self-regulation to achieve professional goals in typical and non-typical situations. This definition implies a componential model consisting of language and discourse resources (lexico-grammar and terminology), pragmatic and sociocultural appropriateness (norms, roles, politeness, ethics), genre and task competence (ability to operate within professional text types and interaction formats), strategic competence (planning, repair, compensation), and reflective competence (self-assessment and improvement). Importantly, the components are not taught as isolated units; they function as a single system during performance.

The proposed interpretation has several implications for research and practice in higher education English instruction. First, it clarifies why vocabulary-focused ESP courses often fail to produce communicatively capable graduates: terminology knowledge without discourse and pragmatic competence does not guarantee successful participation in meetings, negotiations,

or professional writing. Second, it explains why general speaking practice can remain insufficient when it is detached from professional genres and roles. POCC requires learners to internalize how professional communities structure problems, justify decisions, and attribute responsibility through language.

From an instructional standpoint, the pedagogical dimension suggests that POCC development depends on alignment among learning outcomes, learning tasks, and assessment. Outcomes should be written as performative descriptors tied to professional situations, for example, the ability to present a technical solution to a mixed audience, respond to critical questions, and document decisions in writing. Tasks should simulate the communicative constraints of the profession, including time pressure, incomplete information, and the need to coordinate with others. Feedback should target not only linguistic accuracy but also pragmatic appropriateness, clarity of argumentation, and genre conventions.

From a linguistic standpoint, POCC invites a shift from sentence-level correctness to discourse-level effectiveness. Professional communication frequently involves multimodal and hybrid forms, such as slides with spoken explanation, chat-based coordination, and report writing based on data. Therefore, competence should be assessed through integrated performances where learners read, discuss, write, and present as part of a single task cycle. Assessment instruments should capture evidence of discourse organization, strategic behavior, and appropriateness to role and context. This approach is consistent with modern views of language ability as interactional and goal-directed.

Finally, the integrative definition supports research design by providing measurable constructs. Researchers can operationalize POCC through rubrics that combine linguistic quality with genre fulfillment and pragmatic effectiveness, and they can study how instructional technologies, such as blended learning or simulation-based learning, influence the development of specific components. Such operationalization also improves comparability across studies and programs.

POCC is a complex construct located at the intersection of pedagogy and linguistics. Pedagogically, it is an outcome of competence-based education demonstrated through professional tasks; linguistically, it is functional discourse ability governed by genre and pragmatic norms. The integrative definition proposed in this article offers a practical basis for curriculum planning and assessment in higher education ESP courses. Future work may validate the model empirically through performance data from specific disciplines and refine rubrics for reliable measurement.

REFERENCES

1. Hymes D. H. On Communicative Competence // Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings / ed. by J. B. Pride, J. Holmes. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972. P. 269–293.
2. Canale M., Swain M. Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing // Applied Linguistics. 1980. Vol. 1, No. 1. P. 1–47.
3. Bachman L. F. Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. 408 p.
4. Celce-Murcia M., Dörnyei Z., Thurrell S. Communicative Competence: A Pedagogically Motivated Model with Content Specifications // Issues in Applied Linguistics. 1995. Vol. 6, No. 2. P. 5–35.

5.   Dudley-Evans T., St John M. J. Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. 301 p.

6.   Douglas D. Assessing Languages for Specific Purposes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 310 p.

7.   Hyland K. English for Academic Purposes: An Advanced Resource Book. London; New York: Routledge, 2006. 337 p.

NEXT SCIENTISTS CONFERENCES