

CONFERENCE ARTICLE**A MODEL FOR DEVELOPING COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE BASED ON ESP (ENGLISH FOR ECONOMICS)****Samandarova Nargiza Muxammadovna**

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

ABSTRACT

The expansion of international economic cooperation has increased the demand for graduates who can communicate professionally in English within discipline-specific contexts. General English courses often provide insufficient preparation for tasks typical of economists, such as interpreting analytical texts, reporting data, writing summaries, and presenting evidence-based recommendations. This article proposes a model for developing communicative competence through ESP (English for Economics) grounded in needs analysis, genre-based instruction, task-oriented learning, and aligned assessment. The model integrates linguistic resources with economic reasoning and professional discourse norms, emphasizing authenticity, progressive scaffolding, and reflective learner autonomy. A qualitative design-based approach is used to synthesize key components and describe their pedagogical functioning in a university setting. The resulting framework offers a structured pathway from guided comprehension of economic discourse to independent production of spoken and written genres relevant to academic and workplace environments. The article argues that communicative competence in English for Economics develops most sustainably when instructional objectives, learning activities, materials, and assessment criteria reflect real professional performance rather than isolated language knowledge.

KEYWORDS

ESP, English for Economics, communicative competence, discourse-based teaching, task-based learning, genre pedagogy, needs analysis, assessment alignment.

INTRODUCTION

English has become the principal language of global economic communication, shaping the way economic knowledge is produced, disseminated, and applied. University students in economics must increasingly engage with English-language sources, communicate findings, collaborate with international partners, and participate in professional exchanges. Despite this reality, many language courses in higher education still follow general curricula that prioritize everyday communication and grammar progression detached from disciplinary communication. As a result, learners may demonstrate acceptable general proficiency while struggling with professional tasks that require precision, structured argumentation, and genre awareness.

English for Specific Purposes offers a well-established orientation for resolving this mismatch by aligning language learning with professional needs and discourse practices. However, ESP implementation in economics education often faces practical tensions: some programs concentrate narrowly on terminology, whereas others emphasize "business English" routines without sufficiently developing analytical writing, data commentary, or academic discussion skills. This article addresses the need for a coherent teaching model that organizes aims, content, learning processes, and assessment around communicative competence as it is manifested in economics-related genres and situations. The study objective is to propose and substantiate a model for developing communicative competence based on ESP (English for Economics), suitable for university-level instruction.

The article employs qualitative design-based synthesis. First, key constructs of ESP methodology, communicative competence,

task-based learning, and genre pedagogy are conceptually analyzed to determine their implications for economics-oriented language education. Second, a model is constructed by mapping typical communicative situations of economists to pedagogical components: target competencies, discourse content, learning tasks, and assessment criteria. Third, internal validity of the model is strengthened through logical alignment checks, ensuring that each component supports the stated competence outcomes and that evaluation methods correspond to intended professional performance.

The model is designed for adaptation rather than rigid prescription; it can be implemented within different institutional schedules and proficiency levels by adjusting text complexity, task scope, and the balance between guided and independent work.

The proposed model conceptualizes communicative competence in English for Economics as an integrated capacity to understand and produce discipline-specific discourse appropriately, accurately, and strategically. The model is organized around four interdependent blocks: diagnostic-target, content-discourse, process-task, and evaluation-reflective.

The diagnostic-target block begins with needs analysis that identifies target genres and communicative functions relevant to the local economics curriculum and probable professional trajectories. In practice, this includes specifying what learners must do with language, such as summarizing analytical texts, explaining trends, interpreting indicators, presenting positions, and responding to critique. This block defines competence outcomes in terms of performance descriptors, linking language resources to pragmatic goals and audience expectations. By

treating goals as communicative performances rather than abstract knowledge, the model prevents fragmentation between “language study” and “professional training.”

The content-discourse block selects learning material according to authenticity of economic communication. Authenticity is operationalized as genre validity and discourse logic rather than the use of unmodified expert-level texts. Materials reflect economic reasoning patterns, including cause-effect explanation, comparison of scenarios, cautious claims, and evidence marking. Lexical work focuses on high-frequency academic and economic vocabulary, collocations, and formulaic sequences that support professional genres, while grammar is taught as a resource for meaning-making, such as hedging, modality, and complex noun phrases common in analytical writing.

The process-task block structures learning through cycles that connect input, guided practice, production, and revision. Comprehension tasks emphasize strategic reading and listening, training learners to extract arguments, recognize rhetorical moves, and interpret quantitative or semi-quantitative information embedded in texts. Production tasks shift learners toward speaking and writing in economically meaningful situations, where success depends on coherence, precision, and relevance. Interaction is organized to foster negotiation of meaning and disciplinary reasoning, encouraging students to explain, justify, and reformulate rather than merely answer. Feedback is integrated into the cycle and targets both linguistic accuracy and discourse quality, including organization, clarity of claims, and appropriate use of evidence.

The evaluation-reflective block aligns assessment with the same professional performances that define course goals. Assessment tasks simulate realistic outputs, such as short analytical commentaries, structured presentations of findings, or concise written summaries with clear claims. Criteria combine language correctness with discourse indicators: logical flow, genre conventions, appropriate stance, and terminological accuracy. Reflection is treated as a competence-supporting practice; students review feedback, identify recurring issues, and set micro-goals for improvement. This reflective mechanism supports autonomy by teaching learners how to continue professional language development beyond the course.

The model’s main contribution is the systematic linkage between economics discourse and communicative competence development. It avoids the common reduction of ESP to vocabulary accumulation by embedding lexical learning within genre performance and by foregrounding rhetorical competence. At the same time, it addresses the opposite risk of superficial communicative practice that ignores disciplinary reasoning. In economics, communicative success often depends on how well a speaker or writer frames evidence, signals uncertainty appropriately, and guides an audience through an argument. Therefore, integrating language work with economic thinking is not an added feature but a core condition of competence.

A critical implementation challenge is balancing authenticity with accessibility. The model resolves this by prioritizing authentic discourse features while controlling difficulty through careful selection, scaffolding, and iterative practice. Another decisive factor is assessment alignment. When evaluation measures only discrete grammar points, instruction tends to drift away from professional communication. Performance-based assessment, supported by transparent rubrics, reinforces the model’s internal coherence and motivates learners to practice meaningful outputs.

A model for developing communicative competence based on ESP (English for Economics) should function as an integrated system where needs analysis defines performance outcomes, discourse-based content provides authentic genre exposure, task cycles enable guided-to-independent production, and

aligned assessment evaluates professional communication. The model presented in this article offers a structured pathway for economics students to acquire English as a tool for analysis, argumentation, and professional interaction. Future empirical research may test the model’s effectiveness through controlled course implementations, measuring gains in genre performance, discourse awareness, and communicative confidence.

REFERENCES

1. Hutchinson T., Waters A. *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-Centred Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. 183 p.
2. Dudley-Evans T., St John M. J. *Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. 301 p.
3. Swales J. M. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 260 p.
4. Hyland K. *English for Academic Purposes: An Advanced Resource Book*. London; New York: Routledge, 2006. 288 p.
5. Nation I. S. P., Macalister J. *Language Curriculum Design*. New York: Routledge, 2010. 224 p.
6. Richards J. C. *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 320 p.
7. 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.
8. Long M. H. *Second Language Acquisition and Task-Based Language Teaching*. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2015. 448 p.