PRACTICE OF DEVELOPING FUTURE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS' PEDAGOGICAL DISCOURSE COMPETENCE

Ochilova Nilufar Ulmasovna
PhD, Senior Lecturer and Doctoral Researcher,
Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract. *The article defines pedagogical discourse competence as a future foreign language teacher's ability to design, conduct, analyse, and ethically regulate classroom interaction. An integrative review of international, Uzbek, and Russian methodological scholarship supports a six-component structure comprising linguistic-pragmatic accuracy, interaction management, pedagogical intentionality, mediation, reflection, and ethical-intercultural responsiveness. The proposed DIDACT cycle connects diagnosis, intentional design, discourse rehearsal, analysis of interactional evidence, collaborative reflection, and transfer to teaching practice. It offers a concise mechanism for integrating discourse development into methodology courses, microteaching, and practicum.*

Keywords. *pedagogical discourse competence, foreign language teacher education, classroom interaction, mediation, reflective practice.*

Annotatsiya. *Maqolada pedagogik diskurs kompetensiyasi bo‘lajak chet tili o‘qituvchisining sinf muloqotini maqsadli loyihalash, amalga oshirish, tahlil qilish va axloqiy boshqarish qobiliyati sifatida talqin etiladi. Xalqaro, o‘zbek va rus metodik manbalarini umumlashtirish asosida kompetensiyaning olti tarkibiy qismi hamda diagnostika, loyihalash, mashq, daliliy tahlil, hamkorlikdagi refleksiya va amaliyotga transferni birlashtiruvchi DIDACT sikli taklif qilinadi.*

Kalit so‘zlar. *pedagogik diskurs kompetensiyasi, chet tili o‘qituvchisi, sinf muloqoti, mediatsiya, refleksiv amaliyot.*

Аннотация. *Педагогическая дискурсивная компетенция рассматривается как способность будущего учителя иностранного языка целенаправленно проектировать, осуществлять, анализировать и этически регулировать учебное взаимодействие. На основе международных, узбекских и российских методических источников выделены шесть компонентов компетенции и предложен цикл DIDACT, объединяющий диагностику, проектирование, дискурсивную репетицию, анализ данных, совместную рефлексию и перенос освоенных действий в педагогическую практику.*

Ключевые слова. *педагогическая дискурсивная компетенция, учитель иностранного языка, взаимодействие в классе, медиация, рефлексивная практика.*

INTRODUCTION

A foreign language lesson is realised through discourse. Questions, explanations, reformulations, feedback, repair, wait time, and turn allocation determine whether learners merely reproduce an answer or participate in constructing meaning. Language proficiency is therefore necessary but insufficient for professional teaching. A future teacher must connect every interactional move with a pedagogical purpose and adapt it to learners' cognitive, linguistic, and emotional needs. This professionally situated capacity is defined as pedagogical discourse competence.

The CEFR Companion Volume emphasises interaction, mediation, plurilingual resources, and collaborative meaning-making (Council of Europe, 2020). Uzbek methodology also treats communicative purpose, exercise systems, conscious learning, and learner activity as interrelated principles (Jalolov, 2012). Russian scholarship similarly links foreign language instruction with communicative, cognitive, and intercultural development (Galskova & Gez, 2006; Shchukin & Frolova, 2015). However, teacher education programmes do not always make the micro-processes of classroom talk an explicit object of instruction and assessment. This article therefore aims to define the structure of pedagogical discourse competence and propose a concise mechanism for its development.

METHODOLOGY

The study uses an integrative review and conceptual-modelling method. Research on classroom discourse, interactional competence, dialogic teaching, mediation, reflective practice, and national traditions of foreign language methodology was compared by professional function. Recurring teacher actions were identified, grouped into components, and converted into observable indicators suitable for coursework, microteaching, and practicum. This design produces a theoretically grounded model rather than reporting unverified experimental effects.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis distinguishes pedagogical discourse competence from both general communicative competence and target-language proficiency. Its unit is not the isolated grammatical sentence but the discourse move evaluated through its educational consequence. An open question, for example, becomes pedagogically productive only when its cognitive demand, wait time, learner uptake, and subsequent feedback enable elaboration. This position develops the communicative orientation emphasised in Uzbek methodological literature (Hoshimov & Yakubov, 2003; Jalolov, 2012) and the activity-based, intercultural orientation represented in Russian methodology (Shchukin & Frolova, 2015).

Pedagogical discourse competence includes six interdependent components. The linguistic-pragmatic component ensures accurate, comprehensible, and context-

appropriate teacher talk. The interactional component regulates turns, repair, wait time, and equitable participation. Pedagogical intentionality aligns discourse choices with lesson aims. The mediational component enables the teacher to reframe, summarise, connect ideas, and gradually withdraw support. Reflective competence uses transcripts, video, or observation evidence to compare intended and enacted interaction. The ethical-intercultural component protects learner dignity and recognises linguistically and culturally diverse resources. The components must operate together because accurate speech may remain teacher-dominated, while active discussion may lack educational direction.

The proposed DIDACT cycle operationalises this structure. Diagnose reveals habitual interaction patterns through a short video, transcript, or discourse-awareness task. Intentional design requires both a learning objective and an interaction objective. Discourse rehearsal uses microteaching, role play, and alternative scripting. Analysis examines evidence such as turn distribution, wait time, question type, repair, and treatment of errors. Collaborative reflection compares the lesson intention with learner responses and peer or mentor interpretation. Transfer requires the revised discourse decision to be applied in a new teaching context. The cycle thus links university study with school practice and converts broad judgements such as 'communicative' or 'confident' into evidence-based feedback.

Implementation should be distributed across the teacher-education programme. Methodology students can annotate transcripts, compare restrictive and dialogic exchanges, and redesign feedback sequences. During microteaching, each lesson should focus on one manageable discourse target. In practicum, mentors and students should use shared indicators and collect brief interactional evidence. A portfolio may include an interaction plan, transcript extract, learner-response evidence, self-analysis, peer feedback, and a revised decision. Data-led reflection is important because rapid classroom interaction cannot be reconstructed reliably from memory (Walsh & Mann, 2015). Conversation-analytic work also shows that the value of a teacher move depends on its sequential context and participant response (Sert, 2015; Waring, 2016).

The scientific novelty of the framework lies in defining pedagogical discourse competence as a distinct integrative outcome of teacher education and linking its components to a repeatable developmental cycle. It connects macro-level pedagogical aims with micro-level language choices, participation, and reflection. Assessment should therefore combine observable indicators with contextual professional judgement and should use evidence from several teaching events rather than a single lesson.

CONCLUSION

Pedagogical discourse competence is the mechanism through which methodological knowledge becomes learner-responsive classroom action. Its formation requires coordinated linguistic-pragmatic, interactional, intentional, mediational, reflective, and ethical-intercultural development. The DIDACT cycle provides a practical structure for diagnosis, rehearsal, evidence-based reflection, and transfer. Embedding this cycle in methodology courses, microteaching, and practicum can help future foreign language teachers create purposeful, dialogic, and inclusive learning interaction.

REFERENCES

1. Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. Council of Europe Publishing.
2. Galskova, N. D., & Gez, N. I. (2006). Teoriya obucheniya inostrannym yazykam: Lingvodidaktika i metodika. Moscow: Akademiya.
3. Hoshimov, O‘., & Yakubov, I. (2003). Ingliz tili o‘qitish metodikasi. Tashkent: Sharq.
4. Jalolov, J. J. (2012). Chet til o‘qitish metodikasi. Tashkent: O‘qituvchi.
5. Sert, O. (2015). Social Interaction and L2 Classroom Discourse. Edinburgh University Press.
6. Shchukin, A. N., & Frolova, G. M. (2015). Metodika prepodavaniya inostrannykh yazykov. Moscow: Akademiya.
7. Walsh, S., & Mann, S. (2015). Doing reflective practice: A data-led way forward. ELT Journal, 69(4), 351-362. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv018
8. Waring, H. Z. (2016). Theorizing Pedagogical Interaction: Insights from Conversation Analysis. Routledge.