ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

ISSN: 2692-515-x, Impact Factor: 9.23

American Academic publishers, volume 6, issue 01,2026

Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

COMMUNICATIVE DEVELOPMENT AS A CRUCIAL ELEMENT IN THE FORMATION OF STUDENTS' PERSONALITY

Mamatova Nilufar Abdukhoshimovna
Department of foreign languages
Andijan state medical institute

Abstract

This article explores the concept of communicative development as a critical element in the formation of a student's personality. It emphasizes the multidimensional and socially-conditioned nature of communicative development, highlighting its close connection with broader mental processes such as thinking, speech, and reasoning. The article proposes a hierarchical classification of communicative tasks corresponding to increasing levels of complexity and sophistication in communication strategies. Furthermore, the study introduces the notion of a "communicative level" as a developmental milestone characterized by unique novelties in addressing communicative tasks. Finally, it discusses how communicative development contributes to self-awareness, interpersonal competence, and overall functioning within societal contexts.

Keywords

communicative development, students' personality, speech behavior, communicative level, mental processes, logical structure of thought.

The communicative development of a student's personality as a complex multilateral process of socially conditioned changes during human maturation is closely interconnected with the formation of all mental processes, functions, and activities, primarily thinking, speech, and verbal-thinking activity. At the same time, it has its own specifics directly related to key processes in shaping the subject's verbal-thinking and communicative activities that determine their nature and pace of change. The leading among these processes is the gradual transition from one age group to another in the ability to set and solve various communicative speech tasks in communication with people. In this process, all features of personal formation in general and communicative activity in particular are accumulated, which is evidenced by data from our experimental study on the peculiarities of students' communicative development.

The psychological nature of a communicative task as a functional unit of communication is determined by a set of structural and content characteristics, the most important of which is the degree of its communicativity. Classification of communicative tasks based on the criterion of the degree of communicative orientation allows us to build a certain hierarchy of communicative tasks "description-explanation-proof-persuasion," which, according to our research findings, reflects not only an increasingly complicated chain both structurally and substantively but also a definite trend in the communicative development of the subject at different stages of higher education. Notably, this sequence of communicative speech tasks correlates with the periodization of human mental development theoretically justified by L.S. Vygotsky and his followers. For example, tasks whose psychological nature belongs to the category of "description" are most relevant to the psychological characteristics of first-year students, although this does not mean that they can only solve such tasks. Their arsenal of speech behavior in communication is quite rich, so solving communicative tasks is carried out

ISSN: 2692-515-x, Impact Factor: 9.23
American Academic publishers, volume 6, issue 01,2026
Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

by means and methods appropriate for their level of communicative development at this stage of university studies.

In other words, if achieving an optimal way of solving a communicative task of "description" becomes the "psychological novelty" (a term coined by L.S. Vygotsky) of communicative development for freshmen, then solving tasks of a higher order can be considered the main "reserve" (V.V. Davydov, D.B. Elkonin terms) of communicative formation for students at this level. Hence arises the relevance of posing the question about the relevancy between the psychological characteristics of the subject's age and the psychological nature of the communicative tasks he/she solves in the course of communication.

It is known that the psychological characteristics of younger, middle, and older schoolchildren, as well as students—all those age groups involved in active educational activities to varying degrees—have been comprehensively studied and described long ago in domestic and foreign literature. However, the psychological nature of communicative tasks emerged relatively recently as an independent object of theoretical and empirical research. Here, the comparison of the ontogenetic plane or the plan of psychic maturation of man, on the one hand, and the plan of mastering existing language and speech tools and ways of influencing the communication partner, on the other, presents undoubted interest. Our research, conducted precisely in this area, has shown that the psychological content of communicative tasks through which communication is realized is determined by a number of structural and substantive characteristics. Structural characteristics include the composition of the logical structure of thought used to solve them.

Content characteristics include a range of parameters: form and character of reflection of reality, type of revealed connections, forms of cognitive activity engaged, presence or absence of reliance on visual aids, influence on the communication partner, necessity of their physical presence in the act of communication, nature of their response, i.e., the composition of the listener's communicative task. Thus, for instance, "description" unites into one group similar tasks that share common psychological properties and exhibit the lowest degree of communicativity. All of them, like description itself, feature single-component thought structures, predominance of empirical forms of reflecting reality, and explicit temporal links. They originate mainly from concrete-imagery forms of thinking, require mandatory reliance on visualization, exert minimal impact on the communication partner, do not necessitate their participation in the communicative act, and elicit minimal reaction from them, often limited to simply representing the situation described by the speaker.

On the opposite pole lies "persuasion," along with similar tasks, characterized by three-part thought structures upon resolution, dominance of theoretical forms of reflecting reality, theoretical and logical modes of thought. These tasks convey the greatest number of implicit causal relationships, demonstrate maximum influence on the communication partner and their obligatory presence, maximal recipient engagement manifested in full understanding of what was heard, agreement or disagreement with the speaker's viewpoint, and even emotional attitude towards received information. All the above-named psychological properties of persuasion predetermine its relevance to fourth- and fifth-year students, though, as indicated by our experiment results, even these students sometimes struggle to achieve the optimal method of persuading others. This, however, should not imply that persuasive tasks can only be solved by fourth- or fifth-year students. First-year students too may persuade using methods suitable to their individual potential capabilities.

These identified patterns of students' communicative activity development indicate differential sensitivity of communicative developmental stages to solving different types of

ISSN: 2692-515-x, Impact Factor: 9.23
American Academic publishers, volume 6, issue 01,2026
Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

communicative tasks. In other words, there emerges a question regarding the existence of a "communicative level" of the communicating subject—a phase of development characterized by specific novelties in the taxonomy of communicative speech tasks and the manner of their solution.

Thus, analysis of theoretical literature on the issue of students' communicative development reveals the following points:

Students' communicative development is understood broadly in social terms as a process of socially conditioned changes throughout human maturation, closely linked to the evolution of all their mental processes, functions, and activities, particularly thinking, speech, memory, and communicative activities, determining the nature and rate of their transformation.

From a broad psychoeducational perspective, communicative development represents a lengthy, temporally extended process of ontological establishment of an individual's communicative activity, beginning in infancy and continuing throughout life. It involves:

- A multifaceted process of forming all intellectual and linguistic functions necessary for communication, as well as developing all kinds of speech activities, each manifesting differently across distinct phases of personal growth.

In narrower pedagogical terms, we refer specifically to the process of acquiring skills needed to formulate and resolve diverse communicative tasks within communication.

Communicative development logically can be viewed as a sequential progression through stages in the formation of an individual aimed at creating a subject capable of self-actualization, self-design, reflexivity, self-analysis of one's actions, interpersonal interaction, perception, and communication. It is a complex forward movement where the person ascends to a level of developed interpersonal experience required for a student to establish interpersonal contacts and function successfully in society within the framework of their communicative abilities and social status.

References:

1. Ermakova N.I. Stages of the Competence-Based Approach Formation // Problems of the Competence-Based Approach in Higher Education: Collection of articles. Kaliningrad: Publishing house, 2008
2. O'Malley, J. M., & Valdez Pierce, L. (1996). Authentic assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers. New York: Addison Wesley.
3. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. - Strasbourg: Cambridge University Press, 2001
4. Tom Hutchinson & Alan Waters. English for Specific Purposes. Cambridge University Press, 2006.