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ABSTRACT
This article discusses the views of world scientists and researchers on the subcompetence of communicative competence as main component as well as other subcompetences like grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic. However, the main focus of the paper is exploring the significance of discourse competence in terms of oral and written speech coherence and cohesion.
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DISCUSSION
Despite the fact that most scientists agree with the construct of foreign language communicative competence in general, they do not come to a common opinion about the components of subcompetences and their content. In particular, in one of the first works devoted to the development of models of foreign language communicative competence, M. Canale and M. Swain [1] proposed three components of subcompetence: grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic. A few years later, M. Canale [2] refined this model and identified another, fourth, subcompetence - discourse competence. The analysis of the first models suggests that scientists put their conceptual content in some terms denoting subcompetencies. In particular, "grammatical competence" in its conceptual content corresponded to "linguistic competence", since it included not only knowledge of the grammatical structure of the language being studied, but also knowledge of vocabulary and phonology.

Sociolinguistic subcompetence included both the variability of speech utterance depending on the social context of communication, which is traditionally the subject of study of sociolinguistics, and the socio-cultural component, which consists in knowledge of this very social and cultural context of communication. In this regard, it can be argued that M. Canale and M. Swain significantly limited the conceptual content of socio-cultural competence, reducing it exclusively to the knowledge of the social context of using a foreign language.

Discourse competence includes two basic concepts - "coherence" and "cohesion". Coherence is the connectedness of words in a sentence and the connectedness of sentences in a text. Cohesion is the grammatical, stylistic, logical-semantic integrity of a text.

The model of foreign language communicative competence of M. Canale and M. Swain formed the basis of hundreds of American and European scientists' scientific studies. In Europe, the model of foreign language communicative competence of M. Canale and M. Swain was slightly modified and refined in the study of Ek Van [3], who taking into account the criticism of the first model, has already identified six subcompetencies: linguistic, sociolinguistic, social, sociocultural, discourse and strategic. It is obvious that linguistic competence, which includes a person's knowledge of the grammar, vocabulary and phonology of the foreign language being studied, corresponds in content to the grammatical subcompetence of the model of M. Canale and M. Swain. However, in his model, Ek Van separately presented sociolinguistic, sociocultural, and social subcompetencies.

Note that social subcompetence was first identified and presented by the author. Thus, Ek Van draws the attention of the pedagogical community to the fact that communication and its result depend both on the socio-cultural situation of communication, and on the social roles that speakers follow in the process of communication. The discourse component is also represented in the Ek Van model. Its content does not differ from the eponymous component of the model of M. Canale and M. Swain.
It should be noted that both Ek Van, M. Canale and M. Swain included strategic subcompetence in their models of foreign language communicative competence. This subcompetence is responsible for overcoming the language and information gaps that can inevitably appear in the process of foreign language communication.

In addition to the models of M. Canale and M. Swain and Ek Van, the model of communicative abilities developed by L. Bachman [4] has become widely known in the Western scientific literature. Based on the difference between the terms "competence" (as a knowledge category) and "performance" (as an activity category), Bachman suggested using the more correct, in his opinion, the term "communicative ability". In this way, he focused on how the student will be able to use the acquired knowledge about a foreign language in real oral or written communication. In its structure, the model of communicative abilities differs significantly from all other previously developed models of foreign-language communicative competence. The scientist identifies two main types of competencies - organizational (grammatical and textual components (connectivity of speech utterance)) and pragmatic (the social and cultural aspect of communication, as well as the functional aspect of communication). In fact, the content of the model of L. Bachman's communicative ability coincides with the content of the models of foreign language communicative competence of other authors, but in their structure they are radically different models.

In the Russian methodological literature, the models of foreign language communicative competence of R. P. Milrud, V. V. Safonova and I. L. Bim have become widely known. Also, many scientists based their research on the models of foreign authors M. Canale and M. Swain and. In his model of foreign language communicative competence, R. P. Milrud [5] followed the Western tradition, adding a pragmatic subcompetence. The scientist argued that when communicating, communication participants use utterances for various communicative functions, build a speech utterance in accordance with the communicative and pragmatic goals.

In the model of foreign language communicative competence of V. V. Safonova [6], a significant place is given to socio-cultural subcompetence, which includes sociolinguistic, subject thematic, general cultural and country-specific competencies. In addition to socio-cultural, foreign language communicative competence includes language and speech.

In her model of foreign language communicative competence, G.V. Elizarova [7] took as a basis six components proposed by Ek Van. At the same time, the author considered all six components through the prism of cross-cultural competence, highlighting the cross-cultural component in each of the subcompetencies of foreign-language communicative competence. Thus, G.V. Elizarova was one of the first scientists who tried to combine intercultural competence and foreign language communicative competence.

The most famous and widespread was the model of I. L. Bim [8]. The author included language, speech, socio-cultural, compensatory, and educational-cognitive subcompetencies in the construct of foreign language communicative competence. The fifth component of the I. L. Bim model - educational and cognitive subcompetence was not represented in any of the models of foreign language communicative competence.

Educational and cognitive subcompetence means the ability of a person to engage in self-education during extracurricular time or after graduating from an educational institution for the rest of your life. On the one hand, it may seem strange to include in the model of foreign language communicative competence an aspect that will be universal for any subject of the educational cycle. On the other hand, according to P. V. Sysoev [9], by singling out the educational and cognitive subcompetence separately, I. L. Bim wanted to: a) emphasize the importance of developing the ability to engage in self-education in a foreign language; b) focus on the fact that a foreign language as an object of study has specific properties that require adapting universal skills directly to the teaching of a foreign language and the culture of the countries of the native and studied languages.

Within the framework of our research, the main interest is the development of discourse competence of students. In this regard, we will focus in more detail on such concepts as "discourse competence", "discourse", in linguistic and pedagogical research, these terms have various interpretations. Let's consider some of the definitions. M. Canale understands discourse competence as "the ability to combine grammatical forms and meaning to achieve the unity of spoken and written text". The developer of the CEFR model of foreign language communicative competence understands discourse competence as "the ability to use appropriate strategies in communication and for the interpretation of texts". A text is understood as "any fragment of a spoken or written text, of any volume, distinguished by unity".

A. Davis, A. Brown, C. Elder [10] and others understand discourse competence as "a component of foreign language communicative competence responsible for the coherence and cohesion of the text". H. Brown [11] interprets discourse competence as "the ability to connect sentences together and create a meaningful statement". The Russian term "speech competence", which is very often synonymous with the English
term "discourse competence" includes language competence in four main types of speech activity: listening, speaking, reading and writing.

In the dictionary of methodological terms, E. G. Azimov and A. N. Shchukin [12] define speech competence as "possession of the methods of forming and formulating thoughts through language and the ability to use such methods in the process of perception and generation of speech. It is part of the communicative competence. We should talk about the quantitative and qualitative composition of speech competence. It can be larger or smaller. However, speech competence, like language competence, is not an end in itself, but an intermediate link on the way to communicative competence. They are subject to assimilation to the intermediate link on the way to communicative competence, is not an end in itself, but an

Researcher V. V. Safonov [13] understands the following by "speech competence": "On the one hand, awareness of the general and specific rules of speech behavior in the studied areas of everyday and socially significant communication, and on the other operational knowledge of these rules in order to generate and vary foreign language speech and to correctly interpret the content of authentic speech in a foreign language. The level of culture of perception and generation of speech depends on the level of formation of a person's speech competence. In the process of teaching foreign languages, there is a mutual influence of speech competence in the native language and speech competence in a foreign language. The development of cross-cultural speech competence necessary for the use of language as a means of communication in a foreign-language multicultural environment is hardly possible without the parallel formation and development of the corresponding socio-cultural competence". Popova [14] understands discourse competence as "the ability to create a coherent speech utterance, while observing the thematic organization, coherence, cohesion, rhetorical efficiency and logic within the framework of a real communication situation and an adequate functional style".

CONCLUSION

The analysis of the above definitions of the terms "discourse competence" and "speech competence" indicates that they are identical in their conceptual content. Discourse or speech, competence is the ability of a person to produce a coherent oral or written statement, characterized by coherence and cohesion, as well as to adequately interpret a foreign-language statement when reading or listening. Discourse or speech, competence is inextricably linked with all other subcompetencies of foreign language communicative competence (grammatical and socio-cultural /intercultural) and is formed in students along with other components. Some discourse / speech skills (abilities) can be universal and can be transferred from the native language to a foreign language (in the absence of socio-cultural conflicts and socio-cultural gaps).
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