



COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING:

Denov tadbirkorlik va pedagogika instituti

Filologiya fakulteti xorijiy til va adabiyot yo'nalishi

3-bosqich 305-XT guruh talabalari

Reyimboyev Umidjon Otabek o'g'li

Nurmamatov Azamat Abdunazar o'g'li

Raximov Umid Bahodir o'g'li

Abdullayev Xumoyiddin Baxodir o'g'li

umidjonreyimboyev27@gmail.com

Tel: +998200094530

nurmamatova975@gmail.com

Tel: +998888062505

Umidrahimov561@gmail.com

Tel: +998976226555

Abdullayevxumoyiddin16@gmail.com

Tel: +998502773766

Annotatsiya: *Ushbu maqola zamonaviy xorijiy til ta'limidagi eng ta'sirchan metodologik yondashuvlardan biri — Kommunikativ Til O'qitish (Communicative Language Teaching, CLT) ni keng qamrovli tarzda tahlil qiladi. Maqolada CLT ning ijtimoiy-lingvistik asoslardan kelib chiqqan tarixiy shakllanishi ko'rib chiqiladi, uning asosiy nazariy tamoyillari bayon etiladi hamda ushbu paradigma doirasidagi o'qituvchi va o'quvchi rollarining evolyutsiyasi o'rganiladi. CLT ga asoslangan bir qator sinfxona usullari muhokama qilinadi va ushbu yondashuvning kuchli hamda zaif tomonlari tanqidiy nuqtai nazardan baholanadi. Maqola xilma-xil ta'lim muhitlarida, xususan, O'zbekistonning joriy ta'lim islohotlari kontekstida CLT ni joriy etishga oid amaliy tavsiyalar bilan yakunlanadi.*



Kalit so'zlar: kommunikativ til o'qitish, kommunikativ kompetensiya, til o'qitish metodologiyasi, vazifalarga asoslangan o'zaro muloqot, o'quvchiga yo'naltirilgan ta'lim.

Abstract: This article provides a comprehensive examination of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), one of the most influential methodological frameworks in contemporary second and foreign language education. The paper traces the historical emergence of CLT from its sociolinguistic foundations, elaborates on its core theoretical principles, and explores the evolving roles of teachers and learners within this paradigm. A range of CLT-based classroom techniques is discussed alongside a critical evaluation of the approach's strengths and limitations. The article concludes with practical recommendations for implementing CLT in diverse educational settings, with particular attention to the context of Uzbekistan's ongoing educational reforms.

Keywords: communicative language teaching, communicative competence, language teaching methodology, task-based interaction, learner-centred instruction.

Throughout the history of language pedagogy, the dominant question has remained consistent: how can learners best be equipped to use a language effectively in real-life communication? For much of the twentieth century, methodology was dominated by the Grammar-Translation Method and, later, the Audio-Lingual Method, both of which prioritised structural accuracy over communicative fluency. Learners could recite paradigms and complete drills with precision, yet found themselves unable to hold a spontaneous conversation or respond appropriately in authentic social contexts. It was against this backdrop that Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emerged in the 1970s and 1980s, principally in British and North American applied linguistics. Drawing on the sociolinguistic work of Dell Hymes (1972), the notional-functional syllabus proposals of David Wilkins (1976), and the transformative linguistic theories of Noam Chomsky, CLT repositioned the goal of language instruction from the mastery of grammatical rules to the development of communicative competence. This conceptual shift fundamentally altered how educators understand the relationship between language knowledge and language



use. The theoretical core of CLT rests on Dell Hymes's concept of communicative competence (1972), which he introduced as a response to Chomsky's distinction between 'competence' and 'performance.' Whereas Chomsky focused on an idealised speaker-listener's innate grammatical knowledge, Hymes argued that speakers must also know when, where, and to whom to use language appropriately. Communicative competence, in Hymes's formulation, encompasses not only what is grammatically possible but what is socially feasible, contextually appropriate, and practically achievable. Canale and Swain (1980) later expanded this framework into four distinct sub-competencies, which remain influential in CLT theory today: Grammatical competence — knowledge of the formal linguistic system, including phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexis; Sociolinguistic competence — the ability to produce and interpret language appropriately in different social and cultural contexts; Discourse competence — the capacity to connect sentences into coherent spoken or written texts; Strategic competence — the use of verbal and non-verbal strategies to manage communication breakdowns and enhance effectiveness. Wilkins's (1976) notional-functional syllabus further shaped CLT by organising language content around communicative functions (e.g., requesting, apologising, expressing certainty) and notions (e.g., time, quantity, location) rather than grammatical structures. This shift enabled syllabus designers to align language teaching more closely with real-world communicative needs. Richards and Rodgers (2001) identify several defining principles that distinguish CLT from preceding methodologies: Language learning is learning to communicate: the primary aim is developing the learner's ability to convey and interpret meaning in real interaction. Fluency and accuracy are both important: while communicative fluency is the ultimate goal, accuracy is developed in the service of meaningful communication rather than as an end in itself. Learners learn by doing: authentic language use, not mechanical repetition, is the primary vehicle for acquisition. Classroom activities should reflect real-life communication: tasks must be meaningful, purposeful, and relevant to learners' actual communicative needs. The learner's own experiences are valuable resources: CLT encourages personal expression and draws on learners'



backgrounds, opinions, and interests. One of the most significant departures of CLT from traditional pedagogy lies in the reconceptualisation of classroom roles. In conventional methods, the teacher occupied the central position as the authoritative transmitter of knowledge — the “sage on the stage.” CLT, by contrast, repositions the teacher as a facilitator, needs analyst, and communicative resource. The teacher’s primary responsibility is to create conditions that promote genuine interaction: designing meaningful tasks, selecting relevant materials, monitoring learner language, and providing feedback that encourages rather than inhibits communication. The learner, correspondingly, transitions from a passive recipient to an active participant and co-constructor of meaning. Learners are expected to take risks, engage in negotiation of meaning, collaborate with peers, and reflect on their own communicative progress. Error correction in CLT is approached strategically: errors that impede communication are addressed, while those that are part of the natural developmental process are often tolerated to preserve communicative flow. CLT encompasses a broad range of pedagogical activities, all unified by their communicative purpose. Among the most widely employed are the following: Information-gap activities — learners hold different pieces of information and must communicate to complete a shared task, replicating the natural conditions of real conversation; Role-plays and simulations — learners perform communicative scenarios drawn from everyday life (e.g., booking a hotel room, negotiating a deal, resolving a complaint); Problem-solving tasks — small groups collaboratively work towards a solution, requiring the negotiation of meaning and justification of choices; Project work — extended tasks in which learners research, plan, and present findings on a topic of relevance, integrating all four language skills; Debates and discussions — structured argumentation that develops critical thinking alongside persuasive oral communication; Jigsaw activities — each learner acquires a distinct portion of information that must be shared with peers to complete a collective understanding. These activities share a common characteristic: they are task-based, meaning-focused, and require genuine exchange of information or opinion. They stand in contrast to purely form-focused exercises such as grammatical drills or



decontextualised vocabulary tests. CLT has earned widespread endorsement for substantive reasons. Empirical research consistently demonstrates that communicatively oriented instruction produces more proficient and confident speakers than purely form-focused approaches (Savignon, 2002). CLT increases learner motivation by connecting classroom activity to real-world communication; it develops all four language skills in an integrated manner; and it fosters critical thinking, intercultural awareness, and learner autonomy. Nevertheless, CLT has attracted substantive criticism. Holliday (1994) challenged the uncritical exportation of CLT to non-Western educational contexts, arguing that it embeds culturally specific assumptions about learner autonomy and participatory interaction that may conflict with local pedagogical traditions. Medgyes (1986) raised concerns that CLT systematically disadvantages non-native speaker teachers, whose inability to model spontaneous native-like speech may undermine their authority in a communicatively oriented classroom. Additional critiques note that in large, examination-driven classes with limited resources, the practical implementation of CLT can be severely constrained. Furthermore, critics observe that CLT, in its strong form, may neglect systematic attention to grammatical form, potentially resulting in learners who communicate fluently but with persistent inaccuracies. This has prompted the emergence of more balanced post-CLT frameworks, such as Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and the Focus-on-Form approach, which seek to integrate communicative fluency with explicit attention to linguistic accuracy. The principles of CLT hold particular relevance for Uzbekistan, which has undertaken ambitious reforms to modernise its educational system and raise the quality of foreign language instruction. Presidential decrees and national programmes have prioritised English language proficiency as a strategic national competency, introducing English from the first grade of primary schooling and expanding teacher training initiatives. These reforms align broadly with the communicative philosophy: the stated goal is not merely to produce learners who know the language but learners who can use it. However, systemic challenges complicate wholesale adoption of CLT in Uzbek classrooms. Class sizes frequently exceed forty students, limiting opportunities for



individual communicative practice. High-stakes examinations retain a strong structural and grammatical emphasis, creating a backwash effect that incentivises form-focused teaching. Moreover, a significant proportion of English teachers, particularly in rural areas, received their own training within predominantly structural methodologies and may lack both the confidence and the methodological preparation to implement CLT effectively. In light of these realities, an eclectic approach is recommended for Uzbek educators: one that adopts the communicative orientation and learner-centred spirit of CLT while adapting its techniques pragmatically to local class sizes, assessment demands, and institutional cultures. Targeted professional development, the redesign of national examinations to reward communicative performance, and the production of locally grounded CLT-based materials would all support a more sustainable integration of this approach. Communicative Language Teaching has fundamentally transformed our understanding of what it means to know and use a language. By foregrounding communicative competence, authentic interaction, and learner agency, CLT has moved the profession beyond the narrow preoccupation with grammatical correctness that characterised earlier methods. Its central insight — that language is best learned through meaningful use rather than through isolated formal study — has been broadly confirmed by decades of research in second language acquisition. At the same time, CLT is not a monolithic or universal solution. Its effective implementation demands sensitivity to local context, careful teacher preparation, and the willingness to adapt principled theory to practical reality. For educators and policymakers in Uzbekistan and beyond, the most productive path forward lies not in importing CLT wholesale but in internalising its communicative principles and translating them into pedagogically sound, contextually appropriate practice. When this is achieved, CLT ceases to be merely a methodology and becomes a genuine philosophy of language education.

REFERENCES

1. Brumfit, C.J., & Johnson, K. (Eds.). (1979). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.



2. Choriyeva, I., & Buronova, M. (2020). *Teaching aids and teaching materials for EFL classes*. Евразийский научный журнал, (1), 37–38.
3. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
4. Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Penguin Books.
6. Krashen, S.D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon Press.
7. Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Medgyes, P. (1986). Queries from a communicative teacher. *ELT Journal*, 40(2), 107–112.
9. Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
10. Savignon, S.J. (2002). *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching: Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education*. Yale University Press.
11. Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford University Press.
12. Wilkins, D.A. (1976). *Notional Syllabuses*. Oxford University Press.