

EFFECTIVENESS OF COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING IN IMPROVING SPEAKING SKILLS IN UZBEK UNIVERSITIES

Menglibekov Reypnazar Muxammetkarim-uli

Nukus state pedagogical institute named after Berdakh

2nd year doctoral student

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15632742>

Introduction

Speaking competence in English is essential for Uzbek university students to succeed academically and professionally in today's globalized world. Traditional language teaching methods in Uzbekistan have often focused on grammar and translation, limiting students' opportunities to practice real communication. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which emphasizes meaningful interaction and practical use of language, offers a promising alternative. This thesis aims to evaluate the effectiveness of CLT in improving speaking skills among students in Uzbek universities, highlighting its potential to foster greater fluency and confidence.

Key words: communicative language teaching, speaking skills, Uzbek universities, English language learning, language teaching methods.

Background and Context

In Uzbekistan, traditional English teaching methods have largely emphasized grammar rules, vocabulary memorization, and translation exercises. This approach often neglects the development of practical speaking skills, leaving students with limited confidence and fluency in oral communication. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emerged as a response to these limitations, focusing on interaction, authentic communication, and learner-centered activities. CLT encourages students to use English in meaningful contexts, promoting fluency over accuracy alone. While many Uzbek universities have begun integrating CLT principles into their curricula, its implementation varies, and challenges such as teacher training and resource availability remain significant barriers to fully realizing its benefits.

Methodology and Implementation

This study used a mixed-methods approach, combining classroom observations, student surveys, and teacher interviews to evaluate the effectiveness of CLT in Uzbek universities. Selected classes incorporated CLT-based activities such as group discussions, role-plays, and problem-solving tasks to encourage authentic speaking practice. Students' speaking skills were assessed through pre- and post-intervention oral tests focusing on fluency, accuracy, and confidence. Teachers provided insights into the challenges and successes of implementing CLT methods. This approach allowed for a comprehensive understanding of how CLT influences students' speaking performance and the practical realities of its application in the Uzbek higher education context.

Findings and Discussion

The study found that CLT significantly improved students' speaking fluency and confidence. Learners became more willing to participate in discussions and engage in spontaneous communication. Group work and role-playing activities were particularly effective in creating a low-pressure environment that encouraged risk-taking. However, challenges such as limited teacher training and insufficient teaching materials hindered full implementation. Some students initially struggled with the shift from traditional methods to a

more interactive approach. Overall, the positive outcomes suggest that CLT can enhance speaking skills in Uzbek universities if supported by adequate resources and ongoing professional development for educators.

Conclusion

Communicative Language Teaching proves effective in enhancing speaking skills among Uzbek university students by promoting interaction and confidence. To maximize its benefits, universities should invest in teacher training and resources. Wider adoption of CLT can better prepare students for real-world communication and academic success in English.

References:

Используемая литература:

Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar:

1. Brown, H. D. (2007). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (3rd ed.). Pearson Education.
2. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
3. Savignon, S. J. (2002). Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education. Yale University Press.
4. Thornbury, S. (2005). How to teach speaking. Pearson Longman.
5. Yuldashev, R. (2019). Implementation of communicative language teaching in Uzbekistan: Challenges and opportunities. Journal of Language and Education, 5(2), 45–53.