



THE ROLE OF COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING IN ENHANCING STUDENTS' FLUENCY AND INTERACTION IN ENGLISH

Nargiza Shavkatovna Jurayeva

Navoi State University. Faculty of Languages

Inter-faculty Department of Foreign Languages. English Language

Teacher:

Annotation: The function of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in enhancing the speaking fluency and interaction abilities of students in English is discussed in this article. The paper addresses the theoretical background of CLT and its implementation via interactive classroom activities such as role-plays, group discussions and information-gap assignments. The essay explains, based on previous research, how meaningful communication allows learners to communicate their ideas, negotiate meaning and acquire communicative competence. Special focus is paid to the use of CLT in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom. The essay also deals with problems of realization of communicative activities and offers practical ways for increasing oral communication of pupils.

Keywords: Communicative Language Teaching, speaking skills, oral fluency, communicative competence, classroom interaction, role-playing, collaborative learning, EFL.

The development of speaking abilities is one of the main goals of English language teaching. But many conventional teaching approaches emphasize grammar perfection and vocabulary memorization rather than effective communication. Thus, pupils may have appropriate language understanding but may have difficulty in communicating their ideas in real life settings.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has been developed to solve this issue by emphasising interaction and meaningful use of language. Richards [1] stresses the relevance of communicative activities which allow learners to utilise language for real reasons. This article presents theoretical bases of CLT and classroom techniques to promote students' speaking fluency and interpersonal abilities.

The theoretical basis of CLT is intimately tied to communication skills. Canale and Swain [2] suggested a much-influential framework for the linguistic and sociolinguistic aspects of communication and the role of communication strategies.

Littlewood [3] differentiates functional communication activities from social



interaction activities. His technique illustrates how language exercises may be structured to encourage meaningful conversation, while remaining focused on linguistic correctness.

According to Savignon [4], the use of CLT in diverse educational situations is discussed, emphasizing the significance of teacher training and contextual considerations. Taken together, these findings give a theoretical rationale for the inclusion of communicative activities in English language schools.

CLT provides chances to increase speaking fluency via meaningful contact. Instead, relying on instructor explanations, communicative education promotes active participation from students via discussions and collaborative work.

One effective way is role play. Students perform scenarios such as job interviews, professional meetings or ordinary interactions. These tasks help students to use the vocabulary, build answers and gain confidence in their use of English.

Group discussion is another fundamental action of communication. Students express thoughts, argue their case and reply to other viewpoints. This kind of engagement promotes spontaneous speech and the development of conversational techniques.

Information-gap exercises may also help spoken communication. Students get diverse knowledge and must converse to accomplish a joint objective. This gives a real incentive to ask questions, to clear up misconceptions and to negotiate meaning.

The communication activities may be tailored to the professional setting for non-philological pupils. Engineering students may discuss technical challenges, business students can do mock negotiations or presentations. These exercises link language learning to the students' future professional demands.

However, there are several difficulties in applying CLT. Participation may be hampered by large classrooms, limited teaching time, uneven language competency and students' unwillingness to talk. These obstacles may be overcome by teachers via well-structured pair work, sufficient linguistic assistance, clear directions and constructive criticism.

Moreover, conversational fluency should not be at the expense of grammatical precision. Good teaching is a combination of meaningful engagement and attention to language forms. Teachers should thus combine communicative activities with focused feedback and chances for reflection.

To summarize, Communicative Language Teaching offers a useful



framework for increasing English speaking fluency and interaction abilities. Its focus on meaningful communication allows pupils to use their language skills in real life settings rather than just memorizing frameworks.

Role play, group discussion and knowledge gap activities provide possibilities for spontaneous speaking, collaborative learning and communicative problem resolution. But they are successful only when students have the skills, the classroom environment is conducive, and instructional assistance is sufficient.

Integration of CLT with professionally relevant scenarios to make English learning more meaningful for non-philological students. A mix of communicative practice with grammatical teaching and constructive criticism, in the right proportions, may help to create confident and competent speakers of English.

REFERENCES

1. Richards J. C. Communicative Language Teaching Today. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
2. Canale M., Swain M. Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing // Applied Linguistics. — 1980. — Vol. 1, No. 1. — P. 1–47. DOI: 10.1093/applin/I.1.1.
3. Littlewood W. Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
4. Savignon S. J. (ed.). Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching: Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education. — New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.