

**COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TOOLS**  
**Dzugaeva Z. R.<sup>1</sup>, Rakhimova Sh. A.<sup>2</sup>**  
**КОММУНИКАТИВНЫЕ ЯЗЫКОВЫЕ СРЕДСТВА**  
**Дзугаева З. Р.<sup>1</sup>, Рахимова Ш. А.<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Дзугаева Зарина Руслановна / Dzugaeva Zarina Ruslanovna – преподаватель английского языка;  
<sup>2</sup>Рахимова Шоира Атабековна / Rakhimova Shoirat Atabekovna - преподаватель английского языка,  
кафедра общественно-гуманитарных наук,  
Ургенчский филиал Ташкентской медицинской академии, г. Ургенч

**Abstract:** *in this article we analyzed communicative language tools. To get a better understanding of what speech is, the speech is the activity of using a language system for communicative purposes in real situation. We should seek methods of teaching not language so much, as communication through the language. Learners usually attain a much higher level of proficiency in the receptive skills than in the productive skills. Mastering the language skills, like mastering any kind of skill, requires a considerable amount of practice. Step by step in the teaching-learning development process the learner should become more proficient. Teachers can promote the ease and efficiency associated with automaticity in speech production. Communicative Language Teaching is best considered an approach rather than a method. Thus although a reasonable degree of theoretical consistency can be discerned at the levels of language and learning theory, at the levels of design and procedure there is much greater room for individual interpretation and variation than most methods permit. It could be that one version among the various proposals for syllabus models, exercise types, and classroom activities may gain wider approval in the future, giving Communicative Language Teaching a status similar to other teaching methods.*

**Аннотация:** *в данной статье анализируются языковая система, коммуникативные средства речи. В настоящее время происходит много изменений в развитии коммуникативных средств, используемых в обучении иностранным языкам. Слушатели, как правило, достигают гораздо более высокого уровня мастерства в рецептивных навыках. Освоение языковых навыков, как преподавание любого рода мастерства, требует значительного количества практики. Шаг за шагом в процессе развития преподавания и обучения студент должен стать более опытным. Преподаватели могут способствовать развитию легкости и эффективности, связанных с автоматизмом в производстве речи. В коммуникативном средстве обучения языку лучше всего рассматривать подход, а не метод. Таким образом, степень теоретической согласованности можно различить на уровне языка и теории обучения, на уровне проектирования и процедуры есть гораздо больше места для индивидуальной интерпретации и изменений, чем в большинстве методов. Это может значить то, что одна из версий среди различных предложенных программ модульного типа обучения, разновидности упражнений и классных мероприятий может получить более широкое одобрение в будущем, предоставляя коммуникативному преподаванию языка статус, похожий на другие методы обучения.*

**Keywords:** *communication, language, purpose, speech.*

**Ключевые слова:** *коммуникация, язык, цель, речь.*

Communicative language tools are the components learners need in order to actually use language. We must make available to our students all the language tools available to successful language users, not just a subset of those tools. In traditional classrooms, students are taught pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary, but these three tools are not enough, nor are they broadly enough defined. Effective language users, whether native speakers or L2 learners, have a much wider range of tools available, of course including pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary (broadly defined), but also including paralinguistic features, kinesics language features, and pragmatics.

Promoting Fluency". . . teaching fluency is different from teaching other aspects of language. In teaching fluency, we must be willing to let go of some of the control in our classrooms" [1, p. 25-30].

Can we really teach fluency? I think so, but we may have to modify the traditional ways in which we conceive of teaching. We can certainly teach fluency by giving lectures that help expand our students' knowledge of the choices, tools, and strategies at their disposal. However at a certain point, we will have to admit that teaching fluency is different from teaching other aspects of language. In teaching fluency, we must be willing to let go of some of the control in our classrooms; we must be willing to let the students have some of the control and let them do some of the work; we must be willing to set up situations in which fluency can develop, and then encourage the students to actually communicate. I'm not saying that we need to teach fluency all of the time, but I am saying that some of the time students need a little guided communication time during which their knowledge of the many aspects of the language can develop into fluency.

Unlike language knowledge, fluency is about automatizing the language knowledge. As Schmidt said, "Fluent speech is automatic, not requiring much attention, and is characterized by the fact that the psycholinguistic processes of speech planning and speech production are functioning easily and efficiently." Such automaticity can only occur when the students themselves are trying to use their language knowledge to actually communicate, and we can only

help the students become fluent by creating opportunities for them to practice communicating and then stepping out of the way.

Teachers can promote the ease and efficiency associated with automaticity in speech production. As I explained, teachers can promote fluency if they: (a) encourage students to go ahead and make constructive errors, (b) create many opportunities for students to practice, (c) create activities that force students to get a message across, (d) assess student's fluency not their accuracy, and (e) talk openly to the students about fluency [2, p. 394-405].

Communicative Language Teaching is best considered an approach rather than a method. Thus although a reasonable degree of theoretical consistency can be discerned at the levels of language and learning theory, at the levels of design and procedure there is much greater room for individual interpretation and variation than most methods permit. It could be that one version among the various proposals for syllabus models, exercise types, and classroom activities may gain wider approval in the future, giving Communicative Language Teaching a status similar to other teaching methods. On the other hand, divergent interpretations might lead to homogeneous subgroups.

Communicative Language Teaching appeared at a time when British language teaching was ready for a paradigm shift. Situational Language Teaching was no longer felt to reflect a methodology appropriate for the seventies and beyond. CLT appealed to those who sought a more humanistic approach to teaching, one in which the interactive processes of communication received priority. The rapid adoption and implementation of the communicative approach also resulted from the fact that it quickly assumed the status of orthodoxy in British language teaching circles, receiving the sanction and support of leading British applied linguists, language specialists, publishers, as well as institutions, such as the British Council. Now that the initial wave of enthusiasm has passed, however, some of the claims of CLT are being looked at more critically. The adoption of a communicative approach raises important issues for teacher training, materials development, and testing and evaluation. These kinds of questions will doubtless require attention if the communicative movement in language teaching continues to gain momentum in the future [3, p. 122].

### ***Reference***

1. *Mendelsohn D.* Instruments for feedback in oral communication. TESOL Journal, 1992. P. 25-30.
2. *Nation P.* Materials for teaching vocabulary. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching*. London, England: Continuum, 2003. P. 394–405.
3. *Richards J. C., Platt J. & Weber H.* Longman dictionary of applied linguistics. London: Longman, 1985. P. 122.