

### METHODS OF TEACHING ENGLISH

*Sulaymonova Sevara Elyor qizi*

*Pedagogical University of Jizzakh*

**Abstract:** Foreign language teaching has evolved significantly over the past century, adapting to advancements in linguistics, psychology, and educational theory. As globalization continues to shape our interactions, the demand for effective language education has intensified. This article explores various contemporary methods of foreign language teaching, including communicative language teaching (CLT), task-based language teaching (TBLT), and content-based instruction (CBI). It examines the theoretical foundations of each approach, their practical applications, and the challenges they present in modern educational contexts.

**Keywords :** communicative culture, information technologies ,effectively, efficiently , weakness ,role-plays, limitation, real-life, emphasize, resources, relevant, vice versa, solid, conversational.

#### Introduction

The teaching of foreign languages has undergone numerous transformations since its inception, driven by ongoing research and the changing needs of learners. From the grammar-translation method, once dominant in the 19th and early 20th centuries, to the rise of communicative and task-based methods, language education has shifted focus from rote memorization to the development of communicative competence. This article seeks to provide an in-depth review of the most prominent teaching methods currently in use and how they address the challenges of language acquisition in the 21st century

#### Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emerged in the 1970s as a reaction to the limitations of structuralist methods like the grammar-translation method. At its core, CLT emphasizes the development of practical communication skills rather than mere grammatical accuracy (Littlewood, 2004). The primary aim of CLT is to enable learners to use the target language effectively in real-life situations. The theoretical foundation of CLT is based on the communicative competence theory proposed by Hymes (1972), which posits that language learners must acquire not only the grammatical rules of a language but also the social and contextual knowledge needed to use language appropriately. In practice, CLT incorporates activities such as role plays, group discussions, and problem-solving tasks, all designed to engage students in authentic language use.

Despite its success in promoting communicative skills, CLT has been critiqued for its potential neglect of formal grammar instruction and its reliance on native-speaker norms. Critics argue that an exclusive focus on fluency can lead to fossilization of errors and may leave learners underprepared for more formal or academic language contexts (Swain, 2000).

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is another method that focuses on language use in meaningful, real-world contexts. Unlike CLT, which emphasizes communication through structured activities, TBLT is based on the principle that language is best learned through the co

mpletion of tasks that mirror authentic communicative situations (Ellis, 2003). A task in TBLT is typically an activity that requires students to use the target language to achieve a specific goal, such as making a presentation, writing a report, or solving a problem.

TBLT is grounded in the theory of second language acquisition (SLA), particularly the concept of “input hypothesis” proposed by Krashen (1985), which states that language learners acquire language most effectively when they are exposed to comprehensible input slightly beyond their current proficiency level. The TBLT method allows for such input by immersing students in tasks that challenge their language abilities while still providing opportunities for meaningful interaction and feedback. However, TBLT is not without its challenges. Some critics have pointed out that TBLT may be difficult to implement in large classrooms or in contexts where learners have varying levels of proficiency (Samuda and Bygate, 2008). Furthermore, while tasks are designed to be engaging and motivating, they may not always provide the depth of language practice required for certain linguistic structures.

Content-Based Instruction (CBI) is an approach that integrates language learning with subject matter content, such as science, history, or literature. CBI is particularly popular in immersion programs, where students learn a foreign language by studying academic subjects in that language (Snow, 2010). This method draws on the concept of “learning by doing” and aims to improve both language skills and subject knowledge simultaneously. The theoretical basis of CBI is rooted in the cognitive theory of language acquisition, which emphasizes the importance of meaningful content for promoting deeper learning (Swain & Lapkin, 2002). CBI has been shown to enhance learners’ academic performance and language proficiency by providing them with exposure to authentic, context-rich language use.

One of the primary challenges of CBI is ensuring that the content is appropriately pitched for language learners. If the subject matter is too complex, students may struggle to comprehend the material and lose interest in the language learning process. Additionally, instructors must be well-trained to balance content delivery with language support, ensuring that students are not overwhelmed by either the linguistic or the academic demands of the lesson.

The field of foreign language teaching continues to evolve as educators and researchers explore new methods and approaches. CLT, TBLT, and CBI represent three of the most widely used methods today, each with its own strengths and weaknesses. While CLT emphasizes communication in context, TBLT prioritizes task completion, and CBI integrates language learning with academic content. To achieve optimal language acquisition, it is essential for educators to understand the theoretical underpinnings of these methods and to apply them flexibly in diverse learning environments.

### References:

1. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
3. Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.