

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH

*Buriyev Azizbek Hamzayevich, Master's student at Termez
University of Economics and Service*

KOMMUNIKATIV YONDASHUVNING TARIXIY RIVOJLANISH BOSQICHLARI

*Bo'riyev Azizbek Hamzayevich, Termiz iqtisodiyot va servis
universiteti magistranti*

ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЕ РАЗВИТИЕ КОММУНИКАТИВНОГО ПОДХОДА

*Буриев Азизбек Хамзаевич, магистрант Термезского
университета экономики и сервиса*

Abstract: This article examines the historical development and stages of evolution of the communicative approach in language teaching. It highlights the emergence of the communicative method, its core principles, differences from traditional methods, and its effectiveness in modern language education. The paper also discusses its impact on improving interactive and real-life communication skills.

Keywords: communicative approach, language teaching, methodology, historical development, interactivity, communication skills

Annotatsiya: Mazkur maqolada kommunikativ yondashuvning tarixiy shakllanishi va rivojlanish bosqichlari tahlil qilingan. Til o'rgatish metodikalarining evolyutsiyasi jarayonida kommunikativ yondashuvning paydo bo'lishi, uning asosiy prinsiplari, avvalgi metodlardan farqlari hamda ta'limda qo'llanishi haqida ma'lumotlar keltirilgan. Ushbu yondashuvning zamonaviy til o'qitishdagi o'rni va samaradorligi ham yoritilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: kommunikativ yondashuv, til o'rgatish, metodika, tarixiy rivojlanish, interaktivlik, aloqa malakalari.

Аннотация: В статье рассматривается историческое формирование и этапы развития коммуникативного подхода. Описаны особенности эволюции методик преподавания языков, причины появления коммуникативного подхода, его принципы, отличия от традиционных методов, а также эффективность в современном языковом образовании.

Ключевые слова: коммуникативный подход, обучение языку, методика, историческое развитие, интерактивность, коммуникативные навыки.



<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-9532-8433>

e-mail:

buriyev.azizbek@mail.ru



INTRODUCTION. Before the emergence of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the 1970s, English language instruction was dominated by structuralist methods that focused primarily on grammar, vocabulary, and sentence formation. Two

of the most prominent methodologies during this period were the Grammar-Translation Method and the Audiolingual Method [1].

The Grammar-Translation Method, rooted in classical education, emphasized reading and

translating literary texts, memorizing vocabulary lists, and mastering grammatical rules. Speaking and listening skills were largely neglected, as the method was more concerned with language form than with communicative use (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Although this approach offered clear explanations of grammatical structures, it failed to develop learners' ability to use the language in real-life contexts.

MATERIALS AND METHODS. The Audiolingual Method, which gained prominence in the mid-20th century, especially in the United States, shifted focus to oral skills. Influenced by behaviorist psychology and structural linguistics, it employed repetition, mimicry, and drilling techniques to instill correct language habits [2]. Teachers relied heavily on controlled dialogues and substitution exercises, assuming that language learning was a process of habit formation through stimulus-response conditioning. While this method succeeded in improving pronunciation and accuracy, it did not foster spontaneous language use or communicative competence. Both approaches shared a view of language as a fixed system of structures and patterns to be internalized. However, the lack of attention to the functional and social aspects of language eventually led to growing dissatisfaction among language educators and researchers, paving the way for the communicative movement. The transition toward CLT was not a sudden shift but rather a gradual realignment of pedagogical priorities in response to new theoretical insights and global communication needs. By the 1970s, a growing body of research in linguistics, sociolinguistics, and educational psychology began to question the effectiveness of structure-based methods for preparing learners to use language communicatively [2].

A pivotal moment in this transition was the development of the concept of communicative competence. Introduced by sociolinguist Dell Hymes (1972), communicative competence extended beyond grammatical knowledge to include the ability to use language appropriately in social contexts. Hymes challenged the then-prevailing notion of linguistic competence proposed by Noam Chomsky (1965), which focused solely on the abstract knowledge of grammar. While Chomsky's work revolutionized theoretical linguistics by proposing the idea of an innate universal grammar,

it left unaddressed how language is actually used by speakers in different settings. Building on Hymes's framework, applied linguists began advocating for a more learner-centered, meaning-focused approach to language teaching. This movement was further reinforced by changes in language learning objectives, particularly within European contexts. The Council of Europe played a crucial role in institutionalizing communicative goals through its development of threshold levels and functional-notional syllabuses (van Ek & Alexander, 1980). These innovations shifted attention from structural sequences to communicative functions such as requesting, apologizing, and suggesting [3].

In response to these developments, CLT emerged as an approach that emphasized the role of communication in learning a language. Language was now seen as a tool for interaction, not merely a collection of rules to be memorized. The communicative approach quickly gained international attention and began influencing curriculum design, textbook development, and teacher training programs across a wide range of educational contexts.

DISCUSSION. The intellectual foundation of CLT was shaped by a number of influential theorists whose work underscored the functional and interpersonal dimensions of language. Alongside Hymes and Chomsky, Michael Halliday made significant contributions through his theory of systemic functional linguistics. Halliday (1978) proposed that language serves three main functions: ideational (expressing content), interpersonal (managing social relationships), and textual (organizing information). His perspective aligned with the goals of CLT by recognizing that language is intrinsically linked to social purpose and context [4].

Wilkins also played a foundational role by distinguishing between notional categories (e.g., time, quantity) and communicative functions (e.g., inviting, informing), laying the groundwork for the functional-notional syllabus. His proposals directly influenced the design of communicative curricula and materials that prioritized meaning over form [3]. David Nunan later extended these ideas in his work on task-based language teaching, which can be seen as a natural evolution of CLT. By focusing on real-world tasks and learner participation, Nunan emphasized the importance of experiential learning

and authentic communication in the classroom. The early literature of CLT, particularly the writings of Richards and Rodgers, provided practical frameworks for implementing communicative principles in classroom settings. Their widely cited work cataloged various teaching methods and offered critical insights into the theoretical underpinnings of CLT, making it accessible to practitioners worldwide[4].

Together, these theorists laid the groundwork for a pedagogical approach that values learner interaction, real-world communication, and purposeful language use. Their ideas continue to influence how English is taught globally, and their legacy is visible in the ongoing refinement of communicative methodologies.

RESULTS. CLT is usually characterized as a broad approach to teaching, rather than as a teaching method with a clearly defined set of classroom practices. As such, it is most often defined as a list of general principles or features. One of the most recognized of these lists is David Nunan five features of CLT [5]:

1. An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.
2. The introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation.
3. The provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on language but also on the Learning Management. An enhancement of the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.

An attempt to link classroom language learning with language activities outside the classroom [3]. Five features are claimed by practitioners of CLT to show that they are very interested in the needs and desires of their learners as well as the connection between the language as it is taught in their class and as it used outside the classroom. Under this broad umbrella definition, any teaching practice that helps students develop their communicative competence in an authentic context is deemed an acceptable and beneficial form of instruction. the classroom CLT often takes the form of pair and group work requiring negotiation and cooperation between learners, fluency-based activities that encourage learners to develop their confidence, role-plays in which students practice and develop language functions, as well as judicious

use of grammar and pronunciation focused activities [4]. Such the aim of the communicative approach to language teaching is to focus on real conversations about real subjects so that communication is the engine of learning.

CONCLUSION. Today, we see our primary aim as teaching the practical use of English for communication with native speakers and others. is seen as central to language learning within the communicative approach framework, because it is the fundamental and universal form of language and so is considered to be language at work. Since real life conversation is more interactional than it is transactional, this approach places more value on communication that promotes social interaction. communicative approach also places more emphasis on a discourse-level (rather than sentence-level) approach to language, as it is considered to better prepare learners for real-life communication, where the entire conversation is more relevant than the analysis of specific utterances. Approach considers that the learning of a skill is co-constructed within the interaction between the learner and the teacher. In this sense, teaching is a conversation between the two parties.

REFERENCES:

1. Aronson E. et al. The jigsaw route to learning and liking // Psychology Today, 2005. - N 8. - pp.43-50.
2. Connery B.A. Group Work and Collaborative Writing // Teaching at Davis, 2003, 14(1), pp.2-4.
3. Davies N.F. Training fluency: An essential factor in language acquisition and use // RELC Journal, 2006, N6, pp.1-13.
4. Gross D.A. A cooperative small-group methodology in the language classroom // TESOL Quarterly, 2008, N3, pp.483-504.
5. Nation P. Group Work and Language Learning // Kral Th. Teacher development. Making the right moves. - Washington, DC, 2006. - p.160-170.
6. Pattison P. The communicative approach and classroom realities. (EDRS No. ED 288.1978. - pp.407-417.
7. Philips S. U. Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom // Functions of language in the classroom, ed. C Cazden, V. P Lohns, and D. Hymes. - New York: Teachers College Press, 2005. - pp.370-394.