

INTEGRATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING MODELS IN DEVELOPING FUTURE TEACHERS' ORAL COMPETENCE

Zulaykho Ashurova Kholdaraliyeva

Independent researcher

E-mail: prettyzulayho86@yahoo.com

Phone: +998979890086

Annotation. This article explores the effectiveness of integrative language teaching (ILT) models in enhancing oral competence among future English teachers. Drawing on the principles of communicative language teaching, task-based learning, and content and language integrated learning (CLIL), the study investigates how a multidimensional approach can foster fluency, accuracy, and pragmatic competence. A mixed-methods design is employed to assess the impact of integrative tasks, including microteaching, role-playing, and project-based discussions, on students' speaking performance. Findings indicate that ILT models not only improve linguistic output but also enhance learner motivation and classroom engagement. The paper concludes with methodological recommendations for embedding integrative approaches into teacher education programs, ensuring alignment with real-world communication demands and professional teaching standards. The study contributes to the growing body of literature on the methodological innovation in EFL teacher training.

Keywords: integrative teaching, oral competence, EFL, teacher education, CLIL, communicative approach.

Introduction. In an era marked by global interconnectedness and multilingual communication, the ability to express oneself fluently and effectively in English has become a cornerstone of successful teaching in foreign language education. For future English teachers, oral competence is not only a practical requirement for classroom interaction but also a foundational skill that shapes professional identity, student engagement, and pedagogical effectiveness. However, traditional methods of language instruction often focused on isolated grammar drills and scripted dialogues frequently fail to equip trainee teachers with the real-time communicative flexibility demanded by modern classrooms. In response to these challenges, integrative language teaching (ILT) models have emerged as dynamic and holistic approaches that combine various teaching methods and pedagogical frameworks to create more authentic, learner-centered experiences¹. These models often merge principles from Communicative

¹ Richards J.C., Rodgers T.S. Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. – UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014. – 270 p.

Language Teaching (CLT), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), thereby aligning language instruction with practical, professional, and intercultural needs.

By embedding speaking activities into meaningful contexts such as microteaching, debates, simulations, and collaborative projects ILT models offer a multidimensional path toward developing oral fluency, accuracy, and pragmatic competence. Despite the theoretical support for integration, empirical studies on its practical implementation in teacher education settings remain relatively limited. Many pre-service teacher programs still struggle to adopt cohesive strategies that interlink theory and practice in developing oral communication skills. This article addresses this gap by exploring how integrative teaching models influence the oral performance of future English teachers². It aims to analyze specific pedagogical interventions, evaluate their effectiveness through classroom-based research, and offer methodological recommendations for curriculum designers and teacher trainers.

By examining both the linguistic and pedagogical implications of ILT, this study contributes to a broader understanding of how to prepare English teachers for the complex communicative demands of XXI century classrooms³. Integrative Language Teaching (ILT) models operate on the assumption that language skills, particularly oral competence, are best developed when taught in connection with content, context, and real-life communication needs. For future English teachers, this implies more than just learning to speak English; it requires mastering how to teach English orally through pedagogically meaningful interaction. In this section, we examine three core integrative teaching models Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and their application in EFL teacher education programs. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emphasizes functional use of language.

Activities such as interviews, information-gap tasks, and problem-solving are used to simulate authentic interaction⁴. Within teacher education, CLT provides future teachers with tools to facilitate student-centered speaking lessons. They not only learn how to speak fluently but also how to scaffold and guide communicative tasks in their future classrooms. Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) complements CLT by structuring learning around meaningful tasks that mirror real-life scenarios. For instance, trainee teachers may prepare lesson plans and then deliver them through microteaching

² Coyle D., Hood P., Marsh D. CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning. – UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010. – 159 p.

³ Harmer J. The Practice of English Language Teaching. – UK: Pearson Education, 2015. – 446 p.

⁴ Nunan D. Task-Based Language Teaching. – UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004. – 284 p.

sessions⁵. This not only improves their speaking fluency and confidence but also builds awareness of classroom discourse, turn-taking strategies, and feedback techniques. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) pushes integration further by embedding language development within subject content. For example, students might conduct a group presentation on a topic from educational psychology, thereby practicing both academic speaking and subject-specific vocabulary.

This dual focus is especially useful for teachers who must deliver English-medium instruction. In practice, a blended ILT model combines these three approaches into a cohesive curriculum. In a pilot program conducted at a language university, pre-service teachers participated in a semester-long integrative training cycle. Activities included peer teaching, reflective discussions, interactive lectures, and problem-based group projects. Post-training analysis using oral proficiency rubrics showed marked improvements in fluency, coherence, and interactive skills⁶. Moreover, students reported increased motivation and reduced speaking anxiety due to the contextual and meaningful nature of the activities. They viewed language as a tool for professional identity formation rather than a school subject to be memorized.

Table. Comparison of ILT models in developing oral competence.

<i>Model</i>	Core focus	Key activities	Benefits for future teachers
<i>CLT</i>	Real-life communication	Dialogues, interviews, pair-work	Builds fluency, interaction strategies, learner-centered teaching
<i>TBLT</i>	Task completion in communicative context	Microteaching, simulations, task cycles	Enhances planning, classroom language use, pedagogical awareness
<i>CLIL</i>	Language through subject content	Presentations, research-based discussions	Strengthens academic vocabulary, confidence in

⁵ Celce-Murcia M. Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. – USA: Heinle Cengage Learning, 2014. – 566 p.

⁶ Larsen-Freeman D., Anderson M. Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. – USA: Oxford University Press, 2011. – 256 p.

			content-based delivery
--	--	--	---------------------------

The table provides a clear, structured comparison of key integrative teaching models, helping educators understand their distinct yet complementary contributions to oral skill development. It justifies the integrative approach by highlighting how each model targets different dimensions of communicative competence, thus ensuring a more holistic preparation for future English teachers.

Conclusion. The development of oral competence in future English teachers is a critical objective in language teacher education. This article has examined how integrative language teaching (ILT) models specifically Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) can be effectively employed to enhance speaking skills in professional contexts. Each model contributes unique strengths: CLT fosters fluency and interactional confidence, TBLT provides practical and goal-oriented speaking experiences, while CLIL bridges language learning with academic content, reinforcing subject-specific discourse. By combining these models, a more comprehensive pedagogical framework emerges one that not only develops oral proficiency but also equips pre-service teachers with the didactic and reflective tools necessary for effective classroom communication.

The empirical findings suggest that integrative approaches improve fluency, accuracy, and pragmatic awareness, while also reducing learners' speaking anxiety and increasing motivation. For language teacher education programs, adopting an integrative approach represents a move toward realism, relevance, and pedagogical depth. It connects linguistic skill-building with the actual communicative demands of the teaching profession. As a result, future English teachers become more than language users they become confident, competent communicators capable of guiding learners through authentic and engaging language use.

REFERENCES:

1. Celce-Murcia M. Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. – USA: Heinle Cengage Learning, 2014. – 566 p.
2. Coyle D., Hood P., Marsh D. CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning. – UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010. – 159 p.
3. Harmer J. The Practice of English Language Teaching. – UK: Pearson Education, 2015. – 446 p.

4. Larsen-Freeman D., Anderson M. Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. – USA: Oxford University Press, 2011. – 256 p.
5. Nunan D. Task-Based Language Teaching. – UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004. – 284 p.
6. Richards J.C., Rodgers T.S. Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. – UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014. – 270 p.