

INTERACTIVE TEACHING METHODS IN PHILOLOGICAL EDUCATION: ENHANCING LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE THROUGH COMMUNICATIVE AND TEXT-CENTERED APPROACHES

Shakarova Shahlo Azim qizi

*the 4th year, Group 1, student of the Faculty of Philology and Language Teaching,
Navoiy University of Innovations*

Academic adviser: Juraqulov Gulomjon Hamrayevich

NIU, Senior Teacher, Department of Philology and Language Teaching

Abstract. *This article explores the significance of interactive teaching methods in philological education, with particular attention to communicative and text-centered approaches as tools for developing linguistic competence. Traditional instruction has often relied heavily on grammar memorization and structural drills, which may strengthen theoretical knowledge but do not always, enable students to use language confidently in real contexts. In my view, language learning becomes meaningful only when learners actively engage with content and communicate with purpose.*

Keywords: *Interactive teaching; philological education; linguistic competence; communicative approaches; text-centered approaches, interactive pedagogy, task-based learning, text-centered instruction, higher education language teaching*

Introduction

Contemporary pedagogical theory increasingly prioritizes interaction and meaningful communication over mechanical memorization (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). In philological education, students are expected not only to master grammatical structures but also to interpret literary and academic texts and participate effectively in discourse. Linguistic competence therefore extends beyond grammar to include discourse management, sociolinguistic appropriateness, and the ability to negotiate meaning (Canale & Swain, 1980). From my teaching experience, students who focus solely on rules often hesitate when speaking or writing spontaneously. However, when they are given tasks that require real communication, their confidence gradually increases. For example, during a classroom experiment, two groups of philology students were taught the same grammatical topic. One group completed traditional exercises, while the other engaged in role-play and text-based discussions. After four weeks, the second group demonstrated greater fluency and more flexible vocabulary use during oral assessments. This suggests that interaction supports deeper language acquisition. Interactive teaching methods reflect a broader understanding of competence by placing learners in authentic communicative situations. When communicative and text-centered approaches are integrated, students develop both practical skills and analytical awareness.

Interactive Pedagogy and Linguistic Competence

Interactive pedagogy is rooted in constructivist principles, particularly the idea that knowledge is constructed through social interaction (Vygotsky, 1978). Learners actively negotiate meaning, reflect on feedback, and apply language in purposeful contexts. Activities such as debates, simulations, and collaborative problem-solving tasks create meaningful practice opportunities. In my opinion, such activities reduce anxiety because students focus on exchanging ideas rather than avoiding grammatical mistakes. Text-centered approaches strengthen this process by grounding language learning in authentic discourse. Literary works, academic essays, and journalistic texts expose students to stylistic diversity and cultural nuance. Tasks such as annotation, summarization, and genre-based rewriting help learners understand how language choices shape meaning.

In one small-scale classroom trial, students analyzed a short newspaper article and then rewrote it from a different ideological perspective. This exercise required both linguistic adaptation and critical reflection. Students later reported that this task helped them see how discourse influences interpretation, which demonstrates the value of combining analysis with production.

Integrating Communicative and Text-Centered Approaches

The integration of communicative and text-centered methods enhances learning outcomes. For instance, students may first analyze a literary excerpt, discuss its themes in small groups, and then present a critical response orally or in writing. This sequence connects comprehension with expression and balances fluency with accuracy. Pre-task discussions activate background knowledge, task performance encourages negotiation of meaning, and post-task reflection strengthens metalinguistic awareness (Willis & Willis, 2007). I believe this integrated model mirrors real-life language use, where reading, speaking, and writing rarely occur in isolation. Digital tools further extend interaction beyond the classroom. Online forums, collaborative documents, and multimedia presentations encourage multimodal communication and sustained engagement.

Benefits and Considerations

Empirical research indicates that interactive approaches improve oral fluency, reading comprehension, and writing development (Saliyeva, 2021; Numonova, 2023). Beyond measurable outcomes, they also increase learner motivation. When students feel their ideas matter, participation becomes more authentic. However, challenges remain. Teachers must carefully design tasks, manage classroom dynamics, and adopt alternative assessment strategies. Traditional exams often measure isolated knowledge rather than communicative competence. Portfolio assessment and performance-based evaluation may provide a more accurate picture of student progress. Professional development is therefore essential for effective implementation.

Conclusion

Interactive teaching significantly enriches philological education by emphasizing meaningful communication and engagement with authentic texts. Communicative approaches develop discourse and negotiation skills, while text-centered strategies cultivate interpretive and analytical competence. When combined thoughtfully, these

approaches produce linguistically proficient, critically aware, and confident learners. In my view, the future of philology depends not only on preserving linguistic knowledge but also on preparing students to apply that knowledge dynamically in academic, professional, and cultural contexts.

REFERENCES

1.Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1–47.

2.Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.

3.Hinkel, E. (2011). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Routledge.

4.Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*(3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

5.Juraqulov,G.H.(2025). The importance of identifying philologist students'cognitive competencies and making lesson plans to teach them using appropriate methods. *Inter education & global study*, (1 (1)), 90-96.

6.Saliyeva, S. (2021). Interactive methods in communicative language teaching. *International Journal of Social Science & Interdisciplinary Research*, 147–151.

7.Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Harvard University Press.