

INTEGRATING COMMUNICATIVE APPROACHES AND DIGITAL TOOLS IN ENGLISH AND FRENCH LANGUAGE TEACHING

Sabirova Gulasal Babadjanovna, Akromova Nigora Erkinovna

¹Lecturer, Department of Theoretical French, Uzbekistan State World Languages University

gulasal0176@gmail.com

²Associate Professor, Department of English, Uzbek State World Languages University (UzMPU)

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.63001/tbs.2026.v21.i04.S.I\(4\).pp301-306](https://doi.org/10.63001/tbs.2026.v21.i04.S.I(4).pp301-306)

KEYWORDS

*English language,
French language,
foreign language education,
communicative approach,
digital pedagogy,
communicative competence,
independent learning,
formative assessment.*

Received: 16/08 /2026

Accepted :20/09/2026

Published: 12/10/2026

Abstract

This article examines how the communicative approach can be integrated with digital learning tools in English and French language teaching. It focuses on developing listening, speaking, reading, and writing as interconnected skills, preparing learners for authentic communication, and supporting independent learning. The study is theoretical and analytical in nature; it draws on a comparative review of methodological literature, models of communicative competence, and principles of digital pedagogy. The analysis identifies shared methodological principles for teaching English and French, criteria for selecting digital resources, and practical recommendations for lesson planning. The proposed framework may be useful to language teachers, teacher educators, and researchers seeking to combine communicative classroom practice with purposeful technology use.

1. INTRODUCTION

Globalisation, academic mobility, and expanding international cooperation have made effective foreign language education an important priority. English is widely used in international academic communication and digital environments, while French plays a significant role in diplomacy, culture, education, and international organisations. Teaching these languages therefore requires more than memorising grammatical rules and vocabulary. Learners need to develop the ability to communicate appropriately and effectively in a range of situations.

The communicative approach views language primarily as a means of communication. Within this approach, learners do not study

linguistic forms in isolation only; they use them to express ideas, ask questions, exchange information, participate in discussions, and solve problems. The lesson is organised around meaningful learner participation, collaborative tasks, and purposeful language practice rather than extended teacher explanation alone.

Although English and French differ in their phonological, lexical, and grammatical systems, many of their teaching objectives are shared. In both languages, learners need to develop pronunciation, acquire vocabulary in context, use grammatical structures meaningfully, and build intercultural communicative awareness. A common methodological framework can

therefore be useful, provided that it is adapted to the specific features of each language.

The growing availability of digital tools creates additional opportunities for language learning. Audio and video resources, interactive exercises, online dictionaries, collaborative documents, virtual whiteboards, and speech-recording applications can help learners practise beyond classroom hours. However, technology alone does not guarantee improved learning. A digital resource should serve a clearly defined learning objective, match learners' proficiency levels, and be integrated into a coherent teaching sequence.

The purpose of this article is to identify shared principles for integrating the communicative approach and digital tools into English and French language teaching, analyse their methodological potential, and provide practical recommendations. The discussion is guided by three questions: What aspects of the communicative approach are common to both languages? How can digital tools support the four main language skills? Which criteria can teachers use to monitor learning and provide feedback?

The practical value of the article lies in its proposed principles for lesson planning, task design, and learner progress monitoring. The recommendations can be adapted to different age groups, educational contexts, and levels of language proficiency.

METHODS

The study uses a theoretical, analytical, and comparative methodological approach. It does not claim to report a classroom experiment or

newly collected empirical data. Instead, it synthesises established ideas in foreign language education to identify teaching principles that can be applied to both English and French. This approach is appropriate for developing a general framework that can later be examined through classroom-based research.

First, literature on communicative competence, task-based language teaching, learner-centred pedagogy, and digital learning was reviewed conceptually. The theoretical background includes Hymes's concept of communicative competence, the model proposed by Canale and Swain, and the descriptions of language activities and proficiency levels in the Council of Europe's Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). These sources provide a basis for considering language learning as the development of both linguistic knowledge and the ability to use language in context.

Second, English and French teaching were compared across four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. For each skill, the analysis considered the learning objective, possible task types, the function of digital resources, and the expected learner output. The comparison recognises that the two languages have distinct linguistic characteristics. Shared principles are therefore treated as a common instructional structure, not as a claim that English and French should be taught in exactly the same way.

Third, criteria for selecting teaching methods and digital tools were established. These

criteria include alignment with learning objectives, suitability for learners' proficiency levels, active participation, opportunities for meaningful communication, availability of feedback, accessibility, and digital safety. The criteria help teachers assess a resource according to its pedagogical purpose rather than its novelty or technical complexity.

The analysis used synthesis, comparison, classification, and methodological modelling. Synthesis was used to identify principles common to both languages; comparison highlighted similarities and differences in skill development; classification grouped digital resources according to their instructional functions. Finally, the resulting principles were organised into practical recommendations for lesson design.

A limitation of the study is that the proposed framework has not been validated through a controlled classroom intervention in a specific institution. Its recommendations should therefore be interpreted as a theoretically informed methodological model rather than as quantitative evidence of effectiveness. Future research could test the framework with learners of different ages and proficiency levels, using pre- and post-intervention measures and classroom observations.

3. RESULTS

The analysis identified five interrelated principles that can guide English and French language teaching: communication-oriented task design, integration of language skills, contextualised language learning, purposeful selection of digital tools, and formative assessment. These principles should not be viewed

as a disconnected list of techniques. Together, they connect lesson objectives, learner activities, expected outcomes, and assessment.

3.1. Communication-oriented tasks

The first finding is that tasks based on realistic communicative situations are relevant to both languages. Learners can plan a trip, ask for directions, deliver a short presentation, respond to an opinion, or propose a solution to a problem. In English lessons, contexts may reflect international communication; in French lessons, they may draw on everyday and cultural contexts in French-speaking communities. In either case, the task should require learners to achieve a communicative outcome rather than merely repeat a rule.

Pair work and small-group activities give learners opportunities to take turns, ask clarification questions, paraphrase a partner's ideas, and reach agreement. During such activities, teachers may prioritise the continuity of communication instead of interrupting every error. Important recurring errors can be addressed after the task through focused feedback. This approach can help teachers balance fluency with accuracy.

3.2. Integrating the four language skills

The second finding is that listening, speaking, reading, and writing can be developed more coherently when they are connected through a shared topic. For example, learners may listen to a short audio or watch a video, read a related text, discuss its main ideas with a partner, and write a

brief summary or email. This sequence links receptive skills with productive language use.

Listening activities may use a variety of voices, natural speech, and questions that move from general understanding to specific details. English teaching may address differences in stress and pronunciation across varieties, while French teaching may focus on sound distinctions, liaison, and intonation. In both languages, a staged process—identifying the main idea, locating relevant details, and responding to the content—can provide clear support.

Speaking can be practised through short presentations, role-play, discussion, and problem-solving tasks. Learners may record their speech and review it using a checklist. Reading activities can focus on identifying the main idea, locating evidence, evaluating the writer's position, and inferring word meaning from context. Writing can be organised as a process involving planning, drafting, revising, and presenting a final version.

3.3. Purposeful use of digital tools

The third finding is that digital tools have pedagogical value when their use is directly linked to a learning objective. Audio and video resources can support listening comprehension and pronunciation analysis; online dictionaries can help learners check meaning and usage; and interactive quizzes can provide rapid feedback. Shared documents and virtual whiteboards can support collaborative writing, idea organisation, and peer editing.

Digital tasks should be short, clear, and outcome-oriented. Rather than simply asking learners to watch a video, a teacher might ask them to identify three key points, note useful expressions, or prepare a response to the situation presented. This turns screen time from passive viewing into active language practice. Where internet access or devices are limited, teachers should provide an offline or printed alternative whenever possible.

3.4. Assessment and learner autonomy

The fourth finding is that formative assessment should be integrated into the learning process rather than restricted to a final test. Teachers can use observation checklists, criteria-based rubrics, peer assessment, self-assessment, and brief reflection questions at the end of a lesson. Such methods help identify progress and areas requiring further practice.

A shared assessment rubric may include clarity of meaning, task completion, vocabulary use, grammatical accuracy, intelligibility of pronunciation or writing, and use of communication strategies. It is not necessary to assess every criterion in every task. Selecting two or three criteria that match the main learning objective can make feedback more focused and actionable.

The fifth principle concerns learner autonomy. Learners can set weekly goals, record short speaking samples, keep contextualised vocabulary notes, and collect completed tasks in a portfolio. Teachers can support this process

through regular, specific, and achievable feedback. These practices encourage learners to monitor their progress and identify appropriate next steps.

4. DISCUSSION

The findings of this theoretical analysis underline the value of the communicative approach in connecting language learning with meaningful activity. In both English and French lessons, learners should not only memorise grammatical forms or word meanings but also learn to use them appropriately in context. This does not mean that grammar instruction is unnecessary. Rather, grammatical knowledge is presented as a resource for communication, with attention to the relationship between form, meaning, and use.

A common methodological framework can make lesson planning more coherent across English and French. However, it should not obscure the differences between the languages. Challenges related to particular English sounds, stress patterns, and word order differ from those associated with French articles, grammatical gender and agreement, verb forms, and pronunciation. Teachers can retain a shared lesson structure while adding language-specific practice and error-correction strategies.

Digital tools provide access to additional language samples and opportunities for repeated practice. Nevertheless, the number or sophistication of tools used does not determine the quality of a lesson. Too many applications may distract learners from the central objective.

Teachers should define the intended learning outcome first and then select the simplest suitable resource. In some situations, a carefully chosen audio recording and well-designed questions may be more useful than a complex platform.

Digital equity and accessibility also require attention. Learners may not have equal access to devices, reliable internet, or a quiet study environment. Requiring online participation without alternatives can disadvantage some learners. Teachers should consider downloadable resources, flexible deadlines, and offline versions of activities. They should also explain how to protect personal data, avoid sharing recordings without permission, and acknowledge the sources of digital materials.

Assessment requires a similar balance. Focusing exclusively on the number of grammatical errors may fail to capture a learner's ability to convey meaning, sustain a conversation, or solve a communicative problem. Conversely, assessing fluency alone may overlook persistent inaccuracies. A well-designed rubric should reflect the purpose of the task and balance meaning, intelligibility, language resources, and communication strategies.

Because the present article is theoretical, its findings should be interpreted cautiously. The proposed strategies are presented as reasoned methodological recommendations, not as measured proof of improved achievement. Further research could test the framework with learners at different proficiency levels, compare digital and non-digital task formats, and track changes in language performance and motivation. Such

studies would clarify the conditions under which the proposed model is most useful.

Collaboration between English and French teachers is another practical implication. Teachers can jointly develop thematic projects, assessment rubrics, and task-based activities, then adapt them to the specific features of each language. This type of collaboration can strengthen interdisciplinary teaching and help learners transfer effective language-learning strategies from one language to another.

REFERENCES

1. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
2. Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment—Companion Volume*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
3. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Hymes, D. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
5. Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: Some questions and suggestions. *ELT Journal*, 58(4), 319–326.
6. Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Chapelle, C. A. (2003). *English Language Learning and Technology: Lectures on Applied Linguistics in the Age of Information and Communication Technology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
8. UNESCO. (2018). *UNESCO ICT Competency Framework for Teachers (Version 3)*. Paris: UNESCO.