THE PROBLEM OF INCREASING PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OF FUTURE TEACHERS
Yakubova D.M.

Yakubova Dilnoza Mirsharifovna – Teacher of English,
86 SECONDARY SCHOOL,
YUNUSABAD DISTRICT OF TASHKENT, REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

Abstract: as we are living in a modern world everything has face tremendous changes not regarding whether it is economy or educational system and so do social trends of our modern world which were reflected by the change in the face of communicative approach to language teaching. The open and bright ideas of the 20th and 21st century have highly influenced the standard and primitive models of foreign language teaching and completely changed the concept of the teacher's competence. This article highlights a strong connection between the language teacher's role in communication and quality of the process of teaching in communicative language learning. In order to be better experienced for the communicative approach, it is said that the language teacher needs to develop and enrich the communicative competence.
Keywords: communicative competence, communicative approach, language teacher, interdisciplinary approach, interaction, professional development.

Contemporary philologists are discussing the notion of "communicative competence", which is one of the fundamental parts of the communicative teaching which can be used to reach the effective teaching of foreign languages. Strong support from the majority participating in this field was provided immediately after the introduction of the alternative to the concept of teaching, whereas "communicative competence" was accepted as the slogan of public debate about learning communicative language which is used not only learnt. Even though at first it was difficult to change the old paradigm of teaching to contemporary one , it is now the language teacher can effectively introduce a new teaching model into the practice at work . In order to put this approach into practice effectively it is important to analyze it. A communicative approach in language teaching begins with the theory of language as a means communication not a theory. The purpose of language teaching is to develop communicative competence. The goal of the CLT is to provide the student with unlimited access to the social, cultural and pragmatic aspects of the language which is the crucial part of the learning process. Communicative competence is defined as competence in three areas of language learning: grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic competence. The goal of CLT is to achieve grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic competence. Strategic competence is aimed at being able to express oneself successfully in a conversation and tackle any difficulties or problems that may arise, which can lead to a malfunction. It can be strengthened by developing skills such as using fillers, moving from a point, re-phrasing and rounding. There is also such a thing as Grammatical competence which includes knowledge of lexical subjects and rules of morphology, syntax, sentence verb, semantics and phonology [1].

Communicative competence

The nature of the dialogue either points to participants' lack of interest in the topic, potentially in the conversation as a socializing act on the whole, or to artificial speech which sounds unnatural. For ELT, it is not enough to say that talking is the exchange of information between two or more participants. And especially if we are looking at all the materials for self-study, the software for e-learning and information about languages that can be easily found, we must conclude that the presentation of simple linguistic data is not required [2]. The main goal of the teacher is the teaching of communication. While the goal of students is the ability to communicate freely in another language, and of course, effectively. Let's consider the following dialogue, developed for our purposes:

A: I heard that our colleague Malika is in the family way
B: I thought that her husband did not want any more children.
A: Perhaps this is not his decision.
B: When is she going to have her baby?
A: Sometime in August.

Although the language is exhaustive, a logical turn is applied, the text is consistent and acceptable, it is flow is hampered by the lack of cohesive links. The nature of the dialogue either indicates that participants have no interest in the topic, potentially in conversation, as a generalizing act in general, or artificial speech that sounds unnatural.

If we change the conversation slightly without altering the content, we might achieve something like:

A So, I heard our colleague Miraziz is in the family way.
B: You don't say! I thought her husband didn't want any more kids.
A: Well, perhaps it wasn't his call, if you know what I mean.
B: (laughter) Alright, well, when's the baby due?
A: Sometime in August apparently.

Thorn by claim that students learn how to convert such texts, for example, 1 into cohesive and refined texts using discourse markers (for example, 2). Practice has indeed shown that it is extremely difficult and, thus, rare for L2 students to recognize and absorb the language that is used in everyday speech from classroom studies. We could argue that students are exposed to the natural sound of their teacher. However, I found that it does not guarantee that most students will simply retain the language that their teacher uses. I argue that if we require our students to learn

and actively use a certain element of TL, we must include it in the curriculum.

Teaching students the above expressions and devices to help them seem natural should therefore be an integral part of the curriculum. Instead of relying on students' ability to implement grammar and vocabulary concepts, while considering sociolinguistic contexts and choosing the appropriate register, L2 should be presented as ready-made pieces of language where possible and desirable. Even a fluent and eloquent speaker needs time to comprehend and formulate his statements. Second speaking languages have fewer automated linguistic funds, they need more time to formulate their language, they are under a lot of stress. I agree with Thorn bury that a certain degree of automation is needed to achieve communicative effectiveness. To make this process easier for students, we must bear in mind that:

Automaticity is partially achievable at the level of formulation through the use of prefabricated pieces. In the transcripts in section 3, we will also analyze how students of different levels of CEFR use an effective and highly effective spoken language. Thorn bury argues that the spoken language, unlike the written one, is naturally more incoherent and not so carefully formulated. Therefore, the speakers use the so-called complementary strategy. Speaking, both in our native language, and in L2, we press on the time already at the planning stage. It takes an amount of time to form a collapsed sentence, which can cause a pause in the discourse. Naturally, pauses are natural, their length and frequency; however, determine the fluency of the speaker [3]. They should become less numerous and short as a student progresses for a more competent speaker, the less time it takes for the planning phase. Nevertheless, an additional strategy will always be a characteristic part of the oral discourse. Simply adding phrases, incomplete sentences or fragments of language to each other is a consistent part of speech. I believe that applying an additional strategy will be more common among higher-level students for the simple reason that they are more confident in using L2. As students gain confidence in access to the target language, they become aware that the spoken language is much less structured than the language of the textbooks that they teach. To demonstrate their fluency, students at high levels of CEFR use language fragments that they can easily update even by using incomplete sentences. The lower levels, on the other hand, do not show enough spontaneity and naturalness to react instantaneously. Whether it is worth paying more attention to the creation of flawless proposals or whether he prefers a continuous statement with minimal pauses that contains numerous errors is the choice of each person and results from the individuality and approach to communication as a whole.

References

1. *Mitchell R.* Communicative Language Teaching in Practice. Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research. London, 2000.
2. Anusu Omondi Maryslessor is an assistant lecturer in the department of Cirriculum, 2014.
3. *.Richards C.J. and Nunan D*. Second Language teacher education, Cambridge University Press., 2011.