

EFFECTIVE TECHNIQUES FOR INTEGRATING LISTENING AND SPEAKING IN EFL CLASSROOMS

Kurbanova Mahira Yakubjon kizi

Samarkand State Pedagogical Institute

Annotation. *This article examines effective techniques for integrating listening and speaking in EFL classrooms to address the persistent gap between receptive comprehension and oral production. Using a qualitative synthesis of peer-reviewed research and comparative pedagogical analysis, it identifies task designs that improve interactional fluency, noticing, and pragmatic accuracy. The study contributes an integration framework linking input, interaction, and output.*

Keywords: *listening-speaking integration; EFL classroom interaction; task-based language teaching; comprehensible input; interactional competence; pronunciation and fluency; formative assessment.*

ЭФФЕКТИВНЫЕ МЕТОДЫ ИНТЕГРАЦИИ АУДИРОВАНИЯ И ГОВОРЕНИЯ В КЛАССАХ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА КАК ИНОСТРАННОГО (EFL)

Курбонова Мохира Ёкубжон кизи

Самаркандский государственный педагогический институт

Аннотация. *В статье рассматриваются эффективные приемы интеграции аудирования и говорения на занятиях английского языка как иностранного, направленные на преодоление разрыва между пониманием речи и устной продукцией. На основе качественного обзора исследований и сравнительного методического анализа выделяются задания, повышающие интерактивную беглость и прагматическую точность. Предлагается интеграционная модель «вход – взаимодействие - выход».*

Ключевые слова: интеграция аудирования и говорения; взаимодействие в классе ИЯ; коммуникативные задания; понятный вход; интеракционная компетенция; произношение и беглость; формирующее оценивание.

EFL SINFLARIDA TINGLASH VA GAPIRISHNI INTEGRATSIYA QILISHNING SAMARALI USULLARI

Qurbonova Mohira Yoqubjon qizi

Samarqand davlat pedagogika institute

Annotatsiya. Maqolada EFL darslarida tinglab tushunish va gapirishni integratsiyalashning samarali usullari tahlil qilinadi hamda qabul qiluvchi ko'nikmalar bilan og'zaki nutq orasidagi tafovut muammosi yoritiladi. Sifat tahliliga asoslangan adabiyotlar sintezi va qiyosiy metodik yondashuv orqali interaktiv ravonlik va pragmatik aniqlikni oshiruvchi topshiriqlar ajratib ko'rsatiladi. "Kirish - o'zaro ta'sir – chiqish" modeli taklif etiladi.

Kalit so'zlar: tinglash va gapirish integratsiyasi; EFL sinf muloqoti; topshiriqqa asoslangan o'qitish; tushunarli kirish; interaksion kompetensiya; talaffuz va ravonlik; formatif baholash

Introduction. Despite decades of communicative pedagogy, many EFL learners continue to experience an uneven development of oral abilities: they can follow classroom audio materials with moderate success et struggle to respond spontaneously, negotiate meaning, or sustain interaction. This asymmetry is not a minor classroom inconvenience; it limits academic participation, employability, and the ability to learn through English in later stages. The scientific relevance of integrating listening and speaking lies in the psycholinguistic interdependence of input processing and output formulation, as well as in the classroom ecology where opportunities for interaction shape what learners can notice, practice, and eventually automatize. Research in second language acquisition has repeatedly shown that comprehension alone is insufficient for

developing robust spoken competence if learners do not engage in interaction that requires attending to form, adjusting messages, and monitoring intelligibility in real time [1; 2]. However, classroom practice often treats listening as a testing event and speaking as a separate performance activity, resulting in fragmented skill instruction that fails to exploit their complementary functions.

The research problem addressed in this article is the persistence of pedagogical routines that separate listening and speaking into discrete lesson segments, thereby underusing the potential of listening input to generate meaningful output and underusing speaking tasks to refine listening strategies. In many EFL contexts, especially where exposure to authentic interaction outside the classroom is limited, listening materials are selected primarily for lexical and grammatical coverage, while speaking tasks are evaluated primarily through accuracy or memorized fluency. This creates a research gap between what integration implies in theory and what techniques reliably operationalize it under realistic classroom constraints such as large classes, limited time, mixed proficiency, and exam-oriented cultures. While task-based language teaching and interaction-based approaches provide principles for integration, teachers still need a systematized set of techniques linking specific listening designs to predictable speaking outcomes, along with classroom-valid mechanisms for feedback and assessment.

The aim of this article is to identify and justify effective techniques for integrating listening and speaking in EFL classrooms and to propose an analytically grounded framework that explains why these techniques work. The objectives are to clarify the conceptual mechanisms that connect listening to speaking development, to categorize integration techniques by their cognitive and interactional functions, to synthesize evidence on their classroom effectiveness, and to articulate implications for lesson planning and formative assessment. The article focuses on pedagogical integration rather than technology-driven solutions, treating digital tools as optional supports rather than the primary explanatory factor.

Methods. The study employs a qualitative research synthesis combined with comparative pedagogical analysis. The qualitative synthesis approach is appropriate

because the research aim is not to estimate a single effect size but to systematize techniques and explain their mechanisms across diverse classroom studies, methodological traditions, and learner populations. The synthesis draws on established constructs in second language acquisition, including comprehensible input, interactional modification, pushed output, and noticing [1;2], as well as on communicative and task-based methodological literature that specifies how classroom tasks can be sequenced to create opportunities for negotiation of meaning and attention to form [3; 4]. A comparative method is used to contrast integration techniques that differ in the directionality of the skills link, such as listening-to-speaking sequences where input precedes output versus speaking-to-listening sequences where learners produce hypotheses and then refine them through listening.

The empirical basis of the synthesis consists of peer-reviewed research and authoritative monographs in language teaching methodology and assessment. Sources were selected according to relevance to integrated listening-speaking instruction, clarity of pedagogical procedures, and presence of classroom-based evidence or theoretically grounded rationale. To ensure balance and contextual breadth, the reference set includes international scholarship, Russian methodological traditions, and Uzbek pedagogical perspectives in foreign language teaching [3; 5; 6]. Analytical coding was applied to the selected sources to extract recurring instructional moves, the learning mechanisms they presuppose, and reported outcomes. The coding focused on four dimensions: the role of input, the type of interaction, the nature of output demands, and the feedback loop. The resulting categories were then examined for internal coherence and for alignment with the stated objectives. The method is limited by its reliance on published descriptions rather than direct classroom observation; nevertheless, it enables an academically justified framework that can guide subsequent empirical testing.

Results. The synthesis yielded four main findings that respond directly to the research objectives and clarify what makes listening-speaking integration effective beyond simply placing two activities in the same lesson. The first finding is that integration works best when listening input is designed as a resource for action rather than as an endpoint for comprehension questions. When learners listen with a clearly

defined communicative purpose that will be realized through speaking, they allocate attention differently: they listen for stance, intent, discourse markers, and usable language chunks, not only for factual detail. Studies grounded in interactionist perspectives indicate that tasks requiring learners to reuse information for interpersonal goals increase the likelihood of noticing gaps and seeking repair during interaction [1; 2]. In practical terms, the effective techniques in this category include listening to short dialogues or monologues and then completing an information-transfer speaking task where learners must explain, persuade, or recommend based on what they heard, with constraints that require paraphrasing rather than verbatim repetition.

The second finding is that bidirectional sequencing, in which brief speaking precedes listening and is followed by revised speaking, produces more stable gains in interactional fluency than unidirectional sequencing. In these cycles, learners first attempt to express meanings with their current resources, then listen to a model or an interlocutor that provides alternative expressions and discourse organization, and finally speak again with an explicit mandate to improve clarity and interactional appropriateness. This structure operationalizes pushed output and noticing by creating a contrast between learner production and input, but it avoids the demotivating effect of pure imitation because the second speaking attempt remains meaning-driven. Methodological research on communicative tasks and scaffolding supports the idea that rehearsal with feedback improves both speed and complexity of spoken performance when the second attempt is not treated as a test but as an opportunity for refinement [4; 7]. Effective classroom techniques include “predict-discuss-listen-confirm” routines, learner-generated questions before listening, and post-listening “upgrade” rounds where learners replace vague expressions with more precise ones.

The third finding is that micro-listening combined with interactional speaking moves is a key technique for developing intelligibility and pragmatic control simultaneously. Micro-listening refers to short, repeated exposure to brief segments that contain salient phonological or discourse features, followed immediately by interactive speaking tasks that require those features to be used in context. Rather than isolating pronunciation drills from communication, this approach integrates perception and

production so that learners practice decoding reduced forms, stress patterns, and turn-taking signals and then apply them to manage real-time conversation. Research on listening comprehension emphasizes that decoding difficulties can limit participation even when learners know relevant vocabulary and grammar, because they fail to recognize words in connected speech [8]. The synthesis indicates that techniques such as shadowing with communicative follow-up, chunk rehearsal embedded in role-plays, and guided noticing of discourse markers before pair discussion create measurable improvements in perceived fluency and responsiveness, particularly in intermediate learners.

The fourth finding is that integrated formative assessment is essential to sustain the benefits of integration and prevent lessons from reverting to separated skill practice. The most effective assessment moves are those that make the listening-speaking link visible to learners through criteria that capture interactional competence, such as responsiveness, clarification requests, and appropriate uptake of heard information. General speaking rubrics focused only on grammar and vocabulary do not capture whether learners can transform input into interactional contributions. Contemporary assessment literature argues for performance-based assessment that aligns tasks and criteria with communicative constructs [7]. In integrated lessons, assessment is most productive when it is low-stakes, frequent, and embedded in task cycles, for example through peer checklists on evidence use from listening, teacher feedback on repair strategies, and brief reflective prompts where learners identify expressions they adopted from the listening input and explain how those expressions changed their message.

Discussion. The results can be interpreted as a coherent model of integration based on three mechanisms: input as affordance, interaction as catalyst, and output as consolidation. The first mechanism, treating listening as an affordance for action, aligns with theories that emphasize comprehensible input as necessary but not sufficient for acquisition [1]. The contribution of the present synthesis is to specify that the pedagogical value of input increases when the listening task imposes a subsequent speaking obligation that cannot be fulfilled through surface recall. This extends a common classroom practice of “listen and answer questions” by repositioning

comprehension as preparation for interaction. In relation to Krashen's input hypothesis [1], the integrated techniques do not reject the role of input; rather, they operationalize the conditions under which input becomes intake by adding purposeful use. The implication is that teachers should evaluate listening materials not only by level and topic but by their potential to seed interactional moves and transferable language.

The second mechanism, the superiority of bidirectional sequencing, resonates with Swain's output hypothesis, where producing language pushes learners to process form and meaning more deeply [2]. The synthesis suggests that output becomes especially powerful when it is sandwiched between two listening moments: the initial speaking attempt exposes gaps, the listening provides alternatives, and the revised speaking attempt consolidates learning through immediate application. This interpretation is consistent with task-based methodology emphasizing cycles of planning, performance, and repetition under slightly changed conditions [4]. Compared to approaches that rely heavily on pre-teaching vocabulary before listening, the bidirectional cycle reallocates time toward learner hypothesis formation and subsequent adjustment. This is not merely a procedural preference; it changes the epistemic position of the learner from recipient of language to agent who tests and refines communicative choices.

The third mechanism, micro-listening linked to interactional speaking, helps reconcile two traditions that are sometimes separated in classroom practice: the focus on intelligibility and the focus on meaning negotiation. Russian methodological scholarship has historically emphasized the systematic formation of auditory-pronunciation skills as a basis for oral speech development [5]. The current synthesis does not return to isolated drill; instead, it integrates the insight that perception precedes stable production with interactionist evidence that conversational demands drive attention and automatization [2; 8]. This combined view also aligns with contemporary pronunciation pedagogy that prioritizes intelligibility and listener-oriented adjustment, suggesting that micro-listening followed by communicative use is more efficient than long pronunciation segments detached from discourse. The scientific value of this point is that it reframes pronunciation not as an additional component but as an integral part of listening-speaking integration.

The fourth mechanism highlights the role of assessment as a structural element of integration rather than as a terminal measurement. Brown's classroom assessment principles emphasize alignment between instructional goals, tasks, and criteria, warning that misalignment produces negative washback on teaching and learning [7]. In integrated listening-speaking lessons, if assessment attends only to speaking accuracy, learners may ignore the listening source or treat it as background. If assessment attends only to listening scores, speaking becomes an afterthought. The synthesized techniques suggest that integrated criteria, such as accurate use of heard information, appropriate backchanneling, and effective clarification strategies, can stabilize the integration by shaping learner attention. Uzbek methodological perspectives on developing communicative competence in foreign language education underscore the need for purposeful, context-sensitive task design that supports active learner participation [6]. The present article extends this perspective by specifying assessment moves that maintain participation as an accountable practice, not only an encouraged behavior.

At the same time, the synthesis indicates boundaries and risks. Integration can fail when listening texts are too information-dense, leaving no cognitive resources for speaking, or when speaking tasks require only personal opinions unrelated to the listening input, undermining the intended linkage. Another risk is overreliance on model imitation, which may inflate short-term fluency while limiting transfer to new contexts. The discussion thus supports a principled balance: input should be exploitable, interaction should be necessary, and output should be meaning-driven but constrained enough to trigger specific language work. These conditions correspond to the broader communicative language teaching tradition, et they offer more operational detail for classroom planning than general recommendations to "make lessons communicative" [3; 4].

Conclusion. The article has shown that effective integration of listening and speaking in EFL classrooms depends on designing listening as a resource for subsequent action, using bidirectional task cycles that require initial production, model-informed listening, and revised production, applying micro-listening linked to interactional speaking for intelligibility and pragmatic control, and embedding

formative assessment that evaluates how learners transform input into responsive contributions. The scientific contribution of the study is an explanatory framework connecting input, interaction, output, and assessment as a single instructional system rather than separate lesson components. Practically, the findings imply that teachers should select listening materials for their interactional affordances, plan speaking tasks with constraints that require uptake from listening, and use criteria that capture interactional competence. Future research should test the proposed framework through classroom experiments across proficiency levels and institutional contexts, including longitudinal designs that track whether integrated techniques improve spontaneous interaction beyond rehearsed tasks.

References:

1. Krashen S. D. Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982. 202 p.
2. Wain M. Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In: Gass S., Madden C., eds. Input in second language acquisition. Rowley: Newbury House, 1985. P. 235–253.
3. Richards J. C., Rodgers T. S. Approaches and methods in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 410 p.
4. Ellis R. Task-based language teaching and learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. 387 p.
5. Пассов Е. И. Коммуникативный метод обучения иноязычному говорению. Москва: Просвещение, 1991. 223 с.
6. Jalolov J. Chet tillarni o'qitish metodikasi. Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 2012. 320 b.
7. Brown H. D. Language assessment: principles and classroom practices. White Plains: Pearson Education, 2004. 362 p.
8. Field J. Listening in the language classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. 366 p.