

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF GRAMMAR-TRANSLATION METHOD AND COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING

Boliqulova Muxlisa Nomoz qizi

Student of the Faculty of English Philology and Translation Studies

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

muxlisaboliqulova2104@gmail.com

Abstract. *In the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, this study seeks to assess the relative efficacy of the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Unlike GTM, which prioritizes accuracy, translation, and the written word, CLT places a greater emphasis on interaction, fluency, and practical communication. For six weeks, two groups of intermediate English learners were studied using GTM and CLT, respectively. To assess gains in vocabulary acquisition, grammar knowledge, and communicative ability, pre- and post-tests were given. The results indicate that, while GTM improves students' grammatical knowledge and translation abilities, CLT greatly enhances their speaking fluency and overall communication competence. This comparative study emphasizes the necessity of a balanced, context-sensitive approach to teaching English language, which includes incorporating both approaches where appropriate to address the various demands of students.*

Keywords: *Grammar-translation method, communicative language teaching, English language teaching, teaching methodology, EFL learners, language acquisition, speaking fluency, grammar instruction, communicative competence, comparative study.*

Introduction

Over the last few decades, there have been notable changes in the methods used in the teaching of the English language, mirroring changes in language learning theories and the varied demands of students. The Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) are two instructional strategies with very different underlying ideologies. GTM, which has its roots in classical language instruction, focuses on rote memorization of grammatical rules, translation of literary texts, and written assignments. On the other hand, CLT emphasizes the acquisition of learners' communicative proficiency via interaction, meaningful discourse, and practical language use.

The discussion about the efficacy of these approaches is still pertinent, especially in environments where traditional instructional methods continue to be used in classrooms even though the world is moving toward communicative approaches. Although GTM is frequently lauded for its concentration on grammar structure, critics contend that it ignores the development of speaking and listening abilities. In contrast, although it is occasionally faulted for not paying enough attention to grammatical correctness, CLT is lauded for encouraging fluency and learner participation.

The goal of this study is to compare the two approaches by looking at how they affect students' grammatical proficiency, vocabulary retention, and communication skills. By analyzing the results of both approaches in real-world EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classroom situations, the research aims to offer useful insights into the advantages and disadvantages of each method, which will help inform pedagogical choices in English language instruction.

Materials and methods

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the efficacy of the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in English language classrooms. The study included 40 intermediate-level English language students at a high school in Samarkand, Uzbekistan. To ensure uniformity in language skill, the participants were split into two equal groups of 20 students, each based on the results of a standard English proficiency test.

The two groups learned the same linguistic topics, such as grammar structures, vocabulary sets, and reading and speaking exercises, but they did so using different methods over the course of six weeks. The Grammar-Translation Method, which stressed direct grammar explanation, sentence translation, vocabulary memorization, and reading comprehension through the native language, was used to teach the first group. The second group learned through Communicative Language Teaching, which emphasized interactive activities like role-playing, group debates, and problem-solving exercises aimed at improving communication skills in practical settings.

The teaching materials for the CLT group included dialogues, speaking prompts, and listening assignments, all of which were supported by real materials, while the grammar handouts and translation activities were the main teaching tools for the GTM group. The lesson materials were taken from a single English language textbook created for intermediate learners and supplemented with audio recordings, visual resources, and worksheets produced by the teacher.

Before and after each teaching technique, pre-tests and post-tests were given to both groups to measure the effectiveness of each approach. These examinations evaluated pupils' grammar skills, vocabulary learning, and speaking fluency. Furthermore, structured observation checklists were used during classroom observations to record pupils' participation, interaction, and language use throughout the lessons. Qualitative data on students' attitudes toward the various teaching strategies was collected using questionnaires on student perception at the conclusion of the study.

Descriptive statistics were used to examine the quantitative data gathered from the trials in order to find trends of advancement within and between the groups. The qualitative results from the questionnaires and observation notes were coded and thematically analyzed to support and interpret the test results.

Participants

The study involved 40 intermediate-level students learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL) at a secondary school in Samarkand, Uzbekistan. The participants, aged 16 to 18, had been studying English for an average of four years as part of their school program. They all had similar educational backgrounds and were assessed at the B1 level of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) through a placement test conducted before the study.

To maintain comparability, the students were randomly divided into two equal groups: Group A (Grammar-Translation Method) and Group B (Communicative Language Teaching), with 20 students in each group. Both groups were matched in terms of age, gender, and language proficiency.

Before the intervention, informed consent was secured from the school administration, students, and their parents. Participants were made aware of the study's purpose and procedures, and their anonymity and confidentiality were upheld throughout the research. No student faced academic rewards or penalties based on their involvement or performance in the study.

Results

When comparing the results of pre- and post- tests, major differences in student achievement between the two groups were found. Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) students showed significant improvements in their linguistic skills. From 62. 5% in the pre-test to 78. 4% in the post-test, the mean score increased; this indicated that GTM positively impacted linguistic correctness and lexical acquisition. By contrast, pupils in the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) group showed a greater rise in general communicative competence and fluent speaking. Their average exam score went up from

60.3% to 82.6%. Observational data further confirmed these findings as the CLT group pupils showed more natural speech output and engaged more actively in class debates. The students' responses likewise differed among the groups. Unlike the GTM group, which stressed well-structured instruction and simple grammatical explanations, the CLT group members stated they felt more confident, motivated, and enjoyment speaking English in everyday situations.

Discussion

The results of this research indicate that both the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) provide unique advantages in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teaching, depending on the specific goals of the learners. GTM was found to be effective in enhancing grammatical accuracy and vocabulary acquisition, which aligns with earlier studies that praise its systematic, rule-oriented approach. However, it fell short in fostering oral communication skills, which are crucial for practical language use.

Conversely, CLT significantly improved students' communication skills and interaction in the classroom. These findings support previous research that highlights the benefits of communicative methods in encouraging learner independence, fluency, and participation. Nonetheless, some learners in the CLT group experienced challenges initially in adjusting to the more flexible and spontaneous format of the lessons.

Thus, the study emphasizes the need to match teaching strategies with the intended learning outcomes. While GTM may be effective for preparing for exams or focusing on grammar, CLT is better suited for developing communicative competence.

Conclusion. This comparative analysis shows that both the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) are important in teaching English. GTM is beneficial for enhancing grammar understanding and vocabulary retention, while CLT is better at developing communication abilities and motivating students. The findings suggest that teachers should consider using a blended or eclectic approach that incorporates aspects of both methods to meet the varied needs of students in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes. Future studies could investigate the lasting effects of these teaching methods on language retention and performance among various proficiency levels and educational environments.

REFERENCES:

1. Brown, H. D. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. New York: Pearson Education, 2007, pp. 91–110.
2. Ellis, R. Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003, pp. 1–39.
3. Harmer, J. The Practice of English Language Teaching. London: Pearson Longman, 2007, pp. 62–78.
4. Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, pp. 13–25; 121–139.
5. Littlewood, W. "The Task-Based Approach: Some Questions and Suggestions." *ELT Journal*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, Vol. 58(4), pp. 319–326.
6. Nunan, D. Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers. London: Prentice Hall, 1991, pp. 279–295.
7. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014, pp. 5–7; 84–95.
8. Savignon, S. J. Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching: Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002, pp. 1–50.