

A REVIEW OF THE GRAMMAR TRANSLATION METHOD (GTM) AND COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING (CLT): WEAKNESSES AND STRENGTHS

Zarnigor Sanoyeva

Student of English filology at Uzbekistan State

World Language university.

Sodiqova Nargiza Baxodir qizi

A teacher of the department

“Practical aspects of the English language” of

Uzbekistan State World Language University ,

English Philology faculty

zarnigorsanoyeva1@gmail.com

Abstract

This article explores the grammar translation method (GTM) and the communicative language teaching approach (CLT) in language teaching, along with their advantages and disadvantages. Secondly, solutions are sought to the issue of which method provides more benefits and effectiveness in classrooms where the target language is being taught. In teaching, especially in language instruction, methodology plays a crucial role, as the teaching method is the way in which the learning process is effectively organized. The effectiveness of a particular method in language teaching directly and indirectly depends on the teacher's and the students' learning styles. A teacher should conduct lessons using the most suitable approach for their students. However, relying on only one method in the classroom is impractical because every

learner differs from one another. The effectiveness of communicative or traditional grammar-based teaching methods in language classrooms also depends on the target language itself. It is suggested in this article that an integrated approach, where a grammatical foundation is established through GTM and practical application is promoted through CLT, could be more effective. This article examines these methods through the lens of learner engagement, accuracy, and fluency.

Аннотация

В данной статье рассматриваются метод перевода грамматики (GTM) и коммуникативный метод обучения языкам (CLT), а также их преимущества и недостатки. Кроме того, в статье анализируется, какой из этих методов является более эффективным в классах, где изучается целевой язык. Методология играет ключевую роль в обучении языку, так как она определяет, как организован процесс обучения. Эффективность конкретного метода напрямую и косвенно зависит от преподавателя и стиля обучения студентов. Преподаватель должен использовать наиболее подходящий подход для своих учеников. Однако полагаться только на один метод непрактично, поскольку каждый ученик отличается от других. Эффективность коммуникативного или грамматически ориентированного метода обучения также зависит от характеристик самого языка. В данной статье предлагается интегрированный подход, при котором GTM используется для формирования грамматической базы, а CLT способствует практическому применению языка. В обзоре анализируются эти методы с точки зрения вовлеченности учащихся, точности и беглости речи.

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada grammatika-tarjima metodi (GTM) va kommunikativ til o'qitish usuli (CLT) tahlil qilinib, ularning afzalliklari va kamchiliklari ko'rib chiqilgan. Shuningdek, maqolada maqsadli til o'rgatiladigan sinflarda qaysi usul samaraliroq ekanligi haqida aytilgan. Til o'qitishda metodologiya juda muhim rol o'ynaydi, chunki

o'qitish usuli o'quv jarayoni qanday tashkil etilishini belgilaydi. Muayyan metodning samaradorligi bevosita va bilvosita o'qituvchi hamda talabalarning o'rganish uslubiga bog'liq. O'qituvchi o'z o'quvchilari uchun eng mos yondashuvni tanlashi lozim. Biroq, faqat bitta usulga tayanish amaliy jihatdan samarasiz, chunki har bir o'quvchi boshqalardan farq qiladi. Kommunikativ yoki grammatikaga asoslangan o'qitish usullarining samaradorligi, shuningdek, o'rgatilayotgan tilning o'ziga xos xususiyatlariga bog'liq. Ushbu maqolada integratsiyalashgan yondashuv taklif qilinib, bunda GTM grammatik asos yaratish uchun, CLT esa tilning amaliy qo'llanilishini rivojlantirish uchun ishlatiladi. Ushbu maqolada mazkur metodlarni o'quvchilarning faolligi, aniqligi va ravonligi nuqtayi nazaridan nazariy va ilmiy jihatdan chuqur tahlil qilingan.

Key words: Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), EFL (English as a Foreign Language) Instruction, Fluency vs. Accuracy, Grammar-Based Learning, Grammar Translation Method (GTM), Integrated Teaching Approach, Language Teaching Methodology, Learner Engagement, Second Language Acquisition, Technology in Language Learning

INTRODUCTION

The Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) are two well-known but opposing approaches that have emerged over time to meet the needs of both educators and learners. GTM is a traditional approach that emphasizes grammatical rules, translation exercises, and written proficiency, frequently prioritizing accuracy over fluency, while CLT focuses on real-life communication, encouraging interaction and meaningful language use to develop fluency. Both approaches have unique advantages and disadvantages, so it is crucial to assess their efficacy in a variety of learning environments. The success of language acquisition is greatly impacted by the selection of an appropriate teaching method; some students benefit from structured grammar instruction, while others flourish in communicative settings that place a higher priority on practical usage. Additionally,

the success of a given approach is influenced by a number of factors, including the target language's linguistic features, the teacher's instructional style, and the students' preferred methods of learning. For example, achieving communicative competency in languages like Uzbek, which have intricate grammatical structures, may necessitate a solid grammar basis.

By closely examining the benefits and drawbacks of both GTM and CLT, this article seeks to shed light on how well they work in language classes. It also investigates if a more balanced approach might be achieved by using an integrated method, in which CLT improves practical communication while GTM establishes a grammatical foundation. This article aims to add to the continuing conversation about optimizing language teaching methodologies for a range of learning needs by analyzing these approaches in terms of learner engagement, accuracy, and fluency.

One of the main topics of language education research has been the argument between Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and the Grammar Translation Method (GTM). The efficacy, advantages, and disadvantages of these strategies in various educational contexts have been studied by numerous academics.

Numerous research studies have assessed GTM and CLT's efficacy in various educational settings. According to Basri (n.d.), GTM is very helpful for students who need a strong grammatical foundation, particularly in languages like Uzbek that have intricate structures. In a similar vein, GTM is still applicable in academic contexts where reading and writing proficiency are valued, according to McAndrew et al. (1996)

On the other hand, Pop (2010) emphasizes how CLT promotes active participation in language acquisition and increases student engagement. However, scholars such as İltar (2015) and Nomass (2013) note that CLT can be difficult to apply in classrooms with a lot of students or little funding. In these situations, a hybrid strategy that incorporates aspects of both GTM and CLT might produce superior results.

The effect of technology on language teaching approaches has been the subject of recent research. Digital tools, according to Tabatabaei & Gui (2011), can improve GTM and CLT by offering individualized and interactive learning experiences. Motteram (2013) asserts that contemporary technology, such as AI-powered language tools and video conferencing, promotes grammar instruction while promoting communicative practice.

Additionally, researchers like Handley (2012) and Jung (2013) contend that e-learning platforms and text-to-speech synthesizers can help close the gap between GTM and CLT. By combining communicative activities with systematic grammar lessons, these tools help students learn languages more efficiently.

THE GRAMMAR TRANSLATION METHOD: BENEFITS AND DRAWBACKS

The development and historical foundations of the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) are often attributed to the German scholars Wilhelm von Humboldt and Franz Bopp. However, there aren't any specific publications that give them actual credit for creating or popularizing the technique. GTM's use as the main method of instruction for classical languages (Latin and Greek) is what primarily contributed to its creation and spread.

GTM emerged as a method for teaching classical languages, particularly Greek and Latin, in the 19th century. The systematic form and formal nomenclature of this procedure were devised in the mid-19th century.

Although this method has been around for a while, its use has decreased recently. This is because students may see the approach as being difficult and time-consuming. Experts have suggested different approaches as a remedy. Although this is undoubtedly advantageous, one important point should not be missed: people who study a language via the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) typically gain a more thorough and in-

depth collection of knowledge and abilities. This is due to the fact that significant linguistic competency is based on learning a language's syntax, structure, and vocabulary.

Furthermore, not all contemporary language learning techniques are equally appropriate for all languages. Languages like French, Arabic, and Uzbek, for example, have intricate grammatical systems that make learning them challenging without this approach. Using the Uzbek language as a lens, we can see that students who utilize GTM typically perform well in grammar and written translation, which helps them build writing, reading, and analysis skills. Consequently, this improves their capacity for efficient information processing.

Additionally, students improve their ability to build complicated phrases and their ability to understand formal correspondence or printed documents. When working with audio materials, a solid command of grammar enhances understanding and has a good impact on speaking abilities. This makes it easier for students to comprehend and translate formal, difficult material.

But there are disadvantages to GTM as well. One significant problem is that students who use this method frequently have trouble communicating spontaneously. Even if the approach places a lot of emphasis on comprehension, the capacity to communicate ideas clearly and spontaneously may still be lacking or even poorly developed.

Students in European nations specializing in philology and translation studies can still use this approach. In educational institutions, where everyday communication skills are prioritized, it is less commonly utilized.

POSITIVES AND NEGATIVES OF COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING (CLT)

The data indicates that Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) was first implemented in England in the 1970s.

English linguists and educators, especially Dell Hymes and Michael Canale, were the first to design this teaching strategy. CLT was made possible by Hymes' development of the idea of "communicative competence". Canale and Swain worked on this: how to instruct students without using tedious, complex grammar rules.

and then they concentrated on speech, vocabulary, and communication skills. It was highly successful, and it is now known as CLT.

This approach, which has gained a lot of popularity, particularly in Europe, is predicated on learning a language organically via conversation. But it hasn't yet shown itself to be very effective in Uzbekistan. This is due to the fact that both professors and pupils frequently utilize their mother tongue, and in certain situations, there is a lack of an engaged learning environment in the classroom. These elements make CLT less successful.

Additionally, some educators place more emphasis on grammatical correctness than on effective communication. Because of this, even when given the chance to speak, students might shy away from discussions for fear of making a mistake. The development of strong communication and soft skills in students is one of the biggest benefits of the CLT strategy. These skills are extremely important for landing a solid career in the future.

The most obvious drawback of this approach is that pupils frequently make a lot of grammatical, punctuation, and spelling mistakes. To conclude, it is not a good idea to rely only on one approach. The language being learned and the area in which it is taught should inform the teaching methodology selection. Combining the advantages of both approaches is the most efficient way to optimize learning results.

CONCLUSION

The efficacy of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) in various linguistic and educational contexts—specifically in Uzbekistan and European nations—has been investigated in this study. According to the results, GTM helps learners build strong analytical skills in grammar and translation, making it more successful for languages with complicated grammatical structures like German and Uzbek. Speaking and listening skills are crucial for communication in the real world, but GTM restricts them. However, because it improves fluency and interaction skills, CLT works better for languages like English and French that place a higher value on communication. Notwithstanding its benefits, CLT can result in grammatical errors, particularly when used with languages that have complex morphological systems.

The study also emphasizes how crucial cultural and educational elements are to the effectiveness of these strategies. While CLT is more common in private schools and European language programs, GTM is still the most common in Uzbekistan's public education system. Additionally, technology integration is essential to contemporary language acquisition because it bridges the divide between interactive practice and structured instruction.

REFERENCES:

Here is the list of references in alphabetical order:

- A. Pop, “The impact of new technologies in foreign language instruction: Our experience,” *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 1185–1189, Jan. 2010, doi: 10.1016/J.SBSPRO.2010.03.169.
- B. B. Nomass, “The impact of using technology in teaching English as a second language,” *English Language and Literature Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2013, doi: 10.5539.

B. G. İlter, “How does technology affect language learning process at an early age?,” *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 199, pp. 311–316, Aug. 2015, doi: 10.1016/J.SBSPRO.2015.07.552.

E. Cayon, J. S. Correa, and J. A. Sarmiento, “Does quality make a difference for higher education graduates in Colombia? Measuring differences in accredited and non-accredited institutions with similar financial characteristics,” *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, vol. 17, pp. 859–868, 2020, doi: 10.37394/23207.2020.17.84.

G. Motteram, “The benefits of new technology in language learning | British Council,” 2013.

J. T. Roberts, “The communicative approach to language teaching: The king is dead! Long live the king!,” *International Journal of English Studies*, 2004.

K. Bhakta and N. Dutta, “Impact of information technology on the teaching-learning process,” *International Research Journal of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Studies*, vol. II, no. XI, pp. 131–138, 2016, doi: 10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.219-220.1224.

M.-Y. Jung, “Videoconferencing improves students’ language learning in the EFL classroom,” *TESOL Journal*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 743–751, Dec. 2013.

M. M. Batova and V. Baranova I., “Information technology knowledge management in the system of interaction of educational and scientific-production structures,” *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, vol. 16, pp. 545–551, 2019.

M. A. Khan, “EFL teachers’ perceptions on CLT,” *International Journal of Research and Innovation*, vol. 1, 2016.

N. Nazarova, “Innovative methods in foreign language teaching,” *Innovative: Journal of Language, Education, and Cultural Studies*, vol. 3, no. 4, 2023, doi: 10.47134/innovative.v3i4.129.

S. Martin and I. M. Alvarez Valdivia, “Students’ feedback beliefs and anxiety in online foreign language oral tasks,” *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 18, Dec. 2017, doi: 10.1186/s41239-017-0056-z.

T. Dudley-Evans et al., *The Language Teaching Matrix*, Cambridge Language Teaching Library, 2001.

T. H. Mothudi and H. J. Bosman, “Communicative language teaching and learning: Interfacing theory and practice — The case of Botswana secondary schools.”

Y. Nazarova, “Innovative methods in foreign language teaching,” *Innovative: Journal of Language, Education, and Cultural Studies*, vol. 3, no. 4, 2023, doi: 10.47134/innovative.v3i4.129.