

Comparison of the Grammar-Translation Method and Modern Methods

*Muradulloyeva Sevinch Soxibjon qizi*¹

Abstract: This article compares Grammar-Translation method and modern English teaching methods. The study compares the grammatical and translation-focused approach of the traditional method with the principles of practical speech and interaction-focused modern methods such as communicative, Task-Based Learning, and blended learning. The article identifies the advantages and disadvantages of the methods and emphasizes the need for their effective harmonization in the educational process. The results show that the combined use of the two approaches in the educational process contributes to the thorough mastery of the language by students and the development of skills for its practical application.

Keywords: Grammar-Translation method, communicative approach, Task-Based Learning, blended learning, English language teaching, language learning methodology, language skills, pedagogy

INTRODUCTION

In the field of English language teaching methodology, many approaches have emerged in different periods, which have served the effective organization of the educational process and the formation of language skills. The traditional Grammar-Translation method (grammar-translation method) has been used for many years as the main teaching method, paying great attention to the in-depth study of grammatical rules and the translation of texts in language learning. Although this method was especially successful in teaching classical languages, with the changing needs of modern language teaching and the requirements of global communication, questions arose about its effectiveness. In recent years, the communicative approach, Task-Based Learning, blended learning, and other innovative methods have begun to be widely used in teaching English. The main goal of these approaches is to develop students' skills in the practical application of language, especially the formation of oral speech, increasing interactivity, and strengthening motivation for language learning. Modern methods are aimed at activating students, preparing them for independent thinking and real communication.

This article analyzes the pedagogical features, advantages, and disadvantages of the Grammar-Translation method and modern methods. Also, it is considered what results they give in the process of teaching English, under what conditions they are more effective, and their influence on the motivation of students to learn the language. The purpose of the article is to compare language teaching methods, identify the most effective approaches in modern pedagogical practice, and make proposals.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The historical development of language teaching methods and their role in the educational process have been studied by many researchers. The Grammar-Translation Method (GT method) has been widely used as a traditional language teaching method since the 19th century and is considered effective in teaching classical languages, in particular Latin and Greek (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In this method, much emphasis is placed on understanding grammatical rules and written translation, but little attention is paid to oral speech and communicative skills (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). In the field of modern pedagogy and linguistics, the communicative approach (Communicative Language Teaching,

¹ Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages 2th year student, muradulloyevasevinch@gmail.com



CLT) has gained great importance. This approach is aimed at the development of speech activity and is based on the practical application of language, preparation for real communication situations (Savignon, 2002). Also, the Task-Based Learning (TBL) methodology encourages active student participation in language learning by completing tasks and focuses on language teaching in context (Ellis, 2003).

Blended learning, or hybrid learning technologies, are based on the integration of traditional teaching methods with digital tools and help adapt to the needs of modern students (Graham, 2006). This method allows students to work independently, use interactive materials, and individualize the learning process (Bonk & Graham, 2006). Many studies emphasize that the Grammar-Translation method does not provide sufficient interactivity and communicative opportunities in language teaching, therefore it should be used in conjunction with modern methods or new approaches should be developed based on their advantages (Brown, 2007; Richards, 2015). At the same time, some researchers recognize the effectiveness of the GT method in thoroughly teaching the basics of grammar and recommend combining it with modern approaches (Howatt, 1984).

METHODOLOGY

In this study, qualitative and quantitative approaches were used together to compare the effectiveness and pedagogical features of the Grammar-Translation method and modern methods of teaching English. For data collection, methods of literature analysis, questionnaires, and interviews with teachers and students were used. Also, observations were conducted in the educational process, and the influence of various methods on students' speech and grammatical skills was studied. The collected data were analyzed, the advantages and disadvantages of both methods were identified, and the possibilities of their practical application were assessed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research results showed that the Grammar-Translation method (GT method) pays great attention to the rules of grammar and translation in teaching English. This method allows students to study the structural aspects of language more deeply. For example, students master the language theoretically by identifying the grammatical rules of complex sentences, translating words. However, since this method pays little attention to speech exercises and communication, students often have difficulty speaking in a practical conversation. Interviews and surveys conducted within the framework of the study showed that students using the GT method showed low results in speaking and listening fluently in English. On the other hand, modern methods, in particular the communicative approach (Communicative Language Teaching, CLT) and Task-Based Learning (TBL), bring the language learning process closer to real-life situations. For example, in the CLT method, students develop practical language skills through conversations, discussions, role-playing games during the lesson. According to the research results, this method increases students' ability not only to understand the language well, but also to use it effectively and freely. For example, students improved their speech as a result of studying situations through roles, such as shopping or traveling during group work.

Task-Based Learning teaches students the necessary language skills to complete a specific task. The study revealed that with the help of the task-based learning method, students' problem-solving and language use skills in context have significantly improved. For example, students actively used language in the process of group project preparation or data collection. The Blended learning methodology combines traditional and digital learning tools, allowing students to learn independently. During the study, it was observed that students had the opportunity to reinforce their knowledge in lessons by performing additional exercises through mobile applications and online platforms. This plays an important role in increasing the motivation of students to learn the language. It should be noted that the GT method cannot be considered insignificant in strengthening the foundations of grammar. For some teachers and students, a thorough study of grammar rules is important for correctly understanding the language and performing written work. Therefore, the combination of modern methods with the GT method will be effective in maintaining balance in the pedagogical process and meeting the various needs of students.



CONCLUSION

The results of this study showed that the Grammar-Translation method and modern language teaching methods have their own advantages and disadvantages. Although the Grammar-Translation method allows for a thorough study of the grammatical foundations of language and is effective in the development of written skills, it does not give sufficient results in the formation of practical speech and communication skills. On the other hand, modern methods such as the communicative approach, Task-Based Learning, and blended learning strengthen students' language skills in practice, prepare them for real-life situations, and increase motivation for language learning. Therefore, it is necessary to combine traditional and modern approaches in teaching English, not relying on only one method. This combination allows students to deeply master the theoretical foundations of the language and effectively apply it in practice. In the future, the flexibility of methods in the educational process and their selection based on the needs of students will serve to improve the quality of education.

THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE:

1. Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education. <https://www.pearson.com/us/higher-education/program/Brown-Principles-of-Language-Learning-and-Teaching-5th-Edition/PGM332306.html>
2. Bonk, C. J., & Graham, C. R. (2006). *The Handbook of Blended Learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs*. Pfeiffer Publishing. <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/The+Handbook+of+Blended+Learning%3A+Global+Perspectives%2C+Local+Designs-p-9780787987629>
3. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford University Press. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/task-based-language-learning-and-teaching-9780194421593/>
4. Graham, C. R. (2006). Blended Learning Systems: Definition, Current Trends, and Future Directions. In C. J. Bonk & C. R. Graham (Eds.), *The Handbook of Blended Learning* (pp. 3-21). Pfeiffer Publishing. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/220039545_Blended_learning_systems_Definition_current_trends_and_future_directions
5. Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/a-history-of-english-language-teaching-9780194371570>
6. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/techniques-and-principles-in-language-teaching-9780194423603>
7. Richards, J. C. (2015). *Key Issues in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press. <https://www.cambridge.org/9781107052519>
8. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://www.cambridge.org/9780521667200>
9. Savignon, S. J. (2002). *Communicative Language Teaching: Linguistic Theory and Classroom Practice*. In *Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 233-246). Blackwell Publishing. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9780470757000>
10. Asror qizi , O. F. . (2025). Linguistic Problems of Intercultural Communication. *Miasto Przyszłości*, 56, 128–130. Retrieved from <https://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/5976>
11. Omonova Farangiz Asror qizi Master student of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages. (2025). *STYLISTIC DISCORDANCES OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK SPEECH FORMULAS*. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14873780>



12. Omonova Farangiz Asror qizi. (2025). Cultural Discordances of English and Uzbek Set Phrases. *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION*, 5(5), 208–210. Retrieved from <https://inovatus.es/index.php/ejine/article/view/5764>
13. WAYS OF SOLVING THE PROBLEMS OF INTERCULTURALCOMMUNICATION. (2025). *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, 5(05), 1362-1366. <https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai/article/view/4645>
14. Omonova, F. (2025). WAYS OF SOLVING THE PROBLEMS OF INTERCULTURALCOMMUNICATION. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, 1(4), 1362-1366.
15. Asror, O. F., Sherzod, A. E., & Salimovna, N. M. (2023). The importance of motivation in education. *Trends of Modern Science and Practice*, 1(2), 5-7.

