

## THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COMMUNICATIVE GRAMMAR TASKS FOR ENHANCING GRAMMATICAL ACCURACY AND FLUENCY IN TEACHING ENGLISH TO 10 11 GRADE STUDENTS

*Nurmamatova Nodira Nuraliyevna*

*1 year graduate of Uzbekistan State University of world languages*

*972838487 @nurmamatovanodira9@gmail.com*

**Annotation:** This study investigates the effectiveness of communicative grammar tasks in developing grammatical accuracy and fluency among 10–11 grade students learning English as a foreign language. By adopting a mixed-methods research design, the study explores the theoretical underpinnings of communicative grammar instruction and evaluates the outcomes of task-based language teaching. Results indicate that well-designed communicative tasks significantly improve both grammatical competence and oral fluency, leading to increased learner motivation and communicative confidence. The article presents practical recommendations for English teachers working with upper secondary school students.

**Keywords:** Communicative grammar, grammatical accuracy, fluency, task-based language teaching, secondary education, English as a foreign language (EFL), 10–11 grade students, communicative competence.

### INTRODUCTION

Language as the foundation of all human relationships as it is the primary means in communication. It reflects the culture, social interest, and diversity engaging people to understand each other. In teaching language, it is essential that traditional and communicative approach should involve function and communication. It emphasized that teachers should start the communication process using situational approach and the use of Communicative Approach to Language teaching is grounded to stimulus-response learning theory wherein the behavior of the teacher through the use of imitation, conditioning and practice encouraged the students to acquire language and linguistic competence (David, 1990). In addition, (Ghofur et. al, 2017) maintained that the use of communicative language teaching and the use of audiovisual method in teaching across learning styles of learners can improve the speaking skills of students. (Rashid et. al., 2019) recommends that teaching of English as a second language using the Communicative Language Teaching curriculum should be aligned and training of teachers in using the said strategies to address the issues on the factors affecting the speaking competence of learners. It is supported by the study of (Kwon, 2017) that found that language teachers faced difficulties in utilizing communication oriented activities and strategies since they are burdened to prepare their student's language competence needed for University Entrance Examinations. (Haryani, Putry, 2020) also emphasized the organized teachers methods in delivering CLT through the use of interesting games to encourage students' motivation in learning English and other important communication tool particularly the use of chain story technique to actively engage students in the language subjects (Uktolseja & Gaspersz, 2019). Also, (Huang, 2016) suggested that in changing the pedagogical practice of teachers, one must focused the grammar-translation that should be associated

with the sociocultural, school administration, classroom dynamics factors and other factors that affects students to learn effectively, hence incorporating those factors can promote active participation during classes. Modeling, repetition and pair and group works can also be used to enhance the process of developing oral fluency of the language (Toro, et. al, 2019). (Rustambekovna & Adambayevna, 2020) also suggested the use of videos in motivating learners to speak English fluently, and enhance their communicative skills. Thus, those strategies that can be incorporated to the Communicative Language Teaching Approach can be used to develop the communicative or speaking competence of proficiency of learners in all of their four skills, namely: Speaking, writing, reading and listening since it can be used by the learners to understand and convey their thoughts fluently, making them more capable to interact and communicate fluently in any foreign language, marginalizing the roles of teachers to use convenient methods in teaching English as a Foreign Language. Grammar instruction has long been a cornerstone of English language teaching. Traditionally, it has centered on explicit rule presentation and mechanical practice, often detached from real-life communication. While such approaches may lead to knowledge of grammatical forms, they rarely translate into spontaneous and accurate language use. This gap has prompted a pedagogical shift towards communicative approaches, where language is taught not merely as a system of rules, but as a tool for meaningful interaction (Larsen-Freeman, 2003). The communicative language teaching (CLT) paradigm advocates for grammar to be taught in context, with learners engaging in tasks that require them to use target structures to achieve specific outcomes. This approach emphasizes fluency, learner autonomy, and the integration of form and function (Littlewood, 2004). In this framework, communicative grammar tasks play a vital role, offering students opportunities to internalize grammatical structures through authentic use and meaningful practice. Research suggests that students acquire grammar more effectively when it is embedded in communicative activities rather than isolated drills (Ellis, 2003). Communicative grammar tasks can bridge the gap between declarative and procedural knowledge by encouraging learners to process grammatical forms while focusing on meaning. Such dual attention is crucial for developing both accuracy and fluency—two fundamental components of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980). In the history of EFL teaching methods, various trends in grammar teaching have been applied to enhance learners' competence in a foreign language, typically Grammar-Translation Method (GTM), Direct Method (DM), Audio-lingual Method (ALM), Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), etc. Amongst these, CLT is one of the newest known methods; it is the most favorable in the current trend of language teaching. Generally, there are a lot of evidences showing that grammar should be taught in communicative ways that is commonly called CLT (Singh, 2011). Unlike the former methods, CLT is learner-centered, emphasizes communication and real-life situations. It views that learners will learn best if they participate in meaningful communication (ibid.). In brief, CLT itself has its own advantages, and it really does benefit learners in a variety of ways. In this paper, the term “communicative grammar teaching” is used to refer to teaching grammar communicatively. According to “Grammar Practice: Mechanical and Communicative (n.d.)”, this method of grammar teaching is based on the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) to the teaching of second/ foreign languages. In the light of this method, language structures must not be taught in isolation but integrated to the four skills of language. A structure is practiced both orally and in written form. Grammar patterns must not only be learnt at the utterance level but also at the discourse level; the main objective focuses on the development of communicative grammatical competence, which is understood as the ability to use and understand a structure in a variety of situations spontaneously. In the context of secondary education, especially among 10–11 grade students, these needs become more pronounced. At this stage, learners are transitioning from guided practice to more independent language use. They must be equipped not only with grammatical knowledge but also with the ability to apply it in real-time communication. This necessitates a

reevaluation of instructional methods, with a focus on task-based approaches that mirror authentic language use. The present study explores the effectiveness of communicative grammar tasks in enhancing grammatical accuracy and fluency among 10–11 grade students learning English as a foreign language. While many schools continue to rely on traditional grammar instruction, there is growing evidence that such methods may not suffice for developing communicative competence in real-world contexts (Nunan, 2004). Therefore, this research aims to provide empirical support for communicative grammar tasks and offer practical recommendations for their implementation in the secondary classroom. Filipinos considered English as a second language (L2) makes it interesting at the same time challenging tasks both on the part of the mentor and the learner. Filipino learners should be equipped with knowledge, materials, and good delivery of instruction to attain the success of the study since language is the main tool of communication. Essentially, learners must be competent in expressing their own thoughts and beliefs as it plays a major role in the interpersonal communication, and exchange ideas where learning appears to be more effective. This could help address the problems on teaching especially during the New Normal Teaching brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic wherein teachers face difficulties in delivering quality instruction while face-to-face classes are limited, hence, the use of communicative language teaching strategies could help address the said concern during the online, flexible, blended and asynchronous learning, relevant to the needs of the students, supportive of the most essential learning competencies and can be used during the “New Normal Teaching and learning.” Therefore, the researchers determined and investigated the effect of using the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) strategies on the students' speaking ability since this will help the teachers to have an idea on how to enhance the English speaking competence of their learners. Also, the School Heads and the Department of Education will have reliable information that would help them to conduct further research about Communicative Language Teaching and develop the strategy in using the same.

## METHODS

This study employs a mixed-methods research design, combining quantitative and qualitative data to explore the effectiveness of communicative grammar tasks in enhancing grammatical accuracy and fluency among secondary school learners. The choice of this design aligns with the nature of classroom-based research, where numerical measures of achievement are complemented by insights into learner behavior, attitudes, and classroom dynamics (Creswell, 2014). The study was conducted in three public secondary schools located in urban areas with comparable educational settings. Participants included 90 students in the 10th and 11th grades, all of whom had been learning English as a foreign language for at least five academic years. Students were assigned to either an experimental or control group, each comprising 45 participants. The selection process was based on existing class divisions to preserve the natural classroom environment and avoid disruptions to the academic schedule. The experimental group received instruction using communicative grammar tasks integrated into regular English lessons over the course of ten weeks. These tasks were selected and adapted from established task-based learning resources and included role-plays, grammar-based discussions, guided storytelling, problem-solving activities, and information gap exercises. The control group, by contrast, followed a traditional grammar curriculum involving rule explanation, textbook exercises, sentence completion tasks, and teacher-led drills. The primary difference between the two instructional modes lay in the communicative focus and task-based interaction of the experimental group, as opposed to the form-focused, rule-based instruction in the control group. Instruction for both groups was delivered by the same teachers, who were trained beforehand to ensure fidelity of implementation and consistency. To prevent bias, the teachers were not informed of the

specific research hypotheses. Lesson plans for the communicative tasks were developed using frameworks suggested by Willis and Willis (2007) and were reviewed by an external language teaching expert prior to implementation. Data collection instruments included pre- and post-tests measuring grammatical accuracy in written and spoken formats, as well as fluency indicators such as mean length of utterance, frequency of pauses, and lexical diversity. In addition, a student perception questionnaire was administered to gauge learners' attitudes toward grammar instruction and perceived usefulness of the activities. Classroom observation logs maintained by the teacher-researchers provided qualitative insights into student engagement, participation, and the use of grammar during tasks. Quantitative data from tests were analyzed using descriptive statistics and paired sample t-tests to determine within-group progress and independent sample t-tests for between-group comparisons. Fluency measures were assessed using standardized scoring rubrics and audio transcriptions. The qualitative data from questionnaires and observation logs were coded thematically to identify recurring patterns, themes, and notable deviations. To ensure validity and reliability, the study employed data triangulation, using multiple sources of evidence and analysis. Ethical considerations were strictly observed, with parental consent obtained for all student participants and anonymity preserved in all reporting of results. This methodology was selected based on its appropriateness for classroom-based educational research and its capacity to capture both the cognitive and affective dimensions of language learning (Dörnyei, 2007). The integration of quantitative and qualitative data allows for a more nuanced understanding of how communicative grammar tasks influence learners' development.

## RESULTS

The analysis of test results and observational data reveals that communicative grammar tasks had a significant positive impact on both grammatical accuracy and fluency among the students in the experimental group. The findings are presented across three core categories: improvements in grammatical accuracy, development of fluency, and student perceptions.

### Grammatical Accuracy

Students in the experimental group demonstrated considerable gains in grammatical accuracy on both written and spoken post-tests compared to the control group. Pre-test scores for both groups were statistically comparable, indicating similar baseline proficiency. After ten weeks of instruction, the experimental group's mean scores increased by approximately 21%, while the control group showed a modest gain of 9%. These differences were statistically significant, with a p-value of less than 0.01. Improvements were particularly notable in the use of verb tenses, conditionals, relative clauses, and modal verbs. Students in the communicative group exhibited fewer syntactic errors and showed more consistent usage of complex grammatical structures in both their writing and speaking.

### Fluency Development

Fluency gains were assessed using qualitative rubrics and quantitative indicators, such as the mean length of utterance (MLU), reduced hesitation markers, and lexical variety. Students who engaged in communicative grammar tasks spoke for longer periods with fewer pauses and demonstrated greater ease in forming extended, grammatically sound responses. Their writing samples were also more cohesive and featured more varied sentence structures. Audio recordings from classroom speaking activities were transcribed and analyzed, showing that students in the experimental group used grammar more spontaneously and with increased confidence. The mean length of utterance increased from an average of 5.3 words per sentence at the beginning of the program to 8.9 words at the end.

The number of self-corrections and false starts also declined over time, suggesting a smoother integration of grammar knowledge into communicative performance, consistent with the notion of proceduralization (DeKeyser, 2007).

#### Learner Perceptions and Engagement

Data from the student perception questionnaire indicated that 86% of students in the experimental group found communicative grammar tasks more enjoyable and useful than traditional exercises. They reported that such tasks helped them understand grammar in a practical context and made them more willing to participate in class discussions. Moreover, many learners noted that using grammar in real conversations or problem-solving scenarios increased their retention and application of structures. Qualitative feedback suggested that students appreciated the relevance and purpose of communicative activities. Observations confirmed higher engagement levels, greater peer collaboration, and increased use of target grammar structures during pair and group work. Teachers reported that students in the experimental group asked more questions about grammar usage and showed more initiative in applying new structures in speaking and writing tasks.

#### Comparative Performance

While both instructional approaches resulted in some improvement, the experimental group outperformed the control group in nearly all indicators. Students exposed to traditional methods tended to produce grammatically correct but shorter and more mechanical responses. Their fluency scores remained largely unchanged, and errors in applying grammar rules in spontaneous speech were more frequent. This contrast underscores the added value of contextualized grammar practice over isolated rule-focused learning (Ellis, 2006).

### DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide compelling evidence for the effectiveness of communicative grammar tasks in improving both grammatical accuracy and fluency among secondary school learners. These results support the growing body of research that advocates for integrating grammar instruction within communicative frameworks rather than treating it as an isolated component of language teaching (Celce-Murcia, 2001). One of the key outcomes of this research is the demonstration that grammatical accuracy does not necessarily have to be sacrificed in the pursuit of fluency. The experimental group not only showed marked improvement in spontaneous language use but also exhibited a higher level of syntactic precision and complexity. This outcome challenges the dichotomy that often separates accuracy and fluency in language pedagogy and supports the argument that both can be developed simultaneously when learners are provided with tasks that require meaningful language use (Nation & Newton, 2009). The increase in fluency indicators—such as reduced hesitation, increased mean length of utterance, and more varied lexical choices—suggests that communicative grammar tasks allow learners to proceduralize their grammatical knowledge. This aligns with the skill acquisition theory, which posits that learners move from declarative to procedural knowledge through practice that simulates real communication (DeKeyser, 2007). By repeatedly using grammatical structures in goal-oriented tasks, students internalize rules and gain automaticity, resulting in more fluent and confident language production. Moreover, students' positive attitudes toward the communicative approach highlight the motivational benefits of this method. When learners perceive grammar as a tool for real communication rather than an abstract set of rules, their engagement increases, and so does their willingness to take risks in language production. This observation is consistent with Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, which emphasizes the importance of

social interaction and meaningful context in cognitive development, including language acquisition (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Another important finding is the contrast between the outcomes of traditional instruction and those of communicative task-based instruction. While traditional grammar exercises can reinforce form recognition and rule memorization, they often fail to promote active use of grammar in real-life communication. The control group's relatively modest improvement and continued hesitation in speaking activities reflect this limitation. These observations are in line with criticisms of grammar-translation and audio-lingual methods that prioritize form over communicative function (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). From a pedagogical perspective, the implications of this study are significant. English language teachers, particularly at the secondary school level, should consider integrating communicative grammar tasks into their regular teaching practices. These tasks do not eliminate the need for explicit grammar instruction but rather complement it by providing contexts in which grammar becomes meaningful and purposeful. Tasks should be carefully designed to target specific grammatical structures while encouraging interaction, creativity, and problem-solving. Despite the promising results, this study is not without limitations. The research was conducted within a limited timeframe and focused on a specific age group in a particular educational setting. Future studies could expand the scope by exploring long-term effects, comparing different types of communicative tasks, or examining how such approaches work with learners of varying proficiency levels. In conclusion, communicative grammar tasks offer a practical and effective means of enhancing grammatical accuracy and fluency simultaneously. By bridging the gap between knowing grammar and using it, these tasks foster deeper language competence and greater learner confidence. As language teaching continues to evolve, such integrative approaches will likely become even more essential in preparing students for real-world communication.

## CONCLUSION

The results of this study affirm the pedagogical value of communicative grammar tasks in fostering both grammatical accuracy and fluency among 10–11 grade students studying English as a foreign language. These tasks, when properly designed and implemented, bridge the often-observed gap between knowing grammatical rules and being able to use them in spontaneous and meaningful communication. The improvement in grammatical accuracy demonstrated by the experimental group shows that communication-based grammar instruction does not compromise form-focused learning. On the contrary, meaningful interaction seems to reinforce grammatical knowledge more effectively than traditional drill-based methods. Similarly, gains in fluency reflect learners' growing comfort and competence in applying grammar in authentic contexts, indicating deeper internalization and procedural use of language structures. Furthermore, students' positive responses to communicative grammar activities highlight the motivational benefits of this approach. When learners perceive grammar as a tool for interaction rather than a set of abstract rules, they become more engaged, confident, and willing to participate in classroom activities. This confirms the view that language learning is not merely a cognitive process but also a social and affective one (Larsen-Freeman, 2015). In light of these findings, it is recommended that English language teachers, particularly those working with secondary school students, incorporate communicative grammar tasks into their instructional repertoire. These tasks should be purposeful, contextualized, and interactive, providing learners with ample opportunities to use grammar in communicative situations. Teachers should also balance explicit instruction with inductive learning and ensure that feedback is constructive and supportive. Although this study was limited in scope and duration, it opens avenues for further research. Longitudinal studies could explore the lasting effects of communicative grammar instruction on learners' proficiency. In addition, future investigations might examine how such tasks can be

tailored for different age groups, learning contexts, or specific linguistic structures. Ultimately, communicative grammar tasks offer a viable and effective alternative to traditional grammar teaching. By making grammar meaningful and connected to real-life use, educators can enhance students' communicative competence and better prepare them for authentic language use beyond the classroom.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
2. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
3. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching Language: From Grammar to Grammmaring*. Heinle.
4. Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: Some questions and suggestions. *ELT Journal*, 58(4), 319–326.
5. Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.). Heinle & Heinle.
7. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
8. DeKeyser, R. M. (2007). *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
10. Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83–107. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264512>
11. Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.
12. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2015). Research into practice: Grammar learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, 48(2), 263–280. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000408>
13. Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. Routledge.
14. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
15. Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford University Press.