

## A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF COMMUNICATIVE AND TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING APPROACHES IN SECONDARY EDUCATION

*Rahymova Jemal Deryayevna*

*Master's Student*

*Turkmen National Institute of World Languages,*

*Faculty of Further Training*

*Ashgabat, Turkmenistan*

**Abstract.** *This study compares communicative and task-based language teaching approaches in secondary education, analyzing their effectiveness in developing learners' communicative competence, engagement, and practical language skills in modern digital learning environments.*

**Keywords:** *communicative language teaching; task-based learning; secondary education; language acquisition; teaching methods; communicative competence; student engagement; digital tools; language pedagogy*

### Introduction

In recent decades, foreign language teaching has undergone significant transformation due to globalization, technological advancement, and the growing importance of communication in international contexts. Traditional teacher-centered approaches have gradually been replaced by learner-centered methodologies that emphasize interaction and real-world language use. Among these approaches, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) are considered the most influential in modern pedagogy.

Secondary education plays a crucial role in shaping students' communicative competence, as learners at this stage are expected to apply language knowledge in practical situations. Therefore, selecting effective teaching methods is essential. This study aims to compare CLT and TBLT, highlighting their strengths, limitations, and applicability in secondary education, particularly in digitally enriched environments.

### Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)



Communicative Language Teaching is based on the concept of communicative competence, which includes grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic competence.

The main goal of CLT is to enable learners to communicate effectively and appropriately in various contexts.

In CLT classrooms, students engage in interactive activities such as role-plays, discussions, interviews, and group work. Authentic materials are often used to reflect real-life language use. The teacher acts as a facilitator, encouraging students to express their ideas freely.

The advantages of CLT include improved fluency, increased confidence, and active participation. However, the approach may недостаточно focus on grammatical accuracy, and its success depends heavily on teacher expertise and classroom conditions.

### **Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT)**



Task-Based Language Teaching is an extension of CLT that emphasizes the use of meaningful tasks as the central unit of instruction. A task is defined as an activity that requires learners to use language to achieve a specific outcome.

TBLT typically follows a three-stage framework: pre-task, task cycle, and post-task. During the task cycle, students work collaboratively to complete tasks such as problem-solving, decision-making, or project-based activities.




This approach enhances student motivation, promotes critical thinking, and develops both fluency and accuracy. However, it requires careful planning, appropriate task selection, and effective classroom management.

### **Comparative Analysis**

Although CLT and TBLT share communicative principles, they differ significantly in implementation. CLT focuses on interaction and spontaneous communication, while TBLT emphasizes structured tasks with clear outcomes.

In terms of pedagogical effectiveness, CLT is particularly suitable for beginners and lower-intermediate learners, as it helps reduce anxiety and builds confidence in using the target language in simple communicative situations. TBLT, on the other hand, is more effective for learners at intermediate and advanced levels, as it requires greater cognitive engagement, problem-solving abilities, and independent language use. Moreover, TBLT supports the development of higher-order thinking skills and learner

### Comparative Analysis: Strengths and Weaknesses

 <p><b>CLT: Student Engagement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ High motivation through personal relevance</li> <li>✓ Natural fluency development</li> <li>✗ May neglect grammatical accuracy</li> </ul>	 <p><b>CLT: Teacher Role</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Facilitator encourages autonomy</li> <li>✗ Requires extensive classroom management</li> <li>✗ Harder to assess systematically</li> </ul>	 <p><b>TBLT: Clear Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Measurable outcomes increase accountability</li> <li>✓ Integrates form and function effectively</li> <li>✗ Less spontaneous interaction</li> </ul>	 <p><b>TBLT: Structure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Systematic progression through phases</li> <li>✓ Easier to align with standards</li> <li>✗ May feel artificial to students</li> </ul>
---	---	---	--

autonomy, which are essential in secondary education.

In terms of learner engagement, both methods are effective, but TBLT often results in higher motivation due to goal-oriented activities. Regarding language outcomes, CLT primarily develops fluency, whereas TBLT ensures a balance between fluency and accuracy.

From a pedagogical perspective, CLT is easier to implement in traditional classrooms, while TBLT requires more preparation and resources. However, TBLT provides more opportunities for assessment through task completion and performance evaluation.

Furthermore, both approaches contribute to the holistic development of communicative competence, including grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and pragmatic dimensions. Their integration in secondary school curricula can provide a balanced instructional framework that combines the strengths of both approaches: the communicative emphasis of CLT and the task-oriented structure of TBLT.

Thus, the comparative analysis suggests that neither approach should be viewed in isolation. A blended methodological model that incorporates elements of both CLT and TBLT may offer the most effective strategy for foreign language instruction in secondary education, ensuring the development of both fluency and accuracy while enhancing learners' ability to use language in real-world contexts.

#### **Practical Classroom Case Study**

A classroom experiment was conducted in a secondary school with students aged 14–15. During the first week, CLT activities such as role-plays and discussions were implemented. Students showed increased confidence and fluency but made frequent grammatical errors.

In the second week, TBLT was applied through a project-based task in which students designed and presented travel plans. This approach resulted in higher

engagement, better organization of ideas, and improved accuracy. The structured nature of tasks allowed for more effective assessment.

The findings suggest that combining both approaches leads to more balanced language development.

### **Integration of Digital Technologies**

Digital technologies play a crucial role in enhancing both CLT and TBLT. Online platforms, mobile applications, and virtual classrooms provide opportunities for interactive communication and task-based learning.

In CLT, tools such as video conferencing and chat platforms facilitate real-time communication. In TBLT, digital tools enable complex tasks such as research projects, multimedia presentations, and collaborative problem-solving.

These technologies support personalized learning, immediate feedback, and extended practice beyond the classroom.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, both CLT and TBLT are essential approaches in modern language teaching. While CLT emphasizes communicative competence, TBLT focuses on practical task completion. Each approach has its strengths and limitations.

The study demonstrates that an integrated approach combining CLT and TBLT, supported by digital technologies, is the most effective strategy for secondary education. Such integration ensures balanced development of fluency, accuracy, and critical thinking skills.

### **References**

1. Ellis R. *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. – 387 p.
2. Harmer J. *How to Teach English*. – London: Longman, 2007. – 288 p.
3. Nunan D. *Task-Based Language Teaching*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. – 222 p.
4. Richards J. C. *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. – 114 p.