

УДК 378.016:81'243

DOI: [10.35619/pse.vi4.88](https://doi.org/10.35619/pse.vi4.88)

**Liudmyla YASNOHURSKA**

Candidate of Philological Sciences,  
Associate Professor at the Foreign Languages Department,  
Rivne State University for the Humanities,  
Rivne, Ukraine  
ORCID: 0000-0003-3039-447X  
*e-mail: kafedrarshu@ukr.net*

**Vladyslav KOVALIUK**

Senior Lecturer at the Foreign Languages Department,  
Rivne State University for the Humanities,  
Rivne, Ukraine  
ORCID: 0000-0001-6419-7197  
*e-mail: ftalazol72@gmail.com*

**Natalia MICHUDA**

Senior Lecturer at the Foreign Languages Department,  
Rivne State University for the Humanities,  
Rivne, Ukraine  
ORCID: 0000-0001-7936-7996  
*e-mail: kafedrarshu@ukr.net*

**Ivanna KRALIA**

Lecturer at the Foreign Languages Department,  
Rivne State University for the Humanities,  
Rivne, Ukraine  
ORCID: 0000-0002-5671-8981  
*e-mail: kafedrarshu@ukr.net*

## **ON THE ISSUES OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODS**

**Abstract.** This article provides an analytical overview of four prominent methodologies in foreign language instruction: the grammar-translation method, the audiolingual method, the direct method, and the communicative method. Each approach is delineated through its defining characteristics and pedagogical strategies. Scholarly perspectives are incorporated to offer a critical assessment of the theoretical and practical implications associated with each method. The grammar-translation method centers on the development of reading and writing skills through the study of grammatical rules and vocabulary. In contrast, the direct method advocates for immersive oral communication and inductive language acquisition. The audiolingual method emphasizes habit formation through structured repetition and memorization, whereas the communicative method

prioritizes functional language use, focusing on authentic interaction and the development of communicative competence. Through the comparative examination of these methodologies and the integration of expert commentary, the article elucidates the respective contributions and limitations of each approach within the context of foreign language pedagogy.

The article describes that the direct method offers an effective, communication-centered strategy for foreign language learning, particularly beneficial for more advanced learners or those with specific practical goals such as travel or business. Despite its advantages, it is often more effective when used in conjunction with other methods that provide explicit grammatical support, while the audiolingual method was widely adopted in past decades and remains effective for developing basic practical and communicative skills, especially in oral proficiency, it has limitations in fostering comprehensive language development. Its focus on listening and speaking makes it particularly useful for learners aiming for specific, situational language skills such as for travel or business. However, the method's narrow focus and emphasis on repetitive practice mean it is best used in combination with other approaches that support reading, writing, and grammatical understanding to ensure a well-rounded language education. The article also supports the idea that the communicative method remains central to discussions in language teaching, demonstrating its growing importance and continuous evolution in educational settings.

**Keywords:** foreign language, method, Linguistics, language learning, language teaching.

**Problem statement.** In today's globalized world, the acquisition of foreign languages has gained significant importance due to the increasing demand for international communication. As a result, many individuals pursue language learning to enhance their ability to interact across diverse contexts. A variety of teaching methods have emerged to address this need, each offering distinct features and benefits. This article provides an overview of four such language teaching methodologies, outlining their main characteristics.

**Recent publications analysis.** The grammar-translation method has been the subject of considerable debate among scholars. Critics argue that its heavy reliance on grammar and translation limits the development of communicative abilities, particularly in speaking and listening. Nonetheless, some educators recognize its structured and analytical nature as a valuable foundation for more advanced language learning. For instance, C. Eliot defended the grammar-translation method, viewing it as the most effective approach for language instruction [3, p. 21-22]. He emphasized the centrality of grammar in mastering a language and regarded translation as a powerful tool for fostering comprehension and the ability to produce accurate texts in the target language. In contrast, S. Krashen strongly criticized the method, contending that it fails to cultivate effective communicative competence. He maintained that language acquisition is most successful when learners are exposed to the language in meaningful, real-life communicative contexts, rather than through isolated grammar instruction and translation exercises, which may lead to mechanical and superficial learning [7, p. 99-100]. I. Henderson offered a more balanced perspective, suggesting that the Grammar-Translation Method can serve as a beneficial complement to more communicative approaches. According to his view, for learners who possess a basic proficiency in the language, this method can reinforce structural understanding and support the

consolidation of existing knowledge [5, p. 33-34]. In sum, scholarly perspectives on the Grammar-Translation Method remain divided. While some see it as an effective tool for developing grammatical accuracy and translation skills, others argue that it does not adequately support the development of communicative competence. However, there is a general consensus that, when integrated thoughtfully with other methods, it can still hold pedagogical value in modern language instruction.

**The purpose of the article** is to offer deeper insight into their pedagogical implications. The perspectives of various scholars have also been incorporated.

**Presentation of the basic material.** The grammar-translation method is one of the most traditional approaches to foreign language instruction, having been widely practiced across Europe in the 19th century. Its primary objective is to develop learners' written language skills, with a particular emphasis on grammatical structures and vocabulary acquisition. The method follows a structured process involving the analysis of texts in the target language, translation into the learner's native language, and ultimately, the production of texts in the foreign language.

Instruction begins with the systematic presentation of grammar rules, introduced in a logical sequence from basic to more advanced concepts. These rules are reinforced through translation and text analysis activities, allowing students to apply and consolidate their understanding. Subsequently, learners engage in translating authentic foreign-language texts into their mother tongue, a practice that enhances their ability to comprehend and interpret meaning while simultaneously expanding their vocabulary.

The final phase encourages learners to produce written or spoken output in the target language. This component supports the development of both written and oral communication skills and contributes to the gradual attainment of fluency.

The direct method is among the earliest approaches to foreign language instruction and is distinguished by its focus on oral communication and exclusive use of the target language from the outset of the learning process. This method aims to replicate the natural acquisition of a first language, prioritizing listening and speaking before introducing reading and writing. Its central goal is to enable learners to use the foreign language effectively in real-life, everyday situations, thereby enhancing their communicative competence.

Fundamentally, the direct method advocates for teaching language through meaningful and relatable contexts. Teachers rely almost entirely on the target language in the classroom, minimizing the use of students' native language to promote immersion. Through contextualized interaction, learners acquire vocabulary and grammatical structures in an intuitive and practical manner.

One of the key strengths of the direct method is its ability to create an immersive and engaging learning environment, which can significantly boost student motivation. It is especially well-suited for modern spoken languages such as English, French, and Spanish. However, this approach also has its challenges. Objective assessment of

student progress can be difficult, and beginners may find it hard to follow lessons conducted entirely in a language they have yet to understand.

Various scholars have contributed to the discourse on the direct method. M. Berlitz, a prominent proponent, emphasized that speaking should be the starting point of language learning, not reading or grammar study [1, p. 16-19]. M. Swan acknowledged the method's usefulness in developing communication skills but maintained that grammar remains necessary for deeper language comprehension [10, p. 49-50]. J. Richards and T. Rodgers recognized the method's strength in promoting communicative competence, though they noted its limitations for beginners and those who require more structured grammar instruction [9, p. 176-178]. Similarly, H. Brown viewed the method as valuable for offering authentic communication experiences but cautioned against relying on it as a standalone approach [2, p. 120-121]. J. C. Richards and T. Rodgers also highlighted its effectiveness for learners with practical language goals but recommended integrating it with other methods to ensure a well-rounded language education [9, p. 176-178].

The audiolingual method was a prominent approach to foreign language teaching during the 1950s and 1960s, renowned for its emphasis on repetition, memorization, and intensive practice of oral and listening skills aimed at developing communicative proficiency. It was initially developed to meet the demands for rapid foreign language acquisition in the United States during World War II, particularly for military, diplomatic, and commercial purposes. Inspired by behaviorist linguistics, the method assumes that language learning is a process of habit formation through repetitive practice and conditioning.

The foundation of the audiolingual method lies in imitative learning and intensive repetition of commonly used dialogues and language patterns. Students are exposed to these patterns through listening exercises and are expected to repeat them until they can produce them with fluency. The primary goal is to cultivate automaticity in language production and comprehension, helping learners to speak and understand the target language with ease. The method prioritizes oral over written language skills, often delaying the introduction of reading and writing until oral proficiency is achieved.

One of the key strengths of the audiolingual method is its intensive focus on practice. This repetition fosters fluency in speaking, often leading to rapid improvement in students' verbal communication skills. The method also has notable benefits for pronunciation, as the constant oral drills help learners acquire more natural-sounding speech patterns. The emphasis on listening and speaking is especially effective in helping students understand spoken language in real-life scenarios. Additionally, the method is well-suited for learners who aim to develop practical, situational language skills for specific purposes like travel, business, or military communication. Learners can quickly acquire the ability to handle tasks such as making hotel reservations, ordering food, or negotiating contracts.

Despite its advantages, the audiolingual method has significant limitations. Notably, it does not place sufficient emphasis on developing reading comprehension or writing skills. While students may become proficient in speaking and listening, they may struggle with reading texts or producing written language. Furthermore, the method's repetitive nature can make lessons monotonous, which might lead to disengagement and a lack of motivation among students, especially those who find rote learning unappealing. The method is also highly structured and intensive, which may not suit all learners, particularly those with different learning preferences. Some students, particularly those with a more analytical or reflective approach to learning, may find the constant oral drills overwhelming or frustrating.

The audiolingual method has been the subject of considerable debate among language educators. H. Brown describes it as a practice-centered approach that places great emphasis on oral skills and the memorization of common linguistic patterns through repeated drills [2, p. 120-121]. J. Richards and T. Rodgers supports this characterization, noting that the method's focus on repetition and imitation is intended to automate linguistic responses, thus enabling fluent communication [9, p. 176-178]. However, critics like M. Swan point out that the audiolingual method is best suited for learners with an auditory learning preference and may not be as effective for learners who do not respond well to auditory stimuli. Swan also suggests that the intensive oral practice can make some students feel inhibited or uncomfortable, thus limiting their communicative abilities [10, p. 49-50].

M. Berlitz, the founder of the Berlitz Language School, one of the institutions that popularized the audiolingual method, emphasized its focus on pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar through oral drills aimed at achieving fluency. According to Berlitz, the method's immersive nature allows students to experience the language in a practical, real-world context, enhancing their ability to engage in everyday conversations [1, p. 16-19]. However, A. Howatt critiques the method for its insufficient emphasis on reading comprehension and writing skills, arguing that these areas are critical for achieving full language proficiency [6, p. 212-213]. The lack of focus on grammar explanation also means that students may not fully understand the structural rules of the language, which can hinder their ability to make complex language choices.

The communicative method is an approach to foreign language instruction that prioritizes the use of language for real, authentic communication, rather than focusing solely on grammar and structure. It emerged in the 1970s as a response to the limitations of the audiolingual and grammar-translation methods, which concentrated exclusively on the formal elements of language.

The primary goal of the communicative method is to develop students' communicative competencies in both comprehension and production, enabling them to engage effectively in everyday interactions. Teaching is centered around task-based

learning, where students engage in practical, meaningful projects that can be completed individually or in groups.

A key feature of the communicative method is the incorporation of real-life communication scenarios. The materials used are drawn from genuine everyday contexts, such as casual conversations, business exchanges, and professional correspondence. Classes are predominantly conducted in the target language to immerse students in the linguistic environment, allowing them to practice the language as much as possible. Another significant aspect is the focus on student interaction. Classroom activities are designed to encourage collaboration, enabling students to communicate freely with their peers and receive constructive feedback from both classmates and instructors.

Several prominent scholars have shared perspectives on the communicative method's significance in foreign language teaching. J. Harmer views it as a pivotal development, noting its task-oriented approach and student-centered learning [4, p. 12-14]. J. Richards, and T. Rodgers assert that the communicative method sees language as a tool for real communication, allowing students to practice in authentic contexts, thereby boosting their confidence in using the language [9, p. 176-178]. D. Larsen-Freeman highlights the method's flexibility, emphasizing its adaptability to various teaching environments [8, p. 164-166].

**Conclusions and further research prospects.** This article explored four different approaches to foreign language learning, along with insights from linguists regarding their effectiveness in language instruction. Each method has distinct strengths and weaknesses, and it is crucial for language instructors to understand these traits when selecting the best approach for their students. Furthermore, these methods should not be regarded as incompatible but rather as complementary. Teachers can integrate various techniques and strategies to meet the intended learning outcomes. The most suitable method will depend on the specific learning context and the individual needs of the students. Ultimately, the primary goal of foreign language teaching should be effective and meaningful communication, and methods should be used flexibly and adaptably to achieve this goal.

#### СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Berlitz, M. *Método Berlitz para o ensino de línguas modernas*. Nova York: Berlitz Publishing Company, 1914. 118 p.
2. Brown H. D. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education, 2000. P. 120–121.
3. Eliot C.W. *The Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the United States*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909. P. 21–32.
4. Harmer, J. *The practice of English language teaching*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007. P. 12–14.
5. Henderson I. The Grammar Translation Method: Not as Bad as You Think. *The Language Teacher*, 40(5), 2016. P. 33–36.

6. Howatt A. P. R. A history of English language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984. P. 212–213.
7. Krashen, S. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. New York: Prentice Hall, 1989. P. 99–100.
8. Larsen-Freeman D. Techniques and principles in language teaching. 3. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. P. 164–167.
9. Richards J. C. & Rodgers T. S. Approaches and methods in language teaching. 3. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. P. 176–178.
10. Swan M. Practical English usage. Oxford University Press, 2005. P. 49–50.

#### **REFERENCES**

1. Berlitz M. Método Berlitz para o ensino de línguas modernas. Nova York: Berlitz Publishing Company, 1914. 118 p.
2. Brown H. D. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education, 2000. P. 120–121.
3. Eliot, C.W. The Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the United States. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909. P. 21–32.
4. Harmer J. The practice of English language teaching. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007. P. 12–14.
5. Henderson I. The Grammar Translation Method: Not as Bad as You Think. *The Language Teacher*, 40(5), 2016. P. 33–36.
6. Howatt A. P. R. A history of English language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984. P. 212–213.
7. Krashen S. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. New York: Prentice Hall, 1989. P. 99–100.
8. Larsen-Freeman D. Techniques and principles in language teaching. 3. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. P. 164–167.
9. Richards J. C. & Rodgers T. S. Approaches and methods in language teaching. 3. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. P. 176–178.
10. Swan M. Practical English usage. Oxford University Press, 2005. P. 49–50.

**ДО ПИТАНЬ МЕТОДІВ НАВЧАННЯ ІНОЗЕМНИХ МОВ**

**Людмила ЯСНОГУРСЬКА**

кандидат філологічних наук,  
доцент кафедри іноземних мов  
Рівненського державного гуманітарного університету,  
м. Рівне, Україна  
ORCID: 0000-0003-3039-447X  
*e-mail: kafedrarshu@ukr.net*

**Владислав КОВАЛЮК**

старший викладач кафедри іноземних мов  
Рівненського державного гуманітарного університету,  
м. Рівне, Україна  
ORCID: 0000-0001-6419-7197  
*e-mail: ftalazol72@gmail.com*

**Наталія МІЧУДА**

старший викладач кафедри іноземних мов  
Рівненського державного гуманітарного університету,  
м. Рівне, Україна  
ORCID: 0000-0001-7936-7996  
*e-mail: kafedrarshu@ukr.net*

**Іванна КРАЛЯ**

викладач кафедри іноземних мов  
Рівненського державного гуманітарного університету,  
м. Рівне, Україна  
ORCID: 0000-0002-5671-8981  
*e-mail: kafedrarshu@ukr.net*

**Анотація.** Стаття присвячена аналітичному огляду чотирьох провідних методологій у викладанні іноземних мов: граматично-перекладного методу, аудіолінгвального методу, прямого методу та комунікативного методу. Кожен підхід окреслено через його визначальні характеристики та педагогічні стратегії. Граматично-перекладний метод зосереджений на розвитку навичок читання та письма через вивчення граматичних правил та словникового запасу. На противагу цьому, прямий метод надає перевагу усному спілкуванню та індуктивному засвоєнню мови. Аудіолінгвальний метод наголошує на формуванні звичок через структуроване повторення та запам'ятовування, тоді як комунікативний метод надає пріоритет функціональному використанню мови, зосереджуючись на автентичній взаємодії та розвитку комунікативної компетенції. Шляхом порівняльного аналізу цих методологій та інтеграції коментарів експертів, стаття розглядає відповідні переваги та обмеження кожного методу в контексті навчання іноземних мов. У статті описано, що прямий метод пропонує ефективну, комунікаційно-орієнтовану стратегію вивчення іноземних мов, особливо корисну для більш просунутих учнів або тих, хто має конкретні практичні цілі, такі як подорожі чи бізнес.

У статті також підтверджується ідея про те, що комунікативний метод залишається центральним у дискусіях щодо викладання мов, демонструючи його зростаючу важливість та постійну еволюцію відповідно до освітніх умов.

**Ключові слова:** іноземна мова, методика, лінгвістика, вивчення мови, викладання мови.

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 10.05.2025 р.*