

Pedagogical Opportunities of Communicative Grammar in Developing the Speech Activity of Future Teachers

Tursunov Humoyun

Independent Researcher (PhD) at Chirchik State Pedagogical University, Ministry of Preschool and School Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan

Received: 25 February 2026; **Accepted:** 22 March 2026; **Published:** 11 April 2026

Abstract: This paper examines the pedagogical opportunities of communicative grammar in developing the speech activity of future teachers in higher pedagogical education. The relevance of the topic is determined by the growing demand for teachers who are able to use language not only correctly, but also appropriately, flexibly, and effectively in professional communication. In modern teacher education, grammar can no longer be limited to the transmission of formal rules detached from real speech practice. It must be interpreted as a means of organizing thought, constructing meaning, and ensuring successful pedagogical interaction. The purpose of the study is to identify the pedagogical potential of communicative grammar in the development of future teachers' speech activity and to determine the theoretical and methodological principles that make this process effective. The research is based on theoretical analysis, comparison, and synthesis of linguistic, pedagogical, psycholinguistic, and methodological sources devoted to communicative competence, grammar teaching, speech activity, and professional teacher training. The findings show that communicative grammar creates favorable conditions for integrating grammatical knowledge with speaking, listening, reading, and writing; it strengthens the connection between form and function, promotes contextualized learning, supports discourse development, and increases students' professional speech readiness. The paper concludes that communicative grammar has broad pedagogical opportunities in teacher education because it transforms grammar into a functional instrument of professional communication and contributes to the formation of reflective, competent, and speech-active future teachers.

Keywords: Communicative grammar, speech activity, future teachers, communicative competence, grammar teaching, higher pedagogical education, professional communication, discourse, speech development, teacher training.

Introduction: In the system of higher pedagogical education, the development of future teachers' speech activity is one of the most important conditions for their professional formation. A teacher's work is realized largely through language. Explanation, interpretation, questioning, evaluation, persuasion, support, classroom management, and cooperation with learners all depend on the teacher's ability to use speech appropriately and effectively. For this reason, speech activity cannot be treated as an auxiliary component of teacher training. It is a central part of professional competence.

At the same time, the formation of speech activity in

future teachers is closely connected with grammar. Without grammatical competence, speech loses precision, coherence, and logic. However, grammar understood only as a system of rules and paradigms does not automatically ensure the development of real communicative ability. Students may know grammatical forms but experience difficulty in using them in dialogue, monologue, pedagogical explanation, written reflection, or professional discussion. This contradiction reveals the need to reconsider the place of grammar in teacher education.

Communicative grammar offers a productive solution

to this problem. Unlike traditional formal grammar, communicative grammar interprets language forms through their communicative function. It focuses on how grammar operates in real speech, how it expresses intention, structures discourse, clarifies meaning, and supports interaction. In this approach, grammar is not opposed to communication; rather, it becomes one of its principal instruments. For future teachers, such an approach is especially significant because their professional speech must combine correctness with clarity, appropriateness, and pedagogical purpose.

The theoretical foundations of communicative competence were developed by D. Hymes, who argued that language proficiency includes not only grammatical knowledge but also the ability to use language appropriately in social communication [1]. This idea was later elaborated by M. Canale and M. Swain, whose model of communicative competence included grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic components [2]. Subsequent scholars such as S. Savignon, J. C. Richards, T. S. Rodgers, D. Larsen-Freeman, and S. Thornbury demonstrated that grammar teaching is most effective when it is integrated with meaningful communication and contextualized speech activity [3–7].

The present paper proceeds from the understanding that future teachers need grammar not as isolated theoretical information but as a functional means of speech activity. Their professional communication requires not only the ability to construct grammatically correct sentences, but also the ability to use grammatical resources in order to explain educational material, regulate interaction, encourage participation, formulate tasks, organize discourse, and respond to pedagogical situations. The purpose of this paper is to analyze the pedagogical opportunities of communicative grammar in developing the speech activity of future teachers and to clarify the theoretical principles that underlie this process.

The study is theoretical and analytical in nature. It is based on the methods of analysis, comparison, interpretation, and synthesis of scholarly literature in linguistics, pedagogy, psycholinguistics, and the methodology of language teaching. These methods were used to identify the conceptual relationship between communicative grammar and speech activity, to compare traditional and communicative approaches

to grammar teaching, and to synthesize the main pedagogical opportunities that communicative grammar offers in future teacher education.

The methodological basis of the paper includes the competence-based approach, the communicative-activity approach, the functional view of grammar, and the psycholinguistic theory of speech activity. The competence-based approach makes it possible to understand speech development not as the accumulation of abstract language knowledge, but as the ability to apply such knowledge in practical and professional communication. The communicative-activity approach emphasizes purposeful speech action in meaningful contexts. The functional view of grammar explains grammar through communicative intent and discourse. The psycholinguistic theory of speech activity clarifies the mechanisms through which language becomes action in real communication.

The interpretation of scholarly sources was carried out in relation to teacher education. This means that general conclusions about grammar and communication were projected onto the professional tasks of future teachers. The analysis focused on the role of communicative grammar in speaking, listening, reading, and writing, as well as in pedagogical discourse, classroom interaction, and professional reflection.

The analysis shows that communicative grammar has substantial pedagogical opportunities in developing the speech activity of future teachers because it establishes a direct connection between grammatical form and communicative function. In traditional practice, grammar is often taught through paradigms, classifications, and isolated sentence patterns. Such instruction can provide structural awareness, but it does not always prepare students for real speech action. Communicative grammar, by contrast, introduces forms through their use in utterances, situations, intentions, and discourse. This creates favorable conditions for transforming knowledge into activity.

One of the most important pedagogical opportunities of communicative grammar lies in its ability to activate speaking. Future teachers are expected to master monologic and dialogic speech in academic and pedagogical settings. They need to explain, compare, evaluate, describe, justify, and discuss. Communicative

grammar supports these functions because it teaches grammatical structures as tools for expressing these intentions. Tense and aspect become relevant for narrating and explaining processes, modality helps to express obligation, possibility, and recommendation, sentence types organize questioning and instruction, and syntactic patterns allow the speaker to structure thought logically and persuasively. As a result, speaking develops not through spontaneous improvisation alone, but through the conscious and purposeful use of grammatical resources.

The study also demonstrates that communicative grammar contributes significantly to the development of listening as a component of speech activity. Listening in teacher education is not merely passive reception. It is interpretative and interactive in nature. A future teacher must understand not only the literal content of speech but also communicative intention, discourse structure, emphasis, evaluation, and response cues. Communicative grammar supports listening development because it trains students to perceive grammatical signals in real discourse. The recognition of tense shifts, reference patterns, modal meanings, cohesive devices, and syntactic emphasis helps the listener process spoken language more accurately. Thus, grammar becomes a tool of auditory comprehension rather than a separate theoretical subject.

Another important result concerns the role of communicative grammar in reading. Academic and professional reading require the ability to decode complex syntactic structures, trace logical relations, understand textual cohesion, and interpret meaning beyond the sentence level. Future teachers constantly work with educational texts, methodological materials, academic sources, and literary or informational discourse. Communicative grammar strengthens reading competence by showing how grammatical structures organize meaning in context. When students learn to interpret relative clauses, passive constructions, modality, textual connectors, and paragraph-level cohesion in authentic texts, their reading becomes more conscious and analytical. They begin to understand not only what a text says, but how meaning is grammatically constructed.

The analysis further reveals that communicative grammar creates broad opportunities for developing

writing. Writing in teacher education includes lesson reflection, methodological commentary, academic essays, reports, written instructions, and educational communication. Such writing requires coherence, accuracy, and awareness of audience and purpose. Communicative grammar assists this process by linking grammar with discourse formation. It helps students understand how sentence structure influences clarity, how tense and aspect contribute to textual logic, how modality shapes academic and pedagogical tone, and how cohesion is achieved through reference and syntactic connection. Writing therefore becomes not a mechanical arrangement of sentences, but a meaningful communicative act.

A particularly significant pedagogical opportunity of communicative grammar is its ability to integrate all four kinds of speech activity. In many traditional educational contexts, grammar is taught separately from speaking, listening, reading, and writing. This fragmentation weakens transfer and reduces motivation. Communicative grammar overcomes such isolation by organizing grammar instruction around communicative tasks. Students encounter grammatical material in texts, interpret it in listening, activate it in speaking, and consolidate it in writing. Such integration corresponds to the real nature of communication, where receptive and productive processes are interconnected. For future teachers, this is especially important because pedagogical communication is always multimodal and dynamic.

The findings also show that communicative grammar supports the development of discourse competence. Speech activity is realized not through isolated sentences but through coherent discourse. A teacher's explanation, classroom discussion, feedback, and public presentation all require the ability to construct a meaningful sequence of utterances. Grammar plays a central role in this process. Cohesion, subordination, reference, thematic progression, and logical connection depend on grammatical choices. Communicative grammar teaches these choices in relation to discourse purposes. Future teachers therefore develop not only sentence-level competence but also the ability to build sustained and pedagogically effective speech.

Another result concerns the contextualization of learning. Communicative grammar has strong pedagogical potential because it places grammar in real

or simulated communicative situations. For future teachers, these situations may include explaining a concept to pupils, asking guiding questions, responding to misunderstanding, moderating a discussion, or formulating feedback. In such contexts, grammar ceases to be abstract. It becomes professionally meaningful. Students begin to perceive grammatical forms as necessary for performing educational roles. This relevance increases motivation and facilitates the transfer of linguistic knowledge to future practice.

The analysis also indicates that communicative grammar strengthens reflection. Teacher speech must be not only spontaneous but also conscious. A future teacher needs to evaluate the effectiveness of language choices, to understand how wording influences comprehension, and to adapt communication according to situation. Communicative grammar promotes this awareness by encouraging students to reflect on why a form is used, what function it performs, and how it affects meaning. Such reflection turns grammar into an instrument of professional self-development.

Finally, the results show that communicative grammar helps shape pedagogical discourse as a specific form of professional speech. Teacher discourse is characterized by accessibility, precision, dialogicity, emotional balance, and instructional purpose. These qualities are supported by grammar. The ability to formulate clear tasks, soften correction, express encouragement, summarize content, and organize interaction depends on grammatical means. Communicative grammar therefore has a direct influence on the formation of future teachers' professional speech identity.

The findings confirm that the pedagogical opportunities of communicative grammar are broader than the traditional understanding of grammar teaching suggests. Grammar is often perceived as restrictive, formal, and disconnected from living speech. Such a view emerged largely because grammar was historically taught through explanation and reproduction. However, when grammar is interpreted communicatively, its pedagogical nature changes. It becomes a means of speech formation, discourse organization, and professional interaction. This transformation is especially valuable in teacher education, where speech is not merely a vehicle of self-expression but a medium of teaching itself.

One of the major implications of this study is that grammar and speech activity should not be separated. In earlier pedagogical practice, students often learned grammatical rules first and were expected to apply them later in communication. This linear model does not always work effectively because knowledge acquired without communicative context often remains passive. Communicative grammar suggests another logic: grammar should be learned through use and for use. In this way, the development of grammatical competence and speech activity proceeds simultaneously. Future teachers learn to speak, listen, read, and write through grammar, and they learn grammar through speech.

This conclusion corresponds with the communicative approach in language pedagogy. Researchers such as Richards, Rodgers, and Savignon emphasized that meaningful communication should remain central in language instruction, while grammar should be integrated into communicative practice rather than excluded from it [3; 6]. D. Larsen-Freeman's concept of "grammaring" is especially relevant in this regard because it interprets grammar as a dynamic process of using forms to make meaning [5]. Such a view is highly productive for teacher education. Future teachers do not need grammar as static knowledge alone; they need the ability to mobilize grammar in pedagogical speech.

The discussion also makes clear that the psycholinguistic dimension of speech activity is essential. Speech activity involves not only linguistic correctness but also intention, motivation, planning, implementation, and control. From this perspective, communicative grammar is valuable because it links form with these mental and communicative processes. Grammar is acquired more deeply when students use it in purposeful speech action. This corresponds with the activity theory tradition, according to which speech develops in meaningful interaction and is inseparable from practical and cognitive goals [8; 9]. For future teachers, such goals are inherently professional: they speak in order to teach, guide, clarify, and interact.

Another important point concerns the development of teacher agency. Communicative grammar empowers future teachers because it gives them tools for shaping discourse intentionally. Instead of being confined to formulaic or mechanically learned expressions, they learn to select language according to pedagogical aim.

This strengthens confidence and professional flexibility. A teacher who understands grammar communicatively can vary instruction, adapt explanation, reformulate questions, and respond to learners' needs more effectively than one who treats grammar as a detached body of rules.

At the same time, the study suggests that communicative grammar requires a high level of methodological competence from teacher educators. It is not enough to declare the importance of communication; grammar instruction must be deliberately organized around meaningful tasks, authentic discourse, reflection, and professional contexts. The teacher educator should be able to combine systematic explanation with interactive practice, maintain attention to form without sacrificing communication, and create learning situations that mirror future pedagogical realities. Therefore, the effectiveness of communicative grammar depends not only on theory but also on the professional preparedness of those who teach it.

The discussion further highlights the importance of professional orientation. In the context of pedagogical universities, grammar instruction should reflect the future communicative tasks of teachers. This includes classroom discourse, academic argumentation, reflective writing, cooperative dialogue, and public speech. When grammar is connected with these domains, students perceive it as professionally necessary rather than academically imposed. Such orientation contributes to the formation of a stable professional motivation and links language development with pedagogical identity.

Another aspect concerns assessment. If communicative grammar is aimed at developing speech activity, assessment should also reflect this goal. Evaluating only rule reproduction or isolated sentence transformation does not fully reveal whether students can use grammar in speech. More appropriate are tasks that require discourse construction, oral explanation, written reflection, response to communicative situations, and interpretation of authentic texts. In this sense, communicative grammar encourages not only a different method of teaching but also a different understanding of educational outcome.

The study also indicates that communicative grammar

is especially valuable in multilingual and changing educational environments. Future teachers increasingly work in contexts that require adaptive communication, intercultural sensitivity, and the ability to engage with diverse learners. Grammar in such situations must support not only correctness but also accessibility, politeness, flexibility, and clarity. Communicative grammar makes these dimensions visible because it situates grammar within real interaction. This expands its pedagogical scope and confirms its relevance for modern teacher education.

The present paper has shown that communicative grammar possesses broad pedagogical opportunities in developing the speech activity of future teachers. Its central advantage lies in the integration of grammatical knowledge with communicative function, discourse, context, and professional purpose. Through this integration, grammar ceases to be a formal and isolated subject and becomes a functional instrument of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.

The analysis has demonstrated that communicative grammar contributes to the activation of oral speech, the improvement of listening comprehension, the deepening of reading competence, the strengthening of writing skills, the development of discourse coherence, the contextualization of learning, and the formation of reflective pedagogical communication. These opportunities are especially important in higher pedagogical education because the teacher's professional activity is fundamentally speech-based.

It may therefore be concluded that the effective development of future teachers' speech activity requires grammar teaching to be organized on communicative principles. Under such conditions, students do not simply memorize rules but learn to use language purposefully, coherently, and professionally in real pedagogical situations. Communicative grammar thus becomes an essential component of modern teacher education and a productive basis for preparing speech-active, reflective, and professionally competent teachers.

REFERENCES

1. Hymes D. On communicative competence // *Sociolinguistics* / ed. by J. B. Pride, J. Holmes. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972. P. 269–293.
2. Canale M., Swain M. Theoretical bases of

- communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing // *Applied Linguistics*. 1980. Vol. 1, No. 1. P. 1–47.
3. Savignon S. J. *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2002. 330 p.
 4. Thornbury S. *How to Teach Grammar*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 1999. 182 p.
 5. Larsen-Freeman D. *Teaching Language: From Grammar to Grammaring*. Boston: Heinle, 2003. 350 p.
 6. Richards J. C., Rodgers T. S. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 410 p.
 7. Celce-Murcia M., Dörnyei Z., Thurrell S. Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications // *Issues in Applied Linguistics*. 1995. Vol. 6, No. 2. P. 5–35.
 8. Leontiev A. A. *Osnovy psikholingvistiki*. Moscow: Smysl; St. Petersburg: Lan', 2003. 287 p.
 9. Zimnyaya I. A. *Pedagogicheskaya psikhologiya*. Moscow: Logos, 2004. 384 p.
 10. Ellis R. *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. 387 p.
 11. Bachman L. F. *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. 408 p.
 12. Shulman L. S. Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching // *Educational Researcher*. 1986. Vol. 15, No. 2. P. 4–14.