

**The Influence of Communicative Grammar Teaching in Enhancing
Grade 11 Students' Grammatical Knowledge: the Case of Bishaw
Weldeyouhanis Preparatory School in Bonga Town**

By
KasahunTaddese

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for
Master of Arts in TEFL**

Department of English Language and Literature

College of Social Sciences and Law

Jimma University

Advisor: Mr. Youhanis Tefera (Associate Professor)

Co-Advisor: Dr. Tesfaye Gebeyehu

August 2014/15

**The influence of Communicative Grammar teaching in enhancing Grade 11 Students'
Grammatical Knowledge: the Case of Bishaw Weldeyouhanis Preparatory School in Bonga
Town.**

By

Kasahun Taddese

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work, not presented for any degree in any universities, and that all the sources used for it are duly acknowledged.

Kasahun Taddese

Name	Signature	Date
------	-----------	------

Approved by Board of Examiners:

_____	_____	_____
Advisor	Signature	Date

_____	_____	_____
Co-Advisor	Signature	Date

_____	_____	_____
Internal examiner	Signature	Date

_____	_____	_____
External examiner	Signature	Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the God. Second my gratitude also goes to Mr. Yuhannis (Associate professor), my advisor and Dr. Tesfaye Gebeyehu, co- advisor for their constructive comment, suggestion and feedback throughout the paper. Without their key comment and suggestion the study would not have been a success. Finally, I wish to acknowledge all my family for their material and moral support.

Abstract

The main objective of this study was to investigate the influence of communicative grammar teaching in enhancing grade 11 students' grammatical knowledge. It studied students' attitudes towards the communicative grammar teaching, the application and the challenge of communicative grammar teaching in Bishaw weldeyouhanis preparatory school. The research is quasi experimental study that includes descriptive survey study. To do these, two sections of grade 11 were selected through simple random sampling. The one was used as treatment and the other as control group. Four teachers were also included for teaching and scoring. Hence, pre and post tests, questionnaire and observation were used to collect data. The result showed that the treatment group out performed in the post-test. Besides, the students' attitude towards the communicative grammar was positive. Class size, teachers' failure to form group depending on the traditional grammar method and neglecting aspects of grammar (form, meaning, and use) were the problems seen during implementation of the lesson, especially in control group. Therefore, teachers are suggested to design varied, enjoyable activities with interesting topics to increase students' interest to learn grammar communicatively. Also students should be motivated to apply the grammars in meaningful and authentic activities without fear of making mistake. Finally recommendations are given to use more than one experimental group when investigating the influence of communicative grammar in enhancing students' grammatical knowledge so that they might get a more comprehensive result.

Table of contents

	Page
Acknowledgements-----	
Abstract-----	
Table of contents-----	
List of tables-----	
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background of the study-----	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem-----	3
1.3 Research Questions-----	5
1.4 Objective of the study-----	5
1.4.1. Main Objective-----	5
1.4.2 Specific Objectives-----	5
1.5 Hypothesis -----	6
1.5.1 Alternative hypothesis-----	6
1.5.2 Null hypothesis-----	6
1.6 Significance of the Study-----	6
1.7 Limitations of the Study-----	7
1.8 Delimitations of the Study-----	7
1.9 Acronyms used-----	8
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	
2.1 Traditional Grammar-----	9
2.1.1 Grammar-Translation method-----	10
2.1.1.1 Characteristics of GTM-----	12

2.1.2 Approaches to Teaching Grammar-----	13
2.2 Declarative and Procedural Knowledge of Grammar-----	15
2.3 The Origin and Development of CLT-----	17
2.3.1 Definition of communicative language teaching-----	19
2.3.2 Characteristics of CLT-----	20
2.3.3 Principles of CLT-----	21
2.3.4 The role of grammar in Developing Communicative competence-----	26
2.3.5 Classroom activities of communicative grammar-----	31
2.4 Attitudes towards grammar instruction-----	33
2.4.1 Student expectations-----	34
2.4.2 Teacher Expectations-----	35
2. 5 Challenges of Implementing CLT in EFL contexts-----	35
2.5.1 Class size-----	36
2.5. 2 English proficiency of students-----	37
2.5 .3 Cultural impact-----	37
2.5.4 Teachers' English language proficiency-----	38
2.5.5 Grammar-based Examination Instruction-----	38
2.5.6 CLT training-----	38
2.5.7 CLT environment-----	39
2.5.8 Traditional teaching approaches-----	39

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Design of the Study-----	40
3.2 Participants of the Study-----	40
3.3 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques -----	41

3.3.1. Sample Size-----	41
3.3.2. Sampling Technique-----	41
3.4 Procedure -----	42
3.4.1 Pre-Instruction Phase-----	42
3.4.2 Treatment Implementation-----	43
3.4.3 Post-Treatment Phase-----	44
3.5 Data Collection Instruments-----	44
3.5.1 Student Questionnaire-----	44
3.5.2 Pre- and Post-Tests -----	45
3.5.3 Observations-----	46
3.6 Reliability and Validity-----	46
3.7 Methods of Data Analysis-----	47

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Data obtained through the pre and post tests-----	48
4.2 Data obtained through the questionnaire-----	51
4.2.1 Students’ Attitudes towards lesson content-----	51
4.2.2 Students’ attitudes towards task design in presentation stage-----	53
4.2.3 Students’ attitudes towards task design in practice stage-----	55
4.2.4 Students’ attitudes towards influence of instruction-----	57
4.3 Results of the classroom observation-----	59
4.4 Discussion-----	62

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Summary-----	72
5.1.1 The influence of communicative grammar -----	72

5.1.2	Students' attitudes towards the communicative grammar-----	73
5.1.3	What aspect of grammar students improved-----	73
5.1.4	Teachers' application of communicative grammar in classroom-----	73
5.1.5	Factors affecting the implementation of communicative grammar-----	74
5.2	Conclusions-----	74
5.3	Recommendations-----	76

Reference

Appendix1

Appendix2

Appendix3

Appendix4

Appendix5

Appendix6

Appendix7

Appendix8

List of Tables	page
Table. 1 Summary of pre-test-----	48
Table. 2 Summary of post-test -----	49
Table .3 Differences of pre- and post- test results-----	50
Table .4 Frequencies, percentages and mean of the Students' attitudes towards lesson content- -----	51
Table .5 Frequencies, percentages and mean of Students' attitudes towards task design in presentation stage-----	53
Table .6 Frequencies, percentages and mean of Students' attitudes towards task design in practice stages-----	55
Table .7 Frequencies, percentages and means of the Students' attitudes towards influence of Instruction-----	57

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1. 1 Background of the Study

Communicative Language Teaching first emerged in European countries in the 1970s and was successfully implemented into the English curriculum in other countries in the 1980 (Littlewood, 2007). Following the emergence of CLT in English-speaking nations, it is the most influential language teaching methodology in the world (Ying, 2010). Therefore, European linguists saw the need for language instructors to focus on communicative competence rather than on the mastery of structures alone (Savignon, 1991; Littlewood, 2007).

The term ‘communicative competence’ was first used by Hymes, who referred to it as “that aspect of our competence that enables us to convey and interpret messages and to negotiate meanings interpersonally within specific contexts” (as cited in Brown, 2007, p. 246). Since then, researchers have sought diligently to define and redefine the construct of communicative competence and the most widely accepted definition by Canale and Swan (1980) that there are four different components of communicative competence: grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence.

CLT primarily aims at developing language learners’ communicative competence (Tsai, 2007). Pei-long (2011) also argues that language teaching should focus on communicative proficiency rather than mastery of sentence structures. This implies both the declarative (form focused) and procedural (use of language) knowledge of grammar are considered within communicative grammar. Due to this, several researchers identify CLT as one of the most influential and effective language teaching methodologies that increase learners’ communicative competence (Laio, 2000; Savignon, 2002; Ying, 2010).

Besides 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 favourable in the current trend of language teaching. Moreover, 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.

Also a research done by Lakachew Mulat which focused on investigating teachers' attitudes towards the communicative approach explored the constraints teachers face in implementing the communicative approach in the Ethiopian context. The findings indicated that teachers generally have positive attitudes towards communicative language teaching. Though the results indicate that teachers have positive attitude towards communicative language teaching, implementation of CLT can be more effective if teachers have strong attitude towards it.

Regarding challenges of implementing the approach, a research done by Surafel (2002) shows that large class size, inadequate background knowledge of the students, scarcity of textbooks, absence / scarcity of supplementary materials (for listening and reading) and exam practice are some common problems English language teachers face while they are trying to implement the approach. Similarly, Amare (1998) in his article, 'Teachers' Perceptions of Educational Problems in Ethiopia,' has identified the following problems: overcrowded classes, shortage of instructional materials, heavy teaching loads, etc. He further mentions that teachers' attitudes are another source of problems in the teaching/ learning process in Ethiopia.

Besides, language is the most important means of communication. As the base of a certain language, grammar plays an indispensable role in ELT. As Cook (2000) says, "Knowledge of grammar is considered by many linguists to be the central area of the language system around which the other areas such as pronunciation and vocabulary revolve" (p.14). However, in Ethiopia, particularly in Bihsaw Weldeyouhanis preparatory school, teachers focused too much on English grammar explanation, pattern exercises and recitation of English rules. Thus, most grade 11 students of the school perceived grammar as the most boring part among other contents of the book.

Based on this, the researcher raised the issues whether communicative grammar teaching contributes to the enhancement of students' declarative and procedural knowledge of grammar and attracts the students' interest. This is because Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is an innovation in ELT. Richards (2007) argues, "One of the goals of Communicative Language Teaching is to develop fluency in language use" (p.16). 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 (Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richards and Rodgers, 2001, Ying, 2010).

1. 2 Statement of the Problem

No other issue has so preoccupied theorists and practitioners as the grammar debate, and the history of language teaching is essentially the history of the claims and counterclaims for and against the teaching of grammar. Differences in attitude to the role of grammar underpin differences between methods, between teachers, and between learners (Thornbury, 1999:14).

Grammar teaching in the foreign language classroom has constituted an important and debated issue for the last fifty years. In the history of language teaching, the role of grammar has been addressed by a number of linguistic theories and methodologies.

The way grammar is considered has a direct and decisive influence on pedagogical grammars, learning processes and many other areas involved in foreign language teaching. Grammar, as a subsystem in a network of other linguistic sub-systems and sub-skills (Newby, 2003), has been attached different roles in the language classroom, reaching little consensus, not only about the particular items to be taught, but about when, or how, or even where to teach or learn.

Regarding to this, one controversial aspect of CLT is the role of grammar instruction. Krashen's (1982, 1985) Monitor Theory suggests that grammar instruction is unnecessary and has a very minimal effect on second language acquisition (SLA). Since the revised version of the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996), CLT scholars have become interested in integrating form-focused instruction with communicative activities (Spada & Lightbown, 2009).

Pica (2000) argues that communicative teaching that focuses mainly on meaning with very little attention to forms are not adequate to prepare learners for attaining native-like proficiency. As such, the role of grammar in CLT needs to be justified. However, With reference to the current trend of language teaching, CLT is supposed to primarily aim at developing learner's communicative competence. Therefore, the design of grade 11 English textbook developed by the MOE (Ministry of Education) in Ethiopia somehow based on CLT. However, after 10 years of learning English at school with textbooks, Bishaw Weldeyuhanis preparatory school students

could not apply their linguistic ability to real-life situations. This reality originates from the fact that most teachers apply the traditional method namely GTM in teaching grammar, in which grammar rules are taught deductively (G. Nguyen & H. Nguyen, 2004) and thus students keep learning grammar reluctantly to deal with conventional paper-tests (Khuong-Cam, 2010).

There are several possible explanations for this preference. First, teachers always feel more comfortable and confident when using GTM to teach grammar since this method of teaching is quite familiar to them (G. Nguyen & H. Nguyen, 2004). Second, the school facilities cannot meet the demand of CLT application. Particularly, large-size classes are not ideal environment for a communicative lesson; and schools are deprived of equipment (e.g. audiovisual teaching aids). Lastly, according to Khuong-Cam, this problem of English grammar teaching derives from such constraints as grammar-based examinations and textbook-based syllabus.

Relating this common reality to Bishaw Weldeyuhannis's preparatory school, the grammar teaching application was in the same way; because teachers of the school felt more comfortable and confident when using GTM to teach grammar since this method of teaching was quite familiar to them. This truth was proved by the researcher's 6-year experience in teaching English at this school, through his class observations and daily personal communications with students.

To teachers, they all felt confident and comfortable in their current teaching, and thus totally satisfied with the way they had been applying to teach English grammar regardless of knowing that their students could not use the language for communication. Sadly, most of them were quite vague about the CLT implementation, even a few teachers who had an understanding of CLT express their negative view on it. They asserted that applying CLT in grammar teaching as would face a lot of difficulties due to certain constraints of school facilities; besides, it would require much endeavor from the teacher; they hence did not often implement it.

For students, when being asked about the reality of grammar instruction they had been experiencing, most of them stated that what they learn from grammar classes was a series of grammatical structure provision followed by mechanical practice in the form of isolated sentences, which only served conventional grammar-paper tests. Consequently, though they had considerable knowledge of grammar, they could not use English to communicate, even in simple situations like personal introduction.

Stimulated by the basis of the mentioned reality, the researcher was motivated to conduct a study to help students get improved in English grammatical knowledge and communicative performance was made. That is to say, this study was conducted with two primary aims: The first was to investigate the influence of communicative grammar teaching in enhancing grade 11 students' grammatical knowledge, and the second was to explore the students' attitudes towards the communicative grammar teaching.

1. 3 Research questions

The study addresses the following research questions:

1. Does communicative grammar teaching enhance students' grammatical knowledge?
2. What are the students' attitudes towards the communicative grammar teaching method?
3. What aspects of grammar do students improve due to implementation of communicative grammar teaching?
4. What serious challenges do students of the school face in communicative grammar teaching class?
5. To what extent do EFL teachers of Bishaw Weldeyouhanis preparatory school properly apply theories of communicative grammar teaching?
6. What serious challenges do the EFL teachers of the school face in implementing communicative grammar teaching?

1. 4 Objective of the study

1.4.1. Main Objective

The study has the following general objective:

- To investigate the influence of communicative grammar teaching in enhancing grade 11 students' grammatical knowledge.

1.4.2 Specific Objectives

Specifically, the study intends to achieve the following objectives.

1. To investigate students' attitudes towards the communicative grammar teaching method.

2. To investigate what aspects of grammar students improve due to implementation of communicative grammar teaching.
3. To explore factors, if any, those affect students of the school in communicative grammar teaching class.
4. To explore whether the Bishaw Weldeyouhanis EFL teachers properly use theories of communicative grammar teaching.
5. To identify factors, if any, those affect the EFL teachers of the school in implementing communicative grammar teaching.

1. 5. Hypothesis

To compare the influence of the communicative grammar teaching in enhancing the students' grammatical knowledge with the conventional method the following alternative and null hypotheses guided the research study.

1. 5. 1 Alternative hypothesis

Communicative grammar teaching can enhance the students' achievements of grammatical knowledge more than the conventional method.

1. 5. 2 Null Hypothesis

1. There will be no significant difference in the overall mean scores of the pre-test and post-test of the students in both the treatment and control group.
2. There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of the post-test between the students of the two groups in terms of the teaching method.

1. 6 Significance of the Study

The research out comes and recommendations resulting from this research may have the potential to help English teachers enhance English teaching efficiency in the following areas:

It may help them to identify the main influence of communicative grammar teaching in Bishaw welde Yuhanis preparatory school context and this research may provide potential suggestions for English teachers to improve their teaching strategies, and students' communicative competence. Moreover, insights gained from this research may improve the teaching and learning experiences for both teachers and students in Bishaw welde Yuhanis preparatory school.

The results of this study might also help both teachers and students change from emphasizing grammar based translation to a communicative approach, which could motivate students to be more focused on communicative activities and improve students' communicative competence. Lastly, it might assist the country policy-makers and users to understand the complexity of introducing communicative English teaching into the syllabus.

1. 7 Limitations

Though the study got certain success, several limitations due to practical constraints need to be acknowledged. First, the number of the target grammar points taken into the treatment was rather limited (three sub points). It would have provided more convincing results if it had included all the curricular grammar points of the first semester. Second, the grammar-paper tests were developed with a relatively modest number of items (twenty items), which might more or less affect the reliability of the current study. Third, due to the fact that both the pre- and the post-tests were developed by the researcher, a little limitation might arise in validating the research instruments. Finally, it was beyond the scope of this study to examine the topic through all section of grade 11 students, so just two sections were involved. Additionally, the study was conducted in a small scale of subjects—Bishaw Weldeyuhannis preparatory school, hence, the findings are not intended to be generalized to other schools.

1. 8. Delimitations of the Study

This study is restricted to communicative grammar teaching than other aspects of CLT. Therefore, among different issues, it focused on the influence of Communicative grammar teaching in enhancing grade 11 students' grammatical knowledge in Bishaw weldeyouhanis preparatory school in Bonga Town. In addition, the study focused on only grade 11 students because of time and material constraints.

Also, there are about 46 government secondary schools in Kaffa Zone. Among these, only 1 was purposely selected because the researcher could not easily access the remote schools in the Zone for financial capacity and lack of transport and safety roads to do so. Moreover, since the research applied a quasi-experimental research, it would be difficult for consecutive intervention and follow up if the remote schools were included.

1. 9 Acronyms Used

CLT –Communicative Language Teaching

EFL – English as a Foreign Language

ELT – English Language Teaching

ESL – English as a Second Language

ICDR – Institute for Curriculum Development and Research

MOE – Ministry of Education

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Traditional Grammar

The traditional view of language teaching which focuses on language forms presentation explains the grammar rules and practice through drilling, though the required effects are not obtained. Disaffected students who can produce correct forms on exercises and tests do consistently make errors when they try to use the language in context. In other words, students subject to this kind of teaching know a lot about the language. However, these students are unable to use the language itself appropriately in contextualized situations for different reasons. In this respect, language learning, according to the different works in the field related to materials development for language learning, recommends that course books should provide learners with more opportunities to acquire language features from frequent encounters with them during motivated exposure to language in use (Cunico, 2005; Islam, 2001; Maley, 2003).

Different authors support this position from a variety of angles: Experiential learning theory claims that learners gain most from apprehending from experience before comprehending from analysis (Kolb, 1984). Comprehensible input theory states that acquisition is facilitated by meaningful and motivated exposure to language in use (Krashen, 1989, 2004). Deep processing theory also claims that meaningful encounters are necessary to achieve the deep processing needed for durable learning (Craik & Lockhart, 1972).. There is also support for this position from Asian applied linguists (e.g. Masuhara, 2000, 2003; Mukundan, 2005a, 2005b; Renandya, 2005) who argue for a reduction in the number of textbook activities involving explicit teaching of language and an increase in opportunities for implicit learning.

And also, this traditional grammar emphasizes learning technical vocabulary for nouns, verbs, adverbs, and adjectives; learners are taught grammatical rules to master sentence patterns. In this approach, a grammar rule is explicitly presented to students and followed by a practice exercise to apply the rule. So, the learners are in control during the practice and have less fear of drawing an incorrect conclusion related to how the target language is functioning. On the other hand, Ellis

(1995), Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) suggested that this type of language learning may not have major effects on sequences of acquisition, but it has facilitative effects on both the rate and the ultimate level of second language acquisition.

Similarly, other studies on the effectiveness of second language instruction (Norris & Ortega, 2000) concluded that this type of explicit instruction (presenting the structure, describing and exemplifying it, and giving rules for its use) results in important improvements in the learning of target structures. However, implicit instruction (usually consisting of communicative exposure to the target form) alone can delay students to achieve their learning goals.

According to Ulrich (1994), grammatical rules enable learners to know and apply how such sentence patterns should be put together, and the teaching of grammar should focus its attention on the way grammatical items or sentence patterns are correctly used. In other words, teaching grammar should encompass language structure or sentence patterns, meaning and use.

Indeed, in traditional language teaching, what students learn and how they learn are determined with reference to the classroom situation, rather than with reference to the learners' real communicative needs in real situations. As a result, learners often have difficulty using what they have learned, beyond the classroom. For this reason, Skehan (1996) advised that the traditional model is not supported by current research; he maintains that the belief on a precise focus of a particular form leads to learning, but it doesn't mean that to practice drills or diagram sentences has little relevance to use grammar effectively. Besides, this type of logical approach encourages the belief that learning a language is simply a case of knowing rules. However, the traditional methodology can be combined with a new communicative teaching methodology since the latter brings benefits to the students' learning process.

Regarding to this, The GTM is specifically describe as follows since it is more often raised by different authors being compared with the communicative grammar teaching.

2.1.1 Grammar-Translation method

The Grammar-Translation method dominated from the late 19th century to the early 20th century and although it has been generally acknowledged as the least effective teaching methodology, the method is still widely used in many countries including Vietnam. Obviously, the best point of this method is that it helps learners become good translators and use English accurately. In

addition, it requires few recourses and it is also easy to apply and cheap to administer. That is why the method is still used in many classrooms where there is a great shortage of teaching and learning facilities and equipment aids, where the class is large of about 30 students, and where the teachers' inadequate speaking skill are accustomed to teaching procedures and where the exams still emphasize knowledge of grammar. Therefore it is also called classical method because once it was used for teaching classical languages i.e. Latin & Greek Chastain (1988) cited in Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). The idea behind promulgation of this method was that the study of the grammar of target language would familiarize with the grammar of their native language.

The biggest advantage of this method understands of the phraseology (expressions & phrases) i.e. abstract words, idioms, phrases, metaphors, similes etc. since translation is possible in this method. Hence students can have better understanding of complicated concepts. This could be one of the reasons that this method is still prevalent & practiced in some parts of world. Also, the language of student & teacher does not hamper communication gap. Since students are taught in their mother tongue, they can comprehend well. This method is useful from this aspect that students are taught grammatical rules deductively. Consequently, student's comprehension & ability to write correct sentences improves. Students are taught books in their mother tongue they may have a better command than other students. Close reading of literary texts fosters reading & writing abilities. This method requires few specialized skills on the part of teachers so any one can teach.

Supporting this method, Austin J. Damiani (2003) in his paper "The Grammar Translation Method of Language Teaching" stated that as a teacher, he had liked using the grammar translation method because he could assume the intelligence of his students could talk to them like the intelligent people that they were, and they could talk about the grammar and vocabulary that he had been teaching. He added that in another method, he would have had to use simple language and familiar phrases to communicate in the target language, and even then, he could not be sure that his students had known and understood what it was that they were saying. So, this method has remained popular in language pedagogy even after the arrival of new methods. Even today this method is practiced in many countries.

Nevertheless, the biggest disadvantage of this method is the learners find it difficult to communicate in real-life situations, or their utterances are correct but inappropriate. This is the result of the process of learning form and usage, but not use, and learning about the language, not using the language to learn through authentic tasks. Furthermore, this method makes the learners really passive in the process of getting knowledge. They just listen to the teacher's explanation and do not participate in the exploration of new knowledge. To sum up, Brown H.D. (1994), in his *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, states "It does virtually nothing to enhance a student's communicative ability in the language."

2.1.1.1 Characteristics of GTM:

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000) in his book titled "Techniques & principles in Language Teaching" discussed the following principles:

- The purpose of this method is to read literature of foreign language hence literary language is superior.
- The second goal is to translate target language into native language.
- Importance is given to reading & writing on the other hand speaking & listening is neglected.
- The role of teacher is authoritarian.
- The students are passive in the classroom.
- Grammar is taught deductively.
- Learners memorize native language equivalents for target language vocabulary words.
- The interaction in the classroom is from teacher to students.
- Vocabulary & grammar is focused.

Similarly, Prator and Celce-Murcia (1991), listed the following major characteristics of Grammar-Translation Method:

- Target language is used meagerly & classes are taught in the mother tongue.
- Vocabulary is taught in the form of lists of isolated words.

- Long & difficult explanations of the intricacies of grammar are provided
- Classical texts are used for reading.
- The context of texts is almost neglected.
- Drills are exercises in translating disconnected sentences from the target language into the mother tongue.
- Pronunciation is not given importance.

Additionally, Jack C. Richards & Theodore S. Rodgers in their famous book “Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching” (2006) discussed the following main principles of GTM:

- Translation interprets the words and phrases of the foreign languages in the best possible manner.
- The phraseology and idioms of the target language can best be assimilated in the process of interpretation.
- The structures of the foreign language are best learnt when compared and contrasted with those of the mother tongue.

2.1.2 Approaches to Teaching Grammar

Over the past few decades, teaching grammar has undergone a series of interesting movements as a great deal of attention has been paid to its role in the field of second language acquisition (SLA). In the past, the dominating approach was prescriptive grammar, in which providing straightforward rules was encouraged to help avoid making errors (Odlin, 1994). That is to say, appropriate English meant using sophisticated styles and implementing certain grammar rules. Such an approach begins with a list of certain items to be taught in sequence. Thus, the place of grammar within the traditional approach can be referred to as a kind of discipline (Crystal, 2004). Some suggest that it becomes an end in itself since it is mainly taught to ensure the accuracy of sentences and utterances (Yarrow, 2007). Indeed, the traditional approach, as described above, encourages deductive grammar teaching and works on the assumption that once students have learned a structure, their productive language will make sense, not just grammatical sense.

However, it might be argued that being exposed to one grammatical structure at a time does not guarantee that students will master the use of that particular grammatical item before moving on to a new one (Larsen-Freeman, 1997). It is important to note that teaching grammar as an end in itself cannot be helpful. This is largely because it is not a tight clear-cut system like mathematics (Celce-Murcia, 1991). Leech (1994) believes in the inductive method of discovery learning – that is, going from data (or instances) to generalizations (or rules). In order for students to be capable of producing acceptable utterances spontaneously or communicatively, grammatical accuracy is not enough by itself (Ellis, 1997). Instead, grammar should be introduced to serve communicative purposes. It should always be taught with reference to a combination of meaning, social factors, and discourse. In other words, it has to be taken into consideration as a communicative end that is composed of three interrelated dimensions of form, meaning, and use (Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman, 1999).

The question remains, should that “form, meaning, and use” be prescriptive or descriptive. Descriptive grammar refers to the structure of language as it is used by speakers and writers. It does not suggest how words have to be put together to make sentences. Instead, it describes how they are made by language users without mentioning whether or not it is good prescriptive usage (Celce-Murcia, 2002). Discourse analysis, on the other hand, focuses on the relationship between the language and the context in which it is used. It also considers the way language is used by members of certain social groups (Demo, 2001). Therefore, in order for learners to become completely familiar with a form or construction, contextual knowledge is of paramount importance as it paves the way for a deeper understanding of its function at the discourse level (Celce-Murica, 2002).

To sum up, with a focus on process rather than product (Pennington, 1995) and a dynamic rather than static nature (Larsen-Freeman, 1997), modern pedagogical grammar in the field of English language teaching (ELT) encourages awareness-raising rather than practice-based activities (Celce-Murcia 1991). It encourages teachers to deviate from the traditional approach and concentrate their efforts on teaching grammar at the discourse level rather than the sentence level. It consists of two parts: the prescriptive part, which is about the articulation of a set of rules, and the descriptive part, which deals with grammatical analysis. Hence, the focus of this research that is communicative grammar teaching has been discussed from its origin and development below.

2.2 Declarative and Procedural Knowledge of Grammar

Declarative (explicit) knowledge cannot be defined without making reference to procedural (implicit) knowledge. Procedural (implicit) knowledge is “knowledge of language and is typically manifested in some form of naturally occurring language behavior (e.g., conversation) and cannot be easily accessed separately from this behavior. It is “unanalyzed in the sense that language users are not aware of the knowledge they hold” (Han & Ellis, 1998, p. 5).

Ellis defines explicit knowledge as follows: Explicit L2 knowledge is the declarative and often anomalous knowledge of the phonological, pragmatic, and sociocritical features of an L2 together with the metalanguage for labeling this knowledge. It is held consciously and is learnable and verbalizable. It is typically accessed through controlled processing when L2 learners experience some kind of linguistic difficulty in the use of the L2. Learners vary in the breadth and depth of their L2 explicit (declarative) knowledge (Ellis, 2004, p. 244).

From both practical and theoretical point of view it is important to understand the difference between procedural and declarative knowledge and the role they play in second language learning. Accessibility and awareness are taken to be two principal criteria which can be used for making a distinction between procedural and declarative knowledge. As Han and Ellis (1998) assert, implicit (procedural) knowledge accounts for fluent language performance because it can be accessed easily. Explicit (declarative) knowledge, on the contrary, cannot be accessed without control and can be used in language production if there is some time for planning and monitoring. Procedural knowledge is held to be unanalyzed whereas declarative knowledge is viewed as analyzed and “model-based”. Procedural knowledge is believed to exist without awareness while declarative knowledge is believed to account for conscious “insights about language”. Declarative knowledge may or may not involve metalinguistic knowledge (Han & Ellis, 1998). Traditionally, the relationship between the two types of knowledge has been discussed in terms of the interface between them, as shown in the following discussion of three distinct cognitive perspectives.

The noninterface position holds that procedural and declarative L2 knowledge undergo different acquisitional mechanisms, and are accessed for language performance by varying processes, either automatic or controlled (Ellis, 1993). According to this position, declarative knowledge cannot transform directly into procedural knowledge as procedural knowledge cannot become

declarative. According to a weaker version of such a position, the possibility of procedural knowledge transforming into declarative is recognized through the process of conscious reflection on and analysis of output generated by means of procedural knowledge (Ellis, 2005, p. 144).

Roehr (2007) confirms this position and argues that, contrary to learners' and teachers' expectations, metalinguistic knowledge may be constructed on the basis of increased L2 competence, rather than, or in addition to, being instrumental in building up L2 proficiency.

In contrast, the strong interface position claims that not only can declarative knowledge be derived from procedural knowledge but also that declarative knowledge can be converted into procedural knowledge through practice; that is, learners can first learn a rule as a declarative fact and then, by practice, can convert it into a procedural representation, although this need not entail the loss of the original procedural representation. This interface position has been promoted by DeKeyser (2007). Differences exist, however, regarding the nature of practice that is required to affect the transformation from declarative to procedural knowledge; in particular, researchers disagree on whether this practice can be mechanical or needs to be communicative in nature.

The weak interface position exists in three versions, all of which acknowledge the possibility of declarative knowledge becoming procedural but posit some limitation on when and how this can take place. The first version assumes that declarative knowledge can convert into procedural knowledge through practice only if the learner is developmentally ready to acquire the linguistic form (Ellis, 1993). The second version holds that declarative knowledge contributes indirectly to the acquisition of procedural knowledge by promoting some of the processes which are believed to be responsible. Declarative knowledge facilitates attention to form in the input. It can be done in two major ways. First, it aids the process of noticing. That is, if learners are equipped with procedural knowledge of a linguistic feature, they are more likely to notice its occurrence in the communicative input they receive and thus to learn it procedurally. In other words, declarative knowledge helps make a feature salient. Second, declarative knowledge may assist “noticing-the-gap”. If learners know about a particular feature, they are better prepared to detect the difference between what they themselves are saying and how the feature is used in the input they are exposed to (Ellis, 1993).

Finally, according to the third version, learners can use their explicit knowledge to produce output that then serves as “auto-input” to their implicit learning mechanisms (Schmidt & Frota, 1986, as cited in Ellis, 2005). According to Leeman (2003), recasts occurring in appropriate discourse contexts can facilitate the encoding of new declarative knowledge. Prompts, on the other hand, given their aim to elicit modified output, can enhance control over already-internalized forms—that is, prompts serve to assist learners in the transition of declarative to procedural knowledge. To sum up, Ellis et al. (2005) concluded that explicit feedback in the form of metalinguistic explanation can be more effective than implicit feedback (in the form of recasts) and might contribute to implicit as well as explicit knowledge.

2.3 The Origin and Development of CLT

Towards the end of the 1960s there was a growing dissatisfaction among applied linguists and foreign language teachers with the language theories and teaching methods. American

Linguist Noam Chomsky demonstrated that the current standard structural theories of language were incapable of accounting for the fundamental characteristics of language -the creativity and uniqueness of individual sentences. Then, British applied linguists emphasized another fundamental dimension of language that was inadequately addressed in current approaches to language teaching at that time -the functional and communicative potential of language. Consequently, the teaching produced structurally competent students who were often communicatively incompetent. Communicative (CLT) emerged as a response to that judgment. The term CLT covers a variety of approaches that all focus on helping learners to communicate meaningfully in target language.

Hence, CLT began to emerge during the 1970s. It is a new approach to language teaching after the Grammar-Translation Method, Direct Method, and Audio Lingual Method. It was proposed by applied linguists who negated the teaching theory of structuralism. At the beginning, people usually called this teaching method the “Notional Approach” or “Functional Approach”. CLT has been influenced by sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, philosophy of language, anthropology, sociology and some other disciplines, among which, sociolinguistics has had the most impact on it. Richards (2007) argues that, “Communicative Language Teaching can be understood as a set of principles about the goals of language teaching, how learners learn a

language, the kinds of classroom activities that best facilitate learning, and the roles of teachers and learners in the classroom” (p.2). CLT emphasizes that the aim of language teaching is to develop the learner’s communicative competence.

The notion of “communicative competence” was proposed by American sociolinguist Hymes (1972) during the 1970s and it is considered as the theoretical tenet of CLT. Communicative competence was proposed in contrast to Chomsky’s theory of “linguistic competence”. Chomsky’s linguistic competence could be easily understood as the grammatical knowledge of a language (Wang, 2006). Whereas, Hymes pointed out that language competence not only refers to the understanding of grammar, it also includes the following four aspects: formally possible, psychologically feasible, contextually appropriate, and actually performed (Hymes, 1972).

Another linguist Richards (2007) argues: Grammatical competence refers to the knowledge we have of a language that accounts for our ability to produce sentences in a language. It refers to knowledge of the building blocks of sentences (e.g. parts of speech, tenses, phrases, clauses, sentence patterns) and how sentences are formed (p.2).

At the beginning of the 1980s, the theory of communicative competence was complemented by two Canadian linguists, Canale and Swain (1980). They argued that communicative competence contains grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence (1980).

To achieve communicative competence, learners need to be competent in four aspects: linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence (Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980; Swain, 1985). According to Canale (1983) and Canale and Swain (1980), linguistic competence, which is also called grammatical competence, concerns learners’ use of lexis, syntax, and structures. Sociolinguistic competence concerns learners’ appropriate use of language in different situations and settings. Discourse competence refers to the speakers’ ability to form oral and written language appropriately and meaningfully.

As suggested by the term itself, strategic competence relates to the use of strategies that can be used to make up for the inadequate abilities in other aspects of competence. Researchers have investigated the acquisition of each competence (see Meyer, 1990; Rintell, 1990; Swain & Lapkin, 1990). These studies provide evidence that each competence plays a significant role in

the acquisition of communicative competence. However, teachers seem to deemphasize grammar accuracy in their CLT classrooms (Wang, 2009).

During the 1990's, Bachman (1990), an American sociolinguist, developed this theory further. Later, Savignon studied the previous research and emphasized that language teaching should consider the learner's communicative needs and put the learner in the central place (2002).

According to Savignon (2002), there is a difference between communicative competence and communicative ability. Communicative competence refers to the ability to interpret information, express oneself, and negotiate meaning. Communicative ability refers to the ability to comprehend meaning and to use forms appropriately. This implies the importance of grammar learning in order to achieve a higher level of communication.

Generally, According to Savignon (2002), there is a difference between communicative competence and communicative ability. Communicative competence refers to the ability to interpret information, express oneself, and negotiate meaning. Communicative ability refers to the ability to comprehend meaning and to use forms appropriately. This implies the importance of grammar learning in order to achieve a higher level of communication. In the context of CLT, whether or not grammar instruction should be included has been a controversial topic. Therefore, to make this controversy briefer the definition of CLT by different authors has been discussed below.

2.3.1 Definition of Communicative Language Teaching

Different researchers have presented their understandings in relation to communicative language teaching. Ying (2010) argues that CLT is an approach to the teaching of second languages that emphasizes interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of learning a language. It is also referred to as a “communicative approach to the teaching of foreign languages” or simply as the “communicative approach” (Ying, 2010, p, 2). In relation to this, Larsen-Freeman (2000) argues that CLT aims broadly at the theoretical perspective of a communicative approach by enabling communication. Communicative competence is the goal of language teaching by acknowledging the interdependence of language and communication (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

It is clear to see that CLT here means that the language teacher uses communication as a teaching approach to enhance students' communicative competence. In relation to this, Ellis

(1997) also supports that the pedagogical rationale for the use of communicative approach in a language teaching class depends in part on the claim that they will help develop learners' communicative skills and in part on a claim that they will contribute incidentally to their linguistic development. Here, it becomes clear that in relation to being able to communicate, language teaching not only needs the mastering of linguistic knowledge, but also communicative competence.

Communicative competence is the ability to understand the logical basis of linguistic competence (Finch, 2003). According to Finch, there are three kinds of logic: the first one is formal logic, which is connected with the rules which govern valid argument and gets us so far in understanding the basis of communication. Then to be fully competent, we need knowledge of natural logic, which means understanding what people are trying to do through language. In addition to these two logics, we also need to understand the force of our utterance, which requires us to understand the meaning of our utterances according to its social context or particular situational settings. Gonzales (1995) supports this, by arguing that communicative competence includes mastery of language that is needed to handle various situations.

William Littlewood (1981), also stated that Communicative Language Teaching means systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language, combining these into a more fully communicative view. According to Richards & Rodgers, 2001 Communicative Language Teaching is best considered an approach rather than a method. It refers to a diverse set of principles that reflect a communicative view of language and language learning and that can be used to support a wide variety of classroom procedures.

To summarise, communicative competence not only includes good mastery of linguistic knowledge, but also the ability to understand the logic to handle realistic situations. However, according to Richards and Rodgers (2001), CLT starts with a theory of language as communication, and its goal is to develop learners' communicative competence.

2.3.2 Characteristics of CLT

One Of the characteristics of CLT is that meaning is paramount. Wilkins (1972) classifies meaning into notional and functional categories and views learning a second language as acquiring the linguistic means to perform different kinds of functions. According to Larsen-Freeman (1986: 132) the most obvious characteristic of CLT is that “Almost everything that is

done is done with communicative intent.” Students use the language through communicative activities (e.g. games, role-plays and problem-solving tasks).

According to Brown (2001) CLT has the following characteristics:

- Classroom goals are focused on all of the components (grammatical, discourse, functional, sociolinguistic, and strategic) of communicative competence. Goals therefore must intertwine the organizational aspects of language with the pragmatic.
- Language techniques are designed to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes. Organizational language forms are not the central focus, but rather aspects of language that enable the learner to accomplish those purposes.
- Fluency and accuracy are seen as complementary principles underlying communicative techniques. At times fluency may have to take on more importance than accuracy in order to keep learners meaningfully engaged in language use.
- Students in a communicative class ultimately have to use the language, productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts outside the classroom. Classroom tasks must therefore equip students with the skills necessary for communication in those contexts.
- Students are given opportunities to focus on their own learning process through an understanding of their own styles of learning and through the development of appropriate strategies for autonomous learning.
- The role of the teacher is that of facilitator and guide, not an all-knowing best owner of knowledge. Students are therefore encouraged to construct meaning through genuine linguistic interaction with others (P. 43).

2.3.3 Principles of CLT

For years, many English language teachers have taught grammar classes following just prefabricated structures as groups of sentence patterns without any possible flexibility or transformation. But, since the 1990s the Communicative approach has been widely implemented in these classes because “it describes a set of general principles grounded in the notion of communicative competence as the goal of second and foreign language teaching. A new

approach that has evolved as our understanding of the processes of second language learning has developed” (Richards, 2006: 23). Hence, the main principles of CLT are described as follows.

First, the primary principle is that CLT seeks to promote or lead to the teaching and learning of language use in communication. That means teachers should teach English for communicative purposes. The increased interest in taking English as a communicative tool could be observed from the organization of language teaching (Liu & Wen, 2005). Any types of classroom activities are designed for helping teachers to fulfill the goal.

In overall actual classroom teaching, grammar instruction takes a larger part of a class. Teachers spend much time in “grammar explanations, chorus reading, and vocabulary presentations” (Sakui, 2004). And also most language learners have the idea that traditional grammar instruction is so boring that it is very hard for them to concentrate on the class all the time. Application of the communicative teaching method in grammar classes will greatly change this situation. After finishing the theory instruction, teachers can give a context in daily life, and invite couples of students with what they have learned to make dialogues in the classroom. By practicing in a given context, it is much easier for students to totally understand the knowledge they have acquired (Sakui, 2004).

Secondly, teachers ought to conduct classroom activities in the context of the real world as much as possible. As Clarke and Silbertstein (1977) thus argued, “classroom activities should parallel to the real world as closely as possible. Since language is a tool of communication, methods and materials should concentrate on the message and not the medium”.

In the real world, when people communicate with others, the forms of expression and words that they choose are varied. So teachers should design the classroom activities to mirror the real world. It is known that even if the forms of communication are varied, there are some common features existing in daily communications of different people. These common features are what CLT emphasizes. They are also what the teachers want to show to their students. Generally speaking, these communicative features can be summarized into three points: information gap, free choices and information feedback.

Information gap refers to “the fact that in real communication people normally communicate in order to get information they do not possess” (Richards, 2007). Free choice means people can choose the form and content of communication by themselves. As for information feedback, it

refers to people adjusting their communicative content according to the information that other people provide (Xu, 2000).

The third principle of CLT is that teachers do not always correct errors. That means fluency and appropriateness in ELT should take precedence over structural correctness (Mangubhai, Marland, Dashwood, & Son, 2007). This is another notable feature of CLT.

It is clear that CLT places emphasis on the transmission of meanings, selection of words and realization of communicative purposes. “One of the goals of Communicative Language Teaching is to develop fluency in language use” (Richards, 2007, P.16). However, it is normal that students are confused with some new grammar usages during the communicative activities. In order to make themselves better understood, they usually use some improper sentence patterns to convey their meanings. This must run counter to the “accuracy” principle, which has been highly praised by the traditional teaching method. Teachers who stand up for the communicative teaching method may disagree with pointing out students’ mistakes all the time in the process of communication. They believe that students may be frustrated by too many corrections. However, it doesn’t mean ignoring the mistakes. Richards (2007) pointed out that: accuracy work could either come before or after fluency work. For example, based on students’ performance on a fluent task, the teacher could assign accuracy work to deal with grammatical or pronunciation problems the teacher observed while students were carrying out the task (p.18).

Also, through this application of principles, some core assumptions of the current communicative language teaching cited by Richards (2006) will be assumed.

- Second language learning is facilitated when learners are engaged in interaction and meaningful communication.
- Effective classroom learning tasks and exercises provide opportunities for students to negotiate meaning, expand their language resources, notice how language is used, and take part in meaningful intrapersonal exchange.
- Communication is a holistic process that often calls upon the use of several language skills or modalities.

- Language learning is facilitated both by activities that involve inductive or discovery learning of underlying rules of language use and organization, as well as those involving language analysis and reflection (p. 23).

Similarly, Jacobs and Farrel (2003) state key principles of CLT. They are:

- Focusing greater attention on the role of learners rather than the external stimuli learners are receiving from their environment. This is generally known as the move from teacher-centered instruction to learner-centered instruction.
- Focusing greater attention on the social nature of learning rather than on students as separate individuals.
- Focusing greater attention on diversity among learners and viewing these differences not as impediments to learning but as resources to be recognized, catered to and appreciated. This is known as the study of individual differences.
- Connecting the school with the outside world as a means of promoting holistic learning.
- A whole-to-part orientation instead of a part-to-whole approach. This implies beginning with meaningful, whole text, e.g. the choice of words and the text's organizational structure.
- An emphasis on the importance of meaning rather than drills and other forms of rote learning.
- A view of learning as a life-long process rather than something done to prepare students for an exam (p.1).

To sum up, the principles of CLT encourages task-based learning and lays great stress on language functions. In consideration of learners' needs, language teachers should select teaching materials as authentic as possible and design enough activities simulating real life in the classroom. The adoption of CLT could be regarded as a part of the teaching innovation process. "Teachers mould innovations to their own abilities, beliefs and experiences, the immediate school context, and the wider sociocultural environment." (Carless, 2004). The learner's task is not only to master the knowledge, but also put the knowledge into practice. For this purpose, they should actively take part in the classroom activities. Through being involved in those

activities, teachers and students will make clear whether the knowledge has been mastered or not (Carless, 2004).

Here, it is also relevant to mention two approaches that can bring a light to grammar teaching using communicative activities: the inductive approach and the deductive approach. The inductive approach provides students with some examples from which a rule is inferred, and the deductive approach with the presentation of rules and some examples in which the rule is applied. At the same time, Thornbury (1999) mentioned some advantages and disadvantages of these approaches such as:

The inductive approach's advantages:

- Rules learners discover for themselves are more likely to fit their existing mental structure than rules that have been presented to them. This in turn will make rules more meaningful, memorable and applicable.
- Students are more actively involved in the learning process, rather than being simply passive recipients: they are therefore likely to be more attentive and motivated.
- If the problem-solving is done collaboratively, and in the target language, learners get the opportunity for extra language practice (Thornbury, 1999: 59).

Some disadvantages are:

- The time and energy spent in working out rules may mislead students into believing that rules are the objective of language learning, rather than the means.
- The time taken to work out a rule may be at the expense of time spent in putting the rule to some sort of productive practice.
- Students may hypothesize the wrong rule (Thornbury, 1999: 59).

On the other hand, some advantages of the deductive approach are:

- It gets straight to the point and saves time. Many rules can be simply and quickly explained rather than elicited from examples.
- It respects the intelligence and maturity of many—especially adult— students, and acknowledges the role of a cognitive process of language acquisition.

- It allows the teacher to deal with language points as they come up, rather than having to anticipate them and prepare them in advance (Thornbury, 1999: 59).

Also, it has the following some disadvantages:

- Starting the lesson with a grammar presentation may be off-putting for some students, especially younger ones. They may not have sufficient metalanguage (language used to talk about language such as grammar) and may not be able to understand the concepts involved.
- Grammar explanation encourages a teacher-fronted, transmission-style classroom; teacher explanation is often at the expense of student involvement and interaction.
- Explanation is seldom as memorable as other forms of presentation, such as demonstration (Thornbury, 1999: 59).

To sum up, both approaches display advantages and disadvantages in their applicability in the teaching process; however, the deductive approach relates more strongly to the main objective of this research, for teaching grammar in a communicative manner helps students explore the given example and deduce why certain rules are applied to those specific examples. Through this process, learners may have the possibility to adapt those rules to some other examples, create some other rules and develop their own learning process (Thornbury, 1999).

2.3.4 The Role of Grammar in Developing Communicative Competence

There is a mixture of beliefs regarding grammar instruction. Some scholars support the exclusion of grammar learning (e.g. Prabhu, 1987), while other researchers emphasize the need to include grammar teaching in CLT (e.g. Lightbown & Spada, 1990; Spada & Lightbown, 1993).

Specially, there is a widespread belief that Communicative Language Teaching does not include any grammar. However, Spada argues that the thought that “Communicative Language Teaching means an exclusive focus on meaning” is a myth or a misconception (Spada, 2007:275). In fact, that widespread belief that CLT eclipsed attention to grammar is only partly true, since although CLT syllabuses are organized according to categories of meaning or functions, they still have a strong grammar basis (Thornbury, 1999:23), that is to say, the functions into which CLT syllabuses are organized are connected with their correspondent grammatical points.

Discussing the role of grammar within any communicative approach can be controversial, due to these misconceptions and also to the influence of Natural Approaches, which ascribed no grammar role in language learning. However, when explaining the role of grammar specifically in CLT, some of that controversy may be solved if we do not talk about one single type of CLT but about two main types, the shallow-end approach and the deep-end approach to CLT (Thornbury, 1999).

The shallow-end approach to Communicative Language Teaching is based on the thought that in order to make the learner use language in a communicative situation it is necessary first to learn the grammatical rules and then apply them in that communicative situation; on the other hand, the deep-end approach to CLT is based on the belief that grammar is acquired unconsciously during the performance on those communicative situations, so it would be useless to teach grammar previously and explicitly (Thornbury, 1999:18-19).

According to this, CLT does deal with grammar, at least in its shallow-end approach. First, it just dresses up the grammatical structures into communicative functions; although they are not presented explicitly, they are still there. Second, if we have a functional, Hallidayan concept of grammar, the explicit teaching of functions would still be grammar teaching: according to Halliday, grammar is the study of linguistic forms (wordings) realizing functions or meanings; both wordings and functions are studied by grammar (Halliday, 1997).

However, the fact that there is grammar teaching in the shallow-end approach does not mean that this version of Communicative Language Teaching is not communicative. Grammar is considered as a means towards communication. In shallow-end syllabuses grammar is taught, but it is the way in which it is taught and its final result into the learners' communicative performance the two factors that make that grammar meaningful and communicative.

In the shallow-end to CLT, grammar is taught in a way that we can define as inductive: learners are not presented with a list of grammatical rules that they have to learn by heart (presentation-practice-production cycle) but rather, the teacher provides them with examples from which the learners will have to infer the rules by themselves. Rutherford (1996) calls this inductive way of teaching consciousness-raising. By means of this consciousness-raising, the teacher makes the learners relate the new grammatical concepts to other grammatical information that they already have, both from other grammatical concepts in the target language or even from grammatical

information which appears in their L1. By provoking a consciousness-raising in the learners they take into account their general framework of knowledge which is already acquired, so the new grammar is as familiar to the learner as possible and it is not presented as something strange or unattached to previous knowledge.

Contrarily from the shallow-end approach, the deep-end methodology claimed that grammar should be acquired unconsciously, in line with Krashen's theories (1985) reflected on his Natural Approach, which became widely popular as an acquisition-oriented model. The cycle of input-intake- output reflected in this theory assumed no role for grammar, as it would affect the final aim of communication. This model has had a great influence on ELT, and there is still a belief that the teaching of grammar might be harmful for communicative competence, as it claims that conscious reflection about grammar affects negatively input processing and performance.

According to Lock, this excluding view of grammar in deep-end approaches was also strongly influenced by a rejection of traditional methodologies in which grammatical competence was acquired with the approach of the rule plus drilling methodology typical of audiolingual or traditional grammar methods (Lock, 1997:267), because learning outcomes were not satisfactory: learners knew a lot about grammar but were unable to put that grammatical knowledge into practice. The reaction, in deep-end approaches, was not to teach grammar, as learners would be unable to integrate it within communication processes.

However, even when the contradiction about teaching grammar still exists in ELT literature, in the classroom the deep-end approach is not currently used, as most authors and teachers attach a role to grammar, without diminishing the main target of communication. As Larsen-Freeman states:

Despite the popularity such approaches [the Natural Approach] now enjoy, if the pattern alluded to earlier is perpetuated [no grammatical analysis in the classroom], then one would expect them to be challenged. Indeed, there are already signs that this is happening. [...] Thus, a more satisfactory characterization of teaching grammar, harmonious with the above assumptions, is that teaching grammar means enabling language students to use linguistic forms accurately, meaningfully and appropriately. (Larsen-Freeman, 1991:279-280)

Similarly, Long (1991) differentiates between focus on forms and focus on form. He defines focus on forms as learning grammar rules, and focus on form as drawing learners' attention to grammar in activities and tasks. In the past two decades, some researchers have returned to the investigation of form-focused instruction in CLT (e.g. Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 1993; Long & Crookes, 1992). The studies on language accuracy of students in an immersion program in Canada provide important evidence that form focused instruction is needed (e.g. Harley & Swain, 1984; Swain, 1985).

These immersion students received massive amounts of input and had plenty of interaction in the program for a period of time, but their utterances still contained grammatical mistakes. As a result of excluding form-focused instruction, the learners' output reduced in accuracy (Williams, 1995). Despite the negative reports about immersion programs in regard to language acquisition, research also indicates the success of French immersion programs in Canada.

The students in the programs outperformed those who learned French as a separate subject in their overall proficiency in French as well as their knowledge of the target language culture (Cummins & Swain, 1986; Lessow-Hurley, 2009).

Many educators misunderstand focus on form as teaching and learning grammatical rules. However, form-focused instruction does not refer to presenting rules to students. A number of studies (e.g. Doughty & Williams, 1998; Lightbown, 1991; Trahey & White, 1993; White, 1991) have examined the effectiveness of focusing on form and indicated that students with form-focused instruction outperformed those without instruction on the targeted forms. The results of these studies are very important, because they support the role of form-focused instruction.

Some teachers think that form-focused instruction and communicative activities, where the focus is on meaning, should be separated. Teachers believe that drawing students' attention to grammar, while they are engaging in meaning, may have harmful effects (Lightbown, 1998). However, some scholars argue that form-focused instruction and communicative activities should be combined. Students pay more attention to target forms, and the forms become more memorable, if students learn them in context (Lightbown, 1998; Nassaji, 2000; Wang, 2009). One way to present grammar communicatively is through structured input activities (Lee & VanPatten, 2003).

Structured input is a type of instruction that directs learners to pay attention to the target language through arranging input from the instruction. These activities are called structured input activities. The basic notion of these activities is how learners encode grammatical forms through meaningful context. The purpose of structured input activities is to raise learners' awareness of the target structures with meaning (Schmidt, 2001).

In short, all these approaches share the functional view of language but, as has been stated in the first section, they also take into account a more operative view of learning, in which the dichotomy of conscious versus unconscious knowledge (acquisition, in Krashen's terms) is solved by asserting the fact that conscious knowledge can become unconscious or automatized (Schmidt, 2001) and, alternatively, unconscious knowledge can be analyzed (Skehan, 1998).

There is also an issue concerns the thought processes involved in processing and learning this grammatical- knowledge: grammar learning is considered in terms of performance within a skill-based approach (Newby, 2006). The third issue within these approaches relates to how knowledge –grammar- may be acquired, by an inductive or a deductive route, the later typically connected to much traditional grammar teaching but also present in many current classrooms.

Within post-CLT, some of the most commonly applied approaches, Task-based teaching, Focus on- form teaching and Content-based Instruction, will be considered (Newby, 2006). In general, all of them consider that modifications in the input and in the interaction processes have to be combined with explicit grammar teaching (Ortega, 2000:209), or focus-on-form teaching (Doughty, 2001) to improve competence levels.

Generally, learning grammar through a communicative method can provide the learner a better opportunity to communicate than a grammar-based approach. But, there are several aspects that make the Communicative Approach and the traditional grammar method useful tools for students to learn the second language. Some of which are:

- Make real communication the focus of language learning.
- Provide opportunities to experiment and try what they know.
- Be tolerant of learners' errors as they indicate that the learner is building up his or her communicative competence.
- Provide opportunities for learners to develop both accuracy and fluency.

- Link the different skills, such as speaking, reading and listening, together in the real world.
- Let students induce, or discover, grammar rules. (Richards, 2006: 13).

2.3.5 Classroom Activities of Communicative Grammar

“Perhaps the majority of language teachers today, when asked to identify the methodology they employ in their classrooms, identify communicative” as the methodology of choice” (Richards, 2007, p.1). So, to design classroom activities to change the atmosphere of traditional grammar class by adopting the communicative method, Richards recommends two commonly used types in his book.

In the first instance, role-play is a kind of activity that requires participants to “behave in the way somebody else would behave in a particular situation” (Oxford Advanced Learner’s English-Chinese Dictionary, 6th edition). Teachers can choose any context of daily life. Meanwhile, each participant will have two cards—one is the role card, which tells the participant the personal information about the role, such as age, career, family, or hobbies. The other one is the cue card, which describes the situation and general content of the communication. Students who take part in the role-play activity should fully complement the language of the communication, and try their best to make a dialogue suitable for the requirement with their partners.

Nunan (2001) said that “role plays help to make the task-based classroom a lively and rich language environment for learners of all abilities” (p.84). In this process, students will put what they have learned into practice and teachers can get clear about how much knowledge the students have mastered or which parts need to be paid more attention to in the future.

The second type of activity is group discussion. Just as its name implies, group discussion is students in groups who “become skilled at cooperating with others, and express their own opinions, ideas, and feelings, guided by the teacher” (Nunan, 2001, p.83). Nunan also pointed out that in group discussion, students “learn how to solve language problems in a systematic way and to decide what language to use in the different situations that their teachers present in the classroom” (p. 84).

In grammar class, after instructing the theory, the teacher can divide all the students into several groups. Four or five students work in a group to discuss the usage of the grammar that the

teacher instructed in the class. Group discussion can help students solve problem by themselves and also improve their oral language abilities. In a sense, any oral expression contains many aspects of grammar, such as the tense, voice, and sentence patterns. The oral expression is a process in which one should properly integrate all kinds of grammar to make their speech understandable. In view of this, it is easier for teachers to find out what knowledge should be focused on in their later teaching.

Implementation of CLT in the classroom also means teachers and students will witness a shift in their roles. CLT advocates student-centered teaching. Students are no longer passively receiving knowledge, but actively participating in classroom activities. Teachers in the classroom play different roles. They are no longer the master of the class. Now they act as facilitators, organizers, participators, and investigators (Wang, 2009).

Regarding to this, Brown (1994) outlines five techniques which teachers should consider in focusing attention on grammar.

First, the structures should be embedded in meaningful, communicative contexts. When learners see that the context for communication is meaningful, they will be more interested in learning how to grammatically present their ideas and information.

Second, the structures should contribute positively to the learners' communicative goals. This places importance on the significance of continual analysis of our learners' needs to determine that what we are teaching is in line with what they need in their language contexts.

Next, the structures should promote accuracy with fluent, communicative language. Accuracy and fluency must be seen as a continuum and not as an either/or proposition. Second language learners need to be both accurate and fluent in their use of language.

Fourth, teachers should not overwhelm the learners with linguistic terminology. The use of simple terms is appropriate but grammar instruction should not be focused so much on statements of rules as it should be on how that grammar structure can be used accurately and appropriately in accomplishing communication goals.

Finally, the presentation of the grammar structures should be a lively and intrinsically motivating as possible.

Additionally, Brown (1994) points out four significant issues which language teachers should consider in determining how to teach grammar. These issues include:

(a) Determining whether the form should be presented inductively or deductively, (b) choosing to use technical or non-technical language and grammatical explanations, (c) deciding to teach grammar in "grammar only" classes or integrating it into other language skills courses, and (d) providing explicit correction of errors or ignoring errors.

To end this, Ulrich (1994) advised to combine the Communicative strategy and the explicit strategy. The combination of these two strategies provides students with a clear and well-explained theoretical framework and a contextualized and natural environment to make them use the language in a native-like way. This way, language teachers must include communicative activities in their lesson plans such as oral presentations, individual or group projects, free written production, spontaneous speech, and the development of their own written and oral style. This can be done without violating the target language rules and students of a second language can implement all the theoretical aspects in their oral and written performance. In this way, learners will visualize grammar classes as an enjoyable experience that becomes the basis of a lifelong learning process (p. 4).

2.4 Attitudes towards grammar instruction

In teaching grammar, three areas have to be considered: grammar as rules, grammar as form, and grammar as resource. For many L2 learners, learning grammar often means learning the rules of grammar and having an intellectual knowledge of grammar. Teachers often believe that this will provide the generative basis on which learners can build their knowledge and will be able to use the language eventually. For them, prescribed rules give a kind of security.

A better approach is perhaps to see grammar as one of many resources that we have in language which helps us to communicate. We should see how grammar relates to what we want to say or write, and how we expect others to interpret what our language use and its focus. According to Widdowson (1990: 86), ". . . grammar is not a constraining imposition but a liberating force: it frees us from a dependency on context and a purely lexical categorization of reality." Given that many learners – and teachers – tend to view grammar as a set of restrictions on what is allowed and disallowed in language use – ‘a linguistic strait jacket’ in Larsen-Freeman’s words (2002:103).

The conception of grammar as something that liberates rather than represses is one that is worth investigating. According to Morelli (2003), students perceived themselves as having a better attitude towards grammar instruction in context, while performing slightly better after having experienced the traditional grammar instruction. Elkilic and Akca (2008) reported generally positive attitudes of students studying English grammar at a private primary EFL classroom towards studying grammar. In particular, however, a little over 50% of their subjects claimed to enjoy grammar very much and only about 10% reported finding some difficulty in learning and remembering grammar. Hence, students and teachers expectations towards grammar instruction have been discussed as follows.

2.4.1 Student expectations

Regarding to this, Ellis (1994) states that interest is one of the main elements of motivation and a positive response to stimulate based on existing cognitive structures in such a way that learners' curiosity is aroused and sustained. In other words, interest shows learners' desire to learn the target language. It can be seen that students who are given opportunities for communication will be interested in the lesson.

Student expectations of traditional, explicit grammar teaching have been confirmed by many teachers (cf. Borg, 1999a, b). Burgess and Etherington (2002:440-441) also conclude that teachers believe that explicit teaching of grammar is favoured by their students because of expectations and feelings of insecurity.

Since the 1970s, attention has shifted from ways of teaching grammar to ways of getting learners to communicate, but grammar has been seen to be a powerful undermining and demotivating force among L2 learners. In terms of motivation and learner success with languages, grammar has been seen to be a problem and to stand in the way of helping learners to communicate fluently. The hard fact that most teachers face is that learners often find it difficult to make flexible use of the rules of grammar taught in the classroom. They may know the rules perfectly, but are incapable of applying them in their own use of the language. Teachers' recognition of this process (i.e., of transferring declarative knowledge about grammar into procedural knowledge) as a problem for many of their students has been reported by Burgess and Etherington (2002:442). To sum up, the authors have reported that many learners have difficulty in internalizing grammar rules, although these have been taught intensively.

2.4.2 Teacher Expectations

Teacher expectations play an important role in instructional decision-making and teaching practices (Johnson, 1994; Wong, 2010). Teacher perceptions in regard to form-focused instruction have a great impact on whether they will incorporate grammar teaching in their classrooms (Fox, 1993; McCargar, 1993). Several studies have been conducted to investigate teacher beliefs regarding grammar instruction (Richards, Gallo, & Renandya, 2001; Wang, 2009).

Farrell and Lim (2005) examined two English teachers' beliefs of grammar teaching in an elementary school in Singapore. The teachers believe that grammar instruction and providing grammar exercises for students are necessary. In addition, Wang (2009) reported in her study that the teachers agreed that grammar drills are important in language teaching and learning. Nevertheless, they also believe that students need communicative activities to enhance their speaking ability. Similarly, Wong and Renandya (2001) reported that the teachers in their study believe that explicit grammar instruction is essential in L2 learning, although they claimed that they adopted CLT in their teaching.

According to Burgess and Etherington (2002: 444) also stated that teachers believe that their students see grammatical terminology as useful and that its use does not present a particular difficulty for students.

Generally, As Morelli (2003:33-34) has observed, "Grammar can be taught traditionally or contextually, but student perception should be considered by teachers in the decision-making process. Students need to feel confident that educators have met their needs . . . and educators should be willing to consider the attitudes and perceptions of students when making decisions about how to teach grammar." Similarly, as Borg, (1998: 17) said, the use of a particular teaching technique, approach, or methodology will be influenced by the language teacher's educational background, and by the formal training that this teacher had.

2. 5 Challenges of Implementing CLT in EFL Contexts

Even though national policies and school curricula shifted toward CLT in a variety of EFL contexts, researchers have pointed out that there is still a gap between policy and teaching practices (Littlewood, 2007). The implementation of CLT has encountered problems and

resistance in several EFL classrooms (Savignon, 2002). Various research projects reported that instruction in EFL classrooms is still predominantly based on traditional approaches (Littlewood, 2007). In addition, situational factors such as large class size, test-oriented instruction and students' low proficiency have also influenced CLT practices.

Researchers have also reported that the situational constraints in local contexts affecting teachers' success in implementing CLT. Various research studies showed that teachers usually used form-based instruction because they felt pressure to help students pass the exams (Liao, 2000; Liao, 2004). In addition, the research findings suggest that teachers find it difficult to manage group work for large-size classes (Liao, 2000; Liao, 2004). So, the following factors: class size, English proficiency of students, cultural impact, teachers' English language proficiency, grammar-based examination instruction, CLT environment, and traditional teaching approaches are discussed below.

2.5.1 Class size

Regarding class size Kennedy and Kennedy (1996) feel that it is difficult to control what happens when the number of a group passed a certain number. Hayes (1997) thinks the ideal size of a language class maximum is 30 because only under such a scale, can a teacher offer enough chances for the students to communicate with each other. Beside, Hayes (1997) classifies the problems associated with teaching in large classes into five categories as follows: discomfort caused by the physical constraints, control problems (discipline aspects), lack of individual attentions, difficulty on evaluation, and problems of charging learning effectiveness. These problems can be physical, psychological and technical (Hayes, 1997; Ying, 2010).

To support these claims, there are some studies (Li, 1998; Karim, 2004) in EFL settings that report large classes as a barrier to the adoption and implementation of CLT in EFL contexts, the majority of the teachers in Karim's study (2004) identified large class size as a difficulty in practicing CLT or as a possible barrier to the adoption of CLT in Bangladesh (Karim, 2004).

To summarise, teaching large classes is difficult for teachers to discipline the class, especially for students who lack self-managing in studying, to satisfy all the needs of students who have different interests (personalities and capabilities); to organize efficient class activities due to the constraints of time and space; to provide equal chances for the students to participate and practise; to give timely and effective feedback and evaluation (Qiang & Ning, 2011).

2.5. 2 English proficiency of students

In relation to these research studies, Rao (2002) also found that most students in his research are more biased to traditional language teaching styles, which are dominated by a teacher-centred, book-centred approach and an emphasis on rote memory. The students' English strategies are primarily composed of the following features: focus on reading, writing, grammar, word-level translation and memorization of vocabulary (Rao, 2002).

To support these statements, Jin et al. (2005) found that most students where they conducted this research with at least average proficiency in English they were unable to communicate effectively in English. The students were dissatisfied with their communicative competence (Jin et al., 2005).

Therefore, it can be argued that low English proficiency of students hampered or discouraged teachers in adopting CLT in the classroom teaching and learning. As a result, these students seem favour more teacher-centred rather than a communicative teaching approach. They want their teachers to explain everything to them (Incecay & Incecay, 2009). Because they do not enjoy participating in communicative activities in the class because of the fear of losing face by making mistakes and they lack the confidence to express themselves in less than perfect English (Jones, 2007).

To sum up, however it is advisable for teachers adopting a communicative approach to produce and use authentic teaching materials that meet the needs of their particular learners (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Moreover, teachers need to motivate their students, as well as provide them with a comfortable classroom atmosphere for language learning (Jones, 2007; Chang, 2011).

2.5 .3 Cultural impact

Incecay and Incecay (2009) comment that the traditional learning behaviors and styles caused EFL students to be passive in communicative activities. They further argue that it is not easy for EFL students to forget their traditional learning styles and habits which are full of teachers and book centered approaches (Incecay & Incecay, 2009).

2.5.4 Teachers' English language proficiency

Most of the EFL teachers believe that they do not have adequate English knowledge and skills to facilitate communicative activities which might be considered as another barrier inhibiting the adoption of CLT into their classroom (Karim, 2004).

To support this statement, Penner (1995) observed Chinese teachers teaching in this study and found that their English knowledge was limited while CLT requires teachers to have high proficiency in English in order to modify the textbooks and facilitate students. In relation to this, Li (1998) further explained that CLT requires them to be fluent in English and most of the teachers in this study generally felt that they only had high proficiency in English grammar, reading and writing, but they had inadequate abilities in English speaking and listening to conduct communicative activities in their classes. As a result, teachers' lack of English language proficiency is identified as a major difficulty in the adoption of CLT into EFL classrooms.

2.5.5 Grammar-based Examination Instruction

Regarding grammar-based examination instruction, some researchers found that students in EFL classrooms have a lack of motivation to participate in communicative activities which do not help them to pass the final examination (Rao, 2004; Yu, 2001). Because of this examination format, teachers are under pressure to help their student pass the examination as well as students tend to be more focused on grammar teaching and learning because students want to pass the exams and get good grades. Therefore, grammar-based examination format is identified as the biggest obstacle to students' interest in communicative activities (Liao, 2000).

2.5.6 CLT training

Among the various difficulties, the teachers' teaching inability is the one most related to classroom teaching effectively. So the most important thing that educational administrators should do is the teachers training (Liao, 2000). Many teachers in EFL settings should have in-service training particularly in CLT which might improve the teachers' methodologies of teaching (Li, 1998; Liao, 2000; Karim, 2004). However, there is a lack of CLT training for EFL teachers which might be one of the barriers in adopting CLT in the EFL classroom teaching and learning. As some research projects found that lack of training in CLT was identified as a major difficulty in adopting CLT (Li, 1998; Liao, 2000; Karim, 2004).

2.5.7 CLT environment

Learners in ESL settings generally have different native languages from their peers. This means that ESL learner's use of the target language becomes salient in interacting and making friends with classmates in and outside the language classroom (Ellis, 1996; Rao, 2002). As Ellis (1996) points out that a culturally heterogeneous language classroom produces higher motivation and faster adaptation of learning strategies on the part of learners. Nevertheless, EFL learners almost always share the same native language with their classmates. As a result, they generally feel tempted to use their native language when they need to initiate a conversation in the language classroom (Anderson, 1993).

2.5.8 Traditional teaching approaches

Although the school policies and school curricula shifted from a traditional teaching method toward communicative teaching approach in a variety of EFL contexts, most of the teachers mainly prefer using traditional practices in the classes (Karim, 2004). Nevertheless when teachers often apply a traditional teaching method and focus more on grammar and students concentrate more on sentence structure, this will lead to preventing the learners from developing their communicative competence (Incecay & Incecay, 2009).

Generally, EFL and ESL teachers expressed difficulties in including cultural aspects into their classes because of lack experience in an English-speaking country (Yu, 2001; Liao, 2004). Students' resistance and low-English proficiency also hinder teachers from using CLT (Li, 1998; Liao, 2004; Chang, 2011). Moreover the literature on CLT has focused on a range of issues, such as English proficiency of both teachers and students, the design of classroom activities, facilities, social interaction activities, listening activities and the role of teachers, students, funding and instructional materials (Liao, 2004).

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Design of the Study

This research is designed to examine the influence of communicative grammar teaching in enhancing grade 11 students' grammatical knowledge the case of Bishaw weldeyouhanis preparatory school in Bonga town. For this purpose, the study followed a quasi-experimental research design that included survey methods and it lasted for four months including gathering data from target population.

3.2 Participants of the Study

To conduct this study, two sections of grade 11 students who had been enrolled at preparatory school in 2014/15 (2007 E.C.) academic year were selected. And also, four English teachers of the school were included as participants. The school is Bishaw Weldeyouhanis Preparatory school found in Bonga Town. The researcher had chosen the school for two main reasons. One main reason was that the school was found in the Town where the researcher was teaching. Therefore it reduced financial and transport problems. Another reason for the selection was there were some teachers who were taking MA in TEFL in different universities in the schools. So they were expected to support the researcher in teaching or evaluating the targeted students.

Regarding the students and the grade level, the researcher was giving tutorial class for those grade 11 students learning at the school. This implies that the situation would help the researcher to get accurate information about the intended research from the school. Thus, taking these reasons into account, it was possible for the researcher to conduct this study.

Generally, the participants of this study were obtained from the sample preparatory school students who were registered in grade11 in 2014/15 (2007 E.C.) academic year and four English teachers who were teaching grade 11 students. Accordingly, the number of candidates were enroll in grade11 in the school was about 364. Among these, 189 were male and 175 were female students. Subsequently, students who were registered grade11 in the school were arranged in 8 sections. On the other hand, EFL teachers assigned to teach students of grade11 English at the school were 4 (for 8 sections).

3.3 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

This is the stage that the researcher identifies the sample size and sampling techniques for the study. Accordingly, the population of the Preparatory school students enrolled for and teachers who were teaching grade 11 in 2014/15(2007E.C.) were identified and sampled for the purpose of the research as follows:

3.3.1. Sample Size

Of the total 364 students enrolled for first year of grade 11 in 2014/15 (2007 E.C.) academic year, the researcher took 25% to show a sample size. Taking 25% of the total population for the research work is acceptable for the fact that the percent is shared equally between the sections of the schools. For this reason, the researcher calculated 25% of the total population. Accordingly, students from the School were calculated as $364 \times 25/100$ which was equal to 91 students and that was regarded as sample size for the school.

Subsequently, the researcher calculated the number of sections (8) for the school population of 364 students. That was equal to almost 45 students in one section on average. Afterwards, considering one class contained at least 45 students, the researcher selected two sections randomly using lottery method. That is to mean the researcher used the one section as representative of treatment group and the other as control group.

With regard to English teachers of grade 11 students, there were 4 teachers in the school and all were included in this study. Similarly, for the sake of teaching grammar two teachers were selected randomly using lottery method, and the remaining two teachers corrected the pre-test and post-tests.

3.3.2. Sampling Technique

The sampling technique that the researcher used in this research was lottery method of random sampling. The reason why the researcher preferred the technique was due to the following three facts: Firstly, each member of the population under study has an equal chance to be selected. Secondly, the probability of a member of the population to be selected is not affected by the selection of other members within the population. Hence-the members of the sample population of the study were selected using lottery method of random sampling until the required number of the sample was reached.

3.4 Procedure

The study lasted almost four months from the middle of February 2015 to the 30th of May 2015, including the administrations of pre- and post-tests. One major grammar point 'making wish' which included three sub-parts: future, present and past forms was selected from the curriculum of grade 11.

To select the content, the researcher followed purposive sampling method. Because, since the communicative grammar teaching focuses on all aspects of grammar, meaning, form, and use, and these aspects also had to be addressed in the instruction, purposive sampling was the best way. In other words, to select the content (grammar), first all grammar parts included in the text were picked out. Then from the list of grammar parts, making wish was selected. Because, this grammar part was related to other grammar parts such as tense and conditional. Moreover, making wish was the best to show the aspects of grammar, form, meaning and use from the list of grammar parts picked out from the text book. To sum up, the full description of the procedure of the study is illustrated as follows.

3.4.1 Pre-Instruction Phase

Before the treatment, one of the two teachers that were selected randomly for participants was trained how to apply communicative grammar teaching. This might help the researcher to make the work free from bias that would occur if he applied the treatment while analysing the data. Also, all preparations were carefully made. Then, one appropriate grammatical point was chosen in the school syllabus to teach 'making wish'. This grammar part included three sub-parts: (1) Future Wish (2) Present wish and (3) Past wish. Then, to implement communicative tasks, the lesson Plan was adapted from a material which was developed by Anna. U, Catherine. K & Deborah. K (2007).

Next, three grammar lessons were planned in methods of communicative grammar for treatment-group practices. Afterwards, all the three grammar-lesson plans were designed in the model of Structure preparation, Strategy presentation and Practice, Communication Practice part one, Communication Practice Part two, Evaluation and Expansion was given as homework for next class.

Here, the lesson plans for the treatment group were quite communication-oriented; tasks, techniques, and classroom activities were communicatively designed in all phases. Also authentic materials (Written dialogues), written context (Sentences) and learning Strategies were also included (See appendix 2)

Also, the pre- and the post-tests were developed beforehand. The tests had four parts: choose the correct answer, fill in the blank space, write the meaning of the wish and write appropriate wish for the given context.

3.4.2 Treatment Implementation

The treatment was implemented on the treatment group while students from the control group continued with their regular English course throughout the process of the experiment. The treatment conducted to the students in the experimental group were both semantic-based explicit and implicit grammar instruction on expressing wishes (i.e. Future, present, and past wishes) in English using the CLT approach. During the treatment session, the students were taught the form, meaning and use of the wishes explicitly and implicitly as indicated in the lesson plan adapted from Anna.U, Catherine. K & Deborah. K (2007).

The treatment started a week after the training had been given to the treatment group teacher and the pre-test had been given for both treatment and control groups. Briefly, the treatment was given for 40 minutes per day or 4 periods, 2 hours with 40 minutes a week. Therefore, the treatment lasted for 8 periods in two consecutive weeks, totally for 5 hours with 20 minutes. Then, a post-test was administered after the last session of the treatment.

On the first time of treatment, the students were introduced to the types of wishes with corresponding examples focusing on teaching grammar through CLT approach. Also the form, meaning and use of the wishes were generated through a brainstorming or structure preparation session. Then, the students were asked to identify the types of wishes from three dialogues adapted from the grade 11 English text book and other grammar reference book which is entitled, "A new approach to English Grammar," written by Argaw Sileshi(1995 E.C) . And then students were asked to speak what type of grammatical form and meaning they had picked out from the given dialogue.

Also, based on the forms, meanings, and uses of wish they knew, they further created an awareness of the differences and similarities of the grammatical form in the three types of wishes. These similarities and differences were presented to the students further through three dialogues written on paper or handout. Then, students were motivated to act out the dialogues so that they could develop their communication skill in speaking. Also they were asked to drive the grammatical form and identify the meaning of each underlined sentences (wishes) in the dialogues. Finally, in the expansion session, students were asked to write an example of the three wishes based on the context given when they went to their home.

3.4.3 Post-Treatment Phase

In the 2nd week of the second semester of the school-year (i.e. one week right before the treatment phase), one pre-test (i.e. a written test) was administered to all participants of the two groups, which aimed at confirming the equivalence in English capacity of the two groups.

From the first week to the 2nd week of April, all the three treatments were conducted on eight separate days in accordance with the prescribed school curriculum.

Lastly, after two days of the last treatment, the questionnaire was distributed to the experimental group to explore students' perceptions towards the treatment and how their classroom English teachers apply grammar instruction. It was completed within thirteen minutes and then returned to the researcher. Finally, a post test was administered for both groups.

3.5 Data Collection Instruments

3.5.1 Student Questionnaire

Questionnaires are valuable research tools if they are carefully constructed and pilot tested (Gray, 2004; Dornyei, 2007). They may range from closed types to open-ended types, hence support to gather wide range of information.

With reference to the current study, the questionnaire was designed to get specific aspects of the issue. All close-ended questions were designed in a five-point Likert's scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). As normal, the questionnaire consisted of two separate sections. The first section focused on seeking personal information about the respondents. Such information as ages, sex, and Name of school were implied in this section.

The second section—the main substance aimed at collecting data on the students' attitudes towards grammar lessons instructed with communicative grammar teaching. This section was developed with twenty-three items and four sub-items revolving students' evaluation of three main themes: lesson content (Questions 1-5), task design (Questions 6-10), and instruction influence on their learning interest (Questions 11-23). Dealing with the questionnaire, the participants were asked to complete it on the spot within thirty minutes.

To sum up, questionnaire papers were administered to the treatment group two days after they had finished the last treatment. Also, all efforts were made to translate it into the Amharic language with the help of two English teachers in the school.

3.5.2 Pre- and Post-Tests (Grammar-Paper Tests)

The grammar-paper tests were developed to collect data on the students' competence of form, meaning and use of the three grammar points (i.e. future wish, present wish and past wish). Both the pre- and the post-tests were designed in the same matrix and with the same language content; however, the items which were embedded in the two tests were quite different. Also, both objective and subjective items were included.

Items that were included in each test were twenty. Particularly, the three grammar points (i.e. present wish, past wish, and future wish,) made up 20%.

With the current grammar-paper tests, the elicitation techniques suggested by Heaton (1989) namely multiple-choice items, completion items, transformation items, and sentence building-up items were used. Tackling these test tasks, the test takers were required to complete three sections: (A) Choose the best options that complete the sentences by cycling the letter A, B, C, or D comprised ten isolated items; (B) Fill in the blanks of the sentences with the correct forms of the words in brackets—embraced 5 isolated items; (C) Write the meaning of each wish (sentence) transformation, 3 items, and sentence building-up items (write wish for the given context) included 2 separate items.

Accordingly, the total number of items of each test was 20; and time allotted for each test was 50 minutes. Scoring these types of selected responses and limited production responses need a single criterion for grammatical correctness (Bachman & Palmer, 1996). Therefore, based on this

the remaining two teachers were trained in scoring tests and also given the key answers so that they could score the tests accurately.

3.5.3 Observation

To investigate to what extent EFL teachers of the school use theories of the communicative grammar teaching, the two teachers were observed teaching four regular lessons of 40 minutes each. As Borg (2006) suggests, classroom observation “has a central role to play in the study of language teacher cognition by providing a concrete descriptive basis in relation to what teachers know” (p. 231).

The observations took place in normal classroom setting of the two sections by the researcher and co-observer so as to increase the reliability of the data gained from the observation. Therefore, the researcher used class room observation to check how the English teachers were applying communicative grammar teaching and how the treatment was being conducted. To do this, observation check list (format) concerning the theories of communicative grammar teaching was prepared.

Finally, the percentage of the data were obtained and calculated depend on the tally which was made depending on whether the items (point) indicated in the check list were existed or not during the classroom observation. For instance, if the point (idea) of one item is seen for two times within the four sessions of observation, it will get 20 (50%).

3.6 Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity were considered to make this research trustworthy. Reliability is the degree of consistency that an instrument or data collection demonstrates, while validity is the quality of data collection that enables it to measure what is intended to measure (Best & Kahn, 1998). To assure the content validity of the measurements, all items of tests, questionnaire, and observation check lists were first reviewed by two of the researcher’s colleagues who were BA in TEFL. After their approval of the checking grammar and accuracy, the instruments were rechecked by the researcher and co-adviser. Also to increase the reliability of the questionnaire, it was translated in to Amharic by the researcher and two of his colleagues.

To determine the reliability of the instrument, the questionnaire was pilot tested on 10 students of two sections who were not included in the research. After the questionnaire was piloted, some

problems of punctuation, fragment and redundancy (repetition of the same idea) were identified. So, based on the result of pilot test, some necessary amendments were made.

3.7 Methods of Data Analysis

After data were collected, the researcher:

- Checked whether all the instruments, especially questionnaires were filled and returned to the researcher;
- Checked how the tests' answers were completed
- Checked across all the given items on the questionnaire sheets were filled by the respondents.
- Developed data categories (typology) for frequency, mean, and standard deviation.
- Manipulated the data through using the software SPSS 16.0..
- Compared and contrasted the pre-and-post test results of the respondents.
- Reported the results of the data based on statistically significant information.

CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION and ANALYSIS

In this chapter, the analysis and interpretation of data collected through Pre and post test, the discussion, questionnaire, and classroom observation together with the major findings are presented. Accordingly, students' post result after the treatment, analysis of students' attitude towards the communicative grammar teaching are compared with the classroom observation.

4.1 Data obtained through the pre and post tests

Table 1. Summary of pre-test

Group	M	N	Std. Devi	Std. Erro.	Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2 taile d)
					Mea.	Std. Dev.	Std. Err. Mea.	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
								Lower	Upper			
C.G	5.24	50	1.64	.231	.080	2.38	.336	-.596	.756	.238	49	.813
T. G	5.16	50	1.69	.239								

Note: C.G= Control group T.G= Treatment group

The results of the pre-test of the two groups, as shown in Table.1, indicated that though the control group got slightly higher scores than the treatment one (M = 5.24 vs. M = 5.16); there was no statistically significant difference between the two mean scores (sig. (2-tailed) $p = .813$). Because, their mean difference is .080 and the t value is .238. These results are smaller than the p value .813. Thus, it was completely safe to confirm that the two groups were quite equivalent in their grammatical knowledge before the treatment. Also, the two results of standard deviation (C=164, T=169) implies even though it was slightly high in the treatment group, the knowledge gap between the students in both class were closer.

Table 2. Summary of post-test

Group	M	N	Std. Devi	Std. Erro.	Differences				t	Df	Sig. (2 taile d)	
					Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Err. Me	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
								Lower				Upper
T.G	11.0	50	3.66	.517	2.58	5.23	.740	1.092	4.067	3.48	49	.001
C. G	8.42	50	3.83	.541								

From the data in Table 2, we can see that, on average, the two groups achieved higher scores in the post-test than in the pre-test. Particularly, for the treatment group, the mean score of the post-test was 11.0; and with the control group, the mean score of the post-test was 8.42. Thus, the first alternative hypothesis could be accepted. Whereas the two null hypothesis could be rejected.

This shows that communicative grammar teaching enhanced the students' achievements of grammatical knowledge. There was a significant difference in the overall mean scores of the pre-test and post-test of the students in both the treatment and control group. Moreover, there was also a significant difference in the mean scores of the post-test between the students of the two groups in terms of the teaching method (M=2.58). This implies the treatment group's post test mean result was greater than the control one by 2.58.

A possible explanation for the above finding might be that, as the researcher's observation and students' questionnaire data, in both methods of conventional and communicative grammar the target of form focus was met. Although the meaning and use were primarily aimed at in the communicative grammar class, the emphasis on form was not ignored during the instruction stages.

Moreover, it is apparent from Table 2 that, the treatment group got higher scores than the control one (M =11.0 vs. M = 8.42). This result strongly supported that the treatment group and the control one were not equal in the outcome of grammatical knowledge. This finding may be

explained by the fact that, in communicative grammar teaching, the target of form focus was equally paid attention to; all three aspects of grammar instruction (form, meaning, and use) were well explained and practiced inductively or deductively (see students questionnaire data, table 4).

Table 3. Differences of pre- and post- test results

Test	Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Control post – control pre	5.840	2.85	.40240	5.03135	6.64865	14.513	49	.000
Treatment post -Treatment pre	3.180	3.93	.55600	2.06268	4.29732	5.719	49	.000
Paired Differences	2.67	-1.08	-.15336	2.97	2.351	8.794	0	.000

The above Table 3 indicates that how much change the two groups showed in terms of the teaching method, independent variable. Hence, the total mean changed after the instruction of the treatment group is higher than the control one (T=5.840 vs C=3.180). Also, the standard deviation of the treatment class is lower than the control one, 2.85 vs 3.93. These dependent variables, the results, imply that the instruction, the independent variable, in the treatment class was not only more successful in improving the students' achievement of grammar test but also doing students' result closer to each other. Therefore, the data indicates that the conventional method makes only few students improve on a small scale. On the contrary, even though the treatment class scored slightly less result in the pretest, due to communicative grammar teaching approach, the treatment, their mean result became higher and standard deviation lower than the control class. It indicates that a large number of students are attracted by the Communicative

Grammar Teaching. Finally, it is illustrated by the data that teaching grammar through the communicative approach is much more effective than through the conventional method.

4.2 Data obtained through the questionnaire

By using students' questionnaire, their attitudes towards communicative grammar teaching were calculated and presented. In analyzing the attitude, questionnaires items which focused on students' attitudes towards the lesson content, the task design, and the instruction effect were included as a primary source for the study.

4.2.1 Students' attitudes towards lesson content

Table (4) Frequencies, percentages and means of the Students' attitudes towards lesson content

No	Lesson content	Scales										mean	
		5		4		3		2		1			
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
1.1	Form of the new grammar points is well presented in context.	8	16	30	60	3	6	7	14	2	4	3.7	
1.2	Form of the new grammar points is well practiced in context.	21	42	18	36	4	8	5	10	2	4	4.02	
1.3	Meaning and use of the new grammar points are well presented in context.	19	38	20	40	2	4	4	8	5	10	3.88	
1.4	Meaning and use of the new grammar points are well practiced in context	19	38	22	44	2	4	5	10	2	4	4.02	
1.5	The grammar lessons are properly integrated with these language skills	A) Listening	16	32	17	34	5	10	6	12	6	12	3.62
		B) Speaking	20	40	18	36	2	4	7	14	3	6	3.9
		C) Reading	10	20	14	28	3	6	8	16	15	30	2.92
		D) Writing	17	34	26	52	2	4	2	4	3	6	4.04

As indicated in the table 4, the students' response to item one showed that 16% of them strongly agreed, 60% agreed that form of the new grammar points was well presented in context. On the other hand, the 14% and 4% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively.

Similarly, regarding the practice of grammar points in context, under item 2, the majority of students, 42% agreed that they practice grammar-context. The same was true for 36% percent of students who responded agree. Nevertheless, 10% and 4% of the students disagreed and strongly disagreed orderly.

When we come to the presentation of new grammar in context, 38% and 40% strongly agreed and agreed with. However, 8% disapproved it; the 10% also strongly disagreed.

For item 1.4, 38% of the respondents strongly agreed that they practise the meaning and use of the new grammar in context. Also 44% accepted it. Whereas, 10% and 4% of the respondents said disagree and strongly disagree respectively. To sum up, as shown in the Table, most of the respondents recognized that the form of the new grammar points was well presented ($M = 3.7$) and well practiced ($M = 4.02$). The meaning and use of the new grammar points, according to their support, were also well presented ($M = 3.88$) and well practiced ($M = 4.02$).

Regarding to whether the grammar lesson were properly integrated with the four skills, 32% strongly agreed that it was integrated with listening. Similarly, the others 40%, 20% and 34% strongly agreed that the lesson was integrated with speaking, reading and writing respectively. Additionally, 34%, 36%, 28%, and 52% of the respondents agreed that listening, speaking, reading and writing were related to the lesson. On the other hand, the 12%, 14%, 16% and 4% disagreed with the idea that listening, speaking, reading and writing were related to the lesson orderly. Similarly, the 12%, 6%, 30% and 6% of the respondents strongly disagreed with the idea that listening, speaking, reading and writing were related to the lesson respectively.

To sum up, with the three mean scores of 3.62, 3.9, and 4.04 corresponding to the integration of the grammar lessons with these skills of listening, speaking, and writing it. The majority of participants agreed that the grammar lessons were properly integrated with the three language skills. However, regarding the reading skill, its mean result 2.92 implies the respondents were slightly neutral who couldn't decide whether the skill was integrated with the lesson as the mean result is closer to neutral. Nevertheless among these skills, writing was most frequently integrated ($M = 4.04$); while reading was least constantly integrated ($M = 2.92$). Therefore based on the results the students' attitude towards the lesson content can be taken as positive.

4.2.2 Results from the Students' attitudes towards task design in presentation stage

Table (5) Frequencies, percentages and mean of Students' attitudes towards task design in presentation stage

2	Task Design	Scales										
		5		4		3		2		1		mean
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
2.1	The lesson topics used to introduce the new grammar points are interesting.	15	30	22	44	5	10	3	6	5	10	3.78
2.2	The follow-up tasks are designed at reasonable level for me to deal with	17	34	17	34	2	4	10	20	4	8	3.66
2.3	The teacher's leading questions facilitate my self-discovery of grammar rules.	21	42	17	34	2	4	6	12	4	8	3.9
2.4	The phase of presenting the new grammar points is not time-consuming.	17	34	20	40	4	8	6	12	3	6	3.84
2.5	My self-discovery of the new grammar rules is better than being directly provided by the teacher.	22	44	16	32	3	6	5	10	4	8	3.88

Note that: 5= strongly agree 4= Agree 3= neutral 2= disagree 1=strongly disagree

As Table 5 revealed, 30% of the respondents strongly agreed that the lesson topics used to introduce the new grammar points were interesting. The majority respondents, 22 (44%) also agreed that it was interesting. However, it was uninteresting for the 6% and 10% of respondents as they responded disagree and strongly disagree orderly. Nevertheless, there were 10% respondents who were neutral or couldn't decide. Beside, concerning the follow up tasks to be at reasonable level, item 2.1, both answers, strongly agree and agree, were responded by 34% equally. This implies, the follow-up tasks were at reasonable level for the majority of the respondents to deal with. Whereas it was not designed at reasonable level for 20% and for 8% of the students who disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively.

Also, the teacher's leading questions highly facilitated 42% of students' self discovery of grammar rules. This was also accepted by 34% respondents who agreed. In spite of this, 12%

and 8% respondents disqualified it saying 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' orderly. When we come to item 2.4, 34% of students who took the treatment strongly agreed that the phase of presenting the new grammar points was not time consuming. Similarly, the majority of students, 40%, agreed on the idea although the 12% didn't agree. The same was highly disapproved by the 6% of the respondents who strongly disagreed.

Connecting to discovery of the new grammar rules, the majority of respondents (44%), strongly agreed that their self-discovery of the new grammar rules was better than being directly provided by the teacher. The 32% also agreed that this was acceptable. The 10% and 8% of the students, on the contrary, disagreed and strongly disagreed orderly.

To sum up, the five mean scores were all in the range of high evaluation (3.6-5.0); that is, the students' attitude towards the task design in the presentation stage was obviously positive. These good results may be explained by these factors. First, the text topics and the follow-up tasks actually met the students' interest. All the written dialogues exposed to students introduced such realistic and interesting topics as school life, home life, and etc. which were completely close to their daily life.

4.2.3 Results from the Students' attitudes towards task design in practice stages

Table (6) Frequencies, percentages and mean of Students' attitudes towards task design in practice stages

3	Instruction effects on your learning Interests	Scales										
		5		4		3		2		1		mean
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
3.1	The activities applied to practice the new grammar points are varied.	24	48	13	26	6	12	3	6	4	8	3.78
3.2	The forms of oral and written practices are well cooperated in this stage.	23	46	18	36	3	6	4	8	2	4	4.02
3.3	The activities utilized to practice the new grammar points are enjoyable.	24	48	19	38	0	0	5	10	2	4	4.06
3.4	The activities employed in this stage are challenging enough to perform.	10	20	11	22	3	6	12	24	14	28	2.82
3.5	The first activities in this stage require me to get accuracy in grammar.	27	54	13	26	2	4	5	10	3	6	3.84
3.6	The final activities in this stage require me to obtain fluency in communication.	26	52	14	28	3	6	4	8	3	6	3.88

As indicated in the table 6, the activities applied to practice the new grammar points were varied since the majority groups, 26% and 48%, strongly agreed and agreed respectively. On the other hand, the 6% respondents did not agree with the idea. The other 8% students also strongly disapproved the reality. Beyond these opponent groups, there were 12% participants who wanted to be neutral. Regarding to the integration of the forms of oral and written practices, the 36% and 46% of participants strongly agreed and agreed orderly. Even though they agreed, this reality was wrong for those who disagreed, (8%), and strongly disagreed, (4%).

According to the data, item 3.3 concerns whether the activities utilized to practice the new grammar was enjoyable or not. So, the 38% strongly approved the activities to be enjoyable. Similarly, 48% of the students completely accepted since they strongly agreed with the point. On the contrary, even though there was no neutral participant, still there was small number of respondents who disagreed, (10%) and strongly disagreed, (4%), with the idea.

Connecting to the difficultness of the activities, it was difficult for those who strongly agreed, (22%) and agreed, (20%), since they were challenged to perform the task easily. However, the activities were affordable to perform for the majority of students who opposed by selecting disagree, (24%). On the other hand, 6% of the students were neutral. On the issue of accuracy, item 3.5, strongly agree was selected by those, (26%), the first activities in the practice stage required them to get it in grammar. The same was true for the majority of students, 54%, since they agreed with the point. Nevertheless, 10% of respondents disagreed with them. Additionally, the 6% strongly disagreed with the requirement of accuracy in the practice stage. Also, when we come to the point of fluency, the 28% shows us the final activities in the practice stage required them to obtain fluency in communication. Likely, the 52% approved this by saying strongly agree. But, this was not accepted by the other participants who said disagree, (8%) and S. disagree, (6%).

To sum up, the means, as can be seen in Table 4, obviously indicated positive responses from most of the participants to the six items related to this stage. Most of the respondents almost had agreement that the activities utilized in the practice and production stages were varied ($M = 3.78$). A majority of participants showed their approval to the view that the oral and written practices were well cooperated within the lesson procedure ($M = 4.02$). They mostly agreed that the activities in these stages were enjoyable ($M = 4.06$). The final mean scores ($M = 3.84$ and $M = 3.88$) proved that accuracy was required and brought in the first activities fluency in the later by most of the participants. That is, the different targets of each stage accuracy focus and fluency emphasis were highly met. However, it was difficult for few groups ($M = 2.84$) to decide whether the tasks were challenging enough for them to deal with as the mean is slightly closer to neutral.

4.2.4 Results from the Students' attitudes towards influence of instruction

Table (7) Frequencies, percentages and means of the Students' attitudes towards influence of instruction

	Instruction influence on your learning Interests	Scales										Mean
		5		4		3		2		1		
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
3.7	The way of teaching grammar is innovative.	16	32	25	50	2	4	4	8	3	6	3.94
3.8	The way of teaching grammar increases my learning motivation.	25	50	15	30	2	4	3	6	5	10	4.04
3.9	The way of teaching grammar requires me to think critically and work actively.	22	44	21	42	2	4	2	4	3	6	4.14
3.10	Working in pairs and groups helps me feel less stressed and more confident.	21	42	17	34	3	6	5	10	4	8	3.92
3.11	Pair-work and group-work encourage me to promote collaboration in learning.	19	38	18	36	4	8	4	8	5	10	3.84
3.12	I suppose that these grammar lessons well prepare me for grammar-paper tests.	16	32	22	44	3	6	5	10	4	8	3.82
3.13	I suppose that these grammar lessons support me for real-life communications.	30	60	11	22	2	4	3	6	4	8	4.2

According to the data, item, 3.7, the way of teaching grammar was innovative for the majority of respondents who strongly agreed, (32%) and agreed, (50%). On the other hand, it was wrong for the others who said disagree, (8%) and strongly disagree, (6%). Also, when motivation is considered, the majority of respondents, 50%, strongly agreed that the way of teaching motivated their learning interest. Likely, the other 30% of the students were in the same boat with majority of students. Nevertheless, the 6% and 10% were not motivated by the way of teaching since they said disagree and strongly disagree respectively.

According to the data, item 3.9, since the 44% and 42% said strongly agree and agree orderly, almost all of the students accepted that the way of teaching grammar require them to think critically and work actively. However, the two small groups, who said disagree, (4%) and strongly disagree,(6%) opposed the idea. Connecting to group and pair work, item 10, the majority of students had affirmative conception. Because, as it can be shown in the table, working in pair and groups helped the 42% (strongly agree) and 34% (agree) feel less stressed and more confident. However, in spite of supporting the idea, the 10% and 8% of the students neglected it saying disagree and strongly disagree consecutively. Similar to the above point, the majority of students, 38%, strongly agreed that pair-work and group-work encouraged them to promote collaboration in learning. Likely, 36% of students agreed with the above groups. On the other hand, the 8% and 10% of the students did not share their idea since they disagreed and strongly disagreed orderly.

As far as examination is concerned, the two groups, who strongly agreed, (32%) and agreed, (44%), considered that the grammar lessons well prepared them for grammar-paper tests. On the contrary the communicative grammar lesson was meaningless for those who said disagree, (10%), and strongly disagree, (8%). Connecting to outside of the classroom communication, the majority of (60%) students strongly agreed that the communicative grammar teaching supported them for outside communication. The other 22% also were in the same boat with the described groups since they agreed. The 6% and 8% of the students, nevertheless, were not supported by the lesson for they said disagree and strongly disagree respectively.

To sum up, all the seven mean scores were in the range of high evaluation (3.7-5.0) demonstrated the participants' positive attitudes towards the influence of the six instructed grammar lessons they had experienced. Commonly, the respondents found the communicative grammar teaching really innovative ($M = 3.94$). Due to the innovativeness of the teaching method, their learning motivation was increased ($M = 4.04$). Besides, it seems that the participants became more critical in thinking and had to work actively due to the tasks employed in the teaching and learning process ($M = 4.14$). Experiencing the lessons, the participants found that working in pairs or groups helped them decrease their stress and increase their confidence ($M = 3.92$). Significantly, they almost acknowledged that the learning collaboration was promoted due to pair-work and group-work ($M = 3.84$). Finally, the majority of respondents supposed that they would be good at grammatical knowledge ($M = 3.82$) and also able to

communicate well in real-life situations due to the application of communicative grammar (M = 4.2).

4.3 Results of the classroom observation

The classroom observation was held in both treatment and control classes four times each. The percentage of the data obtained and calculated depend on the tally which was made depending on whether the items indicated in the check list were existed or not during the classroom observation. For instance, if the point (idea) of one item is seen for two times within the four sessions of observation, it will get 20 (50%). Similarly, results of the questionnaire on the lesson content, task design, and instruction influence on students learning interest and post test results were analyzed by comparing with the classroom observation. In this part, some of the key points that might show the influence of communicative grammar teaching have been addressed.

Regarding to classroom condition, the sitting spaces were enough (100%) for all students in the control and treatment classes. Since the sits were bench in both classes, it was difficult to completely decide as they were movable. So based on the teacher's effort to use the available access effectively, the control class seats were completely (100%) immovable since the teacher conducted the lesson without arranging the sits and forming group. But, in the treatment class, the teacher formed group and tried to make the sitting arrangement comfortable, 50%. Therefore, there was (100%) enough space for movement between desks in the class though it was reduced by 50% in the control class since the students sat in three on the same benches which were not arranged for group work.

With regard to classroom grammar instruction, the form (50%), meaning (100%), and use (75%) of the wishes (grammar) in context were presented and practiced in treatment class. Moreover, the teacher was the one who most of the time facilitated the grammar teaching. However, in the very beginning, learners' involvements in meaningful interaction with the text to reach on the form, meaning and use of the new grammar (wishes) were low. But, gradually, especially in the third and the fourth sessions, the students motivation and interest were increased during the treatment. This was because the teacher connected the classroom presentation to that of classroom and home-take activities to make them practice the language in authentic context. On the contrary, since the control class teacher used the conventional, especially explicit grammar teaching, he most of the time relied on form for 75%. Also, the degree to which the teacher

focused on meaning was very less, (25%). As the researcher observed, unless the students had asked him, he did not focus on meaning. Context was also considered very less (25%) during the grammar instruction. Besides, most of the time, (75%), clear instruction was observed in the treatment class due to scenario or circumstances. This was similarly seen 50% in the control class although the teacher focused on simply teaching the grammar without context. As the researcher observed, this was because, the teacher explanation of grammar was mostly related to how the students could do better achievement test examinations. Therefore, grammar for the sake of communication had no place in the instruction.

During the communication practice stage in the treatment class, the new grammar, making wish, was 75% discussed related to other grammars (simple past, past perfect, conditional) in different contexts, (100%). However, integrating the grammar with other grammar types in different context was focused with a minimum concern, (25%) in control class. The teacher was usually observed while he was presenting grammar by giving a higher emphasis on form in separate sentences. Additionally, it was observed when students of the treatment class rewrite the meaning of the wish (100%). On the contrary, except during the last session of observation (25%), teacher of the control class didn't make students write the meaning of the grammar. This implies that the teacher was accustomed to not emphasis on the importance of meaning rather than other forms of rote teaching.

Regarding the communicative activities, both teachers never introduced grammar games. Similarly, role play was not used in control class but performed in the treatment class (50%). Additionally, group work (100% and _), pair work (75% and 50%) and information gap (75% and 25%) were observed in the treatment and control classes respectively. Therefore, since students in the treatment class were more motivated (75%) than that of the control class (25%), their willingness in turn taking and forming group was most of the time (75%) affirmative. On the other hand, as the lesson for the control group was not developed by dialogue and the sitting arrangement was not conducive for group work, the above affirmative result was not seen. This may make someone conclude that the teacher was focused on individual performance of the target grammar rather than group nature of learning.

Generally, in all observed classes, the treatment classes' teacher was usually interested in using communicative approach of teaching grammar in classroom and home take activities integrating

form, meaning, and use in authentic context (75%). Whereas the control class teacher often implemented teaching of grammar in a separate sentence without giving chances for learners (75%). He also mostly ignored teaching the new grammar creating different contexts. To sum up, as it was seen during observation session, the teacher method in both classes was not supported by necessary equipment, especially audio visual teaching aids. Moreover, although it was not completely ignored, there was a lack of selecting authentic materials that stimulate communications.

Regarding factors affecting the implementation of CLT in Grammar teaching, the size of the task was not highly affecting the two classes. This is why the researcher focused on one main grammar part, making wish, with its sub parts: future, present, and past wishes. Also, the time allocated for the lesson, 5 hours with 20 minutes was adequate to implement communicative grammar. Similarly, since the school library was rich in reference, there was no any limitation of source that hinders to teach grammar. Also, any administrative constraints were not seen during classroom observation.

However, according to the researcher's observation, the main factor that (100%) affected the implementation of CLT was the students' population in the class. This problem could be reduced in the treatment class because of group work sitting arrangement. On the same manner, teacher's academic ability was easily observed as the problems. Especially in the first observation, teacher of the control class did not feel confident when he was observed. He entered the class with the researcher and co-observer, simply gave greeting for the students. Then, opening the book, he started defining the types of wish with in separate sentences. Then, he asked the students to write wishes based on the example given in the text and his explanation. So, he couldn't create (100%) genuine or actual communication in the class. Also when he was asked the difference between the meaning of future and present wish by the students, he couldn't answer confidentially. Rather he gave chance for the students to answer it and turned it into home work. Likely, when he read what was in the text book (i.e I haven't bought a pen.), he didn't care of any spoken and written English. This implies, reading and collecting the necessary information, the teacher did not make himself fit for the lesson before he got in to the class. Therefore, it may be possible to conclude that his knowledge towards the lesson or wish was (50%) medium.

On the other hand, the problem of the academic ability of the treatment class teacher was 25%. This was the result of the training given by the researcher. So the teacher was trained on how to teach grammar using CLT, in the structure preparation stage, conventionally introduction, he asked students what wish mean and motivated them to speak their individual wish. Then, depending on their answer, he asked the students what type of tense they had used. Also, since the sists had been already arranged in group form, the students motivated to discuss in their groups. Moreover the teacher had supported the text book in writing the three types of wishes in authentic context (dialogue) and delivered it to the class. Due to this, both the complexity of grammar knowledge and the difference between spoken and written language didn't highly affect (25%) the teacher in the treatment class. To sum up, however hard he implemented the communicative teaching as the lesson plan (see appendix 2), because of the students population, he couldn't create (25%) complete genuine communication in the class.

4.4 Discussion

The results of the pre-test of the two groups indicated that though the control group got slightly higher scores than the experimental one ($M = 5.24$ vs. $M = 5.16$); there was no statistically significant difference between the two mean scores (sig. (2-tailed) $p = .813$). Thus, it was completely safe to confirm that the two groups were quite equivalent in grammatical knowledge before the treatment.

When we come to the post test, the data in Table 2, showed that, on average, the two groups achieved better scores in the post-test than in the pre-test. Particularly, for the treatment group, the mean score of the post-test was 11.00 compared with 5.16 of the pre-test; and with the control group, the mean score of the post-test was 8.42 compared with 5.24 of the pre-test. Certainly, the variance was significantly different at the p-values of .00 levels for both groups; so the first alternative hypothesis is accepted where as the two null hypothesis could thus be rejected. This is why, indeed, communicative grammar teaching could influence students' achievement of grammatical knowledge more than the conventional method. Also, there was a significant difference in the overall mean scores of the pre-test and post-test of the students in both the treatment and control group. This shows that teaching grammar with either conventional or communicative grammar teaching was effective in improving students' grammatical

knowledge. Lastly, there was also a significant difference in the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test between the students of the two groups in terms of the teaching method.

A possible explanation for the above finding might be that in both methods of conventional and communicative grammar teaching, the target of form focus was met. Though the meaning and use were primarily aimed at in the communicative grammar class, the emphasis on form was not ignored during the treatment stages. Therefore, this helped both of the class of students score better achievements of the grammar test. But if the form focused instruction had been excluded, the students' grammatical achievement would have been reduced. This finding is consistent with the conclusion of Williams (1995) who said that these immersion students received massive amounts of input and had plenty of interaction in the program for a period of time, but their utterances still contained grammatical mistakes. As a result of excluding form-focused instruction, the learners' output reduced in accuracy.

This was also approved by students' questionnaire data, form of the new grammar points was well presented ($m=3.76$) and well practiced ($m=4$). Specially, as the researcher observed, since the control class teacher used explicit grammar teaching, he most of the time (75%) relied on form. This idea is consistent with Williams 1995 who advised that form focused instruction should not be excluded, otherwise the learners output would be reduced in accuracy. Moreover, since both groups received the same great care from the teacher; they got high achievement in the grammar paper test. That means both the conventional and communicative grammar teaching were effective in improving students' achievement of grammatical knowledge though the communicative grammar teaching was more effective.

Several possible explanations for this result may be laid out as the following. First, other studies on the effectiveness of second language instruction (Norris & Ortega, 2000) concluded that this type of explicit instruction (presenting the structure, describing and exemplifying it, and giving rules for its use) results in important improvements in the learning of target structures. Nevertheless, context was existed in the content and process of communicative grammar class, which completely prevailed over conventional instruction that taught learners how to compose and comprehend sentences as isolated linguistic units of random utterance. Because it might be argued that being exposed to one grammatical structure at a time does not guarantee that students

will master the use of that particular grammatical item before moving on to a new one (Larsen-Freeman, 1997).

Additionally, group work (100% and 25%), pair work (75% and 50%) and information gap (75% and 25%) were observed in the treatment and control classes respectively (See appendix. 4). This higher difference in percentage shows the application of grammar teaching was more applied in the treatment class than the control one. Therefore it seems that it caused difference in students' post test result. This result is consistent with Larsen-Freeman (1986: 132) who said that the most obvious characteristic of CLT is that "Almost everything that is done is done with communicative intent." Students use the language through communicative activities (e.g. games, role-plays and problem-solving tasks) but such language activities as role-plays, problem-solving tasks, or information gaps were entirely strange to the control group.

Second, it was due to the explicit and implicit focus on communicative practice with the aim of teaching learners how to use sentences appropriately to achieve communicative purpose within communicative grammar class. Third, during the treatment process, the students' grammatical knowledge, including to some extent their speaking skill was developed because of the proper integration of the grammar lessons with the four language skills. This is in agreement with Burns and Borg's (2005) findings, which showed the effectiveness of integration of the four language skills in promoting language learning. Last, the real-life situations set up within the stages of grammar presentation and practice, especially within the stage of communication practice one and two created an opportunity for students to communicatively use the target language and increase their negotiation skills as well (Thornbury, 1999).

In short, the present study found that both the conventional and the Communicative grammar teaching were both effective in improving students' grammatical knowledge; and communicative grammar teaching was proved to be more effective in this aspect.

The second question was what are the students' attitudes towards the communicative grammar teaching method? To answer this research question, data were referred from the questionnaire analysis.

The students' attitude towards the lesson content was positive. Most of the respondents recognized that the form of the new grammar points was well presented ($M = 3.7$) and well practiced ($M = 4.02$). The meaning and use of the new grammar points, according to their

support, were also well presented (M =3.88) and well practiced (4.02). Similarly, with the three mean scores of 3.72, 3.9, and 4.04 corresponding to the integration of the grammar lessons with these skills of listening, speaking, and writing, it is visible to learn that the majority of participants agreed that the grammar lessons were properly integrated with the three language skills. However, regarding the reading skill, its mean result 2.92 implies there were neutral group who couldn't decide whether the skill was integrated with the lesson as the mean result is closer to neutral. Nevertheless among these skills, writing was showed to be most frequently integrated (M = 4.04); while reading was least constantly integrated (M = 2.92).

These results were due to several factors. First, the form of the target grammar points was paid enough attention to at the early stage of presentation through self-discovery of rules with the teacher's facilitation. It kept on being emphasized during the practice stage, especially within the sub-phase of grammar practice. Second, grammar, according to Brown (1994), gives the forms, but these forms are literally meaningless without meaning and use; therefore, in the domain of the treatment, the meaning and use were no less focused on from the start of the lessons. Also, the contexts introduced in the presentation stage and the real situations set up within the stages of practice and evaluation the meaning and use were well practiced and consolidated, which reinforced the mastery of meaning and use of the grammar points. Last, during the treatment procedure, the grammar lessons were not taught in isolation but properly integrated with the four language skills as suggested in Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman, (1999) who said that it has to be taken into consideration as a communicative end that is composed of three interrelated dimensions of form, meaning, and use.

Particularly, from the start of each lesson, students were exposed to written dialogue that required students either to speak or write the form, meaning and use of the target grammar part, making wish. This gave them opportunities to practice the grammar through reading the dialogue and listening while the teacher reading the dialogue. Then, during the stage of practice and evaluation, students had chances to practice two productive skills—speaking and writing since they were asked to write and to speak their personal wish depending on the given context.

The students' attitude towards the task design in presentation stage was obviously positive. As it can be seen from table 5, the five mean scores were all in the range of high evaluation (3.6-5.0); that is, the students' attitude towards the task design in the presentation stage was obviously

positive. These good results may be explained by these factors. First, the text topics and the follow-up tasks actually met the students' interest. Both the text and written dialogue exposed to students introduced such realistic and interesting topics as school life, home life, and etc. which were completely close to their daily life. Therefore, for learners to become completely familiar with a form or construction, contextual knowledge is of paramount importance as it paves the way for a deeper understanding of its function at the discourse level (Celce-Murica, 2002).

Second, in working out the rules of the target structures embedded in the texts, the students were facilitated by the teacher's leading questions. So, this facilitator role of the teacher created self discovery of new knowledge within the students. Therefore it created the shift from the stage of passiveness to activeness in the class. This finding is consistent with the idea of Wang (2009) who advised that implementation of CLT in the classroom also means teachers and students will witness a shift in their roles. CLT advocates student-centered teaching. Students are no longer passively receiving knowledge, but actively participating in classroom activities. Teachers in the classroom play different roles. They are no longer the master of the class. Now they act as facilitators, organizers, participators, and investigators. Last the communicative activities at the stage of presentation were successfully accomplished within the planned time.

The students' attitudes towards task design in practice and production stages or the instruction influence had similar affirmative sense. Most of the participants, as can be seen in Table 6, almost had agreement that the activities utilized in the practice and production stages were varied ($M = 3.78$). A majority of participants showed their approval to the view that the oral and written practices were well cooperated within the lesson procedure ($M = 4.02$). They mostly agreed that the activities in these stages were enjoyable ($M = 4.06$). The final mean scores ($M = 3.84$ and $M = 3.88$) proved that accuracy was required and brought in the first activities fluency in the later by most of the participants. That is, the different targets of each stage accuracy focus and fluency emphasis were highly met.

These satisfying results may be explained by a number of factors. First, the activities applied in the stage of practice were actually varied. They were successfully deployed in oral and written practices. Within the first sub-phase of practice namely guided or controlled practice, the students' involvement was maintained due to the easiness and quickness of the exercises. Also,

this was owing to the practice in chorus which helped to bring about joyful learning atmosphere (Maley, 2011). In the next sub-phase of practice namely meaningful or less-controlled practice, students' motivation was increased due to a variety of interesting and challenging tasks. Such meaningful tasks as role-plays, group discussions, information-gaps, and parallel writing did benefit students in getting chances to practice the target structures in meaningful contexts. Supporting this finding Nunan (2001) said that "role plays help to make the task-based classroom a lively and rich language environment for learners of all abilities" (p.84).

Second, the shift from accuracy to fluency came into being at the end of communication practice, part one stage, and then fluency emphasis was intensified within the last stage of communication practice, part two. In this stage, the students had more chances to use the target language in real communicative situations. This stage reflected real language use outside the classroom and created an opportunity for students to increase their negotiation skills in the safety of the classroom (Thornbury, 1999).

Students felt totally comfortable to be in company with their peers and were given more freedom to share their own ideas with friends. Basically, during this stage, students found it quite free to communicate with their mates without any interruption for error correcting from the teacher. Hence, their fluency was more enhanced.

Finally students' attitude towards influence of the instruction was very nice as the majority of the participants favored it. As shown in table 7, the respondents found the communicative grammar teaching was really innovative ($M = 3.94$). It seems that due to the innovativeness of the training method, their learning motivation was increased ($M = 4.04$). Besides, the participants became more critical in thinking and had to work actively most probably due to the tasks employed in the teaching and learning process ($M = 4.14$). Experiencing the lessons, the participants found that working in pairs or groups helped them decrease their stress and increase their confidence ($M = 3.92$). Significantly, they almost acknowledged that the learning collaboration was promoted due to pair-work and group-work ($M = 4.14$). Finally, the majority of respondents supposed that they would be good at grammatical knowledge ($M = 3.82$) and also able to communicate well in real-life situations due to the communicative grammar teaching ($M = 4.2$).

These detailed explanations may substantiate this expected result. First, the target grammatical items were naturally introduced in vivid and realistic topics which were very close to the

students' real-life situations (e.g. school life, home life, sports, and travelling); they hence quickly caught the students' interest. This finding advocates the argument of Harmer (1998), who states that diversity and suitability of topics can be the "springboard" for fascinating lessons.

Second, the tasks for introducing and practicing, the form, meaning and use of the target structures were well-designed and successfully carried out in the forms of oral and written practices and in accordance with the students' level and the lesson plan. The encompassment of the three main dimensions of grammar instruction (form, meaning, and use) actually helped the participants obtain more understanding and ability to use the structure properly. Hence, grammatical knowledge was achieved. This finding of the current study obviously reinforces the relevant idea that CLT emphasizes on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language (Nunan, 1994).

Fourth, it was working in pairs and groups that helped decrease stress on students' learning and increase their interest and confidence in completing the tasks as well as using the target language to communicate. These consequently led to the fact that the students were no longer afraid of making mistakes or asking question or argue with the teacher. Therefore, as Ellis (1994) stated, it can be seen that students who are given opportunities for communication will be interested in the lesson. In addition, within pairs or groups, students became comfortable with their peers in choosing to say, exchanging information, and receiving feedback from friends. The finding further supports the view of Richards (2006), who asserts that effective classroom learning tasks and exercises provide opportunities for students to negotiate meaning, expand their language resources, notice how language is used, and take part in meaningful interpersonal exchange.

Moreover, it seems that due to the application of the three dimensions of grammar instruction as well as the integration of the language skills within the grammar instruction, the majority of the participants felt confident in doing well conventional grammar-paper tests and performing real-life communications. This finding seems to be consistent with the suggestion that grammar should not be treated separately from the language skills in the classroom (Nunan, 1994).

Finally, as far as the lesson content and task design were concerned, they all highly met the students' satisfaction. Similarly, the participants were involved in all the activities applied in the six stages of lesson procedure. By the same manner Richards (2006) said that language learning

is facilitated both by activities that involve inductive or discovery learning of underlying rules of language use and organization, as well as those involving language analysis and reflection (p. 23).

To sum up, the result of the pre and post tests revealed that the students' grammar changed in terms of the following aspects: form, meaning and use. This was because the teacher focused on and integrated the three aspects of grammar. Hence, the students' attitude towards the communicative grammar teaching became positive. This finding is similar to the core assumption of the current communicative language teaching cited by Richards (2006). That is second language learning is facilitated when learners are engaged in interaction and meaningful communication. Effective classroom learning tasks and exercises provide opportunities for students to negotiate meaning, expand their language resources, notice how language is used, and take part in meaningful intrapersonal exchange.

Regarding the teachers application of grammar, as observation data revealed, the teacher in the control class conducted the lesson without arranging the sits in the group manner hence in the very beginning he hadn't intention to teach the lesson with forming group. As a result a free discussion (50%) between students was reduced. Therefore, it looks that there was no value for the principle, "classroom activities should parallel to the real world as closely as possible. Since language is a tool of communication." (Clarke & Sibertstein, 1977).

The teacher relied on form (75%) most of the time. Also, the degree to which the teacher focused on meaning was very less, 25%. As the researcher observed, unless the students had asked him, he didn't focus on meaning. Context was also considered very less (25%) during the grammar instruction. This was because the teacher's explanation of grammar was mostly related to how the students could do better achievement test. On the other hand, most of the students perceived grammar as the most boring part among other contents of the book. Therefore, grammar for the sake of communication had no place in the instruction. This finding is similar to some scholars who argue that form-focused instruction and communicative activities should be combined. Students pay more attention to forms, and the forms become more memorable, if students learn them in context (Lightbown, 1998; Nassaji, 2000; Wang, 2009).

Additionally, the teacher had minimum concern (25%) to integrate the target grammar with other type in different context. The teacher was usually observed while he was presenting grammar by giving a higher emphasis on form in separate sentences. This implies that the teacher was accustomed to not emphasis on the importance of meaning rather than other forms of rote teaching. This reduced the chance that might help students get more knowledge of the target grammar and caused the students result to be less than the treatment class.

Moreover, the lesson was not supported by different activities like game, role play ... and so on. As the result, the students' willingness in turn taking and group forming was negative. This indicates that he couldn't create (100%) genuine communication in the class. This also implies the teacher didn't try to design classroom activities to change the atmosphere of traditional grammar class by adopting the communicative method (Richards, 2007, p.1). Likely, when the teacher pronounced what was in the text book, he didn't care of any spoken and written English. This implies his academic knowledge of the lesson was (50%) medium. Because, considering spoken and written English, the teacher did not explain properly the difference between the three types of making wish or the target grammar during the lesson.

Based on this findings and what was seen in the students' questionnaire the following points could be raised as the challenge that teacher faced during implementation of communicative grammar teaching. First, the number of population in the class was very challenging to implement communicative grammar teaching because the number of students in the class was fifty. This number was not small enough to accurately implement CLT. Similarly, this concern is also shared by many researchers. Kennedy and Kennedy (1996) feel that it is difficult to control what happens when the number of a group passed a certain number.

Beyond this, teachers' willingness, especially in the control class, to form group was very less. This was why the teacher intended to create individual ability rather than group performance. Due to this creating genuine communication in the class was challenging.

Due to the teacher concentrated on form, considering aspects of grammar: form, meaning, and use were another challenge which was observed in the control class. This finding is consistent

with the suggestion of Incecaý & Incecaý (2009) that stated when teachers often apply a traditional teaching method and focus more on grammar and students concentrate more on sentence structure, this will lead to preventing the learners from developing their communicative competence. Also, integrating the target grammar with other type in different context was also other problem that reduced the application of CLT in the control class. Therefore, these problems support someone to conclude that the teacher's academic knowledge of the target lesson was the key challenge that hindered the application of communicative grammar teaching.

Regarding students, the key challenge was fear of making mistake. This was because, formerly the students had no experience using the language for communication in the classroom. Also, due to the teacher minimum concern to use communicative grammar teaching, the students' willingness to form group and to take part in the communication was very less. Because, they do not enjoy participating in communicative activities in the class for fear of losing face by making mistakes and they lack the confidence to express themselves in less than perfect English (Jones, 2007).

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, summary, conclusions and recommendations are included. The summary deals with major findings of the study based on its objectives. Second, based on the research findings conclusion is made. Finally, according to the findings, some possible recommendations are presented.

5.1 Summary

The main objective of this study was to investigate the influence of communicative grammar teaching in enhancing grade 11 students' grammatical knowledge. In order to achieve this objective, other specific objectives, like to investigate students' attitudes towards the communicative grammar, were prepared. Similarly, the research was guided in alternative and null hypothesis to compare the effects of the communicative grammar teaching towards the students' achievements of grammatical knowledge with the conventional method. The major findings are also presented depending on the research questions below.

5.1.1 The influence of communicative grammar teaching in enhancing grade 11 students' grammatical knowledge

To investigate the influence of communicative grammar teaching in enhancing grade 11 students' grammatical knowledge, descriptive statistics data gained from the pre- and the post-tests were calculated and analyzed. The results of the pre-test of the two groups indicated that though the control group got slightly higher scores than the experimental one ($M = 5.24$ vs. $M = 5.16$); there was no statistically significant difference between the two mean scores (sig. (2-tailed) $p = .813$). Thus, it was completely safe to confirm that the two groups were quite equivalent in grammatical knowledge before the treatment.

The post test also showed that, on average, the two groups achieved better scores in the post-test than in the pre-test. Particularly, the treatment group (11.00 vs 8.42). So the first alternative hypothesis is accepted where as the two null hypothesis could thus be rejected. This is why, indeed, the communicative grammar could influence students' achievement of grammatical knowledge more than the conventional method positively.

5.1. 2 Students' attitudes towards the communicative grammar

The analysis of the data shows that the students' attitude towards the communicative grammar was obviously positive. These good results may be explained by the text topics and the follow-up tasks actually met the students' interest. Also the activities utilized in the practice and production stages were varied, enjoyable; oral and written practices were well cooperated within the lesson procedure. Finally, the majority of respondents supposed that they would be good at grammatical knowledge (M = 3.88) and also able to communicate well in real-life situations due to the implementation of communicative grammar teaching (M = 4.26).

5.1.3 What aspect of students' grammar was improved due to implementation of communicative grammar?

The achievement test of grammar was prepared based on form (choice, and fill in the blank space), meaning (write the meaning of the following wishes or sentences) and use (write wishes based on the given context). Then the students achieved more result in the post-test when it was compared to the pre-test. So, the result of the test revealed that the students' grammar changed in terms of the following aspects: form, meaning and use.

5.1.4 Teachers' application of communicative grammar in classroom

The researcher's observation of the control class showed that the teacher spent much of their time in presenting the form of grammar in a separate sentence (75%) rather than creating a context where learners practice the language by using grammar in real life situations. Also, the degree, to which the teacher focused on meaning, was very less, 25%. As the researcher observed, unless the students had asked him, he did not focused on meaning. Beside, context was also not considered (75) during the grammar instruction. Moreover, teachers mostly focused on or were dependent on the text book exercise which was not reach in authentic use of the target language. Almost the teacher never used authentic material to introduce grammar activities. Specially, teachers were not taking their role as a facilitator. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that English teachers of the school were dominantly applying lecture method during grammar instruction and gave less opportunity for learners to practice the language through activities.

5.1.5 Factors affecting the implementation of communicative grammar

Regarding the point, the number of population in the class was very challenging to implement communicative grammar teaching. Also, teachers' willingness, especially in the control class, to form group was very less. Due to this creating genuine communication in the class was challenging. Similarly, considering aspects of grammar: form, meaning, and use was another challenge which was observed in the control class. Integrating the target grammar with other type in different context was also other problem that reduced the application of CLT in the control class. Moreover, using real life activities and the teacher's academic knowledge of the target lesson were also other problems existed during the lesson. Finally, regarding students, the key challenge was fear of making mistake. This was because formerly the students had no experience using the language for communication in the classroom. Therefore, their willingness to take part in the communication was very less.

5.2 Conclusions

Regarding the influence of communicative grammar teaching in enhancing grade 11 students' grammatical knowledge, the post test showed that, on average, the two groups achieved better scores than in the pre-test. Particularly, the superiority of the treatment class was seen (11.00 vs 8.42). This was because though the meaning and use were primarily aimed at in the communicative grammar class, the emphasis on form was not ignored during the treatment stages.

Relating the superiority of the treatment class, though the meaning and use were primarily aimed at in the communicative grammar class, the emphasis on form was not ignored during the treatment stages. Therefore, integrating form, meaning and use is best to enhance students' grammatical knowledge.

The students' attitude towards the communicative grammar was also positive. This was because the text topics and the follow-up tasks actually met their interest; the activities were varied and enjoyable. Also, oral and written practices were well cooperated within the lesson procedure. Then they got the teaching was innovative. Due to this, their learning motivation was increased. Finally, the students supposed that they would be good at grammatical knowledge and also able to communicate well in real-life situations. Therefore designing varied, enjoyable activities with interesting topics increases students' interest to learn grammar communicatively.

Regarding to what aspects of students' grammar were improved due to implementation of communicative grammar, the majority of students supposed that they would be good at grammatical knowledge, able to communicate well in real-life situations due to the implementation of communicative grammar. Specially, the tests of grammar were prepared based on form, meaning and use. The students also achieved more result in the post-test when it was compared to the pre-test. This reveals that the students' grammar changed in terms of the following aspects: form, meaning and use. Therefore, enhancing aspects of grammar, form, meaning and use, communicative grammar helps students to use language for communication.

As far as teachers' application of communicative grammar in classroom concerned, the teacher in the control class spent much of his time in presenting the form of grammar in a separate sentence. The teacher focused on meaning was very less. The lesson was not also discussed related to other grammars within context. Mostly, he was dependent on the text book exercise which was not reach in authentic use of the target language. Similarly, he was not facilitator in classroom activities since he did not form any group to let learners involve actively. Hence, discussion was considered very poor. This implies learners were listening to the teachers' presentation without any attempt to use grammar for actual communication. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that English teachers of the school were dominantly applying lecture method during grammar instruction and gave less opportunity for learners to practice the language through activities. In addition teaching grammar through communication remained impractical.

Connecting factors affecting the implementation of communicative grammar, the number of population in the classes, teachers' academic knowledge of the target lesson and willingness to form group, considering aspects of grammar: form, meaning, and use, Integrating the target grammar with other type in different context, and supporting the lesson with real life activities like game, role play were the challenges that existed during the lesson. Therefore it is possible to conclude that teacher's lack of knowledge, concentration on form and intending to create individual ability rather than group performance were the main obstacles for the implementation of communicative grammar.

Regarding students, the main challenge was fear of making mistake. This was because formerly the students had no experience using the language for communication in the classroom. Also,

due to the teacher minimum concern to use communicative grammar, the students' willingness to form group and to take part in the communication was very less. Therefore it is possible to conclude that students' background together with the teachers' minimum concern to apply communicative grammar had been affecting students' communication skill.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are forwarded for better implementation of CLT in grammar teaching.

- Regarding the influence of communicative grammar, the research findings showed over performance of the treatment class in achieving the grammatical test. This was because though the meaning and use were primarily aimed at in the communicative grammar class, the emphasis on form was not ignored during the treatment stages. Therefore, teachers should integrate form, meaning and use in grammar class to enhance students' grammatical knowledge.
- The students' attitude towards the communicative grammar was also positive. This was because the text topics and the follow-up tasks actually met their interest; the activities were varied and enjoyable. Also, oral and written practices were well cooperated within the lesson procedure. Therefore teachers should design varied, enjoyable activities with interesting topics to increase students' interest to learn grammar communicatively.
- Creating meaningful learning opportunities in and out of the school is very important for learners to make use of the language. So teachers should give students activities and homework that facilitate language use out of the classroom.
- The research revealed that the students' grammar changed in terms of the following aspects: form, meaning and use due to the treatment, communicative grammar. Therefore teachers should facilitate opportunities for learners to discuss on the new grammar's form, meaning and use in authentic context and use these grammars in meaningful and authentic writing and speaking activities.
- This finding showed that students' fearing of making mistake was one of the challenges. Therefore teachers should encourage and help students so that they can control their fear of making mistake in communicative grammar classroom. This may help them to use the lesson for communication.

- Other researchers can use more than one treatment groups when investigating the effects of communicative grammar in enhancing students' grammatical knowledge so that they might get a more comprehensive result.
- The same research can be run with students of the same grade levels in other school to find out whether the same results will be taken.

Reference

- Amare Asgedom. 1998. "Teachers' Perceptions of Educational Problems in Ethiopia." In Amare et al (eds.), *Quality Education in Ethiopia: Visions for the 21st Century Proceedings*. Addis Ababa: IER.
- Anna, U., Catherine, K., & Deborah, K. (2007). Planning a Lesson. From *The Essentials of Language Teaching* www.nclrc.org/essentials *A project of the National Capital Language Resource Center (©2003-2007)*
- Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language Testing in Practice: Design and Developing Useful Language*.
- Borg, S. (1999). Teachers' theories in grammar teaching. *ELT Journal*, 53 (3): 157-167.
- Borg, S. (1999). *Teachers' Pedagogical Systems and Grammar teaching: A Qualitative Study*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32. 1: 9-38. Print.
- Breen, M. P. & Candlin, C. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 89-112.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Addison Wesley Longman
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ : Prentice Hall..
- Burgess, J. and Etherington, S. (2002). Focus on grammatical form: explicit or implicit? *System*,

30: 433-458.

- Burns, A., & Borg, M. (2005). *Grammar and Communicative Language Teaching: Why, When and How to Teach It?* Applied Linguistics and Language in Education Research Centre. Phnom Penh: Camtesol Conference (February, 2009).
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown university round table on languages and linguistics: Language, communication, and social meaning* (pp. 223–237). Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second-language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2002). Why it makes sense to teach grammar in context and through Discourse. In Hinkel, E. and Fotos, S. (eds.), *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. PP. 119-133.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2002). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(3), 459-480. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3586980>.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle.
- Chang, M. (2011). EFL teachers' attitudes toward communicative language teaching in Taiwanese college. *Asian EFL Journal Professional Teaching Articles*, 53, 17-34.
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing Second Language Skills: Theory to Practice* (3rd ed.). San Diego, CA: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Clarke, M. & Silberstein, S. (1997). Toward a realization of psycholinguistic principles in the ESL reading class. *Language Learning*, 27(1), 48-65.
[doi:10.1111/j.14671770.1977.tb00297.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14671770.1977.tb00297.x)

- Cook, V. (2000). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Craik, F.I.M., & Lockhart, R.S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 11, 671–684.
- Crystal, D. (2004). *Making Sense of Grammar*. Pearson Education, England.
- Cummins, J. & Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism in education: Aspects of theory, research and practice*. London: Longman.
- Cunico, S.(2005). Teaching language and cultural competence through drama: some suggestions for a neglected resource. *Language Learning Journal*, 31, 21–29.
- Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism in education: Aspects of theory, research and practice*. London: Longman.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (2007). *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Demo, D. (2001). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. ERIC Educational Report, ERIC Digest. EDO-FL-01-07.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in second language acquisition* (pp. 197– 261). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Elkilic, G. and Akca, C. (2008). Attitudes of the Students Studying at Kafkas University Private Primary EFL Classroom towards Storytelling and Motivation. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 4(1): 1-22.
- Ellis, R. (2005). Measuring implicit and explicit knowledge of a second language: A psychometric study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 141-

172. psychometric study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 141-172.

Ellis, R. (2004). The definition and measurement of L2 explicit knowledge. *Language Learning*, 54, 227-275.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1996). How culturally appropriate is the communicative approach? *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 213-218.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford : OUP.

Ellis, R. (1993). Rules and instances in foreign language learning: Interactions of implicit and explicit knowledge. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 5, 289–319.

Finch, G. (2003). *Word of mouth*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fox, C. A. (1993). Communicative competence and beliefs about language among graduate teaching assistants in French. *Modern Language Journal*, 77, 313–324.

Gonzales, P. (1995). *State-Level Curriculum Guideline: a listing*. In H., Sarah (Ed.). *English as a second language teacher resource handbook: a practical guide for K-12 ESL programs*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Halliday, M. A. (1997). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.

Han, Y., & Ellis, R. (1998). Implicit knowledge, explicit knowledge and general language proficiency. *Language Teaching Research*, 2, 1-23.

Harley, B., & Swain, M. (1984). The interlanguage of immersion students and its implication for L2 teaching. In A. Davies, C. Criper, & A. P. R. Howatt (Eds.), *Interlanguage* (pp. 291–311). Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.

Heaton, J. B. (1989). *Writing English Language Tests* (2nd ed.). New York: London and New York.

- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293).
- Hayes, U. (1997). Helping teachers to cope with large classes. *ELT Journal*, 1, 31-38.
- Incecay, G., & Incecay, V. (2009). Turkish university students' perceptions of communicative and non-communicative activities in EFL classroom. *Social and Behavioural Science*, 1, 618-622.
- Islam, C. (2001). A different beginner textbook. *Folio*, 6(2), 15–19.
- Jacobs, G. & Farrel, T. (2003). Understanding and Implementing the CLT Paradigm. *RELC Journal*, 41, 15-30. Retrieved from URL: <http://rel.sagepub.com/content/34/1/5.short>
- Jin, L., Singh, M., & Li, L. (2005). Communicative language teaching in China: misconceptions, applications and perceptions. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/05pap/jin05646.pdf>
- Jones, L. (2007). *The student-centred classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, K.E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teachers. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 10(4), 439–452.
- Karim, K. M. R. (2004). *Teachers' perceptions, attitudes, and expectations about communicative language teaching (CLT) in post-secondary education in Bangladesh*. Unpublished master dissertation: University of Victoria.
- Khuong-Cam, T. H. (2010). *Teaching Communicative English Grammar to Vietnamese High School Students in Vung Tau City*. Ho Chi Minh City: HOU.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Krashen, S. (2004). *The power of reading: insights from the research*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Krashen, S. (1989). We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for

- the input theory. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 445–464.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Krashen, S. (1982) *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford : Pergamon
- Lakachew Mulat. (2003). “Teachers’ Attitude towards Communicative Language Teaching and Practical Problems in its Implementation.” (Unpublished M.A.Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2002). The Grammar of Choice. In E. Hinkel and S. Fotos (Eds.). *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching* Oxford University.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1997). Chaos/complex science and second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 18(2),
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London/New York: Longman.
- Le-Canh, V. (1999). *Language and Vietnamese Pedagogical Contexts*. Retrieved October 24, 2011, from http://www.languages.ait.ac.th/Hanoi_proceedings/canh.htm
- Leech, G. (1994). Students’ grammar – teachers’ grammar – learners’ grammar. In Bygate,
- Lee, J., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lessow-Hurley, J. (2009). *The foundations of dual language instruction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

- Leeman, J. (2003). Recasts and second language development: Beyond negative evidence. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 37-63.
- Lessow-Hurley, J. (2009). *The foundations of dual language instruction*. Upper Saddle River,
- Liao, X. (2004). The need for communicative language teaching in China. *ELT Journal*, 85(3), 270-273.
- Liao, X. (2000). Communicative language teaching innovation in China: Difficulties and solutions. *ERIC database*, (ED443294). Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED443294.pdf> NJ: Allyn & Bacon.
- Li, D. (1998). It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 677-703.
- Lightbown, P. M. (1998). The importance of timing on focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 177–196). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Lightbown, P. M. (1991). What have we here? Some observations on the influence of instruction on L2 learning. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/L2 pedagogy: A commemorative volume for Claus Faerch* (pp. 197–212). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus on form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on L2. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 429–448.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40, 243-249. doi: 10.1017/S0261444807004363

- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liu Runqing. & Wen Xu. (2005). *Linguistics: A new coursebook*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press. The Role of Grammar in Communicative Language Teaching.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Long, M., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly* 26, 27–56.
- Maley, A. (2011). *Advanced Methodology: Provisional Course Outline* (Unpublished).
- Maley, A. (2003). Creative approaches to writing materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 183–198). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mangubhai, F., Marland, P., Dashwood, A., & Son, J. (2007). Framing communicative language teaching for better teacher understanding. *Issues in Educational Research*, 17(1), 85-106.
- Masuhara, H. (2003). Materials for developing reading skills.
- Masuhara, H. (2000). Is reading difficulty a language problem? Implications of neuroscientific research findings for reading pedagogy and materials development. *The Language Teacher*, 24(2).
- McCargar, D. F. (1993). Teacher and student role expectations: Cross-cultural differences and implications. *Modern Language Journal*, 77, 192–207.

- Meyer, L. (1990). It was no trouble: Achieving communicative competence in a L2. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in L2* (pp. 195–222). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Morelli, J. A. (2003). Ninth Graders' Attitudes toward Different Approaches to Grammar Instruction. Unpublished Dissertation. The Graduate School of Education, Fordham University, New York.
- Mukundan, J. (Ed.) (2005a). *Readings on ELT Materials II*. Petaling Jaya: Pearson Malaysia.
- Nassaji, H. (2000). Towards integrating form-focused instruction and communicative interaction in L2 classroom:
- Newby, D. (2006). “Teaching grammar and the question of knowledge”, in A.B. Fennerand and D. Newby (eds.) *Coherence of Principles, Cohesion of Competences: Exploring Theories and Designing Materials for Teacher Education* Graz/Strasbourg: European Centre for Modern Languages/Council of Europe Press, 1-11.
- Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50(3), 417-528.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00136> Muñoz (ed.) *Segundas Lenguas*. Barcelona: Ariel, 197-229.
- Nunan, D. (2001). *Second language teaching and learning*. Beijing: Foreign Language and Research Press.
- Ortega, L. (2000). “El desarrollo de la competencia gramatical oral en una segunda lengua a

través de la actuación lingüística: aproximaciones interaccionistas y cognitivas”, in C.

- Pei-long, L. (2011). The study on the effectiveness of communicative language teaching strategies used in college English classes. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 8(7), 457-461.
- Penner, J. (1995). Change and conflict: introduction of the communicative approach in China. *TESOL Canada Journal*, 12(2), 1-17
- Pennington, M.C. (1995). *New ways in teaching grammar*. Alexandria, Va: TESOL.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Pica, T. (2000). Tradition and transition in English language teaching methodology. *System*, 28, 1-18.
- Rao, Z. (2002). Chinese students' perceptions of communication and non-communicative activities in EFL classroom. *ELT journal*. 30(2), 85-105.
- Renandya, W.A., (Ed.) (2005). *Methodology and materials design in language teaching: current perceptions and practices and their implications*. Singapore: RELC
- Richards, J. C. (2007). *Communicative language teaching today*. Beijing: People's 21 Education Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., Gallo, P. B., & Renandya, W. A. (2001). Exploring teachers' beliefs and the processes of change. *PAC Journal*, 1(1), 41-58.
- Richards, J. C & Rodgers, T. S. (Ed.). (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rintell, E. M. (1990). That's incredible: Stories of emotion told by L2 learners and native

speakers. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in L2* (pp. 75–94). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Roehr, K. (2007). Metalinguistic knowledge and language ability in university-level L2 learners. *Applied Linguistics*, 29, 173-199.

Rutherford, W. E. (1996). *Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching*. London, New York: Longman.

Sakui, K. (2004). Wearing two pairs of shoes: Language teaching in Japan. *ELT Journal*, 58(2), 155-163. doi:10.1093/elt/58.2.155

Savignon, S. J. (2002). Communicative language teaching: Linguistic theory and classroom practice. In Savignon S. J. (Ed.), *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education* (pp.1–27). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Savignon, S. J. (1991). Communicative language teaching: State of the Art. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2), 261-274.

Schmidt, R. (2001). “Attention”, in P. Robinson (ed.) *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-32.

Singh, R. (2011). Controversies in Teaching English Grammar. *Academic Voices: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 1(1), 56-60.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction.

- Applied Linguistics*: 38-62. <http://appliedlinguistics.oxfordjournals.org/content/current>
- Spada, N. (2007). "Communicative language teaching: Current status and future prospects",
International Handbook of English Language Teaching, 15: 271-288.
- Spada, N. & Lightbown, P.M. (2009). Interaction research in second/foreign language classrooms.
In A. Mackey & P. Charlene (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on interaction*, (pp. 157–175). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Spada, N. & Lightbown, P.M. (1993). Instruction and the development of questions in the
L2 classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 205–221.
- Surafel. Z. (2002). "The Effects of the 'new' English Language Teaching Methodology in the
First Cycle Secondary Schools." *Educational Journal* 6/13: 70-86.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and
comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input
in second language acquisition*, (pp. 235–256). New York: Newbury House.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1990). Aspects of the sociolinguistic performance of early and late
French immersion students. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S. Krashen (Eds.),
Developing communicative competence in L2 (pp.41–54). Boston, MA:
Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Thornbury, S. (1999) *How to Teach Grammar*. England: Longman. Retrieved from URL:
<http://www.free-ebook-download.net/literary-book/16279-scottthornbury-oehow-teach-grammara.html>
- Trahey, M., & White, L. (1993). Positive evidence and preemption in the L2 classroom.
Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15, 181–204.
- Tsai, T. H. (2007). *Taiwanese educators' perspective on the implementation of the new*

English education policy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Alliant International University.

Ulrich, V. (1994). *Are Communicative and Grammatical Skills more Effectively Acquired in a Traditional or Differentiated Beginning Level Foreign language Classroom?* Thesis. Emporia State University.

Wang, Q. (2006). *A course in English language teaching*. Beijing: Higher Education Press.

Wang, P. (2009). A study of teacher and student perceptions concerning grammar-translation method and communicative language teaching. *Nanya Journal*, 28, 135–152.

White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *L2 Research*, 7, 133–161.

Widdowson, H. G. (1990). Grammar and nonsense and learning. In H. G. Widdowson, *Aspects of language teaching*, pp. 79-98. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Difficulties in Teaching and Learning Grammar...*International Journal of Instruction*, July 2011. Vol.4, No.2

Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. London: Oxford University Press.

Wong, C. Y. (2010). *Second language teachers' perceptions and implementations of communicative language teaching* (Doctoral dissertation). Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 340–363). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilkin, D.A. (1972). *Grammatical, Situational, and Notional Syllabuses*. Oxford University Press.

Williams (1995) *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 197-262.

Xu, Qiang. (2000). *The communicative approach to English teaching and testing*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Yarrow, R. (2007). How do students feel about grammar?: The framework and its implication for teaching and learning. *Changing English: Studies in Culture and Education*, 14(2), 175–186. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13586840701443008>

Ying, L. (2010). *Communicative activities in ELT classrooms in China*. Unpublished master dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Platteville.

Yu, L. (2001). Communicative language teaching in China: progress and resistance. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1), 179-194.

1. Appendix

JIMMA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
A TRAINING MANUAL FOR COMMUNICATIVE GRAMMAR TEACHING

(This training manual and Lesson Plan was adapted from a material which was developed by Dr. Anna Uhl Chamot (George Washington University) and Dr. Catherine Keatley and Deborah Kennedy (National Capital Language Resource Center (©2003-2007))

Trainer: Kasahun Taddese (The researcher).

Trainee : Daniel Lioul (The treatment group teacher)

PLANNING A LESSON

A key aspect of effective teaching is having a plan for what will happen in the classroom each day. Creating such a plan involves setting realistic goals, deciding how to incorporate required materials (course textbooks) and other materials, and developing activities that will promote learning.

Section Contents

Set Lesson Goals

- Topic
- Linguistic content
- Communication tasks
- Learning strategies

Structure the Lesson

- Preparation
- Presentation
- Practice
- Evaluation
- Expansion

Identify Materials and Activities

Resource

Lesson plans

Set Lesson Goals

Lesson goals are most usefully stated in terms of what students will have done or accomplished at the end of the lesson. Stating goals in this way allows both teacher and learners to know when the goals have been reached.

To set lesson goals:

1. Identify a **topic** for the lesson. The topic is not a goal, but it will help you develop your goals. The topic may be determined largely by your curriculum and textbook, and may be

part of a larger thematic unit such as Travel or Leisure Activities. If you have some flexibility in choice of topic, consider your students' interests and the availability of authentic materials at the appropriate level.

2. Identify specific *linguistic content*, such as points of grammar or language use, to be introduced or reviewed. These are usually prescribed by the course textbook or course curriculum. If they are not, select points that are connected in some significant way with the topic of the lesson.
3. Identify specific *communication tasks* to be completed by students. To be authentic, the tasks should allow, but not require, students to use the vocabulary, grammar, and strategies presented in the lesson. The focus of the tasks should be topical, not grammatical. This means that it may be possible for some students to complete the task without using either the grammar point or the strategy presented in the first part of the lesson.
4. Identify specific *learning strategies* to be introduced or reviewed in connection with the lesson. See *Motivating Learners* for more on learning strategies.
5. Create goal statements for the linguistic content, communication tasks, and learning strategies that state what you will do and what students will do during the lesson.

Structure the Lesson

A language lesson should include a variety of activities that combine different types of language input and output. Learners at all proficiency levels benefit from such variety; research has shown that it is more motivating and is more likely to result in effective language learning.

An effective lesson has five parts:

- Preparation
- Presentation/Modeling
- Practice
- Evaluation
- Expansion

The five parts of a lesson may all take place in one class session or may extend over multiple sessions, depending on the nature of the topic and the activities.

The lesson plan should outline who will do what in each part of the lesson. The time allotted for preparation, presentation, and evaluation activities should be no more than 8-10 minutes each. Communication practice activities may run a little longer.

1. Preparation

As the class begins, give students a broad outline of the day's goals and activities so they know what to expect. Help them focus by eliciting their existing knowledge of the day's topics.

- Use discussion or homework review to elicit knowledge related to the grammar and language use points to be covered
- Use comparison with the native language to elicit strategies that students may already be using
- Use discussion of what students do and/or like to do to elicit their knowledge of the topic they will address in communication activities.

2. Presentation/Modeling

Move from preparation into presentation of the linguistic and topical content of the lesson and relevant learning strategies. Present the strategy first if it will help students absorb the lesson content.

Presentation provides the language *input* that gives students the foundation for their knowledge of the language. Input comes from the instructor and from course textbooks.

An important part of the presentation is *practice output*, in which students practice the form that the instructor has presented. In practice output, accuracy of performance is important. Practice output is designed to make learners comfortable producing specific language items recently introduced. Practice output is a type of communication that is found only in language classrooms. Because production is limited to preselected items, practice output is not truly communicative.

3. Practice

In this part of the lesson, the focus shifts from the instructor as presenter to the students as completers of a designated task. Students work in pairs or small groups on a topic based task with a specific outcome. Completion of the task may require the bridging of an information gap

(see Teaching Goals & Methods for more on information gap). The instructor observes the groups acts as a resource when students have questions that they cannot resolve themselves.

In their work together, students move from practice output to *communicative output*, in which the main purpose is to complete the communication task. Language becomes a tool, rather than an end in itself. Learners have to use any or all of the language that they know along with varied communication strategies. The criterion of success is whether the learner gets the message across. Accuracy is not a consideration unless the lack of it interferes with the message.

4. Evaluation

When all students have completed the communication practice task, reconvene the class as a group to recap the lesson. Ask students to give examples of how they used the linguistic content and learning or communication strategies to carry out the communication task.

Evaluation is useful for four reasons:

- It reinforces the material that was presented earlier in the lesson
- It provides an opportunity for students to raise questions of usage and style
- It enables the instructor to monitor individual student comprehension and learning
- It provides closure to the lesson

5. Expansion

Expansion activities allow students to apply the knowledge they have gained in the classroom to situations outside it. Expansion activities include out-of-class observation assignments, in which the instructor asks students to find examples of something or to use a strategy and then report back.

Identify Materials and Activities

The materials for a specific lesson will fall into two categories: those that are required, such as course textbooks and lab materials, and authentic materials that the teacher incorporates into classroom activities.

For required materials, determine what information must be presented in class and decide which exercise(s) to use in class and which for out-of-class work. For teacher-provided materials, use

materials that are genuinely related to realistic communication activities. Don't be tempted to try to create a communication situation around something just because it's a really cool video or beautiful brochure.

Truly authentic communication tasks have several features:

- They involve solving a true problem or discussing a topic of interest
- They require using language to accomplish a goal, not using language merely to use language
- They allow students to use all of the language skills they have, rather than specific forms or vocabulary, and to self-correct when they realize they need to
- The criterion of success is clear: completion of a defined task

2. Appendix

JIMMA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Lesson Plan prepared for The Treatment Group

Lesson Topic: Making wish

School Name: Bishaw wldeyouhanis Preparatory school.

Grade: 11

Year: 2007 E.C

Time: 40'

Date: _____

Lesson Goals Linguistic content:

- Using present conditional, simple past and past perfect tenses to describe

Future, Present and past wishes respectively.

- I will ask students to express their wish.
- I will present the grammatical form and its meaning.
- Students will do structure practice with work book exercise.
- Students will use the forms in communication tasks.

Communication tasks:

- Reading dialogue in hard paper and text book.
- Providing information about future, Present and past wishes.
- Writing wishes for the already created context in the text book.

- Students will work in group to share information.
- Student will write individual wishes.
- I will observe and act as facilitator.

Learning Strategies:

- Cooperative
- Selective attention
- I will model selective Attention.
- Students will act out the written dialogue.
- Students will use the strategy in the Communication task.

Structure preparation (5) minutes

- Review homework on adjective and adverbs.
- Ask students what wish mean and to speak their individual wish.
- Depending on their answers, you ask them what type of tense they have used.
- Give the dialogues and ask the meaning of the underlined sentences.

Grammar Presentation and Practice (8 minutes)

- Move from preparation into Presentation of present, future and past wishes.
- Give the dialogue which express present, future and past wishes.
- Motivate students to act out (up on) the dialogue.
- Ask students to drive the grammatical form and identify the meaning of each underlined sentence.
- Clear up any confusion.

Strategy presentation and Practice: (5 Minutes).

- Give the original sentences which give or indicate a context.
- Describe strategy for identifying the tense that is used for describing the wish.

- Connect to discussion during preparation stage if possible.

Communication Practice, Part one (12 minutes)

- Students are divided into groups.
- Describe strategy for identifying tense depending on the time indicated in the contexts given.
- Give the original sentences (contexts) for the group of students.
- Tell them to identify the time given in the context.
- Motivate them to discuss and to decide the type of wish that will be used in each context(original sentence)
- Tell students that they will write wishes using appropriate tense depending on the time of the context.

Communication Practice, Part two (5 minute)

- Each student writes wishes. The tense of each wish should depend on the context given.
- The teacher asks the students to speak the functions and use of these grammars in real context.

Evaluation (5 minutes)

- Ask members of each group how wishes can be identified in terms of form and meaning.
- Ask what grammatical form can be used for each wish.
- Ask the meaning of the following sentences (wishes).

I wish I had gone to library yesterday.

I wish we wouldn't have a test tomorrow.

I wish my father were rich.

Expansion (Homework for next class)

- Have students bring two examples for each type of wish in authentic context or dialogue.

Required Materials:

- Homework exercise on adjective and adverb.
- Text book section on " wish"

Authentic Materials:

- Written dialogue
- Written context (Sentences)

3. Appendix

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Classroom Observation Checklist

The purpose of this observation is for checking how the teachers are conducting communicative grammar teaching in enhancing grade 11 students' grammatical knowledge: the case of Bishaw Welde Yuhanis preparatory school in Bonga town. Beside, it tries to identify what factors are affecting the teachers to implement communicative grammar teaching in grammar teaching. To do so, the check list included classroom condition, classroom instruction, communicative activities and factors affecting the implementation of CLT in Grammar teaching.

1. School Name: _____
2. Teacher's code No: _____
3. Date 1: _____
4. Date 2: _____
5. Date 3 _____
6. Total class sessions observed _____
7. Lesson topic: _____
8. Time: _____
9. No of students: _____

No	List of observation	Session 1		Session 2		Session 3		Session 4		
		yes	no	yes	no	yes	No			
1	Class room condition									
1.1	Are the sitting space enough for all students?									
1.2	Are the seats movable?									
1.3	Is there enough space for movement between desks?									
1.4	Is there enough space in front of the learner									
2	Classroom instruction		Session 1		Session 2		Session 3		Session 4	
			Yes	no	Yes	no	Yes	no	yes	No
2.1	Does the teacher present the grammar's	A) Form?								
		B) Meaning?								
		C) Use in context?								
2.2	Does the teacher employ clear instruction to present classroom Communicative activities	A) Creating a scenario								
		B) Discuss the difference between the new grammar and related grammar								
		C) Create different contexts containing the new grammar								

		D) Rewrite meanings										
3.1	Does the teacher include communicative activities that invite the use of grammatical terminology in the class	A) Role Plays										
		B) Group work										
		C) Pair work										
		D) Games										
		E) Information gap										
3.2	Do students actively participate in the class room activities during Grammar lesson?	A) Willingness in turn taking										
		B) Willingness in forming group										
3.3	Does the teacher give home take activities that invite learners to use the language?	A) Home take activities to use authentic context										
		B) Classroom activities to use authentic Contexts										
3.4	Does the teacher facilitate grammar learning while students are doing the communicative activities?	A) Motivating learners										
		B) Taking roles with learners										
4.1	Are there any problems that hinder the	A) The size of the task (having many new grammar to learn)										
		B) The different										

teacher to practice grammar in CLT?	between spoken and written English (i.e I've written the letter.)									
	C) The limitation of source of information about grammar Reference books, etc.)									
	D) The complexity of grammar knowledge (i.e category of wish, conditionals, tense, form, meaning etc.)									
	E) The students' population in the class									
	F) Teachers' academic ability									
	G) Administrative constraints									
	H) Creating genuine communication									
	Adapted from Richards(2006)									

Appendix 4

Results of the observation data

No	List of observation		Yes				No			
			Exp. class		Cont. class		Exp. class		Cont. class	
1	Class room condition		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.1	Are the sitting space enough for all students?		40	100	40	100	-	--	-	-
1.2	Are the seats movable?		20	50	-	-	20	50	40	100
1.3	Is there enough space for movement between desks?		40	100	20	50	-	-	20	50
1.4	Is there enough space in front of the learner		40	100	20	50	-	-	20	50
2	Classroom instruction		Yes				No			
			Exp. Class		Cont. class		Exp. class		Cont. class	
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2.1	Does the teacher present the grammar's	A. Form?	20	50	30	75	20	50	10	25
		B. Meaning?	40	100	10	25			30	75
		C. Use in context?	30	75	10	25	10	25	30	75
2.2	Does the teacher employ clear instruction to present classroom Communicative activities	A. Creating a scenario	30	75	20	50	10	25	20	50
		B. Discuss the difference between the new grammar and related grammar	30	75	10	25	10	25	30	75

		C. Create different contexts containing the new grammar	40	100	-	-	-	-	40	100
		D. Rewrite meanings	40	100	10	25	-	-	30	75
3.1	Does the teacher include communicative activities that invite the use of grammatical terminology in the class	A. Role Plays	20	50	-	-	20	50	-	-
		B. Group work	40	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
		C. Pair work	30	75	20	50	10	25	20	50
		D. Games	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		E. Information gap	30	75	10	25	10	25	30	75
3.2	Do students actively participate in the class room activities during Grammar lesson?	A. Willingness in turn taking	30	75	10	25	10	25	30	75
		B. Willingness in forming group	30	75	10	25	10	25	30	75
3.3	Does the teacher give home take activities that invite learners to use the language?	C. Home take activities to use authentic context	30	75	10	25	10	25	30	75
		D. Classroom activities to use authentic Contexts	30	75	10	25	10	25	30	75
3.4	Does the teacher facilitate grammar learning while	A. Motivating learners	30	75	10	25	10	25	30	75

	students are doing the communicative activities?	B. Taking roles with learners	10	25	30	75	30	75	10	25	
4.1	Are there any problems that hinder the teacher to practice grammar in CLT?	A. The size of the task (having many new grammar to learn)	5	12.5	10	25	35	87.5	30	75	
		B. The different between spoken and written English (i.e I've written the letter.)	5	12.5	10	25	35	87.5	30	75	
		C. The limitation of source of information about grammar Reference books, etc.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	==
		D. The complexity of grammar knowledge (i.e category of wish, conditionals, tense, form, meaning etc.)	10	25	20	50	30	75	20	50	
		E. The students' population in the class	30	75	40	100	10	25	-	-	
		F. Teachers' academic ability	10	25	20	50	30	75	20	50	
		G. Administrative constraints	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		H. Creating genuine communication	40	100	-	-	-	-	-	40	100

Appendix 5

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

STUDENTS' QUESTIONNRIE

Dear students: I am conducting a study on “The influence of communicative Grammar Teaching in enhancing Grade 11 Students’ Grammatical knowledge: the case of BishawweldeYohanis preparatory school in Bonga town. Therefore, you are kindly asked to fill in the questionnaire, honestly and carefully.

The questionnaire has 23 items focusing on lesson content, task design and instruction influence on your learning interest. Please note that your answers should be based on what you really know and feel but not based on what you wish the teaching learning process should have been. I like to stress that the information you provide is completely confidential used by the researcher only. For this reason, you do not have to write your name.

Thank you in advance.

Part one

Background information

Instruction: Please indicate your answer by making an ‘X’ in the appropriate box or

Writing where it is necessary in the space provided.

1. Name of your school: _____
2. Sex: M _____ F _____
3. Age:
A) 15_19 _____ B) 20_25 _____ C) 26__30 _____

Part two

Lesson content, Task design and Instruction influence on students' learning interests

Instruction: Indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements based on your belief and experience of grammar learning in CLT by putting "√" under each number in the table.

Note that: **5= strongly agree 4= Agree 3 =Neutral 2= Disagree 1= strongly disagree**

CLT Principle

No	List of Questions	Scales				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Lesson content					
1.1	Form of the new grammar points is well presented in context.					
1.2	Form of the new grammar points is well practiced in context.					
1.3	Meaning and use of the new grammar points are well presented in context.					
1.4	Meaning and use of the new grammar points are well practiced in context					
1.5	The grammar lessons are properly integrated with these language skills:	Scales				
		1	2	3	4	5
	E) Listening					
	F) Speaking					
	G) Reading					
	H) Writing					
2	Task Design	Scales				
		1	2	3	4	5
2.1	The text topics used to introduce the new grammar points are interesting.					
2.2	The follow-up tasks are designed at reasonable level for me to deal with					
2.3	The teacher's leading questions facilitate my self-discovery of grammar rules.					
2.4	The phase of presenting the new grammar points is not time-consuming.					
2.5	My self-discovery of the new grammar rules is better than being directly provided by the teacher.					
3	Instruction influence on your learning Interests	Scales				
		1	2	3	4	5

3.1	The activities applied to practice the new grammar points are varied.					
3.2	The forms of oral and written practices are well cooperated in this stage.					
3.3	The activities utilized to practice the new grammar points are enjoyable.					
3.4	The activities employed in this stage are challenging enough to perform.					
3.5	The first activities in this stage require me to get accuracy in grammar.					
3.6	The final activities in this stage require me to obtain fluency in communication.					
3.7	The way of teaching grammar is innovative.					
3.8	The way of teaching grammar ignites my learning motivation.					
3.9	The way of teaching grammar requires me to think critically and work actively.					
3.10	Working in pairs and groups helps me feel less stressed and more confident.					
3.11	Pair-work and group-work encourage me to promote collaboration in learning.					
3.12	I suppose that these grammar lessons well prepare me for grammar-paper tests.					
3.13	I suppose that these grammar lessons support me for real-life communications.					
Adapted from Richards(2006),						

Appendix 6

ጂማ ዩኒቨርሲቲ

የሁለተኛ ዲግሪ ጥናት ት/ ቤት

የእንግሊዘኛ ቋንቋና ስነ ፅሁፍ ትምህርት ክፍል

የተማሪዎች የፅሁፍ መጠይቅ

የተከበራችሁ ተማሪዎች:

በአሁን ሰዓት የተግባቦታዊ ሰዋሰዉ (communicative Grammar teaching method) የማስተማሪያ ዘዴ በቦንጋ ከተማ በቢሻዉ ወ/ ዩሃንስ መሰናዶ ት/ቤት በ11ኛ ክፍል ተማሪች ላይ የሚያመጣዉን የሰዋሰዉ ዕውቀት ዉጤት ተፅዕኖ በማጥናት ላይ እገኛለሁ። ስለዚህ ይህንን የፅሁፍ መጠይቅ በጥንቃቄና በታማኝነት እንድትሞሉ በትህትና እጠይቃለሁ።

የጽሁፍ መጠይቁም 23 ጥያቄዎችን ያቀፈ ሲሆን የትምህርቱን ይዘት፣ የተግባራት አወቃቀርና በእናንተ የመማር ፍላጎት ላይ ያመጣዉን ተፅዕኖ በተመለከተ ትኩረት አድርጉአል። እናም የምትሞሉት መልስ በእርግጠኝነት በምታዉቁት እና በሚሰማችሁ ስሜት ላይ የተመሰረተ እነዲሆን እንጂ የመማር ማስተማሩ ሂደት እንዲ ቢሆን ጥሩ ነበር ብላችሁ በምትመኙት እንዳይሆን አስገነዝባለሁ። እንዲሁም የምትሞሉት መልስ ምስጥራዊነቱ በአጥኚዉ ዘንድ ብቻ የተጠበቀ እንደሆነ ልገልፅላችሁ እወዳለሁ፣ ስለዚህ ስማችሁን መፃፍ አይጠበቅባችሁም።

ስለ ቅንነታችሁ በድጋሚ አመሰግናለሁ።

ክፍል አንድ

የተማሪ ዳራ መረጃ

ትዕዛዝ፦ ከዚህ በታች እርሶን በሚመለከት ለቀረቡት ጥያቄዎች የ " √ " ምልክት በመልስ መስጫ

ቦታዉ ላይ ያኑሩ። እንዲሁም እንደተገቢነቱ መፃፍ ባስፈለገ ቦታ ላይ መልሶን ይፃፉ።

የት/ ቤቱ ስም: _____

የታ: ወ _____ ሴ _____ ዕድሜ: ከ15_19 _____ ከ20-25 _____ ከ26-30 _____

ክፍል ሁለት

የትምህርቱ ይዘት፣ የተግባራት አወቃቀርና የማስተማሪያ ዘዴዉ በርሶ ላይ ያሳደረዉን ተፅዕኖ በሚመለከት የቀረቡ ጥያቄዎች።

ትዕዛዝ፦ የርሶን ዕምነትና በተግባቦታዊ የመማርና የማስተማር አቀራረብ ሂደት የቀሰሙትን

ልምድ መሰረት በማድረግ በሚከተሉት ሃሳቦች ላይ ምን ያህል እንደሚሰማሙ

በመረጡት የመልስ መስጫ ቦታ ላይ የ " √ " ምልክት ያኑሩ።

ማስታወሻ: የሚከተሉት ቁጥሮች የሚከተሉትን መልሶች ይወክላሉ።

5.እጅግ በጣም እስማማለሁ፣ 4.እስማማለሁ፣ 3.ለመወሰን ይከብደኛል 2.አልስማማም፣

1.በፍፁም አልስማማም፣

ተ.ቁ	የጥያቄዎች ዝርዝር	መልሶች				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	የትምህርቱን ይዘት በሚመለከት					
1.1	የአዲሱ የሰዋሰወ ትምህርት ቅርፅ አንጻር ነጥቦች በጥሩ ዑኔታ ቀርበዋልናል።					
1.2	የአዲሱን የሰዋሰወ ትምህርት ቅርፅ አንጻር ነጥቦች በጥሩ ዑኔታ ተግባራዊነታቸውን አሳይተናል።					
1.3	የአዲሱ የሰዋሰወ ትምህርት የትርጉምና አጠቃቀም አንጻር ነጥቦች በጥሩ ዑኔታ ቀርበዋልናል።					
1.4	የአዲሱን የሰዋሰወ ትምህርት የትርጉምና አጠቃቀም አንጻር ነጥቦች በጥሩ ዑኔታ ተግባራዊነታቸውን አሳይተናል።					
1.5	የሰዋሰወ ትምህርቱ ከሚከተሉት ክፍሎች ጋር ተቀናጅቶ ቀርቦልናል።	ሀ. የማዳመጥ ክፍል				
		ለ. የመናገር ክፍል				
		ሐ. የማንበብ ክፍል				
		መ. የመጻፍ ክፍል				
2	የተግባራት አወቃቀሩን በሚመለከት	መልሶች				
		1	2	3	4	5
2.1	አዲሱን የሰዋሰወ ትምህርት ለማስተዋወቅ የቀረበው የትምህርቱ ርዕስ ሳቢ ነው።					
2.2	የመለማመጃ ተግባራት ብዙም ሳይከብዱኝና ሳይቀሉኝ የምተገብራቸው ናቸው።					
2.3	መምህሩ የሚያቀርባቸው የቅድመ ተግባር ጥያቄዎች እራሴን ከሰዋሰወ ህግ አጅያ እንድንመዘን አድርገዋል።					

2.4	የሰዋሰዉ ትምህርቱ ተከፋፍሎ የቀረበበት ሰዓት ለየተግባራቱ የሚመጥንና ተጨማሪ ሰዓት የማይጠይቅ ነዉ።					
2.5	በራሴ መንገድ ጥሬ የማዉቀዉ የሰዋሰዉ ህግ መምህሩ ከሚያሳዩኝ ይልቅ የተሻለ ነዉ።					
3	የመማር ማስተማሩ ሂደት በተማሪዉ የመማር ፍላጎት ላይ ያሳደረዉን ተፅዕኖ በሚመለከት	መልሶች				
		1	2	3	4	5
3.1	አዲሱን የሰዋሰዉ ትምህርት ለመተግበር የሚያስችሉን የተለያዩ ተግባራቶች ቀርበዋል።					
3.2	በሰዋሰዉ ትምህርቱ የንግግርና የፅዕፈት መልመጃዎች በጥሩ ሁኔታ ተቀናጁተዉ ቀርበዋል።					
3.3	የቀረቡት መልመጃዎች አዲሱን የሰዋሰዉ ትምህርት ደስ ብሎኝ እንድተገብር የሚያስችሉ ናቸዉ።					
3.4	የቀረቡት መልመጃዎች አዲሱን የሰዋሰዉ ትምህርት ለመተግበር የሚያዳግቱ ናቸዉ።					
3.5	የመጀማሪያዎቹን መልመጃዎች በዚህ ደረጃ ለመተግበር ትክክለኛ የሰዋሰዉ ዕዉቀት አስፈልጎኛል።					
3.6	የመጨረሻዎቹን የሰዋሰዉ መልመጃዎች ለመተግበር የተፈታ ተግባቦታዊ የንግግር አንደበት እስፈልጎኛል።					
3.7	የሰዋሰዉ ማስተማሪያ ስልቱ ከወትሮዉ በተለየ አዲስ መንገድን የሚያሳይ ነዉ።					
3.8	የሰዋሰዉ ማስተማሪያ ስልቱ የመማር ፍላጎቱን ቀስቅሶታል።					
3.9	የሰዋሰዉ ማስተማሪያ ስልቱ በጥልቅ እንዳስብና እንድሳተፍ አድርጎኛል።					
3.10	በጥንድና በቡድን መስራት እንዳልጨናነቅና ይበልጥ በራሴ እንድተማመን ያግዘኛል።					
3.11	የጥንድና የቡድን ስራ ተረዳድቶ የመማር ባህልን ያሳድግልኛል።					
3.12	ይህ የሰዋሰዉ ትምህርት ለፈተና በጥሩ ሁኔታ አዘጋጅቶኛል ብዬ አምናለሁ።					
3.13	ይህ የሰዋሰዉ ትምህርት ከክፍል ዉጪ ላለዉ ተግባቦት ያግዘኛል ብዬ አምናለሁ።					

Appendix 7

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

A pre test for conducting a quasi experimental research on “The influence of communicative Grammar Teaching on Grade 11 Students’ Achievements of Grammatical knowledge the case of BishawweldeYuhanis preparatory school in Bonga town.

Direction: Read the following questions attentively, and then choose the correct answer from the given alternatives.

_____ 1. **Solomon:** Do you understand this point of grammar?

Markos: No, I don't understand it. I wish I _____ it better.

A. understood B. would understand C. had understood D. understand

_____ 2. **Belay:** Waw, the rain is getting stronger!

Kalid: Oh, we are used to it. It never stops raining here. But I wish it _____ raining.

A. stop B. would stop C. had stopped D. stopped

_____ 3. **Alemu:** Did you tell her how much he hates her?

Melkamu: Yes, I did it. I should never have said that. I wish I _____ that.

A. didn't say B. wouldn't say C. hadn't said D. say

_____ 4. **Minilik:** Have you got your friends yet?

Tedros: No, I haven't. I miss them too much. I wish my friends _____ here right now.

- A. were B. Would be C. had been D. was

_____ 5. **Adugna:** Are you going to sleep?

Beza: Yes, but I can't sleep. The dog next door is making too much noise. I wish it _____ quiet.

- A. Keep B. Would keep C. Had kept D. Kept

_____ 6. **Kedir:** How do you see the speed of the car?

Mifta: Oh, this car is very slow. The earlier car was much faster. I wish I _____ the earlier car.

- A. caught B. had caught C. catch D. would catch

_____ 7. **Miresa:** Did you see the TV program yesterday?

Abdisa: No, I didn't, but everybody said it was excellent. I wish I _____ it.

- A. saw B. would see C. had seen D. See

_____ 8. **Fereja:** Will they offer you the job?

Sisay: No, I don't think so. There are more experienced applicants. I wish they _____ it to me.

- A. would offer B. offered C. Had offered D. Offer

_____ 9. **Kalkidan:** Waw, I like your curly red hair!

Helen: Sure? But, I hate having red hair. I wish I _____ blonde hair.

- A. have B. had C. Had had D. would have

_____ 10. **Mihiret:** Have you seen the exercise on the page? It is boring.

Abel: Yea, the teacher has also given us itself. I wish the teacher _____ us some more interesting things to do now.

- A. give B. would give C. had given D. gave

Direction: Complete the following sentences (wishes) with appropriate grammatical words.

1. **Wesenu:** Is the movie romantic?

Anuar: No, it's terrible. I wish we _____ (go) to see another one.

2. **Ali:** You look comfortable in living England.

Jibril: Is that! I hate living in England. It's cold and it's damp. I wish I _____ (live) in Spain the coming years, but my wife hates the country.

3. **Taddese:** Did you live Hawwasa?

Asres: Yes, I lived there. Even, I wish I _____ (be) there right now.

4. **Debisa:** Will you go to USA next year?

Temesgen: No, I'll go to Dubai. But I wish I _____ (go) to USA.

5. **Tsehay:** How long have you been in Dubai?

Mifta: I was only in Dubai for a week. I wish I _____ (have) more time there, but I had to go on to New York.

Direction: write the meaning of the following sentences (wishes).

1. I wish I could speak Chinese.

2. I wish Solomon had given me that book.

3. I wish I would be with my friend till next week, but he is leaving the city tomorrow.

Direction: Look at each situation and decide if it describes a past or present situation. Then write a sentence using 'wish'.

1. I didn't go out with my friends to play foot ball.

I wish _____

2. I'm not the best student in the class.

I wish _____

Student's Name: _____

Sign _____

Appendix 8

JIMMA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

A post test for conducting a quasi experimental research on “The influence of communicative Grammar Teaching in Enhancing Grade 11 Students’ Grammatical knowledge: the case of Bishaw WeldeYuhanis preparatory school in Bonga town.

Direction: Read the following questions attentively, and then choose the correct answer from the given alternative.

_____ 1. **Belay:** Do you live in the same town with your brother?

Zerihun: No, we don't. I wish we _____ in the same town.

- A. live B. would live C. Lived D. Had lived

_____ 2. **Behailu:** Your essay was not written well.

Endale: Yea, because I didn't have enough time. But, I wish I _____ more time to write this essay!

- A. have B. would have C. had D. had had

_____ 3. **Deyas:** Will she come here?

Abdurezak: No, never. But I wish she _____ here.

- A. would come B. came C. had come D. come

_____ 4. **Birane:** How is the work treating you?

Etagegn: It's boring. Although I have done my best, I don't earn much money. I wish

I _____ a lot of money now.

- A. earn B. would earn C. earned D. had earned.

_____ 5. **Askale:** Sorry for my coming late!

Taddese: You are always saying this. But for the future, I wish You ___ me when you are going to be late.

- A. told B. tell C. had told D. would tell

_____ 6. **Henok:** why didn't you come to school yesterday? You lost maths test.

Wesenu: I missed the bus. I wish I _____ the bus.

- A. don't miss B. hadn't missed C. wouldn't miss D. didn't miss

_____ 7. **Elias:** Can you get me any money, please?

Ayele: Sorry, I can't. I have no money.

Elias: You are well come. But I wish you _____ me some.

- A. Give B. Would give C. Gave D. Given

_____ 8. **Kidist:** Do you spend more time with your family?

Bedlu: No, I don't. I'm busy now. But I wish I _____ more time with them.

- A. spent B. spend C. had spent D. would Spend

_____ 9. **Abraham:** Will you go to the play in the afternoon?

Adisu: I wish I _____. But, I'm going to wash my cloth in the afternoon.

- A. Go B. Gone C. Had gone D. Would go

_____ 10. **Tigist:** Had you ever seen the boy before he stole your bag?

Wubit: No, never. I wish I _____ him before.

- A. see B. had seen C. would see D. Saw

Direction: Complete the following sentences (wishes) with appropriate grammatical words.

1. **Namrud:** Do you know Solomon's address?

Kassahun: No, I don't, why?

Namrud: He's an urgent message from his uncle, but I can't know his address. I wish

I _____ his address till this afternoon. (Know)

2. **Wendimagegn:** Did you write the letter we had been asked to write in the class?

Markos: No, I didn't; because I felt a headache. But, I wish I _____ the letter. (write)

3. **Abiyu:** Can you play foot ball well?

Selamu: No, I can't. But I wish I _____ foot ball well. (Play, can)

4. **Firehiwet:** Will you go market tomorrow?

Yewubdar: No, I will not. I have a makeup class tomorrow. But I wish I _____ to market. (go)

5. **Assefa:** Did you see that movie which Solomon had given you?

Gebre : No, I didn't. Without seeing, I gave him back. I wish _____ it. (see)

Direction: Write the meaning of the following sentences (wishes).

1. I wish I gave you the book; but I'm reading it now.

2. I wish my father had bought me a shoe for the Easter.

_____ -

3. I wish I would be selected for our school team next week, but there are many stronger players than me.

Direction: Look at each situation and decide if it describes a past or present situation. Then write a sentence using 'wish'.

1. I have an old car.

I wish _____

2. I didn't know his name.

I wish _____

Student's Name: _____ Sign: _____