

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

**COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITY SCHOOL OF
POST GRADUATE STUDY DEPARTEMENT OF ENGLISH
LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

**ASSESSMENT OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTION AND PRACTICE OF
COMMUNICATIVE GRAMMAR TEACHING IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE
CLASSROOM; IN THE CASE OF THIRD YEAR ENGLISH LANGUAGE
STUDENTS AT GILGEL BELES, CTE**

BY: TSEHAY JALETA

SEPTEMBER, 5/2019

**JIMMA,
ETHIOPIA**

**ASSESSMENT OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTION AND PRACTICE OF
COMMUNICATIVE GRAMMAR TEACHING IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE
CLASSROOM; IN THE CASE OF THIRD YEAR ENGLISH LANGUAGE
STUDENTS AT GILGEL BELES, CTE**

BY: TSEHAY JALETA

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

**IN FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ART IN DEGREE IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS FOREIGN
LANGUAGE (TEFL)**

SEPTEMBER, 5/2019

**JIMMA,
ETHIOPIA**

Declaration, confirmation, approval and evaluation

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.

Tsehay Jaleta Wolu

Name

Signature

Date

Confirmation and Approval

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as a thesis advisor.

Principal Advisor:

Mr. Guta Legese (Ass. Pro.)

Name

Signature

Date

Co-Advisor:

Dr. Daniel Taye (PhD.)

Name

Signature

Date

Thesis Evaluators:

Mr. Guta Legese (Ass. Pro.)

Principal Advisor

Signature

Date

Dr. Daniel Taye (PhD.)

Co-Advisor

Signature

Date

External Examiner

Signature

Date

Internal Examiner

Signature

Date

Chairperson

Signature

Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

First and for most, I would like to express my deepest and cordial feeling to Mr. Guta Legese (Ass. professor), my thesis Advisor for his relentless intellectual guidance, encouragement, helpful commits, timely responses and hospitality. I fully acknowledge his guidance, friendly understanding, and priceless comment for the accomplishment of the study. I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Daniel Taye (PhD) for his constructive advice to completion of this thesis.

Next, I would also like to take this opportunity to thank my beloved wife, W/o Askal Addisu, who deserves the total credit for carrying of our beloved children, Robel Tsehay and Monika Tsehay and her persistent encouragement for completing my MA program which could in no way be compensated otherwise. Without her, it would have been much tougher task to achieve the goals I set out for myself.

Moreover, I would like to address my heartfelt thanks to the following individuals who helped me in the process of this thesis in one way or the other: Abebaw Maru, Getachew Adamie, Gennetu Kassie, Hamid Mubarek, Kiflie Debasu and Semeneh Bedimo.

Finally, I would also like to express my gratitude to the school of graduate studies of Jimma University and Gilgel Beles, CTE for sponsoring this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGES
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	iv
APPENDIX	viii
Abstract.....	ix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3. Objectives of the Study.....	6
1.3.1. General Objective	6
1.3.2. Specific Objectives	7
1.4. Research Questions.....	7
1.5. Significance of the Study.....	7
1.6. Delimitation of the Study.....	8
1.7. Limitation of the Study.....	8
Acronyms and Abbreviations	9
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	9
2. Introduction.....	9
2.1. Approaches to Foreign Language Teaching	10
2.1.1. The Structural Approach.....	10
2.1.2. Communicative Approach	12
2.2. Concepts of Grammar and Its Teaching	13
2.2.1. Teaching Grammar Inductively	15
2.2.2. Teaching Grammar Deductively.....	16
2.3. Grammar Competence	17
2.4. Communicative Grammar Tasks	19
2.5. Techniques of Communicative Grammar Teaching	20
2.6. Procedures for Communicative Grammar Teaching	23
2.6.1. The Presentation Stage	23
2.6.2. The Practice Stage	24
2.6.3. The Production Stage.....	24
2.6.4. Feedback and Correction	25
2.7. Integrating Communicative grammar teaching approach.....	26

2.8. Grammar instruction and teacher Perception.....	26
2.9. Teachers and Learners in CGT	27
2.9.1. The Role of the Teacher.....	27
2.9.2. The Role of the Learner	28
2.10. Practical Studies on the Teaching of Grammar	29
CHAPTER THREE.....	31
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	31
3.1. Description of the Study Area	31
3.2. Research Design	31
3.4. Population Sample and Sampling Technique	31
3.5. Instruments of Data Collection.....	32
3.5.1. Questionnaire.....	32
3.5.2. Classroom Observation.....	33
3.5.3. Interview	34
3.6. Data collection Procedure.....	34
3.7. Methods of Data Analysis	35
Chapter Four.....	37
4. Analysis of Data and Discussion of the Results	37
4.1. Teachers' Background Information.....	37
4.2. Analysis of teachers' response on the practice of communicative grammar teaching	38
4.2.2. Teachers' Perceptions on CGT.....	41
4.3. Analysis of Learners' Perception of CGT	53
4.4. Classroom Observation Results	59
4.5. Analysis of Teachers' interview	62
4.6. Discussion.....	66
CHAPTER FIVE.....	70
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	70
5.1. Summary.....	70
5.2. Conclusions	71
5.3. Recommendations.....	73
Reference.....	74
LIST OF APPENDIX.....	79

LIST of TABLES	PAGES
Table 4.2.1: Frequency (f), Percentage (%) and Mean of Responses for Classroom Practice-----	39
Table 4.2.2: Frequency (f), Percentage (%) and Mean of teachers' Responses on Conceptual Perspective -----	42
Table 4.2.3: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Students' Learning Perspective-----	44
Table 4.2.4: Frequency (f), Percentage (%) and Mean of Responses for Instructional Perspective in CGT-----	46
Table 4.2.5: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for the Importance of Grammar in CGT-----	48
Table 4.2.6: Frequency (f), Percentage (%) and Mean of Responses for Perspective on Error correction and Assessment on CGT-----	49
Table 4.2.7: Frequency (f), Percentage (%) and Mean of Responses for Perspective on Teachers' role-----	52
Table 4.2.8: Frequency (f), Percentage (%) and Mean of Responses for Perspective On learners' Role in CGT-----	53
Table 4.3.1: Frequency (f), Percentage (%) and Mean of Responses for Students' perception in CGT-----	55
Table 4.3.2: Frequency (f), Percentage (%) and Mean of Learners' Responses for Classroom practice-----	58
Table 4.4.1.1: Instructional Activities-----	61
Table 4.4.1.2: Teacher's Role in class room observation during CGT-----	61
Table 4.4.1.3: Learners' Role in class room observation during CGT-----	62
Table 4.4.1.4: Instructional Materials Used-----	64

APPENDIX

pages

APPENDIX –A: Teachers’ Questionnaire.....	80
APPENDIX-B: Classroom Activities Observation Checklist.....	85
APPENDIX- C: Interview Guide for Teachers	86
APPENDIX-D: Students’ Questionnaire.....	86
APPENDIX- E: Interview Questions for Students	89

Abstract

The main aim of this study was to assess English language teachers' perception and practice of communicative grammar teaching in Gilgel Beles, CTE. To conduct the study, a descriptive survey design was employed. The total populations of the study were only 30 college instructors and 75 3rd year regular English language department students in the college. According to this, the sample of the study was taken by using purposive sampling method. In order to gather data from the subjects of the study, questionnaires, observation and interview were used. In addition to these, the classes were also observed using observation checklist for the seek of checking class room practice. The interview questions were prepared to get detailed information from the instructors and to cross- check the data gathered by other tools. Accordingly, the data gathered through the questionnaires were analyzed with the descriptive statistics whereas the interview data were analyzed qualitatively. Finally, the overall findings of this study showed that the majority of teachers (71%) and 74.6% of learners under the study had high levels perception of CGT respectively. However, the study conversely revealed that there is a clear mismatched between what teachers and learners perceive about CGT and what they actually practice in EFL context. Thus, teachers have some problems to implement it in their English class room practically due to, lack of teachers' planning, large class room size, teachers' resistance, lack of student's interest and their poor communicative language skills, students' mother tongue language interference and their culture. Based on the findings, recommendations were made to the teachers to apply the principles and techniques of communicative grammar teaching in their class room in the college and also for other concerning and interesting bodies too.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the study used to assess teachers' perception and practice of communicative grammar teaching in English classroom at Gilgel Beles, CTE. Thus, the first sections of this chapter dealt with the background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, objectives of the study, significant of the study, scope of the and the limitation of the study.

1.1. Background of the Study

Communicative grammar teaching is based on the principles of the communicative approach to second /foreign language teaching. It focuses on language structures which should be taught in an integrated way with the four skills such as listening, speaking, reading and writing. The teaching of grammar should not be at the sentence level only but it should also be presented at the discourse level (Dickins and Woods 1988 and Ellis 2002). In grammar-based teaching, communicative practice means that people are communicating in real time about real things in a real place for a real purpose. Communicative grammar teaching creates awareness and understanding of the form, meaning and appropriate use of structures (Celce- Murcia 1997).

Thus, for students to use the language rules in real communication, the rules would have to be practiced in context in order to develop communicative competence. Communicative grammar teaching blends grammar with communicative practice opportunities. It ideally provides opportunities for creative use of structures. Communication practice is usually centered on the students' own lives, their opinions, experiences of real life situations including facts that they are trying to learn English. Grammar-based tasks often use classroom as context, building language practice around the people and objects and activities here and now in the classroom (Nitta and Garden 2005).

For many years, 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 this class because it describes that 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 and gradually replaced the previous Grammar-Translation (GT) and Audio Lingual (AL) methods (Richards & Rodgers, 2001) (Richards, 2006: 23).

The method which has been known as Grammar Translation Method was the continuation of the method used to teach Latin. The grammar rules were taught, in a de-contextualized manner, without much bother for the communicative ability of the learners. This was found to be the major drawback and therefore, it was suggested that teaching grammar was not only unhelpful but might actually be detrimental. (Nassaji & Fotos, 2004) state that continuing the tradition of more than 2000 years of debate, whether grammar should be a primary focus of language instruction or not, should be eliminated entirely, or should be subordinated to meaning-focused use of the target language; the need for grammar instruction is once again attracting the attention of second language acquisition (SLA) researchers and teachers. Consequently, the communicative approach did away with grammar teaching, arguing that communicative competence was more important than knowing the grammar rules. But, over a period of observation of the learners repeatedly committing the same errors, there was a realization that the errors had to be corrected, failing which they would get fossilized, Selinker, Lakshmanan (1992)

Grammar as part of language teaching helps learners develop the skills essential for their success in diverse environments where English is used. Ellis (1997) adds that recent research results on EFL/ESL learning show that without grammar instruction learners frequently fail to achieve advanced level of communicative competence. It is, thus, crucial to include grammar in language curriculum through communicative tasks. The communicative grammar instruction can improve the quality of second/foreign language learning/teaching (Byrnes 2007, Ellis and Fotos 1991 Petevitz 1997 and White 1987).

Traditionally, second language teaching approaches have mainly dealt with the achievement of linguistic knowledge which is one important part of language learning. Instead of teaching grammar in a form focused way, teachers need to relate teaching grammar to meaning and use. In other words, language structure should be taught in context that involves some basic principles of communicative language teaching (Petrovitz, 1997). In grammar teaching, it is important to make the language as realistic as possible. The teacher should provide students with suitable situations and contexts that encourage them to ultimately use the rules in real life communication (Zhenhui 2005).

As a result, specific grammar structures should be taught and practiced in contexts which are natural and necessary to learning. It is decisive to prepare materials to teach grammar in a communicative way. Grammar lessons should include games, role plays, and simulations, pair works, group works, information gap and problem solving activities to enhance students' communication. These activities help learners to express their own feelings and interests. Communicative grammar teaching is essential for the learners of second language to communicate with others, to send and receive messages in spoken and written forms, (Alamirew1992 and Haregewain1993).

Cunnings worth (1984) and Harmer (1991) suggest that to introduce a new piece of grammar for a class, a teacher has to use various methods to teach forms, meanings, uses and functions of grammatical items. The teachers should teach different aspects of grammar items that help learners to communicate in the language. To accomplish this goal, it is crucial to use all possible options which can bring better results in language learning.

Research literature in foreign language learning situations do seem to indicate that students find error correction and grammar instruction helpful in language learning. In fact, Schulz's (1996) study on the students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar instruction in a foreign language setting revealed that many students have a more favorable attitude towards grammar instruction than their teachers. The students also believed that in order to master a language, it was necessary to study grammar. On the other hand, more teachers than students believed that it was better to practice language in simulated real life situations than to study grammatical forms explicitly. Peacock (1998) pointed out various gaps between teachers' and learners' beliefs on foreign language learning, which were also observed in Schulz's study. He found that learners were much more in favor of error correction and grammar exercises than their instructors, while instructors rated pair and group work much more highly than the learners. Peacock concluded that there is a high probability that this has a negative effect not only on the learners' progress but also on their satisfaction with the class and their confidence in their teachers.

Is there a mismatch between the teachers and learners concerning the perception of the use of grammar? Horowitz (1990) asserts that there is and that this may often result in negative effects. The goal of her study was to determine students' beliefs on language learning so that teachers could bear them in mind while teaching. Kern (1995) believes that an awareness of this

mismatch is important in understanding conflicts that could result in lack of motivation or anxiety. However, it is important not only to be aware of students' beliefs about the role of grammar in language learning, but also to understand how these ideas about language learning were formed. It may be that the students' prior language learning experiences shaped their beliefs. Alternatively, their teachers' beliefs about language may contribute to their choice of teaching methods, which in turn may contribute to the shaping of the beliefs of their students.

Therefore, it is important to study the perception and classroom practice of CGT by EFL instructors and students to address the problems and to recommend possible solution in Mandura Woreda of Benishangul Gumuz Region in Gilgel Beles, CTE.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

English Language is being used as the medium of instruction in high schools and tertiary levels in Ethiopia. Hence, learners are expected to have adequate proficiency in using the language. This is basically because the learners' skill in using the language highly determines their academic success (Atkins et.al, 1995). Therefore, teachers should be aware that they teach English not only to assist learners to pass examinations but also to assist them to understand other subjects and use the language in real life situations.

CLT advocates teaching practices that develop learners' abilities to communicate in second language. It represents a change of focus in language teaching from linguistic structure to learners' need for developing communication skills (Atkins et.al, 1995). If a student fails to communicate with the target language, then the aim of language teaching may not be said to achieve its goal for language learning. This being the case, the ability to use language is not taken into account in the traditional techniques and principles of language teaching. Language has been taught for many years but learners have only been able to handle the formal elements rather than to manipulate and mobilize the language as a functional entity. In other words, learners may pass language courses but they were not able to use the language for the purpose of communication (Widdowson, 1994). In recent decades, many English language teachers taught English as foreign language (EFL) in their classroom have adopted CLT in to their curriculum to fill this gap.

This may be attributed to the types of grammar items in the teaching learning process. One of the problems is that language teaching in the classroom is more of form focused. The teaching of

grammar for communicative purposes is given less emphasis. Students are not encouraged to write and speak using the structure of the language in a communicative way. Besides, teachers use traditional methods of teaching grammar rules, patterns and word arrangements, (Widdowson, 1994).

In teaching English language (TEL), if students are forced to memorize the rules, they may change the forms according to the given rules. But the question is, can they use these forms of the language in actual communication, concerning this idea, Harmer (1991) and Larson-Freeman (1986) state that memorizing grammatical rules seems very simple. However the more challenging is successfully using these forms for communication purposes.

Research addressing the extent to which CLT principles are carried out in EFL settings suggests some discrepancy between what teachers prefer and actually apply in their instruction. For example, Karavas-Doukas (1996:187) concluded that "the few small scale classroom studies that have been carried out seem to suggest that communicative classrooms are rare. While most teachers profess to be following a communicative approach, in practice they are following more traditional approaches." Moreover, Avignon (2002) confirmed the fact that there is a low correlation between what teachers state and their classroom practice.

Similar findings were reported by Coskun's (2011) case study of two EFL teachers' attitudes in Turkey toward CLT and its application indicated that there were a discrepancy between reported attitudes and actual classroom practices.

In the same way, Doukas (1996) surveyed 14 Greek English language teachers' attitudes toward CLT and compared this with their observed actual instructional practice. The findings showed significant discrepancy between teachers' beliefs, which agreed with CLT principles, and their actual practice, which deviated from CLT prescriptions; both communicative and non-communicative teaching practices were implemented with dominant form-focused instruction.

Additionally, Savignon and Wang (2003) investigated Taiwanese EFL learners' perceptions and attitudes pertinent to classroom practices representative of form-focused and meaning-based instruction. The instruction the learners reported receiving, it was found, did not meet their needs and wants.

Some local research works have also been carried out in relation to this area and among others are Beyene (2008), Endalkachew (2006), Lakachew (2003), and Yemane (2007) worth

mentioning. Beyeneh has conducted a research entitled “Perception and Classroom Practice of Teachers’ and Students’ towards CLT”. In his study, Beyene tried to investigate the teachers’ understanding about CLT concepts, and their practice in EFL classes. The study showed that learners did not get the opportunity to classroom practice during the lessons given in a communicative way, because their teacher did not create conditions for the actual implementation of CLT. This indicates that there is a mismatch between what teachers and learners perceive about CLT and what they actually practice in the classroom.

Lakachew’s research attempted to investigate teachers’ attitude towards CLT and practical problems in its implementation at ten government secondary schools found in West Gojjam and Bahir Dar Special Zone of Amhara Region. The findings indicated that teachers generally have mildly favorable (positive) attitudes towards communicative language teaching. They, however, articulated a number of constraints that hamper the effective accomplishment of CLT as planned.

Endalkachew, on the other hand, conducted a research on the topic “The Communicative Language Teaching in Selected Second Cycle Primary Schools in East Shoa Zone”. His study showed that in addition to large class size, failures of the learners to use the language outside the classroom, and the low proficiency of the learners in the English language, the teachers’ teaching methodology are the most hindrance in implementing CLT. In addition to that, the majority of the English teachers had limited experiences about CLT and they had used traditional type or teacher-centered English teaching methodology.

Even though the above mention studies were conducted on the issue of CLT, none of them has assessed teachers’ perception and practice of communicative grammar teaching in English classroom.

Thus, in this study, the researcher will assess English language teachers’ perception and practice of communicative grammar teaching in English classroom at Gilgel Beles, CTE in Metekel Zone Mandura Woreda of Benishangul Gumuz Region.

. 1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective

The overall objective of this study is to assess English language teachers’ perception and practice of communicative grammar teaching in their English classroom at Gilgel Beles, CTE.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study are:

- To assess the EFL teachers' perceptions to teach grammar in communicative way.
- To find out how often they practice grammar teaching in communicative way in their entire class.
- To identify the factors that affect the teachers to practice their students in grammar teaching in communicative way in the classroom.

1.4. Research Questions

This study aims to answer the following research questions:-

1. How do the EFL teachers' perceive the principle of communicative grammar teaching in English classroom?
2. How often college EFL teachers practice their students in CGT in their English classroom?
3. What are the major factors that affect the teachers to practice their students in communicative grammar teaching in their classroom?

1.5. Significance of the Study

In Ethiopia, English serves as a medium of instruction in most of schools, colleges and in the whole universities. Therefore, the findings of this study may be significant and provide information to the researchers, teachers and students in a number of ways. For students, they can progress their language proficiency in English language and success in their learning of other subjects which is likely to be dependent on their mastery of the language skills of which knowledge of grammar is an important one. For teachers, they can develop awareness with regard to teaching grammar in meaningful context and situation to improve their students' speaking skill. And also, it may help as a reference for other researchers.

The findings of this study are expected to have the following significance:

- Most importantly, this study is expected to provide methodological insights and information to EFL teachers which are helpful for them to implement the principles of communicative grammar teaching appropriately.
- It will help learners be active participants in the learning of grammar items in communicative approach in the classroom.

- And also it is expected suggest to teachers to prepare teaching materials based on the needs and interests of the students.
- It will also stimulate other researchers to conduct similar or further studies and serve as an initial work.
- In addition, this study is expected to provide pedagogical contributions for those who wish to develop curriculum and design ELT materials as a reference to incorporate CGT principles with the actual classroom practices.

1.6. Delimitation of the Study

This study, as stated earlier, was delimited to assess English language teachers' perception and practice of communicative grammar teaching in their classroom at Gilgel Beles, CTE in Benishangul Gumuz Region in Metekel Zone of Mandura Woreda. The reason for delimiting this study at this college was that, it was the only teachers training college which is found in the region. Thus, the researcher was restricted to conduct his research at this college without any alternative.

1.7. Limitation of the Study

This study is believed to have certain constraints. Primarily, it is worth keeping in mind that the sample size of the study was limited to 30 English language teachers and 75 3rd year regular students. This could often create danger on the generalizability of the study. It would have been better and more effective if there were more participants that included in the study to gather sufficient information to obtain better result. Moreover, being observed or investigated could be a stressful situation. In this regard, the teachers as well as the students in each class are closely observed during lesson delivery in the class room. Hence the presence of the observer could cause a certain amount of limitation to the study. The researcher also felt that demonstrating all aspects of CGT method could not be carried out within a short period of time and would require an intensive investigation to reflect all aspects of CGT. Therefore, the instruments that were used to gather data were limited to raise only some features of teaching grammar in communicative approach.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CGT: Communicative Grammar Teaching

CTE: College of Teachers' Education

SLA: second language acquisition

EFL: English as foreign language

ESL: English as Second language

CLT: communicative Language teaching

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2. Introduction

In this chapter, the study will present ideas and findings forwarded by scholars on the subject the researcher deals with. First it describes the approaches to foreign language teaching and it

attempts to find clear meaning of grammar and its teaching. And then, it reviews communicative grammar teaching that includes integrating grammar teaching with language skills, some techniques and procedures in grammar teaching and also the role of teacher and students in communicative grammar teaching. At the end, it discusses empirical studies on the basis of communicative grammar teaching in Ethiopia context.

2.1. Approaches to Foreign Language Teaching

It is generally accepted that the central purpose of language teaching is to help learners enhance communicative competence. To achieve this goal, different approaches are used by different scholars. One cannot suggest an absolute and perfect approach to language teaching. Each approach has its own impact on syllabus design, methods of teaching and procedures in classroom implementation. In this section an attempt is made to discuss the matter on the basis of two approaches, structural and communicative, with relation to theories about the nature of language and language learning that serves as the source of practice in language teaching.

2.1.1. The Structural Approach

The structural approach is the most traditional way of language teaching. It gives more emphases for the formal aspect of the language rather than function. Richard and Rodgers (2001:17) ascertain that language is as system of structurally related elements for coding of meaning. Larson-Freeman (2001) further comments that communicative ends are best served through bottom up process through grammatical structures and lexical patterns until they are internalized. According to this approach, communication in foreign language is possible if learners have very well acquired the basic sentence structures.

Stern (1983:140) indicates that the main concern of this structure centered approach is to help students know the language. It draws a special attention to correct sentence formation. This habit formation can be developed during the repetition of grammatical systems that have been set in to pattern drills. Cook (2001) further states that learning a language is breaking the language in to smaller and smaller pieces so as to examine and know its form because they believe that the knowledge of linguistic form is the basis for language use. Wilkins (1972: 87) also comments:

Parts of the language are taught separately and step by step that acquisition is a process of gradual accumulation of part until the whole structure of the language has been built up. At any one time, the learner is being exposed to deliberately limited sample of

language.

The main purpose of structural approach is to provide a coherent structural foundation on the basis of which a genuinely spontaneous use of language can be achieved (Brumfit 1986:5). As a result, the learners need to be encouraged to practice the drills so they would master the language forms.

Widdowson (1991) also says that the assumption behind the emphasis on the mastery of language structure is that once learners have achieved this semantic knowledge, then, they will be able to use it pragmatically to do things, to converse, to read, to write, to engage in communicative activity. It was assumed that the acquisition of these features will result in subsequent communicative abilities.

Most materials following the structural approach consisted of mechanical drills, such as substitution and transformation drills. Such activities are intended to enable the learners to solely internalize and memorize form without requiring them to use their knowledge of the form meaningfully. Tarone and Yule (1989) write that the traditional language teaching methods and materials that are based on this approach are characterized by concentrating on the development of grammatical competence. The students are expected to develop their grammatical competence in the foreign language.

The students understand the structure of the language but they do not use this knowledge for actual communication in real life situations. Cunningsworth (1984) and Widdowson (1978) argue that the acquisition of linguistic skills does not seem to guarantee the consequent acquisition of communicative abilities in a language, which are appropriate to the context of use, or to interpret the appropriacy of the utterance.

Peterson (1986:2) explains that in this view the teachers should always act as ‘‘questioner, initiator, teachers and formal instructor.’’ The teachers model the target language, control the direction and pace of learning, monitor and correct the learners’ performance whereas Peterson says that learners act as the role of listeners, respondents or formal class students. The teachers most of the time focus on accuracy. The learners do not have chance to express their own feelings and desires as they want since their role is too limited in this approach. The inadequacy of this approach in order to help learners comprehend and use the target language effectively

causes the emergence of other alternative approaches and methods in foreign language teaching to communicate meanings.

2.1.2. Communicative Approach

The communicative approach is referred to as a recent method of foreign language teaching that emphasizes the use and meaning of language items. This could be the product of educators and linguists who had grown dissatisfaction with the audio-lingual and grammar translation methods of foreign language instruction (Tudor 1996). They felt that students were not learning enough realistic, whole language. They also believed that the previous language teaching methods did not help learners to communicate using appropriate social language, gestures, or expressions. These criticisms and counter arguments lead to a new approach to language teaching which focuses on language function and use rather than the formal aspect of language (Larsen-Freeman, 1986).

In the communicative approach authentic language use and classroom exchanges where students are engaged in real communication with one another became quite popular. It has provided a couple of developments in syllabus design, implementation and evaluation. This approach gives a special attention to the needs and interests of the learners (Richards and Rodgers 2001, Hutchinson and Waters 1994 and Harmer 1991). Tudor (1996) explains communicative language teaching provides a desire to develop course design structures which are flexible and more responsive to students' real world communicative needs. Students' motivation to learn comes from their desire to communicate in meaningful ways about meaningful topics (Thompson 1996).

Petrovitz (1997) the communicative language teaching encourages learners to take part in and reflect on communication in as many different contexts as possible. This is because learners need to be given some degree of control over their learning since language is a system of choice. The learners must be given the opportunities to learn how to make choices. Halliday (1994: 17) forwards this:

The communicative approach should not be narrow at all, but essentially adaptable to all the requirements of the classroom situation within its wider institutional and social setting. 'Communicative' does not mean having students practice communication in pairs and groups. It means making decisions, appropriate to the

educational environment, about whether or not, or how often to have pair or groups work and about the lesson's focus on speaking, reading, writing, grammar, pronunciation, etc none of them precluded in communicative approach.

Communicative approach to teaching second languages stresses the use of authentic materials as input and stimuli for the completion of interactive tasks relevant to students' interests, related with them and integrated in skills. The goal of communicative language teaching is to acquaint students with the second language as it is used naturally in real contexts and to provide those opportunities to use the language in these contexts (Jones 1993).

Vatpatten (1998:926) states communicative language involves learners from skill getting to skill using. He suggests the functional nature of language and how language teaching allows communication without a subsequent loss in grammatical accuracy and other areas of discrete language knowledge. Communicative activities should assist this process. The communication activities should invite students to interact. Sauvignon (1997:8) defines communication as a continuous process of expression, interpretation and negotiation of meaning. Later she adds "communicative competence applies to both written and spoken language, as well as too many other symbolic systems." Since the ultimate aim of language teaching is to develop communicative competence, the communicative language has to motivate them to express their own ideas and interests. It can also promote the process through material preparations and task design. The materials and the tasks can be designed to initiate learners for interaction.

Savignon (1991) notes that the use of games, role plays, simulations, pair and small group activities have gained acceptance and widely recommended for inclusion in language teaching programs. Learners' communicative needs provide a framework for elaborating the goal in terms of functional competence. As a result, learners are active participant in the classroom tasks. They have freedom in the learning process. They negotiate meanings, interact with their groups and solve problems by themselves (Breen and Candling 1980).

2.2. Concepts of Grammar and Its Teaching

Grammar is a sound, structure and meaning system of language. All languages have their own grammar. People who speak the same language are able to communicate since they intuitively

share the grammar of the language. Students who are the native speakers of English already recognize the grammar of English. They also know the sound of these words, and different ways of putting words to make meaningful sentences (Brown, 2006).

Harmer (1987:1) notes that “Grammar is the way in which words change themselves and group together to make sentences.” The grammar of a language informs what happens to words, when they become plural or negative, what word orders are used when we make questions or join two clauses to make one sentence. As indicated grammar is a system of rules of syntax that decides the order and patterns in which words are arranged together to make sentence (Celce_Murcia1988:16). However, some scholars argue that rules always may not be accurate. In other words, many rules are not really rules at all but they are rather redundancies. Grammar tells us more than rules. In the first place, it makes the meaning clear. And people use it to do certain functions like stating facts, introductions, accepting or declining invitation, asking for or giving directions, advising and so on (Bloor and Bloor 2004:247). It tells us the relationship between the participants and shows where the topic of the message. It is also a mean of expressing time when the action took place through tenses and time words. It informs us the mood such as certainty, obligation or probability through helping verbs and whether the messages are statements or questions (Atkins, Hailom and Nuru1995).

It refers to the language patterns that indicate relationship among words in sentences. Ur (1988:1) also says “Grammar is the way a language manipulates and combines words (or bits of words) so as to form longer units of meaning.” Therefore, grammar is not only the rule of how words can be combined in a sentence but also the different choices to be made in about which combinations to use for effective communications (Thompson 2003:11). Grammar is the means by which people organize messages in any communicative activity as effectively and as efficiently as possible (Atkins, Hailom and Nuru 1995 and Tudor 1996:209). It is the part of the study of language which deals with the forms and structures of words and sentences and meanings. It is also the system of word structure and word arrangement in a given language at a given time (Webster 1972:21).

It is clear that the main purpose of language teaching is to help learners enable to use the language communicatively. Grammar plays a significant role in supporting learners to acquire language and use it accurately.

It is recognized that grammar instruction helps learners acquire the language more efficiently, but it incorporates grammar teaching learning into the larger context of teaching students to use the language. In the teaching of grammar, students may need many opportunities to listen, read and practice a new structure before they internalize and produce it. To do so, there are two distinct ways of presenting, induction and deduction.

2.2.1. Teaching Grammar Inductively

Inductive grammar teaching is one of the most known methods in which learners become involved in the process of discovering the language and developing their own language strategies. In this grammar teaching, learners are presented with several examples which embody the rule and asked to identify similarities between examples. In such grammar teaching, a teacher supports the students to acquire and practice the language but they do not draw conscious attention to any of the grammatical fact of the language. The teacher may ask the class to work in pairs and groups and write down any rules. They can induce from the examples that they have been working with to elicit their own examples based on the model (Kelly 1990:34).

In first language acquisition, rules are not taught explicitly but learners acquire the structure of the language and produce grammatical sentences (Wright1989). Researchers like Ellis (1993), Brown (1972) and Batstone (1994) felt that this way of grammar teaching is stronger as it engages learners in a more learning process and makes them active. The advocates of this method argue that students should be allowed to learn grammar implicitly without direct instruction from the teachers since this is based on how people learn to use their first language.

In line with this, Harmer (1987) supports the teaching of grammar at the beginner level to be inductive since the main aim is to get students practice and use the language as much as possible. As the students learn more, however, the balance would change and at intermediate levels the students would be in more communicative activities and would have less grammar teaching (Ibid). The teaching of grammar could be more overt when they get more advanced since they can study the grammar rules activity in a more deductive way.

Besides, Cunnings worth (1995) and Rott (2000) argue that using inductive approach in course books is very helpful to develop students' communicative competence. Since many learners will get additional materials that give explanations and rules in straightforward language together with practice exercises on each grammar point.

Humboldt (1974) says one may begin with language itself with a text in which certain specific problems occur. Taking the sentences which involve these linguistic problems from the text and a number of well formulated questions help our students examine and scrutinize the existence and recurrence of these specific forms and constructions. In the inductive method, teachers should help learners observe, compare and analyze language till they have found a definite form.

2.2.2. Teaching Grammar Deductively

In the teaching of grammar, one may state the rule, and give one or several examples and point out that language conforms to the given rule. In other words, we begin with abstractions; verify its correctness through several examples and proceed to construct language synthetically. In this case our presentation is deductive, for we infer or deduce language from a rule (Humboldt (1974). In deductive way of grammar teaching, the teacher explains the rule and the meaning to the learner. Then the learner is expected to apply the rules and provides his/her instances of language guided by an example or two.

This is basically the reverse of inductive method. It encourages teachers to present grammar rules before anything else. It encourages teachers to teach grammar explicitly to their students (Bygate and Tornkyn1994 and Harmer1987). When teachers choose to teach grammar they have couple of choices as to how to go about it.

The adherents of the deductive method propose this type of grammar teaching has many advantages. In the first place, it is helpful for the learner to offer explanation of the structure and its use. It is also very time effective (Cunnings worth 1984, Harmer 1987, Ellis1991, and Fortune 1998).

Many scholars and teachers investigated the advantages of inductive and deductive instructions. For example, Tudor (1996:211) supposes there is no one approach which is equally suited to all learners in all situations. In connection to this, Harmerely (1987) cited in Girma (2005) indicates that some grammatical structures are amenable to deductive, while others are better suited to an inductive approaches. Cunnings worth (1987:82) further states that “It is useful to distinguish between those two learning strategies although it would be wrong to suggest that an individual learner uses only one or the other.”

To sum up, when we teach grammar, we should never hinder our students learning by dogmatic and exclusively to one strategy or the other. Many teachers agree that it is very important to use the combination of approaches. Teaching is a pragmatic process and we should use whatever methods bring the best results. It is not strange to use the combination of methods in solving problems. It is necessary to choose the best element from deductive and inductive methods as conditions demand for teaching grammar.

2.3. Grammar Competence

Linguistic or grammatical competence is commonly referred to as a set of grammatical rules that guide sentence formation. Canale and Swain (1980) find those rules useless since language users are unaware of the rules of language use. Since four skills (reading, listening, writing, speaking) essential to language learning do not occur in isolation from the extra-linguistic reality, it is plausible that sociolinguistic competence addresses the extent to which utterances are produced and understood appropriately in different sociolinguistic contexts depending on contextual factors. The way in which children learn languages illustrates sociolinguistic competence. Children learn to communicate through socialization in their surroundings. By means of various interactions with the external world, by learning family and social values, norms, conditions, culture, even the economic and political situation, a child develops its identity, as well as the world view of the individual. When it comes to the pragmatic aspect of this competence, language learners are supposed to engage in coherent communication on various occasions. Success is achieved by the correct use of grammatical and linguistic rules. Thus, it becomes obvious that the grammar of the target language could not be taught in isolation, but in specific, everyday communicative settings and situations. This fact serves as an illustration of an interrelationship between the form and function in language teaching. Erton (1997) stresses the functional study of language, by insisting on finding specific purposes that language is used for, and on revealing how communicators react to those purposes through the above-mentioned four skills. To sum up, linguistic behavior consists of two parameters: social behavior and people. People talk because they want to socialize and express themselves as human beings, and this sociolinguistic or pragmatic competence enables them to do this.

As far as **discourse competence** is concerned, a language learner is supposed to make a connection between various sorts of discourses, in order to create a meaningful whole by an accurate use of grammar and fluent communication. Consequently, discourse competence is

related to the ability of speakers to put language structures together coherently and cohesively. Discourse Analysis, which has become a popular approach to analyzing spoken, signed and written language, focuses on several aspects of discourse which deal with conversational interaction (sentences, propositions, speech acts and turns-at-talk) (Gill 2000). Therefore, apart from the fact that the development of discourse competence leads to a successful utterance of meaningful sentences, it also enables learners to gain an insight into language, by experiencing different interactional patterns in varying socio-cultural and physical contexts.

Strategic competence is believed to refer to critical and creative aspects of human mind, for it deals with the knowledge and effective and appropriate use of language by speakers in order to take an active part in communicative interaction. Strategic competence illustrates how a communicator makes a completely new sequence of utterances from the prior knowledge of words and phrases, thus achieving the effect of novelty. In other words, strategic competence mediates between the internal traits of the user's background knowledge and language knowledge and the external characteristics of the situational and cultural context (Douglas 2000). When talking about the critical aspect of our minds, it is suggested that critical reflections refer to the processes and activities in which prior experience is recalled, considered and critically assessed in relation to some broader purpose, usually to the process of decision making or planning (Farrell 1998). Decisions and plans are made by analyzing, synthesizing, evaluating, observing, reflection, interaction, etc. Examples of strategic competence abound. For instance, economic discourse shows signs of numerous strategic competences, some of which include negotiated goal alignment, risk assessment, procedural and means-end flexibility, project management, and the ability to tackle unconventional problems. Hedge (2000) added fluency to the list of communicative competences of a successful English language speaker. According to Ellis and Sinclair (1989), language users are supposed not to make pauses and to speak spontaneously and meaningfully, without excessive repetition. Hedge (2000) goes even further with her definition of fluency, stating that it implies coherent response within turns of communication, as well as an appropriate use of linking devices, intelligible pronunciation and proper intonation. The reason why Hedge insists on fluency lies in the fact that in CLT the emphasis is on comprehensibility and not on accuracy. Speaking fluently does not imply speaking accurately (Canale and Swain 1980), which means that errors are tolerated. As a matter of fact, fluency creates a sense of comfort, self-confidence and control even in those speakers who lack strong pragmatic competence. Since the Communicative Approach evolved as a

response to the Audio-Lingual Method, it is reasonable that it prioritizes meaning, that is, the semantic content of language learning over other aspects of language. The idea at the base of this approach is that grammatical structures are learnt and acquired through meaning and not vice versa. Thus, while teaching a language, a teacher is supposed to select learning activities in such a way as to engage learners in meaningful and authentic language use (Richards and Rogers 1986). These kinds of classroom activities actually bring the student into the focus of learning, which was not the case in earlier language teaching methods, supporting the model of a teacher-centered classroom (Al-Mutawa and Kailani 1989). It is active participation instead of passive reception which distinguishes communicative learning from traditional lecturing. The main role that students play in this approach is that of negotiators – between the self, the learning process and the object of learning. Another role is the role of a joint negotiator within the group, which points to the fact that failed negotiation is not the fault of the speaker or listener, but a joint responsibility (Breen and Chandlin 1980; Richards and Rogers 1986). The fact that classes in communicative approach are student-oriented does not rule out the importance of the teacher, who, in this case, is defined as a facilitator of language learning and an independent participant within the learning-teaching group. The teacher is also perceived as a group process manager, analyst, and counsellor (Richards and Rogers 1986; Larsen-Freeman 1986). Should CLT be considered either an approach or a method? Richards and Rogers (1986) claim that it is an approach rather than a model, since methods are considered to be fixed teaching systems with prescribed techniques, while approaches are held to be teaching philosophies that can be applied in various ways in the classroom. One more point to be discussed within the theoretical framework of CLT is whether the theory of language underlying this approach is holistic or behavioristic. Since the basic idea is that of language as communication (Richards and Rogers 1986), this approach is viewed as a *mélange* of the knowledge of grammatical structures and performance. In other words, both the usage and use of language (Widdowson 1984), including active student participation, knowledge construction, individual and collective discovery and problem solving, suggest that this approach is holistic and that it contrasts conventional approaches to education.

2.4. Communicative Grammar Tasks

Communicative grammar tasks help learners create and use original language. They help learners incorporate contexts or language meaningful to their own needs. In fact, activities and strategies

employed in a communicative classroom will differ from teachers to teachers (Wright, 1989:96). But students must have the opportunity to hear the target language being used in meaningful contexts or situations at a level appropriate to their stage of acquisition and be given the opportunity to communicate in the target language while carrying out tasks likely to be encountered in the target culture. The teachers must provide interesting, realistic inputs that include appropriate vocabulary and relevant grammatical structures (Nitta and Garden, 2005).

Different educators and teachers propose several kinds of grammar teaching activities. Some suggest that task-based grammar teaching is advisable for teaching grammar communicatively. Fotos (1994), Fotos and Ellis (1991) recommend that a task-based approach to grammar instruction which involves EFL learners with grammar problem to solve interactively. They call it consciousness raising task. Even though students focus on the form of grammar structure, they are also engaged in meaning-focused use of the target language as they solve the grammar problem. They develop grammatical knowledge while they are communicating. Some others also suggest the use of tasks aimed at promoting accurate production of the target structure (Ur 1988).

According to Harmer (1987), Ur (1988) and Ellis (1997), there are different activities involved in grammar teaching the major ones are drills, interaction activities and written practices. Drills: These are activities that give students rapid practice in using structural items. The main advantages of drills are that teachers can correct any mistakes that students make and can encourage them to concentrate on difficulties at the same time. Al-kharat (2000) states that textbooks usually provide one or more of three types of drills which are mechanical, meaningful and communicative.

2.5. Techniques of Communicative Grammar Teaching

Grammar teaching has often been regarded as a structure based formal activity. After integration of several sources and techniques, which are mainly based on communicative activities, the teaching of grammar gained new insight. In order to make a grammar lesson more effective, beneficial and interesting ELT teachers should use some well-developed and fascinating techniques in the classroom (Sarico ban and Metin 2000). In this section, some of the techniques and resource such as games, role plays, problem solving would be reviewed as fallows: To begin with, games play extremely important role to make the learner use the language communicatively. Games help and encourage learners to sustain their interest and work. Games

also help the teacher create contexts in which the language is helpful and meaningful. Well-chosen games are invaluable as they give a break. They allow students to practice language skills and grammar items. They are highly motivating since they are amazing and at the same time challenging. It lowers anxiety and makes the acquisition of input (Rex2003, Celce-Murcia 1988 and Rinvolveri 1984).

Rinvolveri (1984) elaborates the pedagogic aims of language games which help the presentation of new language; controlled practice and train communication of language. Language games make students use the language in various ways. They also give shy students the opportunity to express their opinions and experience. They are indispensable part of grammar lesson since they reinforce a form discourse match. Through well-planned games, learners can practice and internalize the target language structure.

Secondly, role play is one of the most known language teaching techniques. It is very useful to contextualize any grammar items. Effective uses of role play help learners to improve their communication skills in language learning. It motivates them to use the target structure to describe a certain concept or ideas. It creates situations for second language learners to express ideas using their own words. It can be funny and dramatic so students are able to pretend and learn a lot from each other (Wright 1989:126).

Role play contextualizes the grammar lesson effectively. There are several ways of using role plays at the classroom level. The interest and the age of the learners should be given a due attention. It can be used to practice specific grammatical structure (Petrovitz1997:201). Through acting the structure orally in the classroom learners become more deeply internalize it. It provides learners the opportunity to internalize the meaning and use of the language. It also provides a non-threatening atmosphere for students who are usually tense when they are speaking English in a formal classroom setting. It gives students a chance to reflect actual aspects of the structure of the language.

Role play is advantageous from the point of view of maximizing students talking and providing natural situations for speaking. Wright (1989) indicates that role play activities are usually based on real life situation. This gives the learners the opportunity to practice the kind of language they need outside the classroom. It provokes communication among the students since they may share background knowledge on the issue and relate with the grammar item. When practicing a role

play students should know what they are supposed to do and be clear about the purpose. For example if one wants somebody to report a direct speech they should have enough knowledge about how to change direct speech to indirect speech. They have to have adequate rehearsal time to perform. In order to do it effectively one of the students may say a sentence and the other asks what the first students said and then the other reports what the students said. They can perform different kind of activities in group or pairs (SaricobanandMetin 2000). All in all, role play can create a natural and meaningful situation to learn and practice grammar.

Another important technique is problem solving activities. The problem solving activities are task-based activities and have purposes beyond the production of correct speech. They are also the examples of one of the most preferable communicative activities (Chen 1995). Such activities highlight not only competence but also performance. Problem solving activities require individual response or group works and creative solutions.

Like games and role play, problem solving activities have communicative purpose. In problem solving activities, the problems are either real or imaginary situations. They can be used to generate any specific grammar point (Rinvolveri 1984). They can also be used at all levels. It is also possible to integrate with all skills in such activities. To sum up problem-solving activities provide favorable conditions and usages for extended communicative practice of grammar (Saricoban and Metin 2000). They are also motivating and challenging as well. They encourage students to interact and communicate. They create meaningful contexts for language use.

So far the techniques are classified. The teaching of grammar can be supported effectively by using such techniques. Saricoban and Metin (2000) state that teaching is a developing art, which requires innovative and creative ideas to enrich its effectiveness; we must not hesitate to use such resources in our classroom. These techniques can assist our teaching of grammar by providing a relaxed atmosphere and motivating students. Such activities are student centered; hence, by using them we give a chance to our students to express themselves and enjoy themselves during learning (Larson-Freeman 1986). In short, using different types of techniques bring the structural, semantic and communicative aspects of language together in our language classrooms. ELT teachers should not only know the grammar well enough to explain it to their students, but they should also know a variety of techniques for making it interesting and communicative. Thus, teachers should be able to choose techniques and resources available for them to teach grammar in the classrooms and make teaching meaningful and communicative as well.

2.6. Procedures for Communicative Grammar Teaching

In the preceding discussion, it has been proposed different types of grammar teaching tasks and ways of grammar teaching. Ur (1988:7) and Celce-Murcia (1988:27) suggest that grammar should be presented gradually in step-by-step progression. They comment that when a teacher plans his work, he/she needs to take into consideration the stage of presentation, practice, production, and feedback and correction.

2.6.1. The Presentation Stage

This is the first stage of learning/teaching a new language item. Here the teacher provides the new information, the new piece of language; the learner concentrates on understanding it and remembering it. Celce-Murcia (1988) explains at this stage, grammar can be introduced either inductively or deductively. The variety of techniques can also be used. Selections should be made according to strengths and preferences, and the nature of the structure.

Ur (1988) also comments that this stage is the time of the introduction of grammatical structures or forms and meaning in speech and writing. It is possible to offer grammatical explanation, but it should be short, clear and concise. Harmer (1987:17) defines the presentation stage as the stage which students are introduced to the form, meaning and use of a new piece of language. When students are learning how the new language is constructed, they learn what it means and how it is used. He says the teacher should show students every aspect of rule to understand and internalize the new rule which is being presented.

As Widdowson explains, the context for introducing new language should have a number of characteristics. It should show what the new language means and how it is used. It should be interesting for students. It must provoke the students' needs. A good context will provide the background for a language use so that students can use the information not only for repetition of model sentences but also for making their own sentences. Harmer (1991:60) explains that the main purposes of this stage are to provide students with the opportunity to:

1. Realize the usefulness and relevance of the new language,
2. Concentrate on the meaning of the new language,
3. Pay attention to pronunciation, stress, intonation and spelling of the new language.

Teachers can use different techniques to present the structure of a language. According to Ur

(1988, 7), "... to get the learner to perceive the structure the teacher can use real objects, pictures, actions and context." The presentation of grammar should be clear, natural, efficient, memorable, appropriate and productive.

2.6.2. The Practice Stage

The practice stage is the second stage of the organization of teaching grammar for communication purposes. At this stage, skills are learned by doing or through constant practice. This is the stage at which learners are given intensive practice in new structure, but their production of the language is very carefully guided and controlled by the teacher, so that correct form and meaning are consolidated and the possibility of error is reduced to a minimum (Ur 1988). As stated, learners have the opportunity to practice the language. The teacher models the language items. The practice of the language items is more controlled by the teachers. This makes the teacher's role decisive.

The most common techniques to practice the language are drilling. The purpose of drills is to involve the whole class together in the practice of grammar item. This also helps students to learn the useful purposes by heart. Therefore, teachers use repetition drills, transformation drills, substitution drills, question and answer drills, explanation drills and situational drills. For example, if we see situational drills, the teacher brings facts of real world and invites students to express their view. These types of drills are more natural and meaningful. Then they can be suitable to teach English in a communicative way and students can learn both form and meaning at a time. We should bear in mind when using practice material, it is necessary to select appropriate and helpful exercises. Teachers should help learners avoid excessive error and gradually reduce the control. Finally we have to move relatively free production of the language (Ur: 1988).

2.6.3. The Production Stage

At the production stage, the learners use the language meaningfully to communicate and complete messages. Teachers focus on fluency, the ability to use the language rather than accuracy. The dominance of the teacher at this level is limited. Students try to express their feelings and ideas freely. They are transformed from controlled practice stage to free practice stage. The teacher first introduces students a new structure of the target language. And then they try to internalize it through the given structural practices. Finally they are offered different

activities to do by themselves at this stage. Ideally at this stage, students are free to say whatever they want. They choose the direction of their conversation (Celce-Murcia 1988).

At the production stage, students have freedom to personalize the structure of the target language. The teacher may facilitate situations for communication in pair and group works. The teacher can give individual work to improvise in the classroom that helps them enhance their communicative competence. The teacher can use different types of activities like jumbled sequence, problem solving activities, using pictures, and so on that initiate students to practice grammar item (Ur 1988). Let us suppose the teacher teaches the learner about the simple past tense where he/she facilitates his/her students to talk or write about their past experience. The teacher can ask the question like: What did you do last week? How did you spend you weekend?

The students at the beginning discuss a lot what they did at the weekend in pairs or small groups. Then students write one or two paragraphs. They can present it orally. In this process they can develop their communicative competence.

2.6.4. Feedback and Correction

Feedback and correction must take place throughout the lesson. The teacher's correction may vary according to the change of the phases of the lesson. In the practice phase, correction should be predominantly straightforward (Celce-Murcia 1988:27). It is very important to motivate learners for their correct responses. After a teacher introduces grammatical item, he/she asks them to practice the language. At this time, supportive feedback is more useful to develop confidence to use the language. Markee (1997) says the focus of error correction should be on meaning, not merely on grammatical form. The teachers should tell how the meaning change occurs when the form is changed. There are different kinds of error correction peer, self-correction, teacher correction, and so on. In the case of grammar, the first step with respect to error correction is establishment of certain basic parameters (Tudor 1996:215).

Teachers use different means to correct their students' errors such as guided corrections and controlled corrections. The teachers can direct students to arrive at the right way of using the language by repeating the students' sentences correctly. Both accuracy and fluency are desirable and cannot be taught in isolation. Teachers also should tell their students exceptions and complications on grammar rules .This may help them to avoid overgeneralization of the rule.

2.7. Integrating Communicative grammar teaching approach

The integrated -skill approach, as contrasted with the purely segregated approach, exposes English language learners to authentic language and challenges them to interact naturally in the language. Learners rapidly gain a true picture of the richness and the complexity of the English language as employed for communication. Moreover, this approach stresses that English is not just an object of academic interest nor merely a key to passing an examination; instead, English becomes a real means of interaction and sharing among the people. This approach allows teachers to track students' progress in multiple skills at the same time. Integrating the language skills also promotes the learning of real content, not just the dissection of the language forms. Finally, the integrated – skill approach, whether found in content-based or task-based language instruction or some hybrid form, can be highly motivating to students of all ages and backgrounds, (Nunan, 1989).

2.8. Grammar instruction and teacher Perception

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; Musumeci, 1997; Schulz, 1996). Several studies have been conducted to investigate teacher beliefs regarding grammar instruction (Edilian, 2009; Farrell, 1999; Farrell & Lim, 2005; Golombek, 1998; Ng & Farrell, 2003; Richards, Gallo, & Renandya, 2001; Wang, 2009; Yim, 1993). 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, Richards, Gallo, 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. There seems to be a discrepancy between L2 teachers' beliefs regarding grammar instruction in CLT and their actual classroom practices. As such, there is a need to investigate L2 teachers' perceptions and implementation of grammar instruction within a CLT context.

2.9. Teachers and Learners in CGT

Perhaps the role teachers and learners are supposed to play in language classrooms is determined by the type and the nature of learning activities (Harmer, 1991:235) which are in turn dependent up on the method the language teacher employ. To that end, the role teachers and learners play in communicative classrooms are also dependent up on the types of classroom activities proposed in CLT, and according to Richards (ND) new roles are implied by activities in CLT.

2.9.1. The Role of the Teacher

The role the language teacher plays is of great importance as to help the learners master the necessary skills and develop communicative competence. The teacher plays a variety of roles which, Harmer (2001:57) claims may change from one activity to another or from one stage of activity to another. However, Harmer (1991:235) classifies the variety of roles that a language teacher plays in EFL classes into two categories: as controller and as facilitator. However, when defining the role language teachers play in communicative classrooms, Larsen- Freeman (1986) says that teachers would find themselves talking less, listening more and becoming active facilitator of their students.

In addition to the above explanation or in other ways round, scholars like Littlewood (1981:19), Gatbonton and Segalowitz (2005: 340), Harmer (1991:235-242), Richards and Rodgers (1986:77-78) have put the role the language teacher plays in communicative classrooms as summarized as follows.

- ***Need analyst***- take the responsibility for determining and responding to the learners language needs.
- ***Counselor***- exemplifies an effective communicator seeking to maximize matching of speaker's intention and hearer's interpretation through the use of paraphrase, confirmation and feedback.
- ***Group process manager***- organizes the classroom as setting for communication and communicative activity.
- ***Resource (knowledge provider)*** - offers help if it is needed (when the learners are missing and they wish help).

Generally, we can see from the points raised about teacher's role that teachers do not have direct teaching role in the CLT activities i.e. teachers are not dominant as they could be in the

traditional (teacher-centered) classes. However, they would rather carry a burden of very important roles of creating conducive learning environment and enhancing learning by doing at least some of the above mentioned roles.

2.9.2. The Role of the Learner

It is inevitably true that learners are not empty vessels when coming to language classrooms and are expected to play a number of roles in communicative language classes. Legutke and Thomas (1991:267) confirming this idea state;

The learner does not come in to the project classroom knowing nothing. Rather he brings with him a range of previous learning experiences, of values, views and expectations ... not only have rather fixed idea about which activities are most appropriate for them , but also how the teacher should go about her teaching....

Learners are not merely passive listeners and Aston (1993) stresses that learners are not limited to the consumption of services provided by the teacher. However, they can become animator and creators of the self-access facilities, taking greater control of their own learning. Breen and Candlin (1980:110) cited in Richards and Rodgers(1986:77) describe the learners' role in CLT as follows.

The role of the learner as negotiator- between the self, the learning process, and the object of learning-emerges from and interacts with the role of joint negotiator within the group and within the classroom procedure and activities which the group undertakes. The implication for the learner is that he should contribute as much as he gains, and thereby learn in an interdependent way.

To achieve the goal of foreign language learning/teaching i.e. the development of potential communicative competence by learners (as far as learners are pivot), learners should have positive attitude and motivation towards the learning activities triggered by the teacher's facilitative role in the class. If so, the students would hopefully conduct the activities needed in the communicative classroom either in group or in pair. It is, therefore, very important for the teachers to identify their roles, to integrate with that of the learners, and to help the learners know their distinctive roles CLT puts on and work in collaboration.

2.10. Practical Studies on the Teaching of Grammar

In the countries like Ethiopia where English is not spoken outside the classroom and just taught and learned in school as a foreign language teachers are supposed to create situations and provide communicative activities, and embrace variety of techniques and strategies in the textbooks to teach grammar .

There are several studies which focus on how to teach grammar in language classes. For example, the study conducted by Hailom Banteyerga (1982) compared the effectiveness of communicative approach vs the structural approach in the teaching of “English conditional sentences to first year students of Addis Ababa University.” The findings have indicated the results of communicative approach were better than the structural approach. Similarly, the study made by Worede Yishak (1986) was compared the effectiveness of the structural approach and the form-function approach to the teaching of “English modal auxiliaries” to freshmen students in Addis Ababa university. The findings of the study revealed that the form-function approach showed better results than the structural approach.

Moreover, Due to its prominence in language learning and teaching, teachers’ beliefs in grammar teaching have been the subject of study for many researchers. Borg (2003) classified research on language teacher cognition in grammar teaching into three groups: research on teacher’s declarative knowledge about grammar, research on teachers’ stated beliefs about teaching grammar, and research on teachers’ cognition as indicated in their grammar teaching practices. Borg (2006) described each type of research in greater detail. Studies that examined teachers’ declarative knowledge about grammar, as Borg noted, indicate that prospective language teachers’ knowledge of grammar and grammatical terms and concepts is generally inadequate, so there may be a need to provide teachers in teacher education programs with more training on declarative knowledge about language. Reviewing research studies investigating stated beliefs about teaching grammar, Borg was able to come to three conclusions. First, teachers were generally found to value and promote grammar in their work. Second, while talking about their beliefs about grammar teaching, teachers usually refer to the influence of their views of their previous language learning experiences. Third, it was found that there is generally a wide discrepancy in aspects of grammar teaching between teachers’ and students’ views. Borg finally examined studies that looked at teachers’ practices in grammar teaching and concluded that teachers’ knowledge can have an apparent impact on how they teach grammar and teachers’

understanding of their students and of the classroom can also have an influence on what they do. He further added that teachers' beliefs and practices are not always congruent.

Based on the above literatures and the results it is the belief of the current researcher that the findings of this study will help to check in assessing teachers' perception and practice of communicative grammar teaching in English classroom at Gilgel Beles, CTE.

CHAPTER THREE

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The main purpose of this study, as mentioned in chapter one, was to assess teachers' perception and practice of communicative grammar teaching in English classroom at Gilgel Beles, CTE. Therefore, this chapter describes the research design that was employed to achieve the main objective of the study. It, therefore, discusses the participants of the study, source of data, description of the study area, the data collection instruments, the development of research instruments, the data collection procedure and methods of data analysis used in the entire study.

3.1. Description of the Study Area

The study area was conducted at Gilgel Beles, CTE which is located in Benishangul Gumuz Regional State of Metekel Zone in North West part of Ethiopia. It is about 545 km and 250 km from Addis Ababa and the nearest town, Bahir Dar, respectively.

3.2. Research Design

This study employed a descriptive survey design that includes both quantitative and qualitative techniques to assess teachers' perception and practice of communicative grammar teaching at Gilgel Beles, CTE. To obtain descriptive information, the researcher was designed research questionnaires for teachers and students, interview and class room observation checklists.

3.3. Participants

The participants of the study were 30 Gilgel Beles college English language instructors and 75 regular 3rd year English language students were in the college. The student participants were taken totally. Because, they were the only trainees in the regular program in the college. Thus, as was reported by the students, fifty percent (50%) their age ranged between 20-25, 22.66 % of their age ranged between 17-19 and 10.66% of their age ranged between 23-25 ages.

3.4. Population Sample and Sampling Technique

The target population of the study was 75 3rd year students who found in the college as subjects for the study. The total number of EFL teachers in the college was 30. Therefore, all the teachers were participated in the study. Of all the teachers involved in the questionnaire, the researcher randomly selected four teachers among them as subjects for the observation and interview since it is believed that this much sample size could be enough holding the idea forwarded by scholars

that the sample size is determined by the purpose of the study and the nature of the population (Cohen and Manion, 1994).

In addition to this, the researcher include all 75 regular 3rd year English language department students. Out of the 75 students, ten students were randomly chosen for the interview. There were no first and second year students except evening and weekend class students. The rest of the trainees were students who were studying their mother tongue in regular diploma program in their three language groups in the college. The reason for this study, the researcher was used non-probability sampling technique which is purposive. This sampling technique is a strategy in which particular settings persons or events are selected deliberately in order to provide important information that cannot be obtained from other choices (Maxwell, 1996). It is where the researcher includes cases or participants in the sample because they believe that they warrant inclusion

3.5. Instruments of Data Collection

The research instruments used in this study include: - questionnaire (for both teachers and students), classroom observation and interview (for both teachers and students).

3.5.1. Questionnaire

A questionnaire for teachers including the major principles of communicative grammar teaching in English class room (i.e. aspects of conceptual perspective, students learning perspective, perspective on instructional activities, the importance of grammar, error correction and assessment, the role of the teacher and the role of students contribution) served as the major instrument of the study. This questionnaire was adapted from Karavas-Doukas (1996) and Kim (1999) cited in Beyen (2008) and it contains 57 items of Likert-type five points. Because of developing a new questionnaire, it is sometimes possible to adapt an existing or standardized one to use. Therefore, this may enable the researcher to compare his study with other studies. In addition, there are a number of considerations when adapting another questionnaire because it is going to be used on a different population, in different study area. First, adapting an existing questionnaire for a different purpose or group than that for which it has been developed can have serious implications for its reliability and validity (Herdman et al, 1998; Meadows and Wisher, 2000). Thus, having the reason which was described above, the researcher had adapted the study instrument to make it standardizable and acceptable study instrument. Therefore, the questionnaire was divided in to three sections. They are:

1. Personal information section-served to provide accurate description of the respondents.
2. Communicative grammar teaching (CGT) dimension (aspects of perception) section designed to measure the EFL teachers' conditional perceptions regarding knowledge of CGT in line with the principles of CGT and
3. CGT practical aspect- which is designed to measure the degree to which EFL teachers practice CGT principles.

The questionnaire was developed primarily to meet the objectives of the study; and the items were designed in line with the literature review- which deals with CGT principles. Apart from adapting the questionnaire from scholars, the researcher attached the drafted items to his advisor in order that he could comment on the appropriateness of the items if they are fit to measure the target objective of the study. Furthermore, after receiving the advisor's rigorous comment on the items, the researcher reshaped the instrument. Then, to develop appropriate instrument for the study and to minimize the potential misunderstanding, the researcher conducted a pilot study at Gilgel Beles College to fifteen (15) evening class students. Based on the data gathered, the reliability of the questionnaire in both cases of perception and practice, the researcher was ascertained by using Cronbach's alpha method and the result was found to be 0.741 and 0.795 respectively.

3.5.2. Classroom Observation

The classroom observation was conducted in order to check whether teachers practice the principles of CGT in EFL classroom while the actual class lesson was going on. The observation was made based on a checklist which focused on 'classroom instructional activities or techniques employed by teachers', the role teachers and learners played and instructional materials used in the teaching learning process. The observation checklist was adapted from Yemane(2007) and Razmajoo and Riazi (2000). To avoid the potential personal bias that might occur in the meaning to be given to what was being observed, the observations were conducted by the researcher and an EFL department head as a co-observer for sixteen consecutive lessons and this was conducted into two section of classes. The co-observer and the researcher together observed the English lessons and put a tick mark on the checklist when they observed which focused on classroom instructional activities or techniques employed by teachers, the role teachers and learners played and instructional materials used in the teaching learning process (see Appendix-B). Each session

was scheduled for 50 minutes. The observation was conducted in four sections for four times each. Totally, it was conducted for sixteen periods all together.

3.5.3. Interview

The purpose of the interview was to substantiate the results obtained from the questionnaire and classroom observation and to obtain a greater depth of information, free and flexible responses and to get information concerning feeling, attitude or emotion to certain questions which is not possible through questionnaire and classroom observation(Koul, 1984 and Selinger and Shohamy,1988). The interview questions were prepared based on CGT principles in a similar fashion with that of the questionnaire: - one for the teachers and one for the learners. The interview for both teachers and students comprised unstructured types. Because, this type of questionnaire is used to collect qualitative data and help the researcher to get in-depth information in face to face interaction.

3.6. Data collection Procedure

The data collection session were arranged at times suggested by the college permission and the willingness of the participants. It took over three months period beginning with pilot test, administering the questionnaire, followed by the classroom observation of lessons each about four sections and then by interview from April to June. All participants were encouraged to ask questions so that they did not have any problems with respect to the content, the language, and the ways to deal with the questionnaire.

Therefore, a questionnaire (see Appendix- A) was distributed to 30 participant teachers and all were returned. During the administration of the questionnaire, participant students who needed explanations about the questions or the way they should make their answers were given clarifications. Another questionnaire (see appendix-D) was distributed to 75 students (with the presence of the researcher at the normal class time) and all were returned.

After the questionnaire data was collected, classroom observation was conducted. It took over two months period beginning with administering of the questionnaire. Concerning this, the researcher prepared the observation checklist (see Appendix-B). Then the yes/no of the observed list of behavior were tabulated and analyzed descriptively determining the amount of importance placed on to each principle of the communicative grammar teaching.

After the class room observation conducted, place and time were arranged in accordance with the convenience of student respondents and the teacher participants for in an interview data collection. Then interviews for both teachers (see Appendix-C) and the learners (see Appendix-E) were conducted for the observed classes on the basis of random selection.

3.7. Methods of Data Analysis

To assess the extent to which EFL teachers' perception and practice of CGT principles and the frequency in EFL class room, the data gathered through questionnaire, classroom observation and interview were analyzed by using descriptive analysis methods. Thus, the results of the questionnaire data were reported using frequency, percentages, mean and grand mean. Besides, the data obtained through questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistical tools which are processed through Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) window 20 version. In addition to this, the researcher used Cronbach's alpha method to measure the internal consistency the questionnaire.

After the data obtained from the questionnaires (of both teachers and learners), the items were first tallied, coded and tabulated followed by data entry into SPSS, and finally data cleaning was performed in order to eliminate some mismatch. In order to analyze the data, relevant descriptive statistical procedures were employed. In the next sections, the data gathered through each method are treated separately and interpretations are made with the intention to reach possible conclusions that can lead to workable recommendations. Furthermore, tables were used for demonstratives results and provide the analysis of teacher's mean perception and practice communicative grammar teaching. The data gathered by the observation scheme were analyzed descriptively determining the amount of importance placed on each principle of the communicative language teaching. Similar to the analysis made for the questionnaire, the results obtained through classroom observation with the help of observation checklist (see Appendix-B). The data obtained through teachers' and students' interview were grouped in to themes (See Appendix- C and E) respectively. Thus, the interview data was analyzed based on the basis of frequencies. Besides, the responses were grouped and described thematically as supplementary evidence following the discussion of quantitative data. Mean while, the mean score of each item was computed in line with the coding numerals. For instance, if the frequencies of 30 respondents for perceptions item no. 1 from part I and Practices item no. 1 from part II were as:

- The mean value for perception items was computed as:

SA	A	UN	D	SD	Total	Mean
13	7	5	2	3	115	3.83

$$\begin{aligned}
 X &= (5 \times 13) + (4 \times 7) + (3 \times 5) + (2 \times 2) + (1 \times 3) \\
 &= 115/30 \\
 &= 3.83
 \end{aligned}$$

➤ The mean values for Practice items was computed as:

A	O	S	R	N	Total	Mean
5	10	7	3	5	97	3.23

$$\begin{aligned}
 X &= (5 \times 5) + (4 \times 10) + (3 \times 7) + (2 \times 3) + (1 \times 5) \\
 &= 97/30 \\
 &= 3.23
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, a higher mean score indicates the respondents' high perception or frequent classroom practices (Karavas-Doukas, 1996) cited in Beyene (2008) and vice-versa. Therefore, the analysis was done relating the computed percentage and mean values and the results ranged between mean scores 5 to 1.

The data analysis procedure consisted of Likert –type item analysis. The Likert-type items, which were designed to identify teachers' understanding of CGT concepts and their views on CGT in classroom implementation, were given numerical scores (e.g. 'Strongly Agree' =5; 'Agree' = 4; 'Undecided' =3; 'Disagree' =2 and 'Strongly Disagree' =1) as stated by Karavas-Doukas (1996) and Kim (1999) cited in Beyen (2008).

Chapter Four

4. Analysis of Data and Discussion of the Results

In order to achieve the objectives of the study and seek answers to the research questions raised in the first chapter of this thesis, necessary data were gathered using three methods: questionnaire, interview and classroom observation. Therefore, the collected data were discussed in the light of the objectives below.

In this section, the collected data are presented, analyzed and discussed. This chapter generally consists of presentation of the statistical results obtained, illustrated tables, discussions of the results obtained from questionnaires, observations and interviews of both teachers and learners.

4.1. Teachers' Background Information

No.	Teachers' Background Information					
1	Field of study	Major			Minor	
		English			Amharic	
2	Qualification	BA	MA(TEFL)	PhD	Other (specify)	
		13	17	-	-	
3	Total years of your teaching experience	≤ 5	6-10 years	11-20 years	≥20 years	
		2	11	17	-	
4	Your teaching load in periods per week	≤ 10	11-20	21-30	Above 30	
		9	17	4	-	
5	Average number of students in one class	≤ 30	31-40	41-50	51- 60	Above 61
			14	15	1	
					Total = 30	

As can be seen from the above table, most the teachers from the total of 30 participants were experienced in teaching English as a foreign language. Most of their class room teaching load was ranged between 11-20 periods per a week. And, more than half (17%) of them were MA in the qualification and also, some of them took course and seminar related training of CGT method before. In addition to these, the average number of students in one class was 41-50.

4.2. Analysis of teachers' response on the practice of communicative grammar teaching

Table 4.2.1: Frequency (f), Percentage (%) and Mean of Responses for Classroom Practice

No	Item	Frequency (Percentage)	Strongly agree = 5	Agree = 4	Undecided = 3	Disagree = 2	Strongly disagree = 1	Total	Mean
1	English as foreign teachers explain new grammatical terminologies or forms and patterns (rules) and let the learners be engaged in doing exercises.	f (%)	17 (56.7)	10 (33.3)	1 (3.3)	2 (6.7)	--	30	4.4
2	Explain new words and phrases and let the learners do the grammar exercises in the textbook.	f (%)	15 (50.0)	11 (36.7)	1 (3.3)	3 (10.0)	--	30	4.26
3	Give students explanation of rules with model sentences to illustrate them.	f (%)	13 (43.3)	11 (36.7)	5 (16.7)	1 (3.3)	--	30	4.2
4	Involve students in questioning and answering activities.	f (%)	3 (10.0)	4 (13.3)	2 (6.7)	14 (46.7)	7 (23.3)	30	2.4
5	Involve learners in activities as identifying similarities and differences of pictures in group.	f (%)	3 (10.0)	1 (3.3)	5 (16.7)	17 (56.7)	4 (13.3)	30	2.4
6	Make the learners exchange letters, write reports, advertisements etc. cooperatively.	f (%)	3 (10.0)	1 (3.3)	2 (6.7)	16 (53.3)	8 (26.7)	30	2.16
7	Introduce the new language item in context and demonstrate the use and meaning of the new language and let the learners try to produce, reproduce and communicate with the language.	f (%)	1 (3.3)	5 (16.5)	3 (10.0)	17 (56.7)	4 (13.3)	30	2.4
8	Involve learners in problem- solving activities.	f (%)	4 (13.3)	--	1 (3.3)	18 (60.0)	7 (23.3)	30	2.2
9	Use pair work in which two students work on a given task.	f (%)	1 (3.3)	1 (3.3)	8 (26.7)	16 (53.3)	4 (13.3)	30	2.3
10	Use group work in which more than two students work on a given task.	f (%)	1 (3.3)	2 (6.7)	4 (13.3)	20 (66.7)	3 (10.0)	30	2.26
11	Help learners correct their error in their pair and group discussion.	f (%)	2 (6.7)	2 (6.7)	2 (6.7)	18 (60.0)	6 (20.0)	30	2.2
12	Use pictures and objects to convey the meaning of structure.	f (%)	2 (6.7)	4 (13.3)	4 (13.3)	14 (46.7)	6 (20.0)	30	2.4
13	Let learners do assignments at home and give feedback on other days for the whole class.	f (%)	16 (53.3)	8 (26.7)	3 (10.0)	3 (10.0)	--	30	4.23
14	Use different kinds of language games e.g. word dominoes.	f (%)	2 (6.7)	1 (3.3)	3 (10.0)	18 (60.0)	6 (20)	30	2.16
15	Correct learners' error in controlled practice activities like question and answer.	f (%)	2 (6.7)	2 (6.7)	2 (6.7)	17 (56.7)	7 (23.3)	30	2.16
16	Evaluate students in paper and pencil test (on terms or semesters).	f (%)	18 (60.0)	7 (23.3)	2 (6.7)	3 (10.0)	--	30	4.3
Grand mean = 2.9									

As can be seen from table above under item 1, more than half of the respondents (56.7% strongly agreed and (33.3%) agreed that teachers explain new grammatical terminologies or form and patterns and let the learners be engaged in doing exercise in CGT class room respectively. Thus, this shows that the majority of respondents spend their time in teaching grammar in traditional way rather than in a communicative way.

The result for item 2, reveals that the 15 (50%) and 11 (36.7% of the respondents assured that teachers explain new words and phrases and let the learners do the grammar exercises in the text book always and often respectively. Of these, 86.7% the respondents believed that they use explanation of new words or phrase, which gives a mean value of (M= 4.26). Based on the above result, one can conclude that a great majority of teachers practice grammar in teacher centered teaching method.

In the same fashion, the result of item 3, indicated that 13 (43.3%) and 11 (36.7%) of the respondents reported that teachers always and often give explanation of rules with model sentences to illustrate them respectively. This shows that the great majority of respondents of teachers give explanation of rules with model sentences to the students in their class room. Whereas, 5 (16.7%) of the respondents replied that they sometimes give explanation of rules with model sentences to illustrate them.

On the other hand, in item 4, a total of 70% of respondents with (46.7% rarely and 23.3% never) indicated that teachers do not involve the students in questioning and answering activities. The above result confirms that, more than half of the students do not involve in question and answering in CGT class rooms.

The data analysis for item 5 was to find out whether students involvement in identifying similarities and differences pictures in a group. For this item, 16.7%, 56.7% and 13.3% of students involve in this activity sometimes, rarely and never, respectively. Therefore, this result shows that the majority of learners involve in this kind of activities in their group are rarely.

In the same fashion, regarding item 6, a total of 80% of respondents with (53.3% rarely and 26.7% never) indicated that teachers didn't make learners to exchange letters, write reports, advertisements etc cooperatively.

Based on the result of data analysis to item 7 was to find out that the teachers introduce the new language item in context and demonstrate the use and meaning of the new language and let the learners try to produce, reproduce and communicate with the language. For this item, 17 (56.7%) of the respondents believed that the learners involve in this activity rarely.

In similar way, the result of item 8 indicates that 60% of the respondents replied that they involve the learners in the problem solving activities rarely. Thus, this result shows that the great majority of the learners involve in problem solving activities are rarely. Similarly, on item 9, (53.3%) of the respondent replied, that they rarely agreed on using pair work in which two students work on the given tasks. Whereas, 26.7% of the respondents believed that students use pair work sometimes on the given tasks correspondingly.

In the same fashion, in item 10, (66.7%) of the respondents reported that they rarely use group work. In the same way, in item 11, 60% and 20% of the teachers replied rarely and never respectively concerning on helping learners correct their error in their pair and group discussion.

Based on the result of data analysis to item 12, (46.7%) of the respondents believed that they rarely use pictures and objects to convey the meaning of structure. However, (20%) of the respondents agreed that they use picture and objectives never to convey the meaning of the structure.

On the other hand, in item 13, (53.5%) and (26.7%) of respondents agreed that the teachers let the students do assignments at home and give feedback on other days for the whole class always and often respectively. This shows that more than half of respondents' result indicated that learners are given home work to do at their home and get the feedback on the other days in CGT classrooms.

In item 14, (60%) of the respondents reported that they are rarely use different kinds of language games. Likewise, 20% of the respondent agreed that they never use different language games in CGT class room.

On item 15, 17 (56.7%) and 7 (23.3%) of the teachers reported that they rarely and never correct learners' error in controlled practice activities like question and answer respectively.

Finally, teachers' responses to item 16 show that 60% and 23.3% of the teachers reported that they always and often evaluate students in paper and pencil test (on terms or semesters)

respectively. The results, generally, imply majority of EFL instructors employ traditional ways of grammar teaching.

Generally, as seen from the above, the result obtained from the teachers' response for the classroom practice imply that most teachers tend to favor using traditional way of grammar teaching in the contrary to what they perceive and believe about the communicative approach to grammar teaching in English class room.

4.2.2. Teachers' Perceptions on CGT

The first research question aimed at assessing teachers' perception of the concepts of CGT.

Table 4.2.2: Frequency (f), Percentage (%) and Mean of teachers' Responses

No	Items	Strongly agree = 5		Agree = 4		Undecided = 3		Disagree = 2		Strongly disagree = 1		Total	Mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1	The knowledge of grammar helps learners to communicate efficiently and effectively.	6	20.0	21	70.0	2	6.7	1	3.3	-	-	30	4.06
2	Good EFL instruction is practically synonymous with Communicative Grammar Teaching (CGT) method.	7	23.3	17	56.6	4	13.3	1	3.3	1	3.3	30	3.93
3	A Communicative grammar perspective is the most progressive instructional approach to teach grammatical rule in the field of EFL.	24	80.0	5	17.5	1	3.3	-	-	-	-	30	4.76
4	Teaching grammar in communicative way help learners to take responsibility of their learning.	21	70.0	8	26.7	1	3.3	-	-	-	-	30	4.6
5	The CGT approach to language teaching encourages the student to develop his/her full potential and their language usage properly	12	40.0	14	46.7	2	6.7	1	3.3	S	3.3	30	4.16
6	It is difficult to teach grammar in communicative.	-	-	2	6.7	1	3.3	15	50	12	40	30	1.76
Grand mean:												3.87	

In item 1, 21 respondents (70%) and 6 respondents (20%), reported their agreement and strongly agreement respectively that the knowledge of grammar helps learners to communicate efficiently and effectively.

As can be seen from the above table, under item 2, 56.6% agreed that good EFL instruction is virtually synonymous with Communicative grammar Teaching (CGT) method. In the same way, 7 respondents (23.3%) reported their strong agreement that Good EFL instruction is virtually synonymous with Communicative grammar teaching. Whereas the rest of 4 respondents (13.3%) of the respondents did not have any decision with the above issues. Similarly, from item 3, it is possible to learn that 80% of the respondents strongly agreed that communicative grammar perspective is the most progressive instructional approach to teach grammatical rule in the field of EFL, followed by 17.5% who agreed.

In item 5, in table above showed that 46.7% and 40% respondents made an agreement and strongly agreement up on the CGT approach to language teaching encourages the student to develop his/her full potential and their language usage properly. These considerable proportion of the respondents (46.7% and 40%) give full attention to use CGT method to teach structure to the learners to develop their language usage properly. In contrast, in the last item in table 1, showed 50% and 40% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed to in it is difficult to teach grammar in communicative approach.

In general, the above figure implies that a great majority of the respondent teachers with a total mean value of 3.87 have a good perception for CGT. From the above points, we can generalize that respondent teachers have positive degree of perception of CGT in line with conceptual understanding of CGT.

Table 4.2.3: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of teachers' Responses on Students' Learning Perspective

No	Items	Strongly agree = 5		Agree = 4		Undecided = 3		Disagree = 2		Strongly disagree = 1		Total	Mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1	Students' achievement of English grammatical rule is most productive in the context of a communicative approach.	4	13.3	19	63.3	1	3.3	4	13.3	2	6.7	30	3.6
2	Students' involvement and mastering of the English grammatical rule are the most helpful to progress their communicative skill in EFL Classroom.	7	23.3	17	56.7	2	6.7	4	13.3	-	-	30	3.9
3	Learning grammar at discourse level is boring.	-	-	-	-	6	20.0	17	56.7	7	23.3	30	1.96
4	Learning grammar in communicative form is interesting.	13	43.3	11	36.7	6	20.0	-	-	-	-	30	4.23
5	Teaching grammar in communicative approach supports learners to be fluent in English language.	14	46.7	10	33.3	2	6.7	4	13.3	-	-	30	4.13
Grand Mean = 3.56													

As can be seen from table 4.2.3, majority of the respondents reported their agreement (63.3%) that the students' achievement of English grammatical rule is most productive in the context of a communicative approach. On the other hand, 13.3% and 13.3% of the respondents reported that they strongly agreed and disagreed with the statement equally. From this, it is possible to realize that learners' success in English grammatical rules help them to be the most productive in communicative approach. The same is true to item 2, that a considerable number of the respondents reflected their agreement (that is, 56.7% agreed and 23.3% strongly agreed) on the Students' involvement and mastering of the English grammatical rule are the most helpful to progress their communicative skill in EFL Classroom.

There are 17 respondents (56.7%) and 7 respondents (23.3 %) of the respondents who reported that they disagreed and strongly disagreed in item 3 respectively. However, 20.0% didn't have an

idea to the statement of learning grammar at discourse level is boring. On the contrary to item 4, the considerable respondents reflected their agreement (that is, 43.3% strongly agreed and 36.7% agreed) on the learning grammar in communicative form is interesting. Whereas the rest of 6 respondents (20%) of the respondents reported “undecided.” Similarly in the last item 5, the majority of the respondents reported their strong agreement (46.7%) and agreement (33.3%) that teaching grammar in communicative approach supports learners to be fluent in English language.

In general, the above figures and statements imply that a great majority of the teachers with a total mean value of 3.56 have strong perception of CGT with regard to the concepts of students’ achievement and involvement in CGT while a small minority of them have weak idea and don’t have view of the concept.

Table 4.2.4: Frequency (f), Percentage (%) and Mean of Teachers' Responses for Instructional Perspective in CGT

No	Items	Strongly agree = 5		Agree = 4		Undecided = 3		Disagree = 2		Strongly disagree = 1		Total	Mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1	In EFL programs, grammar teaching is better accomplished with a communicative approach.	9	30.0	12	40.0	3	10.0	4	13.3	2	6.7	30	3.73
2	Grammar is better taught explicitly. That is, rules should be clearly stated and pointed out to the students.	2	6.7	5	16.7	-	-	15	50.0	8	26.7	30	2.26
3	Grammar is best taught implicitly. That is, grammar rules should not be pointed out but they should be understood implicitly through various forms of exposure.	16	53.3	13	43.3	-	-	1	3.3	-	-	30	4.46
4	Grammar should only be taught or mentioned when a particular grammar point appears in the material or communication (in context).	4	13.3	3	10.0	3	10.0	14	46.7	6	20.0	30	2.5
5	Grammar is best taught either inductively or deductively depending on the teachers' preference.	3	10.0	3	10.0	2	6.7	13	43.3	9	30.0	30	2.26
6	Grammar is best taught either inductively or deductively depending on the students' preference.	11	36.7	17	56.7	1	3.3	1	3.3	-	-	30	4.26
7	Grammar should be mainly practiced in oral communication, and then showed the rule later on.	16	53.3	13	43.3	1	3.3	-	-	-	-	30	4.63
8	Practice of structures must always be within full communicative contexts.	11	36.7	15	50.0	3	10.0	1	3.3	-	-	30	4.2
Grand mean = 3.53													

As can be seen from the above table 4.2.4, under item 1, the majority of the respondents reflected their agreement (that is, 40% agreed and 30% strongly agreed) on the grammar teaching is best accomplished with a communicative approach in EFL programs. However, 10% and 13.3% of respondents reported that they did not have idea and disagreed respectively.

From the above table of item 2, (50%) and (26.7%) of the respondents reflected their disagreement and strong disagreement to the statement of the grammar is best taught explicitly, that is, rules should be clearly stated and pointed out to the students respectively. Whereas, the minority of the respondents reported that 6.7% and 16.7% made their strong agreement and agreement in the issue above respectively.

In the contrary, in the item 3, most of the respondents reported their strong agreement (53.3%) and agreement (43.3%) that the grammar is best taught implicitly.

Under item 4, 14 (46.7%) and 6 (20%) of the respondents reported their disagreement and strong disagreement to the issue that the grammar should be taught which could only appear in the teaching material respectively

In the same fashion, the item 5, the majority of the respondents reflected their disagreement (that is, 43.3% disagreed and 30% strongly disagreed) on the issue of the grammar is best taught based on teachers' preference.

In item 6, there are 56.7% and 36.7 % of the respondents reported that they agreed and strongly agreed in the issue of the better way of teaching grammar depend on the students' preference respectively. Whereas, the minor groups of the respondents both reported their similar view (3.3%) of undecided and disagreed in the above statement.

It is also true for item 7, majority of the respondents reported their agreement 16 (53.3%) strongly agreed and 13 (43.3%) agreed on the view of grammar should be mainly practiced in oral communication followed by practicing rule later on.

Similarly, in the last item of table 3, 15 (50%) of the respondents reported their agreement and 36.7% of them also reported their strong agreement.

In general, the above figure implies that a great majority of the respondent teachers with a total mean value of 3.53 have a good perception for CGT. From the above points, we can generalize that respondent teachers have positive degree of perception of CGT in line with the understanding of instructional perspectives of CGT.

Table 4.2.5: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for the Importance of Grammar in CGT

No	Items	Strongly agree = 5		Agree = 4		Undecided = 3		Disagree = 2		Strongly disagree = 1		Total	Mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1	Knowledge of grammar in language does not guarantee the ability to use language for communicative purpose.	5	16.7	5	16.7	1	3.3	11	36.7	8	26.7	30	2.6
2	Direct instruction in the rules is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively.	2	6.7	9	30.0	4	13.3	15	50.0	-	-	30	2.93
3	In general speaking, students' communicative ability improves most quickly if they study and practice the grammar of the language.	5	16.7	13	43.3	-	-	12	40.0	-	-	30	3.36
4	It is more important to practice a L2 in situations simulating real life (i.e., interview, role plays, etc.) than to analyze and practice grammatical patterns.	8	26.7	11	36.7	5	16.7	6	20.0	-	-	30	3.7
5	The formal study of grammar is essential to the eventual mastery of a FL/L2 when language learning is limited to the classroom.	2	6.7	4	13.3	4	13.3	12	40.0	8	26.7	30	2.33
Grand mean												2.98	

As can be seen from table 4.2.5, among 30 respondents 36.7% and 26.7% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed that knowledge of grammar in language does not guarantee the ability to use language for communicative purpose. Whereas, 16.7% and 16.7% of the respondents replied 'strongly agreed' and 'agreed' respectively. One third of the respondents (33.4%) agreed that for most students' language is acquired most effectively when it is used as a vehicle for doing something else and not when it is studied in a direct or explicit way.

Regarding item 2, 50% disagreed, 30%, agreed and 13.3% undecided on the issues that direct instruction in the rules is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively.

Concerning item 3, 43.3% of the respondents agreed that students' communicative ability improves most quickly if they study and practice the grammar of the language. However, 16.7% and 40% of the respondents reported 'undecided' and 'disagree.'

On the same fashion, concerning item 4, 36.7% of the respondents agreed that it is more important to practice a L2 in situations simulating real life than to analyze and practice grammatical patterns. However, 26.7%, 16.7% and 20% of respondents reported "strongly agree undecided and disagree respectively.

In the last item of item 5, 40% and 26.7% of the respondents reflected their disagreement (which is disagree and strongly disagree respectively) on the formal study of grammar is essential to the eventual mastery of a FL/L2 when language learning is limited to the classroom. Whereas, 13.3% and 13.3% of the respondents expressed agree and undecided respectively.

In general, the above statements imply that a great majority of the teachers with a total mean value of 2.98 have strong perception of CGT with regard to the concepts the importance of grammar for communicative skill.

Table 4.2.6: Frequency (f), Percentage (%) and Mean of Teachers' Responses for Perspective on Error correction and Assessment on CGT

No	Items	Strongly agree = 5		Agree = 4		Undecided = 3		Disagree = 2		Strongly disagree = 1		Total	mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1	In CGT approach, Students should correct their grammatical errors in pair or group is essential.	11	36.7	18	60.0	-	-	1	3.3	-	-	30	4.3
2	When my students make grammar mistakes, I will ignore their mistakes, so that they can be more confident and more fluent.	2	6.7	3	10.0	5	16.7	18	60.0	2	6.7	30	2.5
3	When my students make grammar mistakes, I will immediately correct the mistakes, so that they can be more accurate and easier to understand.	6	20.0	9	30.0	1	3.3	14	46.7	-	-	30	3.3
4	Good evaluation is carried out when the focus of the evaluation is on accuracy (grammatical correctness).	1	3.3	5	16.6	-	-	19	63.3	5	16.7	30	2.26
5	Evaluation of students' progress in grammar rule should be carried out on the basis of their day to day classroom communicative performance (e.g. role play).	16	53.3	13	43.3	1	3.3	--	-	-	-	30	4.5
6	The teacher should correct all the grammatical errors which the students make, this will result in imperfect learning.	-	-	-	-	8	26.7	22	73.3	-	-	30	2.26
7	For students to become effective communicators in the foreign language, the teacher's feedback must be focused on English grammatical forms of the students' responses.	3	10.0	2	6.7	1	3.3	16	53.3	8	26.7	30	2.2
8	Since errors are normal (natural) part of learning, much correction is wastage of time.	8	26.7	20	66.7	--	--	2	6.7	--	--	30	4.13
Grand mean = 3.18													

In table 4.2.6 item 1 shows that 60% of the teachers agreed and 36.7% strongly agreed that in CGT approach, students should correct their grammatical errors in pair or group.

With regard to item 2, a large amount of respondents reported that 60% disagreed on when my students make grammar mistakes, I will ignore their mistakes, so that they can be more confident and more fluent. However, 10% and 16.7% of them replied agreed and undecided with the above issue respectively. On the same fashion, 46.7% of the respondents disagreed concerning about giving immediate correction to the students. Whereas, 20% and 30 % strongly agreed and agreed with the above view point.

Regarding item 4, a great majority of respondents (80%) of the respondents do not agree on good evaluation is carried out when the focus of the evaluation is on accuracy; of which about 63.3% replied “disagree” and 16.7% said “strongly disagree”. This show that a large portion of respondents believed that good evaluation is not carried out on grammatical correctness. On the other hand, 16.6% of respondents showed their agreement on the above view.

Concerning item 5, 53.3% of teachers strongly agree while 43.3% of them agree in the issue evaluation students’ progress in grammar rule should be based on their day to day class room communicative performance.

In item 6, the majority of the respondents 73.3% reported their disagreement that teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make; this will result in imperfect learning. On the other hand, 26.7% of teachers remained undecided.

Regarding item 7, most of the respondents 53.3% reported their disagreement while 26.7% reported their strong disagreement that for students to become effective communicators in the foreign language, the teacher’s feedback must be focused on English grammatical forms of the students’ responses. However, 13.3% reported their agreement with the above issues.

Lastly in item 8, 26.7% of teachers showed their strong agreement while 66.7% of them showed their agreement to this issue that errors are normal (natural) part of learning that much of correction is wasteful of time.

In general, in spite of the fact that there were some part of the respondents who misunderstood the concept of grammatical error correction and assessment employed through CGT process

more than half of the respondents with mean value of 3.18 reflected that they had good perception of CGT principles with regard to error correction and assessment based on the seven items.

Table 4.2.7: Frequency (f), Percentage (%) and Mean of Responses for Perspective on Teachers' Role

No	Items	Strongly agree = 5		Agree = 4		Undecided = 3		Disagree = 2		Strongly disagree = 1		Total	Mean
		f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1	Teacher plays a facilitator role in CGT class.	18	60.0	11	36.7	1	3.3	-	-	-	-	30	4.56
34	The role of the teacher in the grammar lesson is to impart (demonstrate) knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing and giving examples.	8	26.7	17	56.7	2	6.7	3	10.0	-	-	30	4.0
35	The teacher should act as an independent participant within the grammar teaching-learning group.	-	-	8	26.7	1	3.3	13	43.3	8	26.7	30	2.3
36	Teacher makes students to discover grammar rules by themselves through dialogue.	16	53.3	14	46.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	4.53
37	Practice is a crucial importance for the students to master grammar points without the help of teacher.	4	13.3	8	26.7	2	6.7	15	50.0	1	3.3	30	2.96
38	The teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials in which it has grammar activities so as to develop the students' communicative skill.	15	50.0	10	33.3	-	-	3	10.0	2	6.7	30	4.1
Grand mean = 3.74													

In table 4.2.7 item 1, shows that 60% of the teachers strongly agreed and 36.7% agreed that teacher plays a facilitator role in CGT class. With regard to item 2, the majority of the respondents (83.4%) disagreed to the point that the role of the teacher in grammar lesson is to impart (demonstrate) knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing and giving examples. However, 10% of the respondents disagreed on the above issue.

Similarly, 43.3% and 26.7% of the respondents reported their disagreement and strongly disagreement that teachers should act as an independent participant with teaching learning group in CGT classroom in item 3. Whereas, 26.7% of the respondents showed their agreement on this issue. On the other hand, in item 36, 53.3% and 46.7% of the respondents showed their strong agreement and agreement to the point that teacher makes students to discover grammar rules by themselves through dialogue in item 4 respectively.

On the contrary, in item 5, 50% of the respondents revealed their disagreement in the point that practice is a crucial importance for the students to master grammar points without the help of teacher. However, in spite of this, 26.7% and 13.3%, of the respondents revealed their agreement and strong agreement in the issue respectively. On the other hand, in item 6, 83.3% of the respondents revealed their agreement that the teacher must supplement the text book with other materials in which it has grammar activities so as to develop the students' communicative skill.

In general, in spite of these, there are small amount of the respondents revealed their weak perception about the teachers' role in CGT class room (in item 35 and 37), more than half of the respondents (with mean value of 3.74) testified that they have strong belief and high level of understanding about what role the teacher should play in EFL classes during CGT.

Table 4.2.8: Frequency (f), Percentage (%) and Mean of Teachers' Responses for Perspective on Learners' Role in CGT

No	Items	Strongly agree = 5		Agree = 4		Undecided = 3		Disagree = 2		Strongly disagree = 1		Total	Mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1	Students can improve their communicative competency through regular practice of grammatical structures.	10	33.3	12	40.0	3	10.0	4	13.3	1	3.3	30	3.86
2	Students can suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for him/her in language classroom.	9	30.0	19	63.3	1	3.3	1	3.3	--	--	30	4.2
Grand mean 4.03													

In the above table 4.2.8, item 1 show that (33.3%) and (40%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed that students can improve their communicative competency through regular practice of grammatical structures respectively. Regarding item 2, (30%) and (63.3%) of respondents strongly agreed and agreed that students can suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for him/her in language classrooms respectively .

In general, the responses obtained from the whole CGT perspectives reveal a mean value 3.55. This computed mean value indicates that the majority of the respondents (71%) have strong view of communicative grammar teaching with regard to the principles of CGT stated. Therefore, the result implies that it is possible to think that teachers can put CGT principles in to in their entire EFL classes in the College.

4.3. Analysis of Learners' Perception of CGT

The learners' questionnaire consists of 12 statements. The coding of the data was done similar to that of the teachers' questionnaire. Therefore, based on the results obtained from the students' questionnaire, the learners' perception of CGT with regard to different principles of communicative grammar teaching method is discussed with reference under table 4.3.1 below.

Table 4.3.1: Students' Responses on Perceptions of CGT

No	Items	Strongly agree = 5		Agree = 4		Undecided = 3		Disagree = 2		Strongly disagree = 1		Total	Mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1	After you are introduced and practiced a new grammar structure you talk and write in an active way.	32	42.7	30	40.0	5	6.7	7	9.3	1	1.3	75	4.13
2	Students can improve their grammar rule through regular practice of structures rather than learning in communicative way.	18	24.0	24	32.0	6	8.0	15	20.0	12	16.0	75	3.28
3	A student who is good in grammar (knows grammar well) she/he can communicate with others in better way.	16	21.5	11	14.7	10	13.3	34	45.3	4	5.3	75	3.01
4	If the students learn grammar in group/pair, they can learn the language in a better way.	48	64.0	19	25.3	3	4.0	2	2.7	3	4.0	75	4.45
5	If the teacher teaches student a grammatical rule by explaining it directly, a student can communicate or speak an English language fluently.	14	18.7	27	36.0	11	14.7	15	20.0	8	10.7	75	3.32
6	Students prefer to progress their communicative competence through regular practice grammatical rules directly.	24	32.0	30	40.0	10	13.3	6	8.0	5	6.7	75	3.82
7	When a student makes a mistake on the grammar activities, he/she prefers to obtain feedback from the teacher explicitly.	32	42.7	19	25.3	9	12.0	10	13.3	5	6.7	75	3.84
8	The best way to learn grammar to the student is through communicative activities to progress his/her language proficiency.	37	49.3	23	30.7	6	8.0	4	5.3	5	6.7	75	4.1
9	Since learning grammar in a communicative way creates classroom noisy, so it is better to avoid learning it in a communicative way.	--	--	4	5.3	10	13.3	34	45.3	27	36.0	75	1.88
10	Students work grammar activities in group can help them to solve their problem independently.	36	48.7	26	34.7	8	10.7	5	6.7	--	--	75	4.24
11	When students work grammar task in group/ pair, it helps to develop their communicative skill.	52	69.3	18	24.0	--	--	5	6.7	--	--	75	4.56
12	A good way to learn grammar to the students is to know grammatical rules implicitly.	32	42.7	30	40.0	5	6.7	8	10.7	--	--	75	4.14
Grand mean = 3.73													

As it is illustrated from table 4.3.1, Item 1, on the idea that after students are introduced and practiced a new grammar structure you talk and write in an active way. Thus, 42.7% and 40% of the respondents reported their strong agreement and agreement respectively. The great majorities of learners i.e.82.7% (4.13 mean value) are ranged between strongly agree and agree and this implies that almost all of the students have strong perception for CGT.

As to item 2, most of the respondents, 32% and 24%, reported their agreement and strong agreement on the idea that the students can improve their grammar rule through regular practice of structures rather than learning in communicative way. Whereas, 20% and 16% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively.

Regarding item 3, intended to realize that a student who is good in grammar (knows grammar well) she/he can communicate with others in better way or no. most of the respondents 45.3% reported their disagreement on the above issue. Whereas, 21.5% of the respondents replied strongly agreed on the above view. Thus, as could be seen from this result 50.6% of the respondents disagree that a student who is good in grammar can communicate with other in better way.

Concerning an item 4, 64% and 25.3% of the respondents reported that they strongly agreed and agreed on the issue of if the students learn grammar in group/pair; they can learn the language in a better way. So, the most respondents believed that they prefer to learn grammar in group/ pair to learn language better as the result (89.3%) indicated above.

In item 5, 36% of the respondents agreed with idea that if the teacher teaches student a grammatical rule by explaining it directly, a student can communicate or speak an English language fluently. while 30.7% of respondents rejected the idea (20% disagreed and strongly disagreed 10.7%) respectively.

The response to Item 6, revealed that 72 % of the respondents favored the idea with 32 % of strong agreement and 40 % of the respondents replied that they prefer to progress their communicative competence through regular practice grammatical rules directly. As can be seen from the table the mean value 3.82 is a signal to show only a very small portion of the respondent reported 13.5%, 8% and 6.7% undecided, disagreed and strongly disagreed to the above respectively. Of course, learners should be assessed continuously in order to evaluate the progresses and evaluate their gap in their day to day performance. This is because; continuous

assessment is an appropriate procedure of evaluation from the point of view of the current education policy of Ethiopia.

From the data analysis for item 7, 42.7% of students responded strongly agreed that they prefer to obtain feedback from their teacher explicitly when they did mistake on grammar activities. Whereas the rest 25.3%, 12%, 13.3% and 6.7% of students responded agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree, respectively. This indicates that less than half (32%) of the respondents believe that students have weak or wrong perception about the way mistakes should be corrected and which do not go in line with the principles of CGT with regard to feedback and error correction straightforward by (Celce-Murcia 1988:27) .

In reply to item 8, large portion of students 80% believed (with 49.3% strongly agree and 30.7% agree) that the best way to learn grammar to the student is through communicative activities to progress his/her language proficiency. But a very less students have (8%, 5.3% and 6.7% undecided, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively) believed with a wrong perception to learn grammar in communicative way to progress their language proficiency.

In contrast, in response to item 9, result shows 45.5% and 36% disagreed and 11.7% of the respondent strongly disagreed respectively that since learning grammar in a communicative way creates classroom noisy, so it is better to avoid learning it in a communicative way.

This implies that 81.3% of learners disagreed that learning grammar in a communicative way creates classroom noisy rather it is better to learn it in communicative way.

As item 10, the majority of the respondents 83.4% believed (with 48.7% strongly agreed and 34.7% agreed) that the students work grammar activities in group can help them to solve their problem independently. However, this clearly reveals that a large portion of respondents agreed up on the idea.

In response to item 11, the result shows 69.3% strongly agreed and 24% of the respondent agreed respectively that when students work grammar tasks in group/pair in which it helps them to develop their communicative skill. Thus, based on result of data analysis in item 11, one can conclude that most students still prefer grammar tasks in group/ pair to develop their communicative skill. Similarly, item 12, 42.7% and 40% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed that a good way to learn grammar to the learners is to know grammatical rules implicitly.

In general, the results obtained from Items 1-12 (average mean 3.73) show that the most respondents have strong perception about CGT. This computed mean value indicates that the

majority of the respondents (74.6%) have strong view of communicative grammar learning with regard to the principles of CGT stated.

Table 4.3.2. Learners' Responses for Classroom Practice

No.	Item	Frequency (Percentage)	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total	Mean
1	ESF teachers' should explain new words and phrases and let us do the grammar exercises in the textbook.	F (%)	32 (42.7)	20 (26.7)	11 (14.7)	7 (9.3)	5 (6.7)	75 (100)	3.89
2	The teacher gives the explanation of grammatical rules to us with model sentences to illustrate them.	F (%)	6 (8.0)	9 (12.0)	14 (18.7)	30 (40.0)	16 (21.3)	75 (100)	2.45
3	Teacher involves us in questioning and answering activities.	F (%)	7 (9.7)	8 (10.7)	18 (24.0)	26 (34.7)	16 (21.3)	75 (100)	2.5
4	Teacher makes us to exchange letters, write reports, advertisements etc. cooperatively.	F (%)	9 (12.0)	8 (13.3)	18 (24.0)	26 (34.7)	16 (21.3)	75 (100)	2.5
5	Teacher helps us to correct their error in their pair and group discussion.	f (%)	12 (16.0)	9 (12.0)	25 (33.3)	22 (29.3)	7 (9.3)	75 (100)	2.96
6	Teacher involves us in conversation and discussion on some issues.	f (%)	9 (12.0)	8 (10.7)	26 (34.7)	23 (30.7)	8 (10.7)	75 (100)	2.78
7	Teacher involves us in activities as identifying similarities and differences of pictures in group.	f (%)	7 (9.3)	12 (16.0)	23 (30.7)	21 (28.0)	12 (16.0)	75 (100)	2.74
8	Teacher corrects our error in controlled practice activities like question and answer.	f (%)	30 (40.0)	19 (25.3)	11 (14.7)	7 (9.3)	8 (10.7)	75 (100)	3.74
9	Teacher introduces the new language item in context and demonstrates the use and meaning of the new language and let us tries to produce, reproduce and communicate with the language.	f (%)	16 (21.3)	21 (28.0)	14 (18.7)	14 (18.7)	10 (13.3)	75 (100)	3.25
10	Teacher uses audiovisual materials to support our lesson.	f (%)	8 (10.7)	8 (10.7)	16 (21.3)	15 (20.0)	28 (37.3)	75 (100)	2.37
11	Teacher uses pair work in which two students work on a given task.	f (%)	1 (1.3)	10 (13.3)	26 (34.7)	32 (42.7)	--	75 (100)	2.49
12	Teacher uses group work in which more than two students work on a given task.	f (%)	3 (4)	6 (8.0)	24 (32.0)	27 (36.0)	15 (20.0)	75 (100)	2.4
13	Teacher evaluates the students in paper and pencil test (in months or semesters).	f (%)	8 (10.5)	10 (13.3)	14 (18.7)	26 (34.7)	17 (22.7)	75 (100)	2.54
Grand Mean = 2.81									

As can be seen in response to Item 1, which states teachers' explanation of new words or phrases', the result depicts that more than half (69.4 %) of their teachers explained new words

and phrases and let the learners do the exercises in the text. whereas, 31.9% and 30.9% of respondents testified that teachers use rarely and never on the issue raised above respectively. This clearly indicated that more than half of the students showed that teachers tend to use with traditional way of grammar teaching in their class room.

In response to item 3, 34.7% and 24% of students revealed that their teachers involve them in questioning and answering activities rarely and sometimes respectively. contrary, the response to item 2, depict that a total of 46.3% students with 30% (rarely) and 16% (never) reported teachers teaching grammatical rules using model sentences to illustrate them . On the other hand, 8%, 12% and 18.7% of students indicated always, often and sometimes respectively. This shows that a great majority of students give their witnessed that teacher teaches grammatical rules without the support of model sentences which is the indication that majority of CGT teachers employ traditional ways of grammar teaching.

In response to Items 4, 5, 6 and 7 depict that their mean values are below 3. This means that a total of 56% (with 35.7% and 30.7% of respondents answered that their teacher makes them to write and exchange letters rarely and never respectively. While 12%, 13.3% and 18.7% of the learners responded to always, often and sometimes. Similarly, the learners' response for Item 6 in which teacher helps them to them correct their error, 62.6 % of the learners replied that their teachers help them to correct their error in pair and group discussion. In addition the result on item 6, 34.7% and 30.7% of the learners indicated that their teachers involved them in conversation and discussion on some issues; item 7, 30.7% and 28% involves in identifying similarities and differences of pictures in the group sometimes and rarely respectively. In general, when we look at the results obtained for all grammar items, we can get an aggregate mean value 2.74 (below3) which means the learners response depict that their teachers practiced the mentioned communicative grammar activities between sometimes and rarely.

In response to Items 8 and 9, which deal with ways correcting students' error and introducing new language item in context, 65.5% of the respondent revealed that their teachers corrects their error in controlled practice way (with 40% and 25.5%) always and often. Whereas, 14.7%, 9.3% and 10.7% of the respondents sometimes, rarely and never respectively with the above views. Similarly, 49.3 % of the students proved that their teachers introduce the new language item in context and demonstrate the use and meaning always and often. However, 18.7% 18.7% and 13.3% of the respondent made their agreement on sometimes, rarely and never respectively.

Moreover, the results of the majority of communicative grammar activity statements (Items 10, 11, 12 & 13- See Appendix-D), depict that their mean values are below 3. (i.e. never) which means that 37.3 % of the learners indicated that their teachers use audiovisual materials to support their lesson. In item 12 and 13, the same result (42.7%) of the learners revealed that their teacher uses pair and group works rarely and sometimes respectively. In addition to item 14, 34.7% and 22.7% of the respondents depicted that their teacher evaluates them in paper and pencil tests on terms or semesters rarely and never; the remaining 10.7 %, 13.3%, and 18.7% of the respondents said that the teachers employed in the above view always, often and sometimes respectively. Generally, the results obtained from all non- grammar activities depict that 57.4% of the respondent learners responded that their teachers practiced them in non- communicative grammar activities which is traditional way teaching them.

To conclude, the results of the learners' response for classroom practice generally reveal that their teachers implemented communicative grammar teaching principles are in a very limited ways between the ranges of 'sometimes' and 'rarely' with a total mean score 2.81. This implies that a mismatch between teachers' perception about CGT principles and their classroom practices prevails and learners are vulnerable to be involved in teacher fronted or traditional ways of grammar learning.

4.4. Classroom Observation Results

In order to find out 3rd year college English language department students and four teachers actual classroom practices in the features of promoting CGT, semi-structured (yes/no) items. The observation was conducted using a checklist.(See appendix-B).

Table 4.4.1. Teachers' Actual Classroom Practices in CGT

Table 4.4.1.1: Instructional Activities

No	Items	Yes		No	
		No	%	No	%
1	Grammatical items are presented and practiced in a meaningful context to develop creative and independent use of the language.	4	25	12	75
2	The activities focus on language as a medium of communication.	3	18.75	13	81.25
3	The activities are more students – centered.	7	43.7	9	56.3
4	The activities are more emphasis on group- work and pair- work.	4	25	12	75
5	The activities emphasis on meaning.	4	25	12	75
6	The activities emphasis on accuracy.	3	18.75	13	81.2
7	Classroom grammar activities are maximizing students' communication opportunity.	7	43.7	9	56.3

Table 4.4.1.1 above indicated that all classroom activities were not well performed by the teachers. For instance, many teachers did not give group work activities, some of them did not focus on meaning rather form, emphasis on both fluency and accuracy or activities focus on language as a medium of communication. Moreover almost all of them did not follow up students' participation and activities. According to the observation result, only 43.7% of the instructors use more students-centered activities.

Table 4.4.1.2: Teacher's Role in class room observation during CGT

No	Items	Yes		No	
		No	%	No	%
1	Does the teacher present grammar items with detailed explanation and give some examples?	5	31.3	11	68.7
2	The teacher gives independent participation to learners' groups.	3	18.7	13	81.3
3	The teacher's role is organizing group –work.	4	25	12	75
4	The teacher's role is Organizing pair-work.	2	12.5	14	87.5
5	The teacher's role is Lecturing.	13	81.3	3	18.7
6	The teacher's role is Facilitating and monitoring class activities.	4	25	12	75

In table 4.4.1.2 above, the classroom observation result indicated that majority of the activities carried out by the instructors as the observers observed during lesson delivery in the actual class

room. Thus, 81.3% of the observed classes did not show the use of different instructional methods to implement CGT rather than it was lecturing.

Table4.4.1.3: Learners' Role in class room observation during CGT

No	Items	Yes		No	
		No	%	No	%
1	Do the students Listen to their teacher's explanation?	7	43.7	9	56.3
2	Do the students participate in group and pair work?	4	25	12	75
3	Are the students taking their note?	10	62.5	6	37.5
4	Do the students ask questions to their teachers?	3	18.7	13	81.3
5	Does the student involve in doing individual work?	9	56.3	7	43.7

The observation result of table 4.3.3 showed that the students did not do their expected activities in their class room during lesson delivery in the class room. Among 16 observed sessions, only 25% and 18.7% of them were observed participating in group and pair work and asking questions to their teacher respectively. The main reason for their poor participation may be the failure of their instructors to use CGT in their respective classes and the students may habituate in teacher centered teaching method in lower grades.

Table 4.4.1.4: Instructional Materials Used

No	Items	Yes		No	
		No	%	No	%
1	The teacher uses teaching modules.	8	50	8	50
2	The teacher uses the Duplicated materials.	5	31.3	9	56.7
3	The teacher uses the Audio-visual material.	-	-	16	100
4	The teacher uses pictures, maps and charts.	4	25	12	75

Availability of instructional materials in classroom is the major factor to improve the teaching and learning process in the class room. In table, 4.3.1.3 above, the observation result indicated that in the 50% of the observed classes, instructors did not use the teaching module. Moreover, in 100% of the observed classes, instructors did not use the Audio-visual material. To sum up, the utilization of instructional materials in the observed classes was found to be at a minimum level. This is might be due to instructors' carelessness.

4.5. Analysis of Teachers' interview

The analysis of data gathered through interview has also shown consistent results with findings of the questionnaires and the class room observation. It has also signified that teachers employ CGT. As mentioned in chapter three, an interview was held with four instructors using a semi-structured interview schedule (appendix-C). In order to address these themes, the five leading questions presented below were raised with relevant investigates.

1. What does communicative Grammar teaching mean for you?
2. What do you think, are the ways of teaching grammar communicatively in your classroom?
3. How do you relate communicative grammar teaching method to your teaching experience?
4. What do you think, should the role of the teacher be in the English Language Classroom during communicative grammar teaching?
5. What are the factors that affect you practice of communicative grammar teaching?

In this section, the interviewees' answers to the above major questions and to respective probes are described, and where possible, an attempt is made to link the findings from the interview, with the results obtained through teachers' questionnaire and class room observation too.

The interview data confirmed that teachers have sufficient understanding of CGT. The interview participants explained their ability to use the language for teaching grammar in communicative way to develop students' language proficiency. One of the teachers, for example defined CGT as follows:

From my point of view, CGT means the method of teaching structures through interaction effectively. Moreover, it is the way of teaching English language rules for communication purpose.

The other teacher, in his definition of CGT, defines it as;

CGT is an approach to teach structures to the students implicitly that help them to understand the rules indirectly and it enhances their communicative skill.

The third instructor explained CGT as follows;

From my point of view, CGT means the method of teaching grammar to the students in order to know the structure or form of tense during communication. Because, if the students practice and use the structure in a communicative way well, they will be fluent speaker in English language in the future.

The fourth instructor explained his own definition about CGT as follows;

CGT is an approach which aims for engaging the learners to learn structures together help them to participate actively in the given tasks in the situation like conversations, group work and pair work which help students to communicate effectively in their life.

Generally, the participants were convinced that CGT, as the most recent method to teach grammar in communicative way, has a great deal to offer to teach grammar in classroom context. Therefore, it should not predominantly teach as grammar /structure should not be studied isolate rather it should as a means for engaging the learners to practice the grammar items in communication. they expressed that CGT could make it possible to change existing attention from teaching structures as isolated items to teaching how to use the language for communication.

The purpose of the second interview question was to elicit information pertaining to the interviewees' perception to the way of teaching grammar communicatively. All of the interviewees considered and shared their experience that the ways of CGT are as follows.

Teaching grammar through dialogue and conversation, in making debate on some issues, by retelling stories, by preparing pair work activities, by inviting the learners to write sentences, paragraphs etc. Therefore, they could learn from their friends than they could by themselves. Furthermore, the interviewees believed that it is essential to expose the students to the target language in order to acquire rules implicitly.

The other question posed by the researcher was: How do you relate communicative grammar teaching method to your teaching experience?

One of the college instructors in expressing her view in teaching experience of CGT highlighted points as follows: I have experienced TEFL for the last twelve years. I am really interested and believe in the views of CGT. It is exactly the way in which one can teach. I have also taken the training that improves my method of teaching grammar in a communicative way. Before five years, I really thought that using CGT was tiresome task for me. Because, I preferred to teach

grammar in explicit way to them instead of teaching it a communicative way. But now, I can practically see that students learn more when they are engaged in group activities that make them participant. As to its practicability, it is difficult to make it 100% because of some factors such as interest, students' background, culture etc.

Another instructor on the other hand put his perception of CGT according to his experience by saying "It is more of theory than practice." First of all, I gave an individual assignment for each student in order to develop about their college life or whatever. Then after, I gave feedback to their work and told them to make conversation according to the feedback which I gave them before. Thus, it is theoretically very useful, but practically impossible to implement CGT by a number of reasons like large class size, work load of instructors, lack of interest and some complaints of both the teachers and students and also the problem of curriculum. If all these problems are minimized and the instructors accept it willingly, it is possible to implement CGT in English class room.

Additionally, the teachers complained much about the classroom management problems that were resulted from over-crowded classrooms.

Since the classrooms are overcrowded, classroom management becomes a Very Serious challenge for the teachers. There is usually chaos chairs in such large classes, when I try to use group work in my class, students become too active and really hard to control.

The other respondents also mentioned that students who are learning grammar at lower grade level focus on memorization of rules and facts. Thus, students start leaning grammar college at level they have too much difficulty to adjust themselves to learn grammar in communicative way even it is hard for them to practice it. But, they are already accustomed to with memorizing rules. With regard to this, one of these instructors forwarded the following.

I am an instructor at this college and my students come from high school in different woreda and kebele. So, the kind of education that they receive from high school affects their later education at College. Thus, our students are not accustomed to learn grammar in Communicative way, learning in a group / pair, in conversation/dialogue they find it difficult to adjust themselves to the concept of CGT. The fourth respondent's idea is almost similar with the above views.

Furthermore, four respondents identified that students have low motivation to learn grammar in communicative way or they have another characteristic problem of CGT.

To the question, “what do you think, should the role of the teacher be in the English Language Classroom during communicative grammar teaching?”

The respondents emphasized that the role a teacher plays is crucial in English language classes during CGT. A teacher, in expressing his views of teachers’ role in CGT, highlighted points as follows.

The roles of language teachers in CGT classrooms are:

- Preparing tasks/activities
- Facilitating the teaching-learning process
- Motivating the students to do activities actively
- Giving feedback and corrections.

This clearly shows that all the respondents have a clear awareness about the role of the language teachers during communicative grammar teaching. However, its effectiveness is yet not proved. But, four of the teachers believed that language teachers play a facilitator role. However, in CGT one of the major roles of language teacher should be an important participant within the teaching/ learning cooperatively. In addition, he/ she facilitates the communicative process between all participants in the English language classroom, and various grammar activities.

To the question, what are the factors that affect you practice of communicative grammar teaching?

The respondents perceived that they have almost the same views they replied for this question. As they replied that there are factors that hindered them not implemented CGT in their class room, like most our students are reluctant in communicative tasks, lack of teachers’ planning and preparation, module contents are too large, teachers’ resistance, mismatch between curriculum and assessment, lack of interest and students’ poor communicative skills, students’ mother tongue language interference and their culture, which means, most of them did not habituate to practice in English to learn grammar in communicative way in their lower classes rather they preferred to talk and practice in their own language. Additions to these, the other hinder factors are large class room size, lack of teachers’ commitment, class work load and students’ shyness to talk and discuss cooperatively in their class room work.

The responses, therefore, imply that there are a number of obstacles that block teachers from implementing principles of CGT despite the fact that they are aware of the importance of teaching grammar communicatively and the fact that they are interested with the notions and principles CGT entails.

In addition to the teachers' complaints, the participating learners suggested that they (the learners) know the importance of communicative grammar learning so as to foster their communicative competence, help them to know rules implicitly, to develop their confidences, to develop their creativity and help them to develop their independent learning and also share ideas and experiences. However, there are problems to do that. For instance, deficiency to speak and write in English is one of the obstacles. Most teachers often teach them grammar and give less emphasis to (neglect) speaking, writing and listening skills. Some students do not want to cooperate with others in group and pair work.

With regard to the importance of teaching grammar communicatively, the majority of learners responded that they believe the principles are important and they wish to employ them if they are not hindered by some contextual factors. Therefore, because of the prevailing obstacles (mentioned earlier) that hinder learners from practicing CGT principles, the learners revealed that they should be taught by their teachers explicitly.

To summarize the findings of the study, the responses of the teachers as well as the learner demonstrated that although they have favorable perception of the principles of the communicative grammar teaching approach, teachers are overcome by the difficulties (obstacles) they have within their contexts and students and do not try to adapt CGT principles at least to some of the contexts; and learners are shaped and guided by the dominant teacher centered teaching classroom practices although they understand the importance of learning grammar communicatively to some extent.

4.6. Discussion

This section revealed that the finding of the ESL teacher's perception and practice of communicative grammar teaching in English class room in Gilgel Beles, CTE. Thus, the findings were discussed in line with the research objectives, research questions and with other related studies which were included in review of literature.

The first research question was aimed to find out how EFL teachers perceive CGT and its principles in English class room. The overall findings indicate that Gilgel Beles CTE, English language teachers have a positive perception toward CGT. Thus, it seems that the teachers strongly favor the use of CGT principles in their English classes. However, only a few teachers apply the CGT principles partially. The findings of this study are in line with the results found in Taiwanese (Savignon and Wang, 2003). Furthermore, the result is consistent with the study conducted by Schulz's (1996) study on the students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar instruction in a foreign language setting revealed that many students have a more favorable attitude towards grammar instruction than their teachers. The results indicated that the teachers held strong beliefs and positive attitudes toward CGT. Their favorable beliefs and attitudes led them to try out CGT in English classrooms and adopt CLT successfully.

However, this result was consistent with the study conducted by Beyen (2008) who found out that the majority of English teachers at Addis Ababa Secondary Schools have strong view of communicative language teaching with regard to the principles of CLT.

The interview data also showed that teachers were convinced that CGT, the most recent English language teaching approach, has a great deal to offer to English grammar teaching in classroom context. This was verified by questionnaire the majority of the respondents (73%) have strong view of communicative grammar teaching with regard to the principles of CGT stated. Therefore, the result implies that it is possible to think that teachers can put CGT principles in to in their entire EFL classes in the College.

The second research question was aimed at finding out to assess how often the college EFL teachers practice and implement CGT in their English classroom. The two groups (teachers and students) reacted either through questionnaire or the interview. To validate the data, structured observation was also made. To this end, the teachers' and the students' questionnaires were developed to know the frequency of using various communicative grammar learning instructional practices. The teachers' indicated that the teachers implemented CGT rarely in their classrooms. The responses of the teachers to question related to their use of CGT were validated by the responses of the students. Students generally tended to agree with the teachers about the frequency of the use of CGT (Appendix D, Part II).

Borg (2006) described in his study of grammar teaching the teachers had positive perception toward CGT tend to use more communicative grammar activities in their classroom practice. But teachers' beliefs and practices are not always congruent because of some constraints.

Beyene (2008), tried to investigate the teachers' and students' understanding about CLT concepts, and their practice in EFL classes, so, they have positive perception of CLT. The study indicated that there is a mismatch between what teachers and learners perceive about CLT and what they actually practice in the classroom. But their positive perception doesn't let them to practice CLT in their classroom.

The results obtained from the teachers' interview revealed, as to the reasons for mismatch between teachers' and learners' perception about CGT and teachers actually practice, a number of reasons were proposed. That the most common problems that hindered them from practicing communicative grammar classroom activities were: lack of teachers' planning and preparation, module contents are too large, teachers' resistance, mismatch between curriculum and assessment, lack of interest and students' poor communicative skills, students' mother tongue language interference and their culture, which means, most of them did not habituate to practice in English to learn grammar in communicative way in their lower classes rather they preferred to talk and practice in their own language and teacher led class room.

This finding is consistent with Endalkachew (2006) who studied a research on the topic The Communicative Language Teaching in Selected Second Cycle Primary Schools in East Shoa Zone found out large class size and English teachers traditional type or teacher-centered teaching methodology. The main reason for this similarity might be due to the fact that in both of the research settings are in the same country even though the studies are conducted in different education level.

Furthermore, based on the position of the two groups of respondents and the interview and observation made by the researcher, it is possible to conclude that the extent of the practice of communicative grammar teaching in the college is low. This implies that a mismatch between teachers' perception about CGT principles and their classroom practices prevails and learners are vulnerable to be involved in teacher-fronted or traditional ways of grammar learning.

The third research question was aimed at finding out to assess the relationship of the teachers' perception of communicative grammar teaching and their practices in the classroom. The researcher obtained similar result to this research question with above idea. Thus, teachers have

good perception for CGT, but they do have ample of problems to implement it in English class room. Such as, lack of teachers' planning and preparation, module contents are too large, teachers' resistance, mismatch between curriculum and assessment, lack of interest and students' poor communicative skills, students' mother tongue language interference and their culture.

So, this finding is also consistent with Endalkachew (2006) study in which there are some factors that that hinder teachers do not implement CLT in the class room, like large class size, failures of the learners to use the language outside the classroom, and the low proficiency of the learners in the English language, the teachers' teaching methodology are the most hindrance in implementing CLT. In addition to that, the majority of the English teachers had limited experiences about CGT and they had used traditional type or teacher-centered English teaching methodology.

In terms of years of experience, there were some differences between the perceptions of the teachers. In the perceptions of the teachers with more than 10 years of experience and teachers who did not take seminar /workshop concerning CGT in the college have a tendency towards former approaches of grammar was observed.

Generally, it can conclude that, this finding revealed that there is a gap between Gilgel Beles English language teachers' perception and practice of CGT in the English class room. But, this finding is not consistent with Hailom Banteyerga (1982) study of communicative approach vs the structural approach in the teaching of "English conditional sentences to first year students of Addis Ababa University." Whereas in this finding, they do have a positive perception for teaching grammar in communicative way, but they cannot practice the students grammar activities in communicative way in the class room due to different factors mention above.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the summary of the findings, conclusions, and some possible recommendations of the study. The purpose of this study was to assess teachers' perception and practice of the Communicative grammar teaching in English class room at Gilgel Beles CTE, Based on the analysis and discussion, the following summary, conclusions and recommendations are made

5.1. Summary

As mentioned in chapter one, this study was mainly concerned with the assessment teachers' perception and practice of the Communicative grammar teaching in English class room. The study was conducted at Gilgel Beles College of teachers' education and 3rd year three diploma level English language students were taken as the subject of the study. Therefore, to arrive at a valid conclusion, addressing the statement of the problem and the research questions in line with review of literature, three types of data gathering instruments (questionnaire, classroom observation and interview) were used. After a pilot study was conducted, the data were gathered through the aforementioned instruments and were presented, analyzed and discussed in chapter four. Thus, the major findings of the study are summarized as follow:

1. Teachers' and students' responses concerning their perception of communicative grammar teaching with regard to the principles of CGT (M= 3.65 and M= 3.73 and for students and teachers respectively) show college EFL teachers and students have a good perceptions and also they seem to be aware of the importance of communicative grammar teaching.
2. The results of the students' response for classroom practice generally reveal that their teachers implemented communicative grammar principles in a very limited ways between the ranges of mostly "sometimes" and "rarely with a (grand mean = 2.8), and this is consistent with the result of classroom observation revealed that 81.3% of them were ineffective which show that teachers did seem to teacher-centered and lecture methods. This result indicates that there exists a discrepancy between what teachers understand about CGT and what they really practice.

3. Whereas, the result of teachers' response for classroom practice of CGT generally reveal that they implemented communicative grammar principles was also in a very limited ways among the ranges of "sometimes" and "rarely plus "never" with (the grand mean value are 2.9). This is directly consistent with the result of classroom observation of teachers' role in organizing the students in group and pair work 75% and 87.5% which is very low respectively. This result indicates that the teachers practice was poor.
4. The results obtained from the teachers' interview revealed that the most common problems that hindered or blocked them from practicing communicative grammar activities in English classroom were:- lack of teachers' planning and preparation, module contents are too large, teachers' resistance, mismatch between curriculum and assessment, lack of interest and students' poor communicative skills, students' mother tongue language interference and their culture. The results obtained from the learners' interview response also substantiated the teachers' complaints which state the obstacles that blocked CGT from being practiced in EFL classes. Meanwhile, the respondent learners professed that although they knew that CGT Principles are important to develop one's communicative competence, writing skills and help to share ideas and experiences, it is difficult to make it effective because it wastes time and it doesn't go in harmony with the examination that they are accustomed to do; and they are Incapable of communicating (writing and speaking) in English.

5.2. Conclusions

The overall findings the responses obtained from the whole CGT perspectives reveal a mean value 3.55. This computed mean value indicates that the majority of the respondents (71%) have strong view of communicative grammar teaching with regard to the principles of CGT stated. Therefore, with regard to teachers' perception of CGT, the findings revealed that the total mean score for conceptual perspective yielded 3.87 the students' learning perspective-3.56 instructional perspective- 3.53, perspective on the importance of grammar- 2.98, perspective on error correction- 3.18, teachers' role perspective- 3.74 and perspective on learners' role- 4.03. Generally, from all the results (which yielded aggregate mean 3.55); we can conclude that college EFL teachers have mildly high level of perception of CGT with regard to its beliefs.

The findings also revealed that more than half of the results (74.6 %), in terms of mean score, from the learners' questionnaire about CGT perception ranged from 3.0- 4.56 with a total mean

score 3.73. thus, this mean value indicates that the majority of the learners have strong view of communicative grammar learning with regard to the principles of CGT stated.

Looking at the results about classroom practices (obtained from both teachers' and learners' questionnaires), we can get a total mean score 2.9 for the teachers' and 2.8 for the learners' responses- which means between the scale values sometimes and rarely. This implies that teachers are often likely to implement non-communicative (traditional) ways of language teaching and ignore the communicative ones and it shows a clear gap between what teachers as well as learners advocate perceiving about CGT principles and what they practice in real EFL classrooms.

The data obtained from the classroom observations and teachers' and learners' interviews indicate that there is a clear mismatch between what teachers as well as learners perceive about CGT and what they actually practice in EFL classes. As can be seen from the results of the observation (Table 4.4.1.3), 81.3% of observed class room shows that teachers failed to practice classroom communicative grammar teaching activities and rather they tend to practice non communicative ones. This can be associated with a number of reasons that teachers as well as learners proposed. The results obtained from the teachers' interview revealed that the most common problems that hindered or blocked them from practicing communicative grammar teaching in the classroom were:-, lack of teachers' planning and preparation, module contents are too large, teachers' resistance, mismatch between curriculum and assessment, lack of students' interest and s poor communicative skills, students' mother tongue language interference and their culture, which means, most of them did not habituate to practice in English to learn grammar in communicative way in their lower classes rather they preferred to talk and practice in their own language.

To conclude, the overall findings of this study indicate that in spite of the fact that teachers mildly have high level of understandings of CGT concepts, in reality they failed to practice them in EFL classes in the entire contexts. Similarly, although learners have somewhat considerable degree of perception of CGT tenets, the traditional types of classroom practice employed are likely challenging for learners to adapt an alternate learner centered learning approach and are forced to devote themselves to teacher led classroom activities due to a number of reasons raised above. This generally indicates that there is a clear mismatch between what teachers and learners perceive about CGT and what they actually practice.

5.3. Recommendations

On the basis of the findings and the conclusions drawn above, the following recommendations were made:

- From the background information of teachers' questionnaire it was observed that majority of them did not get training on communicative grammar teaching. This hinders their implementation of communicative grammar teaching. Therefore, the College, Ministry of Education and other concerned bodies should plan and organize successive workshops and seminars training so that teachers can get the chance to share experiences, gain the approaches to teach grammar in communicative way and on how to cope with the existing problems in the college.
- From students' class room practice evaluation questionnaire, the majority of the teachers evaluated the students in paper and pencil test (in months or semester). So, should be modified in order to evaluate students' grammatical competence through implicitly to the rules.
- Teachers be short of practical application of CGT principles and techniques. Teachers should be given the chance to play the roles of prepare teaching materials, planning, monitoring and evaluating their learning. Therefore, teachers education programs, should address at in-depth training on CGT methodologies. Thus, this can also stimulate other researchers to conduct similar or further studies.
- Next, this research findings should help not only college EFL teachers but also the Ministry of Education (MOE), specially curriculum designers and other concerned bodies to start distancing themselves from primary focus on the teacher fronted language teaching style and it is recommended that teachers should begin implementation of the communicative approach to teach grammar since it may show to provide the most promising results when it comes to learners' communicative competence.
- Finally, hopefully, the research findings in this paper will encourage an extension of research (as mentioned Section1.5) in to teachers' knowledge and understanding of CGT. A range of conceptualization, rich in detail, is further needed to provide college EFL teachers with framework and models that they can follow in their own practical classes.

Therefore, this study is not intended to make any generalization, so any concerned and interested body can make use of this study as avenue for further studies and is suggested to contribute a lot.

Reference

Alamirew, G. (1992). "The Applicability of Group Work in Learning English."

- (Unpublished). M.A. Thesis, Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Al-kharat, M.C (2000). Deductive and Inductive lesson for Saudi EFL Freshman Students. Abha: King Khalid University.<http://iteslj.org/techniques> Alkharrt deductive/
- Atkins, J. Hailom, B. and Nuru, M. (1995). *Skills Development Methodology*. Addis Ababa. AU Printing Press.
- Beyene Gebru (2008), “English Teachers’ Perception and Practice of Communicative Language Teaching in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language” (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Breen, M. P. and Conclin, C. (1980). The Essentials of Communicative Curriculum in Language Teaching. *ELT Journal* 1/2, 89-99
- Brown, K. (2006). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. UK. Elsevier Ltd.
- Burns, A. (1999). Collaborative action research for English language teachers. Cambridge: CPU.
- Bloor, T. and Bloor, M. (2004). *The Functional Analysis of English*. Arnold. Hadder: Headline group.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M., (1980), "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing", *Applied Linguistics* 1: pp. 1-47.
- Clece- Murcia, M. and Hilles. (1988). *Techniques and Resources in Teaching grammar*.
- Cook, V.(2001).*Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Coskun, A. 2011. Investigation of the application of communicative language teaching in the English language classroom: A Case study on teachers’ attitudes in Turkey. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching* 21, pp. 85 – 109.
- Creswell, J. W.2003. *Research Design*. London, UK: Sage Publish House.
- Creswell, J. W. 2009. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd Editioned.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Douglas, D., (2000), *Assessing Languages for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge Language Assessment Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Easton, V. J. & McColl, J. H. (2007) Statistics Glossary: Sampling [Electronic Version] <http://www.stats.gla.ac.uk/steps/glossary/sampling.html>
- Edilian, L. (2009). *A study of attitudes toward grammar instruction in an academic English program*. Saarbücken: VDM Verlag.

- Ellis, N. (1993). Rules and instances in foreign language learning: Interactions of implicit and explicit knowledge. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 5, 289–319.
- Ellis, R. (1991). *Second Language Acquisition and Language Pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters
- Endalkachew W/Mariam (2006) “The Communicative Language Teaching in Selected Second Cycle Primary Schools in East Shoa Zone”
- Erton, İ., (1997), A Contrastive Study of Turkish and English Interrogatives: A Discourse Perspective. (MA Thesis) Ankara: Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (1999). The reflective assignment: Unlocking pre-service English teachers’ beliefs on grammar teaching. *RELC Journal*, 30(2), 1–17.
- Geremew Semu. (1994). “The Effectiveness of Teaching English as a Foreign Language through Grammar Consciousness-Raising Activities to Ninth Grade Students” M.A. Thesis. (unpublished). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Gill, R., (2000), "Discourse analysis", In Bauer, M. W. and Gaskell, G. (eds.) *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound: A practical handbook*. London: Sage.
- Girma Gezahegn. (2005). “A Study of Secondary School English Language Teacher’s Implementation of Methodological Innovations: The Teaching of Grammar in Focus.” PhD. Thesis. (Unpublished). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Hailom Banteyrga. (1982). “English Conditional sentences: A Comparative Analysis of Structural and Communicative Approach in Teaching to Non-native Speakers.” M.A. Thesis. (unpublished). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Haregewein Abate. (1993). “The Feasibility and Value of Using Role Play to Improve Communicative Skills. In Ethiopian Senior Secondary Schools.” M.A. Thesis. (Unpublished) Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Herdman M, Fox-Rushby J, Badia X (1998) *A model of equivalence in the cultural adaptation of HRQoL instruments: the universalist approach*. *Qual Life Res* 7(4): 323–35
- Harmer, J. (1987). *Teaching and Learning Grammar*. London: Longman.
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Hammerly, h. (1987). The Immersion Approach. *Modern Language Journal*, 19/2, 331-59
- Hedge, T., (2000), *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: OUP.
- Horowitz, E. (1990). Attending to the affective domain in the foreign language classroom.

- Hymes, D. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In Pride, J. B., & Holmes, J. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, 269-293. Baltimore, USA: Penguin Education, Penguin Books Ltd.
- Humboldt. (1974). *Presenting Grammar Inductively*. JSTOR: Modern Language Journal 12/6,440-44
- Jones, L. (1993). *Communicative Grammar Practice*. The Modern Language Journal 77/1. Cambridge University Press.
- Lakachew Mulat. (2003). "Teachers' Attitude towards Communicative Language Teaching and Practical Problems in its Implementation." (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Larson-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Teaching Techniques in English as a Second Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage
- Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Markee, N (1997). *Managing Curricular Innovation*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Meadows K, Wisher S (2000) *Establishing cross-cultural validity in health surveys*. National Centre for Social Research. Survey Methods Newsletter 20(2):1363–4518
- McCargar, D. F. (1993). Teacher and student role expectations: Cross-cultural differences and implications. *Modern Language Journal*, 77, 192–207.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Nassaji & Fotos, (2004). "Current Developments in Research on the Teaching of grammar,"
- Niglas, K. 2004. *The Combined Use of Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Educational Research*. Tallinn, Estonia: Tallinn Pedagogical University Dissertation on Social Sciences.
- Nitta, R. and Garden, S. (2005). *Consciousness-raising and Practice in ELT Course Books*. ELT Journal Vol. 59/1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1989). "Designing tasks for the communicative classroom." Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Peacock, M. (1998). Exploring the gap between teachers' and students' beliefs about "useful" m activities for EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 233-250.

- Petrovitz, W. (1997). The role of context in the presentation of grammar. *ELT journal*, 51(3), 201-207.
- Peterson. (1986). *ESP in Practice*. London: Macmillan Publisher Ltd.
- Razmjoo, S.A. and Riazi, A.M. (2000) "Is Communicative Language Teaching in the Expanding Circle? A Case Study of Teachers of Shiraz High School and Institutes." *Journal of Language and Learning*. 4/2:144-171
- Rex, S. M. (2003). Rethinking Grammar in of Foreign Language Classroom. *Journal of Language and Language Learning*. Vol.1, no 1
- Richards, J.C. (N.D.). "Communicative Language Teaching Today." <http://www.Professor jack Richards. Com/pdf/communicative language teaching today -v2.Pdf>.
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T.S. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: 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.
- Saricoban, A. and Metin, E. (2000). Songs, Verse and Games for Teaching Grammar. *The Internet TESL Journal*, vol. VI, no.10. <http://itesis-org/>
- 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., and Wang, C. (2003). Communicative Language Teaching in EFL Contexts: Learners Attitudes and Perceptions. *IRAL*, 44(3), 223-50.
- Selinger, H. W., and E. Shohamy. 1989. *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Selinker, L., & Lakshamanan, U. (1992). Language transfer and fossilization: The "Multiple Effects Principle". In S. M. Gass, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in Language learning* (pp. 197-216). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stern, H. (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language*

Annals, 29, 343-364

- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and Quantitative approaches. *Applied Social Research Methods Series, 46*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Toan, V. (2013). English teaching in Vietnam: Teacher 're-education'. Tuoi Tre News. Retrieved 15/06/2015, 2015
- Thompson, G. (1996). Some Misconceptions and CLT. *ELT Journal* 50/1, 9-15.
- Tudor, I. (1996). *Learner-Centeredness as Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ur, P. (1988). *Grammar Practice Activities. A Practical guide for teachers*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Vanpattern, B. (1998). Perception and Perspectives on the Term "communicative." University of Illinois at Urbana – Champaign.
- Wang, P. J. (2009). A study of teacher and student perceptions concerning grammar-translation method and communicative language teaching. *Nanya Journal*, 28, 135–152.
- Widdowson, H. (1990). *Aspects of Language Teaching*. London: Oxford University Press
- Wright, A. (1989). *Pictures for Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Yemane Debebe (2007). "English Teachers' Perception and Practice of Communicative Language Teaching in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language" (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University
- Yim, L. W. (1993). *Relating teachers' perceptions of the place of grammar to their teaching practices* (Master's thesis). National University of Singapore, Singapore.

LIST OF APPENDIX

APPENDIX –A: TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

**JIMMA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITY SCHOOL
OF POST GRADUATE STUDY DEPARTEMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND
LITERATURE**

Dear Teachers,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information for *an assessment of teachers' perception and practice of communicative grammar teaching* in English language class room. It is one of the instruments which the researcher uses to gather the necessary data for his MA thesis in the teaching of English as a foreign language (TEFL). Your genuine and truthful response to the questionnaire is worthwhile.

Thus, you are kindly requested to read the questions carefully and give your responses to each question. The information will be kept *strictly, confidential* and will not be used to assess you in any way.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

PART 1: Background information

Direction 1: Please give information about yourself for each of the categories below. Put a tick (✓) mark in the appropriate box where necessary.

1. Field of study: Major _____ Minor _____
2. Qualification: A. BA B. MA C. PhD E. Other (specify)
3. Total years of your teaching experience:
A. Five and less than five years C. 11-20 years
B. 6-10 years D. More than 15 years
4. Your teaching load in periods per week
A. 10 and less than 10 C. 21-30
B. 11-20 D. above 30
5. Average number of students in one class
A. 30 and less than 30 C. 41-50
B. 31-40 D. 51-60 E. above 60

II	Students' Learning Perspective in CGT					
7	Students' achievement of English grammatical rule is most productive in the context of a communicative approach.					
8	Students' involvement and mastering of the English grammatical rule are the most helpful to progress their communicative skill in EFL Classroom.					
9	Learning grammar at discourse level is boring.					
10	Learning grammar in communicative form is interesting.					
11	Teaching grammar in communicative approach supports learners to be fluent in English language.					
II	Perspective on Instructional Activities					
I						
12	In EFL programs, grammar teaching is best accomplished with a communicative approach.					
13	Grammar is best taught explicitly. That is, rules should be clearly stated and pointed out to the students.					
14	Grammar is best taught implicitly. That is, grammar rules should not be pointed out but they should be understood implicitly through various forms of exposure.					
15	Grammar should only be taught or mentioned when a particular grammar point appears in the material or communication (in context).					
16	Grammar is best taught either inductively or deductively depending on the teachers' preference.					
17	Grammar is best taught either inductively or deductively depending on the students' preference.					
18	Grammar should be mainly practiced in oral communication, then showed the rule later on.					
19	Practice of structures must always be within full communicative contexts.					
IV	Perspective on the Importance of Grammar for communicative skill					
20	Knowledge of grammar in language does not guarantee the ability to use language for communicative purpose.					
21	Direct instruction in the rules is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively.					
22	In general speaking, students' communicative ability improves most quickly if they study and practice the grammar of the language.					
23	It is more important to practice a L2 in situations simulating real life (i.e., interview, role plays, etc.) than to analyze and practice grammatical patterns.					
24	The formal study of grammar is essential to the eventual mastery of a FL/L2 when language learning is limited to the classroom.					
V	Perspective on Error Correction and Assessments on CGT					
25	In CGT approach, Students should correct their grammatical errors in pair or group is essential.					
26	When my students make grammar mistakes, I will ignore their mistakes, so that they can be more confident and more fluent.					
27	When my students make grammar mistakes, I will immediately correct the mistakes, so that they can be more accurate and easier to understand.					
28	Good evaluation is carried out when the focus of the evaluation is on					

	accuracy (grammatical correctness).					
29	Evaluation of students' progress in grammar rule should be carried out on the basis of their day to day classroom communicative performance (e.g. role play).					
30	The teacher should correct all the grammatical errors which the students make, this will result in imperfect learning.					
31	For students to become effective communicators in the foreign language, the teacher's feedback must be focused on English grammatical forms of the students' responses.					
32	Since errors are normal (natural) part of learning, much correction is wastage of time.					
VI	Perspective on Teacher's Role in CGT					
3 3	Teacher plays a facilitator role in CGT class.					
3 4	The role of the teacher in the grammar lesson is to impart (demonstrate) knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing and giving examples.					
3 5	The teacher should act as an independent participant within the grammar teaching- learning group.					
3 6	Teacher makes students to discover grammar rules by themselves through dialogue.					
3 7	Practice is a crucial importance for the students to master grammar points without the help of teacher.					
3 8	The teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials in which it has grammar activities so as to develop the students' communicative skill.					
VII	Perspective on Learners' Role during CGT					
3 9	Students can improve their communicative competency through regular practice of grammatical structures.					
4 0	Students can suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for him/her in language classroom.					

Section –Two: The following questions are prepared to assess teachers' classroom practice in communicative grammar teaching. Please, read the following items carefully and put a tick (√) mark indicating the most appropriate alternative for each of the given items based on your classroom practice.

The following alternatives are delivered as responses:

- Always=5 sometimes =3
- Often =4 Rarely=2
- Never=1

No	Item	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1

41	ESF teachers should explain new grammatical terminologies or forms and patterns (rules) and let the learners be engaged in doing exercises.					
42	Explain new words and phrases and let the learners do the grammar exercises in the textbook.					
43	Give students explanation of rules with model sentences to illustrate them.					
44	Involve students in questioning and answering activities.					
45	Involve learners in activities as identifying similarities and differences of pictures in group.					
46	Make the learners exchange letters, write reports, advertisements etc. cooperatively.					
47	Introduce the new language item in context and demonstrate the use and meaning of the new language and let the learners try to produce, reproduce and communicate with the language.					
48	Involve learners in problem- solving activities.					
49	Use pair work in which two students work on a given task.					
50	Use group work in which more than two students work on a given task.					
51	Use group work in which more than two students work on a given task.					
52	Help learners correct their error in their pair and group discussion.					
53	Use pictures and objects to convey the meaning of structure.					
54	Let learners do assignments at home and give feedback on other days for the whole class.					
55	Use different kinds of language games e.g. word dominoes.					
56	Correct learners' error in controlled practice activities like question and answer.					
57	Evaluate students in paper and pencil test (on terms or semesters).					

APPENDIX-B: CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES OBSERVATION CHECKLIST IN CGT

CollegeTeacherDate..... entry and section.....Lesson..... Time.....

No	Activities/Tasks	Yes	No
1	Instructional Activities		
1.1	Grammatical items are presented and practiced in a meaningful context to develop creative and independent use of the language?		
1.2	The activities focus on language as a medium of communication.		
1.3	The activities are more students –oriented.		
1.4	The activities are more emphasis on group- work and pair- work.		

1.5	The activities are emphasis on meaning.		
1.6	The activities are emphasis on both fluency and accuracy.		
1.7	Classroom grammar activities are maximizing students' communication opportunity.		
2	Teacher's Role		
2.1.	Does the teacher present grammar items with detailed explanation and give some examples?		
2.2	The teacher gives independent participation to learners' groups.		
2.3	The teacher's role is organizing group –work.		
2.4	The teacher's role is Organizing pair-work.		
2.5	The teacher's role is Lecturing.		
2.6	The teacher's role is Facilitating and monitoring class activities.		
3	Learners' Role		
3.1	The student's role is Listening to teacher's explanation.		
3.2	The student's role is participating in group and pair work		
3.3	The student's role is taking note		
3.4	The student's role is asking questions to teachers		
3.5	The student's role is doing individual work		
4	Instructional Materials Used		
4.1	Does the teacher use teaching modules?		
4.2	Does the teacher use the Duplicated materials?		
4.3	Does the teacher use the Audio-visual material?		
4.6	Does the teacher use pictures, maps and charts?		

APPENDIX- C: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR TEACHERS

General Instructions: This interview is principally composed of open-ended questions addressing the various issues related to the teachers' perception and practice of Communicative grammar Teaching (CGT) in English classroom, particularly at Gilgel Beles, CTE. The participant teachers may ask to review the questions briefly before the interview. The interviewer can ask some additional questions based on the responses that will be given by the particular interviewee on the previously posted questionnaire. Moreover, some further questions may emerge in the course of the interview depending on the interviewee's responses to the interview questions. The interview will last between twenty five to fifty minutes.

1. What does communicative Grammar teaching mean for you?
2. What do you think, are the ways of teaching grammar communicatively in your classroom?
3. How do you relate communicative grammar teaching method to your teaching experience?
4. What do you think, should the role of the teacher be in the English Language Classroom during communicative grammar teaching?
5. What are the factors that affect you practice of communicative grammar teaching?

APPENDIX-D: STUDENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE

JIMMA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITY SCHOOL OF POST GRADUATE STUDY DEPARTEMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Dear students,

This questionnaire is designed to gather information for educational research in a foreign language teaching. The research questions focus on assessment teachers' perception and practice of communicative grammar teaching in English classroom.

Therefore, your genuine and honest response to the questionnaire is worthwhile. You are kindly requested to answer each question. The information will be kept strictly confidential, and will not be used to assess you in any way.

I appreciative your corporation

I. Personal information

Direction-1: Please, give information about yourself for each of the categories below. Put a tick (✓) mark in the appropriate box where necessary.

- A. The name of the College _____
- B. Age 17-19 20-22 23- 25 26 and above
- C. Sex Male Female
- D. Entry First year second year third year

Direction 2: Please read the following items carefully and circle the appropriate answer.

1. How do you learn grammar?
 - A. Teacher explains the grammar rules explicitly.

- B. The teacher organizes group work and explains the rules implicitly.
- C. The teacher lectures the lesson.
2. Why do you learn grammar?
- A. To explain and understand grammar rule.
- B. To learn the language to use for communication.
- C. Only to pass the examination.
3. After you are introduced and practiced a new grammar structure you talk and write in an active way.
- A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Strongly disagree D. Disagree
4. Students can improve their grammar rule through regular practice of structures rather than learning in communicative way.
- A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Disagree D. Strongly disagree
5. A student who is good in grammar (knows grammar well) she/he can communicate with others in better way.
- A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Disagree D. Strongly disagree
6. If the students learn grammar in group/pair, they can learn the language in a better way.
- A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Disagree D. Strongly disagree
7. If the teacher teaches student a grammatical rule directly, a student can communicate or speak an English language fluently.
- A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Disagree D. Strongly disagree
8. Teacher evaluates students' progress in grammar rule should be carried out on the basis of their day to day classroom communicative performance (e.g. role play).
- A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Disagree D. Strongly disagree
9. When a student makes a mistake on the grammar activities, he/she prefers to obtain feedback from the teacher explicitly.
- A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Disagree D. Strongly disagree
10. The best way to learn grammar to the student is through communicative activities to progress his/her language proficiency.
- A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Disagree D. Strongly disagree
11. Since learning grammar in a communicative way creates classroom noisy, so it is better to avoid learning it in a communicative way.
- A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Disagree D. Strongly disagree

12. Students work grammar activities in group can help them to solve their problem independently.
- A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Disagree D. Strongly disagree
13. When students work grammar task in group/ pair, it helps to develop their communicative skill.
- A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Disagree D. Strongly disagree

Section –Two: The following questions are prepared to assess teachers’ classroom practice in communicative grammar teaching. Please, read the following items carefully and put a tick (√) mark indicating the most appropriate alternative for each of the given items based on your classroom practice.

The following alternatives are delivered as responses:

- Always =5
- Often =4
- Sometimes =3
- Rarely =2
- Never=1

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	ESF teachers' should explain new grammatical forms and patterns (rules) and let us be engaged in doing exercises.					
2	ESF teachers' should explain new words and phrases and let us do the grammar exercises in the textbook.					
3	The teacher gives the explanation of grammatical rules to us with model sentences to illustrate them.					
4	Teacher involves us in questioning and answering activities.					
5	Teacher makes us to exchange letters, write reports, advertisements etc. cooperatively.					
6	Teacher helps us to correct their error in their pair and group discussion.					
7	Teacher involves us in conversation and discussion on some issues.					
8	Teacher involves us in activities as identifying similarities and differences of pictures in group.					
9	Teacher corrects our error in controlled practice activities like question and answer.					
10	Teacher introduces the new language item in context and demonstrates the use and meaning of the new language and let us tries to produce, reproduce and communicate with the language.					
11	Teacher uses audiovisual materials to support your lesson.					
12	Teacher uses pair work in which two students work on a given task.					
13	Teacher uses group work in which more than two students work on a given task.					
14	Teacher evaluates the students in paper and pencil test (in months or semesters).					

APPENDIX- E: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR STUDENTS

First of all, I appreciate your cooperation and willingness to my interview. The objectives of this interview is that to know students' understanding on *assessment teachers' perception and practice of communicative grammar teaching in English classroom at Gilgel Beles, CTE*. So, your genuine opinion or response has its own contribution to my study and I kindly request you to give me the required information. Therefore, I would like to thank you again for sparing your valuable time and effort in this interview. I would like to let you know that any information will be kept confidential and used only for this study.

1. What does communicative Grammar teaching mean for you?
2. How does your teacher make you to practice grammar in communicative way in your English classroom?
3. How do you see your teacher's perception to teach grammar in communicative way in your English classroom?
4. How often does your teacher practice you in CGT in English classroom?
5. What are the factors that affect your teacher to teach you grammar in a communicative way in your English classroom?
6. How does your teacher teach you grammar rule well that can help you to progress your communicative competency?