



COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

**EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING
AND THEIR CLASSROOM PRACTICES IN TEACHING GRAMMAR: THE CASE OF
FOUR SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN JIMMA ZONE, SEKA WOREDA**

BY

SEBLEWORK SHIBIRU

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND
LITERATURE IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN
LANGUAGE (TEFL)**

JULY, 2021

JIMMA, ETHIOPIA

EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Communicative Language Teaching and their
Classroom Practices in Teaching Grammar: The Case of Four Secondary Schools
in Jimma Zone, Seka Woreda

By

Seblework Shibiru

Demis Gebretsadik (Assistant professor): Main Advisor

Selassie Cheru (PhD): Co- advisor

July, 2021

Jimma, Ethiopia

Declaration

I, the undersigned graduate student, hereby declare that this thesis is my original work, and it has not been presented for a degree in any other university for academic credit and that all sources of the materials used for this thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Seblework Shibiru Signature _____ Date _____

Confirmation and Approval

The thesis on the title “*EFL Teachers’ Perceptions of Communicative Language Teaching and Their Classroom Practices in Teaching Grammar: The Case of Four Secondary Schools in Jimma Zone, Seka*” Woreda is approved as the original work of Seblework Shibiru and all the sources were properly acknowledged.

Principal advisor: **Demis Gebretsadik** (Assistant prof.) Signature _____ Date _____

Co-advisor: **Selassie Cheru** (PhD) Signature _____ Date _____

Thesis Evaluators

External Examiner _____ Signature _____ Date _____

Internal Examiner _____ Signature _____ Date _____

Chairperson _____ Signature _____ Date _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Above all things, I praise and glorify Almighty God my Saviour for His guidance, protection and mercy to be healthy and fruitful in my life. Hadn't I been given convenient environment and healthy mind by Him; it would have not been possible for me to accomplish this study with success.

Next to that, my gratitude goes to my advisor Mr. Demis Gebretsadik (Assistant professor). Hadn't he been providing me with his professional guidance throughout this study from the very beginning, it would have been impossible for me to reach on this success? I really enjoyed his scholarly advice and friendly approach with him. I am also indebted to my Co-advisor Selassie Cheru (PhD) for his valuable suggestions, guidance and valuables comments on this paper that enabled it to go in the right direction.

Moreover, my special thanks also go to my brother Tamirat Taye and my husband Abiyu Kitaw and my lovely children as well as those who have supported me in every possible way, practically and psychologically, throughout the completion of this research.

Finally, my great thanks go to Seka, Sentema Geta shewa High School English teachers for allowing me to observe their actual class room practices of communicative grammar teaching.

Abstract

The main aim of this study was to assess teachers' perceptions of communicative language teaching principles and their classroom practices in teaching grammar in Seka secondary schools in seka woreda. To conduct the study, a descriptive survey design was employed. The total populations of the study were 30 English teachers of four secondary schools in seka woreda. According to this the sample of the study was taken by using comprehensive sampling method. In order to gather data from the subjects of the study, questionnaires and classroom observation were used. The study was complemented by mixed method approach that employed both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools such as questionnaires, observation checklists and interviews. The quantitative data was analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation. The qualitative was analyzed thematically. Accordingly, the data gathered through the questionnaires were analyzed with the descriptive statics. Finally, the overall findings of this study showed the majority of teachers (71%) under study had high levels perception of CGT. However, the study conversely revealed that there is a clear mismatched between what the teachers perceive about CGT and what they actually practice in EFL context. Thus, teachers had problems to implement principles of CGT in their English classroom practically due to lack of teachers' planning, large classroom size, lack of students 'interest and their poor communicative language skills, students mother tongue interference and their culture. Based on the findings, recommendations were made for effective implementation and techniques of communicative grammar teaching in their classroom. In addition, the researcher recommended that teaching grammar by creating meaningful learning through real life situation in context and using communicative activities.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables	ivii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	3
1.3 Research Questions.....	6
1.4. Objectives of the Study	6
1.4.1. General Objective	6
1.4.2. Specific Objectives	6
1.5. Significance of the Study	7
1.6. Limitation of the study.....	7
1.7. Scope of the Study.....	8
1.8. Definition of Terms Used.....	9
1.8 Organization of the Study	9
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	10
2.1. Historical Overview of Grammar Teaching.....	10
2.2. Some Basic Concepts of Grammar	11
2.3. Second Language Teaching Approaches	13
2.3.1. The Traditional Approach	13
2.3.2. The Contemporary Approach and its Guiding Principles	15
2.4 Perception and Classroom Practice	19
2.4.1 Teachers' Perception of Communicative Language Teaching.....	19

2.5. Grammar Teaching Methods.....	20
2.5.1. Teaching Grammar Deductively	20
2.5.2. Teaching Grammar Inductively.....	22
2.6. Communicative Grammar Teaching	23
2.7. The Communicative Approach, Teachers' Attitudes and Practical Problems.....	25
2.8. The Role of the Teacher in CLT	27
2.9. Techniques of Communicative Grammar Teaching	28
2.10. The Classroom Organization.....	31
2.11. Phases of Grammar Teaching	31
2.11.1. The Presentation Phase.....	32
2.11.2. The Practice Phase.....	33
2.11.3. The Production Phase	34
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	35
3.1. Study Design	35
3.2. Research participants.....	35
3.3. Sample Size and Sampling Techniques	35
3.4. Data Sources.....	36
3.5 Instruments of Data Collection	36
3.5.1. Questionnaire.....	36
3.5.2. Classroom Observation.....	37
3.6. Validity and Reliability of the Tools.....	38
3.7. Data Collection Procedure	38
3.8. Methods of Data Analysis	38
3.9 Ethical issues	39
CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS OF DATA AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS	40

4.2. Teachers' awareness of CLT	41
4.3. Teachers' perception on CGT	46
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	58
5.1. Summary	58
5.2. Conclusions	59
5.3. Recommendations.....	60
References.....	61
Appendices.....	70
Appendix-A: Techer's Questionnaire	70
Appendix: B: Classroom Observation Checklist	76

List of Tables	Pages
Teachers' perception on CGT-----	45
Teachers` responses on students` Learning Perspective-----	46
Teachers` responses for Instructional perspective in CGT-----	48
The Importance of Grammar in CGT-----	50
Teachers` responses for perspective on Error correction and Assessment on CGT-----	51
Teachers' Role-----	53
Teachers` responses for perspective on Learners` Role in CGT-----	55
The relationship between teachers` perception and practice of CGT-----	56
Teachers` Actual Classroom practices in CGT-----	56
Teacher`s Role in classroom observation during CGT-----	57

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

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. Teaching of grammar should not be at the sentence level only but it should also be presented at the discourse level (Dickens and woods, 1988; 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 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 (Richard and Rodgers,2001; Richard, 2006)

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 and 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 and Lakshmanan, 1992).

Ellis (1997) added that recent research results Grammar as part of language teaching helps learners develop the skill essential for their success in diverse environments where English is used 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; &Whitel ,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 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 commutative way. Grammar lesson should include games, role plays, and simulations, pair works, group works, information gap and problem-solving activities to enhance student's communicative grammar

teaching is essential for the learners of second language to communicate with others to send and receive message in spoken and written forms (Alamirew 1992 and Haregewain 1993).

Nevertheless, different studies conducted by Girma (2005), Geremew (1994), Melese (1992), and Hailom (1982) at different levels show that most students who completed their secondary schools and joined their tertiary level lack adequate proficiency in English language. Grammar as a 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.

In Savignon's (2002) definition of competence, she refers to the term's expression, interpretation and negotiation of meaning (p. 1) which appear to be true matches with CLT. Not only does this definition of competence apply to face-to-face discussions, but it also pertains to reading and writing activities (Savignon, 2002) that require learners to go through those steps. Because CLT involves learners in meaning-based activities and enhances their communicative competence, several approaches are considered to be communicatively oriented, such as task-based, content-based, process-oriented, interactive, inductive, and discovery-oriented (Savignon, 2002, p. 22).

Recently, there are attempts to apply communicative language teaching in teaching grammar in Ethiopia's context. In the light of this idea, the present study was examine EFL teachers' perception and their classroom practices of using communicative language teaching in teaching grammar. Some local researchers, on related area, conducted their study at different times on different titles. However, they employed only descriptive statistics and, therefore, failed to see the relationships between these variables using inferential statistical procedure.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Language teaching has undergone a number of phases in using different approaches and methods as a result of continuous development and change of knowledge in the world. Among the many methods, CLT, whose origins are supposed to be found in the changes that took place in the British language teaching tradition from the late 1960s, has expanded throughout the world since the mid-1970s in a wider scope (Richards and Rodgers, 1986), Ethiopia is a country not outside

this scope. Thus, the CLT approach concurrently emphasizes and teaches the four language skills and linguistic structures within authentic contexts with the goal of developing communicative competence. Moreover, CLT has become a viable alternative for teachers who want to meet their learners' growing L2-communication needs/demands.

It is obvious that grammar skill is one of the key elements in learning language for effective and real-life communication purpose. In line with this, Ur (1988) states that grammar is viewed as the central area of a language around which reading, writing, and speaking, vocabulary and other components like meaning and function of a language revolve. It is evident that we cannot accurately communicate the intended message without grammar knowledge.

It is very important that having a good skill of grammar further equips the learners with a better understanding of the contents in each course of study with little difficulty. This can only be realized by making grammar teaching focuses on form, meaning, and function in the meantime. Cunningsworth (1984) and Harmer (1991) recommend that, a teacher has to introduce a new piece of language structure by using various methods to teach forms, meanings, and uses. The researcher in his study, therefore, remains to sponsor this reality as enthusiastically as possible.

Currently, communicative language teaching (CLT) is viewed as the most affective and widely used approach in EFL/ESL teaching, and most modern methods and techniques emphasize on it (Savignon, et al., 2002), and most textbooks and materials are designed for it. In Ethiopia, the modalities and approaches regarding the teaching of the language are not different from the current and widely used language teaching approaches elsewhere; it follows the communicative language teaching approach, with the learner at the center (ICDR, 1994). As a result, CLT has its place in this country, and new English language teaching textbooks were produced for secondary schools on the basis of the communicative approach (MoE, 1997).

Research addressing the extent to which CLT principles are carried out in EFL settings suggests some discrepancy between what teachers prefer and actually in their instruction. For example, Karavas/Douks (1996) concluded that 'the few small scale classroom studies that have been carried out seem to suggest that communicative class rooms are rare. While most teachers profess to be following a communicative approach, in practice they are following more traditional approaches. Similar findings were reported by Coskun's (2011) case study of two

English EFL teachers' attitudes in turkey toward CLT and its application indicated that there was a discrepancy between reported attitudes and actual class room practices.

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

Some local research works have also been carried out in relation to this area and among others are Beyene (2008), Endalkachew (2006), and Yamane (2007). Beyene has conducted a research in titled 'perceptions and class room practice of teachers' and students' towards CLT '. In this 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 class room practice during the lessons given in a communicative way, because their teacher did not create conditions for the actual implementation of CLT and what actually practice in classroom.

Lakachew's (2003) 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 (2006) 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-cantered 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 commutative grammar teaching in English class room.

In light of this, there have been a number of studies conducted in Ethiopia's context on Communicative Language Teaching. For instance, Lakachew (2003) conducted his study on 'teachers' attitudes towards CLT and practical problems in its implementation'. Tiglu (2008) also carried out his study on the 'appropriateness of communicative grammar teaching'. Similarly, Seyoum (2008) study entitled, 'comparative study of grammar teaching methods employed by televised teacher and non-plasma school teachers' is another related study.

1.3 Research Questions

1. How well do EFL teachers perceive the principles of Communicative Language Teaching in teaching grammar?
2. Is there a correlation between EFL teachers' perception and classroom practices of Communicative Language Teaching in teaching grammar?
3. What are the constraints that impede classroom practices of teaching grammar via Communicative Language Teaching approach?

1.4. Objectives of the Study

The study has both general and specific objectives

1.4.1. General Objective

The general objective of the study was to explore the relationships between teachers' perceptions about the principles of communicative language teaching and classroom practices in teaching grammar.

1.4.2. Specific Objectives

This study also has the following specific objectives:

1. To identify the level of EFL teacher's perception about the principles of Communicative Language Teaching in teaching grammar at Seka Secondary Schools

2. To analyze the correlation between EFL teachers' perception and classroom practices of Communicative Language Teaching in teaching grammar at Seka Secondary Schools
3. To find out constraints affecting the practical application of principles of communicative based grammar teaching at Seka Secondary Schools

1.5. Significance of the Study

This study is significant for the fact that it concentrates on one of the relevant issues EFL teaching and learning. Thus, this study will serve different purposes encompassing the following points: For one thing, it can initiate English language teachers to implement a sound grammar teaching in response to communicative based approach i.e., through involving the learners to understand the form, meaning, and function of a newly introduced piece of grammar in a clear context and real situation. In addition, it is expected to provide pedagogical contributions and serve those who wish to develop curriculum and design ELT materials as a reference to incorporate CLT principles with the actual classroom practices. Thus, those who wish to develop curriculum and design ELT materials and teachers training institutions can use it as a relevant source of information.

1.6. 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 only 30 teachers selected from four schools. This could often create danger on the generalizability of the study. It would have been better and more effective if a good number of schools and participants were included in the study to gather sufficient information to obtain better results. The researcher also felt that demonstrating all aspects of CLT method could not be carried out within a short period of time and would require an intensive investigation to reflect all aspects of CLT. Therefore, the instruments that were used to gather data were limited to raise only some features of the communicative approach to language teaching.

1.7. Scope of the Study

Conceptually, the study addresses secondary school English language teachers' perception and practice. i.e., it tries to explore teachers' perceptions of the principles of CLT in teaching grammar. In addition to that, the study is limited to find out the relationships between these two major variables, and possible constraints that teachers face in implementing CLT in teaching grammar. It is felt that demonstrating all aspects of CLT method could not be carried out with in a short period of time so the study is delimited to raise only some features of the communicative approach to language teaching. To keep the study manageable in size, the study was delimited only to English language teachers in four governmental secondary schools that found in Jimma Zone, Seka Woreda of Oromia Region.

1.8. Definition of Terms Used

Perception: the knowledge that teachers have of the underlying systems of the language that enables them to teach and learn effectively (Svalberg, 2007).

Communicative Language Teaching: an approach to the teaching of second and foreign languages that emphasizes interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of learning a language (Wikipedia, 2016).

1.8 Organization of the Study

With the exception of the preliminary Section, this thesis has five chapters. The first chapter deals with introduction to the study, background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, objectives of the study, significance of the study, limitations of the study, delimitation of the study, organization of the study and operational definitions of terms. Chapter two deals with the review of related literature. Chapter three is concerned with research methodology. Specifically, research methodology study design, study population and sampling, sample size and sampling techniques, data sources, data collection instruments, validity and reliability of the tools, data collection procedure, data analysis and ethical issues. Chapter four consists of the data finding and discussion. Finally, Chapter Five presents the summary, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Historical Overview of Grammar Teaching

Traditionally, grammar has been considered as being of primary importance in language teaching. It is regarded as structure based and formal activity. Atkins, et al., (1995) state that traditional grammar asks the question, what do the forms in a sentence mean rather than what the sentence in a context means. They basically identify that grammar more focuses on providing direct explanation of grammar rules in the form of hard and fast rules.

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, p.17) 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 to clauses to make one sentences. As indicated grammar is a system of rules of syntax that decides the order and patterns in which words are arranged together to make sentences (Celce-Murcia 1988).

However, some scholars argue that rules always may not be accurate. In other words, many rules are not really rule 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 four or giving direction, advising and so on (Blower, 2004). It tells us the relationship between the participants and shows where the topic of the message. It is also a means of expressing time when the action took place through tenses and time words. It informs us the mood such as certainly obligation or probability through helping verbs and weather the messages are statements or questions (Atkins, Hylom and Nuru 1995).

In a nut shell, traditional grammar asks the question what each structure or element, that are the end to language learning, in a sentence means regardless of the speakers' and receivers' attitude in a context; however, the contemporary grammar mainly deals with how the structures of a sentence are used to express the intended meaning and use based on the contexts and the intention of the interlocutors. Hence, unlike the traditional approach, language form is not the end to language learning instead the means to the end.

2.2. Some Basic Concepts of Grammar

All languages have their own grammar. It is a sound, structure and meaning system of language. People who speak the same language are able to communicate since they instinctively share the grammar of the language. Students whose vernacular is English already recognize the grammar of English. Brown (2006) also remarks that students in learning grammar know the sound of these words and different ways of putting words to make meaningful sentences. Harmer (1987:1) notes that, "Grammar is the way in which words change themselves and group together to make sentences."

Harmer further explains, grammar is the description of the ways in which words can change their forms and can be combined in to sentences in that language. This on the other hand points out all the elements in a sentence which attribute to its actual meaning. These include the two main parts of a sentence: noun phrase (NP) and verb phrase (VP). Noun phrase (NP) is further sub divided in to a determiner (D) and noun (N). Verb phrase (VP) is also further sub divided in to a verb and another verb phrase (VP2) which constitutes a verb (V2) and a determiner (D2). These eventually get its correct order as:

- $S = NP + VP = D + N + V + D2 + N2$ active voice or
- $S = D2 + N2 + be + V + by + D + N$ passive voice

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 in Celce-Murcia (1988) grammar is a system of rules of syntax that decides the order and patterns in which words are arranged together to make sentence.

However, some scholars argue that rules always may not be accurate. In other words, many rules are not really rule at all but they are rather redundancies. Grammar tells us more than rules. In the first place, it makes the meaning clear. Bloor (2004) claims that people use it to do certain functions like stating facts, introductions, accepting or declining invitation, asking for or giving directions, advising and so on. It tells us the relationship between the participants and shows where the topic of the message. Atkins, Hailom and Nuru (1995) further describes that it is also a means 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.

Grammar refers to the language patterns that indicate relationship among words in sentences. Ur (1988) 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, as Thompson (2003) states, 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.

Atkins, Hailom and Nuru (1995) and Tudor (1996) affirm that grammar is the means by which people organize messages in any communicative activity as effectively and as efficiently as possible. It is the part of the study of language which deals with the forms and structures of words and sentences and meanings. Cook (2001) describes that grammar is sometimes known as the analyzing scheme that relates sound and meaning insignificant by itself and impossible without it. This approves that meaning and sound are highly bound together by language structure in order to convey important message of communication activities. Similarly, Batstone (1994) confirms, the absence of grammar in a language badly handicaps human beings’ communication. Webster 1972) also describes that grammar is the system of word structure and word arrangement in a given language at a given time.

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.

2.3. Second Language Teaching Approaches

There have been two perspectives of teaching a foreign language; the earlier traditional approach and the recent contemporary approach. The primary focus of both views targets at enabling learners to come up with the effective usage of the target language not only in their education but also in their daily communication at different situation and with different group of peoples. However, the extents to which these approaches address their objectives vary due to the presence of some methodological defects in one of the two philosophies that provokes certain linguists to discover an alternative line of attack to address the recent demand of the target language respective to the preliminary objectives.

2.3.1. The Traditional Approach

Earlier views of language learning focused primarily on the mastery of grammatical competence. Language learning was viewed as a process of mechanical habit formation. Good habits are formed by having students produce correct sentences and not through making mistakes. Errors were to be avoided through controlled opportunities for production; either through writing or speaking. The chances of making mistakes were minimized by dialogs and performing drills.

In this regard, Stern (1983) 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 can be developed during the repetition of grammatical systems that have been set in to pattern drills. Learning was extremely under the control of the teacher. This has been known as the structural approach, and it is the most traditional way of language teaching. It emphasizes more on the formal aspect of language rather than use.

Richard and Rodgers (2001) find out that language is a 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: subject, verb, and object which comprise noun phrase and verb phrase. A sentence structure also includes the smaller units that modify word structures (morphemes) their correct order of arrangement (syntax). Cook (2001)

more asserts that learning a language is breaking the language in to its components in order to scrutinize and recognize its structure for the reason that they think the knowledge of linguistic form is the basis for language use. Wilkins (1972) also notes:

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.

Brumfit (1986), remarks that 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. 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.

Tarore 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 exploit this knowledge for genuine communication. Cunnings' worth (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 appropriateness of the utterance.

Peterson (1986) explains that in this view the teachers should always act as 'questioners, initiators, teachers and formal instructors.' 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

basis the appearance of other possible approaches and methods in foreign language teaching to communicate meanings.

2.3.2. The Contemporary Approach and its Guiding Principles

This on the other hand, known as the communicative approach, is referred to as the modern way of foreign language teaching that emphasizes the use and meaning of a language item. This could be the product of educators and linguists who had grown disgruntlement with the audio-lingual and grammar translation methods of foreign language instruction. Tudor (1996) states the educators 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. Larsen- Freeman (1986) describes that these criticism and counterarguments go in front to a new approach to language teaching which focuses on language function and use rather than the formal aspect of language.

The communicative approach to language teaching is, relatively, a newly adapted approach in the era of foreign/ second language teaching. It is a hybrid approach to language teaching, essentially ‘progressive’ rather than ‘traditional’ (Wright 2000). Savignon (1991) indicates that Communicative Language Teaching can be seen to drive from multi-disciplinary perspectives that include at least, linguistics, psychology, philosophy and educational research. Richards and Rodgers (1986), Savignon (1991) and Brown 1994) describes that it is generally accepted that, proponents of CLT see it as an approach, not as a method. For Brown, for instance, “communicative language teaching is a unified but broadly-based theoretical position about the nature of language and language learning and teaching” (1994, p. 244-245).

He further maintains that though it is difficult to generate all of the various definitions that have been offered, the following four interconnected features could be taken as definitions of CLT.

1. Classroom targets are paying attention on all of the mechanisms of communicative competence and not limited to grammatical or linguistic competence.
2. Language teaching methods are chosen to employ learners in the practical, authentic, and functional use of language for momentous purposes. Language structures are not the essential

center of attention but rather features of language that enable the learner to achieve those purposes.

3. Fluency and accuracy are considered as corresponding principles fundamental communicative methods. At times fluency may have to take on more importance than accuracy in order to keep learners meaningfully engaged in language use.
4. In the communicative classroom, students eventually have to use the language, productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts.

In line with this, Richards (2006) claims that language learning has been recently viewed from different perspectives. It is seen as resulting from processes such as:

- ✚ Interaction between the learner and users of the language.
- ✚ Collaborative creation of meaning.
- ✚ Creating meaningful and purposeful interaction through language.
- ✚ Negotiation of meaning as the learner and his or her interlocutor arrive at understanding.
- ✚ Learning through attending to the feedback learners get when they use the language.
- ✚ Paying attention to the language one hears (the input) and trying to incorporate new forms in to one's developing communicative competence.
- ✚ Trying out and experimenting with different ways of saying things 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. Richards and Rodgers (2001), Hutchinson and Waters (1994) and Harmer (1991) state that this approach gives a special attention to the needs and interests of the learners. 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.

Thompson (1996) describes the students' motivation to learn comes from their desire to communicate in meaningful ways about meaningful topics. Petrovitz (1997) declares that 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. Holliday (1994) forwards;

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 excluded in communicative approach.

Communicative approach to teaching second languages stresses on 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. Jones (1993) states that the goal of communicative language teaching is to accustom 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. Vatpatten (1998) 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. Savignon (1997) 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-play, simulations, pair and small group activities have gained acceptance and widely recommended for inclusion in language teaching programs. In this regard, Harmer (1981:5) also claims:

Communicative activities have many advantages: they are usually enjoyable; they give students a chance to use their language; they allow both students and teachers to see how well the

students are doing in their language learning; and they give a break from the normal teacher-students' arrangement in a classroom.

It is essential for learners to be exposed to new language with comprehensible context so that they are able to understand its function and meaning. It is clear that the communicative approach to language teaching is relatively all around. It does not ignore the teaching of structures and vocabulary. In the case of grammar, it plays an important role. It encourages learners to use new items of language in different contexts. Students are initiated to expose the functional and structural parts of the language in use. According to Brumfit (1986) and Brown (1994), the communicative approach is likely to produce the four kinds of competence namely grammatical competence, sociological competence, strategic competence and discourse competence. But others concentrate on one or two competences.

Generally, Richards (2006) briefly identifies ten foundation assumption of CLT as follows.

1. Second language learning takes place by students are involved in interaction and real communication.
2. Satisfactory classroom learning tasks and activities give chances for students to infer meaning, widen their language abilities, perceive how language is used, and participate in real communication.
3. Effective interaction comes from learners exercising content that is important, relaxing, involving and purposeful.
4. Communication is a continuous course of action that often demands the application of many language abilities or modalities.
5. Language learning is assisted both by exercises that require inductive or discovery learning or underlying rules of language use and organization, as well as by those involving language analysis and reflection.
6. Language learning is a step-by-step development that requires creative use of language, and trial and errors. Although errors are a natural product of learning, the primary goal of learning is to acquire the ability to put in action the new language both perfectly and easily.
7. Students boost their own ways to language learning, exercise at different speeds and have diverse desires and inspiration for language learning.

8. Effective language learning requires the use of successful learning and communication tactics.
9. The duty of the teacher of a language classroom is that of an assistant, who makes the language classes favorable to language learning and grants chances for learners to employ and put in to practice the language and to show on language function and language education.
10. The class is a society where students study through cooperation and exchanging thoughts

2.4 Perception and Classroom Practice

Better understanding of a certain teaching method will lead to a kind of teaching/ learning process shaped by that perceived and known method. The contemporary teaching method, thus, widely accepted by many scholars, language teachers, curriculum developers; and still working world wide is CLT (Richards and Rodgers, 1986; Thompson, 1996; Nunan, 1986). Whatever the case is, different kinds of perceptions inevitably prevail among different practitioners –language teachers, educators, material developers etc. In spite of the existing wide acceptance, the varieties of interpretations of CLT can be attributed to the fact that those practitioners who identify with CLT are from different educational and traditional backgrounds (Richards and Rodgers, 1986; Nunan, 1986).

2.4.1 Teachers' Perception of Communicative Language Teaching

Coming towards the reality of different understandings of communicative language teaching method by teachers, different studies reveal different outcomes. Mangubhai, et al. (2007) claim that CLT approach is not finding its full expression in elementary and secondary classrooms and that many teachers remain uncertain about what CLT is and are unsure about how to implement it in the classroom. In addition, Thompson (1996) reveals that certain disparate misconception about CLT still continues to exist, and a large number of teachers he has spoken to were seen to criticize and reject CLT for some reasons.

He says that these teachers perceive CLT means not teaching grammar which means teaching only speaking; CLT means pair work which means role play and it means expecting too much from the teacher. It is also expressed by Medgyes (1988) that language teaching professionals

who are working where English is a foreign (not a second) language most of the time complain that it is difficult or inappropriate to teach the language communicatively.

Contrarily essence, Nunan (1986) in his study reveals that teachers have been influenced by the current trends of teaching method- particularly the principles of communicative language teaching/learning. In addition to Nunan, Hiep (2007) in his study forwards that "... teachers highlighted the potential usefulness of CLT, stressing that CLT primarily meant teaching students the language meaningfully for their future life and helping to improve the classroom atmosphere." Kim (2008), based on his study, also agrees that teachers' perception about the communicative approach is positive.

Generally, we can see from the above points that language teaching practitioners do possess perceptual differences towards communicative language teaching, though a number of language specialists advocate the implementation of CLT in EFL classrooms.

2.5. Grammar Teaching Methods

In the history of language teaching, there are two most common methods by which teachers employ to present grammar. These are teaching grammar deductively and teaching grammar inductively. Both methods are separately discussed in the proceeding sub topics.

2.5.1. 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. Humboldt (1974), states that this kind of our presentation is deductive for we infer or deduce language from a rule. 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. Bygate and Tornkyn (1994 and Harmer (1987) believe that it encourages teachers to teach grammar explicitly to their students. 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. As Cunningsworth (1984), Harmer (1987) Ellis (1991) and Fortune (1998) describe, 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. Brown (1972:269) further stated that;

Since adults are capable of deductive reasoning and abstract formal operational thought grammatical explanations can also serve vital purpose if the grammar itself is real, and the teacher is communicating meaningfully. Here, reference to existing knowledge and motivating sets is of utmost importance, and the students must see purposefulness in explanations.

It is obvious that adult learners appreciate and benefit from direct instruction that allows them to apply critical thinking skills to the language learning. As to Larson-Freeman (1986) teachers can take the advantage of this by providing students with descriptive understanding of each point of grammar.

Many scholars and teachers investigated the advantages of inductive and deductive instructions. For example, Tudor (1996) supposes there is no one approach which is equally suited to all learners in all situations. In connection to this, Harmer (1987) cited in Girma (2005) indicates that some grammatical structures are acquiescent to deductive; while others are better suited to inductive approaches. Cunningsworth (1987) 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 inflexible and exclusively to one strategy or the other. Many teachers agree that it is very important to use the combination of approaches. Ur (1988, p. 4) says, “There is no doubt that knowledge - implicit or explicit - of grammatical rules is essential for a mastery of a language: you cannot use words unless you know how they should be put together.” 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.

2.5.2. Teaching Grammar Inductively

Inductive grammar teaching is one of the most known methods in which learners are 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).

In first language acquisition, rules are not taught explicitly but learners acquire the structure of the language and produce grammatical sentences (Wright, 1989). 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, Cunningsworth (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.

2.6. Communicative Grammar Teaching

Communicative grammar teaching is based on the principles of the communicative language teaching approach, CLT, 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. Atkins, Hailom, and Nuru (1995) state that communicative grammar teaching seems to supply a reasonable authentic and vivid contexts and situations in which new language can be presented and application of rules can be established through motivating exercises; tasks that will help learners to expand knowledge of system of use inductively; certain clear explanation regarding how the elements of the grammar system work; leading in where necessary to assist students recognize that rules are not inflexible but may be true most of the time; a due attention on that change in grammatical structures create meaning changes, and chance for the learners to use language for actual communication purposes as well. Dickens and Woods (1988) and Ellis (2002) state that the teaching of grammar should not be at the sentence level only but it should also be presented at the discourse level.

The objective of the development of communicative grammatical competence is to use a structure of a language in a variety of situations spontaneously. The communicative approach goes beyond the presentation and development of linguistic structures as the only means of developing communicative ability. In line with this idea, Bygate and Tornkyn (1994) explain:

Communicative grammar is an approach to grammar teaching in which its goal is to explore and formulate the relation between the formal events of grammar (words, phrases, sentences and their categories and structure) and conditions of their meaning and use. In linguistic terminology, this means relating syntax and morphology to semantics and pragmatics.

Celce-Murcia and Hilles (1988) also claim that the teaching of grammar entails helping learners perceive the relationship between grammatical structure and other three dimensions of language such as social functions, semantics and pragmatics. They also emphasize the importance of teaching all aspects of grammar in context. Appropriate contextualization can only be achieved if a teacher finds or creates realistic social situations, language texts, and visual stimuli that are interesting and meaningful to students.

Wilkins (1972) describes that a teacher must provide communicative practice for students to achieve non-linguistic goals such as asking for permission to do something, getting someone to do something, giving excuses, asking for help, etc. 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 combines 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. Nitta and Garden (2005) believes that grammar-based tasks often use classroom as context, building language practice around the people and objects and activities here and now in the classroom

Celce- Murcia (1997) further states that communicative grammar teaching creates perception and understanding of the form, meaning and appropriate use of structures. When we say we teach communicative grammar, we are valuing language use above that of form or meanings. Larsen-Freeman (2001) has a claim that every time language users use language, they change the meaning of the language. The integration of form and meaning is gaining importance in the communicative language teaching. Regarding grammar teaching, Chen (2003) explains:

An integrative theory of communicative competence may be regarded as one in which there is a synthesis of knowledge of basic grammatical principles, knowledge of how language is used in social contexts to perform communicative functions, and knowledge of how utterances and communicative functions can be combined according to the principle of discourse.

Fotos and Ellis (1991) and Chen (2003) comment that in the teaching of grammar for communicative competence, one should focus on communicative framework based on tasks of communicative activities. Grammar activities should be compatible with contextualized practice in which rules are presented in discourse contexts. Nunan (1991) explains that grammar is fundamentally important in the communicative classroom. However, he adds that the approach to teaching grammar in classroom requires principles of communicative language teaching.

Nunan provides three decisive strategies as to the way teachers can establish their approach to the teaching of grammar: one is that it should focus on the development of procedural rather than

declarative knowledge. Procedural knowledge refers to the process-oriented knowledge that enables the learners to use it for communication, but declarative knowledge is to indicate only knowing the rules. Therefore, learning grammar means using it in communicative contexts which involves the learners to take part in lots of learning by doing activities. Secondly, it is important to make the relationship between grammatical forms and their communicative functions clearly understandable. Teaching grammar in isolated sentences does not make the lesson fruitful and effective unless the teaching procedure is accompanied with some sorts of communicative situations-authentic language use. The main responsibility of the teacher on the other hand according to Nunan is to maintain the quality of presentation of grammatical items considering form, meaning and use at the same time. Ur (1991) provides parameters to guide the teacher and evaluate whether a grammar presentation is successful:

The structure should be presented in both speech and writing;

- ✚ Both the form and the meaning should be taught;
- ✚ Enough examples in meaningful contexts should be provided;
- ✚ The teacher should be sure that the learners understood the lesson;
- ✚ The structure should be given a “grammar book” name;
- ✚ The lesson should help the learners to communicate;
- ✚ Any other useful terminologies should be considered;
- ✚ Useful rules should be given to the students and should be elicited from them at the same time;
- ✚ Appropriate detail of explanation should be given considering the level of students;
- ✚ The balance of using L1 and L2 should be determined;
- ✚ The teacher should deliver the lesson with clear and moderate speed of speech as well as legible hand writing.

2.7. The Communicative Approach, Teachers' Attitudes and Practical Problems

Teachers bring personal characteristics into the style of their teaching. These characteristics include beliefs that have developed over their lifetimes, and are the result of accumulated events and knowledge of the world. Beliefs can be diverse and developed from a range of angles: experience as a student, perceived exemplary instruction one is exposed to, one's own cognitive

capacities to process learned information and the socio-cultural and political setting of one's developmental years that are currently affecting one's life. Together these beliefs result in attitudes that are firmly entrenched by an individual. Coming towards the reality of different understandings of communicative language teaching method by teachers, different studies reveal different outcomes. Mangubhai, et al. (2007) claim that CLT approach is not finding its full expression in elementary and secondary classrooms and that many teachers remain uncertain about what CLT is and are unsure about how to implement it in the classroom.

In addition, Thompson (1996) reveals that certain disparate misconception about CLT still continues to exist, and a large number of teachers he has spoken to were seen to criticize and reject CLT for some reasons. He says that these teachers perceive CLT means not teaching grammar which means teaching only speaking; CLT means pair work which means role play and it means expecting too much from the teacher. It is also expressed by Medgyes (1988) that language teaching professionals who are working where English is a foreign (not a second) language most of the time complain that it is difficult or inappropriate to teach the language communicatively.

Contrarily essence, Nunan (1986) in his study reveals that teachers have been influenced by the current trends of teaching method- particularly the principles of communicative language teaching/learning. In addition to Nunan, Hiep (2007) in his study forwards that teacher highlighted the potential usefulness of CLT, stressing that CLT primarily meant teaching students the language meaningfully for their future life and helping to improve the classroom atmosphere. Kim (2008), based on his study, also agrees that teachers 'perception about the communicative approach is positive. Generally, we can see from the above points that language teaching practitioners do possess perceptual differences towards communicative language teaching, though a number of language specialists advocate the implementation of CLT in EFL classrooms.

Akindele (2015) stated that the analysis of efficiency in education is necessary in ensuring optimal uses of meager resources allocated to education in order to eliminate wastage. In Zambia, educational wastage is very old. For many reasons, wastage is rampant at the secondary

level, while the non-formal sector is incapable of catering effectively for those affected due to a variety of factors.

In curriculum innovation, teachers' attitudes are seen to play a crucial role in determining the implementation of an approach. For one thing, the introduction of a new programme or approach will be in competition with well-established theories of language teaching and learning is the products of previous teaching and learning experiences, prejudices, and beliefs (Freeman and Richards 1993). For the other thing, teachers' educational attitudes and theories although in many cases unconsciously held, have an effect on their classroom behavior, influence what students actually learn, and are a potent determinant of teachers' teaching style (Kacavas 1996).

However, positive attitudes towards communicative language teaching and positive intentions to do it in the classroom may be influenced by factors that may be divided into two broad categories: (1) internal and (2) external constraints. Internal constraints represent those factors that come from within teachers themselves, such as poor subject knowledge. External constraints refer to factors that come from structural and organizational factors, which teachers have no control over like students and parents' beliefs, lack of resources or administrative obstacles. The two sets of constraints are interdependent.

2.8. The Role of the Teacher in CLT

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) claims may change from one activity to another or from one stage of activity to another. However, Harmer (1991) 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, Breen and Candlin (1980) cited in Richards and Rodgers (1986).

Breen and Candling (1980) cited in Richards and Rodgers (1986) state the roles language teachers ought to play as follows. The teacher has two main roles. One is to facilitate the

communication process among all participants in the classroom, and between participants and the various activities and texts. The second role is to act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching process. These roles involve a set of secondary roles for the teacher; first, as a controller of resources and a resource himself, second as a leader within the classroom procedures and activities.

A third role for the teacher is that of a researcher and learner, which much to contribute in terms of appropriate knowledge and abilities, actual and observed experiences of the nature of learning and organizational capacities. Furthermore, scholars such as Littlewoods (1981), Gatbonton and Segalowitz (2005) Harmer (1991), Richards and Rodgers (1986) disclose the roles a language teacher needs to play in communicative classrooms as put below.

- ✚ **Need analyst:** responsible to determine and address the learners' language needs.
- ✚ **Counselor:** takes responsibility of reconciling misunderstandings among interlocutors to maximize communication through paraphrasing, confirmation and feedback.
- ✚ **Manager:** manages the ongoing group processes in the classroom setting for communication and communicative activities.
- ✚ **Resource:** being as knowledge provider offers the necessary help when the learners are missing and they deserve assistance.

2.9. Techniques of Communicative Grammar Teaching

Grammar teaching was considered as a structure based formal activity. After combination of several sources and techniques, which are mainly based on communicative activities, the teaching of grammar gained new insight. Saricoban and Metin (2000) claims that to make grammar lesson more effective, beneficial and interesting, ELT teachers should use some well-developed and fascinating techniques in the classroom. In this section, some of the techniques and resource such as games, role-play, problem solving would be reviewed as follows.

A. Pictures

Scholars such as, Celce-Murcia (1988), Harmer (1987) and Batstone (1994), claim that pictures are one of the techniques which are useful for presenting grammar lessons. This author typically

argues pictures are interesting techniques for teaching grammar lessons in all phases (in presentation, in focused practice, communicative practice, and for feedback and correction). According Celce-Murcia, entertaining and carefully designed pictures have the potential to motivate students and to respond more than a text book. This is because pictures are more contextualized than learners' books as they encompass various units of the students' real life.

B. Graphs

The same author Celce-Murcia (1988) claims that it is possible to teach grammar points communicatively by using different kinds of graphs. The reason for this is that graphs are free to different interpretations and are able to entertain learners to different language usages.

C. Games

Games particularly play important role to make the learner use the language communicatively. Games promote learners to keep up their interest and work. Games also help the teacher create contexts in which the language is helpful and meaningful. Rex2003, Celce-Murcia 1988 and Rinvolveri (1984) describe those well-chosen games are invaluable as they give a break. They allow students to practice language skills and grammar items.

They are highly inspiring since they are amazing and at the same time challenging. It minimizes nervousness and allows the acquisition of input. 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 a variety of ways. They also give introverted students the opportunity to communicate their views and understanding. They are crucial part of grammar lesson as they reinforce a form discourse match. Through well-planned games, learners can perform and internalize the target language structure.

D. Role-plays

This is one of the most common 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 their ideas using

their own words. As Wright (1989) states, it can be funny and dramatic so students are able to pretend and learn a lot from each other. Role-plays contextualize the grammar lessons 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. Petrovitz (1997) states that role-play can be used to practice specific grammatical structure.

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. Celce-Murcia (1988) suggests on the procedures to use role-play as a technique for teaching grammar as follows. Hand out the problem to students and then introduce and explain difficult words and structures necessary for the task.

- ✚ Divide students in to groups, if necessary, in which they discuss and play the role. During this step, the teacher should allow students to communicate and should not interrupt at the middle of the discussion for any correction. However, the teacher has to take notes on grammatical errors for later correction. After each group has performed the role-play, the entire class discusses the questions raised in connection with the situation.
- ✚ The last step can be assigning writing exercises based on the role-play or related question. Furthermore, subsequent grammar lessons based on the errors observed during the exercise could be presented for further internalization of the structure.

All in all, role-play can create a natural and meaningful situation to learn and practice grammar

2.10. The Classroom Organization

It is vital to have a well-organized classroom to facilitate communicative grammar teaching through which students can be engaged in different activities. Larsen Freeman (1986) claims that these activities are expected to enable the students willingly express their feelings during arguing, debating, or promising. Pair work and group are the two most common organizations in CLT classroom. This, however, does not mean a student does nothing alone.

McDonough and Shaw (1993) and Harmer (1991) state that pair work helps students to switch through information and distribute it based on the given tasks. Doff (1988) further explains that the language teacher can group the whole class in to pairs, and every student can work with his/her colleague and all pairs work at the same time. Besides, Brumfit (1984) Atkins, Hailom and Nuru (1995) describe that it is more interesting for students to do grammar exercises in pair, orally or through writing, than doing alone. Pair work grants students the chance to use English meaningfully and naturally. Group work now a day, regardless of its effectiveness, has been used in CLT classes. It is believed that it provokes interaction among the group by making each student responsible for ideas and facts to contribute something on the topic under discussion. Here, it is a good opportunity that students do not bother about how to say something rather about what they want to express which let them express learn how to use grammar effectively.

Richards (2006) sets some advantages of pair or small group works for students' language learning as below.

- ✚ They get the chance to learn from their peers through hearing when it is used.
- ✚ They get opportunities and a stress-free stage for generating a lot of language without the fear of making mistakes.
- ✚ Their interest to accomplish tasks will increase.

2.11. Phases of Grammar Teaching

In the previous discussion, it has been proposed different types of grammar teaching tasks and ways of grammar teaching. Ur (1988) and Celce-Murcia (1988) 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.

2.11.1. The Presentation Phase

This is the first phase 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. The teacher, therefore, performs different activities so as to realize this successfully because it is the most critical phase at which the effectiveness of the proceeding phases is determined in advance. Harmer (1991) states:

One way of the teacher's job is to show how the new language is formed how the grammar works and how it is put together. One way of doing this is to explain the grammar in detail, using grammatical terminology and giving mini-lecture on the subject. This seems problematical, though, for two reasons; firstly, many students may find grammatical concepts difficult, and secondly it will only be possible in monolingual group at lower levels if the teacher conducts the explanation in the students' mother tongue.

Harmer (1987) defines the presentation phase 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. The best way of doing this is to present the language item in meaningful context. Widdowson (1990) suggests that in foreign language-learning circumstances relation could be established with the local language (L1) or with what is already known of the foreign language (L2) or it could be set up with something non-linguistic such as picture, an object, an action, or a sound, course materials may use any or all of these procedures to structure and conceptualize the learning process.

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) explains that the main purposes of this phase 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 endeavor.
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, P. 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. 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 phase 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 identifies a model containing five procedures throughout the whole phases of teaching a language item; lead in, elicitation, explanation, accurate reproduction and immediate creativity.

2.11.2. The Practice Phase

The practice phase is the second phase of the organization of teaching grammar for communication purposes. At this phase, skills are learned by doing or through constant practice. Ur (1988) states that this is the phase 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. 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. Ur (1988) describes that the final task is to move to relatively free production of the language.

2.11.3. The Production Phase

At the production phase, 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 phase to free practice phase. 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. Celce-Murcia (1988) explains at this that ideally at this stage, students are free to say whatever they want. They choose the direction of their conversation.

At the production phase, 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. Ur (1988) suggests that 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. Let us suppose the teacher teaches the learner about the present continuous tense where he/she facilitates his/her students to talk or write about continuous experience.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND 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 Seka secondary schools. 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. Study Design

This study was intended to investigate EFL teachers' perception and classroom practices of CLT principles in teaching grammar and the possible hindrances teachers face in attempting to implement this approach. For this purpose, therefore, descriptive survey research design was chosen as it is used to specify or describe a phenomenon without conducting an experiment (Selinger and Hohamy 1989). To address all the research questions, the researcher used a mixed approach or both qualitative and quantitative methods. Thus, questionnaires and observation are seemed to be appropriate instruments to collect data for the study since perception and practice can be elements of descriptive studies (Mc Arthur, 1983).

3.2. Research participants

According to Mugenda and Ugenya (2003), the target population should have some observable characteristics, to which the researcher intends to generalize the results of the study. The target populations for this study were secondary school English language teachers from four governmental secondary schools. Thus, the target populations for this study were respondents which were taken from four schools.

3.3. Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

The four target schools were taken based on geographical proximity from where the present researcher is conducting the study. Similarly, to select participants for the study, availability sampling technique was used. Therefore, the participants of this study were all 30 (thirty) English language teachers who are teaching English as a foreign language in four governmental

secondary schools. These schools are found in Jimma Zone Seka Woreda. Thus, all the 4 secondary schools found in this woreda were included in this study.

3.4. Data Sources

The sources of data that the researcher is going to conduct was expected to come from primary sources since they are directly related to the problem and expected to provide sufficient information on the problem under study. This includes the Seka woreda secondary school's English language teachers. the classroom setting to observe the actual teaching-learning situations

3.5 Instruments of Data Collection

The research instruments used in this study include: -questionnaire, and class room observation.

3.5.1. Questionnaire

According to Selinger and Shohamy (1989), a questionnaire is widely used in second language acquisition researches to solicit information about certain conditions and practices, in particular to collect data on phenomena which are not easily observed, such as perception and perception. It also used to obtain background information about the research subjects (Koul 1984). This questionnaire was adapted from Karavas –Dukas (1996) a Kim (1999) cited in Beyene (2008). Because of developing in a new questioner, it is sometimes possible to adapt an existing or standardized one to use. Therefore, this may able 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 and existing questionnaires 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 Wisner, 2000). The researcher had adapted the study instrument to make it standardized and acceptable. Therefore, the questionnaire was divided in to three sections. They are

1. Personal information section- served to provide biography 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 questionnaire was commented by the respective advisors to maintain 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 study and to minimize the potential misunderstanding the researcher conducted a pilot study at Jiren Secondary School on six English language teachers. Based on the data gathered, the reliability of the questionnaire was further ascertained by using Cronbach alpha method and the result was found to be 0.741.

3.5.2. Classroom Observation

The classroom observation was conducted in order to check whether teachers practice the principles of CGT in EFL, class room 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 was adapted from Yamane (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 co-observer and researcher together observed the English lesson 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 . Each session was scheduled for 40 minutes. The observation was conducted in

four sections for two times each. Totally, it was conducted for twenty periods all together. Ten teachers were purposely observed 4 from Seka, 6 from Geta Shawa 6, and Santama, 4.

3.6. Validity and Reliability of the Tools

The validity and reliability issues of the instruments of data collection were an utmost concern of the present research process. Therefore, the selection and adaptation of the questionnaire was done with great caution in order to avoid significant defects, and pilot testing was conducted to increase the reliability and validity before its full-scale administration takes place. Moreover, a statistical procedure using Cronbach alpha test was run to check the reliability of the questionnaire items. Similarly, classroom observation is carried out using a checklist. The items in the checklist were adapted from a preset standardized instrument.

3.7. Data Collection Procedure

The data Collection session were arranged at times suggested by the school's permission and the willingness of 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 from April to June. All participants were encouraged to ask questions so that they did not have any problem with respect to the content, the language, and the ways to deal with the questionnaire. Therefore, a questionnaire was distributed to 30 participant teachers and all were returned. After the questionnaire data was collected, classroom observation was conducted. It took over two month's period beginning with administering of questionnaire.

3.8. 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 and classroom observation 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 alpha method to measure the internal consistency the questionnaire.

After the data obtained from the questionnaires (of teachers), the items were first tallied, coded and tabulated followed by data entry in to 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. The correlation between EFL teachers’ perception and classroom practice in communicative grammar teaching was analysis based on r value given in the table below.

Interpretation of r value

Correlation coefficient	Interpretation
0.00-0.20	Very low
0.20-0.40	Low
0.40-0.70	Moderate
0.70-0.90	High
0.90-1.00	Very high

Source: Mu’awana (2018)

3.9 Ethical issues

First and for most, every activity was done after having the letter of recognition from responsible bodies for conducting research in the study area. Then, before the data collection, the purposes of the study were explained to the participants and they were asked for their willingness in the study. The researcher committed to keep the confidentiality of the participants’ by making their name anonymous when they responded.

CHAPTER FOUR: 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 two methods; questionnaire, 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 and observations of teachers.

4.1. Teachers` Background Information

1	Field of study	Major			Minor	
		English			Amharic	
2	Qualification	BA	MA(TEFL)	PhD	Other (specify	
		20	10	-	-	
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 of 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. From 30 of respondents 10 of them were MA holders and, (20) of them were BA 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. Teachers' awareness of CLT

Table 2 Teachers' awareness of CLT

No	Items	Yes	No	Total
1	Have you ever taken courses on communicative language teaching	20 66.6%	10 33.3%	30
2	Have you ever participated in any seminar, workshop or orientations concerning CLT	1 3.3%	29 96.6%	30
3	Have you ever read anything about EFL and ESL in the Contexts of CLT?	0 0	30 100%	30

According to Table 2 above, teachers' awareness of communicative language teaching is analyzed as follow. As can be seen from item 2 above, with regard to the issue, of the 30 participants, 20 (66.6%) responded positively to learned about CLT, while 10 (33.3%) responded that they did not. Hence, item number 1 implies that 33.3% of the respondents have not taken courses on Communicative Language Teaching.

In response to items 2, with regard to the issue of order to the 30 respondents, 29 (96.6%) replied that they have not participated in any seminar, workshop or orientations concerning CLT. But only 3.3% teachers were participated. This result shows that almost all teachers have not updated information about CLT. Similarly, the result for Item no. 3, which states Show that among the 30 respondents, 30 (100 %) responded no '. This implies that all teacher's awareness on the difference between EFL and ESL in the Contexts of CLT.

Generally, concerning the questionnaire tried to measure teacher's awareness on CLT responses demonstrate that the majority of the respondent teachers (66.6%) have not awareness on CLT and only 33.3 % of the respondents have information and awareness towards CLT.

4.2 Analysis of teachers` response on the practice of communicative grammar teaching

NO	Items	SA	Agree	Und	Dis	SD	Sd.	Mea n
1	English as foreign language teachers explain new grammatical terminologies or forms and patterns (rules) and let the learners is engaged in doing exercises.	17 56.7%	10 33.3	1 3.3	2 6.7	-	0.855	4.4
2	Explain new words and phrases and let the learners do the grammar exercises in the text book.	15 50.0	11 36.7	1 3.3	3 10.0	-	0.944	4.26
3	Give students explanation of rules with model sentences to illustrate them.	13 43.3	11 36.7	5 16.7	1 3.3		0.847	4.2
4	Involve students in questioning and answering activities.	3 10.0	4 13.3	2 6.7	14 46.7	7 23.3	1.276	2.4
5	Involve learners in activities as identifying similarities and differences of pictures in group.	3 10.0	1 3.3	5 16.7	17 56.7	4 13.3	1.102	2.4
6	Make the learners exchange letters, write reports, advertisements etc., cooperatively.	3 10.0	1 3.3	2 6.7	16 53.3	8 26.7	1.112	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	1 3.3	5 16.5	3 10.0	17 56.7	4 13.3	1.040	2.4

	the language.							
8	Involve learners in problem-solving activities.	4 13.3	-	1 3.3	18 60.0	7 23.3	1.129	2.2
9	Use pair work in which two students work on a given task.	1 3.3	1 3.3	8 26.7	16 53.3	4 13.3	.877	2.3
10	Use group work in which more than two students work on a given task.	1 3.3	2 6.7	4 13.3	20 66.7	3 10.0	.928	2.26
11	Help learners correct their error in their pair and group discussion.	2 6.7	2 6.7	2 6.7	18 60.0	6 20.0	1.040	2.4
12	Use pictures and objects to convey the meaning of structure.	2 6.7	4 13.3	4 13.3	14 46.7	6 20.0	1.253	2.4
13	Let learners do assignments at home and give feedback on other days for the whole class.	16 53.3	8 53.3	3 10.0	3 10.0	-	1.006	4.23
14	Use different kinds of language games e.g., word dominoes	2 6.7	1 3.3	3 10.0	18 60.0	6 20	1.020	2.16
15	Correct learners` error in controlled practice activities like question and answer.	2 6.7	2 6.7	2 6.7	17 56.7	7 23.3	1.085	2.16
16	Evaluate students in paper and pencil test (on terms or semesters).	18 60.0	7 23.3	2 6.7	3 10.0	--	.994	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 those 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 (46.75 rarely and 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 pair works 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 late the students do assignment at home and give feedback on the 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 gat the feedback on the other days in CGT class room. In item14, (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 classroom. 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 and semesters).Respectively, the result, generally, imply majority of EFL instructors imply 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 country to what they perceive and believe about the communicative approach to grammar teaching in English classroom.

4.3. Teachers' perception on CGT

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

No	Items	SA	Agree	Und	Dis	SD	Sd.	Mean
1	The knowledge of grammar helps learners to communicate efficiently and effectively.	6 20.0%	21 70%	2 6.7%	1 3.3%	---	.640	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%	.907	3.93
3	A Communicative grammar perspective is the most progressive instructional approach to teach grammatical rule in the field of EFL.	24 80%	5 17.5%	1 3.3%	----	----	.504	4.76
4	Teaching grammar in communicative way help learners to take responsibility of their learning.	21 70%	8 26.7%	1 3.3%	----	----		4.6
5	The CGT approach to language teaching encourages the student to develop his/her full potential and their language usage properly	10 33.3%	12 40%	1 3.3%	2 6.6%	5 16.6%	1.446	4.16
6	It is difficult to teach grammar in communicative.	----- -----	2 6.7%	1 3.3%	15 50%	12 40%	.817	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 item2, 56.6% agreed that good EFL instruction is virtually synonymous with communicative grammar teaching (CGT) method. In the same way some respondents (23.3%) reported their strong agreement that good EFL

instruction is virtually synonymous with communicative grammar teaching. Were us the rest of four respondents (13.3%) of the respondents did not have any decision with the above issue. 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 40% and 33.3 % respondents made agreement and strongly agreement on the CGT approach to language teaching encourages the student to develop his or her full potential and their language usage properly. These considerable proportions of the respondent (40% and 33.3%) 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	SA	Agree	Und	Dis	SD	Sd.	Mean
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%	1.098	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%	---	0.923	3.9
3	Learning grammar at discourse level is	---	-----	6	17	7		1.96

	boring.			20%	56.7%	23.3%	.695	
4	Learning grammar in communicative form is interesting.	13 43.3%	11 36.7%	6 20%	----	-----	.928	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%	----	1.042	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 dis agreed 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 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%0 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

N	Items	SA	Agr ee	Und	Dis	SD	Sd.	Mean
1	In EFL programs, grammar teaching is better accomplished with a communicative approach.	9 30%	12 40%	3 10%	4 13.3%	2 6.7%	1.230	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	1.245	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.	6 20	13 43.3	---- ---	13 43.3	----- ----	1.196	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 10.3	14 46.7	6 20.0	1.306	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	1.352	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	----- -----	.691	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	-----	-----	.724	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	---- ---	.761	4.2

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 program. 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	SA	Agree	Und	Dis	SD	Sd.	Mean
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	1.476	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	---- ----	1.050	2.93
3	In general speaking, students` communicative ability improves most quickly study and practice the grammar of the language.	5 16.7	13 43.3	----- -----	12 40.0	---- ----	1.102	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	8 26.7	5 16.7	6 20.0	----- ----	1.171	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	8 26.7	1.213	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 item5, 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/L2when 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 4.2.7, Frequency (f), Percentage (%), and Mean of Responses for perspective on Teachers` Role

No	Items	SA	Agree	Und	Dis	SD	Sd.	Mean
1	Teacher plays a facilitator role in CGT class.	18 60	11 36.7	1 3.3	----- -----	---- -----	.563	4.56
2	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	---- ----	.868	4.0
3	The teacher should act as an independent participant within the grammar teaching	---- ----	8 26.7	1 3.3	13 43.3	8 26.7	1.248	2.3

	learning group.							
4	Teacher makes students to discover grammar rules by themselves through dialogue.	16 54.3	14 46.7	---- -----	---- ----	---- ----	.688	4.53
5	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	1.259	2.96
6	The teacher must supplement the text book 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	1.262	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%) dis agreed 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, item 5, 50% of the respondents revealed their disagreement in the point that practice is 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 reviled their agreement and strong agreement in the issue respectively. On the other hand, in ite6, 83.3% of the respondents reviled their agreement that the teacher must supplement the text book with their materials in which it has grammar activities so as to develop the students` communicative skill.

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

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

No	Items	SA	Agree	Und	Dis	SD	Sd.	Mean
1	Students can improve their communicative competency through regular practice of grammatical structures.	10 33.3	12 40.0	3 10.0	3 10.0	1 3.3	1.175	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	---- ---	.664	4.2
Grand Mean =4.03								

In the above table 4.2.8 item is how 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 suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are use full for him or for 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 into in their entire EFL classes

Table 4.2.9 Correlations between teachers` perception and practice of CGT

		Total practice score	PERCEPTION SCORE
Total practice score	Pearson Correlation	1	.306
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.137
	N	30	25
PERCEPTION SCORE	Pearson Correlation	.306	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.137	
	N	25	25

The result of the correlation coefficient in the above table indicated that the correlation between EFL teachers' perception and classroom practices was 0.306 at the significant level of 0.137. This result indicates that there was positive correlation between EFL teachers' perception and classroom practices. Based on the interpretation of r value, 0.306 showed that there was low correlation between EFL teachers' perception and classroom practice.

4.4. Classroom Observation Results

In order to find out teachers' actual classroom practices in the features of promoting CGT, (yes/no) items. The observation was conducted using a checklist.

Table 4.4.1 Teachers` Actual Classroom practices in CGT

No	Item	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 meaning.	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 teacher. 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 classroom observation during CGT

No	Item	Yes		No	
		No	%	No	%
1	Dose 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 classroom. Thus 81.3% of the observed classes did not show the use of different instructional methods to implement CGT rather than it was lecturing.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the summary of the findings, conclusion and the possible recommendation of the study. The purpose of this study was to assess teachers' perception and practice of the communicative grammar teaching in English classroom at seka secondary schools used on the analysis and discussion, the following summary, conclusion and recommendation are made

5.1. SUMMARY

As mentioned in chapter one, this study was mainly concerned with the assessment teacher's perception and practice of the communicative grammar teaching in English classroom. The study was conducted at seka secondary schools. Therefore, to arrive at a valid conclusion, addressing the statement of the problem and the research questions in line with review of literature two types of data gathering instruments (questionnaire and classroom observation) were used. Thus, the major findings of the study are summarized as follow:

1. Teacher's responses concerning their perception of communicative grammar teaching with regard to the principles of CGT (M= 3.65) shows seka high school EFL teachers have a good perception and also, they seem to be aware of importance of communicative grammar teaching.
2. 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 (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% which is very low. This result indicates that the teacher's practice was poor.

5.2. CONCLUSIONS

The overall findings the response obtained from the whole CGT perspectives reveal a mean value 3.55. This computed mean value indicate that the majority of respondents (71%) have strong view of communicative grammar teaching with regard to the principles of CGT stated. Therefore, with regard to teacher's 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, Seka secondary schools EFL teachers have mildly high level of perception of CGT with regard to its beliefs.

To conclude, the overall findings of this study indicates that in spite of the fact that teachers mildly have level of understandings of CGT concepts, in reality they failed to practice them in EFL classes in the entire contexts. This generally indicates that there is clear mismatch between what teachers perceive about CGT and what they actually practice.

5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings and the conclusion 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, schools, 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 approach to teach grammar in communicative way and on how to cope with the existing problems in the schools.
- Teachers are 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 the learning. Therefore, teacher's education programs, should address at in-depth training on CGT methodologies. Thus, this can also stimulate other researchers to conduct similar or further studies.
- It would be advisable for the teachers to use communicative activities such as information gap, task completion, role-play and project work as much as possible when they teach language skills through communicative approach in integration.
- It needs that there is small size room for integrated–skills teaching through communicative approach to be effectively practiced in the classrooms unless the teacher's get adequate training on how they practically teach language skills in integration through communicative approach.
- Therefore, concerned bodies such as the school's administrations and agencies in the Ministry of Education should make a concerted effort to arrange and/or give training for the teachers on practical aspects of teaching grammar communicatively. This could be done by preparing workshops, seminars or in-service training.

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.

References

- Alamirew, G. Mariam (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/Alkharat deductive](http://iteslj.org/techniques/Alkharat%20deductive)
- Atkins, J. Hailom, B. and Nuru, M. (1995). Skills Development Methodology. Addis Ababa. AAU Printing Press.
- Bailey, K.D. (1994). Methods of Social Research. New York: The Free Press
- Batstone, R. (1994). Grammar. London: Oxford University Press.
- Beyene Gebru. (2008). "The Teachers' Perception and Classroom Practices of CLT." (Unpublished) M.A. Thesis, Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Bloor, T. and Bloor, M. (2004). The Functional Analysis of English. Arnold. Hadder: Headline group.
- Breen, M. P. and Candling, C. (1980). The Essentials of Communicative Curriculum in Language Teaching. *ELT Journal* 1/2, 89-99.
- Brown, D (1994), Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. London: Prentices Hall Regents.
- Brown, D. (1972). The Psychological Reality of Grammar in the ESL Classroom. *JSTOR: TESOL Quarterly* 50/1, pp.263-279.
- Brown, D. (1972). The Psychological Reality of Grammar in the ESL Classroom. *JSTOR: TESOL Quarterly* 50/1, pp.263-279.
- Brown, K. (2006). Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. UK. Elsevier Ltd.

- Brumfit, C. J. (1979). *Communicative Language Teaching: an Educational Perspective*. Oxford University Press.
- Brumfit, J. (1986). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, A. (1999). *Collaborative action research for English language teachers*. Cambridge: CPU.
- Bygate. and Tornkyn, A. (1994). *Grammar and Language Teachers*. UK: Longman
- Byrnes, H.etal. (2007) *Educating for Advanced Foreign Language Capacities*. Washington, D.C. Georgetown University Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, (1980), “ Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second. . . . Language teaching and testing’ ’applied linguistics 1: pp,1-47.
- Celce- Murcia, M. (1991).*Grammar Pedagogy in Second and Foreign Language Teaching*. TESOL Quarterly 25/3:459-80.
- Chen, T. (2003).In Search of an Effective Grammar Teaching Model. *English Teaching Forum*, Vol.33 No. 3.pp 58-60.
- 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’s, A. (2011). Investigation of the application of communication language teaching in th 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.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1984). *Evaluating and Selecting ELT Teaching Materials*. London: Hermann.

- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing Your Course Book*. London: Heinemann.
- Dickens, P. and Woods, E (1988). Some Criteria for the Development of Communicative Tasks. *JSTOR: TESOL Quarterly*. Vol.22. No. 4
- Douglas, D., (2000). *Assessing language for specific purposes: Cambridge language assessment series*. Cambridge; Cambridge university press.
- Edilion, I. (2009). *A study of attitudes toward grammar instruction in an academic English program*. Saarbrücken; VDM Verlag.
- Ellis, R. (1993). *Talking Shop: Second Language Acquisition Research* Rod Ellis. An Interview with Ellis Rod. *ELT Journal* 47/1:3-11
- Ellis, R. (1995). Interpretation Tasks for Grammar Teaching. *JSTOR: TESOL, Quarterly* 29/1 87-99.
- Ellis, R. (1995). Interpretation Tasks for Grammar Teaching. *JSTOR: TESOL, Quarterly* 29/1 87-99.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA Research and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Ellis. (2002). *Methodological Options in Grammar Teaching Materials: New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in ESL Classrooms*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ellis. (2002). *Methodological Options in Grammar Teaching Materials: New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in ESL Classrooms*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Endalkachew W/Mariam (2006)'' the communicative language teaching in selected second cycle primary schools in east Shoa zone'' English Modal Auxiliaries at Addis Ababa university freshmen level. Addis Ababa:

Fortune, A. (1998). Survey Review: Grammar Practice Books. *ELT Journal* 52/1, 605-625.

Fotos, S. (1994). Integrating Grammar Instruction and Communicative Language Use through Grammar Consciousness-raising Tasks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28/2,323-51

Gatbonton, E. and Segalowitz, N.(2005). Rethinking Communicative Language Teaching: A Focus on Access Fluency. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*.61/3: 325-353.

GeremewSemu.(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.

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.

Halliday.M. (2004).An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold.

Hammerely, H. (1987). The immersion approach. *Modern language journal*, 19/2,331-59.

Haregewain 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..

Harmer, J. (1987).Teaching and Learning Grammar. London: Longman.

Harmer,J.(1991).The Practice of English Language Teaching. London: Longman.

- Hedge, T., (2000), *teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: OUP
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1991). *On communicative language teaching*. *Hispania*, 74(1), 197- 198.
- 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
- Hiep, P. H. (2007). *Communicative Language Teaching: Unity with Diversity*. *ELT Journal*. 61/3: 193-201
- Horowitz, E. (1990). *Attending to the affective domain in the foreign language classroom*.
- Humboldt . (1974). *Presenting Grammar Inductively*. *JSTOR: Modern Language Journal* 12/6, 440-445
- Hutchinson, T. and Waters, A. (1994). *English for Specific Purpose*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1972). *On communicative competence*. In *pride*, J.B., & Holmes, J. (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics*, 269-293. Baltimore, USA: penguin education, penguin books Ltd
- Jin, Y. (2012). *On the cultivation of oral English communicative competence in teaching*. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(3), 59-63.
- Jones, L. (1993). *Communicative Grammar Practice*. *The Modern Language Journal* 77/1. Cambridge University Press.
- Karavas, D.E. (1996). *Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative Approach*. *ELT Journal* 50/3: 187-198. 73
- Koul, L. (1984). *Methodology of Educational Research*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing Ltd.
- Lakachew Mulat. (2003) "Teachers Attitude towards CLT and Practical Problems in its Implementation." (Unpublished) M.A. Thesis, Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University

- Larsen-freeman, D.(2000). Teaching techniques in English as a second language. Oxford:oxford university press.
- Larson-Freeman, D (2001). Teaching Grammar in Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Boston: Heinle and Heinle
- Larson-Freeman, D. (1986). Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larson-Freeman, D. (1997) Grammar and its Teaching: Challenging the Myths.<http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/larsen01.html>.
- Lightbown, P. M., &Spada, N. (2006). How languages are learned (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1981).Communicative Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mu'awana (2018). *The correlation between students reading habit and reading comprehension of the eleventh-grade Islamic senior high school*. Al- Jauharen Jambe.
- Nitta, R. and Garden, S. (2005). Consciousness-raising and Practice in ELT Course Books. ELT Journal Vol. 59/1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Noonan, F. (2004).Teaching ESL Students to “Notice” Grammar.The Internet TESL/TEFL Journal Vol.x.No. 7. <http://Itesli.org/>
- Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative Tasks and the Language Curriculum. TESOL Quarterly, 25/2,279-296.
- Nunan, D. (2003). Practical English Language Teaching. New York: McGraw Hill,
- Nunan. (2001). The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

- Nunan.(2001). The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rex, S. M.(2003). Re thinking Grammar in of Foreign Language Classroom.Journal of Language and Language Learning. Vol.1, no 1
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T.S. (1986). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. (1983). The Context of Language Teaching. New York: Random House Inc.
- Richards, J. (2001). Curriculum development in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge
- Richards, J.C. (2006). Communicative Language Teaching Today.[http://www.professorjackrichards.com/pdfs/com.language teaching today](http://www.professorjackrichards.com/pdfs/com.language%20teaching%20today).
- Rinvolvcri, M. (1984). Grammar Games, Cognitive, Affective and Drama Activities for EFL Students. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Rojas, C.O. (1995). Teaching Communicative Grammar at the Discourse Level. Biblioteca.universia.net/html.
- Rott,S.(2000). Teaching German Grammar through Communicative tasks: Some Suggestions. JSTOR: DieUnterrichtspraxis.Vol.33. No.2. pp125-133
- 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. (1997).Communicative competence: Theories and classroom practice. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Savignon, S. 2002. Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice. Reading, Mas Addison-Wesley.

- Seyoum Haile. (2008). "Comparative Study of Grammar Teaching Methods Employed by Televised Teacher and Non-plasma School Teachers." M.A. Thesis, (Unpublished). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.
- Stern, H. (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tarone and Yule. (1989). *Focus on language learners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tiglu Geza. (2008). "The Appropriateness of Communicative Grammar Teaching." M.A. Thesis. (Unpublished). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.
- Topper, A. G.(1999). *Conversations about Teaching and Technology: A Technology Support Group for Teacher Professional Development*. PHD thesis, Michigan State University. [http://www.edu.msu.edu/Home pages /topper/ AREA sessions 23-25 htm](http://www.edu.msu.edu/Home%20pages/topper/AREA%20sessions%2023-25.htm).
- 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.
- Ur, P. (1991). *A Course in Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vanpattern, B. (1998). *Perception and Perspectives on the Term "communicative."*
- Webster, N. (1997). *Webster's new 20th c Dictionary of the English Language*. Boston.
- White,L.(1987). *Against Comprehensible Input .The Input Hypothesis and the Development of SL Competence*.*Applied Linguistics*, 8, 95-110.
- Widdowson, H. (1990). *Aspects of Language Teaching*. London: Oxford Universe Press
- Widdowson. (1978). *Teaching language as Communication*. London: Oxford university press.

Yonas Adaye.(2003). Primary School Teachers' Perceived Difficulties in Implementing the Innovative ELT methodologies in the Ethiopian Context.Institute of Educational Research (IER) IER lambeau. 11/1:23-55

Zhenhui,Rao.(1993). Modern vs Traditional Language Teaching. English Teaching Forum online. Exchanges. State. Gov. forum/vol...37. No.3

APPENDICES
JIMMA UNIVERSITY
COLLAGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITY
SCHOOL OF POST GRADUATE STUDY
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

APPENDIX-A: Techer's questionnaire

Dear teachers,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information about *teachers' perception and practice of Communicative Grammar Teaching Approach in English language class room*. It is one of the instruments which the researcher uses to gather the necessary data for his /her 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 in the 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 (5 \geq) ----- 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 periods ----- C. 21-30 periods -----

B. 11-20 periods -----

D. above 30 periods -----

5. Average numbers of students in one class

A. 30 and less than 30 -----

C. 41-50 -----

E. above 60-----

B. 31-40 -----

D. 51- 60 -----

Direction 2: please read the following items carefully and put a tick in the appropriate box.

1. Have you taken any course related to communicative grammar teaching (CGT) in university?

A. Yes ----- B. No -----

2. Have you ever participated in any seminar, workshop or orientations concerning CLT

A. Yes -----B. No -----

3. Have you ever read anything about EFL and ESL in the Contexts of CLT?

A. Yes----- B. No-----

Part II: CGT dimension

Section- one: items in the table below are accompanied with five oppositions: strongly Agree, agree, and undecided, disagree and strongly Disagree, respond to these items by putting a tick in the appropriate box

Keys: 5=strongly agree 4= agree 3=undecided 2=disagree 1= strongly disagree

The following questions are prepared to assess teachers' classroom communicative **grammar teaching practice**. Please, read the following items carefully and put a tick mark indicating the most appropriate alternative for each of the given items' classroom practice.

NO	Items	SA	Agree	Und	Dis	SD
1	English as foreign teachers explain new grammatical terminologies or forms and patterns (rules) and let the learners is engaged in doing exercises.					
2	Explain new words and phrases and let the learners do the grammar exercises in the text book.					
3	Give students explanation of rules with model sentences to illustrate them.					
4	Involve students in questioning and answering activities.					
5	Involve learners in activities as identifying similarities and differences of pictures in group.					
6	Make the learners exchange letters, write reports, advertisements etc., cooperatively.					
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.					
8	Involve learners in problem-solving activities.					
9	Use pair work in which two students work on a given task.					
10	Use group work in which more than two students work on a given task.					

11	Help learners correct their error in their pair and group discussion.					
12	Use pictures and objects to convey the meaning of structure.					
13	Let learners do assignments at home and give feedback on other days for the whole class.					
14	Use different kinds of language games e.g., word dominoes					
15	Correct learners` error in controlled practice activities like question and answer.					
16	Evaluate students in paper and pencil test (on terms or semesters).					

The following questions are prepared to assess teachers' perception communicative grammar teaching practice. Please, read the following items carefully and put a tick mark indicating the most appropriate alternative for each of the given items.

Keys: 5=strongly agree 4= agree 3=undecided 2=disagree 1= strongly disagree

No	Items	Rating scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
	Conceptual perspective of Communicative grammar teaching (CGT)					
1	The knowledge of grammar helps learners to communicate efficiently and effectively					
2	Good EFL instruction is practically synonymous with Communicative Grammar Teaching (CGT) method.					
3	A Communicative grammar perspective is the most progressive instructional approach to teach grammatical rule in the field of EFL.					
4	Teaching grammar in communicative way help learners to take					

	responsibility of their learning					
5	The CGT approach to language teaching encourages the student to develop his/her full potential and their language usage properly					
6	It is difficult to teach grammar in communicative.					
	Perception on Students' learning in CGT					
1	Students' achievement of English grammatical rule is most productive in the context of a communicative approach					
2	Student' involvement and mastering of the English grammatical rule are the most helpful to progress their communicative skill in EFL Classroom.					
3	Learning grammar at discourse level is boring					
4	Learning grammar in communicative form is interesting					
5	Teaching grammar in communicative approach supports learners to be fluent in English language.					
	Perception on instructional activities					
1	In EFL programs, grammar teaching is better accomplished with a communicative approach.					
2	Grammar is better taught explicitly. That is, rules should be clearly stated and pointed out to the students.					
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.					
4	Grammar should only be taught or mentioned when a particular grammar point appears in the material or communication (in context).					
5	Grammar is best taught either inductively or deductively depending on the teachers' preference.					
6	Grammar is best taught either inductively or deductively depending on the students' preference.					

7	Grammar should be mainly practiced in oral communication, and then showed the rule later on.					
8	Practice of structures must always be within full communicative contexts.					
Perception about the Importance of Grammar in CGT						
1	Knowledge of grammar in language does not guarantee the ability to use language for communicative purpose.					
2	Direct instruction in the rules is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively.					
3	In general speaking, students` communicative ability improves most quickly study and practice the grammar of the language.					
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.					
5	The formal study of grammar is essential to the eventual mastery of a FL/L2 when language learning is limited to the classroom					
Perception on teacher's role in CGT						
1	Teacher plays a facilitator role in CGT class.					
2	The role of the teacher in the grammar lesson is to impart(demonstrate) knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing and giving examples.					
3	The teacher should act as an independent participant within the grammar teaching learning group.					
4	Teacher makes students to discover grammar rules by themselves through dialogue.					
5	Practice is a crucial importance for the students to master grammar points without the help of teacher.					
6	The teacher must supplement the text book with other materials in					

	which it has grammar activities so as to develop the students' communicative skill.					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

Teachers' Responses for Perceptions on Learners' Role in CGT

No	Items	SA	Agree	Und	Dis	SD
1	Students can improve their communicative competency through regular practice of grammatical structures.					
2	Students can suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for him/ her in language classroom.					

APPENDIX: B: Classroom Observation Checklist

Section-Three: the following questions are prepared to assess teachers' classroom communicative grammar teaching practice. In order to find out teachers' actual classroom practices in the features of promoting CGT, (yes/no) items. The observation was conducted using a checklist.

No	Items	Rating scale	
		Yes	No
1	Grammatical items are presented and practiced in a meaningful context to develop creative and independent use of the language		
2	The activities focus on language as a medium of communication.		
3	The activities are more students-centered.		
4	The activities are more emphasis on meaning.		

5	The activities emphasis on meaning.		
6	The activities emphasis on accuracy.		
7	Classroom grammar activities are maximizing students` communication opportunity.		
Teacher`s Role in classroom observation during CGT			
1	Dose the teacher present grammar items with detailed explanation and give some examples?		
2	The teacher gives independent participation to learners` groups.		
3	The teacher`s role is organizing group-work.		
4	The teacher`s role is Organizing pair-work.		
5	The teacher`s role is lecturing.		
6	The teacher`s role is Facilitating and monitoring class activities.		

A. Beliefs and Practices of Teachers about the Use of Grammar in Language

1. What are your general views or perceptions of teaching grammar through the communicative approach?

2. Some people say that studying grammar is not important because we learnt our first language effectively without learning its grammar. What do you think about this idea?

B. Beliefs and Practices about How to Better Teach Grammar

1. What techniques should we use to teach grammar? Why?

2. How do you help the learners practice the grammar items?

3. It is widely claimed that teachers may not teach grammar the way they think it should be taught. As to what extent do you agree to this idea?

4. How do you check that your students get clear understanding of grammar activities?
