

ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY



SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

POST GRADUATE PROGRAM (MA IN TEFL)

**A STUDY ON THE PERCEPTION AND PRACTICES OF
TEACHING COMMUNICATIVE GRAMMAR: SECONDARY
SCHOOL TEACHERS IN FOCUS**

GADDISA KANAA SANBATO

SEPTEMBER, 2017

ADAMA

ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

POST GRADUATE PROGRAM (MA IN TEFL)

MA THESIS SUBMITTED TO ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING ENGLISH
AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (TEFL)**

GADDISA KANAA SANBATO

SEPTEMBER, 2017

ADAMA

**ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH**

**A STUDY ON THE PERCEPTION AND PRACTICES OF
TEACHING COMMUNICATIVE GRAMMAR: SECONDARY
SCHOOL TEACHERS IN FOCUS**

**BY
GADDISA KANAA SANBATO**

APPROVAL OF THE EXAMINATION BOARD

NAME	SIGNATURE	DATE
_____ ADVISOR	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
EXTERNAL EXAMINER	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
INTERNAL EXAMINER	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned post graduate student, declare that this thesis entitled *A Study on the Perception and Practices of Teaching Communicative Grammar: Secondary School Teachers in Focus* is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other University, and that all sources of the materials used in this thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Gaddisa Kanaa

Signature: _____

Advisor: Abebe Gemechu (PhD)

Submitted to: Adama Science and Technology University, School of Humanities and Law,
Department of English

Date of Submission: _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Abebe Gemechu (PhD), for his invaluable and constructive comments, suggestions and feedback. Without his constructive comments and suggestions, this study would not have been successful. I am very much indebted to the kindness, patience and warm- welcome he has shown me in the course of time. Above all, his unreserved guidance and professional advice throughout the entire course of the thesis was significant that I have really no words to thank him.

I would like to extend my thanks to the EFL teachers and principals of the schools which I conducted in and those participants in the questionnaire, classroom observations, and focus group discussion who contributed a lot for the success of the study. Special thanks are to the following individuals for their sustained cooperation and lots of contributions: Solomon Bekele, for his inspiring friendship; my brother, Kelbisa Kanaa, for his unwavering assistance in time of financial need.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank my spouse, Sudi Olike, for being such a dedicated person in providing all her support and love during the course of my studies despite a number of prevailing challenges. My lovely daughters, Marartu and Biftu, who remained a source of my encouragement since the time they came into being, also deserve my heartfelt appreciation. I dedicate this work to the three of them.

In the end, I praise the Almighty GOD whose divine attributes, love and care prevail beyond this transient world for ever.

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this study was to examine EFL teachers' perception about and practices in teaching communicative grammar with reference to six Government Secondary Schools situated in towns of Special Zone of Oromia Surrounding Finfinne. The participants of the study were thirty EFL teachers who taught in grade 9 in the academic year of 2016/17. The research design was descriptive paradigm involving a mixed methodology: both quantitative and qualitative. In order to achieve the research objectives, therefore, the study used both quantitative and qualitative data gathering tools: questionnaire, classroom observation, and focus group discussion. The questionnaires were administered for 30 EFL teachers. Moreover, for convenience, six classroom observation and a focus group discussion comprising six of the participants were held. As such, frequency, percentage, and mean scores were used to analyze the quantitative data. The data collected through classroom observation and focus group discussion were described qualitatively and analyzed using protocols of content analysis. The overall findings this study revealed that, irrespective of EFL teachers' high perception of CGT (average mean 3.72), communicative grammar teaching was not being successfully implemented. The findings included: students' lack of opportunities to practice language items in meaningful situations, the teachers' reluctance to employ various tasks as well as adapting the textbook based on students' background knowledge, lack of enough training for the teachers, shortage of class time and large class size, and students' mother tongue interference. Besides, fear, frustration, lack of motivation, state of being passive, negative peer attitude towards those who try to make practice in the target language from the side of the students were identified as the potential impeding pitfalls. So, proper classroom observation system should be arranged in the schools to guide the teachers on the right time and proper language development program for teachers should also be arranged so that the students can get better language exposure. Providing additional professional training and supplementary materials that boost teachers' teaching performance so as to have a matched perception with actual classroom practices is also necessary.

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
Acknowledgements.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of tables.....	v
Acronyms.....	vi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	3
1.3 Objectives of the Study.....	4
i) General Objective	4
ii) Specific Objectives	4
1.4 Research Questions.....	5
1.5 Significance of the study.....	5
1.6 Scope of the Study	5
1.7 Limitations of the study.....	6
1.8 Definition of Operational Terms.....	6
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	
2.0 Introduction.....	7
2.1 Grammar and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT).....	7
2.2 Approaches to Grammar Teaching.....	8
2.3 Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) as a Tool to Teach Grammar ...	12
2.4 Grammar Teaching Strategies	13
2.4.1 Explicit Versus Implicit Teaching	13
2.4.2 Deductive Versus Inductive Teaching	14
2.4.3 Communicative Grammar Teaching Strategy.....	15
2.5 Teachers' Perceptions of CLT and Grammar Teaching Practice.....	16
2.6 Integrating Grammar with other Skills	18
2.7 Phases of Grammar Teaching	19
2.8 The Roles of Teachers and Students in Communicative Grammar Teaching and Learning	21
2.8.1 Teacher's Roles	21
2.8.2 Roles of Students	21
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	
3.0 Introduction.....	23
3.1 Research Design	23
3.2 Population of the Study.....	23
3.3 Samples and Sampling Techniques	23
3.4 Methods of Data Collection	24
3.4.1 Questionnaire	24
3.4.2 Classroom Observation	24

3.4.3 Focus Group Discussion	24
3.5 Pilot Study.....	25
3.6 Ethical Considerations	26
3.7 Method of Data Analysis and Interpretation	26

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

4.0 Introduction.....	28
4.1 Sex of Respondents.....	28
4.2 Responses from Teachers' Questionnaire.....	29
4.2.1 EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Communicative Grammar Teaching (CGT)	29
4.2.2 Responses of EFL Teachers on Classroom Practices	30
4.2.3 Responses of Teachers on Using Instructional Communicative Activities	32
4.2.4 Responses Related to Learners' Mastery of Grammar.....	34
4.3 Classroom Observation Results on Teachers' Classroom Practice	35
4.4 Focus Group Discussion	38
4.5 Discussion of the Results.....	38
4.5.1 EFL Teachers' Perception about and Practices of Communicative Grammar Teaching	39
4.5.2 Instructional Communicative Activities to be Practiced and Learners' Mastery of Grammar.....	40

CHAPTER FIVE : SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction.....	42
5.1 Summary	42
5.2 Conclusions.....	43
5.3 Recommendations	44
References	45

Appendices

A. Questionnaire for teachers.....	50
B. Classroom Observation Checklist.....	56
C. Focus Group Discussion Protocol.....	57

List of Tables

Table	Page
Table 4.1 Sex of Respondents.....	28
Table 4.2 EFL Teachers' Perception CGT.....	29
Table 4.3 EFL Teachers' Classroom Practice.....	31
Table 4.4 Instructional Communicative Activities the Teacher Uses.....	33
Table 4.5 Learners' Mastery of Grammar.....	35
Table 4.6 Classroom Observation Results on Teachers' Classroom Practice.....	36
Table 4.7 Elements of Focus Group Discussion.....	37

ACRONYMS

CLT-Communicative Language Teaching

CLL-Communicative Language Learning

EFL-English as a Foreign Language

ELT-English Language Teaching

CGT-Communicative Grammar Teaching

MHESR- Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the general context of the study and provides the overall introduction of the study. First, an attempt has been made to introduce the background of the study. Next, the research problem is stated and then objectives, research questions and significance of the study are identified. Finally, scope, limitations and definitions of operational terms are described subsequently.

1.1 Background of the Study

How English is best taught has been a major issue in teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language (EFL/ESL). Historically, different methods and approaches to language teaching and learning, each with different perspectives, have been introduced over the course of times (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

According to Richards and Rodgers (1986:34), the structural view of language sees grammatical structures as the underlying units of language system the unit of language are structurally rule governed. The Audio-lingual syllabus (audio-lingual method) was also derived from the structural view and was practiced before the implementation of CLT. The Audio-lingual syllabus comprises activities that focus on correct pronunciation, spelling convention and grammatical forms. Drills are also used in the audio-lingual classroom because repetition and memorization are believed to be important. Communicative approach/syllabus, however, has redefined the teaching of grammar, teachers' and students' roles of materials and teaching leaning methodology.

Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983, cited in Chung (nd) describe the CLT syllabus as follows: meaning (function) is emphasized; contextualization is important; language learning is learning to communicate; language is created through repeated trials and errors; and fluency is primary whereas accuracy is secondary. Generally, communicative grammar teaching is based on the communicative language teaching (CLT) method. In light of this method, language structures must not be taught in isolation but integrated to the four skills of language. A structure is practiced both orally and in written form. Grammar pattern must not only be learnt at the utterance level but also at the discourse level.

There are numerous arguments which show that grammar should be taught communicatively (Singh, 2011, as cited in Phamvuphio, (nd)). To Singh, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) unlike the former methods is learner- centered as it emphasizes communication and real life situations and purposes instead of presenting grammar as hard fact to be memorized. Besides, it is believed by many scholars that learners learn better when they are engaged in meaningful communication process. This is because the main objective focuses on the development of communicative grammatical competence, which is understood as the ability to use and understand a structure in a variety of situations spontaneously.

It is the view of linguists and sociolinguists that components of competence, of which communicative competence and grammatical competence are the common ones, are believed to be the core of communicative language teaching (CLT). The linguist, Noam Chomsky and the sociolinguists, Dell Hymes and Michael Halliday are concerned with the 'linguistic theory' which underpins the concept of communicative competence in CLT (Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (MHESR) 2010:7). Linguistic theory, therefore, is the basis of communicative competence in CLT, and methods and principles of EFL teaching are inseparable from linguistic theory. These linguistic theoretical principles also show the necessity of grammar teaching in foreign learning (MHESR, 2010:7).

Chomsky's linguistic theory has two parts: linguistic competence and linguistic performance. Linguistic competence refers to the speaker's knowledge of his language structures. It is this type of knowledge that permits the understanding and producing of an infinite of sentences. Linguistic performance, on the other hand, is concerned with the process of encoding and decoding (Brumfit and Johnson, 1979, as cited in MHESR, 2010:8).

Moreover, linguists argue that grammar is the most important part in a language system; and without grammar, a complete language system cannot be constituted. Linguists agree that language consists of sound, lexicon and grammar, and these three elements influence each other, have interaction and constitute the material basis of the whole language system; i.e., the content of language can be expressed through sound, while sound has to use lexicon and grammar to achieve its function (HU, 2001:115).

However, the researcher has observed many problems during /when teaching grammar lessons in CLT classes at secondary schools. Students lack proficiency in English language and they show failures in achieving advanced level of grammatical competence. The present study, therefore, aimed to investigate whether the problems are related to teachers' perception and their classroom practices in EFL classes during grammar lessons.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Theories and approaches to the teaching and learning of EFL/ESL lay fundamental principles and methods of how to teach grammar skill. Ellis (1997), for example, explains that grammar teaching is one of the essential elements of language that enables learners to communicate efficiently and meaningfully. According to Ur (1988), grammar is viewed as the central area of a language around which reading, writing, speaking, vocabulary and other components like meaning and function of a language revolve. Stern (1983), on the other hand, asserts that the know-how in L1 or L2 comprises mastery of the form, linguistic, cognitive, and affective and socio - cultural meaning expressed by the language forms as well as the capacity to use the language with the maximum attention to communication and minimum retention to form and the creativity of language use.

From the above view points by the scholars, it could be concluded that grammar skill is one of the key elements in language learning for effective and real-life communication purposes and the teaching of grammar is supposed to develop learners' CG, which is what a speaker needs to know in order to communicate in a speech community and which involves knowledge of the language and the ability to use the knowledge in context.

Although the above notions about grammar teaching are worthy and acceptable for use, several studies conducted in the area of CLT did not emphasize EFL teachers' perception about and practices of teaching communicative grammar. For instance, in the Ethiopian context, a study conducted by Hailom Banteyerga (1982) compared the effectiveness of communicative approach versus the structural approach in the teaching of English conditional sentences to first year students of Addis Ababa University. The findings have indicated the results of communicative approach were better than the structural approach. Moreover, Geremew (1994) conducted an

experiment on the –effectiveness of teaching English as a foreign language through grammar consciousness raising activities to ninth grade students.

The findings revealed that consciousness-raising activities were more effective in the teaching of grammar.

Beyene (2008) concludes that in spite of the fact that teachers mildly have high level of understandings of CLT concepts, in reality they failed to practice them in EFL classes in the entire contexts. According to Beyene, there is a clear mismatch between what teachers and learners perceive about CLT and what they actually practice.

Ajebush (2013) also states that communicative language teaching is not well practiced currently in Ethiopia. In this regard, other local researchers have strengthened Ajebush's idea clearly in their study others in writing and speaking. For instance, Demelash (2012) suggests that many English teachers teach grammar still in the old structural grammar teaching method. Demelash (2012) again points out briefly in his study that Ethiopian English teachers' other problem is focused on teaching the structural patterns of the language to respond to the students' interest. To this end, the researcher has observed that, most students face ineffective use of the language in communication with their teachers and friends.

Based on the above literatures and the results, it is the belief of the present researcher that the findings of this study will help to check whether EFL teachers in the study focus have appropriate perception about and practice of teaching communicative grammar. To the knowledge of the present investigator, the title of this paper, *a study on the perception and practices of teaching communicative grammar: secondary school teachers in focus* has not been explored so far.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

i) General Objective

The general objective set for the study was to examine secondary school EFL teachers' perception about and practices of teaching communicative grammar.

ii) Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were to:

- identify EFL teachers' perception towards implementing communicative grammar teaching,
- examine how their perception affects their practice in grammar teaching, and
- investigate how much the instructional practices they predominately employ enable learners grammar mastery.

1.4 Research Questions

In this study, EFL teachers' perceptions and classroom practices will be investigated. Three questions are addressed. These questions comprise the full scope of research on the teachers' perceptions and classroom practices in the present study.

1. What are the teachers' perceptions towards implementing communicative grammar teaching?
2. How do the teachers' perceptions affect their practice in grammar teaching?
3. To what extent do the instructional practices EFL teachers predominately employ enable learners' grammar mastery?

1.5 Significance of the study

As it has already been summarized in the statement of the problem, this study aimed at describing EFL teachers' perception about and practices in teaching communicative grammar with particular reference to secondary school teachers. Hence, the study is expected to provide methodological insights and information to EFL teachers which are helpful for them to implement the principles of communicative language in teaching grammar communicatively. In addition, it is expected to provide methodological contributions to ELT material developers and invite further researchers to make more studies on EFL teachers' perceptions and practices of communicative grammar teaching.

1.6 Scope of the Study

This study, as stated earlier, was delimited to address the perception and practices of teaching communicative grammar by high school EFL teachers. Its conceptual scope is, therefore, confined to assessing teachers' perception towards communicative grammar teaching, practices of communicative grammar teaching, methodologies to be used when teaching grammar communicatively and principles of communicative grammar teaching and

its implementation in EFL classroom. Likewise, the conclusions drawn may not be extended beyond the six government schools where the study focused upon.

1.7 Limitations 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 six 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. Moreover, being observed or investigated could be a stressful situation. In this regard, the teachers were closely observed and recorded. Hence, the presence of the observer could cause a certain amount of limitation to the study. The researcher also felt that demonstrating all aspects of 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 in grammar teaching. Therefore, the instruments that were used to gather data were limited to raise only some features of the communicative approach to teaching grammar.

1.8 Definition of Operational Terms

Perceptions/beliefs: Represented as individual personal knowledge, which are constructed from experience acquired through cultural transmission and serves as implicit theories to guide thoughts and actions.

Teaching: An activity consciously undertaken in order that somebody should learn something.

Communicative Competence (CC): this form of competence is usually achieved when learners are able to use language for a variety of communicative purposes.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

This chapter reviews the theoretical frameworks and empirical research that support the thesis. Therefore, it deals with reviewing EFL teachers' perception and practices of teaching communicative grammar, methodologies to be used when teaching grammar communicatively and principles of communicative grammar teaching and its implementation in EFL classroom.

2.1 Grammar and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

In traditional grammar teaching, language is seen primarily as a set of forms and structures, and grammatical meaning plays a second role. A sentence is the main units of analysis and emphasis is placed on the ability to form correct sentences. Grammar rules are given prominence and learning is seen as a mainly cognitive process. The most common forms of exercises are gapped sentences and sentences for transformation, reflecting a form-based and an extremely passive role on the part of the learners (Newby, 1998:1).

The above illustrative point makes it clear that grammar has been considered as being of primary importance in language teaching though it focuses on providing direct explanation of grammar rules and structures.

In communication approach to grammar teaching, however, language is seen as a means of communication messages between human beings in actual contexts. It follows from this that language is redefined as a set of skills, grammar being seen as a way of expressing certain types of meanings through grammatical forms. Meaningfulness and contextual appropriacy are stressed and formal correctness is given less prominence. Methodological innovations based on semi-authentic forms tasks and communications in small groups reflect this approach (Newby, 1998:1).

Hymes (1972, as cited in kumaravadivelu, 2006:9) defines communicative competence as dependent upon both (tacit) knowledge and (ability for) use. To Hymes, communicative competence consists of grammatical competence as well as socio-linguistic competence, that is, factors governing successful communication. Hymes identified these factors as *setting* (place and time), *participants* (speakers and

listeners), *objectives*, act as sequence (oral or written) and the *code* (formal or informal), *norms* (conventions of interaction and interpretation based on shared knowledge) and *genre* (categories of communication such as lecture, report, essay, poem, and so forth.)

In Larsen-Freeman (2004, cited in Bayisa, 2013:8), Widdowson's theory of communicative performance refers to two aspects of communicative performance: the ability to produce correct sentences and the ability to use the knowledge of the rules for the effective communication. To Widdowson (1979), using creative techniques and providing opportunity to practice in situations which encourage learners to communicate their needs, ideas and opinions, will enable them to operate grammar effectively in the real world. So, the importance of communicative and creative activities is essential for learning grammar. In Brumfit and Johnson (1979, cited Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (MHESR), 2010:10), Halliday states that grammar is learned through the activities in a communicative and interesting way by using functions of language, which are effective for learning grammatical forms. These functions of language can be instrumental, personal, interactional, regulatory, representational, heuristic and imaginative.

2.2 Approaches to Grammar Teaching

According to Newby (1998), grammar teaching in the 1960s shows influences from the following approaches to grammar teaching.

A) Traditional Grammar

In this approach to grammar teaching:

- Language is seen as a set of forms and structures
- Sentence is the main unit of analysis
- Emphasis is placed on the student's ability to form correct sentences
- Grammar rules are given prominence
- Learning is seen as a mainly cognitive process

B) Communicative Approach

As Richards (2006,cited in Badilla and Chacon,(2013)) stated, CLT can be understood as a set of principles about the goals of language teaching, how learners learn a language, the kinds of classroom activities that best facilitate learning, and the roles of teachers and students in the classroom. To Richards, the main goal of CLT is the teaching of communicative competence, which refers to knowledge of the building blocks of sentences (e.g., parts of speech, tenses, teaching methodology, etc.).

In Communicative approach, as Newby (1998):

- Language is seen as a means of communicating messages between human beings in actual contexts;
- Meaning fullness and contextual appropriacy are stressed;
- Formal correctness is given less prominence; and
- Analysis of language is taken as a starting point

C) Learner-based Approaches

Learner-based approaches—partly ‘humanistic’ in their orientation —give center stage to language learners and to acquisition processes and learning strategies. In this approach:

- Language can be acquired by the learner
- Teacher takes the role of a facilitator
- Grammar rules give way to discovery techniques
- Student-centered activities predominate the needs of the learner

D) Focus on Form, Forms and Meaning Approaches

The approaches ‘Focus on form’, ‘Focus on forms’, and ‘Focus on Meanings’ have recently been focused in grammar teaching.

Long (1991:45-46) describes these approaches as follows:

- *Focus on Form*: This approach is defined as –any planned or incidental activity that is intended to include language learners to pay attention to

linguistic forms during meaningful communication (Ellis, 2001:1-2).

Having been informed by Schmidt's Noticing and Conscious-raising Theory and Swain's (1985) Output Hypothesis, this view of 'focus on form' grammar teaching proposes that some sort of notices and conscious-raising to target grammar structure in input, and feedback on errors during language use in meaningful communicative activities would facilitate the acquisition of language (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2002; Long, 1991, 2002).

Such noticing or conscious-raising was stated to contribute to language acquisition in three ways: -Learning will be faster, quantity produced will be greater, and context in which the rule can be applied will be extended (Rutherford, 1987; cited in Uysal, (nd)).

Substantial empirical evidence from studies– a meta-analysis of 9 studies by Norris and Ortega (2000, 2001) and 11 studies by Ellis (2002) –have provided support for 'focus-on-form' compared to other grammar teaching approaches and have demonstrated that focus 'focus-on-form' contributed to faster language acquisition, higher level of accurate oral or written language production, and longer retention of forms when compared to pure-meaning focused implicit learning (Flowerdew, Levis & Davis, 2006; Doughty and Williams, 1998).

- *Focus on Forms:* in focus on forms instructions, language is divided into isolated linguistic units and taught in a sequential manner through explicit explanation of grammar rules and immediate correction of errors. Students follow a typical sequence of presentation of a grammatical structure, its practice is controlled exercises, and there is provision of opportunities for production. The underlying logic of this approach is that the explicit knowledge about grammar rules will turn into implicit knowledge with enough practice.
- *Focus on Meaning:* Focus on Meaning was informed by Krashen and Terrell's Natural Approach to second language (L2) acquisition. Grammar teaching focusing on meaning completely refuses any direct instruction on grammar, explicit error correction, or even consciousness-raising, as L2 is claimed to be naturally acquired through adequate exposure to language or -comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982:64; Krashen, 1985:2).

According to this approach, explicit knowledge about language and error correction is unnecessary and even harmful as it may interfere with the natural acquisition process in which learners would subconsciously analyze the forms and eventually deduct the rules from the language input themselves. Thus, this position claims that there is no interaction between explicit and implicit knowledge. Therefore, conscious learning is different and cannot lead to language acquisition (Krashen, 1982; Larsen-Freeman, 2003).

According to Long (1991; 2000), both focus on forms and focus on meaning have been subject to serious criticism. Focus on forms has been criticized for being teacher-centered, artificial, boring and for not allowing meaningful communication and interaction, which are essential to language acquisition. Focus on meaning has also been called into question based on the empirical evidence that mere exposure to a flood of language input with no attention to grammar or error correction results in fossilization and poor L2 grammar in language production (Doughty and Williams, 1998).

E) Inductive and Deductive Approaches

Richards (1986) and Thornby (1999, as cited in Badilla and Chacol, 2013) suggest the inductive and deductive approaches that can bring a light to language teaching using communicative activities as follows:

The inductive approach provides the students with some examples from which a rule is inferred, and the deductive approach with the presentation of rules and some examples in which the rule is applied.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Inductive approach

Thornbury (1999, cited in Badilla and Chacon, (2013) mentioned the following advantages and disadvantages of inductive approach:

Advantages

- Rules learners discover for themselves are more likely to fit their existing mental structure than rules that have been presented to them. This in turn will make rules more meaningful, memorable and applicable.
- Students are more actively involved in the learning process, rather than being simply passive recipients: they are therefore likely to be more attentive and motivated.

- If the problem-solving is done collaboratively, and in the target language, learners get the opportunity for extra-language practice.

Disadvantages

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

Advantages and Disadvantage of Deductive Approach

Advantages:

- It gets straight to the point and saves time. Many rules can be simply and quickly explained rather than elicited from examples.
- It respects the intelligence and maturity of many-especially adult-students, and acknowledges the role of a cognitive process of language acquisition.
- It allows the teachers to deal with language points as they come up, rather than to anticipate them and prepare them in advance (Thornbury, 1999: 59)).

Disadvantages:

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

2.3 Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) as a Tool to Teach Grammar

Since 1960, the communicative approach has been widely implemented in English as a foreign language (EFL) classes. This approach describes a set of general principles

grounded in the notion of communicative competence as the goal of second or foreign language teaching (Richards 2006:22).

Consequently, a set of principles based on CLT can be applied according to the teaching context, the age of learners, their level, and their learning goals. Through this application of principles, some core assumptions of the current CLT cited by Richards (2006) are listed below:

- Second or foreign language learning is facilitated when learners are engaged in interaction and meaningful communication.
- Effective classroom tasks and exercises provide opportunities for students to negotiate meaning, expand their language resources, notice how language is used, and take part in meaningful interpersonal exchange.
- Communication is a holistic process that often calls up on the use of several language skills or modalities.
- Language learning is facilitated both by activities that involve inductive or discovery learning of underlying rules of language use and organization, as well as those involving language analysis and reflection (Richards, 2006: 22).

2.4 Grammar Teaching Strategies

Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999, as cited in Thu, 2009: 6) pointed out that grammar can be looked at from three dimensions: form, meaning and use. Therefore, students need to learn how to use grammar structures accurately, meaningfully and appropriately. Grammar may be taught in various ways such as explicitly (rules are clearly stated and pointed out to the students), implicitly (rules are not pointed out but they are expected to be understood implicitly through various forms of exposure), *deductively* (telling the rules to the students first), *inductively* (students examining many examples to find out patterns), *separately*(grammar points or structures are taught in isolation), or *integratidely* (grammar is taught together with other learning activities or language skills).

2.4.1 Explicit versus Implicit Teaching

In traditional grammar teaching, learners are taught grammatical rules to master sentence patterns. In this strategy/ approach, a grammar rule is explicitly presented to

students and followed by a practice exercise to apply the rule. So, the learners are in control during the practice and have less fear of drawing an incorrect conclusion related to how the target language is functioning (Ulrich, 1994: 4).

Ellis (1995), Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991, cited in Badilla and Chacon,(2013): 173), on the other hand, suggest that this type of language teaching may not have major effects on sequences of acquisition, but it has facilitative effects on both the rate and the ultimate level of second language acquisition. This type of explicit instruction (presenting the structure, describing and exemplifying it, and giving rules for its use) results in important improvements in the learning of target structures. However, implicit instruction (usually consisting of communicative exposure to the target form) alone can delay students to achieve their learning goals (Norris & Ortega, 2000, cited in Badilla& Chacon, 2013: 173).

Ulrich (1994, cited in Badilla and Chacon, 2013: 173) claims that in traditional grammar teaching, what students learn and how they learn are determined with reference to the classroom situation, rather than with reference to the learners' real communicative needs in real situations. As a result, learners often have difficulty using what they have learned, beyond the classroom. For this reason, Skehan (1996, cited in Badilla& Chacon, (2013)) advised that the traditional model (explicit instruction) is not supported by current research.

2.4.2 Deductive versus Inductive Teaching

In deductive way of grammar teaching, a teacher explains the rules and the meaning to the learner. A teacher gives one or more examples based on stated rules, and then students are expected to apply the rules and provide their own instances of language guided by the model examples and stated rules (Hamboldt, 1974). Teachers are encouraged to present grammar rules before anything else and to teach grammar explicitly. It is viewed that deductive method is also useful for the learner to give explanation of the structure and its use (Ellis, 1991; Harmer 1987, as cited in Bayissa, 2013).

Teaching grammar inductively, as suggested by Kelly (1990: 34, cited in Bayissa, 2013), is a method in which learners are engaged in the process of discovering the language and developing their own strategies. Students are provided with different

examples and are asked to elicit their own examples based on the model examples. A teacher, on his part, helps students to acquire and practice the language. In inductive grammar teaching, the aim is to get students practice and use the language as much as they can. In this method, students learn grammar implicitly without direct instruction from a teacher since the approach is based on how students learn to use the language (Harmer, 1987, as cited in Bayissa , 2013: 20).

2.4.3 Communicative Grammar Teaching Strategy

Learning a language through a communicative approach can provide the learner a better opportunity to communicate than a grammar-based approach (language structure and rules). But, there are several aspects that make the communicative approach and the traditional grammar method useful tools for students to learn to learn the second or foreign language. These aspects are:

- Make real communication the focus of language learning.
- Provide opportunities to experiment and try what they know.
- Be tolerant of learners' errors as they indicate that the learner is building up his/her communicative competence.
- Provide opportunities for learners to develop both accuracy and fluency.
- Link the different skills, such as speaking, reading and listening, together in the real world.
- Let students induce, or discover, grammar rules (Richards, 2006: 13)

Communicative grammar teaching is based on the principles of CLT method of teaching English as a second/ foreign language and it focuses on language structures which should be taught in an integrated way with the four skills such as listening, speaking, reading and writing (Richards, 2006, cited in Badilla& Chacon, (2013)).

The objective of the development of communicative grammatical competence is to use a structure of a language in a variety of situations spontaneously. In line with this idea, Bygate and Tornkyn (1994: 19, as cited in Badilla and Chacon, (2013) explain that –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. Celce-Murcia and Hilles (1988, cited in Bayissa, 2013: 21) 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. Cele-Murcia and Hilles also emphasize the importance of teaching all aspects of grammar in context, and for appropriate contextualization to be achieved, realistic social situations, language texts, and visual stimuli are to be created by a teacher.

2.5 Teachers' Perceptions of CLT and Grammar Teaching Practice

Jordaan and Jordaan (1994: 329-332) state that, for any act of perception to take place, three conditions have to be met. Firstly, there must be a sensory system that functions normally; secondly, that the sensory system be subject to basic sensory stimulation and thirdly, that the stimulation be in a constant state of flux, both physiologically and psychologically. The implication of this seems that a perceived act needs to be persistently put into practice through active performance. As Matlin and Foley (1992:2) maintain, the first step in the perceptual process is the experiencing of multiple stimuli by means of the five senses. Not all individuals perceive things the same way. As to the cause for the physiological differences and deficiencies in individual differences in perception, Coren, Ward and Enns (1999: 2) noted this way, *–...your world is what your senses tell you. The limitation of your senses set the boundaries of your conscious existence*. This shows that certain characteristics of the perceiver can modify perception. For instance, Randolph and Blackburn (1989: 87) identify three such factors, namely that which the individual has previously learnt, the motivation and the personality of perceiver. From the above views, three points seem to be worth considering to consolidating teachers' perception for effective practice: the importance of training, motivation of teachers, and their personality (quality). On the other hand, Robbins (1991: 129) mentions the attitudes, interests, motives, experiences and expectations of the perceiver as having an influence on that which is perceived.

In language teaching, there is a link between teachers' beliefs (considered synonym in this study with perception) and their actual classroom practice. Johnson (1999: 30) pointed out that –beliefs have a cognitive, an affective, and a behavioral component and therefore act as influences on what we know, feel, and do. Woods (1996: 195) further defines beliefs as, –Beliefs refer to an acceptance of a proposition for which there is no conventional knowledge, one that is not demonstrable, and for which there is accepted disagreement. That is how teachers interpret a teaching situation; it is usually based on

their beliefs of second or foreign language learning and teaching. Empirical studies show that EFL teachers in general have positive attitudes towards communicative approach in different countries (Chang, 2000; Liao, 2003; Razmjoo and Riazi, 2006 and Hawkey, 2006). In connection with this, Johnson (1994:439), educational research on teachers' beliefs share three basic assumptions: (1) teachers' beliefs influence perception and judgment. (2) Teachers' beliefs play a role in how information on teaching is translated into classroom practices. (3) Understanding teachers' beliefs is essential to improving teaching practices and teacher education programs.

However, these positive attitudes may not necessarily guarantee teachers' use of CLT in their classes and inconsistency between teachers' beliefs and, wrongly set up perception may lead the teacher to little or no preparation. With regard to this, Anderson (1993) maintains that in addition to teacher and learner resistance, the teachers have difficulties of implementing a meaning based program, lack of communicative competence in English, and the lack of adequate teacher preparation.

Irrespective of the numerous studies conducted in the CLT as an approach to investigate the situation of English language teaching, the number of studies conducted to investigate grammar teaching in general and the role of CLT in teaching grammar in particular seems to be limited. For example, Landolsi (2011) conducted a study to investigate teachers and students' perceptions toward the role of grammar instruction. The results of this study revealed that the majority of teachers have appreciated the role of grammar in language teaching.

According to this study, teachers believe that grammar is important. Furthermore, Mohammed (2012) carried out a study to investigate native speaker English teachers and nonnative speaker English teachers' beliefs toward grammar teaching in the UAE and compare their beliefs with their teaching practices. The quantitative data of this study showed that the teachers' beliefs are similar to their teaching practices; however, the qualitative data revealed that there are some differences between their beliefs and practices due to some other factors such as class size, time, and textbooks.

Jasim (2011) conducted a study to investigate teachers' perceptions toward TBLT in a vocational school in the UAE. The results revealed that the participants have positive attitudes toward TBLT because of its several benefits. They also consider TBLT as a more interesting approach than the other traditional approaches. Eltantawi (2012)

conducted an exploratory study to investigate teachers' beliefs toward grammar teaching in UAE EFL classes. The results of Eltantawi's study revealed that the teachers who participated in the study have shown appreciation to the role grammar can play in assisting students to master language skills. The participants have also shown their preference toward the use of contextualization in grammar teaching. Eltantawi's study also highlighted that the participants perceive the use of a combination of explicit and implicit teaching as an effective approach in grammar teaching.

Silva (2005) conducted a study about three Brazilian internship teachers' perceptions on English teaching in the ESL classroom. They participated in the study when they observed other experienced teachers' classrooms, when they taught, and when they reviewed their own teaching videotapes. The results explained that the teachers' professional knowledge affected their perceptions; in turn, their perceptions affected their classroom practices.

2.6 Integrating Grammar with other Skills

Integrating grammar with other skills refers to the relationship among different language skills. Accordingly, grammar, it could be concluded that grammar is inseparable from any communication skills. As such, students need to be given an opportunity to practice and create language that is structurally accurate. However, teachers should not forget the value of allowing students to discover the structure on their own in reading and listening. Larson Freeman (1997), argues that learning to use a language takes a long time and it takes repeated exposure to structures and vocabulary as well as opportunities to practice it.

On the contrary to this, Harmer (1991:31) reveals that: firstly, it is very often true that one skill cannot be performed without another. It is impossible to speak in a conversation if you do not listen as well and people seldom write without reading- even if they only read what they have just written. Secondly, though, people use different skills when dealing with the same subject for all sorts of reasons. Someone who listens to a lecture may take notes and then write a report of the lecture.

Analysis of recorded dialogues is suggested to be a good example of integrating grammar with the other skills. In line with this, Rojas (1995) and Ellis (2002) suggest

that after learners listen to conversation on a tape; teachers have to ask them to find specific examples of grammar points. The teachers ask the learners why the speaker chooses this particular form at this time and not another. Grammar can also be best taught in a reading text– not just the sentence level only. Teaching grammar in a reading text facilitates learners to understand the context of grammar at discourse level as a reading text is well-off with different grammatical expressions. Nunan (2004) asserts that, these kinds of activities include text replication, text completion, text manipulation, text elicitation, grammatical judgment and text editing. Cloze passage and gapped text can be used for focus on particular grammatical forms, such as verb tense, the passive voice, use of preposition, etc. Moreover, Ellis (1995) suggests that text manipulation exercises, such as controlled composition, sequencing, and converting conversations into indirect speech are useful in getting students to practice their grammatical competence at discourse level.

Grammar can also be integrated in writing. For instance, short essay can serve this purpose. Celce-Murcia (1991:149) maintains that more advanced students may be given exercises in which they should determine grammar of a given text. From the above arguments that favour the integration of grammar with other skills, it could be deduced that grammar teaching is an essential component of communicative language teaching which promotes learners' foreign language performance through appropriate presentation of listening, speaking, reading and writing tasks.

2.7 Phases of Grammar Teaching

As Ur (1988:7) and Celce-Murcia (1988:27) suggest, grammar should be presented gradually in step-by-step progression. The step-by-step progression requires the teacher to take into account the stages of presentation, practice and production. Ellis (N.D: 80) describes the stages as: pre-task, during task, and post- task phases.

According to Ellis, the first phase, the pre-task, concerns the various activities that teachers and students can undertake before they start the task, such as whether students are given time to plan the performance of the task. Harmer (1991: 17) defines this first stage/ phase as, –stage which students are introduced to the form, meaning and use of a new piece of language. To Harmer (1991:60), 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.

The practice phase engages the learners in the practice of grammar for communication purposes. Ur (1988) emphasizes that this is the phase of ‘an 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. Ellis claims that this second phase, during-the task phase, centers on the task itself and affords various instructional options.

The third phase is the production phase. In this phase, learners are expected to 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. As Ellis (N.D:80), this stage involves procedures for following-up on the task performance. 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.

In general, Ellis (ND: 80) gives a framework for designing task-based lessons as follows:

Phase	Examples of options
A. Pre-task	* Framing the activity (e. g. establishing the outcome of the task) * Planning time * Doing a similar task
B. During task	* Time pressure
C. Post-task	* Number of participants * Learner report * Consciousness-raising * Repeat task

2.8 The Roles of Teachers and Students in Communicative Grammar Teaching and Learning

2.8.1 Teacher's Roles

The teacher's roles, as stated by Breen and Candling (1980, cited in Richards and Rodgers (1986: 77), are below. The teacher has two main roles. The first one is to facilitate the communication process among all participants in the classroom, and between participants and the different 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 and a resource himself/ herself; teacher as a leader within the classroom procedures and activities; teachers as a researcher and learner to much contribute in terms of appropriate knowledge and abilities, actual and observed experiences of the nature of learning and organizational capacities.

According to Richards and Rodgers (1986: 77-78), Harmer (1991:235-242) and Littlewood (1981: 19, as cited in Bayissa, 2013), the roles a language teacher needs to play in communicative classrooms are pointed out as follows:

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

2.8.2 Roles of Students

The development of communicative competence enabling learners to use language for communicative purposes is the goal of second/ foreign language learning. Grammatical competence, which is essential for communication, is part of communicative competence that students need to master. So, the development of communicative grammatical competence is ensured making the learners use the

structure of the language in a variety of situations spontaneously. Learners, on their part, have roles and responsibilities for the mastery of their communicative grammatical competence (Cuesta, 1995; Millard, 2000; Richards, 2002; Sheen, 2002; Nunan, 2004; Nassaji and Fotos, 2004, as cited in Beyene, 2016: 40).

According to Wang (nd), the standard of mastering a language embodies the importance of grammar teaching and the need for social development. To understand a language, as Liu (1999) as cited in Wang (nd): 79), is to know its grammar, vocabulary, text structure and rules of use in the culture, which jointly decide how to use decent language on specific occasions. A famous linguist, Woods (1988; cited in Wang, (nd): 78) also addresses that the ability to produce the target language that can be accepted in grammar needs to be obtained/ acquired to understand a language. For these all requirements of the standard of mastering the target language, learners have the following roles:

- Learners ought to participate in classroom activities based on cooperative rather than individualistic approach to learning.
- Learners need to be comfortable with listening to their peers in group work or pair work tasks, rather than depending on the teacher for model.
- Learners are also expected to shoulder a greater degree of responsibility for their own learning (Richards, 2006; Larsen-Freeman, 1986, cited in Wang, (nd)).
- Learners need to be engaged in doing things (activities) with language-that is, that they use language for a variety of purposes in all phases of learning (Savignon, 2002: 6, cited in Beyene, 2016: 14).
- Learners develop their own routes to language learning, progress at different rates, and have different needs and motivations for language learning.
- Learners also have the role of negotiator- between the self, the learning process, and the object of learning – emerge from and interact with the role of joint negotiator within the group and within the classroom procedure and activities which the group undertakes (Breen and Cadlin, 1998: 110, cited in Richards and Rodgers (1986: 77)).

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter provides information about the overall design of the study, sampling technique, the data collection methods (questionnaire, classroom observations, focus group discussion), and data collection procedures, the pilot study, data organization and analysis, and triangulation.

3.1 Research Design

This study employs both quantitative and qualitative approaches. In order to attain the intended objectives, mixed research approach was used as it responds to research questions of both qualitative and quantitative nature. Moreover, it is believed that mixed type provides better information to understand a particular phenomenon under investigation than a single method as a failure of one type could be supplemented by the other (Ary, Jacobs & Sorenson, 2010). Hence, the mixed method approach has been introduced in order to overcome some limitations of using the qualitative and quantitative approaches separately; as well as to combine their strengths (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003, cited in Ibrahim, 2004: 289).

3.2 Population of the Study

The target population of the study was grade 9 EFL teachers from six government secondary schools in towns of Special Zone of Oromia Surrounding Finfinne. They were Burka Nono High School, Burayu High School, Kolobo High School, Holeta High School, Burka Harbu High School, and Sebeta High School.

3.3 Samples and Sampling Techniques

The samples of the study were all 30 (i.e., 100% of total population) High School EFL teachers of the study area, (25 males and 5 females), who teach in Grade 9 in academic year of 2016/17. The selection of the schools was purposive. The schools were selected because of the accessibility to the investigator on the proximity and he has been working at one of the schools for four years. As a result, the schools were cooperative to him. Moreover, experienced teachers were assumed to be available in the study area.

3.4 Methods of Data Collection

The study employed four instruments that were supposed to generate reliable data for the study as the weakness of one instrument could be complemented by the others. The instruments were questionnaire, classroom observation and focus-group discussion (FGD). The details of each of these instruments are elaborated further below.

3.4.1 Questionnaire

To collect data to address the research objectives, Likert-type closed-ended questionnaires were used as large and reliable data could be collected quickly and economically from a large sample (Krathwohl, 1998). The study employed a closed-ended questionnaire because closed ended questionnaires are –quicker to code-up and analyze than word-based data (Bailey 1994: 118 as quoted in Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007: 321). The questionnaires were slightly adapted from Karavas-Dukas (1996), Razmjoo (2006), Beyene (2008) and Lin (2010). The adapted questionnaires were, thus, focused on: EFL teachers' perceptions of communicative grammar teaching (CGT) (13 items), EFL teachers' classroom practice (8 items), instructional communicative activities the teacher uses (15 items), and learners' mastery of grammar (5 items).

3.4.2 Classroom Observation

The classroom observation was conducted in order to check whether teachers practiced the principles of CLT in teaching communicative grammar (besides what they professed in the responses to the questionnaires) in EFL classroom while the actual class lesson was going on. For convenience, six of them were observed once, as it will not be manageable to observe all the participants. The observation was made based on a checklist which focuses on classroom instructional activities or techniques employed by teachers. The observation checklist was adapted from Yemane (2007) and Razmajoo and Riazi (2000). To avoid the potential personal bias that might occur in the meaning to be given to what was being observed, the observations were conducted along with an EFL teacher as a co-observer.

3.4.3 Focus Group Discussion

Qualitative methods such as focus groups are –intended to provide researchers with means for collecting data that can be used to construct a descriptive account of the

phenomena being investigated (Dollar & Merrigan, 2002: 6). A focus group centers on a particular issue and the interviewer (researcher) elicits the views of the group members while noting interactions within the group (Ary, Jacobs and Sorenson, 2010: 439). As Ary, Jacobs and Sorensen, focus groups are helpful because they bring several different perspectives into contact and they are more socially oriented and they make more economical use of time. Moreover, the topics and ideas expressed in the focus group can help the researcher to identify the questions and other important aspects of the phenomenon to pursue in the study, and a focus interview is much more flexible and open in form. The focus group used in the study consisted of six people. The rationale behind was that everyone can take part in the discussions. The groups were homogeneous in terms of prestige and status to ensure comfort in expressing opinions (Ary, Jacobs and Sorensen, 2010: 440). Semi-structured type of focus group, which included six open-ended questions posed by the researcher, was used. The focus group was conducted in the month of June, 2017 and the discussions lasted for an hour.

3.5 Pilot Study

Pilot test was conducted prior to the final administration of the questionnaires. Pilot test refers to the pretesting, or trying out of, a particular research instrument or research procedures (Baker, 1994:182-183). One of the advantages of pilot study is that it can give advance warning regarding weaknesses in a proposed study. These include: where research protocols might not be followed, or whether proposed methods or instruments are inappropriate or too complicated. De Vaus (1993: 54) advised researchers to check to see if there are any ambiguities or if the respondents have any difficulty in responding.

For the present study, after preparing the instruments of data collection, validation of the instrument was done using experts' review and discussion. To maintain the validity of the research instruments, general comments of the esteemed advisor was considered. Accordingly, the items in the research instruments were prepared by adapting questions or statements used by other scholars on similar topic and reflecting the literature in a way that they would meet the intended objectives of the study. Then, the instruments were submitted to two MA degree holders in TEFL to review for the depth, richness, dependability, content, and internal validity of the instruments. Therefore,

the pilot study proved that it was possible to investigate the research problems using the instruments mentioned. Then, the tools were put into effect.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

Approval to undertake the research was obtained from the Department of English, School of Humanities and Law, Adama Science and Technology University. The official letter obtained from the university was given to the respective school principals where the study was conducted. Then, the purpose of the study was explained to the participants and the researcher asked their willingness to answer the questionnaire. He also informed the participants that the information they provide is used only for the purpose of the study. Accordingly, the researcher used the information from his participants only for the study purpose. Having this reality in mind, any communication with the concerned bodies was accomplished at their voluntarily consent without harming and threatening the personal and institutional well-being. In addition, the researcher ensured confidentiality by making the participants unnamed.

3.7 Method of Data Analysis and Interpretation

The data collected through questionnaire, classroom observation, content analysis (textbook) and focus group discussion were presented and analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Accordingly, frequency, percentage and mean scores were used to analyze the quantitative data.

On the other hand, information generated from focused-group discussion and classroom observation was described qualitatively and analyzed using protocols of content analysis. The analysis procedure for data elicited through questionnaires consisted of Likert-type item analysis for all specific objectives of the study. The Likert-type items, which were designed to identify teachers' understandings of CLT concepts and their perceptions and practices in teaching communicative grammar, were given numerical scores (e.g. 'Strongly Agree' =5; 'Agree' = 4; 'Undecided' =3; 'Disagree' =2 and 'Strongly Disagree' =1) As stated by Taylor (1973) cited in Lakachew (2003), Likert assigned numerical values to responses and the numerical representation (the coding) of the items went through the following two ways: The

favorable items (statements which directly address/consonant with the communicative language teaching principles) were coded as: '_Strongly Agree'(SA) =5; '_Agree' (A)= 4; '_Undecided'(U) =3; '_ Disagree'(D) =2 and '_Strongly Disagree' (SD)=1.

The unfavorable items (those which were designed to crosscheck the teachers view and address non-communicative aspects) were coded in the reverse manner as:-

'_Strongly Agree' =1; '_Agree' = 2; '_Undecided' =3; '_ Disagree' =4 and '_Strongly Disagree' =5. Further range of responses like '_Nearly Always' (NA)=5; '_Often' (O)=4; '_Sometimes' (ST)=3; '_Rarely' (R)=2 and '_Never' (N)=1 were also prescribed to a given question or statement.

The data obtained from the questionnaires (of teachers) were first tallied and tabulated and were registered as frequency that could show the number of respondents for each item. Hence, the raw data entered into computer to be analyzed using SPSS version 20. The tables were presented before the analysis and interpretation. Then, the data were first presented in frequency, percentage, and mean value was calculated. Finally, based on the mean value, each item was presented. Thus, the higher mean values were meant to indicate greater practice, and lower mean value indicated lower practice towards the item. For convenience, the items of the responses were categorized into four sub-parts based on the specific objectives of the study. They were:

- questions on EFL teachers' perception towards implementing communicative grammar teaching,
- questions that examine how EFL teachers' perception affects their practice in grammar teaching,
- questions meant to assess EFL teachers' classroom practices in teaching grammar, and
- questions related to investigation of how much the instructional practices EFL teachers predominately employ enable learners grammar mastery.

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the data that were collected using teachers' questionnaires, classroom observations, and focus group discussion.

4.1 Sex of Respondents

The sex of respondents is presented in the table below.

Table 4.1 Sex of Respondents (N=30)

Sex	Respondents	
	Frequency (fr)	Percent (%)
Male	25	83.33
Female	5	16.67
Total	30	100

Table 4.1 indicates that 25 (83.33%) of the teacher respondents were male and 5 (16.67%) were female.

4. 2 Responses from Teachers' Questionnaire

4.2.1 EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Communicative Grammar Teaching (CGT)

Table 4.2 EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Communicative Grammar Teaching

No	Items		Strongly Agree					Total	Mean
			S	A	D	D	S		
			5	4	3	2	1		
			1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
1.1	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.	Fr	14	13	3	0	0	30	4.37
		%	47	43	10	0	0	100	
1.2	Grammar should best be taught either explicitly or implicitly depending on the difficulty of the grammar points.	Fr	9	17	3	1	0	30	4.13
		%	30	56.67	10	3.33	0	100	
1.3	Communicative Grammar Teaching improves students' fluency.	Fr	10	14	4	1	1	30	4.03
		%	33.33	46.68	13.33	3.33	3.33	100	
1.4*	Grammar is best taught deductively (telling the rules to the students first).	Fr	9	13	0	6	2	30	2.30
		%	30	43.33	0	20	6.67	100	
1.5	Communicative Grammar Teaching provides students with a suitable learning environment to better understand grammar.	Fr	9	18	1	2	0	30	4.13
		%	30	60	3.33	6.67	0	100	
1.6	The previous training you received greatly improved your confidence and skills in teaching grammar.	Fr	0	2	5	16	7	30	2.06
		%	0	6.67	16.67	53.33	23.33	100	
1.7	Students' understanding of grammar rules is assessed	Fr	3	2	7	18	0	30	2.66
		%	10	6.67	23.33	60	0	100	
1.8	Grammar is best taught inductively (students examining many examples to find out patterns).	Fr	13	13	2	2	0	30	4.23
		%	43.33	43.33	6.67	6.67	0	100	
1.9	Communicative Grammar Teaching helps students improve their communicative abilities.	Fr	9	11	8	2	0	30	3.90
		%	30	36.66	26.67	6.67	0	100	
1.10	Communicative Grammar Teaching turns grammar into a more practical and interactive subject.	Fr	17	12	1	0	0	30	4.53
		%	56.67	40	3.33	0	0	100	
1.11	Communicative Grammar Teaching helps students use grammatical rules in speaking and writing.	Fr	8	19	3	0	0	30	4.17
		%	27	63	10	0	0	100	
1.12	Communicative Grammar Teaching helps students obtain higher scores in grammar exams.	Fr	6	17	2	5	0	30	3.80
		%	20	56.66	6.67	16.67	0	100	
1.13	Communicative Grammar Teaching enhances cooperative learning in grammar classes.	Fr	11	16	0	3	0	30	4.17
		%	37	53	0	10	0	100	
	Total Average Mean								3.72

*=*unfavourable statement and its corresponding rating scale*

As the above table 4.2 depicts, that the majority (84%) of the respondents with the average mean value 3.97 showed their agreement with the items 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12 and 1.13. It is indicated that the mean values of the mentioned items are found to be between 3.8 and 4.37. This shows that teacher respondents were agreeable that grammar is best taught implicitly (grammar rules should not be pointed out but they should be understood implicitly through various forms of exposure), grammar should best be taught either explicitly or implicitly depending on the difficulty of the grammar points, communicative grammar

teaching improves students' fluency, grammar is not best taught deductively (telling the rules to the students first), communicative grammar teaching provides students with a suitable learning environment to better understand grammar, grammar is best taught inductively (students examining many examples to find out patterns), communicative grammar teaching helps students improve their communicative abilities, communicative grammar teaching turns grammar into a more practical and interactive subject, communicative grammar teaching helps students use grammatical rules in speaking and writing, communicative grammar teaching helps students obtain higher scores in grammar exams, communicative grammar teaching enhances cooperative learning in grammar classes. However, some portions (8% and 8% respectively) of the respondents were not agreeable and remained undecided about the above mentioned items (see table 4.2).

On the other hand, with regard to items 1.6 and 1.7 in the table above, majority (68.33%) of the teacher respondents with the average mean value 2.36 expressed their disagreement implying that the previous training they received did not greatly improve their confidence and skills in teaching grammar, and students' understanding of grammar rules is not assessed. But some portion (11.67%) agreed about the mentioned items (1.6 and 1.7). And the remaining 20% of the respondents remained undecided.

4.2.2 Responses of EFL Teachers on Classroom Practices

The second section focuses on EFL teachers' classroom practices when teaching grammar, and how that can support the idea of communicative grammar teaching (CGT) at the sample schools. Table (4.3) shows English teachers' level of agreement and satisfaction with these classroom practices.

Table 4.3 EFL Teachers' Classroom Practice

The next table presents EFL teachers' Classroom Practice

No	Items		NA	O	ST	R	N	Total	Mean
			5	4	3	2	1		
			1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
2.1	The teacher uses an approach (inductive) that is very useful to develop students' communicative competence.	Fr	5	11	5	9	0	30	3.40
		%	16.66	36.67	16.67	30	0	100	
2.2	The teacher supports students to acquire and practise the language.	Fr	3	8	12	7	0	30	3.23
		%	10	26.67	40	23.33	0	100	
2.3*	Learners are presented with several examples which embody the grammar rule of the language.	Fr	8	15	3	4	0	30	2.10
		%	26.67	50	10	13.33	0	100	
2.4*	The teacher explains the rules and the meaning to students.	Fr	10	16	3	1	0	30	1.83
		%	33.33	53.34	10	3.33	0	100	
2.5	Students are expected to apply the rules and provide their own examples guided by the instances given.	Fr	0	5	5	12	8	30	2.23
		%	0	16.67	16.67	40	26.66	100	
2.6*	The teacher presents grammar rules before anything else and teaches grammar explicitly.	Fr	17	5	6	2	0	30	1.46
		%	56.67	16.66	20	6.67	0	100	
2.7*	The teacher provides students with descriptive understanding of each point of grammar.	Fr	15	7	5	3	0	30	1.67
		%	50	23.33	16.67	10	0	100	
2.8	When teaching grammar, the teacher focuses on language structures which should be taught in an integrated way with the four skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing.	Fr	0	6	5	15	4	30	2.43
		%	0	20	16.67	50	13.33	100	
	Average Mean for favourable items								2.82
	Average Mean for Unfavourable items								1.76
	Total Average Mean								2.29

* =unfavourable statements and their corresponding scale values.

As it can be seen from the above table 4.3, 72.67% of the teacher respondents reported that the teacher uses an approach (inductive) that is very useful to develop students' communicative competence, learners are presented with several examples which embody the grammar rule of the language, explain the rules and the meaning to students, present grammar rules before anything else and teach grammar explicitly and provide students with descriptive understanding of each point of grammar nearly always and often. And the remaining 27.33% practice the above activities sometimes and rarely.

Concerning items 2.5 and 2.8 in the above table, when 66.66% of the teacher respondents claimed that students were expected to apply the rules and provide their own examples guided by the instances given, and the teacher focused on language structures which should be taught in an integrated way with the four skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing when teaching grammar rarely and never, the remaining 33.34% of them gave their responses that students were expected to apply the rules and provide their own examples guided by the instances and the teacher focused on the language structures which should be taught integrated with the four skills of listening, speaking reading and writing often and sometimes, if not nearly always.

The remaining item (item 2.2) deals with the idea that the teacher supports students to acquire and practice the language. As the figure in the table depicts, 63.33% of the teacher respondents said that they supported students to acquire and practice the language sometimes and rarely. However, 36.67% of them implemented the mentioned activity nearly always and often.

4.2.3 Responses of Teachers on Using Instructional Communicative Activities

The third section investigates the instructional communicative activities the teacher uses when teaching grammar. Table 4.4 shows EFL teachers' level of agreement and satisfaction with these communicative activities.

Table 4. 4 Instructional Communicative Activities the Teacher Uses

NO	Items		NA	O	ST	R	N	Total	Mean
			5	4	3	2	1		
3.1	Information-gap Activities	Fr	3	6	15	6	0	30	3.20
		%	10	20	50	20	0	100	
3.2	Information- transfer activities	Fr	2	12	11	5	0	30	3.36
		%	6.67	40	36.66	16.67	0	100	
3.3	Jig-saw activities	Fr	0	2	4	4	20	30	1.60
		%	0	6.67	13.33	13.33	66.67	100	
3.4	Task-completion Activities	Fr	4	12	6	8	0	30	3.40
		%	13.33	40	20	26.67	0	100	
3.5	Information- gathering activities	Fr	0	6	5	18	1	30	2.53
		%	0	20	16.67	60	3.33	100	
3.6	Opinion sharing Activities	Fr	0	8	8	11	3	30	2.70
		%	0	26.67	26.67	36.66	10	100	
3.7	Speaking about personal experiences	Fr	8	5	13	4	0	30	3.40
		%	26.67	16.67	43.33	13.33	0	100	
3.8	Interviews	Fr	0	6	8	14	2	30	2.60
		%	0	20	26.67	46.67	6.66	100	
3.9	Describing people, places, or things	Fr	4	9	8	9	0	30	3.26
		%	13.33	30	26.67	30	0	100	
3.10	Sentence writing applying a grammatical rule	Fr	0	6	5	14	5	30	2.40
		%	0	20	16.67	46.67	16.66	100	
3.11	Role playing	Fr	2	9	7	12	0	30	3.16
		%	7	30	23	40	0	100	
3.12	Asking & answering questions spontaneously.	Fr	15	6	6	3	0	30	4.10
		%	50	20	20	10	0	100	
3.13	Tasks, such as project-based tasks	Fr	4	7	14	5	0	30	3.33
		%	13	23	47	17	0	100	
3.14	Listening to dialogues that focus on certain grammatical rules	Fr	0	5	9	12	4	30	2.50
		%	0	16.67	30	40	13.33	100	
3.15	Reading texts that focus on certain grammatical rules	Fr		2	6	12	10	30	3.00
		%		6.67	20	40	33.33	100	
	Average Mean								2.96

NA=Nearly Always, O =Often, ST=Sometimes, R=Rarely, and N=Never

Table 4.4 shows the responses made for items 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.7, 3.9, 3.11, 3.12, and 3.13 reveal that only average 17.5% of the teacher respondents with average mean value 3.4 attempted to practice the activities such as information gap activities, information

transfer activities, task completion activities, speaking about personal experiences, describing people, places or things, role playing, asking and answering questions spontaneously and tasks such as project-based often in that 27.46% of them implemented the same mentioned activities often. The results also revealed that the average percentage of 55.04 (55.04%) of the teachers reported that they implemented the above mentioned activities in their classroom (33.33% implementing sometimes and 21.71% implementing rarely) when teaching grammar. See table 4.4.

However, regarding the instructional communicative activities like jigsaw activities, information gathering activities, opinion sharing activities, interviews, sentence writing applying a grammatical rule, listening to dialogues, and reading texts that focus on certain grammatical rules, the teacher responses to items 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8, 3.10, 3.14, and 3.15 indicate that the teachers were reluctant to practice the mentioned activities in their classes. The result also shows that only 38.10 % of the teacher respondents with the average mean value 2.47 made attempts to implement the activities in classrooms (16.67% implementing often and 21.43% implementing sometimes in that 61.90% of them implemented the mentioned activities (40.47% implementing rarely, and 21.43% implementing never). See table 4.4.

In general, the total mean value 2.96 of the responses of the 15 items dealing with the teachers' classroom instructional practice of communicative grammar teaching activities reveals that the teachers employed the instructional activities sometimes, if not often or nearly always.

4.2.4 Responses Related to Learners' Mastery of Grammar

This section deals with how much the instructional practices EFL teachers predominately employ enable learners' grammar mastery at the sample schools, and how that particular aspect can affect the issue of communicative grammar teaching.

Table 4.5 Learners' Mastery of Grammar

No	Items		SA	A	U	D	SD	Total	Mean
			5	4	3	2	1		
4.1	Learners are responsible for conducting the interaction to a situation in which an activity is set.	fr	2	5	3	18	2	30	2.57
		%	6.67	16.66	10	60	6.67	100	
4.2	Learners use the structure of the language in a variety of situations spontaneously.	fr	0	8	0	12	10	30	2.20
		%	0	26.67	0	40	33.33	100	
4.3	Learners use language for communicative purposes to develop their communicative competence.	fr	2	8	0	11	9	30	2.43
		%	6.67	26.67	0	36.66	30	100	
4.4	Students are able to communicate more effectively and accurately in the target language.	fr	0	2	5	23	0	30	2.30
		%	0	6.67	16.66	76.67	0	100	
4.5	With the use of meaningful communicative interaction, learners' language accuracy and fluency is improved or promoted.	fr	0	2	0	27	1	30	2.10
		%	0	6.67	0	90	3.33	100	
	Total Average Mean								2.32

Adapted from Lin (2010)

As the above table 4.5 depicts, 75.33% of the respondents with an average mean value of 2.51 showed their disagreement with the items (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5); whereas, 19.34% of the respondents with an average mean value of 0.64 agreed and 5.33% of the respondents with an average mean value of 0.17 remained undecided.

In general, the total mean value 2.32 of the responses of the 5 items dealing with learners' mastery of grammar revealed that learners were not proved to: (a) be responsible for conducting the interaction to a situation in which an activity is set; (b) use the structure of the language in a variety of situations spontaneously; (c) use language for communicative purposes to develop their communicative competence; (d) able to communicate more effectively and accurately in the target language; and (e) With the use of meaningful communicative interaction, learners' language accuracy and fluency is improved or promoted.

4.3 Classroom Observation Results on Teachers' Classroom Practice

In this section, the qualitative results of the classroom observation analysis were presented in tabular form followed by textual discussion referring to table 4.6 below.

Table 4.6 Classroom Observation Results on Teachers' Classroom Practice

Item	Statements	Availability on		
		Yes	No	Total
1.	Does the teacher present a grammar item in a meaningful context?	2	4	6
2.	Does the teacher motivate the learners to practice the language?	2	4	6
3.	Does the teacher integrate the grammatical patterns with language skills?	1	5	6
4.	Are the learners encouraged to discover the grammar rules by themselves?	0	6	6
5.	Are the learners encouraged to produce/ elicit their own idea based on the topic introduced?	1	5	6
6.	Does the teacher make the lesson interactive?	2	4	6
7.	Are the learners asked to practice the structure of the language in real situation?	0	6	6

As shown in the above table 4.6, a direct classroom observation was held to observe teaching methodology of 6 teachers. The lessons were evaluated using evaluation checklist. The classroom practice is not achieved for the items in the checklist. Teaching methodology of 6 teachers normally was observed. The observation checklist was designed on the basis of classroom instructional activities and techniques employed by teachers in the teaching-learning process. It was only for the periods of grammar teaching that the researcher held an observation with respect to the time arranged ahead of time.

As to this circumstance, the classroom observation revealed that the teachers were not in the position to engage the students in the creative learning activities based on the language items in focus so that they deduce that they really learned the lessons. In order for learning to take place, the students should produce their own sentences which are meaningful, contextualized and communicatively functional. This is to say the teachers in most cases of the observation sessions did not attest the students' clear understanding of the lessons.

In conclusion, during the classroom observations, most of the teachers were not seen to: (a) present a grammar item in a meaningful context; (b) motivate learners to practice the language; (c) integrate the grammatical patterns with other language skills (e.g., speaking, reading and writing); (d) encourage learners to discover grammar rules by themselves; and (e) produce their own sentences based on the topic introduced and make the lesson interactive.

4.4 Focus Group Discussion

A focus group discussion was held with six EFL teachers for an hour. To make the discussion easier and manageability at the convenience of the researcher, the elements of the group discussion were put in the following table, followed by textual discussion of the result.

Table 4.7 Elements of Focus Group

Element	Focus Group
Size	6
Length	1 hour
Number of sessions	Two: one for invitation; the other for discussion
Participants	1. Selected (EFL teachers); by invitation only 2. Similar characteristics (homogenous)
Data collection	Notes
Forms of data	1. Conversation, including tone of voice 2. Silences (words and issues) 3. Body language
Formats for reporting	1. Selected quotations 2. Analysis of repeated themes

As per the above elements in the table, a focus group discussion was held to elicit the views of six EFL teachers on: perception towards grammar presentation (explicit, vs. implicit); using CLT in teaching grammar (Communicative grammar teaching); if there is anything that impedes CGT implementation; Perceptions towards the current textbook now being in use in relation to CGT; and teacher training or seminar participation in CLT.

Accordingly, focus group participants were asked to first talk about what they think of presenting grammar elements in their teaching whether the presentation should be explicitly or implicitly. Nearly all participants (83.33%), with the exception of one (16.67%), described their using implicit way of presenting grammar in their teaching. Focus group participants acknowledged the importance and necessity of using CLT in teaching grammar. As such, the interviews unanimously agreed upon the view of one interview which was stated as, *“Grammar is one of the most important elements of*

language which facilitates the acquiring of other skills. Thus, allowing students with free practice exercises from simple to complex helps to promote communicative knowledge of grammar.” However, all FG interviewees admitted that students’ oral and written production is not achieved. The participants mentioned *–observation of fear, frustration and the state of being passive in using the target language*. Moreover, one of the interviewees further tried to justify this as:

Even teachers do not have understanding in English. There are many hindrances to teaching communicative grammar. In the first place, there is scarcity of resources. Background knowledge of primary school teachers makes students unable to use the grammar correctly. That’s why students lack confidence in using the language- there is negative peer attitude towards those who make practice. There is also mother-tongue interference.

Besides, the participants suggested their perceptions that they believe would help to have communicative class in grammar teaching (CGT). These were materials like *conversational videos* and, as to the teachers’ roles, *encouraging students, using motivated students, brain storming activities* were suggested as their beliefs.

As to training, the focus group participants said that they did not have enough training that helps them implement CL in their grammar teaching. To this end, some of their views were presented as the followed: *Yes, but we don’t think the training given helps us to teach grammar communicatively.* Another participant went on saying, *–I have participated in different trainings, I have also trained others and I have seen a great deal of changes in teachers, but the training was interrupted.* Likewise, another of the participants incorporated his views saying, *There is no enough training to boost teachers’ performance—we need more training on this.*

4.5 Discussion of the Results

In this section, the discussions of results are based on the findings of the study obtained from the data through teacher questionnaire, classroom observation and focus group discussion. Therefore, this section focuses on EFL teachers’ perception about and classroom practices in teaching communicative grammar in response to the research objectives. The major themes of discussions are EFL teachers’ perception of

communicative grammar teaching, EFL teachers' classroom practices, instructional communicative activities to be practiced, and learners' mastery of grammar.

4.5.1 EFL Teachers' Perception about and Practices of Communicative

Grammar Teaching

The questionnaire results and group discussion indicated that grammar is best taught implicitly or explicitly depending on the difficulty of the grammar points. Responses of EFL teachers about the statements related to EFL teachers' perception about communicative grammar teaching shows that communicative grammar teaching: (1) improves students' fluency; (2) provides students with a suitable learning environment to better understand grammar; (3) helps students improve their communicative skills; (4) turns grammar into a more practical and interactive subject; (5) helps students use grammatical rules in speaking and writing; (6) enhances cooperative learning in grammar teaching classes. From responses of teacher respondents, it is evident that 84% of the respondents with the average mean value 3.97 showed their agreement about the above mentioned statements dealing with EFL teachers' perception of CGT. The implication is that EFL teachers generally have positive attitude and good perception about communicative grammar teaching

With regard to teacher training on communicative grammar teaching and assessment of students' understanding of grammar rules, the respondents showed their disagreement implying that the previous training they received did not directly focus on communicative grammar teaching. In addition, the responses of the participants made it clear that assessment for students' understanding of grammar rules to measure whether students' grammatical competence is improved was not specifically made. To support this, 68.33% of the respondents with the average mean value 2.36 expressed their disagreement about the statements that concern about teacher training on CGT and assessment of students' understanding of grammar rules.

Furthermore, the focus group interview results also complemented the questionnaire result on teacher training on CGT. The focus group participants reported that they did not have training that helped them implement CGT in their teaching. To this end, the interviewees suggested that they did not think the training given even helped them to teach grammar communicatively.

Irrespective of EFL teachers' positive attitude and good perception about communicative grammar teaching, the analysis of classroom observational data shows the inconsistency between teachers' perception of communicative grammar teaching and their actual classroom practice.

The classroom observational results revealed that the teachers were not in the position to engage students in the activities based on the language items in focus so that they deduce that they really learned the lessons. Similarly, during the classroom observations, most of the teachers were not seen presenting a grammar item in a meaningful context; motivating learners to practice the language; integrating the grammatical patterns with the other skills, especially speaking and writing; and encouraging learners to discover grammar rules by themselves and produce their own sentences based on the topic introduced.

Despite the analysis of observational data, the participants in focus group interviews expressed that large class size, scarcity of resources to facilitate communicative grammar teaching like conversational videos, students' lack of motivation, fear, frustration and the state of being passive in using the target language, lack of background knowledge to use English language, negative peer attitude towards those who make practice using the target language, and the interference of mother tongue are the main challenges they encounter during grammar lessons. This implies that these challenges are among the problems or factors associated to the teachers' actual classroom practice and identified to have influenced their effective teaching of grammar communicatively.

4.5.2 Instructional Communicative Activities to be Practiced and Learners' Mastery of Grammar

With the practices of instructional communicative activities, the results of the questionnaire revealed that most of the communicative activities were not practiced always, but rather they were practiced often, sometimes or rarely. Accordingly, the result obtained through teacher questionnaire on the practices of communicative activities shows only 17.5% of the respondents on average claimed that the communicative activities such as information gap and information transfer activities, task completion activities, speaking about personal experiences and describing people, places or

things, role playing, project-based tasks, etc. were practiced often and sometimes respectively, not always during grammar lessons.

Further, regarding the communicative activities like jigsaw activities, information gathering activities, etc., that focus on grammar, the results revealed that the teachers were reluctant to enable learners practice the mentioned activities during the lesson between the frequency ranges sometimes and rarely.

Generally, the total mean value 2.96 of the responses regarding the practices of communicative activities revealed that the teachers generally employed the mentioned activities sometimes, not nearly always. Accordingly, the overall result obtained through questionnaire and observational data analysis does not go in line with literature as indicated by Larsen-Freeman (2000), who states that the teacher acts as a facilitator in setting up communicative activities during the activities in communicative language classrooms (pp.126-129) and establishes situations that promote communicative interaction and help students to work with the target language in real context in communicative language classrooms (pp.126-29).

Regarding learners' mastery of grammar and their communicative competence, the finding of the study demonstrated that learners were not proved to: be responsible for conducting the interaction to a situation in which an activity is set; use the structure of the language in a variety of situations; use language for communicative purposes to develop their communicative competence; and communicate more effectively and efficiently in the target language. It is indicated that 75.33% of the respondents with an aggregate mean value 2.32 were not in support of the learners' mastery of grammar.

In conclusion, in complementary to the findings obtained through questionnaire, results of FGD, triangulated with classroom observation results, revealed that learners' grammatical and communicative competence were not improved and promoted.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This study focused on examining EFL teachers' perception and practices in teaching communicative grammar at grade 9 of six selected government schools in towns of Oromia Special Zone Surrounding Finfinne. Accordingly, an attempt was made to address the specific objectives set out for the purpose of the present study; (i.e, to: identify EFL teachers' perception towards implementing communicative grammar teaching; examine how their perception affects their practice in grammar teaching; assess EFL teachers classroom practices in teaching grammar; and investigate how much the instructional practices they predominately employ enable learners mastery of grammar. Thus, this chapter has strived to summarize, conclude and suggest the optimal elucidation for the predicaments identified while the analysis, interpretation and discussion of data. The analysis of data in the teachers' responses, classroom observations, textbook analysis and focus group discussion result have been summarized and concluded here under summary and conclusion. Eventually, based on the conclusion, various possible recommendations have been jotted down.

5.1 Summary

Here, the researcher attempts to summarize and conclude the study based on the findings he has come across during the analysis of data obtained through questionnaire, classroom observation and focus group discussion in the previous chapter. The researcher consequently comes up with the following summarized conclusions.

The overall findings of the study revealed that despite EFL teachers' positive perception of communicative grammar teaching (with an average mean value of 3.72), there were a mismatch as regards their classroom practice as checked by the result of classroom practice through questionnaire with average mean value of 2.29 (2.82 and 1.76 for the favourable items and unfavourable items respectively).

The results through questionnaire in the third and fourth questions further revealed that the instructional communicative activities teachers used and learners' mastery of grammar were respectively with an average mean of 2.96 and 2.32 respectively

Therefore, contrary to their perceptions, EFL teachers reported with regard to: (a) their classroom practice (average mean 2.29); (b) instructional communicative activities they used (average mean 2.96); (c) their perception towards learners' mastery of grammar (average mean 2.32).

The data obtained from the classroom observations and the focus group discussion also indicate that there is a clear mismatch between what teachers perceive about CGT and what they actually practice in EFL classes. As can be seen from the results of classroom observation most of the teachers failed to practice classroom communicative activities. This can be associated with a number of reasons that teachers proposed. The results obtained from the focus group discussion held with six EFL teachers revealed that the most common problems that hindered or blocked them from practicing communicative language classroom activities in teaching grammar were: large class size (also seen through classroom observation), frustration and a state of being passive from the side of the learners, background knowledge of primary school teachers in EFL teaching (for grade 9 students are directly coming from primary school/second cycle), lack of sufficient training for EFL teachers to boost their teaching methodology, lack of sufficient time, the volume of the book (being bulky to cover), and lack of supplementary materials (conversational videos). On top of this, EFL teachers' lesson preparation, as seen through classroom observation and checked against their annual lesson plan, was depended up on the textbook. (See table 4.6).

5.2 Conclusions

To conclude, the overall findings of this study indicate that in spite of the fact that teachers have high level of CGT concepts, in reality they failed to practice them in EFL classes in their entire context. Teachers need to be given professional development training courses to make them aware of their existing beliefs about teaching English grammar. There is an essential need to improve teachers' instructional classroom practices in order to improve the present state of language teaching in these schools. Supplementary materials that boost teachers' performance in CG teaching are supposed to be provided. The EFL teachers professed this in revealing their perceptions through questionnaire and focus group discussion, and that the failure in the practice lies in different predicaments raised under the summary. This resulted in a clear mismatch between teachers' perception and their actual practices.

5.3 Recommendations

Promoting the teaching of grammar communicatively calls for the joint effort of every concerning stakeholders. From this study, it is evident that EFL teachers have positive attitude and good perception towards the tenets of CLT in teaching grammar. However, this was not seen in their actual classroom practices. Thus, based on the findings, this study has made the following recommendations.

1. EFL teachers need to look for ways of putting their CGT positive attitudes and good perceptions into the actual classroom practice. This could include adapting the textbook and involving themselves in continuous professional development. They are also advised to encourage learners to use the target language during instruction, and avoid traditional way of teacher-fronted teaching.
2. Training that promotes the tenets of CLT in teaching grammar in the actual classrooms need to be designed and given to EFL teachers from primary to secondary schools.
3. Supplementary materials focusing on actual language usage, like conversational videos, must be in place for use by teachers and students.
4. School administrators need to orient the students what the nowadays language classroom expects of the learners and evaluate the EFL teachers in light of the communicative language classroom.
5. With the joint effort of stake holders, classroom size is supposed to come to the level of the set standard so that having interactive classroom per the allocated time becomes more likely.

References

- Ajebush, A. (2013). Investigating Factors Affecting the Practice of Communicative Language Teaching in EFL Class.
- Amare, Y. (2016). Assessing the Teaching of Grammar: The Case of four Secondary Schools in Jigjiga.
- Anderson, J. (1993). "Is a Communicative Approach Practical for Teaching English in China? Pros and Cons." *System* 21/4: 471-480.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. and Razavieh, A. (1990). *An Introduction to Research in Education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Badilla, D. C. & Chacon, G. (2013). Communicative Grammar: An Effective Tool to Teach a Second Language in Today's Classes. *Remsta De Lenguas Modernas*, 18, 267-283.
- Baker , T. L. (1994). *Doing Social Research* (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Bayissa, G. (2013). Exploring the Implementation of CLT in Teaching Grammar at Fre-hewot no 2 Secondary and Preparatory School.
- Beyene, G. (2008). Perception and Classroom Practice of Communicative Language Teaching by High School EFL Teachers and Learners: The Case of Some Selected High Schools in Addis Ababa (Unpublished MA Thesis). *AAU-ED*, Addis Ababa University.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching: A Review of Research on What Language Teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81-109.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Brown, H. D. (2007a). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed). White Plains, NY: Person Education.
- Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and Implicit Negative Feedback: An Empirical Study of the Learning of Linguistic Generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15(3), 357-386.

- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education* (6th Ed.). London: Routledge.
- Coren, S; Ward, L M & Enns, J T.(1999). *Sensation and Perception*. Fifth edition. Orlando, Fla: Harcourt Brace.
- Demelash Mersha.(2012). The Assessment of communication grammar teaching in Grade 11 Education sector development Program IV (ESDP-IV): 2010/2011-2014/2015. Unpublished document, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- De Vaus, D. A. (1993). *Surveys in Social Research* (3rded.). London: UCL Press.
- Dollar, N. J., & Merrigan, G. M. (2002). Ethnographic Practices in Group Communication research. In L. R. Frey (Ed.), *New Directions in Group Communication* (pp. 59-78). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Geremew Semu. (1994). "The Effectiveness of Teaching English as a Foreign Language Through Grammar Consciousness-Raising Activities to Ninth Grade Students" (Unpublished M.A. Thesis).Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Golombek, P. R. (1998). A study of language teacher's personal practical knowledge. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(3), 447-464.
- Hailom Banteyrga. (1982). English Conditional Sentences: A Comparative Analysis of Structural and Communicative Approach in Teaching to Non-native Speakers." (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Harmer, J. (2003). *The Practice of English language teaching* (3rd.ed.). Cambridge. CUP.
- Humboldt . (1974). Presenting Grammar Inductively. *JSTOR: Modern Language Journal* 12/6,440-445
- Ibrahim, M. K. (2004). *The challenges of teaching English as a Foreign Language to Egyptian Students with Visual Impairment*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Manchester, UK.
- Jasim,I. (2011). *Investigating Teachers' Attitudes toward Task-based Language in a Vocational School in the UAE*. Sharjah University.
- Johnson, K. E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and Instructional Practices of Pre-service English as Second Language Teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10 (4): 439-452.

- Johnson, K. E. (1999). *Understanding language teaching: Reasoning in action*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Jordaan, W & Jordaan, J. (1996). *Man in context*. Second edition. Isando: Lexicon.
- Karavas-Doukas. E. (1996). Using Attitude Scales to Investigate Teachers' Attitudes to the Communicative Approach. *ELT Journal* 50(3), pp. 187-198.
- Kumaravedivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding Language Teaching: From Method to Postmethod*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, London.
- Lakachew, M. (2003): Teachers' Attitudes Towards Communicative Language Teaching and Practical Problems in its Implementation (Unpublished MA Thesis), AAU-ED, Addis Ababa University.
- Landolsi, S. (2011). *Teacher and Student Views towards the Role of Grammar Instruction in UAE University*. Sharjah University.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986, 2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lin, H. (2010). A Case Study An ESL Teacher's Beliefs and Classroom Practices in Grammar Instruction (Unpublished MA Thesis), Kent State University.
- Long, M. (1983). Does Second Language Instruction make a difference? A Review of The Research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(3), 359–382.
- Malika, F. (2010). Implementation of the Principles of CLT in the Teaching of English.[Thesis]. University of Tizi: MHESR.
- Matlin, M W & Foley, H J. (1992). *Sensation and Perception*. Third edition. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Mohammed, S. (2012). *Native and Nonnative English Speaking EFL Teachers' Beliefs about Teaching Grammar and their Classrooms Practices in the Emirate of Abu Dhabi*. BUiD.
- Munby (1983). *A qualitative study of teachers' beliefs and principles*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2004). Current Developments in Research on the Teaching of Grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 126-145.
- Nassaji, H., & Swain, M. (2000). A Vygotskian Perspective on Corrective Feedback in L2: The Effect of Random Versus Negotiated Help on the Learning of English Articles. *Language Awareness*, 9(1), 34-51.

- Newby, D. (1998) 'Theory and Practice in Communicative Grammar: A Guide for Teachers' in R. de Beaugrande, M. Grosman, B. Seidlhofer, (eds.) *Language Policy and Language Education in Emerging Nations, Series: Advances in Discourse Processes Vol. LXIII, pp 151-164*. Stamford.
- Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative language teaching: making it work. *ELT Journal* 41(2), pp. 136-145.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up A Messy Construct. *Review of Education Research*, 62(3), 207-332. Randolph, W A & Blackburn, R S. (1989). *Managing Organizational Behavior*. Boston, MA: Irwin.
- Razmjoo, S.A. and Riaz, A.M. (2000). Is Communicative Language Teaching in the Expanding Circle? A Case Study of Teachers of Shiraz High School and Institutes. *Journal of Language and Learning*. 4/2:144-171.
- Richards, J. C. & Rogers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. NewYork: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards and Rodgers (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C. (2006.). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge University Press.
- Robbins, S P.(1991). *Organizational Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Silva, M. d. (2005). Constructing the Teaching Process from Inside Out: How Pre-service Teachers Make Sense of Their Perceptions of the Teaching of the Four Skills. *TESL-EJ*, 9(2), 1-19.
- Thompson, G. (1996). Some Misconceptions about Communicative Language Teaching. *ELT Journal*. 50 (1), 9-15.
- Thu, H. (2009). Teachers' Perception about Grammar Teaching. Alliant International University.
- Tiglu Geza. (2008). The Appropriateness of Communicative Grammar Teaching. (Unpublished M. A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.
- Uysal, H. (N.D.). Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Grammar Teaching: Focus in Meaning, Form or Forms? *South African Journal of Education*; 2014, 34(1). [http: //www.sjournalofeducation.co.za](http://www.sjournalofeducation.co.za).
- Wang, F. (N.D.). The Necessity of Grammar Teaching: English Language Teaching. Hongshan: HUBEI www.ccsenet.org/elt.

- Widdowson, H.G. (1979). **The Teaching of English as Communication**. In Brumfit, C.J. and Johnson, K. (Eds.), *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching: Beliefs, Decision-making, and Classroom Practice*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Yemane Debebe (2007). English Teachers' Perception and Practice of Communicative Language Teaching in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Zoltan, D. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics. Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methodologies*. UK, Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX-A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH POST GRADUATE PROGRAM (MA IN TEFL)

Dear Teacher,

This questionnaire is designed to *study the perception and practices of teaching communicative grammar with particular reference to secondary school teachers* in the teaching of English as a foreign language (EFL). It is one of the instruments which the researcher uses to gather the necessary data for his **MA Thesis** in the teaching of English as a foreign language (TEFL).

Thus, I kindly request you to give the required information provided. Your contribution is highly important for the success of this study. The researcher would like to assure you that all the responses you give will be kept **confidential** and used only for the research purpose. As a further assurance, you don't need to write your name.

Thank you in advance for your co-operation.

The researcher

PART 1: *Personal Information*

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

1. Name of the school _____
2. Age a) 20-29[] b) 30-39 [] c) 40-49[] d) 50 and above []
3. Sex a) Male [] b) Female []
4. Field of study: Major_____Minor _____
5. Qualification: a) diploma [] b) BA [] c) MA [] d) other (specify) []

6. Total years of teaching experience: a) five and less than five years []
 b) 6-10 years [] c) 11-20 years [] d) more than 20 years []
7. Your teaching load in periods per week
 a) 10 and less than 10 [] b) 11-20 []
 c) 21-30 [] d) above 30 []
8. Average number of students in one class
 a) 30 and less than 30 [] b) 31-40 [] c) 41-50 [] d) 51-60 [] e) above 60 []

PART II: EFL Teachers' Perceptions of CGT

Direction: Please read each statement in this section and decide whether you agree or disagree with the statement by putting a tick (✓) mark against your choice.

For this questionnaire, the following five responses are prepared:

Strongly Agree (SA) = 5	Undecided (U) = 3	Disagree (D) = 2
Agree (A) = 4	Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1	

No	1. Statements related to EFL Teachers' Perceptions towards implementing communicative grammar	SA	A	U	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
		1*	2*	3*	4*	5*
1.1	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.					
1.2	Grammar should best be taught either explicitly or implicitly depending on the difficulty of the grammar points.					
1.3	CGT improves students' fluency.					
1.4*	Grammar is best taught deductively (telling the rules to the students first).					
1.5	CGT provides students with a suitable learning environment to better understand grammar.					
1.6	The previous training you received greatly improved your confidence and skills in teaching grammar.					
1.7	students understanding of grammar rules is assessed					
1.8	Grammar is best taught inductively (students examining many examples to find out patterns).					
1.9	CGT helps students improve their communicative abilities.					
1.10	CGT turns grammar into a more practical and interactive subject.					
1.11	CGT helps students use grammatical rules in speaking and writing.					
1.12	CGT helps students obtain higher scores in grammar exams.					
1.13	CGT enhances cooperative learning in grammar classes.					

PART III: EFL Teachers' Classroom Practice

Direction: The following questions are posed to investigate ***Teachers' classroom***

Practice in communicative grammar teaching (CGT). Please read the following items carefully and put a tick (✓) mark indicating the most appropriate alternative for each of the given items based on your classroom practice.

The following alternatives are delivered as responses:

Nearly Always (<i>NA</i>) =5	Sometimes (<i>ST</i>) =3	Never (<i>N</i>) =1
Often (<i>O</i>) =4	Rarely (<i>R</i>) =2	

No	2. Statements related to EFL teacher's classroom practices in teaching grammar	<i>NA</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>ST</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>N</i>
		<i>5</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>
		<i>1*</i>	<i>2*</i>	<i>3*</i>	<i>4*</i>	<i>5*</i>
2.1	The teacher uses an approach (inductive) that is very useful to develop students' communicative competence.					
2.2	The teacher supports students to acquire and practise the language.					
2.3*	Learners are presented with several examples which embody the grammar rule of the language.					
2.4*	The teacher explains the rules and the meaning to students.					
2.5	Students apply the rules and provide their own examples guided by the instances given.					
2.6*	The teacher presents grammar rules before anything else and teaches grammar explicitly.					
2.7*	The teacher provides students with descriptive understanding of each point of grammar.					
2.8	When teaching grammar, the teacher focuses on language structures which should be taught in an integrated way with the four skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing.					

PART IV: EFL Teachers' Instructional Activities

Direction: The following questions are posed to investigate **instructional activities the teacher uses** in communicative grammar teaching (CGT). Please read the following items carefully and put a tick (✓) mark indicating the most appropriate alternative for each of the given items based on the instructional activities you use.

The following alternatives are delivered as responses:

Nearly Always (<i>NA</i>) =5	Sometimes (<i>ST</i>) =3	Never (<i>N</i>) =1
Often (<i>O</i>) =4	Rarely (<i>R</i>) =2	

No	Statements related to Instructional communicative activities the teacher uses	<i>NA</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>ST</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>N</i>
		5	4	3	2	1
3.1	Information-gap activities					
3.2	Information-transfer activities					
3.3	Jig-saw activities					
3.4	Task-completion activities					
3.5	Information-gathering activities					
3.6	Opinion sharing activities					
3.7	Speaking about personal experiences					
3.8	Interviews					
3.9	Describing people, places, or things					
3.10	Sentence writing applying a grammatical rule					
3.11	Role playing					
3.12	Asking & answering questions Spontaneously					
3.13	Tasks, such as project-based tasks					
3.14	Listening to dialogues that focus on certain grammatical rules					
3.15	Reading texts that focus on certain grammatical rules					

PART V: Learners' Mastery of Grammar

Direction: The following questions are posed to investigate **how much the instructional practices you predominately employ enable learners' grammar mastery**. Please read each statement in this section and decide whether you agree or disagree with the statement by putting a tick (✓) mark against your choice.

For this questionnaire, the following five responses are prepared:

Strongly Agree (SA) = 5	Undecided (U) = 3	Disagree (D) = 2
Agree (A) = 4	Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1	

No	Items	SA	A	U	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
4.1	Learners are responsible for conducting the interaction to a situation in which an activity is set.					
4.2	Learners use the structure of the language in a variety of situations spontaneously.					
4.3	Learners use language for communicative purposes to develop their communicative competence.					
4.4	Students are able to communicate more effectively and accurately in the target language.					
4.5	With the use of meaningful communicative interaction, learners' language accuracy and fluency is improved or promoted.					

Adapted from Lin (2010)

APPENDIX-B OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

Date _____

Grade & Sec. _____ Number of Students _____ Lesson Topic _____

No	Variables	Yes	No	Remark
1.	Does the teacher present a grammar item in a meaningful context?			
2.	Does the teacher motivate the learners to practice the language?			
3.	Does the teacher integrate the grammatical patterns with language skills?			
4.	Are the learners encouraged to discover the grammar rules by themselves?			
5.	Are the learners encouraged to produce/ elicit their own idea based on the topic introduced?			
6.	Does the teacher make the lesson interactive?			
7.	Are the learners asked to practice the structure of the language in real situation independently?			

APPENDIX-C FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION PROTOCOL

Focus Groups Interview Guide

Dear Participants/ Group Members/ Teachers,

I would like to thank you for your willingness to my interview. The objective of this focus group interview is to *study the perception and practices of teaching communicative grammar with particular reference to secondary school teachers.*

Your ideas are highly important for the success of this study. Therefore, I kindly request you to listen to every question thoroughly and forward your ideas/ views on the question.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Instruction: Please answer the following questions pertaining to:

1. What do you think of presenting grammar elements in your teaching? Should it be explicitly or implicitly?
2. Do you think that communicative language teaching can be used to appropriate grammar teaching effectively?
3. Is there anything that impedes/hinders the implementation of CLT in grammar teaching?
4. What do you think of the syllabus or textbook preparation now being used when you relate it to the notion/ approach of CLT in grammar teaching?
5. What else do think should be improved to use CLT in grammar teaching?
6. Do you think that you had enough training in CLT? If not, what do you think should be done?