

**Adama Science and
Technology University
School of Humanity and Law
Department of English**



**The Effectiveness of Teaching English Grammar as a
Foreign Language through Integration of Form and
Meaning in Fana 02 Secondary School Addis Ababa,
*Ethiopia.***

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Adama Science and
Technology University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Master of
Science Degree in English

By: Yimegnu Gizachew

June7 , 2015

Adama Science and Technology University

School of Humanity and Law

Department of English

This is to certify that thesis prepared by Yimegnu Gizachew, entitled “**The effectiveness of teaching English grammar as a foreign language through integration of form, meaning and use in Fana 02 Secondary School Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.**” submitted in requirements for partial fulfillment of degree of master’s science in English complies with regulation of university and meet acceptance standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by examining committee

1. Examiner _____ Signature _____ date _____

2. Examiner _____ Signature _____ date _____

3. Advisor: Dr Mengistu Zelaelem Signature _____ date _____

Chair of department/ graduates program coordinator

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any university.

Name: Yimegnu Gizachew

Signature: _____

Place: Adama Science and Technology University /School of Humanity and Law Department of

English

Date of submission: April, 2015

Acknowledgement

First of all, I would like to thank my advisor Dr Mengistu Zelealm who took his precious time and rendered me valuable advice and constructive comments in writing this paper. It was great help in shaping my thesis.

My thanks are also expressed to Fana 02 Secondary School Dean, directors and Teachers for their help in preparing classes for the training and coordinating students.

Thanks are also due to my Husband Solomon Abebe, my brother Mekonen Gizachew and my sister Embet Gizachew who, in one way or another, encouraged and supported me in my educational career.

Table of content

Content	page
List of Tables	Vii
Acronyms	Viii
Abstract	lx
Chapeter One	1
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Objective of the study	
1.3.2. General Objective	4
1.3.2. Specific Objectives	4
1.4. Hypothesis	4
1.4.1. Null Hypothesis	4
1.4.2. Alternative Hypothesis	4
1.4. Significance of the Study	4
Chapter Two	6
2. Review of related Literatures	
2.1. Grammer and Its role in Language	6
2.2. Arguments in Support and Against Grammer Teaching	8
2.2.1. Arguments against Grammer Teaching	8

2.2.2.	Arguments in Support of Grammar Teaching	10
2.3.	Integrating Form and Meaning in Second language Teaching	12
2.4.	Grammar Teaching Approach	14
2.4. 1.	Deductive Approach	14
2.4. 2.	Inductive Approach	15
2.4. 3.	Integrated Grammar Teaching Approach	17
	Chapter Three	18
3.	Research Methodology	18
3.1.	Study Site Selection	18
3.2.	Research design	18
3.3.	Sample Size and Source Population	18
3.4.	Sampling and Sampling Technique	18
3.5.	Preparing Teaching Materials and Class Room Teaching	19
3.5.1.	Preparing Teaching Materials and Class Room Teaching for Study Group	19
3.5.2.	Preparing Teaching Materials and Class Room Teaching for Control Group	19
3.6.	Data Collection Technique	20
3.6.1.	Pretest	20
3.6.2.	Post Test	20
3.7.	Data Processing and Analysis	21
	Chapter Four	22
4.	Data Presentation and Discussion	20
4.1.	Pretest Results	20
4.2.	Students Class Activity Report	24
4.3.	Post test Results	24
4.4.	Hypothesis Testing	29

Chapter Five	30
5. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation	30
5.1. Summary	30
5. 2. Conclusion	31
5.3. Recommendation	32
6. Bibliography	33
Appendix ---a	
Appendix---b	

List of Tables

Table 1	Mean Value of Pretest Scores for Control and Study Group	22
Table 2	Showing Independent Sample t-test Analysis Result for Pretest	23
Table 3	Mean and Standard Deviation of Post test Scores for Control and Study Group	24
Table 4	Showing Independent Sample t-test Analysis Result for Post test	25
Table 5	Mean and Standard Deviation of Control and Study Group by Question Type	26
Table 6	Independent Sample t-test Result of Post test Score based on Question Type	27

Acronyms

CLT	Communicative Language Teaching
DF	Degree of Freedom
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
L2	Second Language
SPSS16	Statistical Package for Social Sciences 16
TBI	Task Based Instruction

Abstract

The main objective of this study was to determine whether or not teaching grammar through the integration of form, meaning and use is effective and functional than the structural method. For this purpose, 30 students were selected from grade nine and categorized in to control and study group. The study group was taught grammar with integration of form, meaning and use approach whereas the control group taught grammar with structural approach. Pre test was given for both groups before the beginning of the experimental teaching to check their previous language performance. There were no differences in language performance between the two groups. By the end of the experimental teaching, post test exam was given and the result was collected and analyzed.

Descriptive statistics and independent samples t-test were used to compute and analyze the post test results of the two groups. The mean score for study group was 86.33 ± 5.92 whereas the mean score for control group was 62.6 ± 6.915 .

There were statistically significant difference between study group and control group in essay writing type of questions, sentence construction and completion questions ($p = 0.000$) whereas there was no statistically significant difference between study and control group in comprehension and multiple choice questions (p - value 0.303 and 0.171, respectively).

Finally, we can conclude that students who were taught second language grammar with integration of meaning, use and form approach achieve better score than students who were taught grammar only with structural approach.

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction

1.1. Back ground of the study

The English language has been taught in Ethiopia particularly in high schools for several years. In addition, the language is a medium of instruction in all secondary and tertiary education. Hence, students, especially in high school are expected to use the language skills in the class or in the school to convey meaning. As far as the issues of second language pedagogy and learning theories are concerned, it can easily be understood that are dealt with the forms and structural aspects of the target language. In fact, the form and structure of a language are the main part of a language up on which the entire language system is built. Like human house, it cannot stand alone without form and structure of the language. In language a collection of content words cannot make a meaningful communication unless they are combined with the right forms and structural words. This is the major rationale for the inclusion of grammar in second language teaching and learning process. Sysoye (1999) quoted Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics, “Communication cannot take place in the absence of structure, or grammar, a set of shared assumption how language works...” Thus, the issue of grammar becomes worth and very critical in ELT. This does not mean that giving little attention or ignoring other language skills, which are equally important. However, with the introduction of communicative language teaching approach (CLT), it seemed that grammar was given little attention in second language pedagogy. This could be because, as Dickens and Wood (1988) pointed out, there has been confusion about the importance of grammar for communication. Grammar and communication were perceived as two independent features, rather than as two basic elements necessary for effective language use. Due to the above misconception, as Celce-Murcia (1992) cited Eskey (1983), there is now a belief that if students learn to communicate, mastery of that will take care of itself before the introduction of CLT. However, as Eskey (1983) suggested, “the form does not take care of itself”. It is difficult to teach students how to communicate without having the key tools for communication. Regarding this view, Celce-Murcia (1992) stated, “We claim that linguistic accuracy is as much a part of communicative competence as being able to get one’s meaning

across or to communicate in a socio-linguistically appropriate manner”. Grammar is crucial in English teaching language but the way raised question in different time. Grammar teaching method was very helpful for effective language learning. It can be taught through weather explicit or implicit. Language teachers and educators, however, to disagree on this point as the following quotations illustrate: “the important point is that the study of grammar as such as is neither necessary nor sufficient for learning to use language.” “The language teacher’s view of what constitutes knowledge of the syntactic structure of sentences ---the assumption that the language teachers appear to make is that once this basis is provided then the teacher will have no difficulty in dealing with the actual use of language.”(Widdoson, 1979). In the history of ELT, there have been two broad methods of grammar teaching. One is a form-focused grammar teaching .Grammar was taught through translation .The main focused was on reading and writing, with a little attention being given speaking and listening. It taught deductively use presentation and memorizations of rules. Students may also used to the style of teacher-student interaction generated by the grammar exchange. The role of teacher was controlling the students’ interaction. The other (recent) is a meaning-focused grammar teaching approach. As to the question of effectiveness of the methods, Prabhu, 1987 claims that it is determined based on the goals and needs of learners. If the students need grammar for communication, meaning based grammar teaching approach will be effective. However, if the students need grammar for translating L2 to L1, then form-based grammar teaching will be effective. Nevertheless, as the very goal of the current second language learning and teaching process is developing learners’ communicative competence, meaning-focused grammar teaching is believed to be relatively effective. As many researchers conducted in our country showed, meaning focused grammar teaching approach is effective and functional. Many of the researches were conducted in Addis Ababa University, among these; Hailom,1982; Gebremedhin, 1984; Worede, 1986; Geremew, 1994 and Dereje, 2001 are some of the researchers who had conducted a study in connection to the teaching and learning of grammar in Ethiopian context.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Grammar teaching has held a dominant place in English language teaching for forty years. For the last three decades, the communicative language teaching approach (CLT) has been the very fashionable term and an accepted language teaching approach, which is widely implemented in second language classrooms. CLT as an approach may have its own limitations and problems when it comes to the actual classroom setting. However, as compared to the traditional language teaching methods, it is relatively, an effective approach in making second language learners to develop communicative competence (the goal of second language learning). It is due to its broader acceptance that CLT is being implemented almost all over the world, where English is taught as a second/foreign language. But in many Ethiopian English classrooms is something different from what it has to be. For instance, the research, which was conducted by Dereje Taddesse (2001), showed that students have experienced about the learning of grammar. Such view shows that the meaning and the use aspects of grammar in communications are totally neglected. Besides, I have observed different problem in my experience that is most of the English language teachers have a tendency to rely on a form-focused/accuracy-focused ways of teaching English grammar and the tests they set were mostly intended to measure learners' knowledge of correct grammatical forms and structures. As long as the goal of all language teaching and learning including grammar is to build up students' communicative competence, the issue of meaning and use in the teaching of grammar is very critical. It is on the basis of this view that the present researcher planned to conduct an experimental study so as to check whether or not teaching grammar by integrating form, meaning and use is effective. Accordingly the following hypotheses are formulated.

1.3. Objective of the study

1.3.1. General objective

The objective of this study was to determine whether or not teaching grammar through the integration of form, meaning and use is effective and functional than the structural method in Fana 02 Secondary School, in Addis Ababa.

1.3.2. Specific objectives

- To identify effective grammar teaching method
- To determine the effectiveness of teaching grammar through integration of form, meaning and use than structural method.

1.3.3. Research question

The following questions were designed to be answered by the study

1. Which method is effective in teaching grammar to encourage the student's communication?
2. Which method is effective in teaching grammar?

1.4. Hypotheses

1.4.1. The Null Hypothesis

There will not be a significant difference between the effectiveness of structural method of grammar teaching and the effectiveness of grammar teaching through the integration of form, meaning and use.

1.4.2. The Alternative Hypothesis (H1)

There will be significant difference between the effectiveness of structural method of grammar teaching and the effectiveness of grammar teaching through the integration of form, meaning and use.

1.5. Significant of the Study

This study is important in that:

- ❖ It serves as an idea on which other researchers can conduct studies in a similar area with a greater magnitude for reliable and comprehensive research finding.
- ❖ It provides the opportunity for English language teachers to look back and evaluate the effectiveness of the methods and techniques they employ for grammar teaching, and to compare with the integrated approach of grammar teaching.
- ❖ It may be used as an instance for the concerned bodies to deal with the prevailing problems in connection with the method that teachers employ in the teaching of grammar, and strive for a possible solution.

Chapter Two

2. Review of Related literatures

The literature to be reviewed comes mainly from studies that included teaching grammar through integrating form, meaning and use as a primary focus in language learning and studies. The literature review is organized into the following topics: grammar and its role in language, arguments in favour and against grammar teaching, and techniques of grammar teaching.

2.1. Grammar and its role in language teaching

It seems necessary to look at the roles grammar has in a communication through its definitions. David Crystal, (200) defined grammar as follows “*Grammar is the business of taking a language to pieces, to see how it works. It is the mental system of rules and categories that allows humans to form and interpret the words and sentences of their language.*” Grammar adds meanings that are not easily inferable from the immediate context. Grammar is a device for constructing and conveying meaning without which, effective communication would be impossible. As Batstone, 1994 claims, grammar is an immensely broad and diverse phenomenon which embodies three interdependent dimensions: form, meaning and use. This perspective on grammar, where forms are presented in direct association with meaning, views grammar as an integral part of the language.

The kinds of meanings realized by grammar are principally: *representational* - that is, grammar enables us to use language to describe the world in terms of how, when and where things happen and *interpersonal* - that is, grammar facilitates the way we interact with other people when, for example, we need to get things done using language. It is used to fine-tune the meanings we wish to express (Newmark ,1976). Azar, 2001 also described it as, ‘Grammar is a weaving that creates the fabric. All these definitions have some commonality that magnifies the strong bondage which exists between grammar and communication (meaning). In another words, grammar is a backbone of a language system without which communication exists with difficulty (Thornsbury, 1999; Atkins Hailom and Nuru, 1995; Richards and Renardya, 2002; Harmer, 2001).

These views are also supported by Savignon, 2002. He says, “Communication cannot take place in the absence of structure, or grammar, a set of shared assumptions about how language works, along with willingness of participants to cooperate in the negotiation of meanings.”

Moreover, researchers like Higgs and Clifford, 1982 claim that the grammarless communicative approach may lead to the development of a broken, ungrammatical, pidginized form of the target language beyond which students can never really progress. Such students are said to have “fossilized” in their acquisition of the language.

The above mentioned facts and views about grammar learning tells us that knowledge of grammar about a particular language is fundamental to develop ones communicative capacity which is final goal of language learning. It is inevitably convincing that, among the many factors that can influence language learning/teaching, teaching methods play a significant role. The methods language teachers employ have some effect on motivation towards the learning of a particular language (Harmer 1991). It seems that selecting appropriate teaching approach is a main factor in the language acquisition capacity of second language learners.

Prior to 1970s, the structural approach had been the most widely used second language teaching approach. By the time, there was no strong challenge and argument against the centrality of grammar as content for language teaching as well as the basic principle under which the teaching material is organized (Celce- Murcia ,1991). According to the structuralism point of view, language was considered as a system of structurally related elements for conveying meaning. These elements are phonemes, morpheme, words, structures, and sentence types.

The goal of language learning is considered as mastering each part of the grammatical item bit by bit (Wilkins, 1976, Richards and Rodgers, 1986, Celce-Murcia, 1991). Linguistic competence was the goal of language learning and due to this, classroom teaching process was highly accuracy-focused or form-focused. Nevertheless, following the introduction of communicative language teaching (CLT), grammar teaching began to receive very little attention. This is mainly because, structural approach to language teaching failed to enable second language learners to use the target language for their communicative needs. (Lock, 1996)

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is a reaction to the traditional approach which is teaching a language through grammar, translation, and pattern drills (Littlewood, 1981).

CLT is defined as a teaching method which focuses on teaching a language through meaningful communication “in real situations and real time” (xi). Patsy M. Lightbown and Nina Spada, 2008, who are leading scholars in methodology, explain that “CLT is based on the premise that successful language learning involves not only a knowledge of the structure and forms of a

language, but also the functions and purposes that a language serves in different communicative settings”.

Relating to this account, Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers assert that the goal of CLT is to achieve communicative competence in order to communicate effectively (Richards, Jack C, and Theodore S. Rodgers, 1986). Dell Hymes (1972) who states that second language learners should know not only the grammar rules of a target language, but also, “when and how to say what to whom” in order to communicate with native speakers successfully. This implies that communicative competence is more than knowing grammatical structure. It includes sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence. Thus, linguistic/grammatical/ competence is one of the components of communicative competence, which can be acquired through communication. (Ellis, Basturkmen and Loewen, 2001; Lock 1996; Thornsbury, 1999; Richards and Renandya, 2002).

This point of view tells us that there is argument between different scholar in support and against the inclusion of grammar teaching in second language pedagogy.

2.2. Arguments against and in support of grammar teaching

2.2.1. Arguments against grammar teaching

One of the biggest challenges to the teaching of grammar comes primarily from Krashen (1981). He suggests that teaching grammar results in learned (conscious) knowledge, which is only available for monitoring utterances that learners produce using their acquired (unconscious) knowledge, and as such, it is of very limited value. He candidly recommends that teachers should abandon grammar teaching, and concentrate instead on providing lots of comprehensible input so that learners can acquire a second language naturally, in much the same way they have acquired their mother tongue.

Perera (1984) noted that decontextualized grammar teaching that was unrelated to pupils’ other language work was likely to do more harm than good. She also noted that technical terms in grammar seemed to confuse rather than enlighten young people. Studies in the twentieth century have suggested that the learning of formal, traditional (i.e. not transformative) grammar has no beneficial effect on children’s written work (Rice, 1990); that training in formal grammar does not improve pupils’ composition (Asker, 1923; Macaulay, 1947; Robinson, 1960).

It seems that these findings make these proponents to act against grammar teaching in second language pedagogy. Similarly Catherwood, 1932; Benfer(, 1935) presented that a knowledge of grammar is of no general help in correcting faulty usage. Macaulay(, 1947,)added to this view that teaching grammar may

actually hinder the development of children's English. In addition, a recent critical review of the empirical evidence on the teaching of grammar provided an overview of research studies in English-speaking countries (Wyse, 2001). This review concluded that 'the teaching of grammar (using a range of models) has negligible positive effects on improving secondary pupils' writing'. Proponents of against grammar teaching believe that, grammar teaching is wastage of time for nothing.

Other proponents of this view suggests, Natural Approach to second language (L2) acquisition, 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; Krashen, 1985). According to this view, 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 analyse the forms and eventually deduce 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)

The other major argument (according to Thornsbury, 1999) that discredits the weight given for grammar teaching comes from the goal of language learning. As frequently heard, communicative competence is the end goal of second language learning. Here, linguistic competence is considered as one element of communicative competence among other components. As to the learning process, there are two different views. The first view, which is advocated by the adherents of the weak version of CLT, suggests that we learn a language in order to use it and accordingly, language learners should learn the rules first and then engage themselves in a life like communication in order to apply what they have learned. However, as opposed to this point, scholars who are the leading followers of the strong version of CLT believed that L2 learners can acquire a language by communicating or by using the language. In other words, some call it, learning by doing or experiential learning. Due to such belief, explicit grammar teaching is considered 'unhelpful' and a 'waste of time' (Thornsbury, 1999).

Similarly, Holiday, 1973; Wilkins, 1976) claim that communication is the goal of second or foreign language instruction. Thus, the syllabus of a language course should not be organized around grammar, but around subject matter, tasks/projects, or semantic notions, and/or pragmatic functions. In other words, language instruction should be content-based, meaningful, conceptualized, and discourse-based. The teacher's role is primarily to facilitate language use

and communication. As for grammar instruction, there is little or no place in a communicative classroom. Supporters believe that students could simply absorb all the grammar they need from communicative activities. Also, if students want to acquire more grammar, they could easily learn it on their own through homework or reference books.

Despite all these opposite views and arguments against the relevance and the inclusion of grammar in second language pedagogy, there are also a number of strong arguments in favor of the inclusion of grammar and its centrality in the entire foreign language learning and teaching process.

2.2.2. Arguments in support of grammar teaching

For the last 40 decades, the teaching of grammar in the EFL classroom has been focus of heated debate, and has experienced several drastic changes. Previously we have seen arguments against grammar teaching. In the next section we will see arguments in support of grammar teaching.

The main argument which tries to put grammar teaching at the forefront of second language teaching and learning process comes from the view that grammar is 'a sentence making machine' (Thornsbury 1999). In the word stock of English language, the content words comprise the highest percentage of the total words and the remaining are structural or grammatical words (Cook, 2001). However, unless one has the necessary knowledge about how structural words combine with content words to convey meaning; it is mostly very difficult to communicate only by using content words. In support of this argument, Azar (2007) suggested that grammar helps learn to discover the general feature of a language. Similarly, Bowen and Marks [1994: 76/83] indicated that teaching grammar means teaching the “most common and recurrent aspects of meaning” (e.g. modality, tense, number, gender etc) as well as grammar words (the, a/an, his/her, would/could etc).

Many scholars argue that total rejection of grammar teaching reduce not only accuracy but also their communicative competency (Vélez, 2003, p. 191). In this regard, Mulroy on his book *war against grammar* (2003) analyzes how the lack of grammar instruction in U.S. school curricula during the naturalist movement heyday adversely affected native-speaker students' ability to use English as best they could, principally, he argues, because of students' lack of an understanding of what language is and lack of concepts (not rules, but concepts) of grammar.

Similarly, Cohen and Fass, 2001 affirms that in addition to an emphasis on the written language, there has been a focus on learning grammatical forms rather than on promoting oral communication in English language teaching.

In support of this view, many researchers do not agree with the notion that learners seem to master the grammar of a second language simply by being exposed to plenty of comprehensible input (Ellis, 1984; Lightbown, 1985; Long & Robinson, 1998; Skehan, 1989, 1998, 2003; Swain, 1993; Swain & Deters, 2007; Gass, 2000, 2001, 2003; Gass, Mackey & McDonough, 2000; Smidth, 1990, 1995; Ranta, 1998, among many).

Since 1970, with the introduction of CLT teaching second language through structure is declined. In this regard many scholars theoretically argue that CLT is only concerned with oral communication and speaking task. However, practically CLT is not only concerned with oral communication or speaking tasks; rather it is based on the notion of amalgamating the knowledge and use of language as mentioned earlier (or it is accuracy plus fluency to yield appropriacy).

Accordingly, Savignon, 2002 argues that attention to ‘form’ is necessarily required while its involvement in communicative events is seen as central to language development; and to make meaning clear (Widdowson, 1979); language items are presented in classrooms and practiced as formal structures to sustain the interests of the learners and to establish the structures in the learners’ memory. So we should be clear that communication cannot take place without the involvement of grammar or language forms; and grammar teaching has an important place in CLT.

Therefore, CLT cannot neglect the teaching of grammar. Supporting this idea, Savignon, 2002 says, “Communication cannot take place in the absence of structure, or grammar, a set of shared assumptions about how language works, along with willingness of participants to cooperate in the negotiation of meanings.” Therefore, CLT puts balanced treatment and pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language.

By this account, linguistic competence represented in grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation, is equally important and significant as social and cultural rules. These rules are viewed to govern language use as much as the linguistic components do (Berns, 1990). In short, CLT pays equal attention to the functional and the structural aspects of the language (Chen, 1995; Li, 1998).

Fotos and Ellis, 1991; Fotos, 1994; Chitrapu, 1996; Willis, 1996 and Willis and Willis, 1996 argue that learners are encouraged to be engaged in meaningful and challenging tasks that should be designed for grammar-awareness purposes, and which facilitate the acquisition of the target language grammar.

In general, second language learners primarily should have the awareness about how the lexical and grammatical words combine to convey meaning. For the overall language progress (communicative competence) that is sought as the end goal of language learning and teaching program, grammar teaching should be part of it as it forms the basement of the system. Thus, as opposed to Krashen's, 1982 and Prahbu's, 1987 arguments, total negligent of grammar seems against the nature of a language. Both the form and the meaning are two fundamental and compulsory components of communication. We cannot think of language as a tool for communication with the absence of either form or meaning. Grammar knowledge is a necessary condition for communication to occur as it is the means to an end.

2.3. Integrating form and meaning in second language teaching

Many scholars suggest that an exclusive emphasis or focus on one aspect of a language, and giving very little emphasis to the other aspect of a language is dangerous and probably creating an obstacle for successful language learning process. (Girma, 2005; Seedhouse, 1997).

In the same manner, Nassaji and Fotos, 2011 argue that both focus on forms and focus on meaning are problematic. In focus on forms, learners are only required to accumulate discrete grammar items without using a language for communication; therefore, they fail to improve communicative competence. On the other hand, in focus on meaning, learners can improve fluency through verbal interaction and meaningful input. However, learners cannot improve accuracy because of reduced or absent attention to linguistic forms they receive during a class.

Similarly, Doughty and Williams, 1998 assert, "Neither forms-based instruction nor meaning-based instruction alone can lead to complete second language acquisition". Because of these reasons many scholars advocate the need to incorporate both grammar/form and communication/meaning in second language teaching pedagogy. Accordingly Hawkins, 1984, hypothesized that 'though it is by communicative use in real speech acts that the new language sticks in the learners mind, insights in to pattern is an equal partner with communicative use in what language teachers now see as the dual process of acquisition/learning. Grammar approached as a voyage

of discovery into the patterns of language rather than the learning of perspective rules, is no longer a bogey word.

Brown, 1994 also agrees with the indispensable role of grammar in CLT and he presents principles of integrating grammar and communication. Grammar should be “embedded in meaningful and communicative context” and it should meet students’ communicative goals. In addition, teachers should not “overwhelm students with linguistic terminology” but rather help them improve both fluency and accuracy.

The main confusion in grammar teaching in SLA after the introduction of CLT is due to the fact that some scholar argues grammar is not necessary for communication competency. In support of this idea, Newmark, 1976, proposed that, the study of grammar is neither necessary nor sufficient for learning to use the language. Learning activities must respond to what a student needs to communicate at a certain moment. They should not be intended to force students to communicate their ideas grammatically correct, setting aside his intention or communicative purpose.

However, Izumi Shinichi, 2012 a professor at Sophia University in Japan, asserts that, even though, task based instruction (TBI) can improve learners communicative competence by interacting with their peers while attempting a task; and enable them to acquire content words which are directly related to their tasks, the biggest disadvantage is that students are likely to ignore function words such as articles, prepositions, or auxiliary verbs which are important to make their meaning clear and persuasive.

Similarly, Rosanna, 2010 performed research on a French immersion program in which the participants were “grade eleven students who had spent 5300 hours” in learning French; the result of the experiment showed that “their written grammar was not significantly better than that of students with less than 500 hours in regular French classes.” In other words, the students’ fluency in communication was significantly high, but the immersion classes did not help the students improve their accuracy in communication. For these reasons, the necessity to teach grammar has been proposed as a solution to second language learners’ low accuracy in communication (Hammerly, 1991). Therefore, integrative approach can serve as a possible solution by combining form based instruction with meaning base instruction. (Sysoyev, 1999).

2.4. Grammar Teaching Approach.

Although there is a general consensus among scholars on the importance of incorporating grammar in second language pedagogy, the issue about how it should be taught remains controversial. The source of such controversy is the absence of one best grammar teaching approach used for teaching all grammatical rules. (Petrovltz, 1997).

As a result, we have different options used for teaching grammar, such as deductive grammar instruction, inductive grammar instruction and the recently introduced approach- integrated approach.

2.4.1. Deductive Grammar Teaching

Deductive grammar teaching refers to the presentation of grammar rules explicitly. In other words, the teacher explains how a particular sentence or phrase is formed by stating the rules. (Thornbury, 1997). It refers to those instructional strategies used to raise learners' conscious awareness of the form or structure of the target language. Through explicit instruction learners are able to notice features in the input data (Ellis, 1994). Language is divided into isolated linguistic units and taught in a sequential manner through explicit explanations of grammar rules and immediate correction of errors (Long, 2000). Classes follow a typical sequence of "presentation of a grammatical structure, its practice in controlled exercises, and the provision of opportunities for production-PPP". (Ellis & Loewen, 2002).

The main drawback of deductive way of grammar teaching is that teachers draw students' attention only to grammatical forms and linguistic forms. They forget to give attention to meaning. Some scholars such as Widdowson, 1978 and Shahidullah, 1995 indicate that deductive way of grammar teaching is not appropriate as it enhances the development of usage rather than the use. They say that the deductive presentation is very much similar to the grammar translation method in which the teacher explains the rules. According to these scholars, this kind of teaching does not foster the development of learners' communicative competence.

In addition, Seed house, 1997; Ellis et al, 2001 and other suggest that an exclusive emphasis on the form aspect of the language alone is not a sufficient condition for the development of communicative competence. There must be also an emphasis that should be given for the meaning- focused or fluency-focused activities that enables learners to interact freely without fear of committing grammatical errors.

The other drawback for explicit learning is that being teacher-centered, artificial, boring, and for not allowing meaningful communication and interaction, which are essential to language acquisition (Long, 2000). Students are passively receiving grammatical rules from their teachers. It encourages a teacher-fronted, transmission-style classroom; teacher explanation is often at the expense of student involvement and interaction. (Thornbury, 1999).

Even though pure explicit learning has some drawbacks, the use of deductive approach when needed in second language teaching is unquestionable. Learning grammar explicitly helps learners to monitor or edit their mistakes during communication. Ellis, 1994 claims that explicit attention to grammar forms helps learners notice those forms when they occur in natural contexts. Explicit grammar instruction speeds up the progress along the natural order of acquisition (Harmer, 1987). He says that many modern courses often teach structure explicitly and then make learners to use that structure as part of functional conversation.

2.4.2. Inductive Grammar Teaching

Inductive grammar teaching, on the other hand, refers to the teaching of grammar instruction without stating the grammar rules explicitly. Students are exposed to a number of examples which could be in the form of reading text, dialogue or conversation which embody the new grammatical form or rule. Then, students are asked to explore the new linguistic form presented in the given text by means of searching common features revealed in the text. We make the students to arrive at the rule of the language by themselves from the presented tasks or texts. The inductive approach is also called the discovery approach to grammar teaching.

Proponents of inductive grammar teaching believe that making students to work out grammar items by themselves gives greater benefit in terms of accuracy and fluency than explaining the rules explicitly. (Thornbury, 1997). Maley, 1986; Littlewood, 1981 stated that focus on meaning is characterized by its concentration on language use and appropriateness, focus on fluency, learner-centeredness and integration of language skills.

In this approach, students are more actively involved in the learning process, rather than being simply passive recipients: they are therefore likely to be more attentive and more motivated. (Thompson, 1996). They take much of the time to talk and think. The mental effort involved ensures a greater degree of cognitive depth which, again, ensures greater memorability.

It is an approach which favors pattern-recognition and problem-solving abilities which suggests that it is particularly suitable for learners who like this kind of challenge. If the problem-solving

is done collaboratively, and in the target language, learners get the opportunity for extra language practice. Working things out for themselves prepares students for greater self-reliance and is therefore conducive to learner autonomy. (Thornbury, 1999; Harmer, 1987; Girma, 2005).

However, despite the above merits of implicit grammar teaching, it has also some demerits.

The first demerit of implicit grammar teaching is that the time and energy spent in working out rules may mislead students into believing that rules are the objective of language learning, rather than means." (Thornbury, 1999). 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.

The second demerit is that students may hypothesize the wrong rule, or their version of the rule may be either too broad or too narrow in its application: this is especially a danger where there is no overt testing of their hypotheses, either through practice examples, or by eliciting an explicit statement of the rule. (Thornbury, 1999).

In addition, it can place heavy demands on teachers in planning a lesson. They need to select and organize the data carefully so as to guide learners to an accurate formulation of the rule, while also ensuring the data is intelligible. However carefully organized the data is, many language areas such as aspect and modality resist easy rule formulation. (Conningworth, 1984; Thornbury, 1999).

The other demerit of an inductive approach is that it frustrates students who, by dint of their personal learning style or their past learning experience (or both), would prefer simply to be told the rule. (Thornbury, 1999).

Research findings into the relative benefits of deductive and inductive methods have been inconclusive. (Thornbury, 1999). Short term gains for deductive learning have been found, and there is some evidence to suggest that some kinds of language items are better 'given than 'discovered'. Due to this, scholars such as Conningworth, 1984; Thornbury, 1999; Lock, 1996 and others suggest that either approach is acceptable as long as we can apply them according to the given situation as well as according to the kind of linguistic item presented. In relation to this, Celce-Murcia, 1991 said that teachers should not ignore one at the expense of the other as both of them are mutually interdependent. It sounds logical to combine inductive and deductive techniques. (Azar, 2007).

2.4.3. Integrated Grammar Teaching Approach

It is undeniable fact that the main function of a language is communication and the main purpose of teaching grammar is to help students develop their communicative competence. However, becoming totally dependent on inductive or deductive approaches is not an appropriate way of grammar teaching because integrative approach has many advantages than either approach.

The first advantage of integrative approach is that it is appropriate for non homogeneous classroom setting and for students with different learning style and strategies. As we know common class in school are full of heterogeneous students in talent as well as learning styles. Some students can learn better if they are taught grammar rules deductively followed by contextualized communicative exercises to enhance the actual use of the structure they have learned. Others may learn grammar better subconsciously if they are motivated to discuss using the language to arrive at the rule (through the inductive approach), which is similar to what Widdowson, 1979 are saying.

The second advantage of integrative approach may be it is better for faster language acquisition, higher levels of accurate oral or written language production, and longer retention of form. For example, a meta-analysis of 49 studies by Norris and Ortega, 2001 and 11 studies by Ellis, 2002 demonstrated that integrated approach contributed to faster language acquisition, higher levels of accurate oral or written language production, and longer retention of forms when compared to pure meaning-focused implicit learning. Among the analyzed studies, four involved young learners. Some intensive language programmes in Canada also provided evidence that some input enhancement and attention-taking to certain grammatical features, along with communicative language use have a positive and long-lasting effect on L2 proficiency compared with pure communicative focus (Harley, 1998; Spada & Lightbown, 1993; White, Spada, Lightbown & Ranta, 1991; Wright, 1996).

Therefore, recently, the benefits of integrated approach over other approaches have been widely acknowledged (Spada & Lightbown, 2008). When we see the situation in many Ethiopian high schools, the structural approach to grammar teaching is still dominant (Girma, 2005). However, many scholars proposed that integration of meaning, use and form is better than structural approach to have effective communication competency in L2 learners. Therefore, the main purpose of this study was to determine whether or not teaching grammar through the integration of form, meaning and use is effective and functional than the structural method.

CHAPTER THREE

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Study site selection

The study was conducted on Fana 02 Secondary School which is found on Nifas Silk Lafto sub city in Addis Ababa. The site was selected because of its geographical location nearest to the researcher. This made the situation convenience for frequent follow up of the experiment.

3.2. Research Design

Descriptive type of study design was used to study the effectiveness of teaching English grammar as a foreign language through integration of form, use and meaning is effective and functional than the structural method.

3.3. Sample size and source population

In the present study, 30 of grade 9 students were included. Our source populations were all grade 9 students who were registered for the academic year 2007E.C. in Fana 02 Secondary School. There were 10 sections and in each section 50 students were available which result a total of 500 students who were attending the school in that academic year.

3.4. Sampling and sampling techniques

The list and score of all grade 9 students from the registrar were taken and then 100 students whose averages 83-85 were selected based on their first semester academic result. Then, pretest was given to these students in order to check the presence of similar level of language performance among them. The pretest was valued from 100%. Of the 100 students who took pretest, 30 students whose scores between 79 and 89 were selected.

Next, the name of these 30 students were organized in to ascending order (from list 1-30) based on their pretest score and then students listed with odd number were classified in to study group and the remaining were classified in to control group.

Students who were included in control group were given structural approach of teaching whereas students who were classified under study group were given integration of meaning and form

approach of teaching. The training was given for 8 weeks for the two groups and finally post test exam was given and their results were recorded.

Regarding their first language, it was confirmed that Amharic is the first language for all students. The training was given by two grade 9 teachers who had equal level of qualification (BA degree in English).

3.5. Preparing teaching materials and class room teaching

Teaching materials were prepared based on the principles that different scholars proposed to be applied for structural teaching approach and for integrative teaching approach. Separate teaching materials were prepared for the control group and study group. In addition, separate classes were prepared for each group. In the next session we will see the teaching material prepared and the class room teaching delivered for each group.

3.5.1. Teaching Materials and class room teaching for study group

During development of teaching materials for study group, basic principles of integrative teaching approach was applied.

Accordingly, simple present tense and past perfect tense were selected and materials were prepared in a way that developed the knowledge of the study group in form, meaning and use. Different exercises and class activities were adopted from books such as Bland Susan, 1996; Kirn and Jack, 1996; John and Soas, 1987; Alamiraw, 1992 and Murphy, 1994.

During class, the structure of simple present tense and past perfect tense were taught integrated with their meaning and effect in communication. When new topic started, introduction about the structure, meaning and use of the topic was briefly explained by the class teacher and then the students were asked to practice by integrating form, meaning and use in real communication. Furthermore, different individual and group activities were given by the class teacher and individual and group presentations as well as hot group discussions were done. Students were active participant in the class. Mostly, the teachers were unresponsive to errors that students committed during practice of communication. During this time, the teacher took notes of errors. Finally, their errors were told by the end of the class with appreciation of their attempt in order not to discourage them with filtering their error.

3.5.2. Teaching material and class room teaching for control group

Teaching materials for control group were prepared based on theories that underpin structural teaching approach. Exercises and different class activities were taken from books such as Nigusse, 2002; Woods and Mc. Load, 1992; Murphy, 1994.

In this class, explicit explanation of grammatical structures was done by the assigned teacher. Every exercise and explanations were form focused. New grammatical structures were started after the students performances were checked for mastering that grammatical structure. Grammatical errors corrections were given while students were speaking. Most of the class time was taken by the teacher.

3.6. Data collection technique

The main data sources for this study were pretest and posttest exams which were delivered before the beginning of class and after the end of class, respectively. In addition to the tests, the teacher who was assigned to teach the study group was asked to keep record of his classroom observation throughout the experimental phase. The observation was made on students' activities, problems and challenges that the teacher faces while he was conducting the lessons.

3.6.1 Pre-test

The purpose of the pretest was to see whether there was statistically significant difference between the language performance of the study group and the control group before they go into the training. Based on this, the exam was prepared with covering most of the grammar items they had learned before. All the contents were taken from what they learn during the 1st academic year. To make the marking free from the question of subjectivity, objective test items were prepared. The question types were: dialogue and word completion, multiple choices, and matching.

3.6.2. Posttest

The posttest was conducted after the 8 weeks consecutive training to determine the difference in language performance between the study group and control group after the training. Accordingly, the posttest was constructed on the basis of the principles of communicative testing (Atkins, Hailom and Nuru, 1996; Heaton 1988; Weir, 1993). In the test both objective and subjective type questions were included. As suggested by Atkins, Hailom and Nuru, 1996, the subjective type questions are better ways of testing communicative skills (production) as a result we incorporated them. Marking for these questions were carried by another teacher who did not participate in teaching class. The teacher was asked to take the grammaticality and

meaningfulness of words. In this exam questions were prepared to measure student's ability to comprehend a given topic, to construct meaningful and grammatically correct sentence and express his idea with grammatically correct paragraphs. To measure these abilities 5 types of questions were prepared. These includes, reading paragraphs and then answer questions from the paragraph, multiple choice questions, sentence completion questions, paragraph writing questions, and sentence construction questions.

3.7. Data processing and analysis

Data analysis was done using SPSS16. Continues variables were expressed with mean $\pm$ standard deviation. T-tests were employed to check whether there exists any significant difference between the mean scores of the study and the control groups. Pretest score difference was checked within groups and between groups. Post test score difference was compared between study and control group. Statistical significance were taken with $p < 0.05$.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Data Presentation and Discussion

4.1. Pretest results

In the pretest exam 30 questions were prepared and these questions were converted in to 100%. Of the total 30 students who were set in exam, one student from the control group got 79 and another student from study group got 89. The mean value for study group was 84.07 with standard deviation of 2.25 and for control group was 84.033 with standard deviation of 2.17.

Table 1: Mean value of pretest scores for control group and study group

group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Control group	15	84.033	2.17	0.56
Study group	15	84.07	2.25	0.58

Analysis of pretest results using independent samples t-test were done to check whether there exists statistically significant mean difference or not between control and study groups in language performance. Table2 to below shows independent samples t-test result.

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	0.008	0.932	-0.041	28	0.967	-.03333	.80819	-1.68884	1.62217

Table 2: showing independent samples t-test analysis result for pretest

Equal variances not assumed			-0.041	27.967	0.967	-.03333	.80819	-1.68893	1.62226
-----------------------------------	--	--	--------	--------	-------	---------	--------	----------	---------

As we see from the table above, the levene`s test for equality of variance was 0.932 which is not significant (>0.05). This implies that the null hypothesis for equality of variance assumed was correct. The first raw t- value and significant value were taken. The t-value was 0.041 with degree of freedom (df) 28. The analysis of independent samples t-test showed that the mean difference between control group and study group on pretest score were not significant with p-value of 0.967 which is greater than 0.05. Based on this result, we can deduce that the language performance between control group and study group was equal.

4.2. Students class activity report

As we have explained before, when the class started, the teacher who taught the study group was told to keep strict record of student`s everyday class activities, challenges, motivations and progress throughout the study period. Based on this, the teacher reported a large document of students` record. According to this report, students were in difficulty to do their class activities and exercises provided in the study material. They were shy and unconfident in their activity. However, this problem lasted for short time. After the first week class, they began to express their ideas in meaningful words and grammatically sentence. In line with this, their motivation and interest to do exercises, group activities and presentations were equally grow.

Finally the report deduced that the integrated grammar teaching approach was relatively meaningful, interesting and helpful for learners.

4.3. Posttest results

The posttest result was analyzed using student t-test. The result showed that the mean score for control group was 62.6 with standard deviation of 6.92 and for study group was 86.33 with standard deviation of 5.92. The minimum and maximum score for control group were 50 and 78 respectively. Similarly, the minimum and maximum score for study group were 73 and 96. Table 3 below displays mean and standard deviation of control and study group.

Table 3: Mean and standard deviation of post test score for control group and study group.

group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Control group	15	62.6000	6.91582	1.78566
Study group	15	86.3333	5.92412	1.52960

The mean score of study group was greater than control group. In other words, study group perform better result than control group. However, taking the mean score differences, one cannot say there is significant difference or no significant difference between the subjects of the study. We have to further refer to the result of the independent sample t-test. Table-4 presents the result of the posttest of the independent sample t-test.

Table 4: showing independent samples t-test posttest analysis result

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Posttest	Equal variances assumed	0.261	0.614	-10.094	28	0.000	23.733	2.351	28.55	18.917
	Equal variances not assumed			-10.094	27.355	0.000	23.733	2.351	28.55	18.912

The value of t-calculated was 10.094 with 28 degree of freedom (df) and p-value was 0.000 which is below 0.05 (the level of significance). The mean difference between the posttest results of the two groups was 23.733. Here the mean score of the study group exceeded the control group by the stated average. All these statistical data of the posttest results confirmed there was statistically significant difference between the post treatment performances of the two groups. Accordingly, the study group, which was taught through integrated grammar teaching approach, performed significantly higher than the control group.

In addition to the above statistical data, further statistical computation was also made to measure the performance of the two groups in each test types.

As noticed earlier, the posttest contained five types of questions having different objectives. Our analysis result indicated that, there were variations of performance in each test types between the study and the control group. Table-5 presents the mean and standard deviation of the two groups by the test types.

Table 5: The mean and standard deviation of study group and control group by question type

Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Comprehension question	Study group	15	17.8667	1.59762	0.41250
	Control group	15	17.2667	1.53375	0.39601
Multiple choice	Study group	15	18.0000	1.36277	0.35187
	Control group	15	17.3333	1.23443	0.31873
Completion question	Study group	15	17.0667	1.38701	0.35813
	Control group	15	9.6667	1.63299	0.42164
Sentence construction	Study group	15	16.6000	1.29835	0.33523
	Control group	15	9.0000	1.41421	0.36515

Essay writing	Study group	15	16.8000	1.56753	0.40473
	Control group	15	9.4667	2.13363	0.55090

The average scores of the study group and the control group in comprehension question were 17.8667 ± 1.59762 and 17.2667 ± 1.53375 , respectively. Similarly, the average scores of the study group and the control group in multiple choice questions were 18.0000 ± 1.53375 and 17.3333 ± 1.23443 , respectively. According to our data, the mean scores for both groups were nearly similar in multiple choice questions and comprehension questions.

However, the average scores of the two groups were different in the other three test types. The study group performed better than the control group in completion, sentence construction and essay writing test types. The mean scores of the study group and the control group at completion questions were 17.0667 ± 1.38701 and 9.6667 ± 1.63299 , in sentence construction questions, 16.6000 ± 1.29835 and 9.0000 ± 1.41421 and in essay writing question 16.8000 ± 1.56753 and 9.4667 ± 2.13363 , respectively.

Independent samples t-test was used to determine whether or not there was significant difference between the two groups in 5 different question types. The result is presented below in table 6.

Table 6: Independent samples t-test analysis result of posttest score based on question types

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Comprehension question	Equal variances assumed	0.122	0.729	1.049	28	0.303	0.60000	0.57183	-0.57133	1.77133

	Equal variances not assumed			1.049	27.954	0.303	0.60000	0.57183	-0.57142	1.77142
Multiple choice	Equal variances assumed	0.104	0.749	1.404	28	0.171	0.66667	0.47476	-0.30583	1.63917
	Equal variances not assumed			1.404	27.730	0.171	0.66667	0.47476	-0.30626	1.63959
Completion question	Equal variances assumed	0.872	0.358	13.377	28	0.000	7.40000	0.55320	6.26682	8.53318
	Equal variances not assumed			13.377	27.285	0.000	7.40000	0.55320	6.26548	8.53452
Sentence construction	Equal variances assumed	0.038	0.847	15.332	28	0.000	7.60000	0.49570	6.58461	8.61539
	Equal variances not assumed			15.332	27.798	0.000	7.60000	0.49570	6.58428	8.61572
Essay writing	Equal variances assumed	1.097	0.304	10.728	28	0.000	7.33333	0.68359	5.93305	8.73361
	Equal variances not assumed			10.728	25.703	0.000	7.33333	0.68359	5.92739	8.73927

For all question types, levene`s test for equality of variance were not significant. As a result the null hypothesis for equality of variance assumed was not rejected. Because of this, t-test and significance level were taken from the first raw.

The t-test value in comprehension questions and multiple choice questions were 1.049 and 1.404, respectively. Similarly the t-test value in completion questions, in sentence construction question and essay writing were 13.377, 15.332 and 10.728, respectively.

The difference between the average scores of the study group and the control group was not statistically significant in comprehension type of questions and multiple questions (Where the P-values were 0.303 and 0.171 with mean difference of 0.6 and 0.66667, respectively).

The t-test value in completion questions, sentence construction questions and essay writing questions were 13.377, 15.332 and 10.728, respectively. The p-value for these three types of questions were statistically significant ($p=0.000$). This implies that the mean difference between control group and study group were significant in completion questions, sentence construction

questions and essay writing questions. In other words, the language performance outcome for study group was better than control group. This makes true if we concluded that second language grammar learning through integration of meaning, use and form was better to construct meaningful and grammatically correct sentence, to express our ideas with precisely constructed essay and to answer completion questions than learning through structure.

The reason for better performance of the study group in completion questions, sentence construction questions and essay writing may be due to the nature of exercises the study group was exposed during training. The study group was given a number of exercises that promote production/communicative interaction. Students were highly engaged in practicing what they have learnt. Most of the exercises provided in the teaching material of the study group demand the students to express their ideas using the grammar items (present simple and past simple) they have learnt. This could be the possible reason for the better performance attained by the study group.

Thus, from this statistical analysis, we can conclude that the study and control group were performed nearly equal score in comprehension questions and multiple choice questions. However in completion questions, sentence construction questions and essay writing study groups performed better result than control group. This in turn, tells us that learning through exercise, practice, and motivation increase the efficiency of grammar learning which is very important for students to develop their communicative competence (the end goal of second language learning).

4.4. Hypothesis Testing

As we have stated in chapter one, this study had proposed two hypothesis which were planned to be tested. These were:

The null hypotheses (H_0) states, there will not be significant difference between the effectiveness of teaching grammar through the integration of form, meaning and use and the structural approach to grammar teaching.

The alternative hypotheses (H_1), on the other hand, states there will be significant difference between the effectiveness of teaching grammar through the integration of form, meaning and use, and the structural approach to grammar teaching.

Based on our result, there was statistically significant difference in mean scores between students who taught grammar with integration of form, meaning and use, and with structure in their post test. Students who taught grammar with integration of form, meaning and use got higher score than those who taught grammar with structure. This in turn declares the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted ($p < 0.05$).

Thus according to our result we can deduce that teaching grammar by integrating form, meaning and use is relatively effective grammar teaching method than the structural approach of grammar teaching.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

In this chapter summary, conclusion and recommendation are included respectively. The summary deals with major findings of the study based on its objectives. Based on the research findings conclusion will be made. Finally, according to the findings, some possible recommendations will be presented.

5.1. Summary

“Determining whether or not teaching grammar through the integration of form, meaning and use is effective and functional than the structural method in Fana 02 Secondary School, in Addis Ababa” was the main objective of this study. Based on this objective the following findings were appeared.

- ❖ The mean score of pretest for the study group and control group were equal.

- ❖ Study groups in the first week of training were in difficulty to practice with the materials provided.
- ❖ Students in the study group were actively participated in class work, group work and class presentation.
- ❖ The mean score difference in multiple choice question and comprehension question between study and control group was not significant however; it was significant in completion question, sentence construction and essay writing.
- ❖ In post test, the mean score difference was significant between study and control groups.
- ❖ Students who taught second language grammar with integration of form, meaning and usage had greater language performance than students who taught with structure.
- ❖ The integrated grammar teaching approach was found suitable in promoting group work, class participation, self confidence and motivation in language teaching.
- ❖ Integrated grammar teaching approach was suitable for students to express ideas with meaningful and grammatical correct sentence
- ❖ The method of teaching is key element for the success of second language teaching.
- ❖ Integrated grammar teaching was also effective to enable learners acquire and understand the meaning of grammatical forms and their roles in communication.

5.2. Conclusion

Based on our finding, the following conclusions have been made:

In the present study, it was focused on simple present tense and past perfect tense which were taught for 8 weeks by grade 9 students. The study group taught these tenses integrated with form, meaning and use.

By the end of 8 weeks training, post test were given and their results were recorded and analyzed using t-test. According to the result, there was statistically significant difference in effectiveness of second language teaching between integrated approach and structural approach. The study group achieved higher language performance than control group.

From this we can deduce that, second language grammar teaching with integration of form, meaning and use is better than structural approach for effective language acquisition.

5.3. Recommendations

The following recommendations were made on the basis of the above findings of the study.

In order for students to improve their capacity in second language teaching, it is recommended to design English language lessons based on integration of form, meaning and use approach. This encourages communicative interaction between learners through which learners can develop their communicative competence.

The present study put a compass on significance of integrated approach teaching in second language acquisition. Thus, in order to have concrete evidence and to have general consensus with our result, successive and rigorous studies with greater magnitude should be conducted.

6. Bibliography

Alamirew Gebre Mariam (1992). Applicability of Group works in learning English Unpublished MA thesis Addis Ababa University.

Atkins, J. Hailom, B and Nuru, M. (1995). Skill Development Methodology. Vol.1 Addis Ababa University. Addis Ababa Press.

Azar B. (2007): Grammar-Based Teaching: A Practitioners Perspective. The Internet TESL EJ. 11/2. 1-15

Bland Susan (1996). Intermediate Grammar: from form to Meaning and use. Oxford University press.

Batstone, R. (1994). *Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown, H.D. (1994). Principle of Language Learning and Teaching. (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Celce- Murcia (1991). Grammar Pedagogy in Second and Foreign Language Teaching. TESOL Quarterly. 25/2.

Celce-Murcia M. Techniques and Resources in Teaching Grammar. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Celce, Murcia M. (1992). Teaching English as a Second or foreign Language: Boston; HEINLE and HEINLE. Cook; V. (2001): Second Language Learning and Language Teaching: New York. Oxford University Press.

Cunningsworth, A (1984): Evaluating and Selecting EFL Teaching Materials, HEINEMANN.

De Keyser RM 1998. Beyond focus-on-form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar.

C Doughty & J Williams (eds). Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dereje Taddesse (2001): An exploration of students' beliefs about EFL. Grammar Teaching and Learning, and Strategy Use. Unpublished Master, Thesis, Addis Ababa University.

Doughty, Catherine, and Jessica Williams (1998). "Issues and Terminology" Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition. Ed. Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams. New York: Cambridge University Press. 1-13. Print.

Ellis, R. (1993): The Structural Syllabus and Second Language Acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, 2

Ellis, R. (1994). Implicit/Explicit knowledge and language pedagogy. TESOL Quarterly, 28, 166-172. 7/1-91-111. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(02\)00047-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00047-7)

Ellis R, Basturkmen H & Loewen S (2002). Doing focus-on-form. *System*, 30(4):419-432.

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

Hammerly, Hector (1991). Fluency and Accuracy: Toward Balance in Language Teaching and Learning. New York: Multilingual Matters. Print.

Heaton, B. (1988): writing English language tests London and New York. Longman group UK limited.

Holmes. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books. 269-293. Print.

Hymes, Dell (1972). "On Communicative Competence." Sociolinguistics. Ed. Pride, J.B and J.

Izumi, Shinichi (2012). Focus on Form in Second Language Acquisition. Trans. Gang-goo Yoon. Seoul: In Noon Sa. Print.

John and Liz Soars (1987). Headway: Students' book oxford university Press

- Kirn and Jack, D (1996). *A communicative Grammar* New York.
- Krasheshn, S. (1982): *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lock, G. (1996): *Functional English Grammar*. U.S.A, Cambridge University Press.
- Long MH (2000). Focus on form in task-based language teaching. In RD Lambert & E. Shohamy (eds). *Language policy and pedagogy: Essays in honor of A Ronald Walton*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Murphy, R. (1994): *Intermediate English Grammar: reference and practice for south Asian students*. Cambridge University Press.
- Musumeci, D (1997): *The Role of Grammar in Communicative Language Teaching*: Mc-Graw Hillm Companies.
- Nassaji, Hossein, and Sandra Fotos (2011). *Teaching Grammar in Second Language Classrooms: Integrating Form-Focused Instruction in Communicative Context*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Richards, Jack C, and Theodore S. Rodgers (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Print.
- Shahidulah (1995). "Language" [http://www.weekly holiday.net/060902/ mis.html](http://www.weekly holiday.net/060902/mis.html)
- Spada, Nina, and Patsy M. Lightbown (2012). "Form-Focused Instruction: Isolated or Integrated?" *TesolQuarterly* 42.2 (2008): 181-207. Web.
- Velez Rendon, G. (2003). English in colombia: A sociolinguistic profile. *World English's*, 22(2), 185-198.
- Widdowson H.G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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.

Appendix I

A. Teaching material for control group

I. lesson one: simple present

a. Form of simple present

Subject + verb (V1) of the main

Example: She goes to school every day.

We live in Addis

Sub V1

If the subject is third person the verb should take `s` or `es`.

The negative of action verbs is formed by putting the auxiliary verb + not.

Example: He does not work hard.

Simple present statement + verb to be

Present singular verbs (is, am, are) used singular personal pronoun I, she, he, you.

questions in simple present

Is she a student?

Am I?

Are you here?

The question form: auxiliary verb + subject

The simple present: questions (main verbs).

Yes/no			Information or wh- questions			
Do	I			do	I	
Does	you				you	
	he	Work in a		does	he	
	she	hotel?	where		she	Work?
do	we			do	it	
	you				we	
	they				you	
					they	

The simple present: third person singular

Root form ending	Spelling change	example
Ch, ss, sh, o, x, z	Add- `es`	Watch → watches catch → catches
Consonant plus `y`	Change `y` to `i` and add - `es`	try → tries study → studies
All other endings	Add - `s`	work → works stay → stays

II. Lesson two: past perfect

A. Forms of past perfect:

Subject + had + past participle

e.g. a thief **had stolen** all his money

The owner **had not sold** the store

The verb had is a special verb .To make the past perfect tense negative. we add the negative carrier `not` after the tense carrier had.

Tense carrier	Negative carrier	ed form (past participle)
Had	not	stolen
Had	not	sold

With the past perfect tense, there are two possible short forms we can put the subject and the tense carrier.

e.g. He **’d** stayed

Question forms of the past perfect tense

Here are some questions with verbs in the past perfect tense.

e.g. **Had** she **gone** there before?

Had she **taken** the money previously?

The questions are formed by inversion method i.e. by putting the special verb had before the subject.

Exercise

Complete these sentences by using the verb indicated in brackets in the past perfect form.

1. The sick child----- (mean) all the previous night.
2. After ----- (wash) his clothes, he ----- (begin) to study.
3. \Before he arrived, I ----- (leaved) the house.
4. The football match----- (come) to an end before I reached the ground.
5. By the time we ----- (reached) there, all the guests leave.
6. Nobody knew when Abebe ----- (go).

B. Teaching material for study group

I. lesson one: simple present

Students learn simple present tense through integration of form and meaning.

Say the following dialogues with friend.

- a. Where do you live?
- b. I live in Addis
- a. What are you?
- b. I am a student
- a. What do you do every day?
- b. I go to school every day
- a. Excuse me, can you show me the way to the post office?
- b. Yes, of course. Take the first road on the right. Turn the left at the first traffic light.
You can't miss it.

From the above dialogues you can understand the present simple is used.

Say the following dialogue with your friend.

S1: when did you go Addis?

S2: I went there last week

S1: why do you go there?

S2: I went there to visit my friend

S2: when did you eat your lunch?

S1: who was with you?

S2: my wife was with me

Say the following dialogue with your friend.

S1: did you ever smoke cigarette when you were young?

S2: I never smoked cigarette when I was young

S1: with whom did you live?

S2: I always lived with my parents

b. Use of simple present

1. To describe repeated actions

example. I eat bread every morning.

Sub V1

2. To express general truth

The earth is round

Sub V1

3. To express future when referring to a fixed time table.

The plane leaves for Adama tomorrow.

Sub V1

Exercise 1.

Complete the sentence bellow using the correct form of the verb in the box.

rise	live	think	leave
mix	add	marry	

1. The sun ----- in the east
2. Their flight ----- at 9 o'clock.
3. First you ----- the eggs and sugar. Then you ----- the flour.
4. This man ----- in Harare
5. If she ----- him, they will----- in Jimma.

Exercise 2

Construct your own meaningful and grammatical sentences using the following list of verbs. After you write the sentences, show to your pair mate and tell him/her the meaning of your sentence. Finally, show what you write and what it means to your teacher.

kill	borrow	visit	clean	play	chase	pass	eat
------	--------	-------	-------	------	-------	------	-----

Example: The dog chases the cat.

II. Lesson Two: past perfect

Past perfect expresses past action that happened before the past.

Example. After the student had broken the window, he run away. As we have seen above example, the first past action is expressed by past perfect. In the above sentence there are two past actions.

A. the action of breaking

B. the action of running away

The action of breaking took place before the action of running away and we therefore show this by putting the action that took place first in the past perfect and the action which took place second in the simple past. Thus, the past perfect is to indicate

1. Action that happened before another action in the past. there are usually two actions in such sentence

E.g. Taye had gone to the library before he went home.

first action

second action

Abel told us last week that she had bought her dress in 1999

second action

first action

The past perfect is usually used with the adverbs before, after or when studying the following formulas

Subject + past perfect + before + subject + past simple

Subject + simple past + after + subject + past perfect

Example. Taye went home we had gone to the library.

After + subject + past perfect + subject + simple past

Example. After Taye had gone to the library, he went home.

Note: the adverb when can be used in place of before or after in any of these formulas without change in meaning.

Exercise

After before when

Using the above time adverbs complete the following sentences

1. She had lived in Adama for ten years. She moved to Harar.
2. ----- I had entered in the class; the students give a letter to me.
3. The football match had come to an end ----- I reached the ground.
4. ----- he arrived, I had left the house.

Appendix two

Pretests

Choose the correct option to complete the sentences.

1. where----- the students?
A) am
B) is
C) are
2. Girmy and his sister ----- in the sitting room an hour ago.
A) are
B) were
C) be
3. How ----- your mothers?
A) am
B) is
C) are
4. What time -----Liben get up at the weekend?
A) do
B) does
C) did
5. My uncle and aunt ----- in the south

- A) live
- B) lives
- C) are living

6. The children ----- fish

- A) doesn't like
- B) don't like
- C) does like

7. What-----Sofia and her brother doing now?

- A) is
- B) are
- C) do

8. We ----- school uniform today

- A) doesn't like
- B) don't like
- C) does like

9. Who is the head teacher ----- to?

- A) talking
- B) talk
- C) talked

10. I-----this book

- A) am enjoying
- B) enjoy
- C) enjoying

11. I----- Zebida yesterday in the library

- A) see
- B) am seeing

- C) saw
12. -----you go out last night.
- A) did
B) do
C) are
13. Dejene----- do his homework last night.
- A) does
B) doesn't
C) didn't
14. That is a beautiful dog.----- fur is beautiful.
- A) its
B) it
C) it's
15. That isn't your banana it's -----.
- A) me
B) mine
C) my
16. The students are working quietly on ----- projects
- A) your
B) our
C) their
17. It is ----- today than it was yesterday
- A) more cold
B) colder
C) coldest
18. Ras Dejen is the ----- peak in the simian Mountains
- A) highest
B) more heighest
C) most heighest
19. My hand writing is ----- than yours.
- A) bad

B) badly

C) worse

20. This is ----- in the school

A) most noisy

B) noiser

C) the noisiest

Table 1: Pretest exam results for the control and the study groups

Control group		Study group	
Code	Pretest result	Code	Pretest result
A1	87	B1	84
A2	84	B2	84
A3	83	B3	89
A4	84.5	B4	87
A5	83	B5	85
A6	84	B6	84
A7	86	B7	83
A8	88	B8	80
A9	85	B9	81
A10	84	B10	83
A11	82	B11	82
A12	79	B12	84
A13	84	B13	86
A14	82	B14	85
A15	85	B15	84

Table 2: showing posttest result of control group

	Question type					
code	Comprehension question (20%)	Multiple choice (20%)	Completion question (20%)	Sentence construction (20%)	Essay writing (20%)	Total score (100%)
A1	17	18	9	8	8	60
A2	17	17	10	9	10	63
A3	18	18	11	10	12	69
A4	20	19	14	11	14	78
A5	17	18	10	8	10	63
A6	16	17	10	7	8	58
A7	14	16	8	6	6	50
A8	17	18	9	10	9	63
A9	15	15	8	9	10	57
A10	19	19	11	10	11	70
A11	18	17	8	9	8	60
A12	19	18	11	10	12	70
A13	18	18	9	11	9	63
A14	17	15	8	9	7	56

A15	17	17	9	8	8	59
-----	----	----	---	---	---	----

Table 3: showing posttest result of the study group

	Question type					
code	Comprehension question	Multiple choice	Completion question	Sentence construction	Essay writing	Total score
B1	20	20	19	18	19	96
B2	19	20	17	18	19	93
B3	18	18	17	16	18	87
B4	17	17	18	15	16	83
B5	18	17	16	18	17	86
B6	19	19	18	17	15	88
B7	20	18	17	16	16	87
B8	15	17	16	16	15	79
B9	19	17	17	16	15	84
B10	16	19	17	16	17	85
B11	18	18	17	16	18	87
B12	19	19	17	18	18	91
B13	15	15	14	15	14	73
B14	18	19	20	19	18	94
B15	17	17	16	15	17	82

Post test exam

Time allowed 2hours

Name..... SectionNumber.....

I. multiple choice question (20points)

The sentences that follow are incomplete. Decide which one of the choices is the best to produce grammatically correct sentence.

1. the police arrived after the robbers -----
A. had run away C. were running away
B. have run away D. have seen running away.
2. when I arrived at the station, the bus -----
A. has already left C. was already left
B. had already left. D. would already have left
3. After ----- for about thirty minutes, I became a little nervous.
A. to wait C. had waited
B. I am waiting D. waiting
4. ----- I was standing there and waiting, a man I had never seen before approach me.
A. where C. while
B. after D. during

B: -----

- A. yes he is C. yes he doesn't
B. no he does D. yes he does

15. the sun ----- in the east

- A. rises C. rising
B. rised D. rise

II. Using the following words fill the blank space with appropriate words and tense.
(20points)

buy see turn slowly put walk think
look put have notice run

I -----1----- a new alarm clock the other day in Taylor's the jewelers, when I actually -----2----- somebody shoplifting. I'd just finished paying for my clock and as I---3----- round, an elderly woman-----4---- a silver plate into a bag that she-----5----- . Then she-----6----- over to another part of the shop and, when she-----7---- that nobody-----8-----, she-----9----- an expensive-looking watch into the bag. Before I -----10----- a chance to tell the staff in the shop, she -----11----- that I ---12----- her and ---13----- out. Unfortunately for her, two police officers-----14----- past just at that moment and she-----15----- straight into them.

III. Construct 4 meaningful and grammatically correct sentence using the given list of words and phrases.

He	Catch bus	That the earth is round
I	Attend	At 8 o'clock every day
Most people today	Leave	For DireDawa to morrow
The plane	Accept	The board meeting every day

- A-----
B-----
C.....
D.....

IV. Write 8 to 10 sentence using the following topic (20 points)

What do you do everyday immediately after you wake up from sleep?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

V. In the following conversation Mateyas wants to know about Bekalu and asks different questions. Read the conversation carefully and answer questions (20 points)

Mateyas: where do you live?

Bekalu: I live in Addis

Mateyas: what do you do every day?

Bekalu: I go to school

Mateyas: what do you eat for breakfast every morning?

Bekalu: I eat bread

1. how many questions Mateyas asks Bekalu

2. which of the following is true

A. Bekalu is eating bread for breakfast during the time conversation

B. Bekalu was eating bread

C. Bekalu is still eating bread

D. Bekalu eat bread every morning

3. where do you think Bekalu lives currently
 - A. he lives in addis
 - B. he lived in addis but currently he is not
 - C. he will live in addis for the future.
4. who do you think go to school every day?
 - A. Mateyas
 - B. Bekalu
 - C. both