

ნინო წულაია

სოხუმის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52340/sou.2023.19.10>

გრამატიკის სწავლებისადმი საკომუნიკაციო მიდგომის გავლენა ინგლისურის როგორც უცხოური ენის შემსწავლელი სტუდენტების გრამატიკულ ცოდნასა და ზეპირ საკომუნიკაციო უნარებზე (საქართველოს უნივერსიტეტის მაგალითი)

აბსტრაქტი. გრამატიკის სწავლებისადმი ტრადიციული მიდგომა ვერ ეხმარება სტუდენტებს შესწავლილი ენა გამოიყენონ რეალურ საკომუნიკაციო სიტუაციებში. წინამდებარე კვლევის მიზანია გამოარკვეოს აქვს თუ არა გავლენა გრამატიკის სწავლებისადმი საკომუნიკაციო მიდგომას უნივერსიტეტის ინგლისურის როგორც უცხოური ენის შემსწავლელი სტუდენტების გრამატიკულ ცოდნასა და ზეპირი საკომუნიკაციო უნარებზე. კვლევის ფარგლებში გამოყენებული იქნა რაოდენობრივი კვლევის მეთოდი. საკვლევ ჯგუფად შერჩეულ იქნა 20 სტუდენტი. მონაცემები შეგროვდა ექსპერიმენტის წინასწარი და პოსტ-ტესტური ციკლის საშუალებით. ექსპერიმენტის შედეგებმა მნიშვნელოვანი წარმატება აჩვენა სტუდენტების როგორც გრამატიკული კომპეტენციის, ასევე ზეპირი საკომუნიკაციო უნარების განვითარებაში. კითხვარების შედეგებმა კი გამოკვეთა გრამატიკის სწავლების ახალი მიდგომისადმი ექსპერიმენტული ჯგუფის სტუდენტების უაღრესად პოზიტიური დამოკიდებულება.

საკვანძო სიტყვები: გრამატიკის სწავლება, გრამატიკული კომპეტენცია, საკომუნიკაციო ენის სწავლება, საკომუნიკაციო კომპეტენცია, გრამატიკის სწავლებისადმი კომუნიკაციური მიდგომა.

Nino Tsulaia
Sokhumi State University

The Impact of Communicative Approach to Grammar Teaching on EFL University Students' Grammatical Knowledge and Oral Communication Ability

(A Case of Georgian University)

Abstract. Teaching grammar to students in a traditional approach does not help them use the language they have learned to communicate in real-life situations. The present study aims to investigate whether the communicative approach to grammar teaching has an impact on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) University students' grammatical knowledge and oral communication ability. A quantitative approach was applied to the study. The sample of the study comprised 20 students. Data was gathered through the experiment pre- and post-test cycles. The results of the instruction showed significant success in students' development of both grammatical competence and oral communication skill. The survey findings highlighted positive attitudes from the students taught with a new approach.

Keywords: Grammar teaching, grammatical competence, communicative language teaching, communicative competence, communicative grammar teaching

1. Introduction

For thousands of years, grammar was considered the main component of language instruction, and teaching a foreign language was associated with grammar teaching. It was believed that language basically consisted of grammar rules and knowledge of the rules was sufficient for language learners (Nassaji & Fotos, 2010). Grammar focus was reflected in different methods of language teaching but later it had been found that this approach did not meet the communicative needs of foreign language learners. The ultimate goal of language learning became communication. Therefore, teaching focuses on developing learners' communicative competence currently.

The traditional approach to grammar teaching implied teaching grammar in isolation from language skills. Isolated grammar instruction is not very helpful to communication. It doesn't require students to understand the meaning in an authentic context and apply their grammatical competence in oral speech. According to ACTFL (n.d.), learners need 'to learn grammar implicitly through target language use and explicitly through the discovery of grammatical rules through use in meaningful examples'. The need that grammar structures should not to be taught in isolation but integrated with the speaking skill of language has emerged. Mahakaew (2009) states that „in order to enable learners to effectively use language for communicative purposes, grammar and communication must be integrated“ (p.2). Ellis and Fotos (1999) also claim that „formal instruction and communicative language teaching can be integrated through the use of grammar tasks designed to promote

communication about grammar“ (p. 194). Ellis (2006) proposes grammar teaching emphasizing not just form but also meaning and uses of grammatical structures.

Thus, Grammar teaching should stress not only acquiring grammatical knowledge but its application in communication.

Research problem

Though communicative competence is the goal of language teaching nowadays and students are taught English as a Foreign Language for communicative purposes and the textbooks they are taught with are designed to practice all the four skills of language, they are not exposed to activities to practice their grammatical knowledge in communication and link their grammatical competence to communicative activities. From the perspective of communicative language teaching, communicative activities without grammar emphasis do not help students become accurate speakers.

So, grammar should facilitate students to be better communicators. The communicative approach to grammar teaching gives an opportunity not only for theoretical instruction but engaging students in the context of daily life and practicing acquired grammatical knowledge in a given context. Communicative grammar teaching arises a prospect to help students enhance both grammatical competence and oral performance.

Research objectives

Based on the research problem, several research objectives have been formulated:

- To investigate the effects of the communicative approach to grammar teaching on EFL University students' grammatical knowledge;
- To investigate the effects of the communicative approach to grammar teaching on EFL University students' oral communication ability;
- To find out students' perceptions of the communicative approach to grammar teaching.

Research questions

The research objectives lead to certain research questions:

- 1) Does the communicative approach to grammar teaching affect students' acquisition of grammatical knowledge?
- 2) Does the communicative approach to grammar teaching affect students' development of oral communication ability?
- 3) What are the students' perceptions of the communicative approach to grammar teaching?

Research hypothesis

The hypothesis formulated in the research is as follows: EFL undergraduate students' grammatical knowledge and oral communication ability will be significantly enhanced through the implementation of the communicative approach to grammar teaching.

2. Literature review

Traditional language teaching. Teaching a foreign language meant teaching its grammar for quite a long time. Traditional language teaching mainly carried out by the Grammar-Translation method lacked opportunities for students to communicate in the target language. Many linguists indicate that grammatical competence is an important aspect of language learning but only grammar does not make a person proficient in a language. According to Hosni (2014), if the lesson is not followed by the interaction and output of the students, they will face difficulties in oral language acquisition. Alvarez (2017) emphasizes that one can master the rules of sentence formation in a language but still not be very successful at being able to use the language for meaningful communication.

Communicative language teaching. Gradually the goal of language learning has shifted to the development of communicative competence. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) began to emerge during the 1970s. Many authors stress developing communicative competence: Hymes (1972), Widdowson (1978), Canale and Swain (1980), Littlewood (1981), Canale (1983), Scarcella, Andersen, and Krashen (1990), Savignon (1997). The term was coined by Dell Hymes (1972) who proposed that both competence and performance are important. According to Nunan (1989), communicative competence refers to the ability to effectively use linguistic, interpersonal, and sociocultural skills for communicative purposes.

In communicative language teaching, teachers teach a language for communicative purposes. According to Zhong-Guo and Min-Yan (2007), the main idea of communicative language teaching is to improve learners' communicative competence and to overcome the disadvantages of the traditional teaching approach. Weatherford (1997) states that the aim of language teaching under communicative language teaching is 'not built around grammar but around pragmatic communicative functions' (p. 5). Communicative language teaching is a learner-based approach that promotes speaking skills and promises enhanced outcomes (Gerges, 2016).

The role of grammar in communicative language teaching. It is considered that the communicative language teaching approach focuses on fluency but not accuracy in grammar. For example, Revita (2015) urges that this method 'focuses much on meaning not form' (p. 19). Many scholars agree with the fact but point to the misconception of the approach. Yousaf, Umar, and Habib (2017) state that „some of the classroom practitioners ignore the role of grammar and grammatical accuracy in teaching English when they use CLT approach in their English language classrooms” (p.119). According to Fikron (2018) “Grammar has its role to deliver meaning or messages within the communication“ (p. 101).

When teachers do not correct grammatical errors in students' conversations, they miss the chance to put them on the right track. Canale and Swain (1980) state that grammatical inaccuracies will tend to 'fossilize' when grammatical accuracy is not emphasized from the start (p. 11). Joukouliau (2016) notes:

If teachers teach using the communicative approach blindly and never comment on the rules of sentence structure and word order, if they do not pinpoint mistakes and inaccuracies at the proper time, students will fail producing grammatically accurate sentences and identifying their mistakes when compared to other sentences (p. 18).

Thus, if we get familiar with the views of scholars more closely, we will see that communicative language teaching does not mean eliminating grammar instruction from the classroom; instead, grammar teaching should enjoy its due value in the communicative approach classroom. Moreover, Canale and Swain (1980) view grammatical competence as one of the constituents of communicative competence. Leong and Ahmadi (2017) persuade that learners should be fluent in a foreign language, but one of the characteristics of speaking performance is accuracy. Zhong-Guo and Min-Yan (2007) report that the purpose of foreign language teaching should be improving students' communicative performance, but teachers should try to enhance students' capability of using the language in communication in a correct way.

Yousaf et al. (2017) claim that CLT focuses on preparing language learners for real-life meaningful communication but communicative competence could not be realized without learning the form and mastering the linguistic aspects of the language. The authors state that linguistic competence and knowing the structures of the target language also contribute to the communicative competence of language learners (ibid.).

Larsen-Freeman (2006) suggests that it is essential to integrate grammar instruction within a communicative framework if students are to attain high levels of target language accuracy (Larsen-Freeman, 2006 cited in Alvarez, 2017, p. 10). Zhong-Guo and Min-Yan (2007) assert that „teachers should not ignore grammar teaching while they put CLT in the first place. We should help students to sum up the rules of grammar, and at the same time closely link them with their daily life“ (p. 65).

Acker (2000) proposes language acquisition through exposure to meaningful input and through interaction, as well as through formal instruction by combining both grammar and focus on meaning.

As we see many scholars outline the significance of grammar and advocate the integration of grammar instruction into communicative language teaching. Based on the above-mentioned, it can be concluded that in the formation of communicative competence grammar should not be considered as a withdrawn element, but embedded in the communicative situation or communicative context. Grammatical competence has to be viewed as an integral part of communicative competence.

The communicative approach to grammar teaching. If we look at the traditional teaching of grammar, we see that we tackle a similar problem: working with grammar should not be a separate purpose, but should be linked to the practical use of language as an aid to successful communication. In order to communicate, learners need to be able to use their grammatical competence. Teachers should improve the traditional teaching of grammar. For

this, they need to present to students an opportunity to learn grammar from a different perspective. Badila and Chacon (2013) state that teachers need to ‘modify, adjust or implement a new methodology to make the teaching of grammar a challenging and rewarding experience for learners’ (p. 280). The authors urge that „grammar can be the vehicle to encourage a student’s social integration into foreign cultures and peer interactions“ (ibid. p. 280).

It is of no doubt that learners need to communicate both fluently and accurately. Badila and Chacon (2013) propose implementing a communicative teaching methodology in grammar classes. Teaching grammar in a communicative way can promote students’ language accuracy as well as fluency in communication. Chaiyaphat (2013) formulates communicative English grammar instruction as a method of teaching which focuses not only on English grammar structures but on the meaning in contexts and appropriate uses also.

All things considered, it seems reasonable to assume that adopting a communicative approach to grammar teaching is a good opportunity for bridging a gap between grammatical competence and communicative performance. If the shortcoming of traditional grammar teaching was the fact that students could not apply their linguistic ability to real-life situations (Ho & Binh, 2014), communicative grammar teaching allows students to practice grammar items through communicative tasks and activities.

3. Research methodology and methods

Research methodology

University EFL students experience traditional grammar instruction in Georgia, through written exercises without referring to interactive activities. Ellis (1997) (stated in Gedefa, 2013) urges that grammar teaching can be a basis to mould students for effective communication and help them improve their communicative skills in language proficiency. In order to communicate, learners have to use their grammatical competence, and for it, they need to be practiced before. Grammar has to be linked to the practical use of language as an aid to successful communication. The communicative approach to grammar teaching could serve as a bridge between grammatical competence and communicative performance. As explicit grammar teaching does not envisage much authentic input, Acker (2000) states that students should be presented with situations that are as close to real-life communication as possible. Obviously, it is necessary to create such an environment where students will learn grammar from a different perspective and would train them to apply their grammatical knowledge in real-life situations.

On the ground of research objectives – to probe how a communicative approach to grammar teaching can affect Georgian undergraduate students’ grammatical knowledge and oral communication ability – the quantitative method was applied. Muijis (2004) states that the quantitative method allows us to explain a particular phenomenon through collecting and analyzing numerical data. Also, quantitative research is especially relevant for testing hypotheses (ibid.). Creswell (2009) states that quantitative research tests objective theories by examining the relationship among variables. According to Basias and Pollalis (2018), the

quantitative method is usually selected when the research is carried out with questionnaires (usually with closed-ended questions). As the study combines all these purposes the quantitative method was designed to meet the objectives of the research.

Research methods

The research consisted of 2 parts: an experiment and a survey based on students' questionnaire results.

For the experiment:

- 2 pre-tests (grammar paper test and oral test) were applied to both control and experimental groups. Grammar paper test tested students' grammatical knowledge and oral test measured students' oral communication ability before the instruction.
- 2 post-tests (grammar paper test and oral test) were applied to both groups. Grammar paper test identified students' grammatical knowledge and oral test found students' oral communication ability after the instruction.

The survey envisaged finding out students' perceptions of a new method – a communicative approach to grammar teaching. The questionnaire was applied to the experimental group students. It was designed to include entirely close-ended questions to get specific aspects of the issue. All the close-ended questions of the questionnaire followed the five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). There were 10 items in the questionnaire. It was administered to the participants in the University, after having the post-tests and the students were asked to complete them on the spot within 20 minutes. Before the experiment, the pre- and the post-tests and the questionnaire were piloted within a group of 10 students and the instruments were refined for appropriateness.

Students' performances in oral tests were recorded. Students' oral tests were assessed based on the developed rating rubric.

Selection of research participants

The study was quasi-experimental and the population for the study was university undergraduate students. The sample of this study comprised twenty 1st year students: 10 students for the control group and 10 students for the experimental group. The groups were homogenous in English language proficiency, they were students of B1 level according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).

Research context

The research was carried out at one of the state Universities of Tbilisi, Georgia. The participants of the study were the 1st year students of the faculty of Education Sciences who took English as a major course. The curriculum of the four-year undergraduate programs of the University envisages teaching English as a Foreign Language in the first and second years of study. The curriculum is based on the Common European Framework of Reference

for Languages and includes the teaching of four basic language skills - reading, writing, listening and speaking.

The study lasted 8 weeks in the course of English language.

Research ethics

Permission was asked from the University administration to hold the experiment. The students participating in the experiment were told about it, but the nature of the experiment was not described in detail (except that it was going to deal with the teaching approach). Prior to the experiment informed consent was obtained from the participants. They were also informed that they were free to withdraw from the research at any stage. Participants were assured of anonymity and confidentiality of information they were going to provide through the questionnaire. They were told that their responses would be anonymous and their participation would be closed to publicity. They were also informed that they would have been able to drop from it if they had found some items of the questionnaire inappropriate for them and if any information provided by participants was going to be reported or published, assigned codes would be used in order to protect their identities. It was explained to them that the information provided would strictly be used within the scope of this research only and would not be disclosed to any other third party.

Procedure

Before the treatment, all preparations have been carefully made. First of all, a certain amount of grammatical points given in the syllabus were chosen to teach and the lesson plans were made for both experimental and control groups. For designing a plan for the control group, the conventional method of teaching grammar has been applied. The lesson plans for the treatment group focused on the communicative approach to teaching grammar, the model was adapted from Ho and Binh's (2014) conceptual framework of the communicative approach to grammar teaching. Next, pre- and post-tests were developed. The student questionnaire for the experimental group was also designed beforehand. Finally, the instruments were piloted within a pilot group of 10 students and had been refined according to needs.

In stage 1, the two pre-tests (a grammar-paper test and an oral test) were administered to all participants of the two groups, which aimed at confirming the equivalence in the English capacity of both groups.

In stage 2, treatments were conducted in both groups.

In stage 3, both groups were assigned two post-tests (a grammar paper test and an oral test), which measured students' grammatical knowledge and oral communication ability.

In stage 4, the questionnaire was distributed to the experimental group to explore students' attitudes toward the new approach to teaching.

Data analysis

Statistical data of pre and post-tests from control and experimental groups were collected and statistical analyses of the data were made using SPSS 22.0 statistics program. The quantitative data was used for the analysis of students' responses to the survey statements. The survey results were also analyzed using SPSS 22.0 program.

4. Research findings and discussion

Table 1 and Table 2 show the results of control and experimental groups in grammar paper test and oral test before and after the treatment.

In grammar paper pre-test the control group got slightly higher scores than the experimental one (M=47.4 vs M=47.2). In oral pre-test the control group got a bit higher scores than the experimental group (M=45.3 vs M=45). So, no statistically significant difference was found between the two mean scores in both tests. Therefore, it was completely safe to confirm that the two groups were quite equivalent in both grammatical knowledge and oral communication ability before the treatment.

Table 1. Control group pre-test and post-test results

Control group	Grammar paper test		Oral test	
	Pre-experimental	Post-experimental	Pre-experimental	Post-experimental
Student 1	67	75	52	56
Student 2	35	45	36	40
Student 3	47	60	44	50
Student 4	41	60	45	56
Student 5	51	62	46	56
Student 6	49	64	44	52
Student 7	41	60	43	50
Student 8	47	62	49	61
Student 9	55	69	52	60
Student 10	41	66	42	51
Mean	47.4	62.3	45.3	53.2
Median	51	60	44	50.5
Mode(s)	41	60	44	56
St. Deviation	9.03	7.73	4.83	6.06

Table 2. Experimental group pre-test and post-test results

Experimental group	Grammar paper test		Oral test	
	Pre-experimental	Post-experimental	Pre-experimental	Post-experimental
Student 1	65	88	51	89
Student 2	37	70	35	79
Student 3	45	71	45	88
Student 4	42	91	43	85
Student 5	50	92	47	93
Student 6	48	93	45	90
Student 7	43	87	42	88
Student 8	48	91	48	92
Student 9	54	90	51	87
Student 10	40	89	43	85
Mean	47.2	86.2	45	87.6
Median	51	81.5	43	85.5
Mode(s)	48	91	43,45 & 51	85 & 88
St. Deviation	8.01	8.47	4.73	4.01

From the tables, we can see that, on average, the two groups achieved higher scores in the post-tests than in the pre-tests. Particularly, for the control group, the mean score of the grammar paper post-test was 62.3 compared with 47.4 of the pre-test; and with the experimental group, the mean score of the grammar paper post-test was 86.2 compared with 47.2 of the pre-test. For the control group, the mean score of the oral post-test was 50.5 compared with 44 of the pre-test; and with the experimental group, the mean score of the oral post-test was 87.6 compared with 45 of the pre-test.

Table 3. Summary of the control group results

	Grammar-paper test		Oral test	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
Mean	47.4	62.3	45.3	53.2
Median	51	60	44	50.5
Mode(s)	41	60	44	56
St. Deviation	9.03	7.73	4.83	6.06

From the data in Table 3 we can see that mean results of the control group grew slowly from pre- to post-test in both grammar-paper and oral exams, which is a reasonable positive result proving the low efficiency of the traditional approach to grammar teaching. However, after the treatment the control group got higher results in grammar paper test than in oral test (M=62.3 vs M=47.4 in grammar paper test and M=53.2 vs M=45.3 in oral test),

which proves the idea that the traditional approach to grammar teaching facilitates the acquisition of grammar knowledge but not the oral production skills.

Table 4. Summary of the experimental group results

	Grammar-paper test		Oral test	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
Mean	47.2	86.2	45	87.6
Median	51	81.5	43	85.5
Mode(s)	48	91	43, 45 & 51	85 & 88
St. Deviation	8.01	8.47	4.73	4.01

As Table 4 shows the mean results of the experimental group grew faster than those of the control group in both grammar-paper and oral exams, which is a positive result proving a higher efficiency of the experimental method – the communicative approach to grammar teaching. In grammar paper test, the experimental group received results as high as in oral test: M=86.2 vs M=47.2 in grammar paper test and M=87.6 vs M=45 in oral test. So, the new method turned out to be effective in improving students’ both grammatical knowledge and oral communication ability.

The analysis of the groups’ test results at pre and post stages of the research is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Summary for T-test

	Grammar paper test		Oral test	
	Control group	Experimental group	Control group	Experimental group
Pre-test	47.4	47.2	45.3	45
Post-test	62.3	86.2	53.2	87.6

Paired samples T-test was held in order to see whether the obtained difference between the two groups’ results was statistically significant.

Table 6. Paired sample T-test
Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	VAR00001	60.7750	4	18.36598	9.18299
	VAR00002	1.5000	4	.57735	.28868

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	VAR00001 & VAR00002	4	.373	.627

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
Pair 1	VAR00001 - VAR00002	5.92750E1	18.15881	9.07941	30.38028	88.16972	6.529	3	.007

As shown in table 6, $p=0.007 < 0.05$, so the difference between the control and the experimental groups' growth is statistically significant.

At the next stage of the study, the questionnaire was distributed to the experimental group students (see Table 7).

Table 7. Survey questionnaire

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
--	-------------------	----------	------------------	-------	----------------

1. Communicative approach to grammar teaching was innovative for me.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Oral and written practices were well-cooperated in the teaching process.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The activities practiced in the teaching process required me to pay attention to accuracy in grammar.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The activities practiced in the teaching process required me to concentrate on fluency in communication.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The developed materials and tasks were appropriate to my language level.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Knowing the form, meaning and use of grammar structures is significant in language learning.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Working in pairs and groups helped me feel less stressed and more confident.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Communicative approach to grammar teaching enhanced my motivation of learning grammar.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Communicative approach to grammar teaching prepared me for grammar-paper tests.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Communicative approach to grammar teaching prepared me for real-life communications.	1	2	3	4	5

Table 8. Statistic results of the questionnaire

	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard deviation
Item 1	4.7	5	5	0.48

Item 2	4.4	3	5	0.70
Item 3	4.4	3	5	0.70
Item 4	4.5	3.5	5	0.71
Item 5	4.1	3	4	0.74
Item 6	4.7	4.5	5	0.48
Item 7	4.2	3	4 & 5	0.79
Item 8	4.4	3	5	0.70
Item 9	4.6	4	5	0.70
Item 10	4.8	5	5	0.42

It is apparent from Table 8 that all 10 items of the questionnaire received high enough results which means that the students' assessment of the new method was clearly positive - they demonstrated positive attitudes towards the task design, instruction way, motivational influence, etc.

5. Conclusion

The study was successful in seeking evidence for the effects of the application of the communicative approach to grammar teaching on (1) students' grammatical knowledge and (2) oral communication ability and revealing their attitudes towards the new method (3).

The finding on research question 1 „Does communicative approach to grammar teaching affect students' acquisition of grammatical knowledge?“ revealed that being instructed with the communicative approach in grammar, the students achieved high results in grammar test. From the finding on research question 2 „Does communicative approach to grammar teaching affect students' development of oral communication ability?“ we see that students taught with the communicative approach to grammar teaching achieved significant success in oral communication development. Through T-test calculation, this statistical difference was proved to be highly significant ($p\text{-value}=0.007$). The hypothesis of the study has been proved. The survey results on research question 3 „What are the students' perceptions of the communicative approach to grammar teaching?“ revealed that the communicative approach to grammar teaching caught the students' learning interest. The method was innovative for them, oral and written practices were well-cooperated, the activities practiced throughout the treatment required them to concentrate on accuracy as well as fluency, pair or group work

tasks eased their tension and enhanced their confidence, and the new approach helped them develop their grammar competence and prepared them for real-life communications.

Shortly, the current study shows that adopting a communicative approach to grammar teaching did benefit the students in the acquisition of grammatical competence and improvement of oral performance and it did appeal to the students' interest in learning grammar and linking it to real-life communication. The new approach allowed students to practice grammar items through communicative tasks and activities and it led to the enhancement of their language accuracy as well as fluency in communication.

The research conducted by Ho and Binh (2014) revealed similar findings confirming that communicative grammar teaching had a positive effect on students' achievement of grammatical knowledge and oral production skills.

6. Research limitations

The population of this research was restricted to the sample of the participants and the given number of students may not give a full picture of the problem. This is one of the main limitations of the study.

Another limitation is the number of higher educational institutions in which the study was conducted. The study focused on only one University in the city and for this reason, the findings drawn from the research cannot be generalized.

Thirdly, the grammar points to be taught were limited to a certain number because of the time limit of the experiment and did not involve all grammar points of the English language given in the syllabus.

Finally, the research was carried out among the students of one specific level of language proficiency, and the findings to be generalized to students of any level of language proficiency need to be tested with further research.

7. Future research prospects/ Recommendations

For further research studies, it is recommended to do research on a broader sample, in more higher education institutions and with students of other levels of language proficiency.

References

- Acker, V. (2000). *Communicative Grammar Tasks: Language Use and Students' Preferences*. Master's Thesis. Iowa, the USA: Iowa State University.
- ACTFL (n.d.). *Teach Grammar as Concepts in Meaningful Contexts in Language Learning*. Retrieved from <https://www.actfl.org/guiding-principles/teach-grammar-concepts-meaningful-contexts-language-learning>
- Alvarez, E. H. (2017). Enhancing grammar competence of the senior secondary students through communicative language teaching (CLT). *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies*, 4(11), 9-16.

- Badila, D. C & Chacon, G. P. (2013). Communicative grammar: an effective tool to teach a second language in today's classes. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas*, 18, 267-283.
- Basias, N. & Pollalis, Y. (2018). Quantitative and qualitative research in business & technology: justifying a suitable research methodology. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 7(1), 91-105.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Canale, M. (1983). *From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy*. New York: Longman.
- Chaiyaphat, W. (2013). *Effects of English Collocation and Communicative Grammar Instruction on Undergraduate Students' English Speaking and Writing Abilities*. Master's Thesis. Thailand: Chulalongkorn University.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Ellis, R., & Fotos, S. (1999). *Learning a Second Language through Interaction*. Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fikron, R. (2018). Grammatical competence within L2 communication: language production, monitor hypothesis, and focus on forms instruction. *Pancaran Pendidikan EKIP Universitas Jember*, 7(1), 101-112.
- Gedefa, B. (2013). *Exploring the Implementation of CLT in Teaching Grammar at Fre-Hewot No 2 Secondary and Preparatory School*. Master's Thesis. Ethiopia: Addis Ababa University Graduate School College.
- Gerges, B. (2016). *Bridging the Gap between Grammar Competence and Communicative Performance*. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Bridging-the-Gap-between-Grammar-Competence-and-Gerges/3beb5fe416525282e49ff835baebfd39c7a7203e>
- Ho, P. V. P & Binh, N. T. (2014). The effects of communicative grammar teaching on students' achievement of grammatical knowledge and oral production. *English Language Teaching*, 7(6), 74-86.
- Hosni, S. A. (2014). Speaking difficulties encountered by young EFL learners. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 2(6), 22-30. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Bridging-the-Gap-between-Grammar-Competence-and-Gerges/3beb5fe416525282e49ff835baebfd39c7a7203e>
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. *Sociolinguistics*, 269-293.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press Inc.
- Leong, L. & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). An analysis of factors influencing learners' English speaking skill. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 34-41.

- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahakaew, V. (2009). *Effects of Communicative English Grammar instruction using Team Based Learning Approach on Communicative English Language Ability of Tenth Grade Students at Nawamintrachinuthid Norwang Nonthaburi School*. Master's Thesis. Thailand: Chulalongkorn University.
- Ming, D. (2011). *Adapting Communicative Language Teaching to Grammar Teaching in China's University English Classroom*. Master's Thesis. Wisconsin, the USA: University of Wisconsin-Platteville.
- Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing Quantitative Research in Education with SPSS*. London: Sage Publications.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ramdas, R. P. (2018). Traditional grammar and its drawbacks. *Pune Research – an International Journal in English*. 4(1), 1-4. Retrieved from <http://puneresearch.com/media/data/issues/5a65786730dc5.pdf>
- Revita, I. (2015). Communicative approach in teaching English for 3rd year English department students: advantages and weaknesses. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, (10)2, 18-33.
- Savignon, S. J. (1997). *Communicative Competence Theory and Classroom Practice: Texts and Contexts in Second Language Learning (2nd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Savignon, S. J. (2002). *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching: Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scarcella, R. C., Andersen, E. S., & Krashen, S. D. (1990). *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Weatherford, H. (1997). Issues in the teaching of grammar in a foreign language. *Joint meeting of the Southern Conference on Language Teaching and the South Carolina Foreign Language Teachers' Association, South Carolina*, 2-20.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yousaf, M., Umar, H. & Habib, A. (2017). Communicative language teaching (CLT), role of grammar and teachers' beliefs. *Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, (5)1, 116-123.
- Zhong-Guo, L. & Min-Yan, S. (2007). The relationship between traditional English grammar teaching and communicative language teaching. *US-China Education Review*, 4(1), 62-65.