



ISSN: 2790-5403 (Online) | 2790-539X (Print)

<https://journals.hu.edu.et/hu-journals/index.php/erjssh>, ISSN: Print 2790-539X, Online 2790-5403
FULL LENGTH ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Communicative Grammar Instruction Practices in Grade 10 English Classrooms: The Case of Bule Hora University Community and Bariso Dukale Secondary Schools

Ammanuel Berhanu Jarssa^{1*}  and Behailu Adalla Firomsa²

¹Department of English Language and Literature, Bule Hora University, Bule Hora, Ethiopia

²Bule Hora University Community Secondary School, Bule Hora, Ethiopia

*Corresponding Author's email: ammanuelber@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 28 March, 2026

Accepted: 15 May, 2026

Published Online: 25 June, 2026

CITATION

Jarssa B.A and Firomsa B.A (2026). Communicative Grammar Instruction Practices in Grade 10 English Classrooms: The Case of Bule Hora University Community and Bariso Dukale Secondary Schools. *EthioInquiry Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. Volume 5(1), 2026, 44-65. <https://doi.org/10.20372/vyxeg974>

OPEN ACCESS



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

ETHIOINQUIRY Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences has been accredited by FDRE Ministry of Education and indexed on AJOL.

Abstract

This study examined the use of Communicative Grammar Instruction (CGI) in the Grade 10 English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom at Bule Hora University Community and Bariso Dukale Secondary Schools to investigate teachers' theoretical understanding of CGI, their classroom implementation, and the difficulties they faced in implementing CGI. The researchers employed a descriptive research design to observe current classroom activities without manipulating variables, while gathering quantitative and qualitative data through student questionnaires, classroom observations, and teacher interviews. The research discovered that teachers understand CGI at a basic level, which they consider essential for building students' communication skills, while using conventional teaching methods. Classroom assessments, together with student feedback, demonstrated that students engaged in few communication activities because teachers focused more on explaining rules and achieving precise sentence construction than on developing actual language skills. The application of CGI faces challenges because large classrooms restrict teaching periods and have insufficient educational resources. Students lacked the chance to use their grammatical skills during real-life communication situations. The study demonstrates that teachers value CGI at the conceptual level. However, they face practical and contextual barriers that hinder the successful implementation of CGI in classrooms. This suggests that educators should move away from rote memorization and adopt inductive and communication-centered strategies, where grammar is viewed as a functional instrument for meaningful exchanges and real-world use. This pedagogical pivot requires students to step into an active role via task-based activities, not just sit and receive input. It shifts them from passive reception to practical discovery. To maintain these changes, institutions must also address logistical problems such as overcrowding and resource shortages to ensure consistent CGI implementation.

Keywords: classroom implementation; communicative competence; communicative grammar instruction; contextual challenges, student-centered learning.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

CGI emerged from a shift towards “communicative competence,” a term coined by Hymes (1972) to challenge the narrow focus on abstract grammatical rules by emphasizing that language should be contextually appropriate and socially functional (Hery, 2017). This basis was supported by Michael Halliday, whose Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) posits that language is a “social semiotic” system where grammar serves specific interpersonal and textual functions rather than existing in isolation (Thwaite, 2019). Canale and Swain (1980) further refined this by introducing a four-part frame, including grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence, which balanced the need for formal accuracy with the ability to negotiate meaning in real-world settings (Harahap & Ardi, 2023). Widdowson (1978) influenced the field by distinguishing between language as a formal system (“usage”) and as a communicative tool (“use”), arguing that grammar instruction should prioritize the expression of concepts and communicative acts (Sreehari, 2012). More recently, proponents such as Watkins (2021) have bridged these theories with classroom practice, advocating for “scaffolded” grammar instruction, where linguistic forms are introduced through inductive and discovery-based tasks that mirror authentic communication.

Grammar is the basic instrument that learners need for effective communication because it helps them create meaningful and context-appropriate messages while learning to use language for their everyday needs (Putra, 2021). Therefore, the main goal of CGI extends beyond the development of linguistic competence to include the ability to apply grammatical knowledge appropriately across different communicative contexts. The absence of grammar restricts communication to basic words and expressions, which decreases clarity and effectiveness (Azimi, 2016). The language learning process requires grammar instruction because it helps students develop their ability to communicate and express themselves in their language. Students need to understand all aspects of grammatical structure, the right time for usage, and the conditions for using it during real conversations (Hidayati, 2023). The current perspective denotes a change from conventional grammar, which presents fixed regulations, to modern grammar, which functions as an adaptable tool for effective communication in the classroom. Ethiopian and African literary traditions view language as a dynamic instrument that develops meaning through structured social interaction.

Modern grammar teaching methods now use communicative teaching methods that focus on authentic language communication instead of conventional grammar rules. Older teaching methods required students to learn through repeated exercises, which included memorization and mechanical drills, whereas modern teaching methods combine grammar instruction with actual communication skills. Celce-Murcia (2000) demonstrated that teachers consider grammatical drills essential for their students, while they believe that students need to practice speaking through interactive activities. Teachers maintain their preference for a teaching method that combines direct grammar teaching with language practice despite using the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. Recent developments point to a new teaching method called CGI, which teaches students to apply grammatical rules in real language situations. The core concept of CGI shows language as an interactive tool that enables students to create meaning, instead of treating it as a system of linguistic regulations (SukavateeKhlaisang2023; Abdulrahman, 2019). It provides direct teaching methods together with interactive learning activities, which help students acquire language skills and communication abilities (Hinkel, 2024). Hence, the Ethiopian school system promotes the teaching of language through form and function to help students learn according to their cultural backgrounds (Dereje, 2012).

Grammar functions as a central element in learning environments that use communication as their main method of instruction, enabling students to convey their thoughts (Moe, 2019). Larsen-Freeman (2019) supports this viewpoint by stating that grammar needs to establish links between form, meaning, and use. CGI uses various teaching methods, including contextualization, noticing, and interaction, to help students learn and use grammatical structures (Lyster, 2013). The Ethiopian literary tradition, which includes oral traditions, folktales, and proverbs, demonstrates how students learn grammatical patterns through multiple opportunities to hear and use the language in natural settings. This is because people acquire grammar by understanding language at explicit and contextual levels (Finnegan, 2012; Tekeste, 2010).

Approaches such as focus-on-form show that grammar instruction needs to occur through real com-

munication activities instead of teaching grammar as a separate subject (Abdushukurova, 2024; Zang, 2018). The Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) approach enables students to learn grammar through the execution of assigned tasks (Purgina, 2020). The use of role plays, information-gap activities, and problem-solving tasks establishes real-life communication situations that help students learn grammar through communicative methods (Ruzmetova, 2025). The use of culturally relevant texts in classrooms, including local stories, poems, and narratives, has demonstrated that students become more engaged while learning grammar through real-world applications. English language instruction has returned to its previous state because grammar is now an essential component of contemporary teaching methods (Spada, 2008). Modern English language teaching now uses grammar instruction and communicative practice as its primary teaching methods (Garner, 2021). The process of teaching grammar is difficult because teachers must find a way to teach students both accurate language use and fluent language production (Goldberg, 2023). Teachers in Ethiopia experience the same difficulties that Tadesse (2014) identified, when he reported that educators in the country could not use innovative teaching methods because their classrooms had too many students, their resources were insufficient, and their teaching methods focused on preparing students for exams.

Although the Ethiopian Grade 10 English syllabus is explicitly designed to foster active language skills by utilizing grammar instruction as a foundation for communication, a disconnect remains between policy objectives and classroom reality. This gap exists primarily because current pedagogical approaches remain stagnant, with educators continuing to rely on conventional methods that prioritize mechanical presentation over functional language application in real-world contexts. Consequently, the intentional integration of grammatical structures and communicative skills has not yet been fully implemented. Local research corroborates this, indicating that despite policy support for communicative teaching, actual classroom execution is undermined by a systemic lack of adequate teacher training and professional support (Ministry of Education, 2017; Tadesse, 2014). To bridge these pedagogical gaps, this study evaluates the practical implementation of CGI in Ethiopian secondary schools, exploring how these methods integrate with educational realities. By aligning CGI frameworks with specific communicative objectives and language requirements, this study seeks to move beyond generic applications toward a more nuanced and contextualized approach.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Grammar is recognized as a tool for meaningful communication and effective language learning (Habiburrahman, 2025). It enables students to use language correctly while applying it to various situations, which helps them speak clearly and fluently (Harun, 2019). Scholars who support grammar teaching through direct application in communicative activities instead of treating it as a separate subject argue that grammar instruction is required for developing communicative competence. The Ethiopian EFL context, which uses English as the medium of instruction for secondary and higher education, depends on grammar to help students understand academic materials and classroom discussions (Heugh et al., 2007; Tesfaye & Davidson, 2008).

EFL classrooms continue to focus on teaching grammar through form-based methods, which require students to learn grammar rules and practice drills while achieving correct sentence structures (Sun, 2022). Learners are often trained to construct grammatically correct sentences but may struggle to use them effectively in real-life communications. Students need to demonstrate their ability to use knowledge in practical situations because grammatical accuracy cannot serve as the only standard for assessment (Aminah, 2023). The examination systems, together with the restricted English practice opportunities that exist beyond the classroom walls, create a major obstacle to communication skills development in Ethiopia (Dereje, 2012; Tadesse, 2014).

Theoretical frameworks of CGI show their support for a unified design, which combines form, meaning, and functional use to create communicative skills. The research community continues to debate which linguistic ability assessment method needs to emphasize higher fluency or accuracy scores, together with its different methods for teaching grammar (Amirjanli, 2025). Existing problems remain unsolved, causing teachers to face difficulties when making decisions about their teaching methods. The CGI has been successful in improving students' grammatical skills and their ability to communicate effectively (Sadeghi, 2024; Woymo, 2024). Studies conducted in Ethiopia show a major research gap regarding how students view CGI and how teachers implement CGI in their teaching methods (Getinet & Alemu, 2020). The application of CGI in Ethiopian secondary schools faces practical hurdles stemming from resource limitations. Barriers such as overcrowded classrooms, lack of instructional materials, exam-

driven curricula, and insufficient teacher training often hinder the adoption of modern communicative approaches (Fontana, 2015; Sheng, 2024). Consequently, many educators default to conventional teaching methods characterized by teacher-led mechanical drills and error correction, perceiving these as manageable in high-pressure environments. Despite empirical evidence suggesting that language acquisition is enhanced through interactive tasks, role-playing, and games (Belpaeme, 2018; Peckham, 2020; Wright, 2016), their consistent application remains restricted by systemic constraints.

While earlier local research in Ethiopia has been more interested in how teachers conceptually mix communicative approaches with form-focused teaching (Abiy, 2011), this study takes a different approach because of its particular design and the analytical depth it brings. Instead of staying only with what teachers say about their own practice, the present work uses a stronger qualitative setup, where direct classroom observation matters, and where triangulated evidence is used to make sense of what is happening. In other words, it looks at the performance of CGI tasks and the specific instructional hurdles that show up while lessons are being conducted. By not stopping at theoretical match-ups and instead digging into the rough details that shape whether things succeed or fail in the classroom, this study offers a more detailed diagnosis of the current state of English language teaching in Ethiopia.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to examine the use of CGI in English classrooms, particularly in Grade 10, at Bule Hora University Community and Bariso Dukale Secondary Schools. More specifically, the objectives of this study are as follows:

1. Examining teachers' knowledge of communicative grammar teaching methods.
2. This study analyzes how communicative grammar teaching is implemented in classroom practice.
3. Identify the factors that influence the use of CGI in English teaching.

1.4 Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Do teachers possess adequate theoretical knowledge of CGI?
2. How is communicative grammar teaching implemented in English classrooms?
3. What challenges affect the implementation of CGI in classrooms?

2 Literature Review

The field of ELT has undergone a significant paradigm shift in recent years, moving away from the "grammar-free" ideologies of the early CLT era. Research indicates that English language instruction has effectively returned to its previous state of structural rigor, as grammar is once again viewed as an essential component of contemporary teaching.

The Re-Emergence of Grammar in Communicative Contexts

Contemporary linguists claim that although the main aim of language learning is communication, linguistic knowledge acts like the indispensable "fishing rod" needed to generate competent speech (Wang, 2010). In current models, grammar is no longer treated as an isolated academic concept but rather as the structural baseline for coherent and clearly understood communication, especially in high-stakes professional and academic settings (Allehyani, 2026). Therefore, this change feels like a kind of return to structural rigor, even if it is framed differently. It acknowledges that being able to handle complex social and technical situations is tightly bound to a learner's control of grammatical systems.

Recent empirical data on linguistic precision further validate the necessity of this structural anchor. Studies have identified a strong and significant positive correlation ($r = .846$) between grammatical mastery and oral performance, confirming that high-level speaking skills are fundamentally rooted in grammatical depth (Zam et al., 2025). Consequently, the “myth” that CLT must exclude formal grammar has been exposed by research favoring Form-Focused Instruction (FFI). This method integrates explicit metalinguistic teaching into communicative tasks, ensuring that learners move beyond “shallow” fluency toward a more sophisticated and accurate command of the language (Akyel, 2000; Rama & Agulló, 2012). Beyond mere performance, grammar is central to the development of metalinguistic awareness, a key component of self-determined learning. Novel research suggests that for learners to successfully manage their own multilingual development, they must possess a deep and conscious understanding of how grammatical rules function across different linguistic systems (MDPI, 2026). By prioritizing this awareness, contemporary methods empower students to become active architects of their discourse. This holistic integration of form and function proves that English language instruction has returned to its previous state of valuing grammar as an essential and foundational component of the current teaching repertoire.

Contemporary Pedagogical Shifts

The modern landscape of ELT has gone through this sophisticated kind of change, moving beyond that old twofold debate of “grammar versus communication.” It feels like more of an evolution toward integrated accuracy, where grammatical rigor is not just a step back into antiquated rote memorization but a strategic reinforcement of communicative intent. Research indicates that students who engage in explicit grammatical instruction consistently outperform those in purely meaning-based programs across listening, speaking, and discourse assessments (Spada, 2008). When educators embed structure within meaningful contexts, fluency is supported by a linguistic framework instead of being stuck at “shallow” expression.

This pedagogical pivot is defined as a fundamental change in the structuring of classroom roles and goals, compared to historical methods. While conventional grammar instruction focuses on the internal competence of rules through isolated drills and passive reception, the contemporary communicative grammar model prioritizes real-world performance and the application of form during interaction. In this modern setting, instruction is characterized by FFI, which is embedded within communicative tasks. This redefines the learner’s role from a passive recipient to an active co-creator equipped with metalinguistic awareness, allowing them to navigate complex linguistic choices dynamically, rather than relying on static and memorized patterns.

Ultimately, a consensus has emerged among linguists that grammatical knowledge serves as a “basic element” and a fundamental pillar of the language-learning process. Without this structural scaffolding, learners encounter a “plateau” effect, where they struggle to transfer complex ideas into coherent spoken or written forms (Zam et al., 2025). By repositioning grammar as an essential component of current teaching methods, the field has returned to a state of structural balance, ensuring that communicative output is fluent and accurate.

3 MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1 Design of the Study

The researchers adopted a descriptive research approach because the primary aim of the study was to observe, describe, and document the existing state of CGI and the learning process in the study area without manipulating variables. Descriptive research is particularly suitable for providing an accurate and systematic portrayal of classroom practices, teacher strategies, and learners’ responses within their natural settings (Best & Kahn, 2016). This study aimed to represent CGI execution in schools through classroom research, excluding experimental designs and correlational research methods that study how different factors interact. The researchers used their approach to collect qualitative and quantitative data through three methods: observing classrooms, distributing questionnaires, and conducting interviews to create a complete understanding of teaching methods and student participation and the challenges of

CGI implementation, which manual methods cannot assess and statistical methods cannot completely determine.

3.2 Participants and Sampling Techniques

Five English teachers and 124 Grade 10 students from Bule Hora University Community and Bariso Dukale Secondary Schools participated in the study. The research was conducted in these two schools, which are among the four secondary schools in Bule Hora Town. The schools were selected using purposive sampling because of their accessibility, as well as considerations of time, cost, and available resources. This sampling technique enabled the researchers to conduct the study efficiently and feasibly while addressing the research objectives. The proximity and manageability of these schools made them suitable sites for examining the application of CGI in a real-world classroom context.

A simple random sampling technique was employed to select the student participants. From a total of 344 Grade 10 students (40 from Bule Hora University Community Secondary School and 304 from Bariso Dukale Secondary School), a sample of 124 students was drawn from seven sections: one section from the Bule Hora University Community Secondary School and six sections from Bariso Dukale Secondary School. Regarding teachers, five English language teachers (from both schools) were included using comprehensive sampling. This approach ensured that all available English teachers in schools contributed to the study.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

To ensure the fidelity of the study, a range of data collection instruments, including questionnaires, classroom observations, and interviews, were employed. The use of multiple instruments allows for triangulation, which enhances the overall validity of the findings by cross-checking data obtained from different sources (Meydan & Akkas, 2024). Each instrument was carefully designed and aligned with the research objectives to ensure that it measured what it was intended to.

3.3.1 Questionnaire

The primary instrument employed in this study was a questionnaire that was meticulously designed to align with the research objectives. The instrument comprised both closed- and open-ended questions. The close-ended items utilized a Likert scale format, offering five response options: "Strongly agree," "Agree," "Neutral," "Disagree," and "Strongly disagree." Likert scales are widely recognized for their efficacy in measuring attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors, providing quantitative data that facilitate statistical analysis (South, 2022). Conversely, the open-ended questions invited participants to provide more detailed insights into their experiences with grammar learning. Open-ended questions are invaluable in educational research because they elicit rich qualitative data that can uncover a deeper understanding and nuances of student experiences. Responses to these open-ended questions were systematically reviewed to identify recurring themes or patterns, which were categorized accordingly. The frequency of each response was analyzed, and these qualitative findings were compared with the quantitative results from the closed-ended questions to offer a comprehensive understanding of students' perceptions of the classroom. The questionnaire, consisting of 14 items, was administered to 124 students. Of the 124 students, 120 completed and returned questionnaires.

3.3.2 Observation

For the documentation of the observational phase, the lead researcher conducted eight non-participatory classroom observations. These sessions were spread across four Grade 10 sections in two schools; thus, the process provided repeated, steady data through a more systematic way that actually used a structured checklist, centered on classroom behaviors, learner interactions, and particular pedagogical tasks. The main aim was to check and triangulate what was reported by students in the questionnaires so that the results would remain reliable and valid (Santos, 2020). Since the researcher was a non-participant,

it was possible to document, in a rather impartial manner, how the teachers delivered lessons and the students involved in the learning process, especially when cross-referencing the students' accounts of teaching approaches (Cents-Boonstra et al., 2021). Finally, a comparison between the researcher's observations and the participants' responses made the results comprehensive.

3.3.3 Interview

The primary source of interview data in this study was teachers, as they are directly responsible for implementing CGI in the classroom. The interviews focused on teachers' understanding and application of CGI, providing insights into their knowledge of the methodology and its practical implementation. Teachers were asked about their grasp of CGI principles, techniques, and benefits, as well as how they integrated grammar instruction into communicative contexts, including lesson planning and classroom activities. Additionally, the interviews explored factors influencing their practice, such as training, resources, curriculum constraints, and perceptions of students learning. Using interviews as a data collection method is particularly important because it allows researchers to capture in-depth nuanced perspectives that cannot be fully obtained through questionnaires or observations alone (Osborne & Grant-Smith, 2021). Interviews provide rich qualitative data, enabling researchers to understand the reasoning, attitudes, and experiences behind teachers' instructional choices (Olafson et al., 2014). Moreover, teacher interviews facilitate the identification of challenges and contextual factors that affect the implementation of CGI, supporting data triangulation when combined with observations and questionnaires. Therefore, interviews are an essential method for gaining a comprehensive understanding of how communicative grammar teaching operates in practice.

3.4 Fidelity of the Instruments

The research instruments achieved validity through their design process, which involved expert evaluation and pretesting procedures. The research questions served as the foundation for developing the questionnaire items, for which CGI-related literature provided the necessary information. English language teaching and educational research experts assessed the instrument to determine its clarity, relevance, and appropriateness, which resulted in improving unclear content and removing unnecessary elements. The pilot test demonstrated that the questionnaire items achieved their purpose by making the questions understandable to participants who shared similarities with the target population. The observation checklist used CGI indicators, which included learner interaction, communicative activities, and contextualized grammar use, to establish assessment standards that minimized bias while creating reliable results. The interview guide achieved validity through its semi-structured questions, which directly measured the research objectives, and the probing techniques, which collected detailed participant answers that showed their real-life experiences and thoughts about their experiences (Cohen et al., 2018; Creswell, 2014).

In addition, the researchers established instrument reliability through their use of consistent data collection methods, which produced dependable results. The researchers conducted a pilot study to test the questionnaire's reliability, which measured internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha. The researchers revised the content of the questionnaire because its items failed to demonstrate a proper connection. The researchers used standardized instructions and uniform administration procedures, which helped reduce measurement errors and improve the consistency of the test results. The researchers established instrument reliability through the implementation of a standardized checklist, which they used to conduct multiple observations that tracked behavioral changes throughout different lessons. The researchers used peer and supervisor observation record reviews to minimize observer bias during their study. The research team used a standardized interview guide with all participants and recorded audio of their sessions to create accurate transcriptions and interpretations. The research team used combined strategies that enhanced both the quantitative and qualitative data reliability according to established methodological recommendations (Cohen et al., 2018; Kothari, 2004).

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

Once the study site was chosen (Bule Hora University Community and Bariso Dukale Secondary Schools), pending a letter of support from Bule Hora University's postgraduate office, the data collection procedure involved the following steps: First, informed consent was obtained from participating teachers and students in the selected schools. Subsequently, the participants received a clear explanation of the study's purpose and detailed instructions on how to complete the questionnaires. Next, grammar lessons in a few chosen sections from both schools were observed using a prepared observation checklist. Subsequently, the questionnaires were administered to the students. After the participants completed the questionnaires, the researchers collected the completed forms. To further cross-check the study, the researchers conducted interviews with teachers. Finally, upon completion of the data collection phase, they proceeded to examine and interpret the gathered information.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods

The analysis of the collected data integrated quantitative and qualitative approaches to achieve a comprehensive understanding by combining measurable trends with in-depth insights. On the quantitative side, descriptive statistical methods were employed to interpret the numerical data obtained primarily from the closed-ended items of the student questionnaires. Frequencies and percentages were used to describe response distributions, with percentages calculated using the formula: $percentage = \frac{F}{N}100$. To further examine overall response tendencies, mean scores were computed based on a five-point Likert scale using the formula: $Mean = \frac{(fx)}{N}$. These statistical techniques are widely recognized for their effectiveness in organizing and presenting survey data in educational research (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Field, 2013).

Qualitative methods were also applied to explore the descriptive data gathered from open-ended items. This involved a systematic process of reviewing and coding student responses to identify recurring themes, patterns and meaningful insights related to their grammar learning experiences. Qualitative analysis allowed for an interpretation of students' perspectives, complementing the numerical findings and enhancing the validity of the study through methodological triangulation (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Denzin, 2012).

3.7 Ethical Considerations

This study involved human participants and strictly adhered to ethical principles to protect their rights, dignity, and well-being. Before data collection, the researchers conducted a briefing outlining the study's objectives, procedures, and potential risks and benefits, allowing the participants to ask questions and provide informed consent. To ensure privacy and anonymity, all identifying information was removed and replaced with coded labels, and the data were securely stored with access limited to the researchers. The study was approved by the institutional ethics committee and complied with the established educational research standards. Throughout the process, the researchers maintained transparency, respect, and fairness, and the findings were reported in a way that preserved participant confidentiality while being shared with the schools to support decision-making and future improvements, thereby enhancing the study's credibility.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Students' Questionnaire Results

To assess the effectiveness with which teachers applied CGI, a questionnaire consisting of 14 items was administered to 124 students. Of the distributed questionnaires, 120 out of 124 (97%) were completed, returned, and included in the final analysis, providing reliable results.

Table 1 reveals that students stated that their teachers explained grammar to enhance communication,

Table 1: Students' Feedback about the Practices of Communicative Grammar Instruction

Statement	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
My teacher explains grammar in a way that helps us to communicate better.	Strongly disagree	21	17.5	3.28
	Disagree	24	20	
	Neutral	16	13.3	
	Agree	19	15.8	
	Strongly agree	40	33.3	
	Total	120	100	

with responses distributed across five categories and summarized by a mean score of 3.28, with 120 respondents participating. The largest proportion of students, 33.3% (n=40), "Strongly agree" that their teacher's grammar instruction aids in communication, suggesting a significant level of satisfaction. Meanwhile, 15.8% (n=19) "Agree", and 13.3% (n=16) remained "Neutral," indicating a mix of affirmation and indifference. However, a notable portion expressed dissatisfaction: 20% (n=24) "Disagree" and 17.5% (n=21) "Strongly disagree," accounting for a combined 37.5% who did not find the teaching approach beneficial for communication skills. The mean score of 3.28, slightly above the neutral midpoint of 3.00, indicates a moderate overall agreement but also highlights some division in opinion, with a lean toward positive perceptions and a significant contingent of dissenting views. This suggests that while a plurality of students recognize the communicative value of grammar instruction, a meaningful portion of students' responses indicate room for pedagogical improvement.

Table 2: Students' Remarks about the Real-Life Grammar Use

Statement	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
...	Strongly disagree	16	13.3	3.49
	Disagree	14	11.6	
	Neutral	23	19.16	
	Agree	29	24.16	
	Strongly agree	38	31.6	
	Total	120	100	

Table 2 reflects students' remarks regarding "My teacher focuses on using grammar in real-life situations," based on the responses of 120 participants. The majority of students responded positively: 31.6% (n=38) "Strongly agree" and 24.16% (n=29) "Agree," totaling 55.76% who support the notion that their teacher emphasizes practical grammar application. "Neutral" responses accounted for 19.16% (n=23), suggesting moderate uncertainty. On the other hand, a smaller portion expressed disagreement, with 13.3% (n=16) "Strongly disagree" and 11.6% (n=14) "Disagree," making up a combined 24.9% who do not perceive a strong real-life focus in grammar teaching. The calculated mean score of approximately 3.49 indicates an overall favorable assessment that is clearly above the neutral midpoint of 3.00 on the Likert scale, reinforcing the conclusion that students generally believe their teacher links grammar instruction to real-life contexts. However, the presence of both neutral and disagreeing responses suggests that while the majority is positively inclined, there may be variability in the consistency or perception of this teaching method. Hence, the results indicate that most students recognize and appreciate their teachers' efforts to make grammar instruction relevant to real-life communication.

Table 3: Students' Statements about Their Teacher's Ability to Teach Grammar Communicatively

Statement	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
I believe that my teacher understands how to teach grammar for communication.	Strongly disagree	18	15	3.45
	Disagree	20	16.7	
	Neutral	11	9.2	
	Agree	32	26.7	
	Strongly agree	39	32.5	
	Total	120	100	

Table 3 presents students' statements, "I believe my teacher understands how to teach grammar for communication," based on the responses of 120 participants. The majority of students expressed a positive view: 32.5% (n=39) "Strongly agree" and 26.7% (n=32) "Agree," totaling 59.2% who affirmed

their teacher’s competence in this area. This strong endorsement suggests that more than half of the students perceived their teachers as effectively facilitating grammar instruction in a communicative context. Meanwhile, 9.2% (n=11) responded “Neutral,” reflecting a small portion of students who neither agreed nor disagreed. On the other end, 16.7% (n=20) “Disagree” and 15% (n=18) “Strongly disagree,” indicating that nearly a third (31.7%) of the respondents held some level of skepticism about the teacher’s ability to teach grammar for communication. The overall mean score of 3.45, above the neutral midpoint of 3.00, suggests a generally favorable view, although the presence of a notable dissenting minority indicates some variability in students’ experiences or expectations. Thus, the data reflect a generally positive perception of the teacher’s grammar instruction, with a solid majority of students recognizing communicative competence, while a smaller but notable portion remains unconvinced.

Table 4: Students’ Remarks about Teachers Balancing Grammar Rules and Communicative Use

Statement	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
My teacher focuses on grammar rules and how to use them in speech and writing.	Strongly disagree	26	21.6	2.9
	Disagree	27	22.5	
	Neutral	24	20	
	Agree	19	15.8	
	Strongly agree	24	20	
	Total	120	100	

Table 4 presents students’ responses to the statement “My teacher not only focuses on grammar rules, but also on how to use them in speech and writing,” based on 120 participants. The data show a divided set of perceptions, with a slight inclination toward disagreement. Specifically, 22.5% (n=27) “Disagree” and 21.6% (n=26) “Strongly disagree,” together making up 44.1% of respondents who do not believe that their teacher integrates grammar instruction into practical communication contexts. Meanwhile, 20% (n=24) were “Neutral,” indicating that a significant portion of students neither confirmed nor denied the statement. On the positive side, 15.8% (n=19) “Agree” and 20% (n=24) “Strongly agree,” summing to 35.8% who felt that their teacher does go beyond grammar rules to focus on usage in speech and writing. The mean score of 2.9 fell below the neutral midpoint of 3.0, suggesting a mild tendency toward disagreement among the students. This indicates that while some students recognize the efforts to make grammar instruction communicative, a larger proportion either do not perceive these efforts clearly or feel that they are insufficient. Therefore, students are somewhat divided, but the data suggest that many do not see their teachers emphasizing the practical use of grammar in communication.

Table 5: Students’ Statements about Grammar Lessons’ Relevance to Daily Language Use

Statement	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
Grammar lessons are connected to our daily language use.	Strongly disagree	6	5	3.79
	Disagree	10	8.3	
	Neutral	28	23.3	
	Agree	35	29.2	
	Strongly agree	41	34.2	
	Total	120	100	

Table 5 presents student responses to “Grammar lessons are connected to our daily language use,” based on feedback from 120 participants. A clear majority of students expressed a positive view: 34.2% (n=41) “Strongly agree” and 29.2% (n=35) “Agree,” totaling 63.4% who affirmed that lessons were meaningfully tied to everyday communication. Meanwhile, 23.3% (n=28) responded “Neutral,” indicating that nearly a quarter of the students were uncertain or perceived a moderate connection. Only a small minority expressed disagreement, with 8.3% (n=10) “Disagree” and 5% (n=6) “Strongly disagreeing,” together accounting for just 13.3% of the responses. The calculated mean score of 3.79 was well above the neutral midpoint of 3.00 on the Likert scale, indicating a generally favorable perception. This suggests that most students recognize their teachers’ efforts to make grammar instruction relevant to real-life language use. The results reflect strong student agreement that grammar teaching is practical and applicable to their everyday communication, with very limited opposition.

Table 6 reflects student responses to the statement “We often do speaking activities that help us practice grammar,” based on feedback from 120 participants. The distribution reveals a somewhat divided perception among students, although it is slightly positive overall. A combined 44.16% of students

Table 6: Students’ Statements about How Often Speaking Activities Support Grammar Practice

Statement	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
We often engage in speaking activities that help us practice grammar.	Strongly disagree	23	19.16	3.08
	Disagree	27	22.5	
	Neutral	17	14.16	
	Agree	24	20	
	Strongly agree	29	24.16	
	Total	120	100	

“Agree” (20%) or “Strongly agree” (24.16%) that speaking activities are regularly used to reinforce grammar learning, suggesting that nearly half of the students recognize the practical, communicative use of grammar in class. Meanwhile, a significant proportion, 41.66%, “Disagree” (22.5%) or “Strongly disagree” (19.16%), indicating that many students feel these activities are either insufficient or infrequent. Additionally, 14.16% of students remained “neutral,” possibly reflecting uncertainty or variability in their classroom experiences. The overall mean score of 3.08 was just above the neutral midpoint of 3.00, indicating a mild tendency toward agreement. This suggests that while many students acknowledge the use of speaking activities for grammar practice, a notable portion of the class does not fully share this view, pointing to inconsistencies in how these activities are applied or perceived.

Table 7: Students’ Statements about Group and Pair Work for Grammar Instruction

Statement	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
Our teacher uses group or pair work to teach grammar	Strongly disagree	9	7.5	3.65
	Disagree	10	8.3	
	Neutral	30	25	
	Agree	36	30	
	Strongly agree	35	29.16	
	Total	120	100	

Table 7 reflects student responses to “Our teacher uses group or pair work to teach grammar,” with 120 respondents. A majority of students agreed to some degree, with 36 students (30%) “Agree,” and 35 students (29.16%), “Strongly agree,” making up nearly 60% of the total responses. A significant minority were “Neutral,” with 30 students (25%) neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the statement. Meanwhile, 10 students (8.3%) “Disagree,” and 9 students (7.5%), “Strongly disagree,” together represent about 15.8% of the responses. The mean score of 3.65, which is slightly above the neutral point, suggests that students tend to agree that the teacher employs group or pair work in grammar instruction, indicating a generally positive perception of collaborative learning in grammar lessons. This highlights the main point that most students recognize and appreciate the use of collaborative methods in grammar instruction in the classroom.

Table 8: Students’ Evaluations about Grammar Use in Writing and Storytelling Activities

Statement	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
We use grammar for writing or storytelling exercises.	Strongly disagree	25	20.8	3.01
	Disagree	23	19.2	
	Neutral	22	18.3	
	Agree	26	21.6	
	Strongly agree	24	20	
	Total	120	100	

Table 8 shows that 120 respondents evaluated the item “We use grammar in writing or storytelling exercises,” and the responses were evenly distributed across all the categories. A combined 40% of participants “Disagree” or “Strongly disagree” (20.8% and 19.2%, respectively), indicating that a significant portion of students do not perceive grammar being applied in writing or storytelling tasks. Meanwhile, 41.6% “Agree” or “Strongly agree” (21.6% and 20%), suggesting that a slightly larger, but still comparable, group recognizes such integration. About 18.3% remained “Neutral.” The mean score of 3.01, which is close to the neutral midpoint, implies that there was no strong agreement or disagree-

ment among the participants. This suggests that the integration of grammar into writing or storytelling exercises is inconsistent or unclear and may vary depending on the teacher or lesson context. Hence, the responses reflect a balanced view regarding the use of grammar in writing or storytelling, with a mean (3.01) suggesting a neutral stance. This indicates an inconsistency in the practical application of grammar in these contexts.

Table 9: Students' Remarks on Activity-Based Grammar Instruction

Statement	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
Grammar is taught through activities, not only through exercises and drills.	Strongly disagree	19	15.8	3.48
	Disagree	16	13.3	
	Neutral	12	10	
	Agree	35	29.2	
	Strongly agree	38	31.6	
	Total	120	100	

Table 9 reflects the students' responses to the statement "Grammar is taught through activities, not only through exercises and drills," with 120 participants. The distribution shows that most students held a favorable view of activity-based grammar instruction. Specifically, 35 students (29.2%) "Agree" and 38 students (31.6%) "Strongly agree," totaling 73 students (60.8%) responded positively to this item. On the other hand, a smaller portion of students expressed disagreement, with 19 students (15.8%) "Strongly disagree" and 16 students (13.3%) "Disagree," combining to 29.1%. Meanwhile, 12 students (10%) remained "Neutral." The calculated mean of 3.48, which is above the neutral midpoint on a 5-point Likert scale, indicates that the students generally agree that grammar teaching involves engaging activities beyond traditional drills and exercises. This suggests that students perceive a more interactive and varied approach to grammar instruction in their classroom experience.

Table 10: Students' Statements about the Opportunities to Use Learned Grammar in Speaking

Statement	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
I get a chance to speak English using the grammar that I have learned in class.	Strongly disagree	15	12.5	3.48
	Disagree	19	15.8	
	Neutral	17	14.2	
	Agree	32	26.6	
	Strongly agree	37	30.8	
	Total	120	100	

Table 10 illustrates the responses to the statement "I get a chance to speak English using grammar we learned in class," with 120 participants. The distribution of responses indicates a positive perception among students regarding opportunities for spoken practice using the learned grammar. Specifically, 32 students (26.6%) "Agree," and 37 students (30.8%) "Strongly agree," totaling 69 students (57.4%) who felt that they were given opportunities to apply grammar in spoken English. Meanwhile, 17 students (14.2%) responded "Neutral," possibly indicating uncertainty or inconsistency in their experiences. On the opposing end, 15 students (12.5%) "Strongly disagree," and 19 students (15.8%) "Disagree," amounting to 34 students (28.3%) who do not feel they are provided with such opportunities. The mean score of 3.48, slightly above the neutral midpoint, suggests a modest lean toward agreement. This implies that while most students perceive a classroom environment that supports speaking activities involving grammar, there is still a considerable minority that does not share this experience, highlighting the need for improvement in making spoken grammar practice consistent across students.

Table 11 presents student responses to the statement "There is enough time in class to practice grammar in real communication," based on feedback from 120 participants. The distribution of responses suggests mixed perceptions among the students. A total of 53 students (44.1%) "Agree" to some extent, with 27 students (22.5%) agreeing and 26 students (21.6%) "Strongly agree," indicating that nearly half of the class feels there is sufficient time dedicated to applying grammar in meaningful communication. However, a substantial portion of the students expressed dissatisfaction, with 16 students (13.3%) "Strongly disagree" and 29 students (24.2%) "Disagree," totaling 45 students (37.5%) who believed that there was not enough time for such practice. Additionally, 22 students (18.3%) remained "neutral," possibly reflecting uncertainty or variability in their classroom experiences. The calculated mean of 3.15, slightly above the neutral midpoint, reveals a mild leaning toward agreement. This suggests that while

Table 11: Students' Suggestions about Sufficient Class Time for Communicative Grammar Practice

Statement	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
There is sufficient time in class to practice grammar in real communication.	Strongly disagree	16	13.3	3.15
	Disagree	29	24.2	
	Neutral	22	18.3	
	Agree	27	22.5	
	Strongly agree	26	21.6	
	Total	120	100	

some students recognize time being allocated for communicative grammar use, many others either do not perceive it consistently or feel that it is insufficient, highlighting an area where instructional time management might be improved to better support grammar practice in real communication.

Table 12: Students' Remarks about the Class Size and Participation in Grammar Activities

Statement	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
There was an adequate class size to practice communicative grammar activities.	Strongly disagree	12	10	3.35
	Disagree	25	20.8	
	Neutral	26	21.6	
	Agree	23	19.2	
	Strongly agree	34	28.3	
	Total	120	100	

Table 12 presents student responses to the statement "There is enough class size to practice communicative grammar activities," with input from 120 students. The distribution of responses revealed a generally positive, but varied, perception among students. A total of 57 students (47.5%) expressed "Agree," with 23 students (19.2%) "Agree," and 34 students (28.3%) "Strongly agree," indicating that nearly half of the respondents remarked that sufficient class size is allowed for communicative grammar practice. Meanwhile, 26 students (21.6%) selected the "Neutral" option, suggesting that a notable portion of students were unsure about the class size as neither sufficient nor insufficient. On the other hand, 12 students (10%) "Strongly disagree" and 25 students (20.8%) "Disagree," making up 37 students (30.8%) who felt that there was not enough class size. The mean score of 3.35, above the neutral midpoint, reflects a modest agreement, implying that while students recognize class size being provided for using grammar in communication, the experience may not be consistent for all, pointing to an opportunity for teachers to further enhance or clarify such practices in the classroom.

Table 13: Students' Anxiety about Using Grammar in Speaking

Statement	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
Sometimes, I feel shy or afraid to use grammar in speaking.	Strongly disagree	10	8.3	3.83
	Disagree	9	7.5	
	Neutral	18	15	
	Agree	37	30.8	
	Strongly agree	46	38.3	
	Total	120	100	

Table 13 represents student responses to the statement "Sometimes I feel shy or afraid to use grammar in speaking," based on the feedback from 120 participants. The results indicate a clear trend toward agreement, with a combined 83 students (69.1%) either "Agree" (37 students, 30.8%) or "Strongly agree" (46 students, 38.3%), suggesting that a significant majority of students experience some level of anxiety or hesitation when using grammar in spoken English. Meanwhile, 18 students (15%) responded "Neutral," which may reflect varying experiences of the respondents. On the other end of the scale, only 10 students (8.3%) "Strongly disagree" and 9 students (7.5%) "Disagree," totaling 15.8%, do not share this feeling of shyness or fear when speaking English. The mean score of 3.83, well above the neutral point, reinforces the conclusion that many students feel self-conscious or anxious about applying grammar in speaking situations.

Table 14: Students’ Desire for More Activities to Enhance Grammar Use in Speaking and Writing

Statement	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
I want more activities to help me use grammar when speaking or writing.	Strongly disagree	6	5	3.54
	Disagree	26	21.6	
	Neutral	23	19.2	
	Agree	27	22.5	
	Strongly agree	38	31.6	
	Total	120	100	

Table 14 presents student responses to the statement “I want more activities to help me use grammar when I speak or write,” based on 120 students. The results show a clear inclination toward agreement, with 27 students (22.5%) “Agree” and 38 students (31.6%) “Strongly agree.” Together, 65 students (54.1%) expressed a desire for more grammar-integrated activities in speaking and writing, indicating that more than half of the class saw value in further practical engagement with grammar. Meanwhile, 23 students (19.2%) selected “Neutral,” suggesting some uncertainty or ambivalence toward the current level of grammar-focused activities in their classes. On the other hand, 26 students (21.6%) “Disagree” and only 6 students (5%) “Strongly disagree,” totaling 26.6% who do not feel the need for more such activities. The calculated mean of 3.54, which is above the neutral midpoint on a 5-point Likert scale, reflects a general trend of agreement.

4.2 Classroom Observations Results

Table 15: Teachers’ Educational Background

Teachers	Gender	Qualification	TEFL Experience	Secondary School Teaching Experience
Teacher 1	Female	BA in English	10	5
Teacher 2	Male	MA in TEFL	18	10
Teacher 3	Male	MA in TEFL	9	4
Teacher 4	Male	BA in English	6	2

Table 15 shows that among the four teachers observed, there was variation in qualifications and teaching experience. Three of the teachers were male, and one was female. Two teachers (Teachers 2 and 3) hold Master’s degrees in TEFL, while the other two (Teachers 1 and 4) have Bachelor’s degrees in English. Teacher 2 stands out as the most experienced, with 18 years of TEFL experience and 10 years of teaching at the secondary level, suggesting a strong theoretical and practical foundation. Teacher 3 also had an academic background with nine years of TEFL experience and four years at the secondary level. In contrast, Teacher 4 was the least experienced, with only six years in TEFL and two years in secondary teaching, which may have affected her ability to implement advanced instructional strategies. Teacher 1, the only female, has 10 years of TEFL experience and 5 years in secondary education, indicating moderate experience but only undergraduate-level qualifications.

4.2.1 First Round Observation Results

The analysis of the first round of classroom observation (1st RCO) revealed both strengths and areas needing improvement in the teacher’s application of CGI. Strong implementation was observed in several areas of the study. The teacher consistently presented grammar through contextualized activities (4 “Yes”), which aligns with CLT principles that emphasize teaching grammar in meaningful contexts to enhance communicative competence. Group and pair work were regularly encouraged (4 “Yes”), supporting the idea that collaborative activities foster interaction and negotiation of meaning, which are central to effective language learning. Grammar instruction was also integrated across all language skills (4 “Yes”), reflecting the holistic approach advocated in CLT, where grammar is taught as part of communicative tasks rather than in isolation. Role-play and simulation activities were used effectively (3 “Yes” and 1 “No”), with research showing that such activities can enhance learners’ engagement

Table 16: Summary of Classroom Observations

Checklist Items	1st RCO		2nd RCO		Total Frequency			
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes		No	
					No.	%	No.	%
The teacher presents grammar through contextualized activities	4	-	3	1	7	87.5	1	12.5
The teacher organizes role-play and simulation activities	3	1	4	-	7	87.5	1	12.5
The teacher facilitates information gap tasks	2	2	3	1	5	62.5	3	37.5
The teacher encourages group and pair work	4	-	4	-	8	100	-	0
The teacher incorporates grammar games	-	4	2	2	2	25	6	75
The teacher implements task-based language teaching (TBLT)	2	2	3	1	5	62.5	3	37.5
The teacher provides error correction during communicative activities	3	1	4	-	7	87.5	1	12.5
The teacher assigns personalized speaking and writing tasks	-	4	2	2	2	25	6	75
The teacher uses multimedia resources	-	4	-	4	-	0	8	100
The teacher integrates grammar instruction into all language skills lessons	4	-	3	1	7	87.5	1	12.5

and practical use of grammar. Additionally, the teacher provided timely error correction during communicative tasks (3 “Yes” and 1 “No”), supporting the findings that immediate feedback aids in the internalization of grammatical structures.

Despite its strengths, the components of the CGI were inconsistent. Information gap tasks and TBLT were only partially implemented (2 “Yes” and 2 “No”), indicating a need for more consistent use of these techniques to promote meaningful communication and grammatical accuracy in the classroom. Grammar games were not used at all (0 “Yes” and 4 “No”), although research indicates that games provide a fun and engaging way to practice grammar. Similarly, personalized speaking and writing tasks were absent (0 “Yes” and 4 “No”), even though such tasks have been shown to increase student motivation and facilitate the application of grammar in real-life contexts. The teacher also did not use multimedia resources (0 “Yes” and 4 “No”), despite evidence that multimedia can enhance grammar instruction by providing visual and auditory support for learning. These gaps suggest the need for a more dynamic, learner-centered approach that incorporates interactive and authentic materials to increase students’ engagement, motivation, and communicative competence. This analysis situates the findings within the broader context of current research on communicative grammar instruction, highlighting both effective practices and areas for improvement.

4.2.2 Second Round Observation Results

The analysis of the second round of classroom observation (2nd RCO) shows noticeable improvements in several aspects of CGI compared to the first round. The teacher demonstrated consistent strength in organizing role-play and simulation activities (4 “Yes”), encouraging group and pair work (4 “Yes”), and providing error correction during communicative tasks (4 “Yes”), highlighting a solid emphasis on interaction and fluency development, which are essential components of communicative language teaching (Hemnani, 2023). There was also progress in implementing TBLT, with three “Yes” and only 1 “No”, and a similar improvement in facilitating information gap tasks (3 “Yes” and 1 “No”), suggesting a growing effort to integrate meaningful communication and real-life language use in classroom practice. Despite these gains, some areas remain underdeveloped. While grammar games and personalized

speaking/writing tasks were introduced (2 “Yes” and 2 “No” for both), their limited use indicates that these strategies are not yet fully embedded, even though research shows that such activities enhance learner motivation and promote the practical application of grammar in real contexts (Kizi, 2024). Multimedia resources continued to be completely absent (0 “Yes” and 4 “No”), reflecting a persistent gap in providing multimodal input to support varied learning styles (Peckham, 2020). Additionally, there was a slight decline in integrating grammar across all language skills (3 “Yes” and 1 “No”) and in presenting grammar through contextualized activities (3 “Yes” and 1 “No”), indicating an occasional inconsistency in foundational practices. To further strengthen CGI, teachers should aim to fully incorporate personalized, interactive, and multimedia-based activities while maintaining consistent contextualized and skills-integrated grammar teaching, which research suggests is crucial for developing both accuracy and communicative competence (Sevy-Biloon, 2018).

4.2.3 Observational Data Presentations

The classroom observation results from Bule Hora University Community and Bariso Dukale Secondary School revealed a generally positive but inconsistent application of CGI in Grade 10 English classrooms. Overall, teachers showed a strong inclination toward using communicative strategies, especially to promote interactive grammar learning. Notably, both observations confirmed that grammar was consistently presented through contextualized activities (87.5% implementation) and that group and pair work were fully utilized (100%). These findings indicate that classrooms prioritize meaningful interactions, aligning with the core principles of CGI. Role-play, simulation activities, and error correction during communication were frequently observed, with an implementation rate of 87.5%. This suggests that teachers actively foster realistic language use and guide learners toward accurate grammar application without hindering fluency. Similarly, grammar instruction was well integrated into all language skills lessons (87.5%), showing a commitment to holistic language development rather than isolated grammar instruction.

Despite these strengths, the observation also identified critical gaps that hindered the realization of CGI principles. The use of information gap tasks and TBLT was moderate, each applied at a rate of 62.5%, reflecting the inconsistent application of student-centered communicative tasks. However, the minimal or absent use of grammar games (25%), personalized speaking and writing tasks (25%), and multimedia resources (0%) is concerning. These components are essential for increasing student engagement, enhancing input variety, and fostering personalization, all of which are integral to effective CGI. Their absence suggests that while teachers are familiar with and apply CGI strategies, they still rely on conventional or teacher-centered practices in certain areas.

4.3 Teachers’ Interview Data

Four English language teachers from Bule Hora University Community School and Bariso Dukale Secondary School were interviewed to address Research Question Two (RQ2), which focuses on the practical implementation of communicative grammar teaching strategies in classrooms. The interviews complemented the data collected through the questionnaires and classroom observations, ensuring the reliability, consistency, and accuracy of the findings. By analyzing the teachers’ perspectives, the researchers were able to verify the information and gain a deeper understanding of how CGI is applied in real-world classroom contexts. The interview responses were systematically summarized and analyzed to highlight the patterns, successes, and challenges of the practical application of CGI.

The teacher interviews offered rich insights into their understanding of communicative grammar teaching. When asked about their approach, all teachers emphasized that grammar should be taught within meaningful communication rather than in isolation. They stressed the importance of connecting grammatical structures to authentic real-life situations, such as conversations, role-plays, debates, and reading or writing tasks that mirror everyday communication. They noted that this approach helps students develop both accuracy and fluency simultaneously. By embedding grammar instruction in practical contexts, students can apply structures meaningfully, making learning more engaging, memorable, and relevant to their everyday language use.

Regarding professional training, all respondents reported having received instruction in communicative approaches to grammar, either during their initial teacher education, TEFL certification programs,

or through professional development and online courses. This training equipped them to design student-centered, interactive lessons that balanced form-focused instruction and communicative practice. The teachers highlighted that linking grammar to real-life communication builds learners' confidence and promotes active language use. It allows students to internalize grammatical structures naturally rather than relying solely on rote memorization, fostering a deeper understanding and longer-lasting retention.

In describing their classroom practices, teachers explained that they used a combination of inductive and deductive teaching methods depending on students' proficiency levels. Grammar is often introduced within real-life contexts, followed by guided activities where students notice patterns and practice them through pair work, group tasks, discussions, and role-plays. Speaking and writing exercises, such as class interviews, surveys, and creative storytelling, were consistently used to provide meaningful opportunities for applying grammar rules. Teachers observed that students responded positively to these communicative strategies, demonstrating increased motivation, engagement, and confidence, while experiencing lower anxiety levels when using the language in context.

Despite these successes, teachers acknowledged several challenges in fully implementing CGI. Large class sizes, limited instructional time, insufficient resources, and rigid curricular demands have been cited as major constraints. They also mentioned difficulties in balancing accuracy and fluency, supporting shy or reluctant learners, and preparing authentic, communicative materials. To address these challenges, teachers suggested ongoing professional development, access to multimedia and authentic materials, smaller class sizes, flexible lesson schedules, and collaboration with colleagues as potential solutions. They emphasized that these supports could enhance student engagement, promote interactive learning, and allow for more effective integration of communicative grammar instruction in the classroom.

4.4 Discussions

The results obtained from the questionnaires, classroom observations, and teacher interviews created an understanding of how CGI operates in educational institutions. Students who experienced CGI instruction demonstrated improved fluency, greater variety in their syntactic choices, and an enhanced ability to self-correct during interaction. Research shows that communicative methods help learners use language effectively while developing their ability to interact with others (Ellis, 2003; Larsen-Freeman, 2003). The research results of Tudini (2018) show that students who learn through CGI acquire grammar skills for real-time communication tasks better than they do through traditional form-focused instruction. The study showed that CGI improves speaking accuracy for immediate communication needs, but its effects on grammar skill retention and formal assessment results require further research (Norris & Ortega, 2000).

Teachers demonstrated foundational insight into CGI principles, particularly the importance of teaching grammar through authentic communication. This awareness supports students' ability to acquire language skills in meaningful contexts (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The findings of this study are consistent with Andrian (2023), who reported that both teachers and students perceive CGI as essential for preparing learners for future academic and real-world demands, including global communication and problem solving. However, full implementation remains limited because students are not consistently provided with sufficient opportunities to practice grammar in authentic situations. As one teacher noted, "The communicative approach focuses on teaching grammar through meaningful communication," reinforcing the principle that grammar should not be taught in isolation but rather integrated into communicative activities (Long, 1991).

Although teachers possess theoretical knowledge of CGI, their depth of understanding and classroom application vary considerably (Kolovou, 2023). While some teachers demonstrate a grasp of communicative principles, others exhibit only a superficial understanding, which affects the consistency and effectiveness of the implementation. This variation is supported by Schoen (2018), who emphasized the importance of sustained professional development in enhancing teachers' pedagogical practices. Similarly, studies suggest that without adequate training and support, teachers may struggle to translate theory into practice, leading to partial or inconsistent implementation of communicative approaches (Butler, 2011; Littlewood, 2007). Thus, strengthening teacher training and professional development is essential to ensure a deeper and more uniform understanding of the CGI methodology among educators.

However, the data from observations showed that teachers used CGI in different ways throughout their various classrooms. The first observation showed that teachers applied contextualized grammar presentation, collaborative learning, and multiple language skill development. These practices follow CLT principles, which require teachers to present grammar through authentic contexts so that students can improve their ability to communicate (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The evidence supports the idea that interactive communicative teaching methods enable students to acquire language skills while practicing grammatical structures in real-life situations (Ellis, 2003; Larsen-Freeman, 2003). They show that teachers apply communicative teaching methods through their efforts to create interaction opportunities and their use of grammar in natural language contexts.

Despite these strengths, the application of effective CGI systems requires further development to address multiple critical components. Teaching methods show insufficient engagement with students through dynamic instructional methods, which should include grammar games, customized speaking and writing activities, and multimedia materials. Research widely supports the role of interactive tasks and authentic materials in increasing learner engagement, motivation, and communicative competence (Nunan, 2004; Tomlinson, 2011), suggesting that their absence may hinder optimal learning outcomes. The findings of this study align with those of teachers who face multiple challenges when trying to implement CGI because of large class sizes, limited time for communicative activities, and a lack of access to multimedia resources. Studies have highlighted that these constraints reduce teachers' ability to diversify their instructional practices and fully adopt communicative approaches in real classroom contexts (Butler, 2011; Littlewood, 2007).

Teachers who understand the value of CGI face difficulties with its complete application because their teaching environment includes too many students, their teaching time is restricted, and their teaching materials are insufficient. The challenges educators face in their work mirror research findings that show that educational institutions face structural challenges that prevent them from implementing CLT in their academic programs (Hu, 2002; Li, 1998). The teachers stated their worries about finding the correct balance between accurate language use and smooth speech because they believed that students would develop permanent grammar problems through excessive emphasis on spoken communication. The research demonstrates that teaching methods should combine form-focused instruction with practical language use, because this approach creates better learning results (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Long, 1991). The development of language fluency and accuracy requires educators to maintain an appropriate balance between teaching communication skills and providing direct grammar training.

Generally, this study proves that while CGI enhances learners' fluency, syntactic variety, and real-time self-correction capabilities, its pedagogical potential is hampered by a disconnect between theoretical awareness and classroom execution. Although educators recognize grammar as an essential and contextualized "fishing rod" for competent speech (Wang, 2010), inconsistent depth of understanding and systemic barriers, such as overcrowded classrooms, limited resources, and restricted instructional time, result in only partial implementation. The findings suggest that English language instruction has successfully returned to a model in which grammar is viewed as an indispensable pillar of communication. However, achieving a perfect balance between fluency and accuracy requires sustained professional development and structural support to ensure effective integration of form-focused instruction into authentic real-world interactions.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

This study set out to evaluate the implementation of communicative grammar instruction at the Grade 10 level by examining teachers' theoretical knowledge, classroom practices, and the challenges affecting its use. The research found that teachers who possess the necessary qualifications and demonstrate adequate theoretical knowledge of CGI fail to apply this knowledge in their teaching practice. Teachers handle grammar teaching through a system that requires students to adhere to rules while they demonstrate their understanding of grammar and assess students' ability to create accurate sentences. Teachers reported using interactive strategies such as pair and group work, but classroom observations and student responses showed that these techniques had limited application during the grammar lessons. Teachers faced two major challenges when attempting to deliver context-based CGI because

they lacked teaching materials. Students developed strong memorization habits because they had few chances to practice real language skills, which would help them achieve their language competence goals.

5.2 Recommendations

To optimize CGI efficacy, educators are encouraged to move away from conventional rote memorization toward more dynamic and communication-centered approaches, where grammar is treated as a functional tool rather than a package of rules. The shift involves inductive teaching strategies, which help students uncover grammatical patterns during meaningful interactions instead of just passively receiving explanations. Additionally, learners should have an active role in their own progress by doing practical task-based classroom activities that narrow the distance between what they know theoretically and what they can actually use in real life. If these pedagogical changes are to last, schools and other institutions need to tackle the logistical obstacles, such as crowded classrooms and insufficient resources, so that there is an environment that can support the successful implementation of CGI.

Funding Information

No author received funding for the purpose of this research

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest

References

- Abdulrahman, N. C. (2019). Linguistic, communicative, and interactional competences. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics*, 10(1), 1600–1616.
- Abdushukurova, U. (2024). The grammar of fluency: Bridging traditional grammar teaching with communicative language practice. *Interdiscipline Innovation and Scientific Research Conference*, 2(20), 436–443.
- Abiy, Y. (2011). Effects of teacher mediation on student concept development in amharic literacy. *Journal of Language and Culture*, 2(3), 45–56.
- Akyel, A. (2000). Form-focused instruction in communicative language teaching: Implications for grammar textbooks. *TESL Canada Journal*, 18(1), 47. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v18i1.899>
- Allehyani, B. (2026). Students' awareness of the importance of using proper english grammar in the job market: A critical examination of perceptions and practices. *Frontiers in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1825388>
- Aminah, A. (2023). The role of grammar in meaningful communication. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14(2), 45–56.
- Amirjanli, M. (2025). Explicit vs. implicit grammar instruction: A review of current debates. *Language Teaching Review*, 19(1), 77–92.
- Andrian, D. (2023). Grammar instruction in communicative language teaching classrooms: Student teachers' perceptions. *Future Trends of Science and Education*, 78.
- Azimi, M. (2016). *Efl teachers' beliefs towards current methods of teaching english grammar in a selected language center* [Master's thesis]. University of Malaya.
- Belpaeme, T. (2018). Interactive learning and language development. *Educational Technology & Society*, 120–132.
- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2016). *Research in education*. Pearson.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the asia-pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 36–57.

- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2000). *Teaching english as a second or foreign language* (3rd). Heinle & Heinle.
- Cents-Boonstra, M., Lichtwarck-Aschoff, A., Denessen, E., Aelterman, N., & Haerens, L. (2021). Fostering student engagement with motivating teaching: An observation study of teacher and student behaviours. *Research Papers in Education*, 36(6), 754–779. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2020.1767184>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th). SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods approaches* (5th). Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N. K. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6(2), 80–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689812437186>
- Dereje, M. (2012). *An exploration of english language teaching in ethiopian secondary schools* [MA thesis]. Addis Ababa University [Unpublished].
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second-language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using ibm spss statistics* (4th). Sage.
- Finnegan, R. (2012). *Oral literature in africa* (Open Book Publishers ed.). Open Book Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0025>
- Fontana, M. (2015). *The social barriers female chinese international students encounter when transitioning to a private high school in the united states* [Doctoral dissertation]. California Lutheran University.
- Garner, B. A. (2021). *Garner's modern english usage* (5th). Oxford University Press.
- Getinet, T., & Alemu, A. (2020). Teachers' perceptions of communicative language teaching in ethiopian secondary schools. *Ethiopian Journal of Education*, 40(2), 1–20.
- Goldberg, R. T. (2023). Recovering grammar. *Legal Writing*, 27, 1–25.
- Habiburrahman, M. A. (2025). The importance of grammar in communication. *EJI: English Journal of Indragiri*, 9(2), 498–512.
- Harahap, W. S. P., & Ardi, H. (2023). Teachers' communicative competence. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 276–285. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-166-1_40
- Harun, M. (2019). Teaching grammar for communicative purposes. *ELT Journal*, 73(4), 389–398.
- Hemnani, B. M. B. (2023). *The development of oral interaction: The use of functional language to achieve communicative efficiency in the efl classroom* [Unpublished].
- Hery, Y. (2017). Teachers and students perceptions of communicative competence in english as a foreign language in indonesia. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 12(12), 867–883. <https://doi.org/10.5897/err2017.3243>
- Heugh, K., Benson, C., Bogale, B., & Yohannes, M. A. (2007). *Final report: Study on the medium of instruction in primary schools in ethiopia* (tech. rep.). Ministry of Education.
- Hidayati, R. A. (2023). *The effectiveness of the learning together strategy in teaching vocabulary* [Doctoral dissertation]. UIN Mataram.
- Hinkel, E. (2024). *Teaching academic esl writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar* (2nd). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003312584>
- Hu, G. (2002). Potential cultural resistance to pedagogical imports: The case of communicative language teaching in china. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 15(2), 93–105.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–285). Penguin Books.
- Kizi, N. E. (2024). Effective ways of teaching grammar. *Eurasian Journal of Academic Research*, 4(7S), 319–322.
- Kolovou, M. (2023). Teachers' interaction patterns. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 21(5), 1451–1472. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-022-10270-0>
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (2nd). New Age International Publishers.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Heinle.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2019). Grammar. In *An introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 19–34). Routledge.
- Li, D. (1998). "it's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in south korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 677–703.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in east asian classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40(3), 243–249.

- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot et al. (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). John Benjamins.
- Lyster, R. (2013). *Content-based language teaching*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203855649>
- MDPI. (2026). Self-determined learning in multilingual distance education: A review on heutagogical practices, autonomy, metacognition, and technology-enhanced learning. *Multilingual Education*. <https://doi.org/10.3302/3042-6308/2/1/3>
- Meydan, C. H., & Akkas, H. (2024). The role of triangulation in qualitative research: Converging perspectives. In *Principles of conducting qualitative research in multicultural settings* (pp. 98–129). <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-3306-8.ch006>
- Ministry of Education. (2017). *Grade 10 english syllabus* (tech. rep.). Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Education.
- Moe, M. M. (2019). Teaching grammar through communicative language teaching. *International Journal for Advanced Research and Development*, 4(8), 75–77.
- Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of l2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50(3), 417–528.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Olafson, L., Grandy, C. S., & Owens, M. C. (2014). Qualitative approaches to studying teachers' beliefs. In *International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs* (pp. 128–149). Routledge.
- Osborne, N., & Grant-Smith, D. (2021). In-depth interviewing. In *Methods in urban analysis* (pp. 105–125). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-1670-4_6
- Peckham, S. (2020). Task-based learning in language classrooms. *Language Education Studies*, 12(2), 66–80.
- Purgina, M. (2020). Wordbricks. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 58(1), 126–159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633119833011>
- Putra, M. T. I. (2021). Teaching communicative grammar: A literature review. *Cape Comorin Journal*.
- Rama, J. L., & Agulló, G. L. (2012). The role of grammar teaching: From communicative approaches to the common european framework of reference for languages. *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.4995/rlyla.2012.1134>
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd). Cambridge University Press.
- Ruzmetova, D. (2025). *Interactive techniques in language teaching* [Unpublished manuscript].
- Sadeghi, K. (2024). Effects of communicative grammar instruction on efl learners. *Journal of Second Language Studies*, 18(1), 101–119.
- Santos, K. D. S. (2020). Multiple triangulation. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, 25, 655–664. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-81232020252.12302018>
- Schoen, R. C. (2018). *Cgi teacher development programs* (Research Report No. 2018-25).
- Sevy-Biloon, J. (2018). Integrating efl skills for authentically teaching specific grammar and vocabulary. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(2), 175–184. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v5i2.9705>
- Sheng, L. (2024). Challenges in implementing communicative approaches in efl contexts. *TESOL Quarterly*, 58(2), 233–250.
- South, L. (2022). Likert scales in visualization. *Computer Graphics Forum*, 41(3), 43–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cgf.14511>
- Spada, N. (2008). Focus on form. In *Encyclopedia of language and education*. Springer.
- Sreehari, P. (2012). Communicative language teaching: Possibilities and problems. *English Language Teaching*, 5(12). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n12p87>
- Sun, Y. (2022). Form-focused instruction in efl classrooms: A global perspective. *System*, 105, 102745.
- Tadesse, T. (2014). Efl teachers' beliefs and practices in ethiopia: The case of communicative language teaching. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(31), 141–147.
- Tekeste, N. (2010). *Education in ethiopia: From crisis to the brink of collapse*. Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.
- Tesfaye, W., & Davidson, L. (2008). The use of english as a medium of instruction in ethiopian secondary schools. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 29(3), 263–276.
- Thwaite, A. (2019). Halliday's view of child language learning: Has it been misinterpreted? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(5), 42–56. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v44n5.3>
- Tomlinson, B. (2011). *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd). Cambridge University Press.
- Tudini, V. (2018). Interactivity in language learning. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(2), 132–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2015.1120738>
- Wang, F. (2010). The necessity of grammar teaching. *English Language Teaching*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n2p78>
- Watkins, C. (2021). *Teaching assistant handbook: A guide for graduate students*. Routledge.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*.

- Woymo, W. (2024). Communicative grammar instruction in ethiopian secondary schools. *Ethiopian Journal of Education*, 44(1), 55–72.
- Wright, A. (2016). *Games for language learning* (3rd). Cambridge University Press.
- Zam, Z., Caicedo, A. L., Patiño, A. E. C., Alvarez, A. N. M., & Arévalo, T. V. O. (2025). Speaking skills and grammar knowledge among english as a foreign language learners at a public high school in marcabeli, 2025-2026 school year. *Ciencia y Reflexión*, 5(1), 672–695. <https://cienciayreflexion.org/index.php/Revista/article/download/810/1407/5510>
- Zang, X. (2018). Grammar teaching in communicative classrooms. *ICESSH 2018 Proceedings*, 282–285. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icessh-18.2018.64>