



# Benefits of Communicative Method of Teaching Grammar in a Bhutanese Higher Secondary School: A Qualitative Study

Pema Lhadon <sup>a\*</sup>, Sonam Daker <sup>b++</sup>,  
Kesang Wangmo <sup>b#</sup> and Kelzang <sup>c†</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Changzamtog Middle Secondary School, Thimphu, Bhutan.  
<sup>b</sup> Samtse College of Education, The Royal University of Bhutan, Bhutan.  
<sup>c</sup> Thrimshing Higher Secondary School, Trashigang, Bhutan.

## Author's contribution

This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJESS/2023/v43i1932

## Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/98820>

Original Research Article

Received: 13/02/2023  
Accepted: 15/04/2023  
Published: 28/04/2023

## ABSTRACT

The effective method to teach grammar to students has been a point of disputation between advocates for language acquisition and linguistics. The study investigated the benefits of the Communicative Method of Teaching Grammar (CMTG) in a Higher Secondary School under

<sup>++</sup> (Supervisor) Lecturer;

<sup>#</sup> (Co-Supervisor) Lecturer;

<sup>†</sup> Teacher;

\*Corresponding author: Email: pemalhadon\_wcs@education.gov.bt;

Thimphu Thromde. The study was based on the constructivist paradigm and adopted a qualitative case study research design. The study involved twelve students and three English teachers selected purposefully from a Higher Secondary School in Thimphu. The data was collected through one-on-one interviews, Focus group discussions (FGDs), and lesson observations. The data collected was analysed employing the thematic analysis procedure of Creswell & Creswell [1].

The findings revealed the benefits of CMTG. The results showed that the benefits of CMTG included enhancing speaking abilities, fostering creativity, comprehensible input, and the ability for effective communication.

This study recommends that English teachers pursue professional development in the Communicative Method of Teaching Grammar (CMTG) and maintain an average class size of 20 to 25 students. This study also suggests providing classrooms with a sufficient variety of technologically advanced instruments. The CMTG should be used to teach grammar to students, and relevant stakeholders in education should provide policy recommendations on how to train in-service and pre-service teachers on its use. The benefits of CMTG could be thoroughly investigated in future studies utilizing a quasi-experimental design.

**Keywords:** Communicative; grammar; method; benefits; teachers; students.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Various methods for teaching English as a second language have emerged during the past 50 years and helped to advance this discipline [2]. The majority of language teachers and students today prefer Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) over other English teaching methods because of the comprehensive information and abilities it provides students [3]. Grammar is recognised as one of the linguistic means to achieve the communicative goals [4].

Initially English grammar was taught through the traditional methods such as the Grammar Translation Method (GTM), The Direct Method, The Audio-lingual Method, and Presentation Practice and Production (PPP) Method. Traditional methods of teaching grammar focus on the learning of grammar rules and structures. Learners are taught grammatical rules to master sentence patterns [5]. Therefore, the traditional methods of teaching grammar, despite its facilitative effects stand less chance of impacting on language acquisition. As such, the ever-growing need to fill in the insufficiencies of these earlier methods gave rise to the teaching of language through the Communicative Method [6].

The introduction of CLT changed the way teachers teach grammar in English language learning [7]. The CLT gained popularity in the 1970s and prevails in language-teaching methodological theory to this day. Consequently,

CLT is interpreted and applied in a variety of ways [8].

In the context of Bhutan, English plays a vital role in the Bhutanese education system. The role of language in education, in general, and English, in particular, is a key factor that impacts the overall effectiveness of Bhutan's system of government-run education [9]. Tayjasanant & Robinson, [10]. Therefore, it was made mandatory to teach all the subjects in English except Dzongkha. In addition, teaching-learning of English in Bhutan was guided by a 2002 policy document issued by Ministry of Education (MoE) entitled, *'The Silken Knot: Standards for English for Schools in Bhutan'* [11]. The method of teaching grammar in the Higher Secondary Schools in Bhutan continued to be guided by *"The Silken Knot"* till 2005.

One of the major transformations in the field of Bhutanese education system was the revision of English curriculum in 2006. The revision of the English curriculum brought many changes in terms of teaching English to the learners of English language in the Higher Secondary Schools such as grammar. The CMTG was introduced in the Higher Secondary Schools when the National Curriculum Framework was launched in 2006. It focused on teaching grammar through the context, which is referred to as the CMTG in this study.

Thus, this study was conducted to explore the benefits of Communicative Method of Teaching Grammar (CMTG) in a Higher Secondary School (HSS) under Thimphu Thromde.

## 1.1 Purpose of the Study

According to the Curriculum Framework for English, the teaching and learning of grammar in the Higher Secondary Schools should be focused on its functionality and usage [12]. The Curriculum framework for English further mandates the teaching of grammar to be integrated with the teaching of literary texts. Teaching grammar through literary texts is one of the strategies of CMTG. However, as an English teacher in a Higher Secondary School for the past seven years observed that some English teachers do not strictly adhere to the CMTG to teach grammar to the learners. Consequently “Students were found to be poor at grammar usage both in speaking and writing” [13]. Grammar is an essential component of English language learning. The method employed by teachers to teach grammar to the students is critically important for meaningful learning. Numerous studies have investigated beliefs and attitudes of teachers in teaching grammar [14,15], Strategies and approaches to teach grammar [16], and Bhutanese Teachers’ conceptualization of Communicative Language Teaching [17,18]. In addition, several studies report that grammar instruction in English as Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms is still based on the traditional methods [19-21]. However, these studies have focused on the conceptualization, attitudes and practices of teaching grammar in general and very little is known about the effective method of teaching grammar, the Communicative Method of Teaching Grammar. There is lack of research on CMTG in the Bhutanese context. As a result, the existing literature on CMTG is inadequate for teaching grammar to the students for life-long learning in the Higher Secondary Schools in Bhutan. Teachers, therefore, find themselves unaware and ill-equipped with the appropriate skills and knowledge to teach grammar communicatively to the students. Furthermore, researchers recommend teachers to explore more creative, innovative and enjoyable approaches to teach grammar [22].

Thus, this study was intended to address the literature gap by providing adequate literature to motivate teachers to adopt the most effective method of teaching grammar. As a result, the students will be able to enhance their written and spoken proficiency in English.

## 1.2 Research Question

What are the benefits of Communicative Method of Teaching Grammar in a Higher Secondary School under Thimphu Thromde?

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Since grammar is one of the most essential aspects of language, the approach to teaching grammar also corresponds to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). CLT first appeared in the late 1960s [23]. It was Hymes who proposed the concept of communicative competence. He further defined “communicative competence” as what is necessary for a speaker to know to enable him/her to communicate with others [24]. In addition, Sreehari [25] asserts that CLT was then further developed in the early 1980s by Canale and Swain.

According to Liu and Shi [26] the CLT aims to make communicative competence the goal of language teaching through activities related to actual communication and perform meaningful tasks. In addition, Richards [27] opines that CLT is a set of principles about the goals of language teaching, how learners learn a language, the kind of classroom activities that best facilitate learning, and the roles of teachers and learners in the classroom. Also, Richards and Rogers [27] state that language learning is best served when students interact, complete a task, learn content or resolve real life issues as the goal of language is to develop communicative competence. The method of teaching grammar can be thoroughly examined only if it is positioned in a broader conceptual framework, i.e., language [28].

Therefore, the concept of CMTG, in this study is defined based on the four interconnected characteristics given by Brown [29].

- (1) Classroom goals focus on all of the components of communicative competence and is not restricted to grammatical or linguistic competence.
- (2) Language techniques are designed to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes.
- (3) Fluency is considered more important than accuracy in order to keep learner meaningfully engaged in language use.
- (4) In the communicative classroom, students ultimately have to use the language productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts (p. 241).

Communicative Method of Teaching Grammar focuses on the enhancement of the fluency of the learners rather than on the accuracy of the learners while communicating in English in a variety of situations.

The concept “benefit” in this study refers to the advantages that learners gain as a result of the CMTG employed by the teachers in grammar. CMTG makes use of a communicative rather than the structural approach to the learning of English grammar. Firstly, according to Littlewood [30] since the 1990s, national language education policies in ESL countries have shifted toward CLT to increase the number of learners who can effectively communicate in English. Therefore, it demonstrates that this method of teaching grammar enhances the learners’ fluency. Next, the meaning-focused communicative grammar instruction in classroom allows learners to communicate effectively in different context [31-36]. Here too, the literature reveals that the ability to communicate effectively is the advantage learners’ gain when grammar is taught through the Communicative Method (CM).

In addition, context-oriented and significant grammar learning has an extraordinary effect on language instructors and with this new pattern, students ought to get an opportunity to utilize language they learned in a genuine setting with native English speakers [37]. This is true because teaching grammar through the communicative method helps learners to use language correctly in real-life situations, express and justify their ideas, views, and emotions, use language and their imagination to represent and explore the human experience.

A similar outcome is also evident in the manner in which grammar is taught in a Higher Secondary School in Bhutan. The study on “*Beliefs and practices of Bhutanese teachers in teaching English as a second language in Bhutan regarding grammar instruction*” by Dhendup (2020) establishes that the positive development in English language is observed with the implementation of new English curriculum. The implementation of new English curriculum by the teachers is an indication that teachers teach grammar to their learners through the communicative method. Eventually, learners can develop their written and spoken proficiency in English language and enable them to convey their thoughts, feelings, and experiences in an

effective and appropriate manner in a variety of contexts.

Furthermore, the communicative approach of grammar instruction emphasizes “task-oriented, student-centred” language teaching practice and gives students a thorough understanding of how to communicate in English [2]. Additionally, the CMTG incorporates the comprehensible input-based approach by Krashen [38]. According to Krashen [38], instead of learning about language, studying the rules, and memorization of terminology, we receive understandable input in a low anxiety scenario. Teaching grammar through the communicative method does not require the students to memorize grammatical items and grammatical rules. Therefore, learners will have no or low anxiety, which in turn will lead to meaningful learning of grammar.

By contrast, teaching grammar through the traditional methods focuses on accuracy. It mandates the learners to memorize the forms and rules of grammar items thereby causing anxiety in the learners. Consequently, learners will be unable to make text-to-life connections.

However, in the CMTG, efficient communication and comprehensible pronunciation are important aspects of the communication. Furthermore, Wangmo [39] discusses that the main aim of teaching grammar communicatively is to provide hands-on learning experiences to enhance “students’ grammatical skills and communicative competence, consequently making the learning and teaching of grammar fun, interesting, and meaningful” [39]. It indicates that the infusion of authentic texts into learning situations, allows learners to focus on the learning process and they attempt to link classroom language learning with language activities outside of the classroom. As such, the CMTG emphasizes the target language communication. In addition, Krashen [38] claimed that more contextual and interactive books and procedures allow teachers to teach grammar in a meaningful manner. Likewise, teaching grammar through stories stimulates the creativity and imagination of the students [40].

Therefore, it is evident from the above reviews of literature that CMTG engages learners in communicative activities. The main objective of learning a foreign language is not only the knowledge of the language but is also the ability for language [27] and it is the ability to use it in communicative situations. In the teaching and

learning situation, it is significant to facilitate the progression from the acquisition and use of vocabulary and grammar to communicate in an efficient manner. Hence, enhancing the communicative competence of the learners [41,42].

Consequently, there are numerous benefits of CMTG such as it increases the learners' proficiency in the target language, stimulates learners to think critically and it allows learners to be more confident when interacting with others. Thus, learners will enjoy communicating with others in English.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

This study is based on the constructivism paradigm with the goal to find the benefits of CMTG in a Higher Secondary School under Thimphu Thromde. The qualitative research approach was chosen for this study because Creswell and Creswell [1] point out that qualitative research is an approach to explore and understand the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem. Hence, to understand how the participants make meaning of CMTG and to collect valuable and relevant data for the study, the researcher adopted the qualitative research approach. Furthermore, to get an in-depth understanding of the CMTG and to establish a credible platform to investigate the benefits of CMTG, this study was based on exploratory qualitative case study design.

#### 3.1 Sampling Strategies

A purposive sampling strategy was used over random sampling to collect the data needed for the study. Purposive sampling, according to Tongco (2007), is a methodology that involves the selection of participants who have the essential traits and assists the researcher to gather the most relevant data for the study. Since the aim of the study was to identify the benefits of CMTG in a HSS, the researcher purposefully selected six students from class XI, six students from class XII and three English teachers of classes XI and XII to collect the most relevant data for the study. The student participants comprised equal number of male and female students from classes XI and XII. The student participants consisted of high, average and low achievers as well as communicative students. The teacher participants consisted of two male teachers and a female teacher. The participants

were from a Higher Secondary School under Thimphu Thromde and they had lived experiences regarding the CMTG in a Higher Secondary School under Thimphu Thromde in Bhutan.

#### 3.2 Data Collection Method

To fetch the required data for the study, the researcher primarily used semi-structured interviews and lesson observation as the data collection tools.

#### 3.3 Interviews

This study adopted the semi-structured interview because it is one of the primary tools of the constructivist worldview. The questions that are asked of the participants in a semi-structured interview are not predetermined; rather, they are decided by the conversation between the researcher and the participants. The interviews generated the benefits and experiences of teachers and students with regards to CMTG. The researcher followed the interview protocol of Creswell and Creswell [1] and posed general, open-ended questions to one or more participants and recorded their responses. The data was subsequently transcribed for analysis.

#### 3.4 One-on-one-Interview

One-on-one interview allows the researcher to obtain a deeper insight to specific enquiries [43]. As such, the researcher conducted one-on-one interview with three English teachers of classes XI and XII (two from class XI and one from XII) to identify the benefits of CMTG. The two English teachers teach English in class XI and one English teacher teaches English in class XII. As such they represent all the English teachers of the HSS of the research site. The semi-structured interviews questions for the teacher interviewees comprised five guiding questions. Questions 1-2 adapted from Pema Dhendup.

1. The Curriculum guide provides standards for all skills: reading, writing, listening and speaking, from classes PP till XII. How do you integrate grammar in teaching these skills?
2. Have you ever had any interactive and interesting grammar lesson with your students? Could you share what made it so interesting and interactive?
3. Could you comment briefly on how good your students are at learning and applying grammar?

4. What is your opinion on communicative method of teaching grammar?
5. How do you think communicative method of teaching grammar helps students to enhance their fluency in English?

### 3.5 Focus Group Discussion

The researcher conducted focus group discussions (FGDs) with two groups of six members each from classes XI and XII to collect data regarding the CMTG. The FGDs comprised equal number of male and female students. The semi-structured interview questions for the FGDs contained seven guiding questions.

1. What is your view on learning grammar?
2. How often does your teacher use literary texts or stories to teach grammar?
3. What is your understanding of communicative method of teaching grammar?
4. What is your opinion of communicative method of teaching grammar?
5. What are the benefits of CMTG?
6. How do you think communicative method of teaching grammar helps you to enhance your fluency in English?
7. Would you like to suggest some ways for effective methods of learning grammar?

### 3.6 Lesson Observation

In order to obtain the data about the grammar instructional practice of English teachers, the researcher observed classroom teaching. A total of three lesson observations was done: two observations in class XI and one observation in class XII. The lesson observations were done after the semi-structured interviews and the FGDs. The teacher respondents for semi-structured interviews and lesson observations were same. The researcher conducted observation as non-participant. An observer who visits a location and takes notes without getting involved in the activities of the participants is known as a nonparticipant observer [44]. The researcher observed and recorded the events being studied while sitting at the back of the classroom.

The researcher tried to avoid/minimize bias during the process by following the observational protocol of Creswell, 2012 [44]. An observational protocol is a form designed by the researcher to take field notes during an observation [44]. The researcher adapted the observation protocol

from Creswell [44] to record a chronology of events or verbatim quotes of individuals regarding the CMTG. The observational protocol ensured that the researcher had an organized means to record and maintain observational field notes [44]. Therefore, to record and maintain the field notes regarding the benefits of CMTG, the researcher followed the observation protocol of Creswell, 2012. [44]

### 3.7 Data Analysis Procedure

The data collected through interviews and class observations were analysed thematically following the thematic analysis procedure of Creswell & Creswell, 2018 [1].

To identify themes for discussion, data from semi-structured interviews and lesson observations were recorded, compiled, transcribed, coded, and categorized into themes using colour coding. The researcher then examined the codes, discovered patterns among them, and came up with the themes.

For anonymity and confidentiality, the participants were coded as:

Teacher 1: T1  
Teacher 2: T2  
Teacher 3: T3

Focus group discussion 1: FGD1S1 to FGD1S6

Focus group discussion 2: FGD2S1 to FGD2S6

The data collected from the interviews were recorded and transcribed using the otter. ai app. To confirm the transcription accurately captured what the interviewees stated in response to the interview questions, the researcher repeatedly played the audio, listened to it and cross-checked with the transcription. To familiarize with the data, the researcher read and reread the transcription multiple times, colouring specific data points to identify prospective points that were relevant to the research questions. Through coding, the researcher started the data's systematic and latent analysis. A feature of the data that might be pertinent to the study question was identified and given a label using coding for the entire transcription. The data relevant to each code was collated and categorized under various categories. The various categories were then combined together if they appeared to have a

common theme, in order to represent and depict a meaningful pattern in the data. The combination of various categories was given names and formed the sub themes of the study. The researcher reviewed the sub themes in relation to the complete dataset and the research questions. The sub themes were further combined and categorized to depict the major findings. In order to ensure internal and external consistency in the analysis of research data, the researcher sought the opinion of the supervisor and co-supervisor to determine the themes and whether these themes overlap with the nature of the research. The researcher also ensured the trustworthiness of the study [45,46].

### 3.8 Trustworthiness

It is very important for a researcher to check the validity of qualitative findings (Creswell, 2009). Credibility in qualitative research is defined as the extent to which the data analysis is trustworthy (Creswell, 2007). Hence, the trustworthiness of this study was ensured through pilot testing, member checking and data triangulation.

### 3.9 Pilot testing

Pilot testing enables the researcher to make essential changes to the semi-structured-interview questions and lesson observation forms. Therefore, pilot testing was done a week before the actual data collection. It helped the researcher to modify the interview questions and the observation guidelines that were deemed necessary before the commencement of the study.

### 3.10 Member Checking

Member checking is used to ensure the accuracy of the qualitative findings by taking the final report or descriptions or themes back to participants and determining whether these participants feel that they are accurate (Creswell, 2007). To check the accuracy of the data gathered through the semi-structured interviews and lesson observations, the researcher gave the participant the transcribed interview responses and completed lesson observation forms for cross checking.

### 3.11 Data Triangulation

It is the method used to examine information from diverse sources and use it to develop a logical argument for themes. This method can be

claimed as adding to the trustworthiness of the study if themes are created based on the convergence of different sources of data or opinions from participants [1]. First the data collected from one-on-one interview was triangulated. The responses given by class XI English teachers was triangulated with those of class XII English teacher. Similarly, the responses got from class XI FGDs were triangulated with those of class XII FGDs. Finally, the data collected from the semi-structured interviews was triangulated with the data collected through lesson observations. Therefore, it enabled the researcher to find reliable and accurate final findings.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the context of this study, the term “*benefits*” refers to the advantages that learners gain as a result of the CMTG employed by the teachers in grammar lessons. One of the key findings of the study was the benefits of CMTG. The findings exhibited enhancement of speaking skills, fostering creativity, comprehensible input, and the ability to communicate well as the benefits of CMTG. The key elements that contributed to the positive outcome of the CMTG were evident in the analysis of the findings from the one-on-one interviews with the teachers, FGDs with the students, and lesson observations.

The findings of the study revealed the enhancement of speaking skills as one of the benefits of the CMTG. During the one-on-one interviews with the teachers, all the teacher interviewees reported that CMTG helps students to become fluent in English and enables the students to speak effectively in English. Similarly, the enhancement of speaking skills was pointed out as one of the benefits of CMTG by the student participants during the FGDs. For example, FGD1S4 said, “It makes us fluent in English. We can express our ideas well and we can speak well when we sit for job interviews.” In addition, FGD2S6 expressed, “Through the communicative method of learning grammar we learn how to use grammar correctly while speaking with others.” The lesson observations also demonstrated that the CMTG enhanced the speaking skills of the students. During the lesson observations, when the students were directed to construct and tell sentences of their own using grammar items such as figurative language, transitive and intransitive verbs and different kinds of sentences, they were able to use the grammar items in sentences of their own. This

finding indicates that CMTG provides opportunities for students to practice and apply the knowledge of the grammar learned. This in turn enables them to speak fluently in English. This finding is consistent with the studies that pointed out that meaning-focused communicative grammar instruction in the classroom allows learners to communicate effectively in a different context [31]; (Chung, 2005); [33]. Further, the finding also confirms that learning grammar that focuses on the functional purposes enables learners to speak fluently in English [7,34-36,42]. However, the lesson observations revealed that the enhancement of speaking skills was demonstrated by a few talkative and confident students in the class. Therefore, it is crucial for the teachers to find remedial measures to encourage all the students to participate in the class to enhance their speaking skills.

The finding of the study showed that fostering the creativity of the students is another benefit of CMTG. The results of the interviews revealed that when grammar is taught to students using the communicative method, students become creative. Teachers claimed that when they (teachers) teach grammar through the communicative method to the students, the students become creative and analytical. They also admitted that students can apply critical thinking and apply what they have learned when writing their essays or when conversing with others. For instance, T1 pronounced:

When we use this method, students can think when and where to use grammar items like idioms and figures of speech they have come across while reading stories or poems. They can think critically and use what they have learnt in their own write-ups or while making conversations with others.

Likewise, several of the students noted that when they study grammar using the communicative method, they develop critical thinking and context-analysis skills. For example, FGD1S4 stated:

The benefits of learning grammar through the communicative method would be because of this communicative method, many students will be encouraged to learn and develop interest in playing with words and creating our own poems and stories.

These findings indicate that the CMTG makes the students creative and analytical. These

findings are supported by prior research which showed that teaching grammar through the context stimulates the creativity and imagination of the students [40]. However, during the lesson observations, the creativity of the students was found to be limited to the context in which they were taught to use the grammar items. As such, it is pivotal for language teachers to create a more authentic context for students to use the knowledge of grammar learned in class.

Furthermore, the finding of the study demonstrated comprehensible input as one of the benefits of CMTG. The finding of this study aligns with the theory that CLT focuses on "task-oriented, student-centered" language teaching practice and it provides students with comprehensive use of English for communication [2]. Comparably, CMTG incorporates the comprehensible input-based approach [38]. Krashen [38] asserts that in a low-anxiety situation, we get comprehensible input rather than learning about language, studying the rules, and memorizing terminology. Therefore, this study validates that students can understand and learn more about the functional purposes of grammar through the CMTG.

In addition, the findings also exhibited the students' ability to use English in real-life situations as one of the benefits of CMTG. Most of the teachers articulated that when the teachers teach grammar through the communicative method, students can use English spontaneously in a variety of situations. This notion is represented in the quote by T3:

The communicative method places a strong emphasis on the capacity to master English language. Students can combine classroom instruction with practical application. They will be able to express well in different context such as sitting for job interviews or attending international conference etc.

Concurrently, the students opined that the CMTG provides them the platform for authentic context. For example, FGD2S3 said, "When we learn grammar through the communicative method, it is very beneficial for the students as each and every student can improve their effective methods of communications. We can communicate well in different situations."

This finding is in line with the study by Abdullah & Shah, [31]; Chung, [32]; Gutowska, [33]; Mammadova, [34] which revealed that the CMTG



allows learners to communicate effectively in a different context. Similarly, Wangmo [39] opined that the main aim of CMTG is to provide hands-on learning experiences to enhance “students’ grammatical skills and communicative competence. Thus, the finding of this study establishes that the use of CMTG enables learners to communicate well in real-life situations. Therefore, it is imperative for teachers to teach grammar through the communicative method.

Hence, the findings indicated that using CMTG helps students to improve their speaking abilities, promote their creativity, assist them in learning more, and enables them to communicate effectively in real-life circumstances.

## 5. CONCLUSION

This study revealed that there are several benefits of Communicative Method of Teaching Grammar (CMTG) in a Higher Secondary School.

The findings indicated that one benefit of the CMTG is the enhancement of the speaking abilities of the students. This shows that CMTG allows students to put their newly acquired grammatical knowledge to use. They can then speak fluently in English. However, the lesson observations revealed that only a few vocal and confident students in the class demonstrated an improvement in speaking abilities. Therefore, teachers must come up with corrective strategies to motivate all students to participate in class to improve their speaking abilities. Another significant finding of CMTG is the advancement of student creativity. This finding implies that the CMTG fosters students’ creativity and analytical thinking. Nevertheless, it was revealed that the students’ enhancement of creativity was restricted to the context in which they were taught to utilise the grammatical items during the lesson observations. As a result, English language teachers must develop more realistic contexts in which students can use the grammar they have learned in class. Furthermore, the findings demonstrated that one benefit of CMTG is comprehensible input. It suggests that through the CMTG, students can better comprehend and gain knowledge of the functional uses of grammar. In addition, the findings displayed Students’ capacity to use English in real -life situations in a range of contexts as one of the benefits of CMTG. Thus, teachers must teach grammar using the communicative method.

## 6. LIMITATIONS

Although this qualitative case study enabled me to acquire insights into the benefits of CMTG in a Higher Secondary School, the study is susceptible to some limitations, which are described below.

The findings are limited to one school under Thimphu Thromde. It is restricted to the academic year 2022 and the lesson observations employed for the data collection.

In addition, the results of this study cannot be generalised to larger populations with the same degree of assurance as quantitative analyses. This is so because the study employed a qualitative case study with only three types of data collection tools such as one-on-one interviews, focus group discussions and, lesson observations.

## 7. RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study highlighted the benefits of CMTG. The findings demonstrated the enhancement of students’ speaking skills and fostering creativity in students as the benefits of CMTG. However, the study is limited to one school and the topics taught during the lesson observations. Hence, research using a quasi-experiment design could be conducted to examine the benefits of CMTG in greater detail. In addition, research on CMTG across all levels in the schools is recommended to encourage teachers to adopt this method to teach grammar to the students.

## ETHICAL APPROVAL AND CONSENT

The researcher sought prior permission from the research team of Samtse College of Education, Ministry of Education, Chief Thromde Education Officer of Thimphu, school administration of the participating school, research participants and fulfilled the ethical codes of conduct to carry out the process of study. Prior to each participant’s participation in this study, an informed consent letter was sent outlining the study’s ethical considerations. The consent letter was designed to ensure that the participants had access to enough information to understand the study’s objectives and decide whether or not to participate voluntarily. The participants were informed about and offered consideration for the issues relating to confidentiality and anonymity. All participants were coded to ensure confidentiality and safeguard the participants. The researcher’s laptop contains password-

protected databases that contain all of the data sources, including lesson observation forms, fieldnotes, audiotapes, transcriptions, and other papers. These documents can be accessed by the researcher and the supervisor only. The Ethics committee at Royal University of Bhutan (RUB) has designated a deadline after which these data will be destroyed.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Creswell JW, Creswell JD. Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach. SAGE publications, Inc; 2018.
2. Richards JC. Communicative language teaching today. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre; 2005.
3. Nguyen NM. Using stories in presenting English grammar to Vietnamese young learners. *Int J TESOL Educ.* 2021;1(3): 286-300.
4. Nassaji H. Towards integrating form-focused instruction and communicative interaction in the second language classroom: Some pedagogical possibilities. *Modern Language J.* 2000;84(2): 241-50.
5. Doughty C, Williams J. Pedagogical choices in focus on form. *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition.* Cambridge University Press; 1998.
6. Suemith ME. The communicative language teaching approach: Theory and practice. *Magister scientiae, (30).* *Theor Pract | Suemith | Magister Scientiae. The Communicative Language Teaching Approach.* 2011;1-9.
7. Loewen S. Introduction to instructed second language acquisition. Routledge; 2014.
8. Criado Sánchez R, Sánchez A. English language teaching in Spain: Do textbooks comply with the official methodological regulations? A sample analysis. *English Language Teaching in Spain: Do Textbooks Comply with the Official Methodological Regulations? A Sample Analysis | International Journal of English Studies.* *Int J Engl Stud.* 2009;9(1).
9. Royal Education Council. The national education framework: shaping Bhutan's future. Thimphu: School Education and Research Unit; 2012.
10. Tayjasanant C, Robinson MG. Code-switching in universities in Thailand and Bhutan. *Asian Perspect.* 2014: 92-117.
11. Centre for Educational Research and Development. The silken knot: standards for English for schools of Bhutan. Paro, Bhutan; 2002.
12. Curriculum and professional support division. English curriculum framework. Thimphu: Ministry of Education; 2005.
13. Choeda C, Gyeltshen T, Daker S, Gyeltshen S, Wangmo W, Letho D. Communicative competence of secondary schools of Bhutan. *J Humanit.* 2020;2(1): 12-25. DOI: 10.22161/jhed.2.1.3.
14. Dendup P. The beliefs and practices of Bhutanese English teachers in teaching grammar in English as a second language (ESL) classroom in Bhutan. *Int J Linguist Transl Stud.* 2020;1(2):84-99. DOI: 10.36892/ijlts.
15. Dorji J. Communicative language teaching as conceptualized by Bhutanese English as second language teachers. *Indonesian EFL J.* 2017;3(1):1-10. DOI: 10.25134/ieflij.v3i1.648
16. Tshomo T, Choden U, Sherab K, Zangmo P. An Action Research Study with Class Eight students in Paro. *Teaching Grammar using Literary Texts.* *Bhutan J Res Dev.* 2019;8(2).
17. Dorji J. Teaching grammar: A survey of teacher's beliefs and attitudes in Bhutan. *J Asia TEFL.* 2018;15(2):30541. DOI: 10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.2.21.530
18. Dorji J, Puntai W. Bhutanese ESL teachers' conceptualization of communicative language teaching [paper presentation]. 2nd International Conference on Language, Literature, and Cultural Studies. Thailand: Mahidol University; 2015.
19. LaPrairie M. A case study of English-medium education in Bhutan. ([doctoral dissertation]. Institute of Education, University of London). A Case Study of English-medium education in Bhutan - UCL Discovery; 2014.
20. Nunan D. The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asian-Pacific region. *TESOL Q.* 2003;37(4):589-613. DOI: 10.2307/3588214

21. Tshomo T, Sherab K. Bhutanese teachers' and students' perceptions on using literary texts as English as a second language (ESL) teaching and learning materials. RABSEL CERD Educ J. 2017;18(1):26-42.
22. Wangdi N, Chalermnirundorn N. Language learning motivation of grade 12 learners in Bhutan. J Humanit Soc Sci Valaya Alongkorn. CERD Educational Journal - Google Scholar. 2019;14(3):171-86.
23. Nagalakshmi M, Rajaram GK. Recent trends in communicative language teaching and its role in the Sultanate of Oman. Int J Soc Sci Humanit Res. 2016;4(1):571-6.
24. Hymes D. On communicative competence. Sociolinguistics. 1972;269-29:269293.
25. Sreehari P. Communicative language teaching: possibilities and problems. Engl Lang Teach. 2012;5(12):87-93. DOI: 10.5539/elt.v5n12p87
26. Liu Q, Shi J. An analysis of language teaching approaches and methods: effectiveness and weakness. US China Educ Rev. ERIC - ED497389 - An Analysis of Language Teaching Approaches and Methods--Effectiveness and Weakness, Online Submission. 2007-5;4(1):69-71.
27. Richards JC, Rodgers T. Approaches and methods in language teaching. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press; 2001.
28. Khuong CT. Teaching English grammar communicatively: theories, and principles implications in English teaching in Vietnam. Int J Engl Lang Teach. 2015;2(2):68-76. DOI: 10.5430/ijelt.v2n2p68.
29. Brown HD. Principles of language learning and teaching. New York: Pearson Education, Inc; 2007.
30. Littlewood W. Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. Lang Teach. 2007;40(3): 243-9. DOI: 10.1017/S0261444807004363
31. Abdullah HI, Shah PM. Enhancing competency in English: the covert approach a complementary to the overt approach in teaching grammar [international journal]. Appl Linguist Engl Lit. 2015;4(1):191-7. DOI:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.1p.191
32. Chung SF. A communicative approach to teaching grammar: Theory and practice. Engl Teach. 2017;18.
33. Gutowska U. Formulacity in ESP teaching: A case of doing a balancing act between form and meaning. Stud Logic Grammar Rhet. 2017;49(1):89-108. DOI: 10.1515/slgr-2017-0006
34. Mammadova JI. Feasibility of CLIL implementation in the education system of Azerbaijan: attitude towards CLIL and the English I in higher educational institutions. Int J Engl Linguist. 2016;6(5):188-200. DOI: 10.5539/ijel.v6n5p188
35. Subramaniam R, Khan MH. Explicit grammar instruction in communicative language teaching: A study of the use of quantifiers. Malays J ELT Res. 2013;9(1).
36. Thornbury S. Methodology texts and the construction of teachers' practical knowledge. Available from: Avasshop.ir. In: The Routledge handbook of English language teacher education. Routledge. The Routledge Handbook of English Language Teacher Education. 2019; 509-21
37. Borg S. Teacher cognition in grammar teaching: A literature review. Lang Awareness. 2003;12(2):96-108. DOI: 10.1080/09658410308667069
38. Krashen S. Second language acquisition. Second Lang Learn. 1981;3(7):19-39.net).
39. Wangmo K. Module introduction and assessment [ Module LAN501 Power Point slides]; 2021.
40. Sentürk S, Kahraman A. The use of short stories in English language teaching and its benefits on grammar learning. Int J Curriculum Instruction. EJAL Article template. 2020;12(2):533-59.
41. Loewen S, Li S, Fei F, Thompson A, Nakatsukasa K, Ahn S et al. Second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. Mod Lang J. 2009;93(1):91-104. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00830.x
42. Widodo H. Approaches and procedures for teaching grammar. Engl Teach. 2006;5(1):121. Available:https://in\_1-with-cover-page-v2.pdf
43. Marshall C. Face-to-face interviews- *Advantages and disadvantages*. (99+) Face-to-Face Interviews - Advantages and Disadvantages | LinkedIn; 2016.
44. Creswell JW. Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches. Sage Publications; 2012.
45. Canale M, Swain M. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second

language teaching and testing. Appl 46. Curriculum and professional support  
Linguist. 1980;1(1):1-47. division. English curriculum framework.  
DOI: 10.1093/applin/1.1.1 Thimphu: Ministry of Education; 2006.

---

© 2023 Lhadon et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*  
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/98820>