

A Critique of English Grammar Teaching Approaches and Learning Outcomes in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Ijebu-Imusin, Ogun State

Nkopuruk, Imikan N.^{1*}

^{1*}Department of Arts Education, University of Abuja, Nigeria

* **Correspondence:** Nkopuruk, Imikan N.

The authors declare that no funding was received for this work.



Received: 04-February-2026

Accepted: 05-March-2026

Published: 09-March-2026

Copyright © 2026, Authors retain copyright. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> (CC BY 4.0 deed)

This article is published in the **MSI Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (MSIJMR)** ISSN 3049-0669 (Online)

The journal is managed and published by MSI Publishers.

Volume: 3, Issue: 3 (March-2026)

ABSTRACT: It is a well-known fact that English grammar is at the centre of language acquisition but the approaches that are used in teaching grammar still elicit scholarly controversy. This paper explored and discussed the instructional strategies and their consequent learning outcomes in government seniors schools in Ijebu-Imusin, Ogun State, in particular the strengths and weaknesses of the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) and the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) strategy. It employed a qualitative research design relying on the information regarding classroom observations, student assessment, and error analysis in the schools of Saint Anthony Grammar School (SANTOS) and Ikala Comprehensive High School (ICHS). The data was centered on both written and oral performance of the grammar of the students. The results showed that GTM is more likely to develop more structural accuracy in the product of the students but inhibits the process of building communicative competence. On the other hand, CLT encourages oral fluency and often allows the repetition of grammatical errors as unchecked. Students within GTM classrooms demonstrated better results in formal writing assignments whereas their counterparts in CLT-exposed

environments demonstrated better results in spoken-based communication situations. The research had a conclusion that neither of the two methods could be used independently to bring about holistic language proficiency. A comprehensive pedagogical approach that would combine explicit structural approach of GTM and interactive and contextual approach of CLT was thus suggested. The teachers are enticed to strike a functional balance between the form-based and meaning-based teaching. It is also recommended to make more comprehensive changes to the curriculum and provide teachers with continuous professional growth to improve the quality of grammar education. The results suggest a significant change in pedagogical practice that should be aimed at providing a hybrid instruction system, which would be responsive to linguistic diversity and need needs of students, and should lead to the enhancement of the overall outcomes in secondary education.

Keywords: *Language Proficiency, Communicative Language Teaching, Pedagogical Reforms, Error Analysis, Grammar-Translation Method.*

INTRODUCTION

The issue of the most appropriate way to teach grammar has been debated among language teachers over the centuries. Grammar instruction takes a pivotal role in the case of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) since it offers the structural foundation in which all four macro language skills, reading, writing, listening, and speaking, are based. A learner cannot build coherent sentences, understand written or spoken text or convey ideas effectively without having proper knowledge of grammar principles. Grammar controls how words change and blend and create useful sentences, as observed by Harmer (2013, as cited in Nunan, 2015), and with such knowledge, the students become productive when reading and communicating in English. The same author stated Whyld (2013) that not only productive skills are supported by familiarity with grammatical conventions, but also more aware of how language may work under communicative conditions.

Scholars have developed the issue of defining grammar in several ways. Francis (1954, as cited in Hartwell, 2015) found three different understandings grammar as a system of formal patterns, the arrangement of words into meaning; grammar as a discipline, which is interested in describing and analysing those patterns; and

grammar as a collection of conventions in accordance with which it is appropriate to use language. Neuleib (1977, as cited in Hartwell, 2015) agreed with the systemic perspective of Francis that grammar was the knowledge that the native speakers had inside and could share unconsciously. Patterson (1999, as cited in Ruppert, 2018) made a handy distinction between descriptive grammar, which attempts to interpret rather than dictate the correct way the language is used, and prescriptive grammar, which states rules and guidelines that an acceptable use of language should follow. In a cognitive linguistic approach, we have Fernandez (2011, as cited in Burgo, 2015) conceptualising grammar to be the abstract and implicit knowledge, which humans have of the morphological and syntactic frameworks of their own native language.

With these diverse definitions, there is multidimensionalism of grammar as a subject matter. Despite the theoretical schooling, there is a wide agreement that meaningful communication cannot be done without grammatical knowledge. Both Canale and Swain (2020) and Brown (2017) confirmed the importance of having grammar in order to use language in an ambiguous and inaccessible way to interlocutors. Nunan (2021) supported the teaching of grammar because in this way, it is easier to communicate in a target language more accurately and confidently, and according to him, the minimal level of grammatical competence is a condition of effective communication. It is based on this that classroom teachers play a crucial role in tutoring students to grammatical competency.

The controversy that surrounds the issue of whether or how to teach grammar has become a subject of debate over the decades. Traditionally, grammar was studied as an independent part of the study of languages, which could be separated, not connected with real communicative life. Researchers over time came to doubt this independent method, and argued instead in favor of embedding the teaching of grammar in meaningful use (Ruppert, 2018). Ruppert also made the difference between Formalist approaches, such as the structuralist work of the 1950s, of Chomsky; and Functionalist approaches, such as the 1970s work of Halliday, which saw grammar as inherently connected to textual organisation and communicative intent. This was furthered by conversational grammar scholars like Sack and

Schegloff who placed grammar in the context of human interaction and rhetorical exchange.

The Functionalist model became very popular after the application of communicative language teaching. Within this framework, grammar rules are presented in a way that is responsive to communicative needs instead of presented in advance as described by Hassan (2001) such that grammar teaching is contextualised and learner-relevant. It is these theoretical changes which have led to the development of the five major approaches to teaching grammar which have been described by Anh (2013), namely: the Traditional Approach, the Audiolingual Approach, the Cognitive Code Approach, the Comprehension Approach, and the Communicative Approach-each of which represents a different assumption about what language and language teaching is-and how it should be taught. Modern views of grammar are based on the idea that grammar is not only a principle but a resource of meaning. According to Larsen-Freeman (2021), grammar can be defined as a system of meaningful structures based on pragmatic constraints, and Thornbury (2019) defined it as a descriptive account of the rules of sentence structure, which entail the senses that these structures express. As Azar (2017) made it clear, grammar teaching assists students in revealing the logic behind the language as a whole and that, in the absence of grammar, the world would be limited to separate words, pictures, and signs. Ellis (2016) goes on to point out that good teaching in grammar helps in focusing the efforts of the learners on certain forms in a manner that will lead to meta-linguistic knowledge and enable both in comprehension and production.

Brown (2020) observed that in the contextualised teaching of grammar, learners are in a better place to use grammatical structures in all languages skills correctly. Contextualised grammar teaching provides the learner with a chance of noting how the forms work in real discourse, thus enhancing the comprehension and retention. Although the Communicative Approach was sometimes characterized as the denial of the significance of grammatical accuracy in the name of fluency, Al-Humaidi (2017) reminded that even in communicative pedagogical paradigms, effective communication usually requires grammatically consistent utterances, which explains the long-term survival of grammatical competence.

It is in this complicated pedagogical environment that the current research is placed. It majorly focuses on critically examining the teaching practices of grammar based in two state-owned senior secondary schools in Ijebu-Imusin, Ogun State and also examines the ramifications of the practices used by the teachers to the grammatical and communicative learning of the students.

Statement of the Problem

The process of grammar instruction in the school setting is complicated by the fact that the teachers have to balance the structural demands of the subject and the learning needs of the students. The Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach have long been a part of instruction of English in secondary schools in Nigeria, and the discussion of their relative efficiency has been decades old. Almost all Nigerian researchers have recognized the possible complementary character of these strategies, and the importance of explicit grammar teaching in EFL classes has been re-emphasized. The researcher has noted that grammar curriculum currently being followed in the public senior secondary schools in Ogun State is not responsive enough in terms of meeting the methodological needs of effective teaching of grammar. Consequently, learners often find it difficult to establish good command of the English grammatical constructions. To make this worse, the student bodies in different schools vary in the linguistic makeup and the learning requirements which means that a single-fit solution when it comes to teaching grammar will not be of much benefit to all learners. The English teachers are thus confronted with the issue of altering their approaches to diverse classroom settings. It is on this basis that the need to critically analyze the teaching practices that are in practice presently is eminent with an objective of establishing the teaching style or styles that are best suited to enhance the grammatical competence of students.

Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this research is to conduct a critical evaluation of the grammar teaching methods employed in two public senior secondary schools in Ijebu-Imusin community, Ogun State. The specific objectives are to:

- i. identify and categorise the grammatical errors produced by students of Saint Anthony Grammar School (SANTOS) and Ikala Comprehensive High School (ICHS), Ijebu-Imusin community, Ogun State.
- ii. determine whether structural differences exist between the written and spoken language output of students at SANTOS and ICHS, given their exposure to either the Traditional Grammar Translation Method or Communicative Language Teaching Approach.
- iii. establish the differences between GTM and CLT in their respective contributions to vocabulary acquisition, with particular focus on modifiers, at SANTOS and ICHS.
- iv. determine which method is most appropriate for grammar instruction at SANTOS and ICHS, Ijebu-Imusin community, Ogun State.

Research Questions

The following questions guided the investigation:

1. What types of grammatical errors are produced by students of SANTOS and ICHS, Ijebu-Imusin community, Ogun State?
2. Are there observable structural differences between the written and spoken outputs of students at SANTOS and ICHS, based on whether they were instructed using GTM or CLT?
3. In what ways do GTM and CLT differ in their effectiveness for teaching vocabulary, particularly modifiers, at SANTOS and ICHS?
4. Which grammatical teaching method may be considered the more appropriate option at SANTOS and ICHS, Ijebu-Imusin community, Ogun State?

LITERATURE REVIEW

There is a significant amount of literature on the English grammar teaching in various historical, theoretical, and pedagogical frameworks. The literature does not show a consensus but rather a prolonged debate especially on whether grammar is an

element of language curriculum, the level of explicitness needed during the teaching process and whether it is more form oriented or meaning oriented. In these works, grammar is presented not as a fixed set of rules but as an area of controversy, determined by the change in methodological paradigms and situational facts. Mella (2018) explored the conceptualisation and teaching of grammar in secondary schools, and differentiates mental, descriptive, and pedagogical grammar. Based on behaviourist and cognitive learning theories, the research involved the implicit-explicit acquisition debate as well as analysing the consciousness-raising plans in the classroom practice. The study applied a quantitative design and relied on the questionnaire data of sixteen schools in two times (2013 and 2018) to analyse the procedural preferences and professional attitudes of teachers towards grammar teaching. Although the results were an important statistical data point of the current trends in instruction, it was evident that the use of self-reported data was a limitation necessitating a further focus on how these attitudes are implemented in practice and how the institutional limitations influence them.

Thompson (2016) followed the historic path of grammar in second language teaching and revealed that grammar used to be the major organising principle of language teaching. This orientation however changed drastically with the advent of communicative language teaching (CLT) in the 1970s. The focal point of pedagogy has moved to the socio-cultural competence, use of language in real situations, and communicative effectiveness. Task-based and interaction-oriented methods increasingly became the replacement of audio-linguistic and grammar-translation methods. Despite the fact that this shift has widened the focus on meaning and genuine communication, it also created the issue of concerns that structural accuracy has been subordinated to fluency. Thornbury (2019) highlighted this fact by referring to grammar education as one of the least successful discussions in the second language learning. The perceived need to ensure systematic instruction was strengthened by the argument that learners who lacked grammatical guidance ran a risk of fossilisation the untimely fixation of incorrect forms. Ellis (2016) also noted that the approaches of communicative type, being productive in the respect of encouraging meaningful interaction, lacked a focus on the form of linguistic elements, in some cases. Comparative studies hinted that a balance between

communicative goals and a specific focus on grammar structures produces more equity in the achievements of learners as compared to following one side of the coin.

Outside the theoretical discussion, pedagogical propositions have tried to mediate the form and meaning. Soars (2016) suggested a combined approach that includes the stylistic analysis, which encourages learners to analyze both literary and non-literary texts using vocabulary, structure, and register as the criteria. This practice presupposes the processes by which meaning is created, grammar as a practical tool of authentic discourse. Rutherford (2017) touched upon the difference between inductive and deductive teaching of grammar. In deductive instruction, the rules are explicitly presented and thereafter practiced but in inductive methods, learners deduce the patterns based on contextualised examples. Inductive strategies can be linked to the principles of consciousness-raising and commonly attributed to the autonomy of learners, and deductive strategies are appreciated due to clarity and efficiency, especially when it comes to examination-based systems.

The grammar conceptualized by Richards, Platt and Weber (2012) as a system that comprises words and phrases into sentences. This structural approach notes the importance of grammar in the realization of linguistic acceptability and communicative accuracy. Grammatical competence is central even in communicative paradigms, as successful communication implies collective conventions of structure. The discussion has thus now lessened in terms of questioning the relevance of grammar and moved to questioning the best method in which grammar can be integrated.

Such changes in methodology are further contextualised through historical analysis. Howatt (2014) recorded the development of the language teaching as the pre-scientific traditions fuelled by trade and religion to the institutionalization of the Latin in formal education. Grammar Translation Method (GTM) was first introduced in Germany in the later eighteenth century and it formalized the instruction in translation and focused on learning the rules of grammar and the literary texts. Later methodological reforms often were responses to alleged weaknesses of GTM. However, the robustness of practices based on translation in most bureaucracies indicates that there is no linear and universal approach to methodological change.

This complexity is demonstrated by empirical comparisons of GTM and CLT. According to Uysal and Bardakci (2014), Turkish primary-level English teachers tended to use GTM because of the contextual reasons, including big classes, lack of time and exams. Sato and Kleinsasser (2019) established that a purely communicative orientation was not easy to maintain among teachers when grammar had to be clearly explained. Chang (2011) analyzing a Taiwanese college scenario made an inference that GTM was instrumental in learning grammar and involvement among the students. Gorsuch (2018) recorded the Japanese Yakudoku translation technique and could determine quantifiable advantages to grammar and vocabulary learning, especially exam performance.

On the other hand, Abbas and Ali (2014) reasoned that CLT was more effective in equipping learners to meet genuine communicative requirements especially in situations where English was used as a means of international communication. The same view was upheld by Conti (2016), who argued that the communicative methods increase the preparedness of the learners in their real-world communication outside the classroom. With the data collected by the questionnaires to evaluate the preferences of teachers, Jewad and Verma (2014) stated that CLT was universally seen as viable and useful in the practical teaching situation. Fotos and Nassaji (2004) also suggested methods that incorporate grammar into communicative activities where meaning-form relationships become more apparent with time as opposed to treating grammar as an independent material.

A study by Ezzi (2012) of primary and secondary school teacher in Yemen showed subtle perceptions towards grammar teaching. Most of them denied the fact that the English language could be learnt without teaching grammar explicitly and the fact that grammar is learnt naturally by simply engaging in communication. Meanwhile, the respondents were opposed to deep drilling or prioritizing the accuracy. Rather, most of them preferred to incorporate grammar throughout English classes and not consider it as a single subject. About half of them stated that they used inductive methods, over a third said that they used deductive methods and a small number of them used both approaches. Minority strategies were translation and cross-linguistic

comparison, although not all teachers did not use methods that were believed to be effective out of contextual reasons.

Nevertheless, the literature suggests that grammar teaching has a fluctuating and situational role in language teaching. The polarization between GTM and CLT or inductive and deductive approaches, tends to simplify the issues of classroom realities. Empirical evidence indicates that methodological efficacy is inhibited by curriculum structure, evaluation systems, teacher proficiency, class dimensions, and anticipations held by the learners. Instead of closing the debate with categorical support of one approach, the modern world scholarship is more inclined towards the principled integration. Grammar is understood as a means rather than as an end and a tool that facilitates communicative proficiency, textual analysis, and linguistic accuracy. The length of the grammar debate is indicative to more underlying conflicts between form and meaning, accuracy and fluency, tradition and innovation. The changes in behavior over history show that the paradigms of pedagogy are also not adjusted to the same changes as the intellectual trends and socio-political forces, but structural competence cannot be overlooked. Recent developments in research focus on the integration of grammar into the meaningful context without excluding the possibilities of explicit reflection and guided practice. These views imply that sustainable grammar pedagogy takes a balanced, flexible and contextual approach instead of being committed to methodological adherence.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present research is a qualitative work with a corpus approach. The methodological approach was informed by the nature of the research questions and the kind of data that would need to be observed to respond to the research questions as suggested by Richards et al. (2014). It commenced with a systematic study of the literature available on the role of grammar teaching methodology, which was also used to provide a map of the theoretical terrain, in addition to highlighting gaps that are possible to fill by the current research. The primary data were collected by direct observations in the classroom at both the schools involved in the study, which captured the language production of the students both in written and spoken language. The main analytical goal was evaluating the level of students in

grammatical structures and vocabularies based on their classroom products. The qualitative analysis of errors was adopted as the main research tool: the learner errors were categorized based on the possible categories of the sources of their origin, and it was possible to gain a more detailed insight into the nature and causes of constant problems. Sentences that were found to be ungrammatical were evaluated in relation to accepted standard formal English. In instances whereby there were several types of errors in a single sentence, the error with the most significant impact on the ability to be intelligible was given precedence throughout the analysis. The results section contains parts of the sentences which are ungrammatical and written in italics.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This segment gives the outcome of the study and critically evaluates both in Grammar Translation Method and the Communicative Language Teaching technique as used in the two schools involved in the study.

Identification and Categorisation of Grammatical Errors Made by Students of SANTOS and ICHS

The errors made by the students were classified in line with the classification framework designed by Ozcan (2012), which identifies two major groups: the first group based on the interference errors, which happens as a result of the effect of the the mother tongue (L1) on the production of English language, and the second group; developmental errors, which occur due to the imperfect acquisition of the target language rules by the learner.

Table 1. Categorisation of the errors

A	INTERFERENCE
A.1.	L1 interference with the EL
1.1	Syntactic errors
1.1.1	Word order
1.2	Insertion and deletion

1.3	Case marking
1.4	Third-person singular
1.5	Semantic level
1.6	The (Non) use of articles
A.2.	EL interference with EL
B	DEVELOPMENT ERRORS
B.1	The misapplication of rules or features
B.2	Overgeneralisation

(Ozcan, 2012, p. 2311–2322)

In this paradigm, the errors of learners were considered as the manifestations of performance (surface-level slips) and the manifestations of competence (underlying gaps in knowledge) and were organized into the categories of likely underlying causes rather than the categories of surface-level grammatical forms on their own (Ozcan, 2012).

Interference Errors in the Written Data of Students' Routine Class Assessments

In the written data of both schools, the interference errors were found to be a third of all errors detected. The two groups together gave 739 errors associated with interference, which is 20.8% of the total errors. The greatest number of these mistakes were found in the category of article use and omission with SANTOS and ICHS making 328 errors (9.2 per cent) and 411 errors (11.6 per cent) in this subcategory respectively.

Table 2. Interference errors in the written data

S/N	SANTOS	S/N	ICHS
(1)	<i>I hate the school but I love the Mr. Ayo because he is a wonderful person.</i> (Mi onife si Ile Iwe yen)	(2)	<i>(The) Bagger hasn't got money.</i>
(3)	<i>He clean the room.</i>	(4)	<i>I and my mum goes to</i>

S/N	SANTOS	S/N	ICHS
	(O tun iyara naa se)		<i>school.</i> (Emi ati iya mi lo si ke iwe)
(5)	<i>Zipper is wonderful a invention.</i> (Zipper je enia gidi ni didara)	(6)	<i>Oguns is rude a character.</i> (Awon Oguns je olori ni iwwu wasi.)
(7)	<i>I'm excited (excited) and scaried.</i>	(8)	<i>He is huntring (hunting).</i>
(9)	<i>Cemil is hung up Deliha.</i> (Cemil ti pa Deliha.)	(10)	<i>I saw my main school friends.</i> (Mo ri awon ore mi gidi.)
<i>Source: Students' Routine Essays, 2023</i>			

A common trend in both schools was the misplacement of definite article “the” before the object nouns in transitive verb formation as shown in example (1). In answering this usage, the SANTOS participants claimed to be employing “the” as an accusative case marking the former a direct transference of the Yoruba linguistic system, in which comparable case-marking functionality can occur (Ionin et al., 2014). On the other hand, example (2) demonstrates how the omission of the before a noun in the subject position has also been used. This exclusion is in line with the lack of definite article marker in Yoruba of the nouns that describe already-contextualised objects. The latter trend was more common in ICHS data.

The error of the third-person singular agreement will be described in example (3) and (4). The lack of the -s suffix on the verb in example (3) is a demonstration of the fact that Yoruba does not have a morphological marker on verbs that take third person singular subjects. Ironically, applying -s to a plural subject in example (4) indicates that -s had become a default agreement marker in some students, and they used it without considering grammatical number which is an overgeneralisation and is in line with previous results by Ozcan (2012).

The syntactic errors in examples (5) and (6) are the results of the Yoruba noun phrase order where modifiers and articles can be turned about in relation to conventional English patterns. Students replicated a Yoruba-type word order by putting indefinite

article after adjective instead of before the noun phrase. These word-to-word translations resulted in un-English grammatical sequences. The deletion and insertion mistakes in the cases (7) and (8) occurred by the means of analogical thinking: the students were using inflexional patterns of irregular verbs or the derivation processes differently, which was not compliant with the target language rules. The direct transfer of the meaning within Yoruba idiomatic expressions into examples (9) and (10) results in semantic errors that created lexical options that were syntactically correct but semantically incompatible in English.

Comparing the two schools, ICHS generated more overall frequencies of interference errors, especially in the article and third-person agreement categories, whereas SANTOS generated more errors in the word order and insertion/deletion categories, which is probably due to the activities based on translation that defined their instruction. The two groups did not make mistakes that could be attributed to the interference of the target language with itself, which can be interpreted by the fact that learners did not have enough command of the English language and were not able to compare the EL structures with each other (Ozcan, 2012).

The number of developmental errors was higher than the number of interference errors in both groups, approximately two-thirds of the total number of errors was due to developmental errors. The sub-totals of developmental errors by ICHS and SANTOS were 1568 and 1230, respectively (80 and 78.5 percent). The more common subcategory was the misapplication of rules and the second one was overgeneralisation.

Table 3. Developmental errors in written data

S/N	SANTOS	S/N	ICHS
(11)	<i>I am exciting.</i>	(12)	<i>I am scaring.</i>
(13)	<i>Where went to the princess?</i>	(14)	<i>I happied first day at school.</i>
(15)	<i>I did call my mother.</i>	(16)	<i>I readed the book</i>
(17)	<i>King is rules his country.</i>	(18)	<i>Man isn't know swimming.</i>
<i>Source: Achievement Test, 2023</i>			

Examples (11) and (12) represent a general mix-up between participial adjectives that end with -ed (revealing the condition of the experiencer) and those ones that end with -ing (revealing the attribute of the stimulus). Students were seen to apply the adjectives as present continuous verb forms and append -ing to describe the current states. Examples (13) and (15) show problems with auxiliary verb usage in interrogative and emphatic structures and example (14) shows the marking of the regular past tense suffix -ed with a stative verb in a predicative clause- a situation that requires a copular construction and not past tense.

The errors of over generalisation, as shown in (14) and (16) were the errors of the extension of regular past tense suffix -ed to irregular verbs. Lack of irregular verb forms in the Yoruba language might be the reason as to why the students of ICHS were especially vulnerable to this type of fault. Examples (17) and (18) show that students have the tendency to make copula (is) a general Simple Present Tense auxiliary and place it between main verbs in a manner that led to the occurrence of the same marking or the occurrence of structural redundancy. This may indicate that the students were yet to master the distributional restrictions that govern the use of auxiliary verbs in the English language.

Besides the analysis of errors, the descriptive analysis of vocabulary production was also carried out. The SANTOS students were able to retrieve and generate a variety of target vocabulary in both written and oral tasks than their ICHS counterparts.

Interference Errors in the Spoken Data

Among the 120 errors found in the oral productions of the participants, 49 (40.8 per cent) were interference errors and 71 (59.2 per cent) were developmental errors- a distribution which is generally similar to that in written data.

Table 4. Interference errors in spoken data

S/N	SANTOS	S/N	ICHS
(20)	<i>He is a from Irish.</i>	(21)	<i>Person feel like outsider</i>
(22)	<i>She might make a good husband.</i>	(23)	<i>Merlin and The Lady of the lake has powers!</i>
(24)	<i>One day, King Arthur rides his horse in the</i>	(25)	<i>This person is scaring and</i>

S/N	SANTOS	S/N	ICHS
	<i>woods and he sees a beautiful castle.</i>		<i>exciting.</i>
(26)	<i>Character feeling is sad, scare and exciting.</i>	(27)	<i>Merlin is helps Arthur.</i>
(28)	<i>He is likes himself.</i>	(29)	<i>It means when bell is ringing school is finish.</i>
<i>Source: Achievement Test, 2023</i>			

In example (20), there is a direct translation of a Yoruba where the particle in front of the preposition “from” was translated to the indefinite article “a”. In example (22), an idiomatic phrase used by the Yoruba with a reference to marriage was translated literally to give a phrase that had a different meaning in English than what the speaker intended. The process of semantic derivation can be illustrated with the help of the example (21): the student was translating the Yoruba notion of an “outsider” and enriched the preposition “outside” with the agentive suffix -er, thus creating “outsider” when a more specific phrase was needed.

In ICHS, there were a higher number of errors related to the third-person singular agreement in spoken data compared to written data, especially in those sentences with compound subjects, where the participants switched to the use of the singular verb forms. The example (24) given by SANTOS shows a curious transference of the sequence of English syntax in Yoruba in the context of translation work- this shows that the dynamics of language contact are bilateral. ICHS generated higher numbers of errors in interference compared to SANTOS on the spoken data.

Misapplication errors had more instances of occurrence in the developmental error subcategories of oral production compared to the overgeneralisation errors. Students of the ICHS committed 50 developmental errors (56.1 percent of all their spoken errors), and students of the SANTOS made 21 (67.8 percent of their errors). The misunderstanding of -ed and -ing adjectives continued to exist in the oral language as seen in example (25) and (26). The same tendency is verified in written data (27), (28): the copula is was analysed as a systematic auxiliary in Simple Present Tense- a belief which is supported by the repeated and uncorrected use.

In terms of vocabulary production, 21,595 words were analysed in the spoken data. SANTOS produced no vocabulary retrieval errors, while ICHS produced one:

(30) Because she doesn't like anybody and beggar is her lost change (chance).

In example (30), the phonological similarity between “change” and “chance”, in which the onset of both words is /tʃ/ cluster, seems to have elicited erroneous lexical choice during speech production process that is in line with phonological priming in the mental lexicon.

Structural Differences Between Written and Spoken Language Produced by Students of SANTOS and ICHS

Among the most interesting trends to be observed in the data was that, despite the increased number of errors made in a written task, students created more sentences in written assignments than in spoken ones. This inconsistency is probably indicative of a number of confounding factors. In classroom, oral communication implies more social danger than writing: students consciously understand that oral mistakes are easily visible to other students and this aspect causes anxiety that inhibits spontaneous performance. Liu (2017) found out that the main factors inhibiting productive verbal output were anxiety, fear of ridicule, and limited vocabulary. This had also been influenced by the instructional history of both schools, in that, students had always been trained towards written evaluation, and therefore, oral production had been given a relatively minimal consideration in their previous learning.

In both modes, ICHS students were more likely to be structurally erroneous in their productions and their production was mainly text-independent, that is, they did not use text models to construct their sentences. In comparison with the other students, SANTOS students came up with text-dependent sentences based on their translation practice, which provided them with a structural model to compare the Yoruba and the English sentence patterns. According to Sevik (2007), this comparative advantage allows learners to use their mother tongue as a resource that helps them to understand L2. Although Duff (2014) also recognized that translation is text-based by nature and it does not necessarily foster oral communication, Ross (2020) believed that

translation is an essentially communicative ability, which enhances the meaning transfer between languages.

The two groups were more likely to state structurally more correct sentences during oral tasks than during writing, which is a counter-intuitive result that can be attributed to the fact that learners are more deliberate during oral activities. Students were more cautious when speaking, and less monitored when writing, as they were less concerned with the utterance they were about to produce. To a certain extent, especially with articles of indefinite nature and the position of the modifiers, SANTOS generated more incorrect structures than ICHS did in their writing, which was directly due to the impact of Yoruba on their translations. On the whole, SANTOS better than ICHS showed structural accuracy in both modalities, which was in line with the conclusion that the analytical opportunities that TGTM provided, namely close comparison of L1 and L2 structure, has decreased frequency of errors (Ozcan, 2012).

Differences Between GTM and CLT in Vocabulary Teaching, with Particular Focus on Modifiers

There was a significant difference in the amount of vocabulary generated in writing and speaking: students in both conditions generated more vocabulary during writing, in which they could revise their output, and correct themselves before completing it (Krashen and Terrell, 2013). SANTOS was always more effective in vocabulary production in both modes compared to ICHS.

The difference between the two groups in the use of vocabulary was especially impressive in the spoken tasks. The tracking feature of translation worked to the advantage of Santos students, in that they were able to confirm the intended meanings in their L1 and then generate L2. ICHS students, on the contrary, seemed to experience anxiety when speaking and that inhibited them in their willingness to talk, and, therefore, limited the variety of vocabulary they used. This result conflicts with the conclusion provided by Akhtar (2014), who states that CLT is more effective in terms of vocabulary development, and might be based on the classroom setting of ICHS. The associated phenomenon was observed by Al-wossabi (2016): in CLT

classes, oral engagement is often centralized in the hands of more proficient learners, where other less confident students are not engaged.

SANTOS students showed better ability in vocabulary recognition activities, especially in sentence completion and paragraph writing exercises which entailed the purposeful use of specific lexical content. Translations are said to have had a positive effect on the retention of vocabulary as well as on the discriminations of similar words in terms of sound (phonologically) or spelling (orthographically) according to Dagiliene (2012) in her study on the use of translation as a vocabulary learning tool. This is also in tandem with the findings of Sulayman *et al* (2026). The amount of vocabulary that was held in memory and accurately generated by the SANTOS students was thus always larger than that held by the students of ICHS.

Determining the Most Suitable Teaching Method for SANTOS and ICHS

The cumulative analysis of the data (written and oral) indicates a set of method-related benefits and drawbacks. ICHS underperformed in the fourth category which is the interference error category because it generated greater overall frequencies especially in the use of articles, third-person agreement and semantic level errors. SANTOS also committed more mistakes in the word order and insertion/deletion types- a tendency, apparently to the disadvantage of GTM, but which, again, is explained by the word-by-word translation policies promoted by the approach, which intensify the structural differences between Yoruba and English. According to Ionin *et al.* (2014), a learner with access to systemic comparisons between his/her L1 and L2 article system is more likely to develop more accurate article use than otherwise- a benefit that translates into a relatively lower article error rate in SANTOS. The fact that the developmental errors in both groups are much more common than the interference errors indicate that the major problems that the learners had were related not only to the L1 transfer problems but to the lack of exposure and practice of the target language forms. This observation is contrary to the observation made by Taylor (2015), who noted that elementary students usually commit more interference errors than developmental errors, which implies that the subjects of the study were beyond the first level of acquisition despite the continuing structural challenges.

The cases of ICHS making more mistakes than SANTOS in the interference categories occurred again in the oral data. Master (2017) noted that meaning-based strategies like CLT are inclined to undermine the importance of the article accuracy because omission or misuse of articles hardly ever affect communication. This teaching position can also be one of the reasons as to why ICHS students were less improving in using articles with time. In general, students in the SANTOS group showed a greater degree of grammatical precision in written and spoken production, which can be explained by the fact that metalinguistic awareness critical in systematic translation and cross-linguistic comparison provided a certain benefit (Guerra, 2014; Pan and Pan, 2012). Although pre-test data suggested that the two groups had similar levels of proficiency at the start of the study, ICHS had higher increases on some of the measures, which nevertheless SANTOS had an overall advantage in structural correctness.

Implications of the Findings

The results of this paper add to the general picture of how grammar is to be taught in order to achieve not only accuracy but also communicative competence. Grammatical forms can be introduced in meaningful contexts, thus increasing the chances of the learner to understand their purpose, memorize them and use them in a more flexible way in the production. It is in this that a functional-semantic approach to the teaching of grammar, which is one that not only systematises the structure of language, but also links it to communicative end is the most likely to rise above the limitations that both purely structural and purely communicative approaches possess. Communicative language Teaching method has a number of considerable pedagogical implications on the teaching of English grammar. First, it prefigures the potentiality of language meaning, which takes a form as a means of communicative action. Second, it brings into the spotlight the complicated nature of the interaction between linguistic structure and the communicative intent. Third, it locates form and function in an enlarged context of contextual, cultural and interactional influences. Fourth, it involves the ability of the learners to think about the accuracy and appropriateness of their language use concerning communicative context. Fifth, it deals with all four language skills listening, speaking, reading, and writing in an

integrated way. Despite the reported advantages of CLT, the results of this study reiterate the fact that an explicit grammar instruction still has a lot of merit, especially in learners who have L1 structures which are quite different than English. A successful grammar pedagogy in this setting should thus be able to incorporate both the structural support provided by GTM with the communicative richness and authenticity of CLT in a way that is responsive to the developing needs of students.

CONCLUSION

This paper has shown that grammatical knowledge is a key to successful language use not just as some abstract set of rules, but as the structural resource that helps speakers and writers to express specific and consistent meanings. Teachers who offer grammar do not merely teach rules; they empower the students to communicate, as well as, to fulfill their high standards of communication. But, as the results of this experiment verify, the exposure to grammatical material, be it rule-based or communicative, does not necessarily result in accurate and fluent production. The bridging walk between the grammar knowledge and effective use of the language is one that needs continuous and meaningful practice in different situations. Based on the structural analysis and translation among languages, GTM gives learners a clear structure in knowing the formal nature of English and its comparison with that of their native language. This also implies that spoken communication is relatively underemphasized, and learners can remain inactive in the process of language acquisition, as it is largely concerned with reading and writing. CLT, in its turn, makes communication the source and goal of language teaching, giving preference to the real-life conversations and use of language in context. Although this method is closer to the needs of real-life language, this study shows that the data may create long-term structural gaps that are not addressed in cases when learners are not well-guided by metalinguistic knowledge. All the significant approaches discussed in the present paper occurred in the context of different historical and theoretical developments, and every one of them was intended to handle specific educational requirements and issues. It is, therefore, the responsibility of the practitioners to pay close attention to the learner profile, such as proficiency level, communicative needs, and future contexts of using English, prior to concluding on a particular method. The

conclusion of this research may indicate that there is no one particular way that can be employed. The most likely approach to create the well-rounded learner of the two is a judicious and hybrid approach that will combine the advantages of both GTM and CLT, providing structural instruction explicitly as well as instructionally significant communicative practice.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis and the results of the current study, the following recommendations can be suggested:

- i. Future studies ought to be longitudinal at varying levels of proficiency in order to allow wider generalisation of results. The extended implementation period would also give a better evidence of the learner development in the oral production.
- ii. The school authorities ought to assist teachers to have the resources and time to plan communicative, game based and activity centred grammar lessons with a wider scope other than merely preparing students to exams. It is necessary to establish low stakes oral practice so as to minimize anxiety in students and create communicative confidence.
- iii. Parents and guardians ought to be enlightened more on the significance of regular exposure to English language even at home. Language enrichment programmes Community-based language enrichment programmes may assist with the connection between classroom teaching and language environment at home.
- iv. Instructors ought to receive training programmes that enable them to carry out learner needs analysis, develop adaptive lesson plan and provide focused correctional feedback. The focus of professional development must be on the merging of explicit grammar teaching with communicative practices, so that teachers could make accurate methodological choices.

REFERENCES

1. Abbas, S., & Ali, W. (2014). Comparison between Grammar & Translation Method & Communicative Language Teaching. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 2(6), 124–128.
2. Akhtar, R. N. (2014). An experimental study using Communicative Language Teaching Method (CLTM) at higher secondary level to enhance students' reading comprehension skills. *NICE Research Journal*, 7, 1–24.
3. Al-wossabi, S. (2016). Speaking in the target language: Issues and considerations. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(5), 886–893.
4. Al-Humaidi, M. (2017). *Communicative Language Teaching*. King Saud University. Retrieved September 4, 2023, from <http://faculty.ksu.edu.sa/alhumaidi/Publications/Communicative%20Language%20Teaching.pdf>.
5. Anh, D. K. (2013). The current state of the art in the teaching of grammar at Vietnamese high schools. *Language in India*, 13(3), 22–42.
6. Azar, B. (2007). Grammar-based teaching: A practitioner's perspective. *TESL-EJ*, 11(2), 1–12. Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/ej42/a1.pdf>
7. Batstone, R. (2014). *Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Brown, H. D. (2017). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York, NY: Pearson Education.
9. Brown, D. (2020). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). New York, USA: Pearson Education.
10. Brumfit, C. J., & Johnson, K. (2010). *The communicative approach to language teaching*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
11. Burgo, C. (2015). Grammar teaching approaches for heritage learners of Spanish. *Learn Language, Explore Cultures, Transform Lives* (Report of the Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages), 217–233.

12. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (2020). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
13. Chang, S. C. (2011). A contrastive study of Grammar Translation Method and Communicative Approach in teaching English grammar. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 13–24. <https://doi:10.5539/elt.v4n2p13>.
14. Conti, G. (2016). Grammar Translation and Communicative Language Teaching compared. Retrieved from <https://gianfrancoconti.wordpress.com/2016/01/12/grammar-translationand-communicative-language-teaching-compared/>.
15. Corder, S. P. (2017). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 161–169. <https://doi:10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161>.
16. Dagilienė, I. (2012). Translation as a learning method in English language teaching. *Studies about Languages*, 21, 124–129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.21.1469>.
17. Duff, A. (2014). *Translation: Resource books for teachers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
18. Ellis, R. (2016). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83–107. <https://doi:10.2307/40264512>.
19. Gorsuch, G. J. (2018). Yakudoku EFL instruction in two Japanese high school classrooms: An exploratory study. *JALT Journal*, 20(1), 6–31.
20. Guerra, F. A. (2014). The usefulness of translation in foreign language learning: Students' attitudes. *International Journal of English Language and Translation Studies*, 2(1), 153–170.
21. Hartwell, P. (2015). Grammar, grammars, and the teaching of grammar. *College English*, 47(2), 105–127.

22. Howatt, A. P. R. (2014). *A history of English language teaching*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
23. Ionin, T., Heejeong, K., & Wexler, K. (2014). Article semantics in L2 acquisition: The role of specificity. *Language Acquisition*, 12(1), 3–69.
24. Jewad, H. G., & Verma, S. S. (2014). A comparative study of the difficulties faced by teachers in Communicative Language Teaching & Grammatical Translation Method in primary schools of rural areas of Allahabad. *European Academic Research*, 2(2), 2174–2205.
25. Kırkgoz, Y. (2017). English language teaching in Turkey: Policy changes and their implementations. *RELC Journal*, 38(2), 216–228.
26. Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (2013). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. London, UK: Phoenix ELT.
27. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2021). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
28. Liu, M. (2017). Anxiety in oral English classrooms: A case study in China. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 119–137.
29. Master, P. (2017). The English article system: Acquisition, function, and pedagogy. *Pergamon*, 25(2), 215–232.
30. Nunan, D. (2015). *Language teaching methodology*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International.
31. Ozcan, M. (2012). Novelist calls out poetist: A psycholinguistic and contrastive analysis of the errors in Turkish EFL learners' English. *International Scholarly and Scientific Research & Innovation*, 8(6), 2311–2322.
32. Ozsevik, Z. (2010). *The use of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Turkish EFL teachers' perceived difficulties in implementing CLT in Turkey (master's thesis)*. University of Illinois, USA.

33. Öztürk, G., & Gürbüz, N. (2014). Speaking anxiety among Turkish EFL learners: The case at a state university. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(1), 1–17.
34. Pan, Y., & Pan, Y. (2012). The use of translation in the EFL classroom. *Philippines ESL Journal*, 9, 4–23.
35. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2012). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
36. Ross, N. J. (2020). Interference and intervention: Using translation in the EFL classroom. *Modern English Teacher*, 9(3), 61–66.
37. Ruppert, Diane. (2018). *Active grammar: A blended learning case study in business English grammar (Development project report)*. Retrieved from http://www.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/20424/jamk_1209461503_7.pdf.
38. Sato, K., & Kleinsasser, R. (2019). Communicative language teaching (CLT): Practical understandings. *Modern Language Journal*, 83(4), 494–517.
39. Şevik, M. (2017). The place of mother tongue in foreign language classes. *Ankara University, Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 40(1), 99–119.
40. Sulayman, S. E., Nkopuruk, I. N., and Akintunde, A. F. (2026). Enhancing English Phonetic Competence through Digital Micro-Teaching Strategies in Nigerian Secondary Schools. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies* 52 (2), 83-97. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2026/v52i22828>
41. Taylor, B. P. (2015). The use of overgeneralization and transfer learning strategies by elementary and intermediate students of ESL. *Language Learning*, 25(1), 73–107.
42. Thompson, G. (2016). Some misconceptions about Communicative Language Teaching. *ELT Journal*, 50(1), 9–15.
43. Thornbury, S. (2016). *How to teach grammar*. Oxfordshire: Bluestone Press.

44. Whyld, K. (2013). *Everyday, spelling and grammar*. Sydney, NSW: Pascal Press.
45. Wilkins, D. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
46. Wong, C. C. Y., & Barrea-Marlys, M. (2012). The role of grammar in Communicative Language Teaching: An exploration of second language teachers' perceptions and classroom practices. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 9, 61–75.
47. Uysal, H. H., & Bardakci, M. (2014). Teacher beliefs and practices of grammar teaching: Focusing on meaning, form, or forms? *South African Journal of Education*, 34(1), 1–16.