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Abstract—Integrating form-focused instruction (FFI) in the communicative language classroom is the most recently used instructional approach today. To draw learners’ attention to grammatical structures, this approach implements different integrative corrective feedback techniques. The current study investigates the effects of FFI integrated with communicative grammar activities on the speaking fluency of students and their attitudes toward speaking lessons. To carry out the study, participants included 11th-grade students divided into two groups: an experimental group and a control group. Four English teachers from Adilo High School also participated in this study - one of whom intervened and three who had scored the students’ speaking fluency based on the given scoring rubrics. The cognitive and behavioral attitudes of the students were examined through before and after questionnaires. Additionally, the study utilized a quasi-experimental research design with pre- and post-tests to examine students speaking fluency. The finding revealed that FFI integrated with communicative grammar instruction enhanced students’ speaking fluency and their cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons. This suggests that High School students benefit from FFI techniques used in combination with information, opinion, and reasoning-gap communicative grammar activities thus it helped them to improve speaking fluency and change their cognitive and behavioral attitude towards speaking lessons.

Index Terms—attitude, CLT, FFI, speaking fluency

I. INTRODUCTION

Having come about as a result of the interactionist theory, communicative language teaching (CLT) theory is a recently recognized approach to language teaching. Its primary purpose is developing communicative competence, and according to Vu and Binh (2014), it has become one of the more favorable methods of language teaching.

Designing grammar lessons to include communicative tasks leads students to communicative competence (Billah, 2020). Teaching grammar communicatively requires the implementation of effective teaching strategies that help students clearly transmit their ideas. These strategies include designing and implementing different communicative activities in the classroom (BaDilla & ChaCón, 2013).

A communicative grammar lesson allows students to practice the target grammar, and the first step of this lesson often focuses on accuracy while fluency becomes more important during the practice stage. As such, the real conditions are often facilitated through speaking activities (Billah, 2020). Communicative grammar activities that are the means to communicative competence have an impact on language learning and encourage learners to learn in a meaningful way (Ratnasari, 2019). Moreover, they encourage students to continue what was learned in real-life situations.

Communicative grammar activities include information, opinion, and reasoning gap activities (Namaziandost et al., 2019). Information gap activities include finding similarities and differences, putting things in the right order, drawing pictures, and solving puzzles (Sartika, 2016). These activities build students’ confidence in learning English speaking skills (Arjuna & Rozimela, 2020). Other activities that enable students to exchange their own preferences, feelings, and opinions in the actions of responsibility are called opinion gap activities (Fallahi et al., 2015; as cited in Namaziandost et al., 2019). Reasoning gap activities are tasks that involve making deductions to get new information from the given one (Namaziandost et al., 2019). Additionally, there are also different communicative grammar tasks but the
The communicative language syllabus came about because of the shift in attention of language education from language form to meaning-ignored grammar instruction (Mart, 2019). To help students recognize language forms in context and use them for meaningful communication, integrating communicative language use with grammar instruction is important. Mart (2019) revealed that if learners attend to form within communicative practice, they obtain language structure by using form-meaning association to convey meaning. The current study focuses on exploring the effects of form-focused communicative grammar instruction on students’ speaking fluency and their cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons.

Speaking is one of the most frequently used language skills by which people express their opinions. It is viewed as a crucial skill in the EFL teaching and learning process. Recently, the aim of teaching speaking skills has become to develop students’ communication skills (Kayi, 2012). However, many teachers view this task as being very difficult to do (Tavil, 2010), and students often see speaking EFL as one of the most troublesome aspects of learning the language (Brown & Yule; as cited in Getachew, 2017). Tiglu (2008) mentioned that many Ethiopian students present low proficiency in English and face many problems in trying to convey a message through speaking. A related finding was reported by Dereje (2021) who indicated that a majority of high school students face problems in speaking English in Ethiopia. Esayas (2019) also reported that the number of Ethiopian students who speak English has shown a decline over the last few decades. Ebissa and Bhavani (2017) stated that, although the design of English language textbooks, the way teachers teach, and the implementation of communicative language teaching at schools were all based on CLT, the learners failed to communicate through speaking. As Esayas (2019) pointed out, the challenges students face in speaking English are common in many countries. Researching scholarly literature and other studies on the English language teaching experience showed that there was quite a bit of doubt surrounding the communicative competence of students.

There are a variety of dilemmas linked to EFL students and their challenges concerning their speaking skills. According to Getachew (2017), unsuitable methodology in teaching speaking skills is a gap that is related to the inability of students to convey meaning through speaking. Currently, theoretical views on language teaching and learning have overreacted to the failures of the form-based approach and the strengths of CLT (Jensen, 2008). The use of explicit grammar teaching, error corrections and other traditional methods may have a place in the classroom, but they often went unnoticed. As far as the researcher is aware, little to no research has been conducted on the effects of form-focused communicative grammar instruction on the speaking fluency of high school students and their cognitive and behavioral attitude towards spoken lessons.

However, some studies were done on the general areas of speaking skills, CLT, and FFI. For example, Mart (2019) studied a comparison of form-focused content-based and mixed approaches to literature-based instruction to develop the speaking skills of learners. It revealed that language instruction integrating form and content produced the knowledge and skills necessary for communicative competence.

A study was carried out by Mokhiberi and Marzban (2012) on the effects of form instruction on intermediate EFL learners’ grammar learning in task-based language teaching. It proved that the reactive FFI in comparison to preemptive techniques provided an admirable means of improving the skills needed to use the grammatical knowledge of the target form in context.

Research was also carried out by Zaheer (2014) on the effects of FFI on the accuracy of the writing skills of students. The results of the study showed that a planned focus on forms practiced in their L2 classrooms was beneficial to the students and their writing. Moreover, it was suggested that explicit FFI may present some benefit to the accuracy of L2 learners’ writings.

A study carried out by BaDilla and ChaCón (2013) briefly examined the advantages of integrating CLT with traditional grammar lessons and how it helps students learn a second language in an interactive and creative classroom environment. The findings disclosed that CLT helped teachers improve their grammar lessons at Universidad Nacional (BaDilla & ChaCón, 2013).

Nevertheless, no studies have examined the effects of form-focused communicative grammar instruction on the speaking fluency of students and their cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons. Inspired by practical and theoretical gaps, the researchers of this study were interested in carrying out a study to see whether form-focused communicative grammar instruction helps students acquire English speaking fluency and improves the attitudes of students towards speaking lessons.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Research objectives formulated for this study are:
1) to investigate the effects of form-focused communicative grammar instruction on students’ performance of fluency in speaking;
2) to examine the effects of form-focused communicative grammar instruction on students’ cognitive attitude toward speaking lessons;
3) to explore the effects of form-focused communicative grammar instruction on students’ behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons.

III. RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

To achieve the purposes of the study, the following research hypotheses were formulated:

H01: There was no significant difference in the performance of fluency in speaking between the experimental and control groups in pre- and post-tests.

H1: There was a significant difference in the performance of fluency in speaking between the experimental and control groups in pre- and post-tests.

H02: There was no significant difference in the students’ cognitive attitude toward speaking lessons before and after intervention.

H1: There was a significant difference in the students’ cognitive attitude toward speaking lessons before and after intervention.

H03: There was no significant difference in the students’ behavioral attitude toward speaking lessons before and after intervention.

H1: There was a significant difference in the students’ behavioral attitude toward speaking lessons before and after intervention.

IV. METHODOLOGY

A. Design

To achieve its purpose the study followed a quasi-experimental study design in the form of pre- and post-tests with experimental and control groups. The design of the study is concisely showed in Figure 1 below:

![Figure 1. Design of the Study](image)

B. Participants and Setting

For this study, two sections of Grade 11 students from Adilo High School were selected and took part as both the experimental and control groups. Since the selected classes were intact classes, it was expected that the students had similarities in English capability. The selection was made with the school administrators’ permission. The teacher who was teaching both the experimental and control groups was selected using the convenient sampling technique since his assignments were done before the classes were selected as the experimental and control groups. The teachers who would be performing the rating were selected following random sampling techniques and based on their agreement. Both experimental and control groups had 40 students each. Moreover, the students’ gender categories between the two groups were not very different from one another.

C. Instruments

The data-gathering tools employed for the study were pre- and post-tests, before and after intervention questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The pretest was given in need to study the students’ equivalence in their background performance of fluency in speaking. Both pre- and post-tests were used in order to gather quantitative data from the intervention. Five speaking test items containing speaking fluency were administered to both the experimental and the control groups before and after the intervention. The formats of the speaking tests included presentation, dialogue and picture descriptions. The content was designed to contain information, opinion and reasoning gap communicative grammar activities. The pre- and post-tests were designed in the same format. Concerning the test types, responsive, interactive and extensive task assessment test types and holistic scoring techniques were employed. The scoring rubrics were adapted from the Council of Europe (2014; as cited in Ulker, 2017). Scores ranged from 1 to 5.

There were 16 questionnaire items that were designed and administered before and after the experiment. Both experimental and control group students participated in filling out the questionnaire. The goal of the questionnaire given before intervention was to look into students’ cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward the speaking lessons before any
treatment took place. The goal of the questionnaire that was employed after the intervention was to prove the difference before and after treatments.

D. Data Analysis

Both the quantitative data of tests and the questionnaire were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 26. An independent sample t-test was employed to analyze pretest results in order to discover whether or not there was a significant pre-existing difference in the speaking fluency between the two groups before intervention. Likewise, it was used to compare the results of the control and experimental groups and check whether the intervention had produced a relatively statistically significant change in speaking fluency. Furthermore, the questionnaire data was statistically analyzed by employing an independent sample t-test to compare the results of both the experimental and control groups of students.

E. Procedures

The experiment lasted for 11 weeks from 03 October to 16 December 2022 including the administrations of the pre- and post-tests, the before and after intervention questionnaires and the interviews. The content of teaching material for the experimental group was developed parallel to the normal curriculum of a Grade 11 student’s textbook. The experiment with the experimental group was carried out using the same content but designed to include information, opinion, and reasoning gap communicative grammar activities. The teaching method used for the experimental group was strictly form-focused. It implemented input flood and enhancement, explicit and implicit, planned and incidental meta-linguistic explanation corrective feedback techniques [all together] for the purpose of the intervention. Both groups were taught speaking using similar content for each parallel lesson in order to avoid material bias.

The lesson plan for the control group was as usual. The pre- and post-tests and questionnaire items were prepared before starting the intervention. Similarly, the teacher’s training manual, teaching materials, and rating rubrics were developed before the intervention.

The pre-test was administered to both groups of students a week before the intervention. All the treatments were conducted between the second and eleventh weeks. The first week was used to complete the pre-tests and questionnaires. The twelfth week was used to collect data using post-tests, post-intervention questionnaires and interviews. Each test took six hours and forty minutes for each group. The raters were carefully trained on scoring from the rubric before each test. The data collection using questionnaires was employed a day after pre- and post-tests. It was completed within 45 minutes. The results of the interview helped the researcher prove the results gained from the questionnaire and tests. To this effect, out of 40 students from the experimental group, nine students were selected based on their achievement using the stratified random sampling technique and were interviewed afterward.

V. RESULTS

A. Results of the Pre-Test

As indicated in Table 1, below, the findings of the study indicated that the speaking fluency mean scores of the experimental group and control group totaling 40 students were 1.71 and 1.74, respectively, for the pretest. The p-value of the pretest was 0.805. This value shows that there was no statistically significant difference between the experimental and control groups’ pretest results performance of fluency in speaking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Results of the Post-Test

As shown in Table 2, the average scores of the post-test of both the experimental and control groups were 3.08 and 1.85, respectively. The p-value of both groups was 0.000. This result shows that there was a statistically significant difference between the experimental and control groups’ post-test results performance of fluency in speaking. This suggests that the experimental group made significant improvement on its post-test compared to that of the control group’s speaking fluency. The findings of the tests showed that form-focused communicative grammar instruction could contribute greatly to enhancing students’ performance of fluency in speaking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. The Results of the Before Intervention Questionnaire of Cognitive Attitude
In Table 3 below, the results of the Before Intervention Questionnaire of Cognitive Attitude toward speaking lessons highlighted the fact that the mean scores of both the experimental and the control groups were 1.65 and 1.63, respectively. Additionally, the p-value was 0.867. Both the mean and p-value scores illustrated that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups before intervention. Thus, the mean and p-value confirmed that the two groups were equivalent in cognitive attitude towards speaking lessons before the intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>BEFORE INTERVENTION QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS OF COGNITIVE ATTITUDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. The Results of the Post Intervention Questionnaire of Cognitive Attitude

The results of the Post Intervention Questionnaire of Cognitive Attitude Toward Speaking Lessons (Table 4) pointed out that the average score of the experimental group was 2.90, and the average score of the control group was 1.89. The p-value was 0.00. This score suggests that there was a statistically significant difference formed between both the experimental and the control groups after intervention concerning the cognitive attitudes of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>AFTER INTERVENTION QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS OF COGNITIVE ATTITUDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. The Results of Before Intervention Questionnaire of Behavioral Attitude

The results of the questionnaire on Before Intervention Questionnaire of Behavioral Attitude Toward Speaking Lessons, shown below in Table 5, show that the mean scores of the experimental and the control groups were both 1.70. Moreover, the p-value was 1.000. Thus, the mean and p-value confirmed that the two groups were equivalent in their behavioral attitude towards speaking lessons before the intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>BEFORE INTERVENTION QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS OF STUDENTS’ BEHAVIORAL ATTITUDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. The Results of the After Intervention Questionnaire of Behavioral Attitude

Below, Table 6 presents the findings of the Post Intervention Behavioral Attitude Towards Speaking Lessons informed the researchers that the mean score of the experimental group was 2.98 and the mean score of the control group was 1.86. The p-value was 0.00. The mean and the p-value scores show that there were statistically considerable variations made between both the experimental and the control groups after intervention on the behavioral attitude students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>AFTER INTERVENTION QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS OF STUDENTS’ BEHAVIORAL ATTITUDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Results of Students’ Interview

The respondents of the interview pointed out that, before the treatments, they could produce speech, but with pausing and hindrance. They also added that they were using pre-packaged utterances and pausing for grammar and lexical planning to repair communication before intervention. They noted that they could produce patterns and expressions spontaneously and express themselves more smoothly after intervention. The students interviewed stated that the implementation of integrated form-focused instructional techniques such as implicit and explicit, and planned and incidental corrective feedback helped them improve their fluency in speaking. Furthermore, the participants noted that integrated form-focused instructional techniques were critical to enhancing their fluency in speaking. In general, the students who participated in the interview indicated that form-focused communicative grammar instruction helped them to produce communicatively effective fluency in speaking.

Those who participated in the interview told the researchers that learning spoken English was one of the skills of English they were taught before the implementation of FFI. The respondents believed that learning spoken English was challenging and confessed to facing setbacks. They also said that they preferred to learn through grammar rules. Moreover, the students who participated in the interviews also informed the researchers that their preferred language
skills were reading and writing. The participants offered a different perspective about the function of learning spoken English as a means of exchanging information with others and having confidence in learning other school subjects rather than only learning one English language skill after the intervention. The respondents commented that the intervention on the challenges of learning spoken English improved through the comments of others that were given while learning spoken English due to the mistakes they made as part of the learning process. They added that their preferred way of learning spoken English was communicating with others through speaking. The interview respondents also said that speaking skills became their priority among all language skills. In general, they told the researchers that form-focused communicative grammar instruction improved their interest and became their preference for speaking lessons.

The students who were interviewed also reported that, before the intervention took place, whenever they felt challenged by speaking English and needed clarification, their preferred strategies included asking the speaker to repeat and slow down. However, after the intervention, their preference of asking for clarification became guessing based on the speaker’s gestures and other contexts.

Concerning their attitude towards the strategies of practicing the English language before intervention, the students who were interviewed thought that using their own new expressions could improve their spoken English abilities. After the intervention, however, their opinion towards the strategies of practicing English changed to following the expressions of native speakers and practicing them helped improve their spoken English. They also stated that, before the intervention, they became shy to talk to friends and native speakers, but after the intervention, they started talking to native speakers. They also started initiating conversation with friends, making conversation on familiar topics and even prepared what they would say in advance of making conversation. The students also presented that they encourage others to correct them when they make mistakes and informed researchers that they started implementing different strategies that could help advance their speaking skills. These students also added that they started to practice speaking in different situations after the implementation of form-focused communicative grammar instruction and using different techniques in the classroom. In general, they reported that the pedagogical intervention used was convenient and interesting for them and they became more interested in speaking English.

**H. Group Comparisons of Enhancement**

The paired-sample t-test is a parametric test. It is used when researchers are interested in the difference between two variables for the same subject but separated by time. The purpose of the test is to determine whether there is statistical evidence that the mean difference between paired observations is significantly different from zero.

In the current study, the paired-sample t-test was used to compare the effects of the interventions in both the experimental group and the control group both before and after the interventions. The results of the paired-sample t-test of the experimental group students are presented in Table 7, below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Pre-test Mean</th>
<th>Pre-test SD</th>
<th>Post-test Mean</th>
<th>Post-test SD</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the results in Table 7, there was a significant difference in both pre- and post-tests. The Cohen’s difference of fluency between pre- and post-tests was 1.933. This effect size is greater than the effect size of 0.8 and thus, it is a very large effect size. This means that the experimental group showed a significant difference between the pre- and post-test results of their fluency in speaking. In the same way, the improvement was made from pre- to post-test at p < 0.05 (0.000) for fluency in speaking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Pre-test Mean</th>
<th>Pre-test SD</th>
<th>Post-test Mean</th>
<th>Post-test SD</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 8 indicate that the change in the control group was not statistically significant for all tests at p>0.05 level (0.805) for fluency in speaking. The Cohen’s difference in the pre- and post-test was 0.272. This effect size (0.272) is less than the moderate effect size (0.5) Thus, it is a small effect size. This means that the control group students did not show a statistically significant difference between the pre- and post-test results of their fluency in speaking. In the same way, the p-value (0.805) is greater than its average level of 0.05 for the speaking fluency of students.

The results of both experimental and control groups imply that the experimental group showed significantly higher scores and faster progress than the control group on the speaking fluency of students and their post-test results.
Communicative language teaching has recently become the most popular method for teaching and learning languages. Thus, many scholars have been trying to manage the strengths and weaknesses of grammar-based teaching approaches (Jensen, 2008). Despite its popularity, however, CLT is not successful in improving the English-speaking skills of Ethiopian high school students (Esayas, 2019). To equip students to be fluent in speaking English, confirming the suitable method of teaching was the focus of this study. As a result, the present study intended to verify the effects of form-focused communicative grammar teaching on the speaking fluency of students and their cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons. To remedy the failure of CLT, different error correction and explicit grammar teaching techniques were implemented in the study. These teaching methods were implemented in FFI by combining explicit grammar instruction with communicative grammar instruction.

Implementing CLT with grammar instruction presents obvious benefits for students to distinguish language structures in context and use them in real-life situations (Mart, 2019). The findings of the study greatly concur with this idea. The data showed that the experimental group scored higher results in the speaking fluency of students in a post-test. Likewise, the post-intervention questionnaire data indicated that the cognitive and behavioral attitudes of students toward speaking lessons were influenced positively. The results of the interview also confirmed that pedagogical intervention helped students improve their fluency in speaking and improved their attitudes toward speaking lessons. Thus the study accommodated information, opinion, and reasoning gap communicative grammar activities which were integrated with the flexibly implemented planned technique versus the accidental, explicit vs. implicit, information flood, and information-enhanced form-focused instructional techniques. Still, it did not contain all aspects of FFI; on the contrary, it was not limited to certain fixed FFI techniques. Likewise, it did not include all types of language structures and the overall context of CLT instruction.

Another limitation is that the study was not implemented with various communicative activities that appeal to the four language skills. Consequently, it suggests that additional studies having different communicative grammar tasks and FFI techniques be carried out. In sum, reality showed that FFI taught in combination with communicative grammar instruction helped the learners improve their fluency in speaking and improved their cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons. Thus, it is suggested that high school EFL teachers apply communicative grammar activities incorporated into form-focused instruction while teaching English speaking skills.

| TABLE 9 | RESULTS OF THE PAIRED SAMPLES T-TEST FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP’S ATTITUDE |
|----------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|---|----------------|
| Attitude | Pre-test Mean | SD | Post-test Mean | SD | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Cognitive | 1.65 | 0.700 | 2.90 | 0.591 | 0.093 | 1.938 | .000 |
| Behavioral | 1.70 | 0.687 | 2.98 | 0.733 | 0.116 | 1.802 | .000 |

According to the results in Table 9, there was a significant difference in the results of both questionnaires with the experimental group showing a significant improvement from pre- to post-questionnaire at $p < 0.05$ (0.000) for both cognitive and behavioral attitude towards speaking lessons. The Cohen’s difference of the pre- and post-questionnaires for cognitive and behavioral attitudes were 1.938 and 1.802 respectively. These effect sizes are greater than the large effect size (0.8) and thus, it is a very large effect size. This let the researchers know that the experimental group students showed a statistically significant difference between the pre-intervention questionnaire and post-intervention questionnaire results of their cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons. In the same way, the p-value (0.000) is less than its average (0.05) significance level. This shows that there were statistically significant improvements in the experimental group students’ cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons.

| TABLE 10 | RESULTS OF THE PAIRED SAMPLES T-TEST FOR THE CONTROL GROUP’S ATTITUDE |
|----------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|---|----------------|
| Attitude | Pre-test Mean | SD | Post-test Mean | SD | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Cognitive | 1.63 | 0.628 | 1.89 | 0.599 | 0.095 | 0.423 | .086 |
| Behavioral | 1.70 | 0.687 | 1.86 | 0.620 | 0.098 | 0.245 | .262 |

According to the results in Table 10, there was not a statistically significant difference in both pre- and post-tests. The control group did not show a statistically significant improvement from pre to post-test at $p > 0.05$ for cognitive (0.086) and behavioral (0.262) attitudes toward speaking lessons. The significance level shows that there were no statistically significant improvements shown in the control group students’ cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons. The effect sizes of the pre- and post-intervention questionnaire for cognitive and behavioral attitudes were 0.423 and 0.245, respectively. These effect sizes (0.423 and 0.245) are less than the moderate effect size (0.5) and thus, it is a small effect size. This means that the control group students did not statistically show a worthy difference between the pre- and post-intervention questionnaire results of their cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons.

VI. DISCUSSION

Communicative language teaching has recently become the most popular method for teaching and learning languages. Thus, many scholars have been trying to manage the strengths and weaknesses of grammar-based teaching approaches (Jensen, 2008). Despite its popularity, however, CLT is not successful in improving the English-speaking skills of Ethiopian high school students (Esayas, 2019). To equip students to be fluent in speaking English, confirming the suitable method of teaching was the focus of this study. As a result, the present study intended to verify the effects of form-focused communicative grammar teaching on the speaking fluency of students and their cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons. To remedy the failure of CLT, different error correction and explicit grammar teaching techniques were implemented in the study. These teaching methods were implemented in FFI by combining explicit grammar instruction with communicative grammar instruction.

Implementing CLT with grammar instruction presents obvious benefits for students to distinguish language structures in context and use them in real-life situations (Mart, 2019). The findings of the study greatly concur with this idea. The data showed that the experimental group scored higher results in the speaking fluency of students in a post-test. Likewise, the post-intervention questionnaire data indicated that the cognitive and behavioral attitudes of students toward speaking lessons were influenced positively. The results of the interview also confirmed that pedagogical intervention helped students improve their fluency in speaking and improved their attitudes toward speaking lessons. Thus the study accommodated information, opinion, and reasoning gap communicative grammar activities which were integrated with the flexibly implemented planned technique versus the accidental, explicit vs. implicit, information flood, and information-enhanced form-focused instructional techniques. Still, it did not contain all aspects of FFI; on the contrary, it was not limited to certain fixed FFI techniques. Likewise, it did not include all types of language structures and the overall context of CLT instruction.

Another limitation is that the study was not implemented with various communicative activities that appeal to the four language skills. Consequently, it suggests that additional studies having different communicative grammar tasks and FFI techniques be carried out. In sum, reality showed that FFI taught in combination with communicative grammar instruction helped the learners improve their fluency in speaking and improved their cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons. Thus, it is suggested that high school EFL teachers apply communicative grammar activities incorporated into form-focused instruction while teaching English speaking skills.
VII. CONCLUSIONS

As high school students, speaking and understanding English as a foreign language (EFL) does not require only the need to know a long list of vocabulary and grammatical structures, but speaking English fluently also requires the use of grammatical structures in a meaningful way.

The present study explores the effect of form-focused communicative grammar instruction on the speaking fluency of some Ethiopian students and their cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons. The findings of the study indicated that the experimental group of students who had been taught spoken English using form-focused communicative grammar instruction as the intervention showed the most improvement in the post-test score of speaking fluency and in their cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons.

The study revealed that communicative grammar instruction (i.e. information, opinion and reasoning gap communicative grammar activities) integrated with different form-focused instructional activities (i.e. explicit and implicit, planned and accidental, input enhanced and flood techniques, recast, and clarification request) could contribute to the development of student performance in speaking fluency. Likewise, they also enhanced their cognitive and behavioral attitudes toward speaking lessons.

In general, the present study revealed a new way to focus on form by taking into account the opinions of students regarding the changes to be exerted in the process of instruction. Taken together, the present study will contribute to the line of research on form-focused communicative grammar instruction as an alternative methodology, especially in teaching speaking skills. Therefore, such research activities may create major insights that draw on methodological inquiries to combine methodologies about EFL students' needs.

VIII. LIMITATIONS

The study was limited in its scope. The communicative grammar instruction implemented in this study comprises only information, opinion, and reasoning gap communicative grammar activities that were integrated with form-focused instruction to advance the speaking fluency of learners and their cognitive and behavioral attitude towards speaking lessons.

Other factors such as the type of grammatical form, the overall context of instruction, and the students' ages might have influenced the findings of the study. The study was conducted in an adult EFL context at the high school level. More extensive research is necessary to have more noticeable results regarding the learners' age groups, proficiency levels and other contexts in the execution of form-focused communicative grammar activities.

Despite the limitations, this study has made some valuable findings. Concerning the selection of target forms and language skills which might have drawn more realistic and conclusive results, it makes suggestions for further study using a range of activities that demand different language skills.
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