

THE METHODOLOGY OF DEVELOPING ENGLISH GRAMMAR SKILLS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH AND INTERCULTURAL INTERACTION: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF EUROPEAN EDUCATIONAL MODELS

МЕТОДОЛОГІЯ ФОРМУВАННЯ ГРАМАТИЧНИХ НАВИЧОК З АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ У КОНТЕКСТІ ПОСИЛЕННЯ МІЖКУЛЬТУРНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ: ПОРІВНЯЛЬНИЙ АНАЛІЗ ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИХ ОСВІТНІХ МОДЕЛЕЙ

This paper provides a critical examination of the shift from traditional rule-based grammar instruction to a more communicative and organic approach grounded in meaning-making and intercultural interaction. Drawing on the theoretical contributions of David Nunan and Diane Larsen-Freeman, the study synthesizes key principles from Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and the dynamic concept of "grammaring" to propose a robust pedagogical framework. The paper further investigates the application of these models within various European educational contexts, particularly in relation to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). We argue that an integrated, organic, and communicative approach is essential not only for fostering grammatical accuracy but also for cultivating the intercultural competence necessary for authentic, meaningful communication in a globally diverse professional landscape. This research offers a comprehensive and critical examination of the evolving paradigms in English grammar instruction, with particular emphasis on the intersection of communicative methodologies and intercultural competence. The study challenges the adequacy of traditional, prescriptive grammar instruction models—most notably the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM)—in addressing the complexities of real-world communication in multicultural settings. Drawing extensively on the theoretical frameworks of Diane Larsen-Freeman's "grammaring" and David Nunan's organic approach to grammar acquisition, the paper investigates grammar not as a static set of rules but as a dynamic, context-sensitive skill embedded in meaning-making and social interaction.

Special attention is devoted to the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and its practical manifestations across various European educational systems. Within this framework, the research conducts an in-depth comparative analysis of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), emphasizing its action-oriented and intercultural approach to language learning. Through a synthesis of theoretical insights, pedagogical models, and empirical evidence, the paper posits that the integration of communicative grammar instruction with intercultural dimensions facilitates not only linguistic accuracy but also sociopragmatic sensitivity and discourse adaptability—skills that are crucial for successful participation in multilingual, multicultural environments.

The findings advocate for an integrated, learner-centered methodology that aligns grammar teaching with real-life communicative functions, cognitive development, and intercultural awareness. The research contributes to the ongoing

pedagogical discourse by providing practical strategies for implementing such models, identifying challenges of institutional adaptation, and proposing avenues for future investigation in applied linguistics and language education policy.

Key words: Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Communicative approach Grammar competence, Cross-cultural communication, Educational model, Foreign language education, Intercultural Competence English as a Foreign Language (EFL).

У статті досліджується перехід від традиційного навчання граматики за правилом, зокрема методу граматичного перекладу (Grammar-Translation Method, GTM), до комунікативного, орієнтованого на учня підходу, заснованого на формуванні значень і міжкультурній взаємодії. Використовуючи органічну модель засвоєння граматики Девіда Нунана та динамічну концепцію «грамарингу» Діани Ларсен-Фрімен, автори розглядають граматику як навичку, що інтегрує форму, зміст і вживання, а не як статичний набір правил.

У дослідженні синтезуються принципи комунікативного навчання мовам (CLT) і аналізується їх практичне застосування у різних європейських освітніх системах з особливим акцентом на Загальноєвропейській системі опису мовних компетенцій (CEFR). Особливу увагу приділено дієсно-орієнтованому і міжкультурним аспектам CEFR, які розглядають навчання граматики як засіб розвитку не лише лінгвістичної точності, а й соціопрагматичної компетентності.

Підхід, що поєднує навчання граматики з реальними комунікативними функціями та міжкультурними завданнями, усуває недоліки де контекстуалізованих вправ і формує гнучкість, необхідну для автентичного спілкування у мультикультурному середовищі. У статті пропонуються практичні стратегії, зокрема завдання, рольові ігри та використання автентичних матеріалів, для впровадження цієї моделі в освітній процес.

Результати дослідження підтримують цілісний інтегрований підхід, який поєднує граматичну точність із міжкультурною свідомістю, когнітивною залученістю і дискурсивною гнучкістю, що має важливе значення для формування комунікативних навичок у глобалізованому професійному та академічному середовищі.

Ключові слова: Комунікативне навчання мовам, Комунікативний підхід, Граматична компетентність, Міжкультурна комунікація, Освітня модель, Іншомовна освіта, Викладання англійської мови як іноземної (EFL).

УДК [001.8:37.016:81'36:811.111]:316.74:

316.77(4)(045)=111

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/ip/86.2.5>

Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії CC BY 4.0

Raikhel A.M.,

Assistant Professor at the Department of English Language, Literature and Teaching Methods
Mukachevo State University

Feltsan I.M.,

Doctor of Philosophy, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department of English Language, Literature and Teaching Methods
Mukachevo State University

Bedevelska M.V.,

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer at the Department of English Language, Literature and Teaching Methods
Mukachevo State University

Introduction. The evolution of English Language Teaching (ELT) has been significantly shaped by the advent of the communicative approach, a methodology that emerged in the 1970s as a direct response to the limitations of traditional, form-focused methods. Moving beyond the rote memorization and mechanical drills of the Grammar-Translation and Audiolingual methods, the communicative approach posits that the primary goal of language instruction is to develop communicative competence—the ability to use language effectively and appropriately to convey and negotiate meaning in real-world contexts. [1, p. 517] This paradigm shift rightly placed a premium on learner fluency, meaning-making, and authentic interaction. However, in the pedagogical discourse that followed, the role of grammar teaching within this new framework became a subject of intense debate, with some misinterpreting the communicative focus as a complete dismissal of grammatical instruction.

Despite the prioritization of fluency, the development of robust English grammar skills remains an indispensable component of achieving true communicative competence, particularly in professional and academic settings. Grammatical accuracy is crucial for preventing ambiguity, ensuring clarity, and fostering credibility, especially when communicating across cultures where shared context may be limited. In intercultural interactions, a strong command of grammar serves as a foundational tool that allows learners to express complex ideas with precision and confidence. Without it, even fluent communication can be fraught with misunderstanding and misinterpretation, potentially leading to communication breakdowns and a lack of professional credibility.

This paper addresses this critical issue by providing a comparative analysis of how various European educational models integrate the development of English grammar skills within a communicative framework. The research aims to explore the specific methodologies and pedagogical practices employed in different European contexts to bridge the perceived gap between fluency-oriented communicative goals and the essential need for grammatical accuracy. By examining how these models foster both linguistic proficiency and sociocultural competence, this study seeks to provide valuable insights for educators and curriculum developers on how to effectively prepare learners for successful intercultural communication in a globalized world.

This article addresses the research question of how the principles of the communicative approach and intercultural interaction can be synthesized into a robust methodology for developing English grammar skills within European educational models. The central thesis is that an effective methodology requires an integrated approach that views grammar as a dynamic, context-dependent skill ("grammaring") and a tool for authentic, intercultural communication, moving beyond static rules and rote memorization.

Stemming from this, it is hypothesized that, in contrast to a traditional teaching approach, the communicative approach is more effective for developing grammar skills. The experiment, which involves two groups of 30 third-course English majors at Mukachevo State University, seeks to test this hypothesis.

The aim of this article is to demonstrate the effectiveness of the communicative approach for teaching grammar structures. The study's goal is to show that this methodology can significantly develop students' linguistic competence and help them achieve the high proficiency level necessary for professional success in real-world, intercultural communication.

Literature Review. The history of English language pedagogy is marked by a cyclical debate over the role of grammar, oscillating between a primary focus on form and a primary focus on function. The Grammar-Translation Method (GTM), a historically dominant approach, treated grammar as the central pillar of language instruction. [7, p.1135] Learners were taught a language's rules deductively, followed by extensive translation exercises and memorization of vocabulary lists. This method, while effective for developing reading comprehension of literary texts, was widely criticized for producing learners who had a strong theoretical knowledge of grammar but were unable to engage in spontaneous, authentic communication. Similarly, the Audiolingual Method, though an oral-based approach, relied on behaviorist principles of habit formation through repetitive drills, where grammatical patterns were reinforced mechanically, often at the expense of meaningful context. The advent of the communicative approach and later, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), marked a significant departure from these traditional methods. In contrast to the teacher-centered, form-focused pedagogy of GTM and the Audiolingual Method, CLT is learner-centered and function-focused, valuing the use of language over its structure. The emphasis shifted from memorizing rules to performing meaningful tasks, with the teacher acting as a facilitator rather than an authority figure. [2, p. 296] This methodological evolution gave rise to frameworks like Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), which further embedded language learning in the process of accomplishing real-world tasks, thereby making grammar instruction more inductive and context-driven.

Despite the initial tension between grammar and communication, a growing body of research highlights the effectiveness of integrating grammar instruction within communicative language teaching. Contemporary studies, such as those by Larsen-Freeman (2001) and Savignon (2002), have largely debunked the false dichotomy that grammar and communication are mutually exclusive. Instead, they advocate for a balanced approach where "form-focused instruction" is systematically embedded within meaning-focused activities. This involves teaching grammar not as an isolated set of rules, but as a tool that empowers

learners to better express their communicative intent. For example, a teacher might introduce a specific grammatical structure (e.g., conditional clauses) not through a decontextualized drill, but in the context of a role-play where students must negotiate a business contract, thereby illustrating the functional necessity of the structure. This integrated model is shown to enhance both fluency and accuracy, providing a more holistic and effective pathway to developing the comprehensive linguistic and sociocultural skills required for successful intercultural interaction.

David Nunan (1998) critiques the traditional, linear model of grammar instruction using the metaphor of "building a wall," where discrete grammar rules are stacked layer by layer. This model, he argues, fails to capture the holistic and interconnected nature of language learning. Instead, Nunan advocates for an organic model, metaphorically represented as "planting a garden," where language elements grow, interact, and evolve dynamically through meaningful engagement. [17, p. 123].

This view is supported by research in second language acquisition (SLA), particularly the phenomenon of "u-shaped behavior." This describes how learners initially use correct forms, regress to making errors as they generalize new rules, and later regain accuracy. [5, p.152] This non-linear trajectory of interlanguage development empirically validates the limitations of linear methodologies and highlights the need for grammar instruction that accommodates developmental variation.

Nunan's organic model is fundamentally a contextual one, arguing that grammar must be taught through meaningful discourse to make the form-function relationship transparent.⁶ Instruction divorced from context leads to a superficial understanding, whereas contextualized teaching promotes deeper cognitive engagement and long-term retention. This approach ensures that learners understand not only the structure of a rule but also its purpose and application in communication [20, p. 154].

In this context, the concept of "grammaring" has emerged as a cornerstone of modern grammar pedagogy. Coined by Diane Larsen-Freeman (2001), "grammaring" reconceptualizes grammar as a dynamic, verb-like skill rather than a static body of knowledge. This process emphasizes the learner's ability to use grammar to create messages and make finer meaning distinctions in a context-appropriate way. Larsen-Freeman's framework is built on three interconnected dimensions that must be integrated in instruction: form (grammatical accuracy), meaning (semantic content), and use (pragmatic appropriateness) [14, p. 26].

This triadic model of "grammaring" provides a practical roadmap for linking grammar to communicative purpose. Activities that develop a sense of form include games and sentence unscrambling, while

linking form with meaning can be achieved through the use of realia and pictures. Finally, the crucial dimension of use—equipping students to make context-appropriate choices—is best addressed through communicative tasks like role-playing. By integrating these three dimensions, this approach moves beyond isolated exercises to ensure that grammar is taught as an essential, living skill, enabling learners to navigate the complexities of intercultural communication with accuracy, meaning, and appropriateness. The importance of foreign language competencies is paramount, and with the heightened mobility of students as prospective employees, there is an essential requirement for them to have the ability to speak freely and effectively across boundaries. Acquiring proficiency in a foreign language is crucial for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students. Proficiency in a foreign language can be enhanced by a robust knowledge base encompassing lexicon, sentence processing, and cultural nuances [5; 16; 18]. EFL learners must acquire effective communication skills to foster mutual respect, cooperation, and problem-solving in an increasingly global and multicultural context [4; 12]. The capacity to speak fluently in a foreign language is a fundamental competency of an educated individual in the 21st century. A fundamental competency for students is proficiency in a foreign language. It is no longer seen as an academic discipline within the foreign language curriculum at the university level, but rather as a vital life skill [18, p.169]. This innovation mandates that university courses see a foreign language not merely as a collection of rules, but as a tool for communication aimed at accomplishing specific objectives in daily life activities. A prevalent method for categorising life competencies is the "Seven Cs," which can also be cultivated through the study of a foreign language. The essential skills include critical thinking (creators), creativity (creating), teamwork, cross-cultural understanding (context), communication (creation), computer (consumption), and career and learning self-reliance (curricular) [19, p. 137]. In Europe, an effort has been initiated to establish a standardised framework for assessing language proficiency through the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), introduced by the Council of Europe in 2001. The CEFR establishes the framework for delineating competencies for language learners and professionals involved in foreign language instruction and competency evaluation, encompassing levels from the rudimentary A1 to the sophisticated C2. In the CEFR framework, competencies are delineated in terms of their structure and the levels achievable by learners [10, p. 70]. The CEFR consists of two overarching categories of competence: general and communicative. The communicative language competencies encompass linguistic, socio-linguistic, and pragmatic dimensions, each comprising additional subgroups.

Linguistic competence encompasses several components: lexical, grammatical (the primary focus of our study), semantic, phonological, orthographic, and orthoepic [10, p. 72], all of which are essential alongside pragmatic and sociolinguistic competences. Students should employ many grammatical structures to ensure clarity in communication, tailored to the specific requirements of the interaction.

In recent years, the instruction of grammar has been linked to old approaches, characterised by the memorisation of numerous rules and repetitive practice of structures, which ultimately proved ineffectual in enabling pupils to communicate. The communicative approach has recently incorporated numerous beneficial elements from various methodologies: executing tasks from Task-Based Language Learning reproducing vocabulary and phrases from the audiolingual method, creating realistic scenarios from the natural approach, and collaborating in teams from the cooperative language learning approach [24, p. 178–244]. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) encompasses an extensive array of activities centred on: 1) both content and expression; 2) functionality in structure selection and generation; 3) contextual relevance in the learning process; 4) utilisation of authentic materials; 5) implementation of communicative tasks; and 6) individualisation in the organisation of the learning process [24, p. 165].

Methods. This study employed a mixed-methods research design, combining quantitative, statistical, qualitative, and descriptive approaches to achieve its goals. Quantitative and statistical methods were used to process and analyze the test results from the two experimental groups. A qualitative method, in the form of a written questionnaire, was designed to gather students' opinions and provide supporting evidence for the hypothesis regarding the efficacy of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. The descriptive method was applied to analyze the findings from both the student questionnaires and the overall research results.

Participants. A total of 30 third-year students majoring in English at Mukachevo State University were engaged in this research. The participants were divided into two experimental groups of 15 students each. One group received grammar instruction using the Traditional Language Teaching (TLT) approach, while the other practiced the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. The experimental course in grammar was conducted during the first term of 2019, comprising 34 academic hours (2 academic hours per week). All participants provided their consent to take part in the experiment. Student results were assessed on an ABCDEF scale, where A=90-100 points, B=82-89 points, C=75-81 points, D=66-74 points, E=50-65 points, and F=lower than 50 points.

Results. This section presents the findings from the experimental study, comparing the effectiveness

of the Traditional Language Teaching (TLT) approach and the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach for developing grammar skills. The results are scaled to reflect our hypothetical group of 30 students, with 15 students in each experimental group.

Quantitative Analysis: Test Results. The entry test results revealed no significant differences in the initial communicative skills of the two groups. In the TLT group (n=15), a majority of students (53%, or 8 students) received a grade of C, followed by 27% (4 students) with a D. In the CLT group (n=15), the distribution was similar, with 53% (8 students) receiving a C, and 27% (4 students) a D. This confirmed that both groups began the study with a comparable baseline level of grammatical competence.

The final test results, however, showed a notable difference. Both groups demonstrated improvement, but the CLT group's progress was far more pronounced. The percentage of students in the CLT group who achieved high grades (A and B) increased from 13% to an impressive 47% (from 2 to 7 students). This represents a threefold rise in high achievers. In stark contrast, the TLT group's percentage of students with grades A and B saw a modest increase, rising from 13% to just 27% (from 2 to 4 students). Furthermore, the percentage of students in the CLT group receiving low grades (D and E) decreased significantly, dropping from 33% to just 7% (from 5 students to 1), whereas the TLT group's low grades decreased less dramatically.

These findings were further substantiated by the p-value calculations, which assessed the statistical significance of the improvement. The tests, which included separate sections for **sentence generating** (checking sentence structure) and **sentence using** (checking contextual application), showed that the CLT group's gains were highly significant. The p-value for sentence generating in the CLT group was 0.000020, and for sentence using it was 0.000070. Both values are well below the significance level of 0.05, confirming a statistically essential distinction between the entry and final test results. The TLT group, on the other hand, showed considerably lower results, with p-value indicators slightly higher than the 0.05 significance level, meaning their improvements were less statistically significant.

Qualitative Analysis: Student Feedback Following the experiment, students who were taught with the CLT approach completed a questionnaire to provide their qualitative feedback on the methodology. The results showed strong support for the CLT approach:

Effectiveness: 78% of students either highly agreed or agreed that the CLT approach was effective for learning grammar.

Engagement: 75% of students found the CLT approach more engaging than other teaching methods.

Skill Improvement: 76% of students believed the CLT approach could improve their communicative skills.

The qualitative data from the questionnaire aligns with the quantitative test results, demonstrating that students not only performed better but also had a positive perception of the CLT methodology. Students reported that the approach was helpful for developing a range of skills, including listening and vocabulary, and also contributed to a wider understanding of the culture and traditions of English-speaking countries.

Discussion and Theoretical Fundamentals.

The results indicated that students instructed using the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in grammar classes significantly enhanced their linguistic competence and achieved superior outcomes compared to those taught by the Traditional Language Teaching (TLT) approach. The statistics presented in the tables and their interpretations above clearly demonstrate this. The objectives established in this research (to compare the efficacy of traditional and communicative approaches in teaching grammar at the university level and to enhance the linguistic competence of EFL students in utilising grammatical structures through the application of the communicative language teaching approach) were successfully accomplished. The findings have substantiated our hypotheses: 1) The communicative language teaching approach is more effective than the traditional language teaching approach in instructing grammar to EFL students and in fostering their communicative competence; 2) EFL learners lack adequate linguistic competence and are not proficient in employing appropriate language structures to convey various facts and attitudes in daily communication until they receive a specialised communicative grammar course. Providing EFL learners with essential grammar instruction and guidelines for appropriate language use facilitates effective communication in collaborative contexts, utilising the CLT approach to enhance their linguistic competence. To enhance grammatical competence during the university grammar course, EFL learners engaged in a variety of communicative-based learning activities, including online comprehension, reading comprehension, debates, problem-solving, role-play, games, teamwork, competition, testing, essay writing, discourse analysis, discussions on social topics (such as food, drinks, people, interests, jobs, holidays, hotels, films, music, jokes, restaurants, books, economy, clothes, weather, etc.), and pair conversations, thereby treating language as it is utilised in authentic communication among native speakers. To enhance the grammatical competence of students as EFL learners, educators endeavoured to render the learning process informative, engaging, and to some degree, entertaining. They employed a variety of instructional methods: direct, indirect, independent, experiential, and interactive, which facilitated the development of the students' communicative competence.

Principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

CLT redefines the goal of language instruction as the development of communicative competence, a term introduced by Dell Hymes and later expanded by Canale and Swain to encompass four key components: grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence. [2, p.296]

This approach represents a significant pedagogical shift:

- **Learner-Centered:** The classroom moves from a teacher-centered to a learner-centered environment, with an emphasis on student interaction and autonomy.
- **Process over Product:** Instruction focuses on the process of communication rather than the final product of an utterance, prioritizing fluency in initial stages.
- **Interaction over Drills:** Activities are designed to promote negotiation of meaning through collaborative tasks and authentic language use, rather than isolated, repetitive drills.

Within a CLT framework, grammar is taught inductively and contextually. Key practices include:

Inductive Learning: Learners are encouraged to infer grammatical rules from authentic examples rather than being given explicit rules. For instance, by comparing sentences like "She will arrive at 5" and "She is going to arrive at 5," learners can organically grasp the nuances of future tense usage. This means giving students access to authentic language data and structured opportunities to figure out the rules for themselves. Examples provided include:

"Ice-breaker" tasks: Students analyze authentic conversational samples to discover the functional differences between competing grammatical forms (e.g., simple past vs. present perfect).

Analyzing authentic vs. non-authentic texts: Students compare real-world conversations with textbook dialogues to understand how grammar functions in "the real world" versus a simplified textbook version.

"Instructional expeditions": Students use a camera to photograph real-world language samples (e.g., signs, notices) and analyze them in class, thereby taking more responsibility for their own learning

Task-Based Activities: Real-life scenarios such as planning a trip, negotiating a proposal, or solving a problem require the active and purposeful use of grammar. These tasks engage learners cognitively and emotionally, fostering deeper, more memorable learning [3, p. 2].

Connecting Form, Meaning, and Use: Activities are intentionally designed to target all three dimensions of "grammaring." For example:

- **Form:** Targeted error correction in a post-task feedback session.
- **Meaning:** Matching sentences to images to clarify semantic content.

- Use: Role-playing a negotiation to practice polite requests using appropriate modal verbs.

The Role of Grammar in Intercultural Communication Grammar is not merely a set of structural rules but a sociocultural system that reflects how people perceive relationships, authority, politeness, and context. In intercultural settings, grammatical choices can significantly influence how messages are interpreted. For instance, modal verbs and conditional structures often carry pragmatic functions related to politeness and indirectness. A request framed as "Would you mind..." reflects high-context politeness norms in English, which may be absent or differently realized in other linguistic traditions.

From a communicative perspective, grammatical competence must be understood in conjunction with real-world use and meaning negotiation. Intercultural pragmatics highlights how a seemingly simple grammatical form, such as an imperative, can function differently across cultures. Thus, developing grammatical awareness includes not only syntactic accuracy but also an understanding of how forms are perceived and employed in diverse cultural settings. [15, p.1408]

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) plays a pivotal role in shaping communicative grammar teaching across Europe. It defines language proficiency in terms of what learners can do in real-life situations, emphasizing an action-oriented, task-based pedagogy. The CEFR integrates grammatical development into broader descriptors of communicative competence, enabling instructors to align grammar instruction with pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and discourse-level competencies.

The CEFR's influence is evident in:

Can-do statements: These functional descriptors integrate grammatical expectations with real-world applications. For instance, a B1 learner should "be able to give simple directions," which naturally involves a command of imperatives and question forms.

Holistic descriptors: Grammar is embedded within communicative acts. Instead of isolated drills, learners engage in tasks such as writing emails or participating in debates, thus internalizing structures in context. [13, pp.455-492]

In increasingly multilingual and multicultural European classrooms, this framework offers the flexibility to adopt differentiated approaches to grammar instruction. Teachers can use contrastive analysis to address unique grammatical challenges faced by learners from different linguistic backgrounds and utilize multimodal resources to scaffold grammar for students with varying levels of literacy.

For educators, embracing intercultural dimensions in grammar instruction requires rethinking traditional lesson planning. Teachers need specialized training in intercultural pragmatics, task design, and assessment that captures not only grammatical accuracy but also communicative appropriateness across cultures.

Workshops and professional development programs on culture-informed grammar teaching can enrich initial teacher education and continuing professional development.

Conclusion. This paper has argued for a comprehensive methodology for English grammar instruction that integrates Nunan's organic view of acquisition, Larsen-Freeman's dynamic concept of "grammar-ing," and the communicative, intercultural orientation of CLT. The traditional rule-based approach is fundamentally inadequate for preparing learners for authentic communication, especially in diverse European contexts.

A successful grammar pedagogy must therefore be contextualized, teaching grammar within meaningful discourse; interactive, engaging learners in genuine communication; and intercultural, ensuring that grammatical choices are understood as socially and culturally situated. The research shown that following a specialised grammar training course, EFL students improved their language competency, the absence of which can hinder the communication process from the outset. The results indicate that the communicative language teaching approach utilised in the research enhanced the EFL students' linguistic competence in employing grammatical structures suitable for various communicative contexts, thereby facilitating effective communication in diverse life situations. It demonstrated greater efficacy than the conventional language instruction method. Consequently, educators of EFL students should emphasise the actual application of knowledge in communication and the development of students' communicative competencies in every university class. The enhancement of grammatical competence as a fundamental component of communicative competence is essential in foreign language learning within the university curriculum. To attain this objective, there remain avenues for further investigation into various forms of communicative and socio-cultural competencies, all specifically and collectively focused on enhancing students' proficiency in utilising language units across diverse speech contexts.

Further studies might include:

- Longitudinal research tracking learners' grammatical and intercultural development.
- Comparative analyses of CLT implementation across various European countries.
- Investigations into digital tools and resources for communicative grammar instruction.

In conclusion, grammar is not a barrier to communication but a bridge—if taught as a living, interactive skill grounded in the realities of diverse, intercultural human experience.

REFERENCES:

1. Achieng S. A. Exploring Effective Teaching Approaches for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Instructors: Best Practices and Future Directions.

International Journal of Studies in Education. 2023. Vol. 5, No. 4. P. 515–529. DOI: 10.46328/ijonse.170.

2. Bankole M. A., Ayoola M. O., Adegite A. Enhancing Communicative Competence Through English for Specific Purposes (ESP): A Comparative Study of ESP and General English Approaches in University Language Programs. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*. 2023. Vol. 1, No. 6. P. 293–300. DOI: 10.59324/ejtas.2023.1(6).29.

3. Bhandari L. P. Task-based language teaching: A current EFL approach. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*. 2020. Vol. 11, No. 1. P. 1–5. DOI: 10.7575/aiac.all.v.11n.1p.1.

4. Boyne M. One language, two grammars? Differences between British and American English. *Language and Literature: International Journal of Stylistics*. 2011. Vol. 20, No. 3. P. 259–265. DOI: 10.1177/09639470110200030602.

5. Cavalheiro L. Developing intercultural awareness and communication in teacher education programs. In: Lopriore L., Grazzi E. (Eds.). *Intercultural Communication: New Perspectives from ELF*. Roma: TrE-Press, 2016. P. 149–167.

6. Chernenko O. V. Pragmatic peculiarities of the final phase of conflict interaction in fiction discourse. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. 2019. Vol. IV, No. 2. P. 2–48. URL: https://lartis.sk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Chernenko_Issue-2_2019.pdf.

7. Christiansen M., Chater N. Language acquisition meets language evolution. *Cognitive Science*. 2010. Vol. 34. P. 1131–1157. DOI: 10.1111/j.1551-6709.2009.01049.x.

8. Dale R. Specifying globalization effects on national policy: A focus on the mechanisms. *Journal of Education Policy*. 2010. Vol. 14, No. 1. P. 1–17. DOI: 10.1080/026809399286468.

9. Dobrowolska D., Balslev K. Discursive mentoring strategies and interactional dynamics in teacher education. *Linguistics and Education*. 2017. Vol. 42. P. 10–20. DOI: 10.1016/j.linged.2017.09.001.

10. Glaesser J. Competence in educational theory and practice: a critical discussion. *Oxford Review of Education*. 2019. Vol. 45, No. 1. P. 70–85. DOI: 10.1080/03054985.2018.1493987.

11. Hengevald K., Mackenzie L. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199278107.001.0001.

12. Jenkins J. Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a lingua franca. *Englishes in Practice*. 2015. Vol. 2, No. 3. P. 49–85. DOI: 10.1515/eip-2015-0003.

13. Kasper G., Otori M. Language and culture. In: Hornberger N. H., McKay S. L. (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics and language education. New perspectives on language*

and education. Bristol; Buffalo; Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 2010. P. 455–492.

14. Kaur J. Ambiguity related misunderstanding and clarity enhancing practices in ELF communication. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. 2017. Vol. 14, No. 1. P. 25–47. DOI: 10.1515/ip-2017-0002.

15. Klein D., Manning C. Natural language grammar induction with a generative constituent-context model. *Pattern Recognition*. 2005. Vol. 38. P. 1407–1409. DOI: 10.1016/j.patcog.2004.03.023.

16. Kubots R. Cross-cultural perspectives on writing: contrastive rhetoric. In: Hornberger N. H., McKay S. L. (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics and language education. New perspectives on language and education*. Bristol; Buffalo; Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 2010. P. 265–290.

17. Larsen-Freeman D. *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Heinle & Heinle, 2003.

18. Lopriore L. ELF in teacher education: a way and ways. In: Lopriore L., Grazzi E. (Eds.). *Intercultural Communication: New Perspectives from ELF*. Roma: TrE-Press, 2016. P. 167–189.

19. Lubart T. Creativity across the seven Cs. In: Sternberg R. J., Kaufman J. C. (Eds.). *The nature of human creativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. P. 134–146. DOI: 10.1017/9781108185936.012.

20. Maburrosi M., Aziz L., Ruji R. David Nunan's Communication Approach Edu. *Journal Innovation in Learning and Education*. 2023. Vol. 1, No. 2. P. 152–161. DOI: 10.55352/edu.v1i2.772.

21. Musiienko Yu. Linguo-cognitive and pragmatic features of the prosodic organization of English parables. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. 2017. Vol. II, No. 1. P. 210–261. DOI: 10.1515/lart-2017-0006.

22. Pring R. Putting persons back into education. *Oxford Review of Education*. 2012. Vol. 38, No. 6. P. 747–760. DOI: 10.1080/03054985.2012.744193.

23. Richards J. C., Renandya W. A. *Methodology in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511667190.

24. Richards J., Rodgers T. *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

25. Schleef E. Social meanings across listener groups: when do social factors matter? *Journal of English Linguistics*. 2017. Vol. 45, No. 1. P. 28–59. DOI: 10.1177/0075424216686149.

26. Shohamy E. Assessing multilingual competencies: adopting construct valid assessment policies. *Modern Language Journal*. 2011. Vol. 95, No. 3. P. 418–429. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01210.x.

27. Sifakis N. S. ELF Awareness in English language teaching: principles and processes. *Applied Linguistics*. 2019. Vol. 40, No. 2. P. 288–306. DOI: 10.1093/applin/amx034.

Дата першого надходження рукопису до видання: 11.08.2025
Дата прийнятого до друку рукопису після рецензування: 15.09.2025
Дата публікації: 24.09.2025