COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING APPROACH
IN PROMOTING THE LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE OF EFL LEARNERS

Victoriia Berezenko (Corresponding author)**, Olesya Cherkhava, Yuliia Musiienko**
Kyiv National Linguistic University, Ukraine
berezenkovika@bigmir.net

The article is devoted to the problems of foreign language education in linguistic universities, namely to promoting the students' linguistic competence, which has been the most urgent in mastering the language as a means of communication. The research prompts the standards to progress the grammatical competence. In the current study, we make a hypothesis that, in contrast to traditional teaching approach, the communicative approach is supposed to be more effective in teaching grammar and helps students to master the language and upgrade their linguistic competence in comprehending and processing spoken and written texts and become professionals after graduating the University. In the experiment two groups of students were involved: one using traditional approach to learning grammar at the classes and the other practising communicative language teaching approach. In total 79 bachelor's degree students of Kyiv National Linguistic University (Ukraine) took a tentative course in grammar. The current study testifies the effectiveness of the communicative approach to studying grammar structures as a way to develop the linguistic competence of students and to help them to acquire proficiency level for achieving success in real communication.

Keywords: foreign language education; linguistic competence; grammatical competence; communicative language teaching.

Introduction

The significance of foreign language competences cannot be overestimated, and with the increased mobility of students as potential workers, there is a crucial need for them to learn to communicate freely and effectively without any boundaries.

Gaining foreign language competence is very important for English foreign language (further on as EFL) students. Fluency in a foreign language can be supported by the substantial knowledge base of lexicon, sentence processing as well as of peculiarities of culture (Cavalheiro, 2016; Christiansen & Chater, 2010; Dale, 2010; Kaur, 2017; Schleef, 2017; Musiienko, 2017). EFL learners should learn to communicate effectively in order to promote mutual respect, cooperation and problem-solving in an increasingly global and multicultural environment (Boyne, 2011; Jenkins, 2015; Li, 2016; Pring, 2012; Shohamy, 2011; Vettorel, 2016; Wierzbicka, 1985). The ability to communicate freely in a foreign language is one of the key competencies of an educated 21st century person (Kasper & Omori, 2010; Roberts & Liszka, 2019). The key competency to be mastered by a student is the ability to speak a foreign language. It is no longer the target of an academic subject as a part of the study of a foreign language in the university curriculum but as a life skill (Gass, 1997; Lopriore, 2016). This innovation prescribes that the University classes have to treat a foreign language not simply as a set of rules, but as a means of communicating for achieving specific goals in everyday life activity. One of the most popular ways to classify life competences is the so-called "Seven Cs", which can also be developed by studying a foreign language. They are: critical thinking (creators), creativity (creating), collaboration, cross-cultural understanding (context), communication (creation), computing (consumption) as well as career and learning self-reliance (curricular) (Lubart, 2018).

In Europe, to test the level of competence an attempt has been made to provide a common framework with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) by the Council of Europe in 2001. The CEFR forms the basis for defining competences for language learners and for professionals who deal with teaching foreign languages and assessment of language proficiency, with the levels ranging from the most basic A1 to the most advanced C2. Within the CEFR framework, competences are defined both with regard to their structure and to the levels, which may be attained by learners (Glaesser, 2018, p. 70). In terms of its structure, the CEFR comprises two broad areas of competence: general and communicative. The communicative language competences include linguistic, socio-linguistic and pragmatic, each with further subdivisions. The linguistic competence, in its turn, comprises the following competences: lexical, grammatical (which we focus on in our study), semantic, phonological, orthographic and orthoepic (Glaesser, 2018, p. 72), each of which is also fundamental alongside with pragmatic and socio-linguistic competences.

In accordance with the needs of a particular communication process, students should use various grammatical structures to be clearly understood by the partners of communication. It is of vital importance,

therefore, to develop grammatical competence, which is the most valid of all linguistic competences and serves as the basis for other communicative competences in the process of foreign language acquisition. The main approach for teaching grammar chosen at Kyiv National Linguistic University is a descriptive one, which offers a number of advantages, such as real examples, coverage of language variation, preference and frequency parameter and interpretation of context. In contrast to the prescriptive approach, based on prescribing to use of language units in accordance with the norms which are often not followed in spoken and written discourse, descriptive grammar focuses on actual patterns in use and reveals the possible reasons for those patterns (Hengeveld & Mackenzie, 2008; Owen, 1993). Rather than a prescriptive grammar with the human factor excluded and the description of the form and meaning of grammatical constructions displayed out of context, descriptive grammar provides the analysis of different registers: conversation, fiction, news, general prose and academic prose in both American and British English. Only the descriptive communicative grammar, including basic topics for investigation (namely, the structure, processing and functioning of major 1) phrase types; 2) clauses; 3) sentences; 4) texts), places the main spotlight on spoken English and shows how the grammar of conversation is adapted to the particular demands of spontaneous spoken interaction. Moreover, we pay considerable attention to one more crucial point – the influence the mother tongue can have on the foreign language studied (Ganuza & Hedman, 2019). To avoid a number of problems the students have much practice in translating and retelling native fiction or academic texts in English. It is not the question whether to teach grammar but how the grammatical knowledge base is to be provided in the process of foreign language studying (Sifakis, 2019; Tsuchiya, 2020).

In recent years the process of teaching grammar was associated with the traditional methods, including learning the numerous rules and endless repetitions of the structures, which in the long run in the course of time revealed to be ineffective in teaching students to communicate. Fluent conversational English as an objective of every student can be gained in the process of language learning by using the communicative approach, introduced by a British linguist D. A. Wilkins and specified in his book titled ''Notional Syllabuses'' as communicative language teaching (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 154), with the focus on the speech activity in the process of learning. The communicative approach appeared latest embraced many useful elements from other approaches: performing tasks from the Task-Based Language Learning (Bhandari 2020), reproducing words and phrases from the audiolingual approach, making up situations close to reality from the natural approach and working in teams from the cooperative language learning approach (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 178-244).

With a communicative language teaching (CLT, in terms of D. A. Wilkins, or, in other words, communicative grammar) the range of activities is unlimited and focused on: 1) both the content and the expression sides; 2) functionality in the choice and the generating of structures; 3) context and the situation in the learning process; 4) usage of authentic materials; 5) communicative tasks and 6) individualisation in organising the process of learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 165).

Aim and hypothesis

In the current study, we make a hypothesis that, in contrast to traditional teaching approach, the communicative approach is supposed to be more effective in teaching grammar and helps students to master the language and upgrade their linguistic competence in comprehending and processing spoken and written texts and become professionals after graduating the University. We also hypothesise that the EFL learners do not have sufficient linguistic competence and are not well skilful in using proper language structures to display different facts and attitudes to them in daily communication until they are provided with a special communicative grammar course. To test the assumption this research was initiated and carried out. The aims of our study were: 1) to compare the efficiency of traditional and communicative approaches in teaching grammar at the university; 2) to progress the linguistic competence of EFL students in using grammatical structures by applying the communicative language teaching approach.

Methods
Research Design

In order to achieve the goals set we initiated a combined research model based on quantitative, statistical, qualitative and descriptive methods. To obtain the objective results quantitative and statistical methods were used, which helped us to process the test results of students in two experimental groups, one using the traditional language teaching (further on as TLT) approach and the other – communicative language teaching (further on as CLT) approach. A qualitative method was designed to examine the students' opinions on the discussion of the lesson's issues. The inquiry in the form of a written questionnaire

was designed to testify to the hypothesis of CLT approach efficacy. A descriptive method was applied for analysing the students' questionnaire and the research results.

Participants

Six academic groups of the 3^d grade students of Kyiv National Linguistic University were engaged in the research. The six academic groups were divided into two experimental groups of students: one experimental group involved three academic groups (39 students), in which grammar was taught by using TLT approach, and correspondingly the other experimental group included three academic groups (40 students), which studied grammar using CLT approach. In total 79 bachelor's degree students of Kyiv National Linguistic University took an experimental course in grammar during the first term in 2019. The participants gave their consent for participating in the experiment. The study included 34 academic hours (2 academic hours a week). The results were assessed on the ABCDEF scale (A=90-100 points, B=89-82 points, C=81-75 points, D=74-66 points, E=65-50 points, F=lower than 50 points).

Instruments and Procedure

In order to check the significance of gaining the linguistic competence, the students of Kyiv National Linguistic University were suggested the experiment, which included three stages: 1) diagnostic: entry testing, aimed to check the initial foreign language learners' linguistic competence 2) training period and 3) checkout: final testing, designed to check the final foreign language learners' linguistic competence.

At the beginning of the learning process at the very first stage, the students were offered an entry test to check the initial foreign language learners' linguistic competence. At the third stage, the students were given a final test to assess their achievements. For both tests, they could get a maximum of 100 scores. The time needed to assess the levels of linguistic competence was about 80 minutes.

Both the diagnostic and final tests 'Testing the linguistic competence of EFL students' were similar in tasks and included three parts. In Part 1 (Word use in the sentence) students were given a series of tasks designed to check the students' competence in using appropriate to the context words in the correct forms and positions. The next tasks of Part 2 (Sentence processing) were designed to clear out the students' ability to create sentences in accordance with the speech situation. The last tasks of Part 3 (Sentence functioning) included three sections: 'Team work', 'Individual work' and 'Discussion'. Section 'Team work' checked the abilities of the students in: 1) making up a dialogue using some of the indicated grammar patterns (different types of questions, comparative structure, have something done, incomplete sentences, one-member or two-member sentences, different communicative types of sentences) in one of the situations suggested; 2) discussing the situation from different topical perspectives using as many grammar patterns as possible; 3) describing the pictures using the listed grammar phenomena. Section 'Individual work' was designed to examine students' skills in presenting soliloquies (stories, essays etc.). Section 'Discussion' included tasks to control the students' communicative capacities in enterpreting different issues, on which the students were to share their opinions.

During the second stage – training period – the groups of students were expected to integrate grammar and vocabulary in close to real communicative situations. In both groups, there were studied the same grammar issues on the basis of the vocabulary from the same topics. The methods, though, were quite different.

That group, which was taught grammar applying TLT approach, was given the usual instructions explaining new terms and items, doing spoken and written tasks, writing essays. The teacher acted as the instructor, who controlled all the students' activities.

In the second group with the CLT approach used, students practised nearly all the grammar phenomena in groups. Teachers recommended students to use strategies such as predicting, summarizing, clarifying, questioning, supporting etc. A special accent was laid upon developing teamwork and communication skills. Accordingly, the situations in the tasks were designed to be close to real. EFL students communicated with each other using the studied grammar units within the setting of a certain life problem. The basic aim of the teacher was to give maximum independence to students and to help them only if needed. The full learning period included three periods in the curriculum of grammar: 1) the teacher's presentation of the phenomena (or students' pre-reading), 2) language practice, 3) communicative practice. During the first period, new grammar units were introduced to students, stimulating their participation in the explanation, encouraging them to logically associate new terms or structures with the previous. The assignments of the language practice session were the following: filling in the blanks, transforming the structures, reproducing authentic dialogues, analyzing the contents of the texts. The communicative practice session included such tasks as filling in the missing contents in the sentence or a text, making a choice of the way to solve a problem,

answering open-ended questions, analyzing the structures logically, discussing diagrams/pictures etc., making up dialogues, practising role-plays, recoding the information. The tasks of language and communicative practice motivated students to generate their understanding of the external (formal) features of the studied grammar units and their incorporation into the internal (semantic) cognitive basis and use the studied phenomena in discourse. At the final period during the group activity, students performed different communicative tasks, which represented various life situations. The teacher's role was a bit different in this group: being rather the assistant than the instructor.

For acquiring the linguistic competence during the communicative grammar course EFL learners in the group with CLT approach investigated different language structures in divergent communicative situations through various activities. To achieve the goals set in the research teachers used certain strategies and methods, most of which at the final teaching stage dealt with interactional dynamics (Brooks, 2009; Dobrowolska, Balslev, 2017; Nunan, 1989; Richards & Renandya, 2002). The prevailing was collaborating interactive approach to create a cooperative classroom rather than a competitive one. Students achieved success as a result of paying attention to their peers, asking questions, helping each other. The cooperative strategy as the prevailing in the communicative language teaching approach revealed the most effective collaborating forms of group work: problem-solving, discussion, active learning, writing reports, essays, articles, literary sources studying for finding and commenting the illustrative material, translating, making up dialogues, making presentations, watching and discussing video materials, interactive/participatory role-play and games.

For instance, during the teaching session at the grammar classes while studying particles students practised their use in the form of the game "Guess the activity". This game was based on informing some facts, which students should have interpreted with the implication shown by the appropriate modal word.

Guess game: "Where did students go at the weekend?" aimed at studying the meaning and use of modal words in discourse. Teacher/student gave some clue sentences: *Pete travelled by car. Jane visited her friends. Anna celebrated her birthday.* Students made their assumptions taking into account the value of the particle: '*only*' implying contrast, while '*even*' – addition. For example: *Only Sam did his home exercise in grammar / Even Sam had a rest from studying.* Having made their supposition students could verify it by checking the teacher's version.

Another practice activity suggested at the grammar classes was paraphrasing the sentence with the modal word or expression by using the correlating modal verb. For instance, in the sentences like "*Perhaps they go/went to the zoo*" the students substituted the modal words for the modal verbs *might/may/could* with the Indefinite or Perfect Infinitives.

After students' finishing communicative based course in English grammar, having practised different activities and having exercised various communicative tasks suggested, it was an easier matter for them to cope with the tasks of the final testing.

After the final stage in order to check the value of the CLT approach, the students from the second group practising this approach were suggested an anonymous questionnaire, which contained several assertions for the respondents to agree or disagree. This questionnaire contained 5 questions with variants of answers that could be chosen by the respondents. All the questions were closed-ended. The time needed to complete the questionnaire was about 5-7 minutes.

Ethical issues

The study was carried out following the main ethical principles, which point to the need to do good and do no harm. The participation of the students in the experiment was completely voluntary. The students were informed about all the details and benefits of the research in advance and gave their informed consent for participating in the experiment.

Data Analysis

The process of data analysis contained three stages. First of all, an entry test (stage 1) was offered to the EFL learners to define the level of their communicative competence. Six levels were singled out for assessing the students' achievemnets: 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). After the experimental learning final testing (stage 2) was conducted. The results of the two tests were interpreted by the statistical significance tests, namely Mann-Whitney and Wilcoxon non-parametrical pair tests. The purpose of the Mann-Whitney test was to examine and process independent patterns which were entry and final tests within different groups. The Wilcoxon pair test was designed with the dependent samples (the entry test and the final tests within the same group). The significance level of α = 0.05 of the tests mentioned above was suggested by

Brownlee (2019), Sharpe, De Veaux, and Velleman (2010). For calculating the data received the statistical program 'Statistica 10' was used. Finally, after the testing period, the questionnaire (stage 3) was suggested to the participants to clarify their attitude toward the CLT approach in the education process at grammar classes. Almost all the respondents involved in the experiment (97%) took part in the questionnaire and mostly 80% of them were sure in answering the questions. A number of participants (75%) testified that using CLT approach was engaging and helpful. All research results are illustrated by tables, presented in the next article section.

Results

The results of the entry testing revealed no remarkable differences in the levels of communication skills in both groups (See Tables 1 and 2). To assess the results the ABCDEF scale was used (A=90-100 points, B=89-82 points, C=81-75 points, D=74-66 points, E=65-50 points, F=lower than 50 points). Both groups had approximately the same percentage of students who achieved grades A: 5.1% and 5%, respectively, B: 7.7% and 7.5% of students, respectively, C: 51.3% and 55 % of students, respectively, D: 28.2 % and 25 % of students, respectively, E: 7.7% and 7.5 % of students, respectively. The final test results testified to the considerable rise in both groups. However, the percentage of students who got high grades (A, B) in the group increased significantly (thrice) compared to the group that used TLT approach (by 15% vs 5.1%, 17.5% vs 5.1% respectively). Also, the percentage of students who received low grades, D and E, decreased more significantly in the group with CLT approach than in the group using TLT approach (by 20 % vs 7.7%, 7.5% vs 2.6%, respectively).

Table 1. *Entry and final test results in the group with TLT approach used in the grammar course*

Grades	Entry test		Final test		Difference
	Number of students (39)	%	Number of students (39)	%	%
A	2	5.1	4	10.2	+5.1
B	3	7.7	5	12.8	+5.1
C	20	51.3	18	46.2	-5.1
D	11	28.2	8	20.5	-7.7
E	3	7.7	4	10.3	-2.6

Table 2. *Entry and final test results in the group with CLT approach used in the grammar course*

Grades	Entry test		Final test		Difference
	Number of students (40)	%	Number of students (40)	%	%
A	2	5	8	20	+15
B	3	7.5	10	25	+17.5
C	22	55	20	50	-5
D	10	25	2	5	-20
E	3	7.5	-	-	-7.5

The entry and final tests, which included communicative tasks (one part being focused on checking the sentence generating skills, the other – on sentence using skills), were given to both groups of students. Carrying out the research we calculated the p-value to find out the existence of statistical significance, which is usually represented as a p-value between 0 and 1. To obtain p-value index the results of the whole group were evaluated not a particular student's one. The lower p-value indicates that the null hypothesis should be disputed (McLeod 2019). The statistics results are demonstared in the table 3.

The research result showed that the students of both groups improved their final points, though, in the group, in which CLT approach was used, much better results both in sentence generating and in sentence using were revealed. It could be verified by comparing the figures. The outcomes of sentence generating in the group with the CLT approach show that 14 students out of 40 raised their grades in contrast to 5 out of 39 students from the group in which TLT approach was used. Much better results are also achieved in the sentence using part of the final testing: 15 students of 40 in the group with the CLT approach improved their level in comparison to 6 out of 39 students in the group in which TLT approach was used. It is notable that in the group with the CLT approach p-value indices are lower than the significance level of 0.05, as there are statistically essential distinctions between the entry test and the final test results both for sentence generating

and sentence using. The p-value for processing sentence generating in the group with the CLT approach equals 0,000020, thus it testifies great results. Concerning the sentence using skills in the group with the CLT approach – the result is also improved and is quite high – p-value equals 0.000070 which is slightly worse than for sentence generating skills. To sum up, the students from the group with the CLT approach improved a lot, mastering both sentence generating and sentence using skills. That means their linguistic competence was remarkably promoted. In the group in which TLT approach was used, in contrast, the p-value indicators are a little higher than the significance level of 0.05, what means that considerably lower results are obtained. Students increased their sentence generating and sentence using skills, though slightly. So, it became evident from the test results difference that the students after the CLT course demonstrated the efficiency of its integration into teaching EFL learners.

Table 3.*The results of the entry and final tests in both experimental groups*

Group	Points	Communicative skills					
		Sentence generating			Sentence using		
		Entry test results %	Final tests results %	p-value	Entry test results %	Fnal tests results %	p-value
With TLT approach used	90-100	6.1	11.2	0.051320	5.1	10.2	0.051960
	82-89	6.7	11.8		7.7	12.8	
	75-81	50.3	44.2		51.3	46.2	
	66-74	30.2	23.5		28.2	20.5	
	50-65	6.7	9.3		7.7	10.3	
With CLT approach used	90-100	4	18	0.000020	5	20	0.000070
	82-89	8.5	27		7.5	25	
	75-81	50	45		55	50	
	66-74	32	10		25	5	
	50-65	5.5	-		7.5	-	

After the testing period, the questionnaire was suggested to the participants to clarify their attitude toward the CLT approach used in the education process at grammar classes. Data analysis results of the questionnaire are presented in Table 4 below. It is clear, that a large number of students – 78 % – support the CLT approach in the process of learning, 75 % of students consider CLT approach to be engaging in the process of learning and rather helpful to obtain communicative skills and improving their level of English.

Table 4. *Questionnaire results about students' opinion on learning process based on CLT approach*

Assertion	Highly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Not sure (%)	Disagree (%)	Highly disagree (%)
CLT approach in the process of learning is quite effective	25	53	12	8	2
CLT approach is more engaging than other approaches to learning	16	59	15	7	3
CLT approach can improve my communicative skills	10	66	14	4	6
CLT approach can improve my level of English	13	62	16	5	4
I would rather learn by TLT approach	5	10	25	40	20

Considering the communicative skills, the most of students (76%) are sure that CLT approach can improve their communication competence. Due to the interview with the students, it can be indicated that they increased the level of their communicative skills after the application of CLT approach. Besides CLT approach was effective not only for the practice of speaking, but they occurred to be very helpful in many ways including listening skills, increasing vocabulary, especially such lexical units as slang, idioms, and academic words, widening the general outlook in terms of customs and cultural traditions of the English speaking countries.

Discussion

The results showed that the students taught with CLT approach used at the grammar classes greatly promoted their linguistic competence and had higher results than those who were taught by applying TLT approach. It can be clearly seen from the data provided in the tables and their interpretations above. Accordingly, the objectives set in this research (to compare the efficiency of traditional and communicative approaches in teaching grammar at the university and to progress the linguistic competence of EFL students in using grammatical structures by applying the communicative language teaching approach) were successfully achieved.

The findings, therefore, have proved our hypotheses: 1) that the communicative language teaching approach is more effective than the traditional language teaching approach in the process of teaching grammar to EFL students and in helping them to develop their communicative competence, 2) the EFL learners do not have sufficient linguistic competence and are not well skilful in using proper language structures to display different facts and attitudes to them in daily communication until they are provided with a special communicative grammar course.

Giving EFL learners the fundamental grammar experience with guidelines to proper language use for communicating effectively in a cooperative way in a particular communicative situation by using CLT approach gave the possibility to promote their linguistic competence. To develop the grammatical competence during the teaching period in the University grammar course with the communicative based learning EFL learners practised divergent forms of studying: online comprehension, reading comprehension, debates, problem-solving, role-play, games, team-work, competition, testing, writing essays, discourse analysis, speaking on a social topic (food, drinks, people, interest, jobs, holidays, hotels, films, music, jokes, restaurants, books, economy, clothes, weather etc.), pair conversation, which, in terms of the communicative grammar, consider the language as it is used in real communication between native speakers.

To train the grammatical competence of students as EFL learners the teachers tried to make the process of learning informative and engaging, to some extent even entertaining, and practised a variety of forms of instruction: direct, indirect, independent, experiential, independent and interactive what provided the students' developing their communicative competence.

This research supports the importance of the studied issue and the achieved results reflect the EFL learners' variation in their diligence during the studying. The experiment revealed some handicaps students faced in the learning process. It appeared difficult for some of the students to use grammar structures in different situations. Some students didn't have well-developed skills in using grammar forms. The number of students tended to use the structures of sentences, which didn't look authentic. The figures presenting the elementary level (E) of grammatical competence can be partially explained by the students' lack of motivation to study and missing a number of grammar classes. Even if working out all the missed classes, the students were not able to gain the proper level of the grammatical competence. Concerning other figures reflecting the dynamic move to a higher grammar competence level, they might have been much better. The University course of grammar for EFL learners is considered to be supported by the grammatical knowledge base of the native language, which was sometimes very poor. What is more, the general tendency of students' attitude to the process of learning is such: they demonstrate lower motivation at the beginning (during the first two years of study), but having moved to the third course they become more initiative, more creative and more engaged in the studying activity. This interest can be easily explained by their solid knowledge base, which gives them the full support for further progress.

The results of this experimental investigation are similar to those gained in the research carried out by Bhandari (2020), Bazylyak & Cherkhava (2017). We support the idea of L. Bhandari (2020), who states that using communicative tasks in the classroom changes the grammar practice routines through which many learners have previously failed to learn to communicate (p. 4). We also share the opinion of Bazylyak and Cherkhava (2017) that the main objective of the communicative approach is to provide the students with input and promote interaction between them (p. 345), because interaction, as the basic issue in the communicative tasks, is important for language acquisition and within the communicative approach language is used for communication and is learned through communication.

These research conclusions are in the line with other investigations (Klein & Manning, 2005; Bhandari, 2020; Roberts & Liszka, 2019) devoted to communicative competence. We agree with the scientists, we referred to above, that by developing communicative competence students become more confident in their class and everyday life activities. This study proceeds the initiative of the previous investigation concerned with the study of the level and the ways of improving the pragmatic competence of EFL students (Berezenko, 2019) and confirms other researchers' (Chernenko, 2019; Kubots, 2010; Turnbull, 2017; Shleef,

2017; Zhu, 2019) ideas that pragmatic and cultural knowledge are crucial alongside with the grammatical competence for the process of teaching EFL students the basics in their mastering the language.

Limitations

It is appropriate to emphasise that an approach to evaluating the results of the study was limited as only one institution was involved in the experiment, as well as the fact that solely third-year students' achievements were assessed.

Conclusions

The research testified the fact that after a special training grammar course the EFL students succeeded in processing and developing their linguistic competence, the lack of which can block the communicative process at its very initial stage.

Judging by the results presented, we can make a conclusion that the communicative language teaching approach applied in the research helped to promote the EFL students' linguistic competence in using grammatical structures appropriate to the communicative situations and as a result to maintain successful communication in different life situations. It proved to be more effective than the traditional language teaching approach.

Accordingly, teachers of EFL learners should focus on the practical application of the knowledge base in communication and process communicative competences of students at each university class. The promotion of grammatical competence as the basic one within the set included into the communicative competence is an integral part of the foreign language acquisition in the University course. To achieve this goal there are still perspectives for further research of other types of communicative or socio-cultural competences all in particular and together aimed at students' progressing in using language units in different speech situations.

References:

Bazylyak, N. O., Cherkhava, O. O. (2017). Communicative competence formation of future English Language teacher. *Man in India*, *97*(3). 341–352. http://miar.ub.edu/issn/0025-1569

Berezenko, V. (2019). Developing the pragmatic competence of foreign learners: guidelines to using constatives in modern English discourse. *Advanced Education, 13*, 81-88. https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.156658

Bhandari, L. P. (2020). Task-based language teaching: a current EFL approach. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *11*(1), 1-5. https://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.11n.1p.1

Boyne, M. (2011). One language, two grammars? Differences between British and American English. *Language and Literature: Intrenational Journal of Stylistics, 20* (3), 259-265. https:// doi.org/ 10.1177/09639470110200030602

Brooks, L. (2009). Interacting in pairs in a test of oral proficiency: Co-constructing a better performance. *Language testing*, *26*(3), 341-366. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532209104666

Brownlee, J. (2019). Statistical methods for machine learning: Discover how to Transform Data into Knowledge with Python. Machine Learning Mastery Pty. Ltd. Retrieved from https://dokumen.pub/statistical-methods-for-machine-learning.html

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

Chernenko, O.V. (2019). Pragmatic peculiarities of the final phase of conflict interaction in fiction discourse. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow, IV* (2), 2-48 https://lartis.sk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Chernenko_Issue-2_2019.pdf

Christiansen, M., & Chater, N. (2010). Language acquisition meets language evolution. *Cognitive Science*, *34*, 1131–1157. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1551-6709.2009.01049.x

Dale, R. (2010). Specifying globalization effects on national policy: A focus on the mechanisms. *Journal of Education Policy*, *14* (1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/026809399286468

Dobrowolska, D. & Balslev, K. (2017). Discursive mentoring strategies and interactional dynamics in teacher education. *Linguistics and Education, 42*, 10-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.09.001

Ganuza, N. & Hedman, Ch. (2019). The Impact of mother tongue Instruction on the development of biliteracy: Evidence from Somali–Swedish bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics*, *40* (1), 108–131. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx010

Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction and the second language learner*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Glaesser, J. (2019). Competence in educational theory and practice: a critical discussion. *Oxford Review of Education, 45* (1), 70-85. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2018.1493987

Hengevald, K. & Mackenzie, L. (2008). *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199278107.001.0001

Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice, 2*(3), 49-85. https://doi.org/10.1515/eip-2015-0003

Kasper, G. & Omori, M. (2010). Language and culture. In Hornberger N. H. and McKay S. L. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education. New perspectives on language and education* (pp. 455-492). Bristol.Buffalo.Toronto: Multilingual matters.

Kaur, J. (2017). Ambiguity related misunderstanding and clarity enhancing practices in ELF communication. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 14 (1), 25-47. https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2017-0002

Klein, D., & Manning, C. (2005). Natural language grammar induction with a generative constituent-context model. *Pattern Recognition*, *38*, 1407–1409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patcog.2004.03.023

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

Li, W. (2016). New Chinglish and the post-multilingualism challenge: Translanguaging ELF in China Article. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *5*(1), 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2016-0001

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

Lubart, T. (2018). Creativity across the seven Cs. In Robert J. Sternberg and James C. Kaufman (Eds.), *The nature of human creativity* (pp.134-146). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108185936.012

McLeod, S. (2019). What a p-value tells you about statistical significance. Simply Psychology. Retrieved from https://www.simplypsychology.org/p-value.html

Musiienko Yu. (2017). Linguo-cognitive and pragmatic features of the prosodic organization of English parables. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*, *II* (1), 210–261. https://doi.org/10.1515/lart-2017-0006

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Owen, Ch. (1993). Corpus-based grammar and the Heineken effect: lexico-grammatical description for language learners. *Applied Linguistics*, *14* (2), 167–187. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/14.2.167

Pring, R. (2012). Putting persons back into education. *Oxford Review of Education*, *38* (6), 747–760. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2012.744193

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press. http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190

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

Roberts, L., Liszka S.A. (2019). Grammatical aspect and L2 learners' online processing of temporarily ambiguous sentences in English: A self-paced reading study with German, Dutch and French L2 learners. *Second Language Research*, 37(4), 619-647. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658319895551

Schleef, E. (2017). Social meanings across listener groups: when do social factors matter? *Journal of English Linguistics, 45*(1), 28-59. https:// doi.org/ 10.1177/0075424216686149

Sharpe, N.R., De Veaux, R.D., & Velleman, P.F. (2010). *Business Statistics*. Boston: Addison Wesley.

Shohamy, E. (2011). Assessing multilingual competencies: adopting construct valid assessment policies. *Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 418 – 429. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01210.x

Sifakis, N. S. (2019) ELF Awareness in English language teaching: principles and processes. *Applied Linguistics*, *40*(2), 288–306. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx034

Tsuchiya, K. (2020). Conclusion: ELF research as a pedagogic device**.** In Konakahara, M. and Tsuchiya, K. (Eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca in Japan. Towards multilingual practices* (pp. 335-354)**.** https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33288-4_17

Turnbull, B. (2017). Towards new standards in foreign language assessment: learning from bilingual education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(4), 488-498. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1375891

Vettorel, P. (2016). WE-And ELF-informed classroom practices: Proposals from a pre-service teacher education programme in Italy. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *5*(1), 107-133. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2016-0005

Wierzbicka, A. (1985). Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts: Polish vs. English. *Journal of Pragmatics, 9* (2/3), 145–178. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(85)90023-2

Zhu, R. (2019). English compliments by Chinese and German female EFL speakers. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 9* (6), 64-76. https:// doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n6p64