

The Effectiveness of the Communicative Teaching Approach in Enhancing the Vocabulary and Grammar Acquisition in English of the Junior High School Teachers in Capalonga District, Division of Camarines Norte

Juvy G. Dianela¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:

Published: May 2026

Keywords:

Communicative Teaching Approach
 Vocabulary Acquisition
 Grammar Acquisition

ABSTRACT

Communicative language teaching remains a central pedagogical response to the need for functional, accurate, and socially meaningful English use among junior high school learners. This study examined the utilization and perceived effectiveness of the communicative teaching approach in enhancing vocabulary and grammar acquisition in English. The investigation was situated in Capalonga District, Division of Camarines Norte, during School Year 2024-2025. It focused on teacher-rated evidence from English instruction across big, medium, and small schools. The study addressed two broad instructional concerns: how extensively communicative teaching was utilized and how effective it was perceived to be in improving vocabulary and grammar acquisition. Utilization was examined through accuracy in grammar usage, vocabulary retention, engagement in interactive activities, and application of language skills in real-life contexts. Effectiveness was examined through improvement in vocabulary usage, accuracy and fluency in grammar application, engagement and participation in communicative activities, and retention and practical application. These dimensions were selected because they represent the movement from language knowledge to communicative competence. A descriptive-evaluative-correlational design guided the inquiry. Capalonga District was selected purposively as the research locale, while total enumeration was used for the thirty-three junior high school teacher-respondents. Data were gathered through a structured questionnaire and were analyzed using weighted mean, ranking, Kendall's coefficient of concordance W, and chi-square. The level of significance was set at 0.05 to determine agreement in rank orders across school groupings. Findings showed that the communicative teaching approach was much utilized in English instruction, with an overall weighted mean of 4.14. Engagement in interactive activities obtained the highest mean at 4.20, followed by vocabulary retention at 4.16, application of language skills in real-life contexts at 4.12, and accuracy in grammar usage at 4.09. These ratings indicate that teachers commonly employed student-centered, interaction-based, and contextualized language practices. The results also suggest that communicative teaching was embedded not only in speaking activities but also in grammar and vocabulary development. The highest utilization indicators reflected teacher practices that encourage active participation, meaningful vocabulary use, and contextual grammar support. Corrective feedback, digital tools, listening and speaking tasks, group activities, real-world writing, and social conversations emerged as particularly visible classroom practices. These findings affirm that communicative teaching in the district was not limited to oral fluency but included purposeful attention to linguistic form. The combination of fluency-oriented and accuracy-oriented practices supports a balanced interpretation of communicative teaching. The test of agreement on utilization showed mixed results. No significant agreement was found for accuracy in grammar usage, vocabulary retention, and engagement in interactive activities, while significant agreement was observed for application of language skills in real-life contexts. This pattern implies that teacher perceptions and school practices were relatively varied in most utilization dimensions but more convergent in real-life language application. Such variation may reflect differences in resources, teacher readiness, classroom routines, and opportunities to connect English lessons to authentic contexts. The communicative teaching approach was also rated much effective in enhancing vocabulary and grammar acquisition, with an overall weighted mean of 4.32. Retention and practical application ranked highest at 4.49, followed by improvement in vocabulary usage at 4.35, accuracy and fluency in grammar application at 4.33, and engagement and participation in

communicative activities at 4.10. These results indicate that teachers perceived communicative teaching as especially valuable when learners retained language forms and applied them beyond classroom exercises. The evidence suggests that meaningful practice contributed to both language memory and practical language performance. The strongest effectiveness indicators showed that learners were perceived to use English outside the classroom, retain words through interaction, improve sentence construction, and reduce language anxiety during communicative tasks. These results support the theoretical claim that language learning becomes more durable when learners use words and grammar structures to accomplish meaningful purposes. The findings further suggest that grammar accuracy and vocabulary growth can be strengthened through interaction rather than through isolated memorization alone. Communicative teaching therefore appears to operate as both a linguistic and motivational intervention. The test of agreement on effectiveness showed no significant agreement across all four effectiveness dimensions. Although the overall effectiveness rating was high, the absence of significant agreement indicates that teachers across school groupings did not rank the effectiveness indicators in the same way. This result points to contextual differences in implementation, assessment expectations, learner proficiency, and available instructional support. It also emphasizes the need for district-level professional development and policy mechanisms that can harmonize communicative teaching practices across schools. The study concludes that the communicative teaching approach is a viable and productive instructional framework for enhancing vocabulary and grammar acquisition in junior high school English. Its strongest contribution lies in enabling learners to retain language through meaningful practice and apply English in practical situations. However, the variability in rank agreement suggests that implementation should be supported by teacher training, localized materials, performance-based assessment, and regular monitoring.

1. Introduction

English language education continues to occupy an important place in basic education because it supports academic access, civic participation, and future employability. In multilingual contexts, English instruction is expected to develop not only knowledge about language but also the ability to use language for meaningful communication. This expectation places considerable pressure on English teachers to move beyond mechanical drills and toward classroom experiences that allow learners to speak, listen, read, and write with purpose. The challenge is especially evident in junior high school, where learners are expected to consolidate foundational language skills while preparing for more complex academic tasks.

Traditional language instruction has often emphasized grammar rules, vocabulary lists, and controlled exercises. While such instruction can build awareness of language forms, it may not sufficiently develop the ability to use language in authentic interaction. Learners may remember definitions or rules but still hesitate to express ideas, negotiate meaning, or use grammar accurately in spontaneous situations. This gap between knowledge and use has encouraged educators to revisit communicative approaches to language teaching.

Communicative language teaching is grounded in the view that language is best learned when it is used for communication. Its central concern is communicative competence, which includes grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic dimensions of language use (Canale & Swain, 1980; Hymes, 1972). This means that successful language learning cannot be reduced to grammatical correctness alone. It also requires the ability to select appropriate language, sustain interaction, organize ideas, and compensate for communication difficulties.

The communicative teaching approach repositions the learner as an active participant in constructing meaning. In this approach, classroom activities commonly include pair work, group discussion, role-play, interview, dialogue, problem-solving, task completion, and authentic writing. These activities allow learners to process language input, produce language output, receive feedback, and negotiate meaning. Such processes are consistent with interaction-based views of second language acquisition, which emphasize the role of meaningful language use in developing proficiency (Long, 1996; Swain, 1985).

Vocabulary acquisition is one of the most essential components of English language learning. Without adequate vocabulary, learners struggle to understand texts, express ideas, participate in discussions, and perform writing tasks. Vocabulary is also cumulative, meaning that repeated exposure across different contexts strengthens recognition, recall, and use. Communicative teaching supports vocabulary growth because words are encountered not as isolated items but as tools for accomplishing meaningful communicative goals.

Vocabulary retention depends on frequency, meaningful use, contextual variation, and opportunities for retrieval. Nation (2013) emphasized that vocabulary learning requires a balance of meaning-focused input, meaning-focused output, language-focused learning, and fluency development. Communicative classrooms can support this balance because learners encounter words in listening and reading, use them in speaking and writing, and revisit them through tasks. When vocabulary appears in purposeful interaction, learners are more likely to understand its function and remember its use.

Grammar acquisition remains equally important in English language education. Communicative teaching does not reject grammar; rather, it places grammar within meaningful contexts. This distinction matters because grammar taught only through isolated drills may not transfer to actual communication. Ellis (2006) argued that grammar instruction remains useful when it is connected to how learners process, notice, and use forms in communicative situations.

A balanced communicative approach therefore recognizes both fluency and accuracy as legitimate goals. Fluency allows learners to express meaning with confidence and continuity, while accuracy allows them to communicate with clarity and precision. The most productive classroom practices are those that give learners opportunities to communicate while also receiving feedback on language form. Corrective feedback, guided practice, and contextualized grammar tasks can help learners develop grammatical competence without reducing language learning to rule memorization.

Junior high school learners need learning experiences that connect English to real-life situations. They are increasingly expected to write emails, explain opinions, participate in collaborative tasks, understand social issues, and interact across school and community settings. If English instruction is separated from these everyday purposes, learners may view the subject as purely academic. Communicative teaching responds to this problem by making classroom language tasks resemble authentic communication.

Engagement is another critical concern in English instruction. Learners who are hesitant, anxious, or passive may have fewer opportunities to practice language and receive feedback. Communicative activities can reduce this barrier by creating supportive peer interaction and shared responsibility. When learners work in pairs or groups, they may feel more willing to take risks, ask questions, and test language forms.

The role of teachers in communicative teaching is complex and highly professional. Teachers are not merely transmitters of rules but facilitators, designers of tasks, feedback providers, and monitors of interaction. They must balance classroom freedom with instructional structure, especially when learners have different proficiency levels. This requires skill in planning tasks, grouping learners, providing scaffolds, and assessing performance.

Assessment also becomes more performance-oriented under a communicative framework. If the aim is communicative competence, assessment must include tasks that show how learners use vocabulary and grammar in speaking, writing, reading, and listening contexts. Role-plays, dialogues, interviews, presentations, collaborative outputs, and written communication tasks can reveal language application more directly than recognition tests alone. Such assessment practices give teachers richer information about learner progress.

The school context influences how communicative teaching is implemented. Large schools may have more teachers, materials, and exposure to professional development, while small schools may provide closer learner-teacher interaction but fewer resources. Medium schools may occupy an intermediate position, with varying levels of instructional support and classroom diversity. These contextual differences can shape teacher perceptions of both utilization and effectiveness.

In district-level language programs, consistency across schools is an important quality concern. Even when teachers agree that communicative teaching is valuable, they may differ in how they rank its indicators or apply its strategies. Such differences may arise from class size, instructional materials, school leadership, teacher training, learner readiness, and local culture. For this reason, examining agreement across school types can reveal whether a pedagogical approach is being implemented uniformly or unevenly. The present study addresses this need by examining the communicative teaching approach in relation to vocabulary and grammar acquisition in English. It focuses on teacher-rated utilization and effectiveness rather than direct test performance, allowing the study to capture the instructional experiences and professional judgments of classroom teachers. This perspective is valuable because teachers observe learner behavior across daily lessons, activities, assessments, and informal communication. Their perceptions provide evidence about how communicative teaching functions in actual school settings.

The study is situated in Capalonga District, Division of Camarines Norte, where junior high school teachers implement English instruction across different school types. The district context provides an opportunity to analyze whether communicative teaching is practiced consistently and whether its perceived effects are similar across instructional environments. The focus on vocabulary and grammar acquisition is timely because these domains are foundational to comprehension, expression, and academic achievement. It also responds to the practical need to strengthen English instruction through evidence-informed policy recommendations.

The inquiry is organized around utilization, effectiveness, rank agreement, and policy implications. Utilization describes the extent to which teachers apply communicative practices in grammar, vocabulary, interaction, and real-life language use. Effectiveness describes the perceived contribution of these practices to vocabulary usage, grammar accuracy and fluency, participation, retention, and practical application. Rank agreement provides a statistical lens for understanding whether teachers across school groupings share similar judgments.

By integrating descriptive and correlational evidence, the study contributes to the continuing discussion on how communicative teaching can be sustained in junior high school English programs. It highlights areas of strong practice and areas that require harmonization, especially where school types differ in implementation. It also clarifies that communicative teaching should not be understood narrowly as speaking practice alone. Rather, it is a broader instructional framework for developing vocabulary, grammar, interaction, confidence, retention, and real-life language performance.

2. Methodology

The study employed a descriptive-evaluative-correlational research design. The descriptive component was used to determine the extent to which the communicative teaching approach was utilized in English instruction. The evaluative component was used to determine the extent of its perceived effectiveness in enhancing vocabulary and grammar acquisition. The correlational component was reflected in the use of Kendall's coefficient of concordance W to test agreement in the rank orders of responses across school groupings.

The research was conducted in Capalonga District, Division of Camarines Norte, during School Year 2024-2025. The locale was selected purposively because it provided an appropriate setting for examining English instruction across different types of schools. The district context allowed the study to compare teacher perceptions from big, medium, and small schools. This classification was important because school size may influence resources, instructional routines, and opportunities for communicative learning activities.

The respondents were thirty-three junior high school teachers who were involved in English instruction in the district. Total enumeration was used because the population of qualified teacher-respondents was manageable and directly relevant to the inquiry. This sampling decision reduced selection bias within the available population and allowed the study to include all teachers who met the criteria. The teacher perspective was appropriate because teachers regularly observe the planning, implementation, and effects of classroom language activities.

The main data-gathering instrument was a structured questionnaire aligned with the research problems. The first part measured the extent of utilization of the communicative teaching approach in terms of accuracy in grammar usage, vocabulary retention, engagement in interactive activities, and application of language skills in real-life contexts. The second part measured the extent of effectiveness in terms of improvement in vocabulary usage, accuracy and fluency in grammar application, engagement and participation in communicative activities, and retention and practical application. The indicators were written to capture concrete practices and observable classroom outcomes.

The questionnaire used a five-point scale interpreted through weighted mean ranges. For utilization, the scale ranged from not at all to very much utilized, while for effectiveness it ranged from not at all to very much effective. The use of weighted means allowed the study to summarize teacher judgments for each indicator and dimension. Ranking was then applied to determine which practices and effects were most prominent in the district.

The instrument was prepared in relation to communicative language teaching principles and the objectives of the study. It was subjected to review to ensure that the indicators were relevant to grammar usage, vocabulary retention, interactive engagement, real-life language application, and communicative effectiveness. The items were framed in language that teacher-respondents could answer based on classroom experience. This process supported the content relevance and practical usability of the instrument.

Data collection was conducted through the administration of the questionnaire to the identified teacher-respondents. The responses were gathered, checked, tallied, tabulated, and encoded for statistical treatment. Care was taken to organize the responses according to the dimensions of utilization and effectiveness. The data were also grouped according to school type to support comparative analysis of rank agreement.

The statistical tools used were weighted mean, rank, Kendall's coefficient of concordance W , and chi-square. Weighted mean identified the extent of utilization and effectiveness, while rank established the relative order of indicators within each dimension. Kendall's W determined the degree of agreement among school groupings regarding the rank order of the indicators. The corresponding chi-square test determined whether the observed agreement was statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

The study was limited to teacher-rated evidence; therefore, the findings should be interpreted as professional perceptions rather than direct measures of learner achievement. The design provides valuable information about instructional implementation and perceived outcomes, but it does not substitute for pretest-posttest language performance data. Nevertheless, teacher-rated evidence is useful for program evaluation because teachers observe learner behavior across multiple language tasks. The results provide a strong basis for instructional planning, policy refinement, and further empirical investigation.

3. Results and Discussions

This section presents the empirical results on the utilization and perceived effectiveness of the communicative teaching approach in English instruction. The presentation begins with utilization indicators, followed by the summary of utilization and the test of rank agreement. It then proceeds to effectiveness indicators, the summary of effectiveness, the test of rank agreement, and policy directions derived from the findings. Each table is followed by an analytical discussion to connect the numerical results with instructional interpretation and language teaching implications.

The ratings are interpreted using the scale applied in the study, where higher weighted means indicate greater utilization or effectiveness. The tables emphasize average ratings and ranks to make the results suitable for journal presentation. The analysis also recognizes the teacher-rated nature of the evidence and the differences among school groupings. This orientation avoids overgeneralization while still drawing practical meaning from the patterns observed.

Table 1. Extent of Utilization in Terms of Accuracy in Grammar Usage

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Teachers provide corrective feedback during communicative activities	4.65	Very Much Utilized	1
Teachers incorporate real-life conversations to enhance grammar accuracy	4.55	Very Much Utilized	2
Learners actively correct their grammar errors during speaking tasks	4.13	Much Utilized	3
Learners apply grammar rules in interactive tasks rather than isolated drills	4.13	Much Utilized	4
Learners demonstrate improved subject-verb agreement in conversations	4.09	Much Utilized	5.5
Teachers use authentic materials to reinforce grammatical structures	4.09	Much Utilized	5.5
Role-playing exercises encourage the practical application of correct grammar	4.06	Much Utilized	7
Grammar games and interactive tasks promote accuracy in language use	3.99	Much Utilized	8
Group discussions help learners naturally apply grammatical rules	3.8	Much Utilized	9
Grammar is taught through contextualized speaking and writing activities	3.77	Much Utilized	10
Peer feedback is utilized to improve grammar accuracy	3.69	Much Utilized	11
Average	4.09	Much Utilized	

The findings in Table 1 show that accuracy in grammar usage obtained an average weighted mean of 4.09 and was rated Much Utilized. This pattern indicates that the communicative teaching approach was not treated as an occasional supplement but as a visible element of classroom practice. The highest-rated indicator, teachers provide corrective feedback during communicative activities, suggests that teachers gave priority to practices that connect language use with purposeful interaction. The lowest-rated

indicator, peer feedback is utilized to improve grammar accuracy, identifies an area where implementation may still be strengthened through more deliberate instructional planning.

The result is pedagogically important because it shows how communicative teaching can support both participation and language form. In a communicative classroom, learners are expected to use English to accomplish tasks, negotiate meaning, and receive feedback. When such experiences are consistently present, vocabulary and grammar become functional tools rather than isolated lesson content. The rating therefore reflects a shift toward instruction that values meaningful use while still attending to linguistic control.

This interpretation is consistent with Canale and Swain's (1980) view that grammatical competence is one part of communicative competence, and Ellis's (2006) position that grammar instruction is more useful when connected to communicative use. Communicative competence requires opportunities for input, output, feedback, and contextualized practice. The findings imply that the teachers' classroom practices were generally aligned with these principles, although the strength of alignment varied by indicator. Such variation is expected because communicative teaching depends on teacher readiness, resources, learner confidence, and school support.

The instructional implication is that the district should preserve the strong practices while targeting the weaker indicators for improvement. Professional learning may focus on lesson designs that integrate interaction, vocabulary recycling, grammar feedback, and real-life language tasks. Administrators may also use the results to identify which practices should be modeled in learning action cells and peer coaching. In this way, the data can serve as a practical guide for improving the quality and consistency of English instruction.

Table 2. Extent of Utilization in Terms of Vocabulary Retention

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Digital tools and media support vocabulary acquisition	4.67	Very Much Utilized	1
Vocabulary retention is improved through listening and speaking tasks	4.54	Very Much Utilized	2
The communicative approach promotes active vocabulary use in discussions	4.32	Much Utilized	3
Repeated exposure to words in different contexts strengthens retention	4.31	Much Utilized	4
Learners acquire new words through authentic communication tasks	4.29	Much Utilized	5
Vocabulary games and activities enhance word recall	4.21	Much Utilized	6
Peer interactions encourage the natural use of learned vocabulary	4.11	Much Utilized	7
Learners apply new vocabulary in structured conversations	3.93	Much Utilized	8
Learners demonstrate improved word recognition in reading and speaking	3.91	Much Utilized	9
Teachers use storytelling and narratives to reinforce vocabulary	3.84	Much Utilized	10
Contextual learning aids in long-term vocabulary retention	3.65	Much Utilized	11
Average	4.16	Much Utilized	

The findings in Table 2 show that vocabulary retention obtained an average weighted mean of 4.16 and was rated Much Utilized. This pattern indicates that the communicative teaching approach was not treated as an occasional supplement but as a visible element of classroom practice. The highest-rated indicator, digital tools and media support vocabulary acquisition, suggests that teachers gave priority to practices that connect language use with purposeful interaction. The lowest-rated indicator, contextual learning aids in long-term vocabulary retention, identifies an area where implementation may still be strengthened through more deliberate instructional planning.

The result is pedagogically important because it shows how communicative teaching can support both participation and language form. In a communicative classroom, learners are expected to use English to accomplish tasks, negotiate meaning, and receive feedback. When such experiences are consistently present, vocabulary and grammar become functional tools rather than isolated lesson content. The rating therefore reflects a shift toward instruction that values meaningful use while still attending to linguistic control.

This interpretation is consistent with Nation's (2013) emphasis on meaningful input, meaningful output, deliberate learning, and fluency development in vocabulary acquisition. Communicative competence requires opportunities for input, output, feedback, and contextualized practice. The findings imply that the teachers' classroom practices were generally aligned with these principles, although the strength of alignment varied by indicator. Such variation is expected because communicative teaching depends on teacher readiness, resources, learner confidence, and school support.

The instructional implication is that the district should preserve the strong practices while targeting the weaker indicators for improvement. Professional learning may focus on lesson designs that integrate interaction, vocabulary recycling, grammar feedback, and real-life language tasks. Administrators may also use the results to identify which practices should be modeled in learning action cells and peer coaching. In this way, the data can serve as a practical guide for improving the quality and consistency of English instruction.

Table 3. Extent of Utilization in Terms of Engagement in Interactive Activities

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Group activities encourage collaboration and peer interaction	4.5	Very Much Utilized	1
Learners participate actively in communicative games and discussions	4.47	Much Utilized	2.5
Teachers facilitate student-centered activities to maximize participation	4.47	Much Utilized	2.5
Debates and dialogues enhance learners' confidence in speaking	4.39	Much Utilized	4
Real-life problem-solving tasks enhance engagement	4.34	Much Utilized	5
Interactive storytelling boosts learners' motivation to communicate	4.25	Much Utilized	6

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Role-plays and simulations make learning more engaging	3.91	Much Utilized	7
Learners take part in language exchanges and real-world communication	3.89	Much Utilized	8
Learners enjoy using English in various interactive contexts	3.87	Much Utilized	9
Speaking and listening exercises promote active engagement	3.86	Much Utilized	10
Average	4.2	Much Utilized	

The findings in Table 3 show that engagement in interactive activities obtained an average weighted mean of 4.20 and ranked highest among the utilization dimensions. This pattern indicates that the communicative teaching approach was not treated as an occasional supplement but as a visible element of classroom practice. The highest-rated indicator, group activities encourage collaboration and peer interaction, suggests that teachers gave priority to practices that connect language use with purposeful interaction. The lowest-rated indicator, speaking and listening exercises promote active engagement, identifies an area where implementation may still be strengthened through more deliberate instructional planning.

The result is pedagogically important because it shows how communicative teaching can support both participation and language form. In a communicative classroom, learners are expected to use English to accomplish tasks, negotiate meaning, and receive feedback. When such experiences are consistently present, vocabulary and grammar become functional tools rather than isolated lesson content. The rating therefore reflects a shift toward instruction that values meaningful use while still attending to linguistic control.

This interpretation is consistent with Richards's (2006) description of communicative language teaching as a set of principles that prioritize meaningful classroom activities and learner participation. Communicative competence requires opportunities for input, output, feedback, and contextualized practice. The findings imply that the teachers' classroom practices were generally aligned with these principles, although the strength of alignment varied by indicator. Such variation is expected because communicative teaching depends on teacher readiness, resources, learner confidence, and school support.

The instructional implication is that the district should preserve the strong practices while targeting the weaker indicators for improvement. Professional learning may focus on lesson designs that integrate interaction, vocabulary recycling, grammar feedback, and real-life language tasks. Administrators may also use the results to identify which practices should be modeled in learning action cells and peer coaching. In this way, the data can serve as a practical guide for improving the quality and consistency of English instruction.

Table 4. Extent of Utilization in Terms of Application of Language Skills in Real-Life Contexts

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Writing tasks focus on real-life applications such as emails and letters	4.69	Very Much Utilized	1
The communicative approach helps learners adapt to social conversations	4.48	Much Utilized	2
Learners engage in discussions that reflect real-world issues	4.4	Much Utilized	3
Role-playing real-life scenarios improves learners' confidence	4.3	Much Utilized	4
Problem-solving activities promote critical thinking in English	4.25	Much Utilized	5
Teachers incorporate authentic materials such as news articles and interviews	4.15	Much Utilized	6
Teachers integrate cultural aspects into language lessons	4.11	Much Utilized	7
Learners use English in meaningful, real-world situations	3.89	Much Utilized	8
Learners become more comfortable using English outside the classroom	3.51	Much Utilized	9
Learners practice ordering food, asking for directions, and other daily tasks	3.42	Utilized	10
Average	4.12	Much Utilized	

The findings in Table 4 show that application of language skills in real-life contexts obtained an average weighted mean of 4.12 and was rated Much Utilized. This pattern indicates that the communicative teaching approach was not treated as an occasional supplement but as a visible element of classroom practice. The highest-rated indicator, writing tasks focus on real-life applications such as emails and letters, suggests that teachers gave priority to practices that connect language use with purposeful interaction. The lowest-rated indicator, learners practice ordering food, asking for directions, and other daily tasks, identifies an area where implementation may still be strengthened through more deliberate instructional planning.

The result is pedagogically important because it shows how communicative teaching can support both participation and language form. In a communicative classroom, learners are expected to use English to accomplish tasks, negotiate meaning, and receive feedback. When such experiences are consistently present, vocabulary and grammar become functional tools rather than isolated lesson content. The rating therefore reflects a shift toward instruction that values meaningful use while still attending to linguistic control.

This interpretation is consistent with Nunan's (2004) discussion of task-based language teaching, particularly the value of rehearsal tasks that approximate real-world communication. Communicative competence requires opportunities for input, output, feedback, and contextualized practice. The findings imply that the teachers' classroom practices were generally aligned with these principles, although the strength of alignment varied by indicator. Such variation is expected because communicative teaching depends on teacher readiness, resources, learner confidence, and school support.

The instructional implication is that the district should preserve the strong practices while targeting the weaker indicators for improvement. Professional learning may focus on lesson designs that integrate interaction, vocabulary recycling, grammar feedback, and real-life language tasks. Administrators may also use the results to identify which practices should be modeled in learning action cells and peer coaching. In this way, the data can serve as a practical guide for improving the quality and consistency of English instruction.

Table 5. Summary of the Extent of Utilization of the Communicative Teaching Approach

Area	Big Schools	Medium Schools	Small Schools	Average	Interpretation	Rank
Accuracy in Grammar Usage	4.08	4.09	4.09	4.09	Much Utilized	4
Vocabulary Retention	4.28	4.27	3.93	4.16	Much Utilized	2
Engagement in Interactive Activities	4.35	4.22	4.02	4.2	Much Utilized	1
Application of Language Skills in Real-Life Contexts	4.28	4.03	4.05	4.12	Much Utilized	3
Average	4.25	4.07	4.02	4.14	Much Utilized	

Table 5 shows that the communicative teaching approach obtained an overall average weighted mean of 4.14 and was rated Much Utilized. Engagement in interactive activities ranked first with a mean of 4.20, followed by vocabulary retention, application of real-life language skills, and accuracy in grammar usage. This distribution suggests that the most visible use of the approach was in learner participation and interaction. At the same time, all areas remained within the Much Utilized range, indicating broad adoption across communicative dimensions.

The school-type pattern also provides meaningful insight. Big schools obtained the highest overall utilization mean at 4.25, followed by medium schools at 4.07 and small schools at 4.02. Although all school types remained within the same descriptive interpretation, the numerical differences suggest that school size may relate to variation in resources, collegial exposure, or instructional routines. These differences should be examined not as weaknesses but as opportunities for targeted support.

The result supports the view that communicative teaching is adaptable across different school contexts. Its strategies can be implemented through high-resource tools such as digital media and through low-resource practices such as discussion, role-play, peer interaction, and authentic writing. The district-wide Much Utilized rating indicates that teachers had already incorporated communicative principles into their classroom work. However, the variation across areas shows that implementation still needs refinement and alignment.

For program improvement, engagement practices may be used as entry points for strengthening grammar and vocabulary instruction. Since teachers already use interactive activities frequently, these activities can be deliberately designed to include vocabulary targets, grammar feedback, and real-life applications. School leaders may also encourage the sharing of practices from schools with stronger implementation. Such sharing can help reduce unevenness across school types while preserving contextual flexibility.

Table 6. Test of Significant Agreement on the Rank Orders of Utilization

Area	SSD	No. of Indicators	Kendall W	Computed chi-square	df	Critical value at 0.05	Decision	Agreement
Accuracy in Grammar Usage	473	11	0.48	14.4	10	18.31	Accepted	Not Significant
Vocabulary Retention	508.5	11	0.51	15.3	10	18.31	Accepted	Not Significant
Engagement in Interactive Activities	312	10	0.42	11.35	9	16.92	Accepted	Not Significant
Application of Language Skills in Real-Life Contexts	494.5	10	0.67	18.09	9	16.92	Rejected	Significant

Table 6 presents the Kendall coefficient of concordance results for the utilization dimensions. The null hypothesis was accepted for accuracy in grammar usage, vocabulary retention, and engagement in interactive activities because their computed chi-square values did not exceed the critical values at the 0.05 level. The null hypothesis was rejected only for application of language skills in real-life contexts, where the computed chi-square value was 18.09 against a critical value of 16.92. This means that only the real-life application dimension showed statistically significant agreement in rank ordering.

The results indicate that teachers across school groupings did not rank most utilization indicators in the same way. This does not mean that communicative teaching was absent; rather, it means that teachers differed in which practices they considered most frequently used. Such variation is understandable because communicative teaching can take many forms, including feedback, digital media, games, discussions, role-plays, and authentic writing. Different school contexts may naturally emphasize different strategies. The significant agreement in real-life language application is noteworthy. It suggests that teachers had a more shared view of which real-life language practices were most and least utilized. Writing tasks such as emails and letters ranked highest, while everyday transactional tasks such as ordering food and asking for directions ranked lowest. This shared pattern can guide curriculum planners in determining which real-life contexts need more systematic integration.

The policy implication is the need for instructional harmonization without imposing uniformity that ignores local conditions. Learning action cells, peer observations, and model lesson demonstrations can help teachers develop a common understanding of quality communicative practice. Training should especially address how grammar, vocabulary, interaction, and authentic language use can be planned within a single lesson cycle. This approach can improve consistency while still allowing teachers to adapt tasks to learner needs.

Table 7. Extent of Effectiveness Along Improvement in Vocabulary Usage

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Repeated exposure through interaction enhances word retention	4.64	Very Much Effective	1
The communicative approach strengthens learners' ability to express ideas	4.63	Very Much Effective	2
Daily communication tasks promote the natural use of vocabulary	4.47	Much Effective	3
Teachers observe increased word choice variety in learners' speech and writing	4.47	Much Effective	4

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Vocabulary development leads to improved reading comprehension	4.41	Much Effective	5
Learners expand their active vocabulary through meaningful conversations	4.38	Much Effective	6
The approach supports long-term vocabulary retention	4.32	Much Effective	7
Learners use synonyms and antonyms effectively in speech	4.22	Much Effective	8
Learners recall and apply vocabulary in multiple contexts	4.19	Much Effective	9
Real-life interactions reinforce the use of vocabulary in context	4.14	Much Effective	10
Learners confidently use newly learned words in conversations	3.97	Much Effective	11
Average	4.35	Much Effective	

The findings in Table 7 show that improvement in vocabulary usage obtained an average weighted mean of 4.35 and was rated Much Effective. This pattern indicates that the communicative teaching approach was not treated as an occasional supplement but as a visible element of classroom practice. The highest-rated indicator, repeated exposure through interaction enhances word retention, suggests that teachers gave priority to practices that connect language use with purposeful interaction. The lowest-rated indicator, learners confidently use newly learned words in conversations, identifies an area where implementation may still be strengthened through more deliberate instructional planning.

The result is pedagogically important because it shows how communicative teaching can support both participation and language form. In a communicative classroom, learners are expected to use English to accomplish tasks, negotiate meaning, and receive feedback. When such experiences are consistently present, vocabulary and grammar become functional tools rather than isolated lesson content. The rating therefore reflects a shift toward instruction that values meaningful use while still attending to linguistic control.

This interpretation is consistent with the principle that vocabulary development improves when learners repeatedly encounter and use words in meaningful contexts (Nation, 2013). Communicative competence requires opportunities for input, output, feedback, and contextualized practice. The findings imply that the teachers' classroom practices were generally aligned with these principles, although the strength of alignment varied by indicator. Such variation is expected because communicative teaching depends on teacher readiness, resources, learner confidence, and school support.

The instructional implication is that the district should preserve the strong practices while targeting the weaker indicators for improvement. Professional learning may focus on lesson designs that integrate interaction, vocabulary recycling, grammar feedback, and real-life language tasks. Administrators may also use the results to identify which practices should be modeled in learning action cells and peer coaching. In this way, the data can serve as a practical guide for improving the quality and consistency of English instruction.

Table 8. Extent of Effectiveness Along Accuracy and Fluency in Grammar Application

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Speaking and writing tasks improve both grammar accuracy and fluency	4.56	Very Much Effective	1
Interactive grammar activities help learners internalize language rules	4.51	Very Much Effective	2
The communicative approach reduces reliance on memorization of rules	4.4	Much Effective	3.5
Contextualized grammar practice leads to better long-term retention	4.4	Much Effective	3.5
Learners exhibit improved sentence construction in both oral and written communication	4.33	Much Effective	5
Teachers notice a reduction in grammar-related errors	4.31	Much Effective	6
Learners apply grammar rules naturally in conversations	4.25	Much Effective	7
The communicative approach supports spontaneous and grammatically correct speech	4.24	Much Effective	8
Learners develop confidence in structuring sentences correctly	4.15	Much Effective	9.5
Grammar practice through real-world tasks enhances fluency	4.15	Much Effective	9.5
Average	4.33	Much Effective	

The findings in Table 8 show that accuracy and fluency in grammar application obtained an average weighted mean of 4.33 and was rated Much Effective. This pattern indicates that the communicative teaching approach was not treated as an occasional supplement but as a visible element of classroom practice. The highest-rated indicator, speaking and writing tasks improve both grammar accuracy and fluency, suggests that teachers gave priority to practices that connect language use with purposeful interaction. The lowest-rated indicator, grammar practice through real-world tasks enhances fluency and learners develop confidence in structuring sentences correctly, identifies an area where implementation may still be strengthened through more deliberate instructional planning.

The result is pedagogically important because it shows how communicative teaching can support both participation and language form. In a communicative classroom, learners are expected to use English to accomplish tasks, negotiate meaning, and receive feedback. When such experiences are consistently present, vocabulary and grammar become functional tools rather than isolated lesson content. The rating therefore reflects a shift toward instruction that values meaningful use while still attending to linguistic control.

This interpretation is consistent with Ellis's (2006) argument that grammar pedagogy should be responsive to second language acquisition processes and classroom use. Communicative competence requires opportunities for input, output, feedback, and contextualized practice. The findings imply that the teachers' classroom practices were generally aligned with these principles,

although the strength of alignment varied by indicator. Such variation is expected because communicative teaching depends on teacher readiness, resources, learner confidence, and school support.

The instructional implication is that the district should preserve the strong practices while targeting the weaker indicators for improvement. Professional learning may focus on lesson designs that integrate interaction, vocabulary recycling, grammar feedback, and real-life language tasks. Administrators may also use the results to identify which practices should be modeled in learning action cells and peer coaching. In this way, the data can serve as a practical guide for improving the quality and consistency of English instruction.

Table 9. Extent of Effectiveness Along Engagement and Participation in Communicative Activities

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Hands-on activities boost motivation to use English	4.51	Very Much Effective	1
Debates and presentations enhance critical thinking and language use	4.38	Much Effective	2
Teachers observe a reduction in language anxiety during communication tasks	4.32	Much Effective	3
Collaborative learning fosters peer-to-peer interaction	4.19	Much Effective	4
Learners show increased enthusiasm for language activities	4.11	Much Effective	5
The communicative approach helps shy learners become more engaged	3.97	Much Effective	6
Group discussions encourage spontaneous communication	3.96	Much Effective	7
Role-playing enhances speaking skills and encourages participation	3.93	Much Effective	8
Learners actively participate in interactive speaking tasks	3.91	Much Effective	9
Learners feel more confident in expressing their ideas in English	3.69	Much Effective	10
Average	4.1	Much Effective	

The findings in Table 9 show that engagement and participation in communicative activities obtained an average weighted mean of 4.10 and was rated Much Effective. This pattern indicates that the communicative teaching approach was not treated as an occasional supplement but as a visible element of classroom practice. The highest-rated indicator, hands-on activities boost motivation to use English, suggests that teachers gave priority to practices that connect language use with purposeful interaction. The lowest-rated indicator, learners feel more confident in expressing their ideas in English, identifies an area where implementation may still be strengthened through more deliberate instructional planning.

The result is pedagogically important because it shows how communicative teaching can support both participation and language form. In a communicative classroom, learners are expected to use English to accomplish tasks, negotiate meaning, and receive feedback. When such experiences are consistently present, vocabulary and grammar become functional tools rather than isolated lesson content. The rating therefore reflects a shift toward instruction that values meaningful use while still attending to linguistic control.

This interpretation is consistent with Dornyei's (2001) emphasis on motivation and supportive classroom conditions in language learning, as well as communicative teaching principles that promote interaction. Communicative competence requires opportunities for input, output, feedback, and contextualized practice. The findings imply that the teachers' classroom practices were generally aligned with these principles, although the strength of alignment varied by indicator. Such variation is expected because communicative teaching depends on teacher readiness, resources, learner confidence, and school support.

The instructional implication is that the district should preserve the strong practices while targeting the weaker indicators for improvement. Professional learning may focus on lesson designs that integrate interaction, vocabulary recycling, grammar feedback, and real-life language tasks. Administrators may also use the results to identify which practices should be modeled in learning action cells and peer coaching. In this way, the data can serve as a practical guide for improving the quality and consistency of English instruction.

Table 10. Extent of Effectiveness Along Retention and Practical Application

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Teachers observe improvements in learners' ability to use English outside the classroom	4.81	Very Much Effective	1
The communicative approach enhances language retention through meaningful practice	4.66	Very Much Effective	2
Learners remember and apply new words and grammar rules effectively	4.61	Very Much Effective	3
Task-based learning encourages practical language use	4.59	Very Much Effective	4
Practical communication tasks reinforce long-term language retention	4.54	Very Much Effective	5
The approach fosters continuous language development beyond the classroom	4.53	Very Much Effective	6
Real-world applications strengthen learners' ability to think in English	4.42	Much Effective	7
Learners retain language skills by using them in real-life situations	4.26	Much Effective	8
Learners independently apply vocabulary and grammar in daily conversations	4.25	Much Effective	9
Learners recall and use grammar structures effectively in various contexts	4.23	Much Effective	10
Average	4.49	Much Effective	

The findings in Table 10 show that retention and practical application obtained an average weighted mean of 4.49 and ranked highest among the effectiveness dimensions. This pattern indicates that the communicative teaching approach was not treated as an occasional supplement but as a visible element of classroom practice. The highest-rated indicator, teachers observe improvements in learners' ability to use English outside the classroom, suggests that teachers gave priority to practices that connect language use

with purposeful interaction. The lowest-rated indicator, learners recall and use grammar structures effectively in various contexts, identifies an area where implementation may still be strengthened through more deliberate instructional planning.

The result is pedagogically important because it shows how communicative teaching can support both participation and language form. In a communicative classroom, learners are expected to use English to accomplish tasks, negotiate meaning, and receive feedback. When such experiences are consistently present, vocabulary and grammar become functional tools rather than isolated lesson content. The rating therefore reflects a shift toward instruction that values meaningful use while still attending to linguistic control.

This interpretation is consistent with task-based and communicative theories that treat language learning as the use of linguistic resources to complete meaningful purposes (Nunan, 2004; Richards, 2006). Communicative competence requires opportunities for input, output, feedback, and contextualized practice. The findings imply that the teachers' classroom practices were generally aligned with these principles, although the strength of alignment varied by indicator. Such variation is expected because communicative teaching depends on teacher readiness, resources, learner confidence, and school support.

The instructional implication is that the district should preserve the strong practices while targeting the weaker indicators for improvement. Professional learning may focus on lesson designs that integrate interaction, vocabulary recycling, grammar feedback, and real-life language tasks. Administrators may also use the results to identify which practices should be modeled in learning action cells and peer coaching. In this way, the data can serve as a practical guide for improving the quality and consistency of English instruction.

Table 11. Summary of the Extent of Effectiveness of the Communicative Teaching Approach

Area	Big Schools	Medium Schools	Small Schools	Average	Interpretation	Rank
Improvement in Vocabulary Usage	4.14	4.62	4.29	4.35	Much Effective	2
Accuracy and Fluency in Grammar Application	4.21	4.7	4.08	4.33	Much Effective	3
Engagement and Participation in Communicative Activities	4.21	4.22	3.86	4.1	Much Effective	4
Retention and Practical Application	4.42	4.69	4.36	4.49	Much Effective	1
Average	4.24	4.56	4.15	4.32	Much Effective	

Table 11 shows that the communicative teaching approach obtained an overall effectiveness mean of 4.32 and was rated Much Effective. Retention and practical application ranked first at 4.49, followed by improvement in vocabulary usage at 4.35, accuracy and fluency in grammar application at 4.33, and engagement and participation at 4.10. The ranking indicates that teachers perceived the approach as most powerful when learners retained and applied language beyond immediate tasks. This is an important result because retention and transfer are central goals of language education.

The school-type data show that medium schools recorded the highest overall effectiveness mean at 4.56, which was interpreted as Very Much Effective. Big schools followed with 4.24, while small schools obtained 4.15; both were interpreted as Much Effective. These differences suggest that medium schools may have conditions that support strong communicative implementation, such as manageable class size, instructional support, or balanced resource availability. However, the ratings across all groups confirm that the approach was positively perceived in different contexts.

The overall pattern suggests that communicative teaching contributed to vocabulary and grammar acquisition through a combination of interaction, feedback, practical tasks, and repeated use. It is important that grammar application and vocabulary usage both received high ratings, because this counters the misconception that communicative teaching develops fluency while neglecting form. The findings imply that communicative instruction can support accuracy when teachers design tasks carefully and provide meaningful correction. It also suggests that vocabulary retention improves when words are used in authentic or semi-authentic exchanges.

For school improvement, the strongest dimension - retention and practical application - should become a benchmark for lesson design. Teachers can plan lessons that begin with input, move to guided practice, and culminate in tasks requiring independent use of vocabulary and grammar. The lower but still favorable rating for engagement and participation suggests the need to intensify motivation-building strategies, especially for shy or anxious learners. District-level coaching can help teachers use communicative tasks more systematically across varied learner profiles.

Table 12. Test of Significant Agreement on the Rank Orders of Effectiveness

Area	SSD	No. of Indicators	Kendall W	Computed chi-square	df	Critical value at 0.05	Decision	Agreement
Improvement in Vocabulary Usage	435.5	11	0.44	13.2	10	18.31	Accepted	Not Significant
Accuracy and Fluency in Grammar Application	200	10	0.27	7.29	9	16.92	Accepted	Not Significant
Engagement and Participation in Communicative Activities	235	10	0.32	8.64	9	16.92	Accepted	Not Significant
Retention and Practical Application	308.5	10	0.42	11.34	9	16.92	Accepted	Not Significant

Table 12 shows that all computed chi-square values for effectiveness were below the corresponding critical values at the 0.05 level. The null hypothesis was therefore accepted for improvement in vocabulary usage, accuracy and fluency in grammar application, engagement and participation, and retention and practical application. This means that there was no statistically significant agreement in the rank orders of effectiveness among school groupings. The finding indicates that the perceived effectiveness of specific communicative outcomes varied across contexts.

The absence of significant agreement should be interpreted carefully. The overall effectiveness rating was high, but the rank ordering of specific indicators differed among big, medium, and small schools. In practical terms, teachers agreed that the approach was effective, but they did not necessarily agree on which outcomes were most effective. This may reflect differences in learner needs, classroom culture, teacher expertise, and available instructional materials.

The result reinforces the importance of contextual implementation in communicative language teaching. A strategy that is highly effective in one school type may not produce the same perceived effect in another without adaptation. For example, participation may depend on class size, while practical application may depend on exposure to English outside the classroom. Vocabulary and grammar gains may also vary based on the quality of teacher feedback and the design of tasks.

The implication is that program policy should not rely only on general endorsement of communicative teaching. It should also identify how different school types experience and implement the approach. Monitoring tools, common lesson exemplars, coaching sessions, and learner performance data can help clarify why rank perceptions vary. These mechanisms can make implementation more equitable and evidence-informed across the district.

Table 13. Policy Directions Derived from the Findings

Policy Area	Recommended Direction
Professional learning	Institutionalize teacher-led learning action cells, INSET demonstrations, mentoring, peer coaching, and classroom feedback focused on communicative strategies.
Instructional design	Embed communicative tasks, real-life scenarios, debates, interviews, role-plays, dialogues, and problem-solving tasks in lesson exemplars and modules.
Assessment	Use performance-based assessments that evaluate vocabulary use, grammar accuracy, fluency, confidence, interaction, and practical language application.
Localization and materials	Develop localized modules, English corners, language hubs, differentiated communicative tasks, and resource banks that respond to learner levels.
Monitoring and accountability	Track learner progress in grammar and vocabulary through classroom observation tools, communicative task outputs, and periodic program reviews.
Research and community support	Support teacher-led action research, benchmarking, and community-based projects that extend English language use beyond the classroom.

Table 13 consolidates the policy directions derived from the findings. The recommendations emphasize professional learning, instructional design, assessment, localization, monitoring, research, and community support. These directions respond directly to the strong utilization and effectiveness ratings while addressing the variability shown in the tests of agreement. A policy response is necessary because high teacher endorsement must be translated into consistent instructional systems.

Professional learning is the first priority because communicative teaching depends heavily on teacher skill. Teachers need support in designing tasks, facilitating interaction, providing feedback, assessing performance, and integrating grammar and vocabulary targets into meaningful communication. Learning action cells, peer coaching, and INSET demonstrations can create a shared technical language among English teachers. This shared understanding may reduce unevenness in implementation across school types.

Instructional materials and assessment are also essential. Communicative teaching will be difficult to sustain if modules, lesson exemplars, and assessment tools remain primarily form-focused or decontextualized. Performance-based assessment should be institutionalized so learners are evaluated through role-plays, interviews, dialogues, presentations, authentic writing, and collaborative tasks. Such measures align assessment with the actual goals of communicative competence.

Finally, monitoring and research should be used to sustain continuous improvement. Schools should track learner progress in grammar and vocabulary through communicative outputs and classroom observation evidence. Teacher-led action research can identify which communicative strategies work best for specific learner groups. Community-based projects and language hubs can extend English use beyond the classroom and strengthen the practical application dimension that emerged as highly important in the study.

4. Conclusions and Implications

4.1 Conclusions

The communicative teaching approach was much utilized in junior high school English instruction in Capalonga District. The overall utilization mean of 4.14 indicates that teachers regularly applied communicative practices across grammar, vocabulary, interaction, and real-life language use. Engagement in interactive activities ranked highest, showing that teachers gave strong attention to participation, collaboration, and learner-centered classroom activity. This conclusion affirms that communicative teaching had become a visible instructional approach in the district.

Grammar instruction was not absent in the communicative approach. Accuracy in grammar usage was rated Much Utilized, with corrective feedback and real-life conversations receiving the strongest ratings. This suggests that teachers attempted to connect grammar accuracy with meaningful communication rather than treating grammar as an isolated body of rules. The conclusion is that

grammar development can coexist with communicative practice when teachers use feedback, role-play, authentic materials, and contextualized tasks.

Vocabulary retention was also rated Much Utilized, indicating that teachers frequently supported word learning through digital tools, listening and speaking tasks, games, peer interaction, and authentic communication. This suggests that vocabulary was developed through repeated and meaningful exposure. The use of media and oral tasks was particularly strong, showing that teachers recognized the importance of varied input and active use. The conclusion is that communicative teaching provided a practical structure for vocabulary reinforcement.

The use of English in real-life contexts was much utilized, although some everyday transactional situations remained comparatively weaker. Writing emails and letters, engaging in social conversations, discussing real-world issues, and role-playing practical scenarios were highly visible. However, everyday tasks such as ordering food and asking for directions received the lowest rating within the dimension. This indicates that practical language application was recognized but could still be expanded to include more daily-life communicative events.

The test of rank agreement showed that teacher perceptions of utilization were not fully uniform across school types. Agreement was not significant for grammar accuracy, vocabulary retention, and interactive engagement, while it was significant for real-life language application. This means that teachers differed in how they prioritized most utilization indicators, except in the real-life application dimension where rankings were more consistent. The conclusion is that implementation was broadly positive but not fully harmonized across school contexts.

The communicative teaching approach was much effective in enhancing vocabulary and grammar acquisition. The overall effectiveness mean of 4.32 shows that teachers perceived the approach as beneficial for language learning outcomes. Retention and practical application emerged as the strongest effectiveness dimension, suggesting that communicative practice helped learners remember and use English beyond immediate classroom exercises. This conclusion supports the value of meaningful practice in sustaining language acquisition.

Vocabulary usage and grammar application were both rated Much Effective, demonstrating that communicative teaching was perceived to strengthen both lexical development and grammatical performance. Repeated interaction, daily communication tasks, sentence construction, and interactive grammar activities were associated with positive outcomes. This indicates that communicative teaching can support form and meaning together. The conclusion is that vocabulary and grammar need not be taught separately from communication if tasks are designed with clear language targets.

The effectiveness rank agreement test showed no significant agreement across all effectiveness dimensions. This means that although teachers generally rated the approach as effective, school groupings differed in how they ranked specific outcomes. The finding points to contextual variation in implementation quality, learner response, and instructional conditions. The final conclusion is that communicative teaching is effective, but its outcomes can be strengthened by systematic training, common performance expectations, and localized support mechanisms.

4.2 Implications

The findings imply that communicative teaching should be sustained as a major instructional approach in junior high school English. Its high utilization and effectiveness ratings show that teachers perceive it as relevant and productive for developing vocabulary and grammar acquisition. However, sustainability requires more than teacher familiarity with communicative activities. Schools must provide structures that help teachers plan, implement, assess, and refine communicative lessons consistently.

For English teachers, the results imply the need to design lessons that integrate vocabulary, grammar, and communication in one coherent instructional sequence. A communicative lesson should not only ask learners to talk but should also guide them toward accurate and meaningful use of target forms. Teachers should prepare language input, model expected output, facilitate interaction, provide feedback, and require transfer to practical tasks. This integrated design can improve both fluency and accuracy.

For school heads, the findings imply the importance of instructional leadership. Since implementation varied across school types, school heads should support classroom observation, coaching, peer mentoring, and learning action cells focused on communicative teaching. Observation tools should include indicators on interaction quality, corrective feedback, vocabulary use, grammar application, and authentic task design. These mechanisms can help schools move from general use of communicative activities to quality-assured implementation.

For curriculum planners, the findings imply that learning materials should contain more communicative tasks tied to explicit vocabulary and grammar objectives. Modules should include role-plays, interviews, problem-solving tasks, authentic writing, debates, dialogues, storytelling, and community-linked activities. These tasks should be sequenced so that learners move from guided practice to independent communication. Materials should also include differentiated versions to support learners with varying levels of proficiency.

For assessment practice, the results imply that performance-based assessment should be strengthened. If communicative teaching aims to develop real language use, learners must be assessed through tasks that require them to apply vocabulary and grammar in meaningful contexts. Rubrics should evaluate accuracy, fluency, vocabulary appropriateness, interaction, confidence, and task completion. Such assessment can provide more valid evidence of communicative competence than isolated grammar and vocabulary tests alone.

For district-level policy, the findings imply the need for common standards and flexible implementation. Common standards can define what quality communicative teaching looks like, while flexibility allows schools to adapt tasks to learner needs and available resources. District supervisors and English coordinators can support this balance through exemplar lessons, demonstration teaching, peer-sharing sessions, and resource banks. These actions can reduce implementation gaps without suppressing teacher creativity.

For learners, the findings imply that English acquisition improves when they are given repeated opportunities to use language for real purposes. Learners should be encouraged to participate in group tasks, speak in meaningful situations, use new vocabulary in

different contexts, and apply grammar in authentic writing and speaking. Confidence-building is especially important because language anxiety can limit participation. A supportive communicative classroom can help learners become more willing and capable users of English.

For future research, the study implies the need to complement teacher-rated evidence with direct learner performance data. Pretest-posttest designs, classroom observations, learner interviews, and analysis of speaking and writing outputs can deepen understanding of how communicative teaching affects actual language achievement. Future studies may also investigate why medium, big, and small schools differ in their ranking of effectiveness indicators. Such evidence can further refine communicative language teaching policy and practice in the district.

References

- [1] Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.1.1>
- [2] Dornyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- [4] Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264512>
- [5] Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Penguin.
- [6] Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Heinle.
- [7] Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). Academic Press.
- [9] Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- [10] Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- [11] Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- [13] Savignon, S. J. (2002). *Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education*. Yale University Press.
- [14] Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Newbury House.
- [15] Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to teach grammar*. Pearson Education.
- [16] Ur, P. (2012). *A course in English language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- [17] VanPatten, B., & Williams, J. (2015). *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Routledge.