



Effects of Contextualized Grammar Teaching on Students' Writing Development and Paragraph Writing Motivation

^{1*}Gemechis Denu, ¹Zelege Teshome & ²Tekle Ferede

¹Department of English Language and Literature, Wollega University, P.O. Box 395, Nekemte, Ethiopia

²Department of English Language and Literature, Jimma University, Ethiopia

Abstract

The main objective of the study was to investigate the effects of contextualised grammar instruction (CGI) on students' writing motivation and their paragraph writing performance. A quasi-experimental pretest-posttest research design was used in this study. Two groups of students were selected from the total of seven sections of Gute Secondary School Grade 11 students. These groups were selected using simple random sampling techniques, and they were assigned as treatment and comparison groups. In this study, therefore, a sequential mixed-method research approaches (QUAN qual) in which quantitative data are followed by qualitative data was utilized. Hence, tests, questionnaires, and self-reflection journal writing research tools were employed. In data analysis, the study employed MANOVA, paired sample t-tests, independent sample t-tests, and some descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation). The multivariate-test analysis results of pre-intervention paragraph writing tests showed that both treatment and comparison groups were homogeneous. Regarding this, it was confirmed that there was no statistically significant difference among the two groups before the intervention as F -ratios, which is Wilks' Lamda = 0.99, $F(3, 70) = .613$, $P = .609$, and partial eta squared = .026. Then, after the treatment group was taught for about eight weeks using the intervention manual, both treatment and comparison groups were given a post-intervention writing motivation and paragraph writing test to see if any significant difference was seen because of the intervention. Hence, the findings at the post-intervention revealed that the treatment group achieved a significant change in their writing motivation and paragraph writing performance, as Wilks' Lamda = 0.99, $F(3, 70) = 76.00$, $P = .000$, partial eta squared = .76. This shows that the study found contextualised grammar instruction attributes to affect students writing motivation and their paragraph writing performance. Therefore, this is an important input for the ministry of education and English language teachers to place emphasis on contextualised grammar instruction in teaching and learning procedures so that the students' paragraph writing skills will improve.

Article Information

Article History:

Received : 10-07-2020

Revised : 17-08-2020

Accepted : 27-09-2020

Keywords:

Contextualized grammar instruction, writing motivation, writing perception

*Corresponding Author:

Gemechis Denu

E-mail:

gemechisdenu2012@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

English has been used as a means of communication across the globe in different sectors. It is widely used across the world, and people use it for different kinds of communication and interaction. It has a great role in different educational settings and serves as a medium of instruction in all forms of communication across countries. It is considered to be one of the world's most useful languages in connection with social, economic, and political affairs (Crystal, 2003; Jorda, 2005). This makes English undeniably important in different segments, as it is an international language.

The English language has become more pronounced as it is the official language of most international gatherings and the central language of communication throughout the world. According to Mydans (2007), language pedagogy has undergone a paradigm shift in theories and methods. Sharma (2000) adds that language teaching methodology shifts in terms of theoretical assumptions and pedagogical applications at different times. Thus, language teaching methodologies have been changed or emerged one after the other so that the gap seen in the former methods would be fixed.

In the traditional language teaching era, grammar was learned as a discrete set of rigid rules to be memorised, practiced, and followed in language teaching and learning. In this language teaching approach, linguistic aspects were presented in rule-governed teaching, in which linguistic aspects were the basis of language proficiency and grammar was taught (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In the

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., July-Sept. 2020, 9(3), 71-86

former method, grammar is defined primarily as a set of forms and structures, which is the main focus of the textbook syllabus (Newby, 2000). This does not mean grammar was taught deductively and explicitly through drills. In this regard, students should be very conscious of the grammatical rules of the target language. Despite this, in the early nineteenth century, the structural approach began to be questioned in terms of students' success in using the language.

In connection with these points, Rothman (1999) explains that there has been a debate about the most effective way of teaching grammar. In order to fix the problem that appears due to the traditional way of teaching grammar, language teachers and researchers have attempted to develop other methods of language teaching that they think could bridge the gaps. As a result, English language teaching has been exposed to different changes, especially during the initial period of the communicative approach to language teaching and learning in the 1960s.

Candlin and Mercer (2001) suggest that students are better off when they are taught in line with tasks those base students' cultural contexts on developing their sense of motivation for learning. The changes were attributed to different natures, such as sociological, pedagogical, and economic, and multiple intelligences of learners' preferences. It is described that, from the point of view of social constructivist theory, knowledge is not mechanically acquired but rather actively constructed within the learning environment of the learners (Mathew, 2009). Thus, the proponents of this theory believe that learning takes place in the immediate learning

Gemechis et al

environment. This does mean that learning is considered to be a situation-specific and context-bound activity. Therefore, English language tasks need to be designed in line with the learners' background knowledge contexts so that they can achieve the intended language competence.

Rothman (2010) claims that knowing the culture and context of the society in which knowledge construction occurs is considered an important aspect. This does mean that contextualised grammar instruction has become the target area of any language program. In line with this point, Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000) reflect that the current cutting-edge pedagogy argues that language learning materials should be well contextualised and meaningful to learners. Moreover, Widodo (2006) affirms that teaching and learning grammar separately is not favourable to learners in developing writing skills. Thus, teachers are suggested to use alternative teaching grammar methods so that they can achieve the necessary skills in paragraph writing.

In teaching and learning a second or foreign language, methodology is one of the motivational sources that inspire the learners to engage in different language tasks and create a good learning environment. This does mean the methodology he or she employs will have some effects on the students' motivation to write. Atikins, Hailom, and Nuru (1995) assert that contextualised grammar teaching seems to supply a reasonable amount of authentic, vivid contexts and situations in which new language items can be presented. The application of rules can be established through motivating exercises and tasks that could

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., July-Sept. 2020, 9(3), 71-86
help students understand the language system inductively.

Weaver and Bush (2006) argue for the importance of contextualised grammar teaching, which has the potential to use grammatical resources to produce effective writing. This shows that teaching grammar in context assists the writers in governing the way writing takes place and ensures that it can be easily understood by the people who read it. From these arguments, it is evident that grammar contributes to students writing production in order to convey a clear message. Thus, this needs appropriate methods that give students a chance to produce effective written compositions in the correct form of the language.

The pedagogical assumption of producing effective writing is the effort of using a systematic method of constructing sentences that enables students to develop paragraph writing with the correct form of the language. This proves that effective writing is a result of teaching grammar in context, as it allows students to apply conventions to produce effective writing (Janet, 2007; Weaver, 2006). This notifies us that contextualised grammar instruction helps students familiarise themselves with various syntactic patterns of the language and empowers them to improve their paragraph writing development with accurate forms of the language.

The English language is a medium of instruction at secondary and tertiary levels with the assumption that the language contributes to the attainment of knowledge and skills and that the language skills are used for real and genuine communication (Girma, 2005). However, Geremew (1994) and

Gemechis et al

Haregewoin (2008) report that students' English language performance is deteriorating from time to time. Though students are required to generate further written materials with grammatically correct language to their best ability, their writing performance is below the standard. In line with this, some research findings strongly suggest that high school students in Ethiopia seriously lack all English skills in general and writing skills in particular. "Students have a shortage of the English language to write up to their level best (Amalaku, 2010).

It is heard from different English teachers while they have been complaining about the students' paragraph writing performance during various trainings at various high schools and university levels. The main students' writing problems might be related to their grammatical issues or the students' motivation towards learning the target language. Hence, the students' paragraph writing performance at different levels of education in general and Grade 11 students at Getema Secondary School in particular is also less encouraging. Moreover, as far as the researcher's knowledge is concerned, the learners' grammatical problems during paragraph writing remain low, as does their writing motivation. Therefore, it could be sound to investigate the role of contextualised grammar instruction and its effects on writing motivation and paragraph writing achievement.

Materials and Methods

In this study, a quasi-experimental research design was adopted. The purpose of choosing

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., July-Sept. 2020, 9(3), 71-86

a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design is to treat treatment and comparison groups in line with the nature and objectives of the problem to be studied. Moreover, the means of obtaining information is also considered when choosing the appropriate research design. In this study, therefore, a sequential mixed-method research approaches (QUAN qual) in which quantitative data are followed by qualitative data was utilised (Creswell, 2003). Accordingly, a quantitative research approach was used mostly for this study, and qualitative data was used to gather data from the participants' self-reflection journals to complement the quantitative data.

Samples and sampling techniques

This study was carried out in the East Wollega Zone, Oromia Regional State. Among many high schools, one was selected from the zone. Accordingly, Gute High School was selected as a sample for the study. The main reason for the choice of Gute High School, among many high schools in the zone, has to do with convenience. Besides, the rationale for selecting the East Wollega zone was determined by the nature of the study. This was hoped to ease the administrative procedures of the study, as the nature of the research needs extensive follow-up. This helps the researcher have a good insight into the actual research issue for administrative purposes. Moreover, Grade 11 students were chosen, thinking that students need to have a good grounding in paragraph writing and preparing them for tertiary education. It also gave the researcher an insider perspective that helped to effectively explore the real

Gemechis et al

classroom situation, understand better, and come up with a more valid result. It also gave the researcher an insider perspective that helped to effectively explore the real classroom situation.

Accordingly, from seven sections of Grade 11 students, two sections were selected using the lottery method. Of the two sections, one was assigned as the treatment group and the other as the comparison group; this was done using the lottery method. Since the study requires quantitative and qualitative data, different research tools were employed. These include tests, questionnaires, and self-reflection journal writing. For the qualitative aspect, students' self-reflection journals were employed. Thus, according to Cohen, Manion, Morrison, (2008), the more we use various data collection instruments, the stronger our tendency is to generate in-depth and reliable information from the participants in the study.

Data collection instruments

The study employed both quantitative and qualitative data. Hence, different research tools were used. Hence, for the quantitative data, tests and questionnaires were used, whereas a self-reflection report was used for the qualitative aspect. Students' self-reflection reports about the effects of contextualised grammar instruction on their writing self-efficacy, and they were encouraged to express their feelings about what had been perceived during the lessons. Accordingly, learners were prompted to self-explain what it meant to them after the training. The students wrote about their feelings and things they observed from the training through their self-reflection journal writing.

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., July-Sept. 2020, 9(3), 71-86
Test

A test is one of the data collection instruments of this research that was employed to answer the designed research question. The treatment group and the comparison group received pretests and posttests during the study. The aim of the pre-test administration is to get baseline data on students' actual performance before the intervention. Accordingly, the pre-test was administered to both treatment and comparison group students. A pretest is used to verify the groups' initial similarity regarding the issue under investigation, and a posttest is used to prove the effects of the intended approach on students' writing motivation and their paragraph performance. And these tests were employed by the research participants to address the intended research objectives. Hence, students were given different topics to write a well-organised paragraph on. The result of the test was scored by two raters to produce reliable results. They were rater 1 and rater 2. Raters took a brief orientation on how to score the participants. Both pre- and post-tests scored out of 50%. This was used to maintain inter-rater reliability.

At the end of the intervention, a post-test was prepared and conducted for both treatment and comparison groups. The aim of the post-test was to see the extent to which contextualised grammar instruction has had the projected effects on students' paragraph writing performances. The questions for the post-test involved guided writing and free writing, just like those for the pre-test, in the same allocated time. Hence, the topic 'the impacts of COVID-19 on the education

Gemechis et al

sector' was given as an outline, and students were asked to extend the outlines further to construct an organised paragraph.

Questionnaire

A questionnaire for both pre- and post-assessment was administered to assess the level of students' paragraph writing performance and the variation in paragraph writing improvement due to the treatment made for the experimental group. The questionnaire items were adapted from Guilloteaux, Marie-Jose (2007). Based on this, a closed-ended, multi-item Likert-type, five-point scale questionnaire was used for the students. The five-point scale range from 5: strongly agree (SA), 4: agree (A), 3: undecided (UD), 2: disagree (DA), and 1: strongly disagree (SDA) was set. In the same way, students were asked to indicate their choices under the appropriate rating scales provided under each column. The items were administered to both treatment and comparison groups. The questionnaire was translated into the participants' native language, Afan Oromo, to avoid misunderstandings.

Students' Self-Reflection Journal Writing

Reflective journal writing is one of the research tools used to gather data. According to Sundem (2006), journal writing is a personal account of an educational experience that offers a variety of benefits, including enhancing one's writing skills and helping them retain information to express their thoughts in different ways. It facilitates a self-reflection report about teaching-learning

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., July-Sept. 2020, 9(3), 71-86
experiences, and a practice in a practical setting is used for the qualitative data. In journal writing, students are simply asked to reflect on their daily observations or practices.

Data Gathering Procedure

The process of data collection via the three instruments described above was carried out as follows: First, the quantitative and qualitative data were gathered sequentially. In order to do so, the pretest was administered first to verify the two groups' background experience. Then, the training material was offered to the treatment group for a few months. Whereas no treatment was given for the comparison group, they were directed to use conventional methods as usual. Following the intervention, a posttest was administered to test the effects of the approach (contextualised grammar instruction) on students writing achievement. Likewise, journal writing in the form of a self-reflection report was conducted to get participants' experience with the intended method.

Data Analysis and Procedures

In order to carry out the data analysis, principally, the SPSS software was utilised for analysing quantitative data collected from the students' questionnaires and paragraph writing performance tests using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Accordingly, paired sample t-tests, independent t-tests, and MANOVA were used to compute the mean scores of the pre- and post-tests of both treatment and comparison groups. To confirm this, descriptive statistics were run. Therefore, the result of the computation is presented in Table 1.

Findings of the study

To see if there were differences amongst the treatment and comparison groups, the researcher used an independent sample t-test

in order to confirm the similarity of both groups among the three variables, and the figures are presented in Tables 1 and 1 below.

Table 1

Independent Samples T-Test for between-Group Mean Differences on their Writing Motivation at Pre-Intervention Stage

Respondent group	N	M	Std. Deviation	Mean difference	t	Df	Sig
Treatment Group	46	2.93	.208	.024	.595	91	.554
Comparison Group	47	2.89	.194	.024			

As can be seen from Table 4.3, the result of the above independent sample t-test table shows that the writing motivation of the students in both groups shows that there is no statistically significant difference on the variable writing motivation at $t(91) = .595$, $p > 0.05$. Hence, the difference is statistically significant as the probability value (P-value) = .554. This confirmed that there was no significant difference between the treatment and comparison group students in their pre-intervention paragraph writing test scores. The level of significance is also found to be greater than .05. The result in this case revealed that both groups had almost similar background experience in their writing motivation at the beginning of the study. Thus, no significant difference was observed in their writing motivation before the intervention. The result shows that the difference between the performance of the treatment and the comparison group students before the intervention was statistically not significant. It

means that students in both groups had relatively similar levels of performance between the groups before the intervention. Therefore, the results of the analysis revealed that the two mean differences of both groups have similar performance in their writing motivation. In summary, students' group performances were almost similar before the intervention with respect to writing motivation. The result, in this case, revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between the students writing motivations in the two groups of students before the intervention. In light of this finding, it was established that there was no statistically significant difference between the two scores above and the pre-test, rendering the null hypothesis (Ho) impossible to reject at the .05 level of significance. Hence, it can be said that the pre-intervention result discloses negligible instances of differences in both groups writing motivation. To see if there were differences amongst students in the

treatment group and comparison groups in their paragraph writing performance, statistical analysis t-tests were performed on

the pre-intervention stage, and the figures are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Independent Samples T-Test for between-Group Mean Differences on writing motivation after the Intervention

		Levene's Test for Equality of variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Posttest result	Equal variances assumed	7.221	.009	8.54	91	.000	.655	.0766
	Equal variances not assumed			8.51	76.44	.000	.655	.0770

According to Table 2, the p-value (level of significance) is less than 0.05 (.000). Since there is a significant difference in the students' motivation for the two groups being compared, it is said that the calculated value of 'T' is larger or equal to the calculated value of the t-table with a given degree of freedom (df). Additionally, if the calculated t-score is lower than the t-table number, it can be assumed that there is no discernible difference between the groups' performance. The p-value of Levene's test for equivalence of variances is less than 0.05. If the p-value is less than 0.05 (as shown in Table 4.7), which is p = .009. The results show that there is a meaningful relationship between contextualised grammar instruction and students writing motivation.

As a consequence, it is said that there is a significant difference in the students' motivation for writing in the two groups being

compared if the value of t-calculated is greater than or equal to the value of t-table with a given degree of freedom (df). Furthermore, it can be inferred that there is no appreciable difference between the groups' performance if the calculated t-score is lower than the t-table number. The average scores of the groups vary significantly if the p-value is less than 0.05 (the accepted level for significance). On the basis of this assumption, it was found that the t-calculated at the post-test had more degrees of freedom than the t-table (t-calculated = 8.945; DF = 91; mean difference = .655). Therefore, it can be said that the treatment and comparison groups' levels of language performance are significantly different from one another (p = .000). The treatment has had a major impact on the students' desire to write. It demonstrates that the groups' mean score was determined to be

statistically important. The result thus implies that contextualised grammar teaching positively affects students' motivation to write. This instruction could help students become more accurate with their grammar when composing assignments. As a result, students must provide relevant context when teaching and learning English grammar. The alternative hypothesis (H1), "There is a statistically significant difference in writing motivation

between Grade 11 students who learn grammar through contextualised grammar instruction and those who learn grammar using the conventional method," is also disproved in light of the results. Therefore, statistically significant differences between the study groups were seen in writing motivation with respect to all the writing attributes.

Table 3

MANOVA Test for between-Group Mean Differences on WM and PWA Together After the Intervention

Effect	Multivariate Tests			Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	
	Value	F	Hypothesis df				
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.996	5.985E3 ^a	3.000	70.000	.000	.996
	Wilks' Lambda	.004	5.985E3 ^a	3.000	70.000	.000	.996
	Hotelling's Trace	256.505	5.985E3 ^a	3.000	70.000	.000	.996
	Roy's Largest Root	256.505	5.985E3 ^a	3.000	70.000	.000	.996
Group	Pillai's Trace	.765	76.004 ^a	3.000	70.000	.000	.765
	Wilks' Lambda	.235	76.004 ^a	3.000	70.000	.000	.765
	Hotelling's Trace	3.257	76.004 ^a	3.000	70.000	.000	.765
	Roy's Largest Root	3.257	76.004 ^a	3.000	70.000	.000	.765

The output from the multivariate test (table 3) figured out that there was a statistically significant difference between the treatment group and comparison group in the post-test ($p < 0.001$). As it is displayed in the table, Wilks' Lamda = 0.23, $F(3, 70) = 76.00$, $P < .001$) all reach the criterion for significance of less than .05, where partial eta

squared = .765. Hence, the observed value for the given post-intervention study reveals that the result was found to be significant as $p = 0.000$ at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the output revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the comparison group and the treatment group in their writing motivation and paragraph writing

Gemechis et al

achievement. In this section, the findings from the analysis of this data were compared using the pre- and post-intervention findings. This indicated that the treatment group performance is almost different from the findings from the pre-intervention results.

Discussion of the Findings

Findings from the analysis show that students who had a chance to learn grammar in the context are more likely to be motivated in their writing practices in a certain task than those who learn grammar discretely. Similarly, as the data gathered from students' reflective journal writing showed, the respondents reflected that the approach helped them improve their writing motivation. They further reported that they had benefited from the manual during the intervention. In addition, they have included in their reflection that they felt excited about the contextualised grammar instruction as it helped them use it in their writing practices.

The study therefore revealed that students' who were treated with the training intervention exceeded those who learned in a conventional way. This demonstrates that contextualised grammar instruction has brought about changes for the treatment group students. The implication is therefore that students who were treated with the method improved their paragraph writing. Thus, it is suggested that students' always perform well when they are acquainted with their own contexts so that they can understand the tasks easily and develop a strong sense of writing motivation. The result shown is due to the nature of the material that the treatment group was exposed to during the intervention phase.

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., July-Sept. 2020, 9(3), 71-86

Most of the English text book exercises provided in the intervention material demand that the students practice different grammar items in different contexts. This could be understood as a possible reason for the better performance achieved by the treatment group students.

The student's self-reflection journal was used as one of the tools to supplement the quantitative data for the study. The instrument was used to answer the research question, which is stated as "explore how students' perceive the effects of contextualised grammar instruction on their writing motivation and paragraph writing achievement". The main purpose of using this tool was to get qualitative data regarding students' perceptions of the effects of contextualised grammar instruction during the intervention period. Therefore, the participants (all the treatment group students) were asked to write a reflective journal.

The fundamental goal of teaching grammar in context is to provide students with grammatical knowledge through which they can construct grammatically correct writing easily. Scholars have argued that contextualised grammar and writing skills have strong relationships (Myhill, 2005; Weaver & Bush, 2006; Hudson, 2001). They have made an argument that contextualised grammar instruction gives students a meaningful basis for understanding and using new language structures and patterns in their writing practices. This noted that presenting grammar in context initiates students' learning of grammar freely so that they can improve their paragraph writing. Learners' language performance refers to background knowledge,

Gemechis et al

confidence, motivation to learn, ability in language skills, cultural knowledge or awareness, and linguistic knowledge (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

In language learning steps, background experience, cultural knowledge, or awareness have a dramatic effect on the learners' grammar skills. This helps learners apply their grammar knowledge to their writing practices. The presentation of grammar in context in line with students' background experiences really enables them to distinguish between accepted and unacceptable forms of communication in the target language. Deepti and Getachew (2011, p. 69) found that "the more students are motivated towards writing, the higher the use of writing strategies, which in turn leads to the development of improved writing competence". Learning takes place when students express their ideas well. Learning takes place in the real world. Therefore, this is one way of presenting and learning language forms to overcome some grammatical difficulties in writing.

The primary aspect of teaching grammar in context is that when grammatical structure is presented, the rules should be presented in clear contexts in which students learn the structure easily (VanLier, 1988). This noted that grammar as well as other language activities should be contextualised clearly to motivate students so that they could express their own ideas through writing. Hence, language teachers need to use creative, context-based, and innovative attempts to teach grammar in order to improve students' grammatical problems in writing. The data analysis was mainly focused on some motivational constructs. The extent to which

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., July-Sept. 2020, 9(3), 71-86
students' interest in their approach and effort in learning writing skills with the intended method might be affected by the method they use in learning and teaching. Moreover, the analysis also focused on the extent to which contextualised grammar instruction affects the students writing.

The average scores of the groups vary significantly if the p-value is less than 0.05 (the accepted level for significance). On the basis of this assumption, it was found that the t-calculated at the post-test had more degrees of freedom than the t-table (t-calculated = 8.945; DF = 91; mean difference = .655). Therefore, it can be said that the treatment and comparison groups' levels of language performance are significantly different from one another (p = 0.000). The treatment has had a major impact on the students' desire to write. It demonstrates that the groups' mean score was determined to be statistically important. The result thus implies that contextualised grammar teaching positively affects students' motivation to write. Therefore, the results revealed that treatment group students favoured the contextualised grammar instruction positively.

In order to see any significant difference between the pre- and post-intervention results of the two groups, the treatment group students were taught the intervention manual for about two months. Then, posttests were conducted for both treatment and comparison group students. The post-intervention data was analysed using a multivariate analysis test after the intervention. After intervention, multivariate test results show that the treatment group's students outperformed the comparison group's students writing

Gemechis et al

motivation variable as a result of the training intervention (contextualised grammar instruction).

The result shows that Wilks' Lamda = 0.23, $F(3, 70) = 76.00$, $P = .000$, partial eta squared = .765. The observed value of the post-test results reveals that it was found to be significant ($p = 0.000$ at the 0.05 level of significance). This means that there is a statistically significant difference between the groups ($p = 0.000$), which is less than 0.05. Therefore, it could be noted that the treatment group students performed significantly on the post-intervention when compared to the comparison group students post-test results.

The above findings are in proportion to the research findings of Weaver and Bush (2006). They argue for the importance of contextualised grammar teaching, which has the potential to use grammatical resources to produce effective writing, in their research findings. They also argued that effective writing is a result of teaching and learning grammar in context, as it allows learners to apply it in mechanics and conventional ways, and this makes students produce effective writing. This does mean teaching grammar in context assists the writers in governing the way writing takes place. Due to this, the null hypothesis that says "there is a statistically significant difference in writing motivation between Grade 11 students who learn grammar through contextualised grammar instruction and those who learn grammar through the conventional method that was retained in the pre-intervention was disproved through writing motivation after the intervention.

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., July-Sept. 2020, 9(3), 71-86

The study conducted by Banti (2003) accounted for motivation to learn the English language. Besides, Harmer (2001) also asserts that the sources of motivation emanate from the methodology we use in the classroom. This does mean that the appropriate methodologies we apply in the classroom engage the students in different language activities and create a good climate to learn the language. The teacher should be aware of the methodology that he or she employs in the classroom, as it has some effect on the students' motivation. Concerning this, Dornyei (2008, p. 55) suggests that "motivation is one of the key factors that determine foreign language performance and serves as an impetus to generate learning initially and later as a sustaining force to the tedious process of acquiring a target language". The findings have revealed that the treatment group significantly exceeded the comparison group in their writing motivation results.

The findings in this respect are consistent with other research findings. For example, Amin (2009) conducted a study on the effectiveness of teaching grammar in context to minimise students' grammatical errors in writing. The study revealed that teaching grammar in context improves students' grammatical errors in their writing. Therefore, the findings noted that grammar presentation in contexts allows students to make appropriate linguistic choices in order to produce effective writing. Hence, this method clearly signifies that the connection between writing and grammar in context supports writers' and hence, this method clearly signifies that the connection between writing

and grammar in context supports writers' and others' various language experiences. This makes connections between what the students write and how they write it. From these points of view, it is possible to conclude that grammar in the context assists the learners in engaging themselves in writing practices effectively to their level. This could be evidence for the progress seen in the post-intervention results of the treatment group students.

From the self-reflection journal, it is possible to identify that students' enjoyed and felt positive towards the instruction as it benefits them to write in the correct form of the language. This shows us that contextualised grammar instruction motivates students' engagement in different levels of writing activities. Therefore, providing the learners with tasks that are related to their background experience intends to prolong the learners' motivation to perform the tasks. This can be done by making the task content attractive by adapting it to the students' real contexts, in which they can easily understand the lesson as well as the grammatical structure. Regarding this, Hammond (1992) suggests that writing has a very close relationship with grammar as a means of reinforcing and manipulating grammatical and rhetorical structures in writing processes. As a part of language teaching and learning, grammar-in-context can relate grammar teaching to a situational context. This is a means through which students could become familiar with the method and enjoy writing without worrying about grammar when constructing any composition they are asked to produce.

The findings proved that there is a statistically significant difference between the groups ($p = 0.000$), which is less than 0.05. Accordingly, the result portrays that Wilks' $\Lambda = 0.23$, $F(3, 70) = 76.00$, $P = .000$, and partial $\eta^2 = .765$. In addition, the significant value is $p = 0.000$ at the 0.05 level of significance. The results, pre- and post-intervention, were compared and indicated that the treatment group performance was almost different from the findings of the pre-intervention result, confirming that the changes in the dependent variables were due to the training intervention. Here, it is possible to deduce that the method has brought changes to the treatment group students writing motivation and paragraph writing achievement. In the same vein, Weaver and Bush (2006) agreed that effective writing is a result of learning grammar in context. Likewise, it helps one to confirm that grammar is a resource in different compositions in general and paragraph writing in particular. On the other hand, from the self-reflection journal, students have reported that contextualised grammar instruction benefits students a lot in improving their grammatical structure during paragraph writing. Moreover, the findings of the tests seem to indicate that contextualised grammar instruction made a considerable contribution to enhancing students' grammatical accuracy in their written compositions. Therefore, on the basis of the above data, one can infer that contextualised grammar instruction is a relatively more effective grammar teaching and learning method than teaching grammar discreetly. This enables learners to achieve linguistic competence and to be able to use

Gemechis et al

grammar as a resource in different writing tasks efficiently.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the above findings, the following conclusions are drawn: Contextualised grammar instruction has enormous effects on writing motivation and paragraph writing achievement. It was found that the writing motivation and paragraph writing performance of treatment group students were significantly higher than the comparison group due to the intervention taken during the treatment.

In the post-intervention phase, posttests were given to both groups, and the t-test was used for statistical analysis. Accordingly, both the paired sample t-test and MANOVA (see Table 4) showed that there is a statistically significant difference between the post-test performances between the two groups. The mean score of the treatment group was found to be significantly higher than that of the comparison group. These findings show us that the treatment group students achieved a significant change in their paragraph writing after the intervention. This indicates that the treatment group did better in their post-intervention than the comparison group as a result of the treatment. It was also found that the qualitative data substantiated the quantitative findings. Therefore, this suggests that teaching students grammar items out of context did not improve their grammatical accuracy or their paragraph writing achievement.

In relation to the conception of contextualised grammar instruction, the analysis of the post-intervention data indicated

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., July-Sept. 2020, 9(3), 71-86

that there is an observable change in the learners' understanding of the issue under investigation. Regarding these concepts, Weaver and Bush (2006) reveals that teaching grammar in context attributed to students writing practices is more effective than teaching grammar discreetly. She added that contextualised grammar instruction could have a positive effect on students' writing achievement, and students could also develop a positive attitude towards writing as their worries about grammatical errors were minimized. This clearly shows that students would learn a language more effectively if emphasis was given to grammar teaching in context, especially to improve their writing skills. Thus, it is rational to conclude that the training has had a positive effect on the students' writing motivation and paragraph writing. Based on these, it can be concluded that contextualised grammar instruction appears to be one of the important methods that treat students' writing motivation and paragraph writing achievement. This research project, therefore, concludes that grammar items should be presented in context to improve learners' grammatical accuracy in their writing. The contextualised grammar activities have to be presented in line with the students' real-world experiences, cultural knowledge, and others.

REFERENCES

- Amlaku, B. (2010). *Language Policies and the Role of English in Ethiopia: A presentation paper at the 23rd Annual Conference of IATEFL BESIG*, 1-15.
- Amin, Y. (2009). *The Effectiveness of Teaching Grammar in Context to Reduce Students'*

Gemechis et al

- Grammatical Errors in Writing* (MA Thesis), English Education Department, Graduate Program of State University of Malang.
- Atkins, J., & Nuru M. (1995). *Skills Development Methodology Part1*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa printing press.
- Banti, M. (2003). *Orientations and motivation in the learning of English as a foreign language* (MA Thesis), Addis Ababa University.
- Candlin, N. (2001). *English Language Teaching in Its Social Context*. USA: Routledge.
- Celce- Murcia, M. (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching. A Guide for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Cohen, L.; Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2008). *Research methods in education* (6th edition) Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, C A.: Sage
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundation of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Sage Publication, Inc.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Deepti, G., & Getachew Seyoum. (2011). The influence of motivation and attitude on writing strategy use of undergraduate EFL students: Quantitative and qualitative perspectives. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 13 (2). ISSN : 1738-1460
- Dornyei, Z., & Guilloteaux, M.J. (2008) Motivating Language Learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42 (1), 55-77.
- Girma Gezahegn. (2005). *A Study of Secondary School English Language Teacher's Implementation of Methodological Innovations: The Teaching of Grammar in Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., July-Sept. 2020, 9(3), 71-86*
- Focus (PhD Thesis), Addis Ababa University.
- Geremew Lemu. (1994). *The Effectiveness of Teaching English as a Foreign Language Through Grammar Consciousness-Raising Activities to Ninth Grade Students* (M.A Thesis), Addis Ababa University.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve the writing of Adolescents in middle and high schools – A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). *Competing paradigms in qualitative research. Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Guilloteaux, M. J. (2007). *Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of teachers' motivational practices and students' motivation*. University of Nottingham, England.
- Haregewoin, A. (2008). *The effect of communicative grammar on the grammatical accuracy of students' academic writing: An integrated approach to TEFL* (Ph.D. Dissertation), Addis Ababa University.
- Hammond, J. (1992). *English for social purposes*. Sidney: NCLTR Macquarie University.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. England: Pearson education limited.
- Hudson, R. (2001). Grammar teaching and writing skills: the research evidence. *Syntax in the Schools*, (17), 1-6.
- Janet, R. (2007). *Comparison led writing*: Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, B, et al. (2004). A Research Paradigm. *American Educational Research Association*, 33(7), 14-26

Gemechis et al

- Jordan, M.P. (2005). *Third Language Learners: Pragmatic production and Awareness*, Clevedon. Multilingual Matters.
- Locke, T. (2010). *Beyond the grammar wars. A Resource for Teachers and Students on developing Language Knowledge in the English/Literacy Classroom*. Routledge Taylor & Francis: New York
- Matthew, J, R. (2008). *Successful Scientific Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mesfin, A. (2016). The Students' level of English language proficiency in ensuring quality education. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature*, 4(1), 374-385
- Muncie, J. (2002). Finding a place for grammar in EFL composition classes, *ELT Journal*, 56(2), 180-186.
- Myhill, D. (2005). Ways of knowing: Writing with grammar in mind. *English teaching: practice and critique*, 4(3), 77-96.
- Mydans, S. (2007). *Across cultures, English is the word*. New York Times.
- Newby, T. J. (2000). Behaviorism, Cognitivism, Constructivism: Comparing critical features from an instructional design perspective. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 26(2), 43-71.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Phillips, D. C., & Burbules, N. 2000. *Post positivism and educational research*. Lanham, MA: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Prince, M.J., & Felder, R.M. (2006). Inductive Teaching and Learning Methods: Definitions, Comparisons, and Research Bases. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 95(2), 123-138.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rothman, J. (2010). *Theoretical Linguistics Meets Pedagogical Practice Pronominal Subject Use in Spanish as a Second Language as an Example*, 93(1). 52-65 DOI: 10.1353/hpn.0.0001
- Sharma, N. (2020). Pedagogies in Language Teaching. A paradigm Shift. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature* 8(3).
- Sundem, G.(2006). *Improving Student Writing Skills*. USA: Shell Education.
- Ur, P. (1988). *Grammar Practice Activities*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Van Lier, L. (2002). The role of form in language learning. In, M. Bax (Ed.), *Reflections on Language and Language Learning: In Honor of Arthur van Essen*. Philadelphia (pp. 253-267). PA, USA: John Benjamins.
- Wahyuni , D. (2012). The Research Design Maze: Understanding Paradigms, Cases, Methods and Methodologies. *Journal of Applied Management Accounting Research*, 10(1), 69-80.
- Weaver, C., & Bush, J. (2006). Grammar intertwined throughout the writing process: An "inch wide and a mile deep. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 5(1), 77-101.
- Widodo, H.P.(2006). Approaches and procedures for teaching grammar. *English Teaching: Practice and critique*, 5 (1), 122-141.
- Wyse, D. (2004). Grammar for writing? A critical review of empirical evidence. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 49(4), 411-427.