

Original article: Contextualized grammar instruction influences on students' writing motivation and their paragraph writing performance

¹Gemechis Denu, ²Zelege Teshome & ³Tekle Ferede

^{1,2}, Department of English Language and Literature; Institute of Languages Study and Journalism; Wollega University, Nekemte, Ethiopia, P.O. box 395

³Department of English Language and Literature, Jimma University, Ethiopia

Corresponding Author: Gemechis Denu

Abstract

The main objective of the study was to investigate the influences of contextualized grammar instruction (CGI) on students' writing motivation and their paragraph writing performance. 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 technique 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, test, questionnaire were employed. In data analysis, the study employed MANOVA, paired sample t-test; independent sample t-test. The multivariate-test analysis results of pre- intervention showed that both treatment and comparison groups were homogeneous. However, after the treatment group was taught for about eight weeks using the intervention manual, both treatment and comparison groups were given a post intervention, to see if any significant difference is 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 contextualized grammar instruction attributes to students writing motivation and their paragraph writing performance. It is inferred that students favored the influence of contextualized grammar instruction in order to improve their writing. Therefore, this is an important input for the ministry of education and English language teachers to place emphasis on contextualized grammar instruction in teaching and learning procedures so that the students manage their paragraph writing skills would be improved.

Key Words: 1.Contextualized grammar instruction role, 2.writing motivation, 3.writing performance

1. Introduction

English has been used as means of communication across the globe in different sectors. It is widely used across the world and people use it for different kind 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 [10, 24]. This makes English undeniable important in different segments as it is an international language. In connection to this, Mydans [30] states that language pedagogy has come through different paradigm shift of theories and methods however, language teaching methodology has been changed or emerged one after the other so that the gap seen in the former methods would be fixed.

In traditional language teaching era grammar was learnt as a separate set of rigid rules to be learned. In such language teaching method, rule governed teaching was dominated in which linguistic aspect has got as the basis of language proficiency [35]. This makes grammar a set of forms and structures. Newby [31]. This does mean grammar was taught deductively and explicitly through drills. In this approach, students were encouraged to be 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 to these points, Rothman [36] explains that there has been a debate about the most effective way of teaching grammar in order to fix the problem appears due to the former way of grammar teaching. Language teachers and researchers attempted to develop other methods of language teaching that they think the newly emerged method could bridge the gaps.

Candlin and Mercer [5] suggest that students better achieved when they are taught in line with tasks that bases students' cultural contexts to develop their sense of motivation in learning. The changes were attributed to different nature such as sociological, pedagogical and multiple intelligences of learners' preferences. This illustrate that students favored lessons that bases their cultural contexts. In the context of social constructivist theory also it points out that, knowledge is not mechanically acquired, rather actively constructed within the learning environment of the learners [26]. Thus, the proponents of this theory believe that learning takes place with the immediate learning environment. This does mean that learning is considered to be situation-specific and context-bound activity. Therefore, English language activities need to be designed in line with the students' background knowledge that focuses their actual contexts so that they could achieve the skills of paragraph writing performance.

Rothman [37] claims that the culture and the context of the society helps the students' more to construct the required knowledge. This does mean, contextualized grammar instruction has become the target area which assists the students to improve the grammatical structure in writing proposition. To this respect, Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000) reflects that the current cutting-edge pedagogy argues language learning materials should be well contextualized and meaningful to learners. Moreover, Widodo (2006) affirms teaching and learning grammar separately is not favorable to learners in developing writing skills. Therefore, teachers are suggested to use alternative teaching grammar methods so that students could achieve the necessary skills in paragraph writing.

In teaching and learning second/foreign language, methodology is one of the motivational source in which it inspires the learners to engage in different language tasks, and create good learning environment. This does mean the methodology he/she employs will have some effects on the students' motivation to write. Atikins, Hailom, and Nuru (1995) assert that contextualized grammar teaching seems to supply a reasonable authentic, vivid contexts and situations in which new language items can

be presented. The application of rules can be established through motivating exercises, tasks that could help students understand language system inductively.

Weaver and Bush [44] argue for the importance of contextualized grammar teaching which has a potential to use grammatical resources in producing effective writing. This shows that teaching grammar in context helps the learners' in governing the way writing takes place and ensure that it can be easily understood by the people who read it. From these arguments, it is evident that grammar contributes in students writing production in order to convey a clear message. Thus, this needs appropriate methods that give a chance to students produce effective written composition with the correct form of the language. The assumptions of producing effective writing are resulted from the effort of learning grammar in context. This proves that effective writing is a result of teaching grammar in context as it allows students to apply conventions to produce effective writing [22, 44]. This notice that contextualized grammar instruction helps students to familiarize themselves with various syntactic patterns of the language. This empower the students improve their paragraph writing development with accurate forms of the language.

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 using the language skills for real and genuine communication [13]. However, Geremew [14] states 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 level best, students writing performance is below the standard. It is heard from different English teachers while they have been complaining about the students' paragraph writing performance during conducting various trainings at various high schools and university level. Inline to this, some research findings strongly suggested that high school students in Ethiopia seriously lack in all English skills in general and writing skills in particular. "Students have shortage of the English language to write up to their level best [1]".

The main students' writing problems might be related to their grammatical issues, 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 knowledge of the researcher is concerned, the learners' grammatical problem during paragraph writing remains low and does their writing motivation. Therefore, it could be sound to investigate the role of contextualized grammar instruction and its effects on writing motivation and paragraph writing achievement.

2. Methodology

In this study, quasi experimental research design was adopted. The purpose for choosing quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design is to treat as treatment and comparison groups in line with the nature and the objectives of the problem to be studied. Moreover, the means of obtaining information is also considered to choose 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 utilized [8]. Accordingly, quantitative research approach was used mostly for this study and qualitative data was used gather data from the participants' using self- reflection journal to accompaniment the quantitative data.

This study was carried out, Oromia Regional State, East wollega zone. Accordingly, Gute High School was selected as a sample of the study. Accordingly, from seven sections of Grade 11 students, two sections were selected using lottery method. Of the two sections, one section was assigned as treatment group

and the other as comparison group- this was done using lottery method. Since the study requires quantitative and qualitative data, different research tools were employed. These include: test, questionnaires and self-reflection journal writing. Thus, as to Cohen [7] the more we use various data-collecting instruments, the stronger tendency to generate in-depth and reliable information from the participants of the study. The study employed both quantitative and qualitative data. Hence, different research tools were used. These are test and questionnaire. Test is one of the data collecting instruments of this research which was employed to answer the designed research question. The treatment group and the comparison group received pretest and posttest during the study. The aim of the pre-test administration is to get a baseline data of students' actual performance before the intervention. Accordingly, the pre-test was administered for both treatment and comparison group students. A pretest is to verify the groups' initial similarity regarding the issue under investigation, and a posttest was used to prove the effects of the intended approach on students' writing motivation and their paragraph performance. And these tests were employed for the research participants to address the intended research objectives. Hence, students were given different topics to write a well-organized paragraph. The result of the test was scored by two raters to produce reliable results. They were rater 1 and rater 2. Raters took brief orientation on how to score the participants score. Both pre& posttest were scored out of 50%. This was used to maintain inter rater reliability. At the end of the intervention, 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 contextualized grammar instruction has brought the projected effects on students' paragraph writing performances. The questions for post-test involved guided writing and free writing as that of pre-test in the same allocated time. Hence, the topic 'the impacts of Covid- 19 on education sector' was given as outline and students were asked to extend the outlines further to construct an organized paragraph.

On the other hand, questionnaire for both Pre- and post- assessment was administered to assess the level of students' paragraph writing performance and the variation of paragraph writing improvement due to the treatment made for the experimental group. The questionnaire items were adapted from the Guilloteaux, Marie-Jose [17]. Based on this, a close-ended multi-items Likert type five point scales questionnaires were used for the students. The five points 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 participants' native language, Afan Oromo to avoid misunderstanding.

3. 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 for the treatment group for some few months. Whereas no treatment was given for the comparison group and they were directed to use conventional way as usual. Following the intervention, posttest was administered to test the effects of the approach (Contextualized grammar instruction on students writing achievement).

4. Data Analysis and Procedures

In order to carry out the data analysis, principally, the SPSS software was utilized for analyzing a quantitative data collected from the students' questionnaires and paragraph writing performance test using a descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Accordingly, paired samples t-test, independent t-

test and MANOVA were used to compute the mean scores of the pre and posttests 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

Table.1: Paired Samples t-test for Mean Differences within the Treatment Group on Writing motivation (WM) and paragraph writing performance (PWP).

Variables	N	Mean	SD	T-value	Df	Sig(2 tailed)
WM	37	.624	.741	7.382	36	.000
PWP	37	6.253	5.073	9.793	36	.000

Table.1. showed that the analysis of the paired sample t-test on treatment group students’ pre- and post-intervention data writing motivation was computed to test whether or not the training has brought any significant change. Regarding the pre and post-intervention writing motivation mean score results of the treatment group, the test result signifies that the difference between the mean score of the students writing motivation (M=.624, SD=.741) and the statistical figure depicts that (t (36) =7.382; P<0.05). Accordingly, the result was found to be significant at (p= 0.000) which is less than 0.05 alpha levels. This implies that the difference mean score with in groups has been observed from pre- and post-intervention results. The cause of students’ inclination towards writing motivation results after the intervention might be emanates from the effect of contextualized grammar instruction training provided for the treatment group. On the other hand, the treatment group paragraph writing performance result indicated in the table is (M=6.253,SD=5.073) and (T=9.793; p<0.05) which proved that the observed mean scores were significantly higher than the expected value. On the post intervention, however, the figure illustrates that there is a noticeable difference between the treatment group pre and post paragraph writing performance mean score result. This does mean that the paragraph writing performance of the treatment group has markedly inclined after the intervention. Similarly, the results of the analysis of comparison group students regarding the dependent variables writing motivation and paragraph writing performance values are presented in Table.2.

Table.2: Paired Samples t-test for Mean Differences within the Comparison Group on WM(writing motivation, and PWA (Paragraph writing performance)

Variables	N	Mean	SD	T-value	Df	Sig(2 tailed)
WM	37	.0327	.3100	.907	36	.598
PWP	37	4.301	1.794	4.349	36	.371

Table.2 depicts that results of the paired sample t- test statistical analysis revealed that the mean differences with in comparison group of the two variables (Writing motivation and paragraph writing achievement) were found to be almost similar. The mean scores of each variable for WM and PWA were (.0327 and 4.301) respectively. Likewise, the test indicated that the difference between the scoring of the students writing motivation (M = .0327, SD = .3100) and that (t (36) =.907; P>0.05). This does mean that the t- value indicates, T= .907 with 36 degrees of freedom at p > 0.05 level of significance which is (P=.598). This result shows that there is no significant difference between the pre-and post-interventions at writing motivation among the comparison group.

From the findings, paragraph writing performance is almost similar and the p value for each variable is not significant. As the results depicts that M = 4.301 SD = 1.794) and that (t (36) =4.349, P>0.05). This

does mean that the t- value indicates, $T= 4.349$ with 36 degrees of freedom at $p > 0.05$ level of significance which is ($P=.371$). Similar result was seen on the performance of comparison group students before and after the intervention. This confirmed that there were statistically insignificant differences between the comparison group students' pre- and post-intervention data. Therefore, the performance of students in comparison group did not significantly differ since paired samples t-test for mean differences within the group on writing motivation and paragraph writing achievement. This is because p-values of the variables were greater than 0.05. This indicates that the comparison group students have expressed slightly under mean score along the variables as they didn't get a chance to be part of the treatment. Consequently, MANOVA was run to determine group differences (treatment group and comparison groups) on the three dependent variables WM and PWA before the intervention.

The respective results from the multivariate analysis, it is observed that the value for the given pre-intervention study of both groups were found on a similar performance as the F- ratios, which is Wilks' Lamda= 0.983, $F(3, 70) = .394$, $P=.758$, partial eta squared =.017 and the $P>0.05$. From the findings, it is possible to verify that the groups do indeed similar result that shows their homogeneity among the intended variables at pre intervention phase of the study. Hence, based on this statistical figure, the treatment and the comparison group students were homogeneous for the p-value (probability value) is greater than 0.05. This means there is no observed mean differences with regard to the two dependent variables mean scores for the comparison and treatment group students together before the intervention. Generally, the pretreatment performance of the treatment group and the comparison group revealed statistically non- significant difference.

Based on the results drawn, the treatment was carried out to investigate the effects of the contextualized grammar instruction on students writing motivation and paragraph writing achievement. Therefore, the treatment group students were taught for about eight weeks using the intervention manual. Regarding this, the researcher thought that the 'eight weeks long' seemed optimal duration and it was found enough to conduct the experiment. Thus, after the intervention, posttests treatments were conducted for both treatment and comparison group students. Accordingly, the results revealed that treatment group students outperformed the comparison group on the combined dependent variables. The MANOVA test statistics indicated a significant difference on students writing motivation and paragraph writing achievement. See the details in Table.3.

Table.3: MANOVA Test for between-Group Mean Differences on WM and PWA Together After the Intervention

Multivariate Tests							
Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
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 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 .05 level of significance. Therefore, the output revealed that there was statistically significant difference between the comparison and the treatment group in their writing motivation and paragraph writing achievement. In this section, findings from analysis of this data were compared using the pre- and post-intervention findings. This indicated that the treatment group performance is almost different with the findings from the pre-intervention results.

5. Discussion of the Findings

Findings from the analysis, 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 more than those who learn grammar discretely. Similarly, as the data gathered from students' reflective journal writing the respondents reflected that the approach helped them improve their writing motivation. They further reported that they have benefited from the manual during the intervention. In addition, they have included in their reflection that they felt excited about the contextualized grammar instruction as it help them use it in their writing practices.

The study therefore, revealed that students' who were treated with the training intervention exceed those who learned in conventional way. This demonstrates that contextualized grammar instruction has brought changes on the treatment group students. The implication is therefore, students who are 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 could understand the tasks easily and develop 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. Most of English text book exercises provided in the intervention material demand the students to practice different grammar items in contexts. This could be the possible understood as a reason for the better performance succeeded by the treatment group students.

Students' 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 contextualized grammar instruction on their writing motivation and paragraph writing achievement". The main purpose of using this tool was to get qualitative data regarding students' perception about the effects of contextualized grammar instruction during the intervention time. Therefore, the participants (all the treatment group students) were asked to write the reflective journal.

The fundamental goal of teaching grammar in context is to provide students with grammatical knowledge in which they construct grammatically correct writing easily. Scholars argued that contextualized grammar and writing skills have strong relationships [29, 44, 21]. They have made an argument on the effects of contextualized grammar instruction gives students a meaningful basis for understanding and using a new language structures and patterns in their writing practices. This noted that presenting grammar in context initiate students' to learn grammar freely so that they could improve their paragraph writing. Learner's language performance refers to background knowledge, confidence, motivation to learn, ability in language skills, cultural knowledge or awareness, and linguistic knowledge [35].

In language learning steps, background experience, cultural knowledge or awareness contributes a dramatic effect on the learners' grammar skills. This helps learners to bring their grammar knowledge in the writing practices. The presentation of grammar in context in line with students' background experience really enables them to distinguish between accepted and unaccepted forms of communication in the target language. Deepti and Getachew [11, p.69] found "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 when learning takes place their real world. Therefore, this is one way of presenting and learning language forms to overcome some grammatical difficulties in writing.

The primary aspects of teaching grammar in context is that when grammatical structure is presented, the presentation of the rules should be in a clear contexts in which students learn the structure at easy [42]. This noted that grammar as well as other language activities should be contextualized 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 motivation constructs. The extent to which students' are interested in their approach and effort in learning writing skills with the intended method might be affected by the method the use in learning and teaching. Moreover, the analysis also focused on the extent to which the contextualized grammar instruction affects the students writing.

In order to see any significant difference between pre- and post- intervention results of the two groups, the treatment group students were taught for about two months with the intervention manual. Then after, posttests were conducted for both treatment and comparison group students. The post-intervention data was analysed using multivariate analysis test after intervention. After intervention, multivariate test results show that the treatment group's students outperformed the comparison group students' on writing motivation variable as a result of the training intervention (contextualized 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 as $p = 0.000$ at .05 level of significance. This signify that there is statistically significant difference between the group as $p = 0.000$ which is less than 0.05. Therefore, this could be noted that the treatment group students performed significantly on the post- intervention when compared to the comparison group students post tests results.

The above findings are in proportion with the research findings of Weaver and Bush [44]. They argue for the importance of contextualized grammar teaching which has a potential to use grammatical resources in producing 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 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 lean grammar through contextualized 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.

The study conducted by [4], accounted for motivation to learn English language. Besides, Harmer [20] also asserts that the sources of motivation emanates 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/she employs in the classroom as it has some effect on the students' motivation. Concerning this, Dornyei [12, 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 treatment group significantly exceeded comparison group in their writing motivation results.

Therefore, the findings noted that grammar presentation in contexts allows students in making appropriate linguistic choices in order to produce effective writing. Hence, this method clearly signifies that connection between writing and grammar in context support writers in their various language experiences as writers' and others. 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 engage themselves in writing practices effectively to their level best. This could be the 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 with the correct form of the language. This shows us that the contextualized grammar instruction motivate students' to engage in different level of writing activities. Therefore, provide the learners with task that is related to background experience intends to prolong the learners' motivation in performing the tasks. This can be done making the task content attractive by adapting it to the students' real contexts in which students can easily understand the lesson as well as the grammatical structure. Regarding this, Hammond [19] suggests that writing has 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 situational context. This is a means through which students could become familiar with the method and enjoy writing without worrying about grammar in constructing any composition they are asked to produce.

The findings proved that there is statistically significant difference between the group as $p = 0.000$ which is less than 0.05. Accordingly, the result portrays that Wilks' Lamda= 0.23, $F(3, 70) = 76.00$, $P = .000$, partial eta squared = .765. In addition, the significant value is $p = 0.000$ at .05 level of significance. From the results, pre-and post-intervention were compared and indicated that the treatment group performance is almost different from the findings of the pre-intervention result confirming that the changes in the dependent variables was due to the training intervention. Here, it is possible to deduce that the method has brought changes on the treatment group students writing motivation and paragraph writing achievement. In the same vein, Weaver, et al. [44] agreed that effective writing is a result of learning grammar in context. Likewise, it helps one to confirm that grammar as a resource in different compositions in general and paragraph writing in particular in efficiently. On the other hand, from the self-reflection journal students have reported contextualized grammar instruction benefits students a lot in improving their grammatical structure during paragraph writing skills. Moreover, the findings of the tests seem to indicate that contextualized grammar instruction had considerable contribution in enhancing students' grammatical accuracy in their written compositions. Therefore, on the basis of the above data one can infer that contextualized grammar instruction is relatively effective grammar teaching and learning method than teaching grammar discreetly. This enables learners to achieve linguistic competence and to be able to use grammar as a resource in different writing tasks efficiently.

6. Conclusion

On the basis of the above findings, the following conclusions are drawn. Contextualized 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. At the phase of post intervention, posttests were given to both groups and the t-test was used for statistical analysis. Accordingly, both the paired sample t- test (see table.1.); MANOVA (see table 3) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the post-test performance in between the two groups. The mean score of the treatment group was found significantly higher than the comparison group. This 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 out that the qualitative data substantiate the quantitative findings. Therefore, this suggests that teaching students grammar items out of contexts did not benefit students to improve their grammatical accuracy in their paragraph writing achievement.

From the above points of view one can draw those students writing motivation and paragraph writing achievement. In relation to the conception about contextualized grammar instruction, the analysis of the post-intervention data indicated that there is an observable change in the learners' understanding about the issue under investigation. Regarding this concepts, Weaver [44] reveals that teaching grammar in context attributed to students writing practices than teaching grammar discreetly. She added that contextualized grammar instruction could show positive effect on students' writing achievement, and students could also develop positive attitude towards writing as their worries of 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 students writing skills. Thus, it is rational to conclude that the training has brought positive effect on the students' writing motivation and paragraph writing. Based on these, it can be concluded that contextualized grammar instruction appeared to be one of the important method 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 of their writing. The contextualized grammar activities have to be presented in line with students' real world, experiences, cultural knowledge and the others.

References

- B. Amlaku, "Language Policies and the Role of English in Ethiopia," A presentation paper at the 23rd Annual Conference of IATEFL BESIG, 1-15,(2010).
- Y. Amin, "The Effectiveness of Teaching Grammar in Context to Reduce Students' Grammatical Errors in Writing." English Education Department, Graduate Program of State University of Malang. MA Thesis, (2009).
- J. Atkins, & M. Nuru . *Skills development methodology*. Vol.1. Addis Ababa University: Addis Ababa printing press, (1995).
- M. Banti, "Orientations and motivation in the learning of English as a foreign language," (MA Thesis) Addis Ababa University, (2003).
- M. Celce-Murcia, "Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching," *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(3), 459-477,(2000).
- L Cohen; L. Manion, & K. Morrison. *Research methods in education (6th ed.)*. London & New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group,(2008).

- J. Creswell. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage,(2003).
- M. Crotty. *The foundation of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Sage Publication, Inc,(1998).
- G.Deepti & S. Getachew, "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), (2011).
- Z. Dörnyei, "Motivating Language Learners," *A Classroom-Oriented Investigation of the Effects of Motivational Strategies on Student Motivation TESOL Quarterly*, 42 (1), PP.55-63,(2008).
- G. Girma. *A Study of Secondary School English Language Teachers' Implementation of Methodological Innovation: The Teaching of Grammar in Focus*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Addis Ababa University, (2005).
- S .Geremew.. "The Effectiveness of Teaching English as a Foreign Language Through Grammar Consciousness-Raising Activities to Ninth Grade Students," M.A. Thesis. (Unpublished).Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University, (1994) S. Graham, & D. Perin, "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, (2007).
- E. Guba, & S. Lincoln. *Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences in the Sage handbook of qualitative research*. London: Sage. (2005).
- M. J. Guilloteaux, " Motivating language learners,": A classroom-oriented investigation of teachers' motivational practices and students' motivation. University of Nottingham, England, (2007).
- J. Harmer, *The practice of English language teaching*. England: Pearson education Limited (2001).
- [21] R. Hudson, "Grammar teaching and writing skills: the research evidence," *Syntax in the Schools*, (17), pp. 1-6, (2001).
- R. Janet, *Comparison led writing: A transformation approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,(2007).
- M.P.S. Jordan, *Third Language Learners: Pragmatic production and Awareness*, Clevedon. *Multilingual Matters*, (2005).
- T. Locke , "Beyond the grammar war," *A Resource for Teachers and Students on developing Language Knowledge in the English/Literacy Classroom* by Routledge Taylor &Francis: New York, (2010).
- J, R. Matthew. *Successful Scientific Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.(2009).
- A. Mesfin, "The Students' level of English language proficiency in ensuring quality education. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature*," Peer Reviewed (Refereed). *International Journal*,4,(1), (2016).
- J. Muncie, "Finding a place for grammar in EFL composition classes," Oxford: Oxford university Press. *ELT Journal*, 56(2): 180-186, (2002).
- D. Myhill, "Ways of knowing: Writing with grammar in mind. *English teaching, practice and critique. School of Education and Lifelong Learning: University of Exeter*4(3):77-96, (2005).
- T. J. Newby, "Behaviorism, Cognitivism, Constructivism: Comparing critical features from an instructional design perspective," *Performance Improvement Quarterly*,26(2): 43-71, (2000).
- D. C. Phillips & N. Burbules, "Post positivism and educational research," Lanham, MA: Rowman and Littlefield, (2000).
- M.J Prince, & R.M. Felder, "Inductive Teaching and Learning Methods," *Definitions, Comparisons, and Research Bases'*, *Journal of Engineering Education*, 95(2): 123-138, (2006).
- J. C. Richards & T. S. Rodgers. "Approaches and methods in language teaching," (2nd ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (2001).
- K.R. Rose, *Teachers and students learning about requests in Hong Kong*. In E.Hinkel (ed.) *Culture in second language teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,(1999).

- J. Rothman, "Theoretical Linguistics Meets Pedagogical Practice Pronominal Subject Use in Spanish as a Second Language as an Example," *University of Iowa, USA. Hispania* 93(1), (2010).
- [38].Sharma, "Pedagogies in Language Teaching," *A paradigm Shift. Research Journal of English Language and Literature. A Peer Reviewed Interational Journal. Vol.8,Issue 3,(2020)*
- P.C.Taylor, & M.N.D. Medina, "Educational research paradigms," *From positivism to multi paradigmatic. Journal for Meaning Centered Education, 1. DOI:10.13140/2.1.3542.0805, (2013).*
- D. Wahyuni, "The Research Design Maze: Understanding Paradigms, Cases, Methods and Methodologies," *Journal of Applied Management Accounting Research, 10(1): pp. 69-80,(2012).*
- C.Weaver & J. Bush, "Grammar intertwined throughout the writing process: An "inch wide and a mile deep," *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 5(1): 77-101, (2006).*
- H.P. Widodo, "Approaches and procedures for teaching grammar," *English Teaching: Practice and critique, 5 (1) pp. 122-141,(2006).*
- D.Wyse, "Grammar for writing," *A critical review of empirical evidence. British Journal of Educational Studies, 49(4) pp.411-427, (2004).*

¹ First Author (gemechisdenu2012@gmail.com); ² Corresponding reader (tzeleke11@yahoo.com); ³ Corresponding reader (tekle.ferede2014@gmail.com)