



The Effects of Contextualized Grammar Teaching on Developing EFL University Students' Writing Skills and Grammatical Accuracy

Paiman Omer Mustafa*

Fatimah Rasheed Hasan Al Bajalani **



* English Department, College of
,Basic Education Salahaddin
University-Erbil
** English Department, College of
,Languages Salahaddin
University-Erbil
paiman.mustafa@su.edu.krd
fatimah.hassan@su.edu.krd

Reiceved 20/05/2023
Accepted 02/07/2023
Published 15/04/2024

Keywords:

writing skills,
grammatical accuracy in writing,
explicit-implicit grammar
teaching.

Abstract

This experimental study aimed at investigating the effectiveness of contextualized (explicit/ implicit) grammar teaching in developing writing skills and grammatical accuracy in writing among EFL students majoring at the English Department/ College of Basic Education/ Salahaddin University-Erbil. To this end, 52 second-year students were randomly assigned into two experimental groups and a control group. The first experimental group was exposed to contextualized explicit grammar teaching and the other experimental group was treated with contextualized implicit grammar teaching, while the control group just received traditional grammar teaching. To assess the effectiveness of the treatments, pre- and post-tests in the form of paragraph writings were used and analysed using the ANCOVA test. Although the results attested that contextualized (explicit/ implicit) grammar teaching was found to be effective, the results were very promising for the contextualized explicit grammar teaching method. The study concluded by discussing the results and providing suggestions for further research.



About the Journal

ZANCO Journal of Humanity Sciences (ZJHS) is an international, multi-disciplinary, peer-reviewed, double-blind and open-access journal that enhances research in all fields of basic and applied sciences through the publication of high-quality articles that describe significant and novel works; and advance knowledge in a diversity of scientific fields.
<https://zancojournal.su.edu.krd/index.php/JAHS/about>

1. Introduction

It is proven that writing is the most difficult language skill for foreign language learners to attain. The skills needed in writing are highly complex to achieve (Rajabi and Dezhkam, 2014; Özdemir and Aydin, 2015; Ahmad, Al-Tanany, and Musa, 2020). There is a need to consider components of writing like organization, content, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and vocabulary (Rajabi and Dezhkam, 2014; Likaj, 2015). Although many skills are involved in writing, grammatical accuracy is at the top of students' writing (Macaro and Masterman, 2006; Ahmad, Al-Tanany, and Musa, 2020; Myhill and Watson, 2014). According to Fareed, Ashraf, and Bilal (2016), ideas are put into understandable sentences through grammar so they can clearly convey the targeted meaning in a written production as well as avoid misunderstanding. Martine (2001) also stated that this is grammar gives meaning to written or oral language, and talks about the word arrangements through which message can be conveyed.

Within the field of applied linguistics, grammar teaching methods are highly researched (López, 2004; Diaz et al., 2019). To López (2004, p.13), "there is no debate as to whether or not it is necessary to teach grammar but how it should be taught." For this, there has been much debate over the link between grammar teaching and writing development- whether writing and grammar should be taught in isolation or contextualized (Weaver, 1996; Andrews et al., 2004; Locke, 2009; Myhill et. al., 2012; Jones, Myhill, and Bailey, 2013). Fourteen years ago, Johnson argued that 80 years of research concluded that teaching grammar traditionally (separately) has very little or no effect on enhancing students' writing. Such an approach to teaching grammar involves the teacher explaining the grammar rules and drilling these into the learners utilizing controlled practice (Alenezi, 2019). The problem with this approach is that most students are often able to explain grammar rules but cannot use them in the right context, especially in writing (Frodesen, 2001; Abdel Rahim, 2013). On the other hand, contextualized grammar teaching (CGT) was found to be effective to develop students' writing (Weaver, 1996; Jones, Myhill, and Bailey, 2013; Cawley, 2017; Omar, 2019). For Myhill (2005; 2010), the notion of CGT means more than grammar learning where the focus is not only grammar learning but some other features of language learning. In line with Myhill's view, Gaikwad (2014) claimed that it is, thus, necessary to think that the purpose of CGT first of all should be to aid students develop their writing skills. Constance Weaver (1996, p.16), in addition, clarified that "teaching grammar in context includes suggestions to teach a minimum of grammar for maximum benefits". Perin (2011), in her study, revealed other advantages of CGT for students such as motivating, interesting, and engaging.

Accordingly, researchers have mentioned ways to contextualize grammar that help students develop their overall writing skills. One way to contextualize grammar is to teach grammar in the context of writing which has a positive effect on developing writing (Huang, 2010; Weaver, 2010; Jones, Myhill, and Bailey, 2013). The concept of teaching grammar in the context of writing is frequently associated with Weaver. To her, "the teaching of grammar should occur throughout the writing process. . . it has a natural place within all writing phases, from planning through revision and editing" (Weaver, 2008, p.12). Moreover, Hans and Hans (2017) claimed that the most helpful way of developing students' writing skills with contextualized grammar is to use their writings for discussing grammatical concepts, thus allowing them to have a chance to discuss and consider the other subskills of writing. Another way to contextualize grammar that helps students develop their overall writing skills is to teach grammar in the context of authentic reading texts which contain target grammar items (Huang, 2010; Tai, 2016; Aka, 2020). For this, Halliday (2014, p.3) claimed that "language is... a resource for making meaning, so text is the process of making meaning in context". Furthermore, Krashen (1985) maintained that input (such as reading authentic texts) plays a vital role in language learning because it provides comprehensive opportunities for students to

communicate. Hinkel (2004) claimed that when students are exposed to a reading text before writing, they can infer and learn the grammar point naturally and consider what follows and proceeds them. Added to the importance of teaching grammar in reading contexts, Thornbury (2012) said that it is very easy for students to guess the intended meaning of a word or phrase when students are provided with a text.

Over the past few decades, there have been several opinions about the different possible approaches to teaching grammar in context to develop writing skills. Some prefer grammar teaching explicitly while others prefer implicitly. These approaches affect not only students' grammatical accuracy but also their overall writing (Altun and Dincer, 2020). In accordance with the Consciousness-raising theory, the concept of explicit grammar teaching refers to teaching a grammar structure during the learning process and encouraging the learners to develop metalinguistic awareness of the target structure (Ellis et al., 2009; Nazari, 2013) whether inductively (presenting contexts and then eliciting the rules) or deductively (presenting the rules and then providing examples) (Andrews, 2007). On the other hand, implicit grammar teaching involves providing learners with certain conditions under which they can infer and internalize the rules without being taught by their teacher (Ellis et al., 2009).

EFL students in our universities study grammar in isolation not in context. They may be able to state a grammar rule, but consistently fail to apply the rules when writing (Muhammad and Jawad, 2019), and their English writing performance is extremely poor in such a way that they are unable to write a well-formed piece of writing (Brime, 2018). There is a kind of disconnection between knowing the rules of grammar and being able to apply those rules effectively in basic language skills, especially writing. Moreover, another study by Salih et al. (2019) on Kurdish EFL undergraduate students revealed that our students mostly have problems with writing among other language skills due to the wrong teaching methods. They further stated that our students need a teaching method to link grammar to students' writing so as to transfer the grammatical knowledge that they know to their writing. In this regard, a review of past research claimed that teaching grammar as a separate subject is not beneficial to writers (Gaikwad, 2014; Nazari, 2013; Eldoumi, 2012; Abdel Rahim, 2013, etc.) whereas numerous researchers (Myhill, 2010; Jones, Myhill, and Bailey, 2013; Myhill et al., 2012; Zina, 2015; Myhill, 2018; Omer, 2019; Marjokorpi, 2022; Bhavani and Shankar, 2023, etc.) have discussed in detail the advantages of CGT for developing writing skills. More specifically, the comparison of the impact of contextualized implicit and explicit grammar teaching on developing writing skills is not investigated fully yet, and there is not much agreement in the previous research to show which method of grammar teaching is more effective (Abdel Rahim, 2013; Nazari, 2013; Cawley, 2017; Colbert, Ware, and Jones, 2018; Altun and Dincer, 2020; Ke, Piggott, and Steinkrauss, 2021). With this in mind, the current experimental study, aimed at investigating contextualized explicit grammar teaching (CEGT), contextualized implicit grammar teaching (CIGT), and traditional grammar teaching (TGT) simultaneously to reveal their effectiveness in developing writing skills and grammatical accuracy in writing. Thereupon, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a statistically significant difference between the effects of contextualized explicit grammar teaching, contextualized implicit grammar teaching, and traditional grammar teaching on developing EFL university students' writing skills?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference between the effects of contextualized explicit grammar teaching, contextualized implicit grammar teaching, and traditional grammar teaching on developing EFL university students' grammatical accuracy in their writing?

2. Literature Review

The effect of grammar teaching on writing skill development has been debated for many years. Much of the discussion revolved around the question of whether grammar and writing instruction should be separate, or whether context should be considered to facilitate writing. TGT is about teaching grammar and writing separately, while CGT involves integrating the teaching of grammar with other language skills such as reading and writing for writing development (Xavier, Hong, and Enandya, 2020). Accordingly, Vukadin (2019) argued that overall writing skills will develop concurrently when grammar is contextualized in a meaningful context. She further clarified that in the CGT method, the intended grammar structure is presented in authentic reading texts and then incorporated into writing, by doing so, the overall writing skills are developed simultaneously. Studies that have studied the effect of TGT on writing development have found that such an approach has no effect on developing writing. For example, Myhill and her colleagues conducted a series of randomized controlled trial studies in 2011, 2012, 2014, and 2018 in England to examine the effect of CGT on the writing development of students. They found that CGT positively affected the writing performance of students. Another experimental study was conducted in 2015 by Zina to investigate the effects of integrative grammar teaching on developing second-year students' writing. The findings showed that students decreased the number of grammar errors made in writing as well as their overall writing was developed. Moreover, in their study on evaluating the grammatical competence in 93 Kurdish EFL junior students' writings at the English Department/ Duhok University, Sulaiman and Mohammed (2019) found that students made a lot of grammar errors in their writing due to inappropriate teaching materials and techniques, that is, teaching grammar and writing separately. Similarly, Omer (2019) conducted a qualitative study interviewing 9 English language learners participating in an IELTS preparation course in Benghazi, Libya to investigate whether teaching pedagogical grammar was effective to develop students' academic writing or not. The data obtained from the participants revealed that pedagogical grammar developed their language level in writing and academic writing as well. Another study was conducted by Marjokorpi in 2022 to examine the link between grammar understanding and writing skills development in the writing of 138 Finnish grade 9 students. The results from the linear regression test reported a strong relationship between grammar teaching and writing development. More recently in 2023, Bhavani and Shankar performed an experimental design study to inspect the effect of direct grammar teaching in writing on the quality of 18 fifth-grade students' writing skills for four months. The findings revealed that experimental group students' writing skills improved well due to CGT in writing.

On the other hand, in regard to developing writing skills, the ongoing debate on whether to teach grammar explicitly or implicitly in context has created a dilemma for researchers (Abdul Rahman and Rashid, 2017). Some found that CEGT was effective while others supported CIGT. For instance, Nazari (2013) adopted a comparison group experimental design to find out the difference between the effects of explicit and implicit grammar teaching on learners' receptive and productive skills. The data obtained from 60 elementary female adult students showed that the participants in the explicit group outperformed the participants in the implicit group in both receptive and productive skills. Similarly, Altun and Dincer (2020) investigated the impact of explicit and implicit grammar teaching on students' grammar and writing scores. Students' post-test writing scores indicated that explicit grammar teaching was more effective than implicit. Added to this, Colbert, Ware, and Jones (2018) intended to investigate the effects of CEGT on developing writing skills of secondary school students with dyslexia in Wales. The findings of this action research indicated that the treatment enabled participants to develop their writing skills. On the contrary, the results of Abdel Rahim's experimental study in 2013 indicated the superiority of implicit grammar teaching in developing students' writing performance. The researcher taught the experimental

group implicitly with the help of songs. Similarly, Cawley (2017) conducted a study aimed at comparing the effects of implicit and explicit grammar teaching on enhancing 17 master students' writing development. The results were very promising for implicit grammar teaching. Nonetheless, Ke, Piggott, and Steinkrauss (2021) found that both modes of instruction were equally effective in terms of developing writing fluency and accuracy. For this, 114 Dutch secondary school learners studying English as a second language participated in their study. Reviewing the literature revealed that most of the previous studies have not studied the three methods of grammar teaching (CEGT, CIGT, and TGT) in one research study concurrently, but they are studied separately.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

The participants of this study were 52 second-year undergraduate students enrolled in the English Department evening class/ College of Basic Education/ Salahaddin University-Erbil. The students were randomly assigned into three groups of almost equal number of participants. Before carrying out the experiment, the equivalence of the three groups was checked on the basis of their performance in the grammar module of their first-year stage. The control group (CG =18) received TGT, experimental group 1 (EG1 =17) was exposed to CEGT, and experimental group 2 (EG2=17) was treated with CIGT.

3.2. Materials and Instruments

The first source material included in this study was the *English Grammar in Use* (intermediate level) textbook (2019) by Murphy and *Macmillan English Grammar in Context Intermediate* (2008) by Vince was used as supplementary material. The selected grammar structures studied in this study were *passive voices, articles, pronouns, quantifiers, and relative clauses*. The rationale for choosing these grammar items could be seen from several angles. Firstly, these grammar structures were emphasized in the second-year coursebook adopted by the department. Secondly, they were not studied by first-year students. Thirdly, these grammar items are found to be problematic structures for learners in the literature (Kamil, 2007; Sabir, 2008; Mahdi, 2018; Ahmad, Al-Tanany, and Musa, 2020; Altun and Dincer, 2020). Added to this, the participants' needs were assessed by performing a diagnostic grammar test prior to conducting the study.

The instruments used to collect the intended data were pre- and post-tests in the form of paragraph writing aiming at measuring overall writing skills (out of 80 marks) and grammatical accuracy in writing (out of 32 marks). The first researcher together with the other trained rater (she was a university instructor with a strong background in writing instruction) reviewed the students' writing paragraphs individually utilizing an analytical scoring rubric to achieve reliability of scoring the pre-and post-test paragraph writings. The rubric included five components, namely content, organization, targeted grammar structures, vocabulary, punctuation, and spelling. Prior to administering the tests, face and content validity as well as inter-rater reliability were sought to collect accurate and reliable data.

3.3. Procedures

The " **pretest-post-test two treatment design** " proposed by Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2018, p.403) was adopted to conduct this experimental study. The following steps lasted for 16 actual academic weeks. In the first step, the groups were pre-tested before initiating the experiment in which the students were required to use the intended grammar structures and consider the other skills of paragraph writing.

In the second step, the three groups were exposed to three different treatments. The pedagogical plan of the present study performed in the experimental groups, which dealt with

writing skills development, was grounded on two different models to deliver CEGT in EG1 and CIGT in EG2. Noticing-Awareness-Practice (N-A-P) model by Roy Lyster (2004) was followed to deliver CEGT whereas Noticing-Practice (N-P) model designed by the researcher was used to deliver CIGT based on the existing literature (Hyland, 2003; Ellis, 2006; Sargent, 2009; Suntharesan, 2013; Nazari, 2014; Mueller, 2015; Peng, 2015; Tang, 2017; Atinafu, 2018; Altun and Dincer, 2020), mixed with the learning theories reviewed as their points of support and theoretical basis. In the former model, the familiarization stage of the intended grammar items takes place explicitly in the noticing and awareness phases whereas the practice phase involves the controlled, guided, and free writing tasks. In the latter model, on the other hand, the familiarization stage of the intended grammar topics takes place implicitly in the noticing phase and the practice phase includes the aforementioned writing tasks. Regarding the CG, the researchers focused primarily on teaching grammar traditionally in which grammar was taught in isolation rather than in context (unrelated to reading and writing), and students did not practice paragraph writing.

At the end of the experiment, the three groups were post-tested to measure the effect of the treatments.

4. Results

To answer the first research question, the scores obtained by the two ratters were computed. Then, the data were analysed through descriptive and inferential statistics. Table 1 displayed the mean differences between pre- and post-test writing scores of the three groups. Referring to Table 1, in the pre-test, the mean scores of the three groups were close to one another, whereas, in the post-test, the scores of the groups taught with CEGT and CIGT increased significantly.

	Groups	Mean
Pre-test	CG (TGT)	27.97
	EG1 (CEGT)	28.62
	EG2 (CIGT)	31.82
Post-test	CG (TGT)	30.61
	EG1 (CEGT)	52.34
	EG2 (CIGT)	47.19

Table 1: Pre- and Post-test Writing Skills Scores

To answer the first research question, a one-way between-groups analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with a significant level of 0,05 was performed in SPSS version 22. Since ANCOVA is a complex set of procedures, it needs the meeting of a number of preliminary assumptions. Thus, prior to conducting the test, assumptions like normality, linearity, homogeneity of variances, and homogeneity of regression slopes were met. The output of ANCOVA was presented in Table 2. After adjusting for pre-test scores, there was a significant difference between the three groups on developing their writing skills, $F = 111.03$, $p = .000$ (less than 0.05), partial eta squared = .82 (according to Cohen's 1988 guidelines, it is a large effect size). Thus, there was a significant difference among the students taught by TGT, CEGT, and CIGT in regard to writing skills development.

Source	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Groups	111.03	.000	.82

Table 2: The ANCOVA Results

To determine exactly where the differences among the groups occur, the *Post Hoc* comparison using the *Bonferroni* test was conducted and the output was displayed in Table 3.

Groups (I)	Groups (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
CG	EG1	-21.74*	.000
	EG2	-16.58*	.000
EG1	CG	21.74*	.000
	EG2	5.15*	.006
EG2	CG	16.58*	.000
	EG1	-5.15*	.006

Table 3: The Post Hoc Test Results

From Table 3, the asterisk symbol (*) showed that the three groups being compared were different from each other. The mean score for CG was significantly different from the mean score for EG1 with a mean difference by -21.74, and from EG2 by -16.58. Meanwhile, the EG1 was significantly different from the EG2 by 5.15. It could be interpreted that CGT served the purpose whereas TGT was not effective in developing writing skills.

Despite the fact that the two methods of CGT were found to be effective separately for developing participants' writing scores, the effect was really different when they were compared. A closer inspection of Table 1 revealed that the scores of EG1 ($M=52.34$) increased better than EG2 ($M=47.19$). The former increased by 23.73 points while the other increased by only 15.37 points. In support of this, the Post Hoc test output showed that the score of EG1 exposed to CEGT was 5.15 points higher than EG2 exposed to CIGT.

To answer the second research question, the attained data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Table 4 below disclosed the results of the pre- and post-test grammatical accuracy in writing.

	Groups	Mean
Pre-test	CG (TGT)	8.14
	EG1 (CEGT)	9.44
	EG2 (CIGT)	9.56
Post-test	CG (TGT)	10.94
	EG1 (CEGT)	23.2
	EG2 (CIGT)	19.71

Table 4: Pre- and Post-test Grammatical Accuracy Mean Scores in Writing

The mean scores shown above quantified that the mean scores of the three groups treated differently were close at the outset, whereas the two experimental groups exposed to CEGT and CIGT increased noticeably. Due to the nature of the research question displayed, the ANCOVA test was employed. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure that there was no violation of the assumptions. Table 5 displayed the ANCOVA test results.

Source	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Groups	130.82	.000	.85

Table 5: The ANCOVA Results

The above table specified that there was a significant difference between the three groups in developing grammatical accuracy in writing, $F = 130.82$, $p = .000 < 0.05$, partial eta squared

= .85 (large effect size). in light of the results, hence, CEGT and CIGT were found to be effective in developing grammatical accuracy in writing. Added to this, the results presented in Table 6 showed that the mean score for CG was significantly different from the mean score for EG1 by -12.26, and from EG2 by -8.77. More specifically, the EG1 was significantly different from the EG2 by 3.49.

Groups (I)	Groups (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
CG	EG1	-12.26 *	.000
	EG2	-8.77*	.000
EG1	CG	12.26 *	.000
	EG2	3.49*	.000
EG2	CG	8.77*	.000
	EG1	-3.49*	.000

Table 6: The Post Hoc Test Results

Similarly, the results attained in Table 4 indicated that EG1 (M= 23.2) was more effective than EG2 (M= 19.72). As a result, the achievement of the EG1 exposed to CEGT in grammatical accuracy in students' paragraph writing was seen so apparently.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

This experimental research focused on the effectiveness of using contextualized (explicit/implicit) grammar teaching in developing second-year students' writing skills and grammatical accuracy in writing. Grounded on the attained results, it can be concluded that CGT had advantageous effectiveness whereas TGT was not effective in developing writing skills. This is reinforced by Weaver (1996, 2006) who argued that teaching grammar in context develops writing. Myhill (2005; 2010) supported Weaver's view in which she stated that the notion of contextualized grammar means more than grammar learning where the focus is not only grammar learning but some other features of language learning. Another plausible explanation of the result generated is that writing needs to consider different skills like organization, content, the intended grammar point, etc. The students in the experimental groups were familiar with the process and able to put their ideas easily on paper as a result of teaching grammar contextually in reading authentic texts and writing. Added to this, CGT induced the participants to become more motivated, interested, and engaged, as supported by Perlin (2011). Thus, it formed more identifiable learning opportunities for students. The current result is in line with some previous research results reported that teaching grammar in context improved writing (Myhill, 2011; Myhill et al., 2012; Myhill and Watson, 2014; Zina, 2015; Myhill, 2018; Omer, 2019; Marjokorpi, 2022; Bhavani and Shankar, 2023). More precisely, CEGT was superior to CIGT in terms of developing writing skills. This generated result agreed with that of (Nazari, 2013; Altun and Dincer, 2020). There can be different explanations for why the group taught with CEGT came to the forefront. Time and extra practice can be assumed as an issue when discussing the success of the explicit method. To Altun and Dincer (2020), learning grammar implicitly requires more time and treatment practice. The attained result, however, is inconsistent with other studies (Abdel Rahim, 2013; Cawley, 2017), which asserted that implicit grammar teaching could help learners better develop their writing, as such studies compared implicit teaching with traditional explicit grammar teaching in which grammar was taught in isolation rather than in context.

Consistently, the yielded results attested that contextualized, not traditional, grammar teaching was found to be effective in developing grammatical accuracy in writing. A reasonable explanation of the generated result is that the EFL Kurdish students in our universities study grammar in isolation not in context. They may be able to state a grammar

rule, but consistently fail to apply the rules when writing. Accordingly, researchers argued that when TGT is involved, most students are often able to explain grammar rules but cannot use them in the right context, especially in writing (Frodesen, 2001; Abdel Rahim, 2013). This finding is in harmony with some research findings conducted by Zina (2015) and Omer (2019). Although students' grammatical accuracy in writing in both experimental groups developed significantly, the results again were very promising for the CEGT method. A sensible interpretation of the finding obtained is the habits of learners. As the participants were adult learners, they usually were accustomed to explicit teaching. This result echoes the study by Altun and Dincer (2020) who addressed the same issue.

Even though, based on the results of this study, practicing explicit teaching is inevitable in classes, implicit teaching should not be overlooked because it was found to be effective in developing writing skills and grammatical accuracy in writing. Thus, curriculum designers should integrate grammar in reading authentic texts and writing tasks to develop overall writing skills as well as modify the curriculum based on these methods. It is recommended that future research is needed to conduct the same experiment among school-level learners to realize whether age influences the comparison between CGT and TGT.

6. References

- Abdel Rahim, A. A. M. (2013) Enhancing Secondary Stage Students' Writing: Effects of Context of Songs in Teaching Grammar Implicitly [online]. Available at: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED546464.pdf>.
- Abdul Rahman, A. M. & Rashid, R. (2017) Explicit and Implicit Grammar Instructions in Higher Learning Institutions, *English Language Teaching*, 10(10), pp. 92-101.
- Ahmad, A. S. K., Al-Tanany, A. A. K. & Musa, H. I. (2020) Contextualized Grammar in EFL Students' Writings: A Case for Corrective Feedback, *JRCIET*, 6(4), pp. 295-324.
- Aka, N. (2020) Incidental Learning of a Grammatical Feature from Reading by Japanese Learners of English as a Foreign Language, *System*, 91, 102250.
- Alenezi, S. M. (2019) Exploring Explicit and Implicit Grammar Teaching, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 8(1), pp. 104-106.
- Altun, L. & Dincer, R. (2020) A Comparison of Implicit and Explicit Teaching in Terms of Grammar and Writing Skills of Intermediate Learners, *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 9(1), pp. 96-105.
- Andrews, R., Torgerson, C., Beverton, S., Locke, T., Low, G., Robinson, A. & Zhu, D. (2004) *The Effect of Grammar Teaching (Syntax) in English on 5 to 16 Year Olds Accuracy and Quality in Written Composition*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education.
- Andrews, K. L. Z. (2007) The Effects of Implicit and Explicit Instruction on Simple and Complex Grammatical Structures for Adult English Language Learners, *TESL-EJ*, 11(2), pp. 1-15.
- Atinafu, M. (2018) *The Effect of Explicit Grammar Instruction on EFL Students' Paragraph Writing Performance: with a Special Reference to Adet Preparatory School*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Bahir Dar University.
- Bhavani, C. & Shankar, B. (2023) A Study on Impact of Grammatical on English Written Skills, *Journal of Engineering Sciences*, 14(1), pp. 603-616.
- Brime A. B. (2018) *The Impact of the Process Writing on Enhancing EFL Students' Critical Thinking at Salahaddin University-Erbil*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Salahaddin University-Erbil.
- Cawley, V. D. (2017) *Contextualized Grammar Instruction: A Case Study of Master's Students' Writing Development*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Judson University.
- Cohen, J.W. (1988) *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. 2nd edn. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2018) *Research Methods in Education*. 8th edn. New York: Routledge.
- Colbert, A. M., Ware, J. & Jones, S. W. (2018) Developing Writing Skills of Learners with Persistent Literacy Difficulties through Explicit Grammar Teaching, *Support for Learning*, 33(2), pp. 165-189.
- Diaz, A. L., Martinez, J., Jiménez, D., Perez, I. & Mateo, V. (2019) How We Teach Grammar: An Exploratory Study on How Dominican Teachers Deal with Grammar Teaching, *MEXTESOL Journal*, 43(4), pp. 1-9.
- Eldoumi, A. F. (2012) *A practical Approach to Teaching Grammar in Context to English Language Learners*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Oklahoma State University.
- Ellis, R. (2006) Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective, *TESOL QUARTERLY*, 40(1), pp. 83-107.

- Ellis, R., Loewen, Sh., Elder, C., Erlam, R., Philp, J. & Reinders, H. (2009) *Implicit and Explicit Knowledge in Second Language Learning, Testing and Teaching*. UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Fareed, M., Ashraf, A. & Bilal, M. (2016) *ESL Learners' Writing Skills: Problems, Factors, and Suggestions*, *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 4(2), pp. 81-92.
- Frodesen, J. (2001) *Grammar in Writing*. In Marianne Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, p. 233-248, (3rd edn.). Boston: Heinle.
- Gaikwad, V. (2014) *Contextualized Grammar Pedagogy: Integrating Grammar into Writing Instruction*, *US-China Education Review A*, 4(7), pp. 490-499.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014) *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 4th edn. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hans, A. & Hans, E. (2017) *Role of Grammar in Communication -Writing Skills*, *IJELLH*. 7(1), pp. 39-50.
- Hinkel, E. (2004) *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Huang, J. (2010) *Grammar Instruction for Adult English Language Learners: a Task-based Learning Framework*, *Journal of adult education*, 39, p. 29-37. Available at: <http://www.eric.ed.gov>.
- Hyland, K. (2003) *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, S. J. (2009) *Why can't they write right? Teaching grammar in the composition classroom*. Masters's thesis. 1462715. Northern Michigan University. United States -Michigan. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT) database.
- Jones, S., Myhill, D. & Bailey, T. (2013) *Grammar for Writing? An Investigation of the Effects of Contextualized Grammar Teaching on Students' Writing, Reading and Writing*, 26(8), pp. 1-25.
- Kamil, N. G. (2007) *College Students' Errors in Using English Articles*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Salahaddin University-Erbil.
- Ke, H., Luo, Y., Piggott, L. & Steinkrauss, R. (2021) *Long-term Effects of Explicit Versus Implicit Instruction on EFL Writing*, *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics* 10: DOI 10.51751/dujal9361
- Krashen, S. (1985) *The Input Hypothesis*. London: Longman.
- Likaj, M. (2015) *Teaching Writing through Communicative Approach in Military English*, *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(20), pp. 102-107.
- López, E. M. (2004) *Implicit and Explicit Teaching of Grammar: An Empirical Study*, *Teachers Professional Development*, 5(1), pp. 7-12.
- Locke, T. (2009) *Grammar and Writing: The International Debate*. In Beard, D., Myhill, D., Nystrand, M. & Riley, J. (Eds.), *International Handbook of Writing Development*. London: Sage.
- Lyster, R. (2004) *Differential Effects of Prompts and Recasts in Form-focused Instruction*, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, pp. 339-432.
- Marjokorpi, J. (2022) *The Relationship between Grammatical Understanding and Writing Skills in Finnish Secondary L1 Education, Reading and Writing*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-022-10405-z>
- Martin, R. (2001) *How Teachers Can Use Grammar to Help Young Writers [Online]*. Available at: <http://www.eric.ed.gov>.
- Mahdi, A. (2018) *Difficulties in Learning Grammar, a Study into the Context of University of Technology, Department of Materials Engineering*, *LARK JOURNAL FOR PHILOSOPHY, LINGUISTICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES*, 1(31), pp. 23-31.
- Mueller, K. (2015) *Rethinking Pedagogical Options for Teaching Explicit Grammar in French Immersion*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Calgary, Calgary, AB. Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/11023/2084>.
- Muhammad, L. K. & Jawad, H. F. (2019) *Assessing Teaching English Grammar to Kurdish EFL students at University level*, *Journal of University of Garmian*, 6(1), pp. 576- 578.
- Murphy, R. (2019) *English Grammar in Use*. 5th edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myhill, D.A. (2005) *Ways of Knowing: Writing with Grammar in Mind*, *English Teaching: Practice & Critique*, 4(3), pp. 77-96.
- Myhill, D.A. (2010) *Ways of Knowing: Grammar as a Tool for Developing Writing*. In *Beyond the Grammar Wars: A resource for teachers, Students on Developing Language Knowledge in the English/literacy classroom*, ed. Locke, T., pp. 129-48. London: Routledge.
- Myhill, D.A. (2011) *Grammar for Designers: How Grammar Supports the Development of Writing*. In *Insight and Impact: Applied Linguistics and the Primary School*. Ellis, S., McCartney, E. & Bourne, J. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp81-92.
- Myhill, D., Jones, S., Lines, H. & Watson, A. (2012) *Re-thinking Grammar: The Impact of Embedded Grammar Teaching on Students' Writing and Students' Metalinguistic Understanding*, *Research Papers in Education*, 27, pp. 139-166.
- Myhill, D. & Watson, A. (2014) *The Role of Grammar in the Writing Curriculum: A Review of the Literature*, *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 30(1), pp. 41-62.
- Myhill, D. (2018) *Grammar as a Meaning-making Resource for Improving Writing*, *Li-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 18, pp. 1-21.

- Myhill, D., Watson, A. & Newman, R. (2020) Thinking Differently about Grammar and Metalinguistic Understanding in Writing, *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 13(2), pp. 1-19.
- Nazari, N. (2013) The Effect of Implicit and Explicit Grammar Instruction on Learners' Achievements in Receptive and Productive Modes, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, pp. 156–162.
- Omar, D. Y. Z. (2019) Teaching Pedagogical Grammar in Context to Enrich English Language Learners' Academic Writing, *Academic Writing*, 13, pp. 213-225.
- Özdemir, E. & Aydin, S. (2015) The Effects of Blogging on EFL Writing Achievement. *Procedia-social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199(1), pp. 372-380.
- Peng, F. (2015) The Effectiveness of Explicit Instruction Versus Implicit Instruction Method on Chinese Grammar Acquisition. Unpublished Master's thesis. University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Perin, D. (2011) Facilitating Student Learning through Contextualization, *Community College Research Center Brief*, 53. Available at: <http://www.eric.ed.gov>.
- Rajabi, P. & Dezhkam, E. (2014) The Effect of Explicit Grammar Instruction on Improving Writing Accuracy of Iranian EFL Learners, *Journal of ELT and Applied Linguistics (JELTAL)*, 2(1).
- Sabir, A. (2008) Sentence Relations in the Writing of Kurdish Learners' of English. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Salahaddin University-Erbil.
- Salih, M., Sulaiman, A. & Mohammed, H. G. (2019) Evaluating Grammatical Competence in Kurdish EFL Junior Students' Writings at the English Department, College of Languages, University of Duhok, *Journal of University of Duhok*, 22(2), pp. 304-324.
- Sargent, D. (2009) Implicit Grammar Teaching Activities, *WAESOL*, Available at: <http://www.schoolofTESL.com>.
- Sulaiman, M. S. A. & Mohammed, H. G. (2019) Evaluating Grammatical Competence in Kurdish EFL Junior Students' Writings at the English Department, College of Languages, University of Duhok. *Journal of University of Duhok*, 22(2), pp. 304-324.
- Suntharesan, V. (2013) Implicit Grammar Teaching Activities, *Language in India*, 13(6), pp. 610-617.
- Tai, M.Y. (2016) Monograph on 50 years of Developments in English Language Teaching and Learning in Singapore. English Language Institute of Singapore [Online]. Available at: https://books.google.iq/books/about/Monograph_on_50_Years_of_Developments_in.html?id=33aWnQAACA&redir_esc=y.
- Tang, G. (2017) *Contextualization: An Experimental Model for EFL Writing Instruction in China*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Portland State University. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.5371>
- Thornbury, S. (2012) *How to teach grammar*. Harlow: Longman.
- Vince, M. (2008) *Macmillan English Grammar in Context Intermediate*. London: Macmillan Education.
- Vukadin, M. (2019) *Contextual Grammar Teaching - Activities for Making Grammar Meaningful to Your Students* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk>. (Accessed: 8 April 2023).
- Weaver, C. (1996) Teaching grammar in the context of writing, *The English Journal*, 85(7), pp. 15-24.
- Weaver, C. (2008) *Grammar to Enrich and Enhance Writing*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Weaver, C. (2010) Scaffolding Grammar Instruction for Writers and Writing. In Locke, T. *Beyond the Grammar Wars: A Resource for Teachers and Students on Developing Language Knowledge in the English/literacy Classroom*, pp. 185-205. New York: Routledge.
- Xavier, C. A., Hong, H. M., R & Enandya, W. A. (2020) Grammar in Writing: Teachers' Reflections, *PASAA*, 60, pp. 100-221.
- Zina, Z. (2015) *The Role of Integrative Grammar in Developing Academic Writing: Case Study Second Year Students of English at Biskra University*. Unpublished Master's thesis. University of Biskra, Biskra, Algeria.

كاريگهري فيركردني رژيماني كونتيكست لهسهر پهره پيداني كارامه كاني نووسين و ورديني رژيماني بو قوتاياني زانكو كه زماني ئينگليزي وه زمانتيكي بياني دهخوين

فاطمة رشيد حسن باجة لاني

بهشي ئينگليزي، كوليژي زمان، زانكو سيلاحه دين-ههولير
fatimah.hassan@su.edu.krd

پهيمان عمر مصطفى

بهشي ئينگليزي، كوليژي پهره روهدي بنه رته، زانكو سيلاحه دين-
ههولير
paiman.mustafa@su.edu.krd

پوخته

ئهم توژينه وه ئەزموونيه ئامانجی ليكوئيلينه وهيه له كاريگهري فيركردني رژيماني كونتيكستي راشكاوانه-نااشكرا (contextualized explicit/ implicit grammar teaching) لهسهر پهره پيداني كارامه كاني نووسين و ورديني رژيماني له نووسيندا له تيوان قوتاياني زماني ئينگليزي له بهشي ئينگليزي / كوليژي پهره روهدي بنه رته / زانكو سيلاحه دين - ههولير. بو ئهم مهبهسته ش 02 قوتاي قوناعي دووهم به شيويه كي هه رهمه كي دابهشكران بهسهر دوو گروهي تافيكاري و گروهيني كونترولدا. يهكهم گروهي تافيكاري بهر كهوته ي پهره روهدي كونتيكستي راشكاوانه بوو، گروهي تافيكاري بهر كهوته ي پهره روهدي كونتيكستي نااشكرا بوو، له كاتيكا گروهي كونترول تهنيا پهره روهدي رژيماني لاسايانه ي وه رگرت. بو هه لسه نگاندي كاريگه ريه كاني شيوازه كاني وانه وتنه وه، تافيكردنه وه كاني پيشي و دواي له شيوه ي نووسيني پهره رگرافدا به كارهينران. ئه و زانيارانه ي له م ليكوئيلينه وه يه دا دهست كه وتن به هو ي به كارهيناني تافيكردنه وه ي ANCOVA (SPSS) وه شاني 22 شيكرانه وه . هه رچه نده ئه نجامه به دهست هينراوه كان ده ريانخست كه فيركردني رژيماني كونتيكست (راشكاوانه/نااشكرا) كاريگه ره له پهره پيداني توانا كاني نووسيني قوتايان و ورديني رژيماني له نووسينه كه ياندا، به لام ئه نجامه كان له بارتر بوون بو شيوازي فيركردني رژيماني كونتيكستي راشكاوانه. توژينه وه كه به گفتوگو كردني ئه نجامه كان و پيشنياركردني ليكوئيلينه وه ي زياتر كوتايي پتهات.

ووشه كليله كان: كارامه كاني نووسين، ورديني رژيماني له نووسيندا، فيركردني رژيماني كونتيكستي راشكاوانه-نااشكرا.

تأثير تدريس النحو السياقية على تطوير مهارات الكتابة والدقة النحوية لطلاب الجامعة الدارسين اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

فاطمة رشيد حسن الباجلاني

قسم الانجليزي، كلية اللغات، جامعة صلاح الدين - اربيل
fatimah.hassan@su.edu.krd

پهيمان عمر مصطفى

قسم الانجليزي، كلية التربية الاساسية، جامعة صلاح الدين - اربيل
paiman.mustafa@su.edu.krd

ملخص

يهدف هذا البحث التجريبي إلى التحقيق في تأثير تدريس النحو السياقية الصريح-الضمني (contextualized explicit/ implicit grammar teaching) في تطوير مهارات الكتابة والدقة النحوية في الكتابة بين الطلاب الدارسين اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية / كلية التربية الأساسية / جامعة صلاح الدين - اربيل. ولهذه الغاية، تم تقسيم 52 طالباً في السنة الثانية بشكل عشوائي إلى مجموعتين تجريبتين ومجموعة ضابطة. تعرّضت المجموعة التجريبية الأولى إلى تعليم النحو السياقية الصريحة، وتعرضت المجموعة التجريبية الأخرى إلى تعليم النحو السياقية الضمنية، بينما تلقت المجموعة الضابطة تعليم القواعد التقليدية فقط. ولأجل تقييم تأثيرات اساليب التعليم، تم استخدام الاختبارات القبليّة والبعديّة في شكل كتابة فقرات. وتم تحليل البيانات الناتجة باستخدام اختبار ANCOVA. توصلت الدراسة إلى أن التدريس النحوي السياقي (صريح / ضمني) كان فعالاً في تطوير مهارات الكتابة لدى الطلاب والدقة النحوية في كتاباتهم. أن النتائج كانت أكثر تفضيلاً لطريقة التدريس النحوية السياقية الصريحة. واختتمت الدراسة بمناقشة النتائج واقتراحات لمزيد من البحوث.

الكلمات المفتاحية: مهارات الكتابة، الدقة النحوية في الكتابة، التدريس النحوي السياقي الصريح-الضمني.