EFL University Students' Attitudes Towards the Effect of Implementing Contextualized Grammar Teaching on Developing Their Writing Skills

Paiman Omer Mustafa / Department of English, College of Baisic Educations, Salahaddin University-Erbil, Erbil, .Kurdistan Region, Iraq

Fatimah Rasheed Hasan Al Bajalani /Department of English, College of Langiages, Salahaddin University-Erbil, Erbil, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

CORRESPONDENCE
Paiman Omer Mustafa
paiman.mustafa@su.edu.krd

Abstract

This study aims at investigating EFL university students' attitudes towards the effect of implementing contextualized (explicit/ implicit) grammar teaching on developing their writing skills. A total of 34 second-year undergraduate students who were enrolled in the evening class of the English Department/ College of Basic Education/ Salahaddin University-Erbil took part in the study. The students were randomly assigned into two groups, ensuring an equal number of participants in each group. The first group was exposed to contextualized explicit grammar teaching, while the second group received contextualized implicit grammar teaching. To gather the intended data, two sets of questionnaires were designed by the researchers and administered to the groups. The analysis revealed that the students stated positive attitudes towards the use of both methods for developing their writing skills. Nevertheless, contextualized explicit grammar teaching received a higher level of the students' agreement. The study ended with some conclusions and suggestions for further studies.

1.Introduction

Each of the four language skills in the English Language holds importance, but writing stands out as the most crucial skill among them (Bhavani and Shankar, 2023). This is because writing assists in developing other language skills and serves as a meaningful and transparent assessment tool for evaluating students' performance (Salem, 2013), awarding a grade, evaluating programs (Javed, Juan, and Nazli, 2013), knowing student's progress, and diagnosing any difficulties students might be facing (Alfaki, 2015). Accordingly, writing skill as one of the most productive skills is often considered challenging for learners in general (Bhavani and Shankar, 2023) and foreign language learners (FLL) in particular (Ariana, 2010; Omer, 2016; Brime and Bajalani, 2017). The challenges that greatly affect FLLs can arise from factors like variations in language structures, writing styles, the way of articulating thoughts, and cultures (Benson and Heidish, 1995). Added to this, acquiring the skills of writing is distinctively challenging as it necessitates the simultaneous mastery of a diverse range of language skills, encompassing grammar accuracy, vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, content, and the capacity to effectively organize and articulate ideas (Zemach and Islam, 2004; Bhavani and Shankar, 2023).

Scholars have proposed an effective teaching method known as contextualized grammar teaching (CGT) (Weaver, 1996; Jones, Myhill, and Bailey, 2013; Lindenmeyer, 2014; Cawley, 2017; Omar, 2019). According to educational materials, CGT is considered the most effective way for teaching grammar in today's classrooms (Hanson, 2019) because context facilitates the provision of meaning for grammatical forms (Ismail, 2010). Myhill (2005; 2010) noted that the idea of grammar in context goes beyond mere grammar teaching, as it entails not only the teaching of grammar itself but also includes some other aspects of language learning.

Consequently, various studies have introduced different strategies to assist teachers in incorporating CGT and help students develop their writing skills. One widely recommended strategy, highlighted in the available literature, 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 idea of linking grammar to writing dates back more than a century. The initial scholarly investigation can be traced back to Hoyt (1906, p.478), who examined the impact of grammar study on the "use of better English in the oral and written expression". Through analyzing their own writing, students acquire a stronger base for understanding the material presented to them and gain an opportunity to apply their knowledge in written form (Rampey, 2016). Hyland (2003) argued that teaching grammar to develop writing can be done through practicing various writing activities including controlled writing, guided writing, and free writing. Another effective strategy for contextualizing grammar and fostering the development of students' writing skills is to teach grammar within the context of reading authentic texts with multiple examples of targeted grammar structures (Huang, 2010; Tai, 2016; Aka, 2020). Reading authentic texts will contribute to driving grammar lessons in a meaningful way. Such texts can be utilized as a valuable resource and base for examining and discussing various aspects such as grammar, content, organization, and so on (Eldoumi, 2012; Hanson, 2019).

Several opinions have emerged regarding the different approaches to teaching grammar in a contextualized way for the purpose of developing writing skills. Basically, two fundamental approaches, namely explicit and implicit are universally recognized (Atinafu, 2018). These approaches not only develop students' grammatical accuracy but also their overall writing skills (Altun and Dincer, 2020). The concept of explicit grammar teaching refers to teaching a grammar structure and helping the learners "to develop metalinguistic awareness" of the target structure during the learning process "by providing them with a grammatical description of the rule or assisting them to discover the rule for themselves from the data provided" (Ellis, et al., 2009, p.17). On the other hand, implicit grammar teaching involves

exposing learners to "grammatical structures in a meaningful and comprehensible context in order that they may acquire, as naturally as possible, the grammar of the target language" (Scott, 1990, p.779). To Ellis (1997), implicit grammar teaching can also involve intentional learning, where learners are conscious of the fact that they are learning grammar.

As previously mentioned, the development of writing skills poses a challenge for many learners. Yet, there are several factors considered to have influenced the process such as attitudes, motivation, anxiety, age, aptitude, and mental competence (Shams, 2008; Pratolo, 2017). Among all these factors, attitude is recognized as a crucial element (Zulfikar, Dahliana, and Sari, 2019). Attitudes can be understood as a person's responses, opinions, or evaluations related to a particular idea, entity, or belief (Arsari, 2017). language learning attitude refers to learners' tendencies in relation to their effort in learning the target language (Zulfikar, Dahliana, and Sari, 2019). Though evaluations are commonly categorized as positive or negative, they can also exhibit uncertainty (Mokhamar, 2016). Scholars (Haddock and Maio, 2008) agreed that attitudes have affective, cognitive, and behavioral components. The affective component "refers to the feeling and emotions that one has towards an object: the " likes " or "dislikes " and the "with " or " against" (Mokhamar, 2016, p.46). Whereas the cognitive component "refers to beliefs, thoughts or opinions, and attributes we associate with a particular object" (Haddock and Maio, 2008, p.116). Finally, the behavioral component of attitudes "refers to ones' consistent actions or behavioral intentions towards the object" (Mokhamar, 2016, p.46). Thus, attitudes involve the feeling, emotions, beliefs, thoughts, attributes, and behaviors displayed by an individual towards the subject in question.

Even though writing stands out as the most prominent skill among other language skills (Denu, Teshome, and Ferede, 2022; Bhavani and Shankar, 2023), Kurdish EFL undergraduate students mostly have problems with writing, compared to other language skills, as a result of ineffective teaching methods (Salih, Sulaiman, and Mohammed, 2019). The students need a teaching method to link grammar to their writing so as to transfer the grammatical knowledge that they know to their writing and consider other aspects of writing (ibid). In this respect, a comprehensive review of past research claimed that teaching grammar as an isolated subject does not yield favourable outcomes for writers (Fearn and Farnan, 2007; Weaver, 2008; Eldoumi, 2012; Nazari, 2013; Abdel Rahim, 2013; Gaikwad, 2014, etc.). Conversely, multiple researchers (Weaver, 1996; Myhill, 2010; Myhill et al., 2012; Jones, Myhill, and Bailey, 2013; Khoshsima and Tanhaei, 2014; Myhill, 2018; Omar, 2019; Ahmad, Al-Tanany, and Musa, 2020, etc.) have highlighted the benefits of CGT for developing writing skills.

To bring a positive change and support the development of the students' writing skills, contextualized explicit grammar teaching (CEGT) and contextualized implicit grammar teaching (CIGT) were implemented by the researchers of this study. It is essential to acknowledge that investigating students' attitudes during the teaching and learning process holds immense significance and can potentially have a crucial influence on shaping the existing state of the teaching and learning process. Similarly, it was argued that having knowledge of students' attitudes towards the learning environment has a direct influence on the extent of their learning, thereby affecting the effectiveness of the instructional methods implemented (Bloemert et al., 2019). Besides, the identification of students' attitudes is important as it allows teachers to gain a profound understanding of their students, including their learning styles and behavior. This understanding plays a key role in facilitating the implementation of effective teaching methods (İnal, Evin, and Saracaloğlu, 2003). More specifically, investigating learners' perceptions and attitudes helps researchers to assess how well the intended method was able to meet their needs and improve their writing skills (Denu, Teshome, and Ferede 2022).

Given these considerations, the current study, aimed at exploring students' attitudes towards the implementation of two methods of CGT: CEGT and CIGT, and their effects on the

development of students' writing skills. Therefore, this study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the students' attitudes towards the effect of implementing contextualized explicit grammar teaching on developing their writing skills?
2. What are the students' attitudes towards the effect of implementing contextualized implicit grammar teaching on developing their writing skills?

2. Literature Review

Teaching grammar in context enables learners to observe how rules are applied in sentences. On the contrary, in the absence of context, it is exceedingly challenging to determine the intended meaning of an individual word or phrase because "language is context-sensitive" (Thornbury,1999, p.69). Dean (2008) further argued that the purpose of CGT is multifaceted. It serves to "train the brain, … to help students score well on-scale tests, … and to help them improve as writers and readers" (p.13).

Even though numerous research studies have been conducted covering the effects of CGT on developing writing skills (Myhill, 2010; Myhill et al., 2012; Jones, Myhill, and Bailey, 2013; Zina, 2015; Myhill, 2018; Omar, 2019; Marjokorpi, 2023; Bhavani and Shankar, 2023, etc.), the attitudes regarding the method have not been deeply investigated. Besides, it is acceptable to state that there is no known research on exploring students' attitudes towards CGT in the Kurdish context. To this end, the related studies, presented in this study, are categorized according to the themes, focusing on studies that investigate students' and teachers' responses. Moreover, these studies have been arranged in chronological order within their respective themes.

In regard to the student variable, in a related study, Wang and Wang (2014) found that the participants held a positive perception towards explicit grammar teaching. Their study involved 15 students who were enrolled in an intermediate-level freshman English writing and reading course in Seoul. The students were given an online survey to reflect on their experience after a period of intervention. Likewise, in his study, Ayeche (2018) focused on investigating learners' attitudes related to the impact of grammar teaching on their writing skills. For the purpose of the study, a survey questionnaire was administered to 80 second-year students enrolled in the English language department at the University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia Jijel in Algeria. The results indicated that the students held positive attitudes towards the impact of the deductive type of grammar teaching on their writing skills. This implies that explicit grammar teaching was more favorable since deductive teaching is a type of explicit grammar teaching. Besides, in 2022, Denu, Teshome, and Ferede explored students' perceptions concerning the impact of CGT on their paragraph writing. Two intact groups of Grade 11 of Gatema Secondary School students in Ethiopia were randomly assigned to participate in the study. The analysis of self-reflection data reported that the students enjoyed and felt positive towards the CGT as it helped them to enhance their writing skills and write more accurately.

On the other hand, concerning the teacher variable, Basoz (2014) surveyed teachers' perceptions regarding explicit and implicit grammar teaching. For this, 86 pre-service EFL teachers who were enrolled in the English Language Teaching department at Balikesir University in Turkey were assigned to take part in responding to a four-point Likert scale questionnaire. The descriptive data obtained from the questionnaire reported that the majority of the respondents expressed a preference for implicit grammar teaching over explicit one. In contrast to Basoz's findings, the study performed by Sopin (2015) yielded results representing that the majority of the teachers, 84% to be specific, had a positive attitude regarding explicit grammar teaching, especially when it was contextualized. On the other hand, Abdul Rahman and Rashid (2017) conducted a study with the purpose of gaining insights into the teachers' beliefs regarding explicit and implicit grammar teaching in Malaysian Higher Learning

Institutions. The researchers gathered data through semi-structured interviews with five teachers. Data analysis revealed that most of the interviewees favored explicit grammar teaching in their classrooms. Nevertheless, they also acknowledged the significance of incorporating implicit grammar teaching in accordance with the specific needs of their students. In another study, Shirvani (2022) explored 6 Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions regarding the explicit and implicit approaches to teaching grammar. The interview findings provided verification that explicit grammar teaching is indeed beneficial in EFL situations. It can be concluded that even though implicit grammar teaching was viewed positively, the preference for explicit grammar teaching can be inferred from the findings of the studies mentioned.

A review of the existing literature uncovered a predominant focus on studying teachers' and students' perceptions and beliefs, while little attention was given to exploring students' attitudes. As highlighted earlier, the identification of students' attitudes has a direct influence on the extent of their learning, teachers' understanding of their student's needs, and facilitating the implementation of effective teaching methods. Therefore, to investigate the effectiveness of the two implemented methods, namely CEGT and CIGT, the students' attitudes were sought in this study.

3. Methodology
3.1. Participants

This study included a total of 34 participants who were second-year undergraduate students attending the evening class of the English Department/ College of Basic Education/ Salahaddin University-Erbil. The students were randomly assigned into two experimental groups, ensuring an equal number of participants in each group. Experimental group 1 (EG1), consisting of 17 students, was exposed to CEGT whereas experimental group 2 (EG2), also comprising 17 students, was treated with CIGT.

3.2 Research Design and Data Collection Tools

A quantitative research design was utilized in this study with the main aim of investigating students' attitudes regarding the effects of the intended methods on developing their writing skills. To assess the effect of each intended method, a questionnaire was designed by the researchers to gather the quantitative data. Thus, two sets of questionnaires were designed to collect the intended data. The items of the questionnaires utilized in the present study were specifically designed and sequenced according to the treatment phases and how the treatments were implemented in both groups.

When designing the questionnaires, the researchers adhered to the guidelines outlined by influential pioneers in the field, such as Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2018) and Aithal and Aithal (2020). The first questionnaire involved 22 Likert scale items targeting EG1 participants to reveal their attitudes towards the effect of implementing CEGT on developing their writing skills. On the other hand, the second questionnaire comprised 23 Likert scale items requiring EG2 participants to reveal their attitudes towards the effect of implementing CIGT. For this, a 5-point Likert scale was used, where participants could indicate their agreement or disagreement on a scale as: (*1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Partially Agree, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree*). It was not difficult for respondents to complete as they feel comfortable with a wide range of choices on its continuum scale. In fact, both questionnaires contained reverse items to ensure that students were stable in their own thinking. Accordingly, Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010, p.27) argued that in the case of "negatively worded items", where the items assess the opposite of the intended concept, the scores need to be reversed before carrying out the analysis (i.e., 5 becomes 1, 4 becomes 2, etc." Therefore, the negative items of the current study's questionnaires (labeled with asterisk mark*) were reversed as (*1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Partially Agree, 4=Disagree, and*

5=Strongly Disagree). Moreover, before administering the questionnaires, the researchers sought to ensure face and content validity, as well as internal consistency reliability in order to gather accurate and reliable data. The questionnaires' reliability was checked utilizing Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient test, resulting in reliability coefficients of 0.885 and 0.862, respectively. Thus, the results supported the use of the questionnaires.

3.3. Procedures

The subsequent steps took place over a span of 16 academic weeks, which corresponds to four months in total. In the first step, the students were randomly assigned into two experimental groups before initiating the experiment. In the second step, the two groups were exposed to their respective treatments (CEGT and CIGT) that were designed by the researchers. Soon after the experiment was over, the researchers commenced the distribution of the questionnaires. In each group, all participants responded to the questionnaire. Finally, the quantitative data were analyzed through descriptive statistics utilizing percent, mean, and standard deviation. Additionally, inferential statistics were performed, specifically the independent-samples t-test, to draw conclusions from the data.

4. Results and Discussions

The data analysis and discussion have been organized by following the sequence of research questions as a guiding framework.

1. What are the students' attitudes towards the effect of implementing contextualized explicit grammar teaching on developing their writing skills?

With reference to research question one, Table 1 presents the percentage of agreement, mean, and standard deviations for 22 items that are associated with students' attitudes towards CEGT. To begin with, it appears that 78.8% with Mean=3.94 and SD=.966 of the students liked learning grammar structures in their writing context. This was due to the fact that the students realized the advantage of using their own written work as a basis to discuss grammatical concepts and consider the other subskills of writing. In relation to the 2nd item, 81.2% with Mean=4.06 and SD=.748 of the participants expressed their agreement that identifying grammar structures based on their errors aided them in accurately applying these targeted structures in their writing. This implies that the idea of teaching grammar topics based on the students' errors aided in identifying their weaknesses and addressing the specific areas they were concerned about.

No.	Item	% of Agreement	Mean	SD
1	I liked learning grammar structures in my writing context.	78.8	3.94	.966
2	Identifying grammar structures based on my errors helped me to apply these particular structures accurately in my writing.	81.2	4.06	.748
3	Selecting a text that contains multiple examples of the targeted grammar structures helped me to be more familiar with the intended grammar structures.	84.8	4.24	.606
4	Highlighting the structures in the text made me notice the right application of the structures in the selected texts.	89.4	4.47	.874
5	Sharing our hypothesis about the highlighted structures in the texts increased my understanding of the right application and meaning of the structures.	84.8	4.24	.717
6	Teacher's step-by-step explanation of the form and function of the targeted grammar structures developed my writing skills.	80	4.00	.791
7	Explaining and discussing the skills of writing (organization, content,	89.4	4.47	.624

	vocabulary, grammar, etc.) developed my writing skills.			
8	Teacher's direct feedback and error correction referring to the rules, stimulated my understanding of writing skills.	78.8	3.94	.827
9	The peer-editing activity helped me to proofread my writing.	82.4	4.12	.781
10	Working in groups stimulated my knowledge in writing skills.	93	4.65	.606
11	Interacting with my peer stimulated my knowledge in writing skills.	81.2	4.06	.659
12	Comparing the targeted English structures with those in the Kurdish language increased my grammatical accuracy.	68.2	3.41	.870
13	The controlled writing activities helped me apply the targeted grammar structures accurately in writing.	76.4	3.82	.728
14	Due to the guided writing practice, I can now write a paragraph on any topic with regard to the skills of writing.	95.2	4.76	.562
15	Due to the free writing practice, I can now write a paragraph on any topic that required me to consider the skills of writing.	84.8	4.24	.831
16	Due to the teacher's continuous monitoring of my writing, I am now a better writer.	80	4.00	.612
17	Through CEGT, all my writing skills developed.	83.6	4.18	.636
18	Overall, I am very satisfied with how the CEGT developed my writing skills.	85.8	4.29	.686
19	CEGT was a waste of time. *	90.6	4.53	.717
20	Due to CEGT, I feel more active and motivated when I write a paragraph.	84.8	4.24	.562
21	I think grammar should be taught separately, rather than in context. *	90.6	4.53	.717
22	I need to have more CEG tasks in the future in order to better improve my writing skills.	84.8	4.24	.970
	Total		**4.21**	**.166**

Table 1. Students' Responses Regarding Their Attitudes towards CEGT (N=17)

According to the findings of the 3rd item, 84.8% with Mean=4.24 and SD=.606 of the students found selecting a text with multiple examples of the targeted grammar structures helpful in becoming more familiar with those structures. The 4th item received 89.4% of the students' agreement with Mean=4.47 and SD=.874. This high percentage of agreement shows students' preference for highlighting the targeted grammar structures in the given texts to notice the right application of those structures.

Moreover, the data gathered from the 5th item draws attention to the fact that 84.8% of respondents, with Mean= 4.24 and SD=.717, expressed their agreement that sharing their hypothesis about the highlighted structures in the texts increased their understanding of the right application and meaning of the structures. This was due to their engagement in sharing ideas and discovering the rule for themselves. This result supports the importance of the inductive type of explicit grammar teaching that was followed in this study. Concerning the 6th item, it is evident that 80% of the students found the teacher's step-by-step explanation of the form and function of the targeted grammar structures to be beneficial for their writing skills with Mean=4.00 and SD=.791. This degree of agreement suggests that the students acknowledged the value of receiving clear and detailed explanations from the teacher regarding how the grammar structures are formed and how they function in writing.

As for the 7th item, 89.4% of the students agreed and strongly agreed (Mean=4.47 and SD=.624) that their writing skills were developed through the process of explaining and discussing together the skills of writing, including organization, content, vocabulary, grammar, etc. That is, the students' recognition of the significant effect of actively engaging in reading texts and writing paragraphs to explain and discuss the skills of writing demonstrates their awareness of the substantial influence this engagement had on the development of their writing skills.

Regarding the teacher's direct feedback and error correction, the mean value for the 8th item was below 4 (Mean=3.94, SD=.827). Despite this, over three-quarters (78.8%) of the respondents expressed agreement with their teacher's direct feedback and error correction,

identifying it as a valuable means of developing their writing skills. In terms of pair work and group work, items 9th, 10th, and 11th, however, produced mean values exceeding 4, students mostly preferred group work (Mean=4.65 and SD=.606, and Percentage=93%) over pair work (Mean=4.12 and 4.06, SD=.781 and .659, and Percentage=82.4% and 81.2%, respectively). This could be attributed to the presence of diverse opportunities for collaboration, meaningful discussions, and knowledge-sharing in group settings.

On the other hand, only 68.2% of the respondents agreed with the 12th item, which produced the lowest mean (3.41) and SD= .870. It implies that more than half of them perceived the practice of comparing the targeted English structures with those in the Kurdish language to increase their grammatical accuracy as relatively effective. This could be a result of variations in language structures.

Regarding controlled, guided, and free writing tasks, the results of the 13th, 14th, and 15th items revealed that the highest proportion (95.2%) with Mean=4.76 and SD=.562 of the students perceived guided writing as the most effective activity to assist them in writing a paragraph on any topic with regard to the skills of writing. Whereas the free writing activity ranked second with 84.8% of the students selecting it (Mean=4.24 and SD=.831) and the controlled writing activity ranked third with 76.4% of the students choosing it (Mean=3.82 and SD=.728). Guided writing was preferred because the students received guidance like expanding from a plan or outline, responding to questions, following a model, or using pictures as aids to write about a new topic. Moreover, based on the results of item 16th, 80% of the students agreed that they became better writers due to their teacher's continuous monitoring of their writing with Mean=4.00 and SD=.612. This suggests that the students perceived the ongoing monitoring and feedback provided by their teacher as valuable in developing their writing skills.

As for the 17th and 18th items, a comparable percentage of students (83.6% and 85.8%, respectively) showed their agreement regarding the effect of CEGT and the level of their satisfaction with this treatment to develop their writing skills. However, the mean score of item 17th was slightly lower (Mean=4.18 and SD=.636) compared to the mean score of item 18th (Mean=4.29 and SD=.686). Taken together, these statistics suggest that a high proportion of students agreed on the positive effect of CEGT and were satisfied with the treatment. After reversing the negatively worded items (i.e., 19th and 21st), it was found that the same proportion (90.6%) of the respondents with Mean=4.53, and SD=.717 strongly disagreed with the statements (*CEGT was a waste of time**) and (*I think grammar should be taught separately, rather than in context**). This finding indicates that the participants did not perceive CEGT as a waste of time. Moreover, they expressed a preference for grammar teaching in context. This shows their reliable answers.

Similar to the 3rd, 5th, and 15th items, the 20th and 22nd items also revealed that 84.8% of the participants (with a mean of 4.24 and standard deviations of .562 and .970, respectively) felt more active and motivated when writing paragraphs, and perceived the need to continue practicing CEGT in the future to better develop their writing skills. This indicates that practicing CEGT had a positive impact on the participants' levels of activity and motivation when writing. Moreover, it underscores that the students acknowledged the importance of practicing CEGT as a valuable means for their ongoing writing development.

Finally, the **overall** mean of the students' attitudes toward applying CEGT to develop their writing skills was found to be 4.21, with a standard deviation of .166. This indicates that the students held a generally positive attitude towards CEGT for developing their writing skills. This finding aligns, to some extent, with the findings of some previous studies (Wang, 2014; Sopin, 2015; Rahman and Rashid, 2017; Ayeche, 2018; Shirvani, 2022), indicating similar results. Nevertheless, it should be noted that this finding contradicts the findings reported in the relevant literature (Basoz, 2014). Basoz's study investigated teachers' preferences for

traditional explicit grammar teaching, where grammar was taught in isolation rather than in context.

   2. What are the students' attitudes towards the effect of implementing contextualized implicit grammar teaching on developing their writing skills?

Regarding research question two, Table 2 provides data on the agreement percentage, mean values, and standard deviations for 23 items that pertain to students' attitudes towards CIGT. Initially, it is apparent that 77.6% of the students displayed a preference for learning grammar structures in their writing context with Mean=3.88 and SD=.928, indicating a relatively high level of liking and moderate variability among the responses. Regarding the 2nd item, it can be observed that 80% with Mean=4.00 and SD=.791 of the students agreed that identifying grammar structures based on their errors assisted them in accurately applying these specific structures in their writing. This reveals that the students recognized the value of preparing teaching material based on their needs and its potential role in developing their writing accuracy. Similarly, based on the findings of the 3rd item, it is evident that 80% of the students with Mean=4.00 and SD=.707 found the practice of selecting a text with multiple examples of targeted grammar structures to be beneficial in increasing their familiarity with those specific structures. This finding suggests that the students recognized the value of learning grammar within the context of reading texts to understand and infer the grammar rules by themselves. Moreover, the 4th item obtained a high agreement rate of 84.8% with Mean=4.24 and SD=1.2 among the students. This implies that the students preferred highlighting the targeted grammar structures in the provided texts to better notice and understand their correct application. Their agreement validates a clear inclination towards employing the method of noticing as an effective means to enhance their comprehension of the intended grammar structures. Moreover, the data collected from the 5th item highlights that 82.4% (Mean=4.12 and SD=.993) of the respondents agreed that engaging in the process of sharing ideas and collectively discovering the rules without their teacher's direct explanation allowed students to deepen their comprehension and supported the significance of the implicit type of grammar teaching.

No.	Item	% of Agreement	Mean	SD
1	I liked learning grammar structures in my writing context.	77.6	3.88	.928
2	Identifying grammar structures based on my errors helped me to apply these particular structures accurately in my writing.	80	4.00	.791
3	Selecting a text that contains multiple examples of the targeted grammar structures helped me to be more familiar with the intended grammar structures.	80	4.00	.707
4	Highlighting the structures in the text made me notice the right application of the structures in the selected texts.	84.8	4.24	1.2
5	Sharing our hypothesis about the highlighted structures in the texts increased my understanding of the right application and meaning of the structures.	82.4	4.12	.993
6	Discussing the skills of writing (organization, content, vocabulary, grammar, etc.) developed my writing skills.	78.8	3.94	.748
7	Teacher's indirect feedback and error correction without referring to rules, developed my writing skills.	85.8	4.29	.772
8	The peer-editing activity helped me to proofread my writing.	78.8	3.94	.748
9	Working in groups stimulated my knowledge in writing skills.	88.2	4.41	.795
10	Interacting with my peer stimulated my knowledge in writing skills.	78.8	3.94	.659
11	The controlled writing tasks helped me apply the targeted grammar structures more accurately in writing.	75.2	3.76	.752
12	Due to the guided writing practice, I can now write a paragraph on any topic.	91.8	4.59	.712
13	Due to the free writing practice, I can now write a paragraph on any topic that required me to consider the skills of writing.	82.4	4.12	.857

14	Due to the teacher's continuous monitoring of my writing, I am now a better writer.	81.2	4.06	.748
15	Through CIGT, my writing developed.	82.4	4.12	.857
16	Overall, I am satisfied with how the CIGT developed my writing skills.	80	4.00	.612
17	CIGT was a waste of time. *	80	4.00	1.17
18	Due to CIGT, I feel more active and motivated when I write a paragraph.	81.2	4.06	.966
19	I think grammar should be taught separately rather than in context. *	76.4	3.82	.883
20	The teacher's encouragement to understand the rules without direct explanation helped me to internalize the rules.	77.6	3.88	.993
21	Writing our errors on the board by the teacher and correcting them by the class as a whole without mentioning the rules developed my writing accuracy.	80	4.00	.791
22	My grammatical accuracy developed due to comparing my own use of the intended grammar structures in writing to its use in the highlighted text.	81.2	4.06	1.03
23	I need to have more CIG tasks in the future in order to better improve my writing skills.	80	4.00	1.06
	Total		**4.05**	**.219**

Table 2. Students' Responses Regarding Their Attitudes towards CIGT (N=17)

Concerning the 6th item, it is evident that 78.8% of the students found the practice of discussing various skills of writing such as organization, content, vocabulary, grammar, and others to be beneficial in developing their writing skills with Mean=3.94 and SD=.748. This finding indicates that the students recognized the value of engaging in discussions without their teacher's direct interference. Regarding the teacher's feedback (7th item), it is evident that 85.8% (Mean=4.29, SD=.772) of the respondents expressed agreement with their teacher's indirect feedback and error correction, even without explicitly referring to rules. They identified this form of feedback (i.e., recast) as a valuable means of developing their grammatical accuracy.

Like the students' responses in EG1 concerning pair work and group work, the data gathered regarding the 8th, 9th, and 10th items indicated that the students acknowledged the value of pair work (8th and 10th items) and group work (9th item). Specifically, the data revealed the preference for group work (Percentage=88.2%, Mean=4.41, and SD=.795), which involves a larger number of participants, over pair work (same Percentage=78.8% and Mean=3.94, but with differing SD=.748 and .659, respectively). This could be attributed to the increased diversity of perspectives and opportunities for collaboration, meaningful discussions, and knowledge-sharing within the group setting. In a similar vein, the results from the 11th, 12th, and 13th items verified the students' attitudes towards controlled, guided, and free writing tasks. Among these activities, guided writing was perceived as the most effective by the highest proportion (91.8%) with Mean=4.59 and SD=.712 of the students selecting it for writing paragraphs on any topic, considering the skills of writing. Free writing ranked second, with 82.4% (Mean=4.12 and SD=.857) of the students choosing it, while controlled writing ranked third, with the lowest proportion of 75.2% (Mean=3.76 and SD=.752) of the students selecting it. Guided writing was the favored activity as it provided students with guidance, such as helping them expand on a plan or outline, answering questions, following a model, or using pictures as aids to compose a piece of writing on a new topic.

Based on the results of the 14th item, 81.2% of the students agreed that their writing skills developed as a result of their teacher's continuous monitoring with Mean=4.06 and SD=.748. That is, the students perceived their teacher's attentive and consistent monitoring as a valuable factor in enhancing their writing skills. Like the 5th and 13th items, the 15th item also indicated that 82.4% of the students (Mean=4.12 and SD=.857) displayed their agreement on the effect of CIGT to develop their writing skills. This implies that the students acknowledged the positive effect of the CIGT method.

Items 16th, and 21st, and 23rd revealed that the same proportion (same Percentage= 80% and Mean=4.00, with varying standard deviations of .612, .791, and 1.06, respectively) of the students displayed their agreement regarding their satisfaction with CIGT treatment and the process of involving the entire class in the error correction to avoid student embarrassment as well as develop their writing skills. Moreover, they perceived the need to continue practicing CIGT in the future to better develop their writing skills. This indicates that the students acknowledged the positive effect of CIGT and the value of collaborative learning approaches in the classroom. Additionally, their willingness to continue practicing CIGT in the future emphasizes its value as a valuable means for their writing development.

After reversing the negatively worded items (i.e., 17th and 19th), it was found that 80% of the respondents did not perceive CIGT as a waste of time with Mean=4.00 and SD=1.17. On the contrary, a smaller proportion (76.4%) of them expressed a strong disagreement with the statement (*I think grammar should be taught separately, rather than in context**) with Mean=3.82 and SD=.883. This shows that the participants regarded CIGT as a valuable treatment and believed that grammar teaching is best delivered when contextualized.

Similar to the 14th item, the 18th and 22nd items also received 81.2% of the respondents' agreement with the same mean value of 4.06 (SD=.966 and 1.03, respectively). Based on this finding, it can be inferred that practicing CIGT had a positive influence on the students' level of engagement and motivation when writing. Moreover, it implies that the respondents perceived the practice of comparing their own use of the targeted grammar structures in their writing to its use in the highlighted texts as highly effective to develop their grammatical accuracy. Thus, the comparative technique aided the students to identify and rectify errors, which in turn contributed to enhancing their grammatical accuracy in writing.

On the other hand, 77.6% of the respondents agreed with the 20th item, which produced a mean score of 3.88 (SD=.993). It implies over three-quarters of the respondents acknowledged the value of the teacher's encouragement to understand and internalize the rules, even without the teacher's direct explanation. This underscores that the students recognized the importance of the teacher's encouragement. The **total** mean of the students' attitudes toward implementing CIGT to develop their writing skills was found to be 4.05, with a standard deviation of .219. This suggests that the students expressed a positive attitude towards the application of CIGT to develop their writing skills. This generated result agreed with that of (Basoz, 2014; Rahman and Rashid, 2017), reporting that the study participants also held a positive view towards implicit grammar teaching.

To sum up, the findings obtained from both sets of questionnaires revealed that the students acknowledged the value of both CEGT and CIGT methods. Nevertheless, it is important to highlight that the mean score for the CEGT questionnaire (4.21) was greater than the mean for the CIGT questionnaire (4.05), as summarized in Table 3. Besides, the results of the independent-sample t-test demonstrated a significant difference since $p=.023 < .05$ (Table 4). This implies that the CEGT method was significantly more effective in developing students' writing skills.

Type of Questionniare	Mean	SD
CEGT Attitude Questionniare	4.21	.166
CIGT Attitude Questionniare	4.06	.219

Table 3. Data Summary for the Two Questionnaires

	F	t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Equal variances assumed	1.908	2.387	**.023**	.15918

Table 4. Independent Samples Test

5. Conclusions

This study aimed at investigating the university EFL second-year students' attitudes towards the effectiveness of implementing the CEGT and CIGT methods to develop their writing skills. The study's findings lead to the conclusion that the students stated a positive attitude towards the implementation of both methods for developing their writing skills. Nevertheless, the CEGT method received a higher level of the students' agreement and was thus deemed significantly more effective in developing their writing skills. The findings hold important pedagogical implications for EFL university teachers. According to the students' attitudes, grammar teaching should not be conducted as isolated lessons but instead contextualized within their reading and writing activities. Besides, it is indispensable to notice that there is no one-size-fits-all method to grammar teaching that can be applied to all learners in every context. Both CEGT and CIGT methods were effective in developing writing skills. Therefore, teachers should be open to employing a varied range of methods based on their students' needs. The study's findings also suggest the need for replicating the same study among school-level learners to realize whether they have such a positive attitude towards the two methods. Conducting such research would provide valuable insights into the potential applicability and effectiveness of both methods across different educational settings.

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, pp. 1-14.
- Alfaki, I. M. (2015) University Students' English Writing Problems: Diagnosis and Remedy, International Journal of English Language Teaching, 3(3), pp. 40–52.
- 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.
- Ariana, S.M. (2010) Some Thoughts on Writing Skills, Annals of the University of Oradea, Economic Science Series, 19(1), pp. 134-140.
- Aithal, A. & Aithal, P.S. (2020) Development and Validation of Survey Questionnaire & Experimental Data— A Systematical Review-Based Statistical Approach, Int. J. Manag. Technol. Soc. Sci., 5, p.233–251.
- Arsari, R. W. (2017) Students' Attitudes toward Grammar Teaching: Independent and Integrated Grammar Teaching Methods. Unpublished Master's thesis. University of Kristen.
- 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.
- Ayeche (2018) Students' Attitudes' Towards the Impact of Grammar Teaching on the Writing Skill. Unpublished Master's thesis. Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University -Jijel.
- Basoz, T. (2014) Through the Eyes of Prospective Teachers of English: Explicit or Implicit Grammar Instruction? Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences,158, pp. 377-382.
- Benson, P. J. & Heidish, P. (1995) The ESL Technical Expert: Writing Processes and Classroom Practices. In D. Belcher and G. Braine (Eds.), Academic Writing in a Second Language: Essays on research and pedagogy. Norwood: Ablex.
- Bhavani, C. & Shankar, B. (2023) A Study on Impact of Grammatical on English Written Skills, Journal of Engineering Sciences, 14(1), pp. 603-616.
- Bloemert, J., Paran, A., Jansen, E. & van de Grift, W. (2019) Students' Perspective on the Benefits of EFL Education, The Language Learning Journal, 47(3), pp. 371- 384.
- Brime, A. A. & Bajalan, F. R. S. (2017) Incorporating Outside Sources in Kurdish EFL Students' Academic Writing, European Scientific Journal, 13(31), pp. 307-316.
- Cawley, V. D. (2017) Contextualized Grammar Instruction: A Case Study of Master's Students' Writing Development. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Judson University.

- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2018) Research Methods in Education. 8th edn. New York: Routledge.

- Dean, D. (2008) Bringing grammar to life. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

- Denu, G., Teshome, Z. & Ferede T. (2022) Effects of Contextualized Grammar Instruction on Students' Paragraph Writing Achievement and Their Perception Towards the Instruction: Grade 11 In Getema High School in East Wollega Zone in Focus, Int. J. Grad. Res. Rev., 8(4), pp. 103-111.

- Dörnyei, Z. & Taguchi, T. (2010) Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing. New York: Routledge.

- 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. (1997) SLA Research and Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- 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.

- Fearn, L. & Farnan, N. (2007) When Is a Verb? Using Functional Grammar to Teach Writing, Journal of Basic Writing, 26(1), pp. 63-87.

- Gaikwad, V. (2014) Contextualized Grammar Pedagogy: Integrating Grammar into Writing Instruction, US-China Education Review A, 4(7), pp. 490-499.

- Gawronski B. (2007) Attitudes Can Be Measured! But What Is an Attitude? Social Cognition, 25(5), pp. 573-581.

- Haddock, G. & Maio, G.R. (2008) Attitudes: Content, structure and functions, Introduction to Social Psychology: A European perspective, pp.112-133.

- Hanson, L. J. (2019) Middle Level Contextualized Grammar Instruction: Classroom Approaches & Supports. Unpublished Master's thesis. University of Wisconsin-Stout.

- Hoyt, F. (1906). The Place of Grammar in the Elementary Curriculum, Teacher's College Record, 7, pp.467-500.

- Huang, J. (2010) Grammar Instruction for Adult English Language Learners: A Task-based Learning Framework, Journal of adult education, 39, p. 29-37.

- Hyland, K. (2003) Second Language Writing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- İnal, S., Evin, İ. & Saracaloğlu, A. S. (2003) The Relation between Students' Attitudes Toward Foreign Language and Foreign Language Achievement. Approaches to the Study of Language and Literature [online]. Available at: http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/27/754/9618.pdf

- Ismail, S. A. A. (2010) ESP Students' Views of ESL Grammar Learning, Journal of Language Studies, 10(3), pp. 143-156.

- Javed, M., Juan, W. X. & Nazli, S. (2013) A Study of Students' Assessment in Writing Skills of the English Language, International Journal of Instruction, 6(2), pp. 129-144.

- Jones, S. M., Myhill, D. & Bailey, T. C. (2013) Grammar for Writing? An Investigation into the Effect of Contextualised Grammar Teaching on Student Writing, Reading and Writing, 26(8), pp. 1241-1263.

- Khoshsima, H. & Tanhaei, R. (2014) The Impact of Teaching Grammatical Structures on Writing Ability of Iranian Students, International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 3(6), pp. 134-138.

- Lindenmeyer, H. L. (2014) Revitalizing Grammar Instruction for High School Juniors: Toward a Contextual, Student-Driven, and Minimalistic Method. Unpublished Master's thesis. Eastern Illinois University.

- Marjokorpi, J. (2023) The Relationship between Grammatical Understanding and Writing Skills in Finnish Secondary L1 Education, Reading and Writing. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-022-10405-z

- Mokhamar, N. W. (2016) The Impact of Integrating Reading and Writing Skills on Palestine Technical College Students' Paragraph Writing and Attitudes. Unpublished Master's thesis. The Islamic University–Gaza.

- 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. 129–148. London: Routledge.

- 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. (2018) Grammar as a Meaning-making Resource for Improving Writing, L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 18, pp. 1-21.

- 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.

- Omer, A. A. (2016) Assessing EFL Students' Development in writing at university level. Unpublished Master's thesis. Salahaddin University-Erbil.

- Pratolo, B. W. (2017) Exploring Indonesian learners' beliefs about language learning strategies through reflection. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Monash University Australia.

- Rampey, C. (2016) Gram Slam! Teaching Contextualized Grammar through Cooperative Learning. Unpublished Master's thesis. The University of Mary Washington.

- Salem, A. M. S. (2013) The Effect of Using Writer's Workshop Approach on Developing Basic Writing Skills (Mechanics of Writing) of Prospective Teachers of English in Egypt, English Language Teaching, 6(7), pp. 33-45.

- 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.

- Scott, V. M. (1990) Explicit and Implicit Grammar Teaching Strategies: New Empirical data, The French Review, 63(5), pp. 779- 789.

- Shams, M. (2008) Students' Attitudes, Motivation and Anxiety towards English Language Learning, Journal of Research, 2(2), pp. 121-144.

- Shirvani, M. (2022) Teachers' Perceptions about Teaching Grammar to Adolescents: Implicit or Explicit? International Journal of Innovation Scientific Research and Review, 4(9), pp. 3277-3280.

- Sopin, G. (2015) Teachers' Beliefs and Perceptions of Grammar Teaching in EFL/ ESL Classroom at Misurata University, Libya, International Journal of English Language, Literature in Humanities, 3(10), pp. 467-481.

- 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=33aWnQAACAAJ&redir_esc=y.

- Thornbury, S. (1999) How to Teach Grammar. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

- Wang, G. H. & Wang, S. D. (2014) Explicit Grammar Instruction for EFL Writing and Editing: An Exploratory Study at a Korean University, Linguistics and Literature Studies, 2(2), pp. 65-73.

- 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.

- Zemach, D. E., & Islam, C. (2004) Paragraph Writing: From Sentence to Paragraph. Macmillan: Macmillan Publisher Limited.

- 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.

- Zulfikar, T., Dahliana, S. & Sari, R. A. (2019) An Exploration of English Students' Attitude towards English Learning, English Language Teaching Educational Journal (ELTEJ), 2(1), pp. 1-12.

هەڵوێستی ئەو خوێندکارانەی کە زمانی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانێکی بیانی دەخوێنن بەرامبەر بە کاریگەری جێبەجێکردنی فێرکردنی ڕێزمانی کۆنتێکست لەسەر پەرەپێدانی تواناکانی نووسینیان

فاطمة رشید حسن باجەلانی   **پەیمان عمر مصطفی**

بەشی ئینگلیزی، کۆلێژی زمان، زانکۆی سەڵاحەددین-هەولێر,هەولێر   بەشی ئینگلیزی، کۆلێژی پەروەردەی بنەڕەتی، زانکۆی سەڵاحەددین-

,هەرێمی کوردستان,عێراق   هەولێر,هەولێر ,هەرێمی کوردستان,عێراق

fatimah.hassan@su.edu.krd   paiman.mustafa@su.edu.krd

پوخته

ئەم توێژینەوەیە ئامانجی لێکۆڵینەوە بوو له هەڵوێستی ئەو خوێندکارانەی کە زمانی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانێکی بیانی دەخوێنن بە کاریگەری جێبەجێکردنی فێرکردنی ڕێزمانی کۆنتێکستی ڕاشکاوانە-نائاشکرا (contextualized explicit/ implicit grammar teaching) لەسەر پەرەپێدانی تواناکانی نووسینیان. کۆی گشتی ٣٤ خوێندکاری قۆناغی دووەمی زانکۆ بەشداریان کرد له پۆلی ئێواران بەشی ئینگلیزی / کۆلێژی پەروەردەی بنەڕەتی / زانکۆی سەڵاحەددین - هەولێر. قوتابیەکان بە شێوەیەکی هەرەمەکی دابەشکران بەسەر دوو گرووپدا، بەشێوەیەک کە ژمارەیەکی یەکسان له بەشداربووان له هەر گروپێکدا بوون. گروپ یەکەم بەرکەوتەی فێرکردنی ڕێزمانی کۆنتێکست ڕاشکاوانە بوون، له کاتێکدا گروپی دووەم فێرکردنی ڕێزمانی کۆنتێکستی نائاشکرایان وەرگرت. بۆ کۆکردنەوەی زانیاریە مەبەستدارەکان، دوو کۆمەڵە پرسیارنامە لەلایەن توێژەرانەوە دیزاین کران و بەسەر گروپەکاندا دابەشکران. شیکارییەکە دەرخست کە خوێندکاران هەڵوێستی ئەرێنیان نیشاندا بەرامبەر بە بەکارهێنانی هەردوو شێوازەکە بۆ پەرەپێدانی تواناکانی نووسینیان. بەڵام فێرکردنی ڕێزمانی کۆنتێکستی ڕاشکاوانە ئاستێکی بەرزتری ڕەزامەندی قوتابیانی وەرگرت. توێژینەوەکە بە باسێکی بەرفراوان له ئەنجامەکان و پێشنیارەکان بۆ لێکۆڵینەوەکانی زیاتر کۆتایی هات.

ووشه سەرەتاییەکان: کارامەکانی نووسین، هەڵوێست، فێرکردنی ڕێزمانی کۆنتێکستی ڕاشکاوانە، فێرکردنی ڕێزمانی کۆنتێکستی نائاشکرا.

اتجاهات الطلاب الدارسین اللغة الإنجلیزیة کلغة أجنبیة تجاه تأثیر تنفیذ تدریس النحوالسیاقیة علی تطویر مهارات الکتابة لدیهم

فاطمة رشید حسن الباجلانی   **پەیمان عمر مصطفی**

قسم الانجلیزی ، کلیة اللغات، جامعة صلاح الدین - أربیل,أربیل,أقلیم   قسم الانجلیزی، کلیة التربیة الاساسیة، جامعة صلاح الدین –

کوردستان,العراق   أربیل,أربیل,أقلیم کوردستان,العراق

fatimah.hassan@su.edu.krd   paiman.mustafa@su.edu.krd

ملخص

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلی التحقق من اتجاهات الطلاب الدارسین اللغة الإنجلیزیة کلغة أجنبیة تجاه تأثیر تنفیذ تدریس النحوالسیاقیة الصریح - الضمني (contextualized explicit/ implicit grammar teaching)علی تطویر مهارات الکتابة لدیهم. شارك في البحث 34 طالبًا جامعیًا في السنة الثانیة في الدراسة المسائیة لقسم اللغة الإنجلیزیة / کلیة التربیة الأساسیة / جامعة صلاح الدین - أربیل. تم تقسیم الطلاب بشکل عشوائي إلی مجموعتین ، مما یضمن عددًا متساویًا من المشارکین في کل مجموعة. تعرضت المجموعة الأولی إلی تدریس النحوالسیاقیة الصریح ، بینما تلقت المجموعة الثانیة الی تدریس النحوالسیاقیة الضمني. لجمع البیانات المقصودة ، تم تصمیم مجموعتین من الاستبیانات من قبل الباحثتان وتوزیعها علی المجموعات. أظهر التحلیل أن الطلاب أبدوا اتجاهات إیجابیة تجاه استخدام کلتا الطریقتین لتنمیة مهاراتهم في الکتابة. ومع ذلك ، تلقی التدریس النحوي السیاقي الصریح مستوی أعلی من موافقة الطلاب. واختتمت الدراسة بمناقشة مستفیضة للنتائج وتقدیم اقتراحات لمزید من الدراسات.

الکلمات المفتاحیة: مهارات الکتابة، اتجاهات، التدریس النحوي السیاقي الصریح، التدریس النحوي السیاقي الضمني.