



Research Article

© 2023 Berhe et al.
This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Received: 26 November 2022 / Accepted: 20 April 2022 / Published: 5 May 2023

Students' Motivation to Learn Grammar: The Contribution of Focus on Form Instruction

Tigist Berhe^{1*}

Dawit Amogne²

Birhanu Simegn³

¹Lecturer, Doctoral (TEFL) Candidate,
Bahir Dar University,
Ethiopia

²PhD, Associate Professor of English,
Addis Ababa University,
Ethiopia

³PhD, Associate Professor of English,
Bahir Dar University,
Ethiopia

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2023-0060>

Abstract

Enhanced motivation of ESL students results from an application of appropriate instructional method. However, the extant literature related to the choice of appropriate instructional method is scant. Thus, the present study aimed at examining effectiveness of the focus on form instruction structured output in enhancing students' motivation of learning grammar is initiated to identify an appropriate instructional method that motivates learners. Mixed methods approach through which self-administered questionnaire and semi-structured interviews were used to gather data from participant students was implemented. The results of one way-ANOVA and thematic analysis in line with the motivational dimensions showed that structured output is an effective instructional method in enhancing students' motivation of learning grammar. It was found that the use of structured output instructional method enhances learners' level of motivation to learn English grammar as measured using integrativeness, instrumentality promotion/prevention, criterion measures, attitudes to L2 community, ideal L2 self, ought to L2 self, and learning experience. Thus, the application of structured output as an alternative technique to teaching grammar is recommended.

Keywords: output based instruction, motivation, EFL learning, dimensions of motivation, Ethiopian students

1. Introduction

English is used as medium of instruction in primary partially, secondary and tertiary education in Ethiopia. It is an important language in school and in other aspects of life. However, the quality of

students' English is deteriorating (Dawit, 2014). Some study findings indicate that there is an English language use difficulty in classrooms (Berhane & Mishra, 2019). Haregewoin (2008) illustrates that "[m]any secondary and university students in Ethiopia write grammatically inaccurate sentences" (p. 4). University students have lack of ability to produce accurate structures (Birhanu, 2013). Moreover, studies conducted on two universities in Ethiopia (Bahir Dar University & Jimma University) revealed the prevalence of poor grammar use in students' writing (Abebe, 2018; Mandefro et al., 2018). Therefore, it is imperative to investigate the possible causes of poor grammar acquisition among students.

Low motivation of L2 learners to learn grammar could be among the causes. As Gilakjani and Leong (2012) and Qomariyah (2019) assert, students with low motivation cannot be successful in their language learning. These claims are consistent with Berhanu's (2010) view which specifies that Ethiopian students have low motivation of learning English language.

Motivation is one of the crucial components of effective second language acquisition (Anjomshoa & Sadighi, 2015). Fujimoto (2020) specifies that motivation has a significant role in the success of L2 learners especially in the acquisition of English grammar (Qomariyah, 2019). Therefore, it is necessary to apply a mechanism that enhances students' motivation of learning grammar. Applying appropriate instructional methods is considered among such mechanisms (Fujimoto, 2020).

The relationship between motivation of learners and teaching method has been noted earlier in the work of Harmer (2001). Recently, Zahira's (2022) work magnifies this issue by claiming an improvement in the motivation of learners when they are taught through methods that are fun and easy for a learning process.

Different studies (e.g., Ho & Binh, 2014; Khodabandeh et al., 2006; Namazian et al., 2017; Yu, 2005) confirmed the contribution of instructional methods in enhancing students' motivation of learning grammar. Furtherance to this, Fujimoto (2020) and Sato et al. (2012) claim that focus on form instruction improves students' motivation of learning grammar; however, these studies emphasise on incidental type of focus on form instruction.

There is a dearth of literature that addresses effects of planned (instead of incidental) focus on form instruction in general and structured output instruction in particular on students' motivation of learning grammar. The present study is initiated with an aim to examine the effectiveness of structured output instruction in enhancing motivation of students in learning grammar taking the instance of higher education in Ethiopia.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Motivation and L2 learning

Motivation in second language acquisition refers to (1) reason, (2) desire, (3) want, and (4) an effort or behaviour of the L2 learner towards a target second language. The effort learners exert to achieve a certain goal of being proficient in a target language with a purpose in mind (e.g., to get a better job) or to be a member of the target language community is also related to motivation (citation). The determinate role for motivational behaviour is not only liking or disliking (affective) of learning; it also engenders efforts of learners to do something (Gardner, 1985). Dörnyei (2005) also refers to motivation of L2 learners as the desires of L2 learners to minimize the discrepancies between their actual self and ideal self.

In their seminal work towards theorizing the concept of motivation in SLA, the Canadian social psychologists Gardner and Lambert (1959) posited that second language acquisition is influenced by attitudinal and motivational characteristics. They claim that students' effort and enthusiasm towards acquiring a language is regarded as aspects of motivation (Gardner & Lambert, 1959).

Since the 1990s, L2 motivation has been a hot issue among researchers (e.g., Csiz'er & Dörnyei, 2005; Dörnyei, 2005; Taguchi et.al, 2009) who were questing for new insights into the theory of L2 motivation proposed by Gardner and his associates. Notably, Dörnyei's (2005) contest towards

Gardner and Lambert's (1959) integrativeness emerged being among influential works of the time. The L2 Motivational Self System focuses on the view that L2 learners' final goal is associated with the learners' inner self-concept which is different from the assumption in intergrativeness which views L2 learners' final goal to be related to target language community (Dornyei & Ushioda, 2009).

It can be deduced that more enthusiastic, goal oriented, and committed L2 learners are more motivated. This can lead the learners to be more effective in learning (Csiz'er & Dornyei, 2005; Dornyei, 2005; Taguchi et al., 2009). L2 learners' motivation is an important factor to enhance L2 learning effectiveness. Thus, it is imperative that researchers are also needed to investigate what motivates L2 learners. As it is mentioned earlier, enhancing of students' motivation could be caused by application instructional methods.

2.2 Instructional methods

In the field of second language acquisition, several instructional methods have been emerged. However, there is inconsistency among researchers with respect to naming and defining the instructional forms (Long, 1991; Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2001). The most widely used instructional forms are focus on forms (F on Fs), focus on form (F on F), and focus on meaning (F on M).

Focus on forms focuses purely on linguistic form; focus on form emphasises not only on the forms but also on meaning, and in focus on meaning the focus is on only meaning (Ellis, 2001). Focus on form, which is the focus of this study, is an instructional method in which learners are encouraged to focus on targeted linguistic forms that are given in a communicative context (Long, 1991).

Focus on form instruction helps learners to focus on processing target forms by noticing them in input (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Schmidt, 1990) as well as it encourages them to produce language containing target forms that help them to identify the gap between what they know about the target form and what they should know about the target form. Input-based instructions and output-based instructions are amongst the oft-referred variants within the focus on form category (Ellis, 1998, 1999).

2.2.1 Output-based instruction

Output based instruction is "a form of explicit output practice" in which learners are encouraged to focus on producing form (Keating & Farley, 2008, p. 640). Output is a component of language that is produced by learners during writing and speaking (Zhang, 2009).

The argument in support of output-based instruction is that oral or written language production, particularly when learners face difficulty to convey their intended message effectively, forces them to produce appropriate, precise and coherent message (Swain, 1998). The most common output based pedagogical interventions are collaborative tasks, dictogloss, and structured output tasks (Benati, 2020). Structured output is in focus in the present study.

2.2.1.1 Structured output

The concept of structured output was first mentioned by VanPatten and Cadierino (1993) in their study examining the relationship between the nature of explicit instruction and its effects on SLA. VanPatten and Cadierino (1993) described structured output as "... output activities that encourage learners to be accurate while also attending to meaning ..., tasks that are structured around particular grammatical points where real messages are communicated, and learners attend to both content and form" (PP. 239-240). Structured output is a focus on form output-based instruction in which learners use target grammar form to convey message. It also enhances learners' accuracy of grammar. It helps learners to use language features in communicative way (Lee & VanPatten, 2003).

Structured output involves two characteristics that are important for enhancing learners'

language production: (1) pushes learners to exchange previously unknown and unrehearsed information, and (2) requires learners to access a particular structure/form in order to express meaning. In addition, as it can be inferred from the background section structured output is a focus on form instruction that improves learners' motivation of learning grammar.

2.2.1.2 Sample of written structured output activity

- a) Select one of the holidays given in the brackets; insert it in blank space (a) and write about what Ethiopian people do on that day in blank space (b).
(Ethiopian New Year, Eid al-Fitre, Ethiopian Easter) _____ (a) is a holiday _____ (b).

- b) Choose two of the holidays given in table, and write three sentences for each holiday about what people do on that day.

Ethiopian holidays

Eid al-Fitre	Ethiopian Christmas	Ethiopian Easter	Ethiopian Good Friday	Moulid
Ethiopian New Year	Orthodox Epiphany	Meskel	Eid Al Adaha	

- c) Develop comparison and contrast expository paragraph based on the sentences you constructed in 'b'.

3. Research Method

3.1 Design of the study

As the purpose of the study was to examine effects of structured output instructional method on students' learning motivation, an instructional intervention had to be designed and implemented through a quasi-experimental classroom study. Moreover, to triangulate the findings of quasi-experimental study, thematic analysis of interview data was applied. Therefore, mixed research design wherein qualitative research approach is embedded in a primarily quasi experimental design (Schoonenboom & Johnson, 2017) was applied to execute the present study.

3.2 Participants

Two groups (i.e., experimental & control) participated in the present study. To select the participants, multistage sampling method was used. First, purposive sampling method was used to choose first year students from Bahir Dar University because this group takes the course Communicative English Language Skills II in which all of the target grammar features in this study were incorporated. Then through lottery method, natural science fresh man students that attended their fresh man courses at Zenzelima Campus of Bahir Dar University were drawn. Among these students, two sections were randomly selected to be participants of the present study. For the interview, five students were selected from the experimental group based on their willingness.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

3.3.1 Questionnaire

Before the intervention, a pre-intervention questionnaire was administered to both groups to check their level of motivation and homogeneity of their level. After the intervention, a post intervention questionnaire was administered for both groups.

The questionnaire was adapted from Taguchi et al.'s (2009) questionnaire items. Integrativeness, instrumentality, attitudes to L2 community and criterion measures from Do"rnyei and Csiz'e'r (2002) and Do"rnyei et al.'s (2006) the L2 Motivational Self System (ideal L2 self, ought-

to L2 self, and L2 learning experience) were used as dimensions to measure motivation. The two types of instrumental motivation, promotional and preventional, were also considered in the present study (Dörnyei, 2005).

Each of the dimensions was conceptualized by researchers (e.g., Dörnyei, 2005; Taguchi et. al., 2009). Criterion measures refer to “assessing the learners’ intended efforts toward learning English” (Taguchi et. al, 2009, p. 74). Ideal L2 self refers to “L2-specific facet of one’s ideal self” (Dörnyei, 2005, p. 106). Ought-to L2 self is defined as “the attributes that one believes one ought to possess (i.e., various duties, obligations, or responsibilities) in order to avoid possible negative outcomes” (Dörnyei, 2005, p. 106). As to Taguchi et.al (2009), while instrumentality-promotion is related to regulating personal goals for success, instrumentality-prevention is connected to regulating duties and obligation. L2 learning experience is connected to the immediate classroom environment e.g., the experience of success (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). Attitudes to L2 community refer to learners’ attitude toward target language speakers (Taguchi et.al, 2009). Integrativeness is a motivational factor that states the purpose of learning L2 is to know about the target language speakers and to be part of the speakers (Gardnor & Lambert, 1995).

The questionnaire consisted of 31 close ended questions. The questionnaire was five-point Likert Scale type (responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree).

3.3.2 Interview

To triangulate the findings of the quantitative analysis, semi-structured pair-interviews were conducted. An interview guide was prepared based on Suzuki’s (2011) semi-structured interview questions and the questionnaire in the current study.

3.4 Instructional treatment

For the experimental group, structured output instruction targeting relative clauses, reported speech and future tenses was applied as a treatment. The treatment lasted for six weeks. The structured output activities were designed based on the six guidelines suggested by Lee and Vanpatten (2003). During the intervention, participants were asked to produce the target features and convey communicative message in the form of clause, sentence, and paragraph writings. Students did not make oral production for the whole class since it may be incidental input for other students which can affect the validity of the study (Lee & VanPatten, 2003). Rather, the students were let to make oral production individually for us. No explicit information about the target features (about meanings, rules, & functions of target features) was provided to the participants. However, some explanations about some terms (e.g., paragraph writings & conjunctions) other than the grammar forms were given to the participants. Feedback was given in a way that the students were only informed whether they were right or wrong, but no explanation was given at the end of each activity (Benati & Batziou, 2019). Instructions were also given very carefully in order to avoid incidental inputs (Morgan-short & Bowden, 2006). Sample of written structured output activity is attached in the appendix (see Appendix A).

The control group was taught same grammar features using the conventional method, based on the module prepared to teach the course communicative English Language Skills II. Explanations were given to the group about the target grammar features and they were let to practice the features with exercises (e.g., inserting appropriate relative pronouns in blank spaces, changing direct speech into indirect speech, inserting future tenses in a contextualized paragraph with blank spaces). For ethical consideration, after completing the intervention and data collection, makeup classes were arranged for the control group to teach them the grammar features through structured output instruction.

3.5 Validity and reliability

Before applying the tools, their validity and reliability were checked initially through expert review and then through piloting. The face and content validities of the questionnaire items and interview questions were checked by the supervisors and two experts in the area. Then the tools were revised based on comments from the reviewers.

Based on pilot data, reliability of the questionnaire was checked using Cronbach's alpha. The Cronbach's Alpha value of the questionnaire items was 0.85 implying acceptable level of reliability. The face and content validities of the interview guide and the teaching material were also checked during the pilot phase. As a result, several amendments were made. Some modifications were made on the interview guide; for instance, two redundant interview questions were merged. In the teaching material, it was discovered that there was lack of clarity in some parts. To fix these, making instructions and writing scenarios clearer, and incorporating additional activities and illustrations were made. Moreover, the number and parts of the lessons in the teaching material were re-arranged.

3.6 Data Collection Procedures

The first step in the data gathering procedure was administering pre-intervention questionnaire to the two sections of participants. Then grammar knowledge test was given for the experimental group to check whether they have some knowledge about the target grammar features because it was a pre-condition to apply structured output (Benati, 2020). After the intervention, data gathering was executed by administering the post-intervention questionnaire to both groups to check effectiveness of the experiment and by conducting semi-structured interview to triangulate data gathered through the post-intervention questionnaire.



Figure 1 Data gathering procedure

3.7 Procedures of data analysis

Data were analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively. One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to analyse the quantitative data. It was applied to examine effects of structured output instructional method on the participants' motivation of learning the target grammar features. One-way MANOVA was employed for further analysis of the motivational dimensions. Thematic analysis was applied to analyse the data gathered through semi-structured interviews.

4. Results

4.1 Motivation scores

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics results on students' motivation (as a whole) of learning the target grammar features. The means and the standard deviations of the students' pre-intervention and post-intervention motivation scores are presented in Table 1. Before conducting pre-intervention questionnaire, we designated the two groups as section A and section B. After assuring homogeneity of the two groups in terms of their motivation, we randomly designated section A as experimental

group and section B as control group.

Before the intervention, the means and the standard deviations of section A and section B students' motivation scores were ($M = 1.74, SD = 0.19$) and ($M = 1.7, SD = 0.16$) respectively. This indicates that before the intervention, the two sections had almost similar level of motivation scores. After the intervention, the means and standard deviations of the control group and the experimental group became different ($M = 1.7, SD = 0.14$) and ($M = 4.04, SD = 0.15$). Mean of post-intervention motivation of the experimental group is higher than that of the control group. This implies that after the intervention, numerically, the two groups of participants had different motivation scores.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for effects of structured output on motivation as a whole

Condition	Group	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Pre-inter.	Section A	1.74	45	.19554
	Section B	1.70	44	.16467
Post-inter.	Experimental	4.04	45	.15486
	Control	1.70	44	.14026

As it is indicated in Table 1, the two groups had similar mean motivation scores before the intervention while they had different mean motivation scores after the intervention. However, these results were based on descriptive statistics. Hence, to assure whether the differences were statistically significant one-way ANOVA was employed.

Table 2: One-way ANOVA test results of students' motivation of leaning grammar

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Pre-inter.	Between Groups	.036	1	.036	1.102	.297
	Within Groups	2.848	87	.033		
	Total	2.885	88			
Post-inter.	Between Groups	121.626	1	121.626	5565.801	.001
	Within Groups	1.901	87	.022		
	Total	123,528	88			

The results in table 2 reveal a statistically non-significant difference between the two groups, ($F(1, 87) = 1.102, p = .297$) before the intervention. Thus, the overall motivation of students in both groups was similar before the intervention. The post-intervention motivation mean value of the experimental group and the control group were compared by running a one-way ANOVA. The results show that mean motivation values of the experimental and control groups were significantly different ($F(1, 87) = 5565.801, p = 0.001$). Hence, after the intervention the motivation of students in the experimental group was significantly higher than that of the control group.

The experimental and control groups were also compared based on scores with respect to each dimension of motivation (see the results in table 3). As the descriptive statistics indicate, for some of the components (criterion measures, Attitude to L2 community & Ideal L2 self), the two groups had similar means before the intervention and different means after intervention.

For example, for 'Ideal L2 self', the means and standard deviations of section A and section B students were ($M = 2.10, SD = 0.45$) and ($M = 2.12, SD = 0.46$) respectively whereas the means and standard deviations of the experimental and the control groups were ($M = 4.71, SD = 1.07$) and ($M = 2.46, SD = 0.88$) respectively.

However, for the case of the remaining components, mathematically the two groups had differences in mean scores before and after the intervention. As it can be seen in table 3, for the case of the component 'instrumentality promotion', the means and standard deviations of section A and section B students were ($M = 1.76, SD = 0.58$) and ($M = 1.64, SD = 0.40$) respectively while the means

and standard deviations of experimental group and control groups were (M = 4.18, SD = 0.54) and (M = 1.86, SD = 0.59) respectively.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics: Effects of structured output on dimensions of motivation

Dimensions		Pre-inter.	Pre-inter.	Post-inter.	Post-inter.
		Section A	Section B	experimental	Control
Criterion measures	Mean	1.73	1.72	4.31	1.75
	Std. Deviation	0.44	0.38	0.51	0.57
Ideal L2 self	Mean	2.1	2.12	4.90	2.47
	Std. Deviation	0.45	0.46	1.05	0.87
Ought-to L2 self	Mean	1.79	1.66	3.95	1.66
	Std. Deviation	0.48	0.44	0.37	0.57
Instrumentality-promotion	Mean	1.76	1.64	4.18	1.86
	Std. Deviation	0.58	0.40	0.54	0.59
Instrumentality-prevention	Mean	1.74	1.8	4.17	1.74
	Std. Deviation	0.54	0.41	0.62	0.31
L2 learning experience	Mean	1.8	1.73	4.05	1.68
	Std. Deviation	0.49	0.41	0.46	0.39
Attitudes to L2 community	Mean	1.81	1.82	4.04	1.63
	Std. Deviation	0.44	0.39	0.53	0.33
Integrativeness	Mean	1.75	1.63	4.22	1.63
	Std. Deviation	0.35	0.35	0.36	0.53

Based on the results of the descriptive statistics, there was no consistency in the mean scores of motivational dimensions between the groups before the intervention. In addition, the descriptive statistics indicate that the groups had different means in motivation scores after the intervention. However, to make sure that the differences were significant one-way MANOVA was conducted.

Table 4: One-way MANOVA test results of students' scores in dimensions of motivation

Source	Condition	Dependent variables	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Group	Pre-inter.	Criterion measures	.007	1,87	.007	.040	.842	.001
	Post-inter	Criterion measures	145.926	1,87	145.926	490.281	.000	.849
	Pre-inter	Ideal L2 self	.014	1,87	.014	.068	.795	.001
	Post-inter	Ideal L2 self	131.000	1,87	131.000	139.692	.000	.616
	Pre-inter	Ought-to L2 self	.375	1,87	.375	1.762	.188	.020
	Post-inter	Ought-to L2 self	117.326	1,87	114.79	515.590	.000	.856
	Pre-inter	Instrumentality-pro.	.277	1,87	.277	1.121	.293	.013
	Post-inter	Instrumentality-pro.	119.903	1,87	119.903	372.930	.000	.811
	Pre-inter	Instrumentality-pre.	.086	1,87	.086	.374	.543	.004
	Post-inter	Instrumentality-pre.	130.541	1,87	130.541	536.065	.000	.860
	Pre-inter	L2 learning expe.	.090	1,87	.090	.438	.510	.005
	Post-inter	L2 learning expe.	125.131	1,87	125.131	696.518	.000	.889
	Pre-inter	Attitudes to L2 com.	.001	1,87	.001	.006	.936	.000
	Post-inter	Attitudes to L2 com.	129.022	1,87	129.022	658.138	.000	.883
	Pre-inter	Integrativeness	.317	1,87	.317	2.565	.113	.029
	Post-inter	Integrativeness	149.632	1,87	149.632	721.301	.000	.892

As Table 4 indicates, the p-values of all the pre-intervention comparisons are greater than 0.05. This implies that before the intervention, there were no significant differences between the two groups regarding the groups' scores in each component of motivation. However, regarding the post

intervention comparisons, all the p-values are less than 0.05 (i.e., 0.001). This p-value indicates that after the experiment, there were significant differences between the experimental and the control groups in their mean scores in components of motivation. This implies that in the context of teaching the target features through structured output instruction, all the motivational dimensions contribute in enhancing learners' motivation towards learning the target grammar features.

4.2 Thematic analysis of learners' views on their motivation to learn grammar

The results of the qualitative data show that learners have positive experience on the intervention class. The themes that emerged from the data corpus are summarised in line with the eight dimensions of motivation (i.e., integrativeness, instrumentality promotion, instrumentality prevention, criterion measures, attitudes to L2 community, ideal L2 self, ought to L2 self, & learning experience) using deductive thematic analyses and are presented in this section. Citations of participants are made by using pseudo names to protect their privacy.

Integrativeness: This concept is related to learners' need to be part of L2 speaking community; or to live with the community and hence they need to be able to use the language for that purpose. This need motivates them to engage more in learning the language. In the instance of the studied group, there is evidence for the prevalence of such need among students. Here is a data segment extracted from the interview transcription of Sefanit and Semahegn:

"I want to have a skill to communicate in English with English [native] speakers. When I try, I feel I have difficulty in speech. I also want to talk [to communicate with] English speakers. But remember grammar always and correct writing is difficult [It is difficult for me to always remember the correct grammar]. But this class was not grammar teach [teaching]. ...important to think and write [The instructions are leading me to think and write]. I think it is better. ...I was always happy to exercise writing in the class because that is similar to speaking with someone who speak [speaks] English only [who do not speak my native language]." (Sefanit)

"Because of the activities I was happy [I was happy to engage in the activities that were given during the intervention]...I consider me one of native speaker of English [I had feeling of being part of the community of native speakers of English]." (Semahegn)

As can be understood from the excerpts above, these participants were eager for classes because of the exercises that were pretty much same as real communication scenarios with English native speakers. The first participant wanted to test if she could communicate in situations where there is real need.

Instrumentality Promotion: This dimension refers to motivation of learners when driven by the goal of achievement of something (e.g., education, job, shopping). This is when a learner faces a scenario wherein using the L2 is necessary. The data below are typical of how members of the experimental group explain such needs.

"I like the class; why because I am learn in English language even other subjects [English is the medium of instruction for all subjects]. After I finish my university also, I may probability of employed in English working language organisation [I may have to work for an organization whose working language is English]. So, I must at least write in English language with correct grammar. The class is I enjoy because there is exercise of writing from idea thinking instead of grammar thinking." (Abebe).

"I learn[ed] the grammar [to] use [it] correctly in writing. So, I learned to have good writing [will be good at producing accurate texts]." (Semahegn).

From the above texts, the instrumentality of the language as a motivator and the teaching approach which Abebe stated as "writing from idea thinking instead of grammar thinking" to refer to the scenario are contributing for the motivation of the students to learn grammar.

Instrumentality prevention: This dimension is explained by the need to avoid negative consequences of inability to communicate using the language. It is related to the previous dimension in that both are related to the necessity of using the language; but the previous one relates to the benefits of having the required language skills while the later one is about the adverse impacts of not having the required language skills.

Below are extractions of data from two participants' explanation of the issue:

"I was struggle to do the activities why because I don't want to fail [I was trying my best to engage in the writing activities because I don't want to get bad marks in writing]." (Abebe)

"Not know English means very difficult for university student; because if you not write by good English what you know about the subject, you got poor mark. [If you cannot write accurately in English you will not be successful in other subjects]. Grammar and vocabulary I am always with problem to write correctly. I am afraid when write because I don't know the correct grammar. [I had problem of writing accurately]. The class was attention divert to idea. This is because I can exercise writing my idea. I improve through the practices during the classes. [In the experiment, I used to practice to express my idea through writing; this helped me to improve my writing accuracy] Therefore, I liked to have skill that helps to write during at examination and not fail [having this skill saves me no to fail in examination]." (Semahegn)

Semahegn used to worry about his writing skill because of lack of grammar knowledge. He found the intervention is helpful as he learned how to use grammar in writing through the practices during the intervention. Because of this, he became interested to engage more on intervention activities. Deep inside, he is concerned about the importance of the skill for his education. Abebe's reflection has a message that the goal of his learning during the intervention was not to fail in writing tests. This indicates that the concept of instrumentality (prevention) dimension of motivation had relations with what the students felt.

Criterion measures: This dimension refers to the attention, effort, and commitment of learners. Themes that can be categorised into this dimension emerged during the analysis of the data corpus gathered from the participants. The following quotations are exemplar descriptions by participants:

"The exercises during those classes were different from my experience. I forget the grammar but I write by paying attention to the questions and instruction gave [given]. I forget to worry about a specific grammar formula. I directly start [to] write my experience[s]. The exercises forced me [I am guided] to concentrate on writing because the ideas are what I know. It is not filling blank exercise; I cannot write it if I am not [do not] give attention. ...Therefore, I am not fear [afraid of] writing because of mistake." (Abebe)

"Before the exercises, I have [had] problem of to express [expressing] my idea in writing... My commitment[s] before and after the exercises was [were] different. Compared to before, the exercise helped me to be very hard worker to write by the grammar [to write using the grammar forms]. I am [also became] more concentrated." (Yeshi)

These participants described how their experience during the intervention helped them to concentrate on and be committed to the exercises because of the new approach as compared with the old one which Abebe referred to as "it is not filling blank exercise".

Attitudes to L2 community: If L2 learners have positive attitude to L2 community, they will be more initiated to learn their language. In the context of this study too, participant students reflect their views if they have good feelings about native speakers of the language.

"I like English language speaking community." (Zeyiba)

"Yes, I have good feeling to native speakers of English. I like to [if I] can speak the language. But pronunciation is difficult." (Yeshi)

These excerpts indicate that the learners have positive attitude to L2 community. That means, there is no negative affectivism that discourages learners in the study context to lose motivation to learn the language.

Ideal L2 self: An L2 learner's need to achieve some level of proficiency in using the language relates to this dimension. The following are a data segments from two participants:

"I try my best because I want to be perfect like English speakers [native speakers of English language]."
(Sefanit)

"I imagine myself speaking native like English." (Zeyiba)

As they precisely described, these participants are motivated to learn the language because they want to be perfect. Being perfect is the level they aspire to achieve through learning. Learning here serves as a path towards the goal of being perfect.

Ought to L2 self: This dimension captures a learner's motivation to be similar to or be in the category of a referent, a friend or a group.

"The class was like... hm... everyone in the class was very serious and writing with concentration. I was like ... oh my God, I have to write too. It creates a situation where everyone focuses on the exercise. I had to be like them." (Zeyiba)

"I enjoyed... My classmates [were] working hard. Their hard working influenced me [to be hard worker]."
(Abebe)

These participants' motivation to engage more on the intervention activities was as a result of being similar to classmates because they believed they should do what others do. This is the result of the features of the target instructional method which engages each learner through a thoughtful design of scenarios.

Learning experience: This dimension is represented by teacher's style, quality of teaching material, classroom atmosphere, and success of learner. The following excerpts are descriptions by two students about their learning experiences:

"I had good experience. I enjoyed [the] experiment.... I liked learning relative clauses, future tenses and reported speech. The exercises were very good. ...Yes. I enjoyed your [referring to the instructor] method. I was happy [with your method]. ...I was active [in classroom]. I write and speak many times [I used to write and speak frequently in classroom]. ...You are good [were good]. The class was attractive." (Yeshi)

"Yes... The atmosphere was very attractive. I liked everything in the classroom. I liked your teaching style. It helped me to know more about the use of grammar." (Zeyiba)

These participants' experience of learning with reference to the intervention was motivational. The students also used some descriptors of the classroom atmosphere (e.g., the exercises, being active in doing the tasks, and the instructor). These concepts comply with the learning experience dimension of motivation.

In this sub-section, major reflections of the interview participants were presented. Ought-to L2 self, Ideal-L2 self, L2 learning experience, intergativity, instrumentality prevention, instrumentality promotion, attitude to L2 community, and criterion measures were supported by emergent themes of the qualitative data analyses.

Generally, the result of the qualitative data analyses correlates with the analysis of data collected through questionnaire. Both analyses show that all the targeted dimensions of motivation, in the current study, hold true in the study context too. They positively contributed towards motivating the participants to learn the target grammar features through structured output

instructional method.

5. Discussion

The aim of this research was to examine effects of structured output instructional method on students' motivation of learning grammar. The quantitative and qualitative analyses results indicate that structured output (i.e., focus on form) instruction has contribution in improving students' motivation to learn target grammar features.

As measured from the questionnaire data, post-intervention mean of motivation scores of the experimental group is higher than that of the control group. This implies that after the intervention, numerically, the two groups of participants had different motivation scores. This difference is not a random one; as confirmed through one-way ANOVA, there is significant difference between the experimental and the control groups regarding their scores in post-intervention motivation scores. This implies that the instructional method is effective in improving students' motivation to learn grammar.

This finding is consistent with Sugan et al. (2021) and Hammer (2001) assertions that instructional methods influence students' motivation of learning. Recter (2013) also had prior work that specifically supports the view that FFI has contribution to a high level of student motivation in general and learning grammar in particular.

The present study particularly shows that the communicative activities in structured output instruction enhance learners' motivation of learning grammar. This finding is supported by researchers (e.g., Al Haj, 2011; Ochoa et al, 2016; Zahira, 2022) in the field who support the view that students become motivated to learn when they engage in communicative activities.

Other scholars proclaim the contribution of focus on form instruction towards enhancing students' motivation to learn through further trickling the notion of motivation down into its components such as effectiveness and success (Fujimoto, 2021). Regarding this dimension, the present study found out that focus on form instruction improves EFL students' motivation of learning grammar that is manifested by success. This is linked to one of the motivational dimensions (i.e., learning experience) which were applied in the present study. The finding in the present study also supports the findings of Sato et al, (2012); Rectem (2013) and Richards and Rodgers (2001) who reported that learners' success in achieving the goals of tasks increases their motivation. Fujimoto's (2021, p. 86) study supports the present study's finding that 'FFI [focus on form instruction] brings a positive atmosphere into the classroom'. This concept is under the dimension of L2 learning experience.

The other motivational dimension which was brought to the fore of discussion in this study is learner's ideal L2. In the instance of the experimental group in the present study, this dimension was found to have significant contribution towards motivating the learner towards learning grammar. This builds on the thesis of Fujimoto (2021) that states as focus on form instruction helps learners to have positive self-image of achieving a level of communicative competence which enhances their motivation of learning language features.

The finding of the present study also conforms to Fujimoto's (2021) claim that through focus on form instruction, students can work hard when they see other students work hard. This dimension is called ought-to L2 that leads learners to be motivated to learn grammar.

Therefore, the results of the present study showed that all the focused components of motivation were significant factors in constructing the notion of motivation of learning grammar. These results are consistent with the previous works of scholars in the field. For example, ought-to L2 self, Ideal-L2 self, L2 learning experience (Dornyei, 2005), integrativeness, learners' attitudes to L2 community and criterion measures (Dornyei & Csiz'er's, 2002), instrumentality promotion and instrumentality prevention (Taguchi, et. al, 2009) are significant motivational dimensions that build on the concept L2 Motivation these scholars have contributed.

6. Conclusions

The central inquiry in this article is whether the application of structured output enhances students' motivation of learning relative clauses, reported speech and future tenses. The results of both the quantitative and the qualitative data analyses indicate that students showed improvement in their motivation of learning the target grammar features when exposed to structured output instructional method.

Based on these results, it can be concluded that structured output is an effective instructional method in enhancing learners' motivation of learning the target grammar features. Structured output that incorporates communicative activities could enhance the learners' motivation as it requires them to learn grammar through communicating their idea rather than struggling to rehearse and to produce what they read or listen. When learners engage in structured output activities, their focus is on conveying message. This might create a relaxed environment for them to use the language features.

The present study had some limitations. In the study, effects of structured output on motivation were focused. Its contribution in enhancing learners' use of the target grammar features in communication was less emphasized. The instructional method's effects on each component of motivation was also examined. However, the most affected motivational factor(s) as well as the correlations among or between the dimensions were de-emphasized.

Therefore, further research is needed to examine the instructional method's effects on grammatical accuracy in writing; to make it more valid this research should be re-conducted for longer time. Investigating the extent to which structured output affects each of the dimensions of motivation as well as showing correlations among or between the components is needed. As the findings of the present research suggest, practitioners should incorporate structured output method and its features during future instructional designs.

References

- Abebe, T. (2018). Analysing errors in students' paragraphs: The case of first year Biology students at Bahir Dar University. *The Internet Journal of Language, Culture and Society*, 5(46), 13-25.
- Al Haj, A. (2011). Enhancing motivation in the EFL classrooms is the solution: A case study of secondary schools of the Gezira state, Sudan. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(3), 524-529. doi:10.4304/jltr.2.3.524-529.
- Anjomshoa, L. & Sadighi, F. (2015). The Importance of Motivation in Second Language Acquisition. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 3 (2), 126-137.
- Benati, A. (2020). *Key Questions in Language Teaching: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Benati, A., & Batziou, M. (2019). Discourse and long-term effects of isolated and combined structured input and structured output on the acquisition of the English causative form. *Language Awareness*, 28(2), 1-18. doi: 10.1080/09658416.2019.1604721
- Berhane, G. & Mishra, I. (2019). Foreign Languages in Ethiopia: History and current. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews (IJRAR)*, 6(1), 1431-1439
- Berhanu, A. (2010). *The effects of motivation and vocabulary knowledge on reading comprehension: A case of grade 12 EFL students of Ghion Secondary and Preparatory School in Bahir Dar town*. [Unpublished MA Thesis] Bahir Dar University
- Csize'r, K. & Do'nyei, Z. (2005). The internal structure of language learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort. *Modern Language Journal*, 89 (1), 19-36.
- Dawit, A. (2014). *Applying Process-Genre Approach to Written Business Communication*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Bahir Dar University.
- Do'nyei, Z. & Csize'r, K. (2002). Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(4), 421-462
- Dörnyei, Z. & Ushioda, E. (2009). Motivation, language identities and the L2 self: A theoretical overview. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 1-8). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1998). Teaching and research: Options in grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(1), 39-60.
- Ellis, R. (1999). *The study of second language acquisition*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Languages Education Press.
- Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language learning*, 51(1), 1-46.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107.
- Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL learners' writing skills: problems, factors and suggestions. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 4(2) 81-92. <https://doi.org/10.20547/jesso421604201>
- Fujimoto, T. (2020). *The Impact of Focus-on-Form Instruction on Japanese Senior High School Students' Motivation and Communicative Competence*. [Unpublished MA Thesis]. Nagoya University of Foreign Studies.
- Gardner, R., & Lambert, W. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13(4), 266-272
- Gardner, R. (1985). *Social psychology and second-language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London, England: Edward Arnold.
- Gilakjani, P. & Leong, L. (2012). A Study on the Role of Motivation in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching. *Modern Education and Computer Science*, 7(2), 9-16. DOI: 10.5815/ijmecs.2012.07.02
- Habtamu A. (2011). *Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of Effective Grammar Teaching*. [Unpublished MA Thesis]. Addis Ababa University.
- Haregewain, A. (2008). *The effect of communicative grammar on the grammatical accuracy of students' academic writing: An integrated approach to TEFL*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation] Addis Ababa University.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Teaching*. (3rd Ed.). Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Ho, P., & Binh, N. (2014). The effects of communicative grammar teaching on students' achievement of grammatical knowledge and oral production. *English Language Teaching*, 7(6), 74-86.
- Jha, S. K. (2014). An ethnographic insight into the causal factors of degrading English education in Ethiopia, Libya, and India. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2(2), 44-55
- Keating, G., & Farley, A. (2008). Processing instruction, meaning-based output instruction, and meaning-based drills: Impacts on classroom L2 acquisition of Spanish object pronouns. *Hispania*, 91(3), 639-650.
- Khodabandeh, F., Alian, J., & Soleimani, H. (2017). The effect of MALL-based tasks on EFL learners' grammar learning. *Teaching English with Technology*, 17(2), 29-41, <http://www.tewtjournal.org>
- Lee, J., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen (2nd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thompson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S., & Chen, X. (2009). Second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *The Modern Language Journal*. 93(1), 91-104. DOI:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00830.
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In B. Kees, G. Ralph & K. Claire (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*. (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mandefro, F., Asnakech, D., & Alemayehu, N. (2018). Investigation of university students' writing problems: Two public Universities in South West Ethiopia in focus. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)*, 42(4), 83-95.
- Morgan-Short, K., & Bowden, H. W. (2006). Processing instruction and meaningful output-based instruction: Effects on second language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(1), 31-65
- Namazian, I., Bohloulzadeh, G., & Pazhakh, A. (2017). The Effect of Task-Based Language Teaching on Motivation and Grammatical Achievement of EFL Junior High School Students. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(2), 243-259
- Ochoa, C., Cabrera, P., Quiñónez, A., Castillo, L., & González, P. (2016). The Effect of Communicative Activities on EFL Learners' Motivation: A Case of Students in the Amazon Region of Ecuador. *Colomb. Appl. Linguist. J.*, 18(2), 39-48.
- Qomariyah, S. (2019). The correlation between students' motivation and learning grammar. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 18-24. DOI:10.33394/jo-elt.v6i1.2345
- Recterm, M. (2013). Communicative competence and focus form. In N. Sonda & A. Krause (Eds.), (*JALT 2012 conference proceedings*). Tokyo: JALT.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sato, K., Fukumoto, Y., Ishitobi, N., & Morioka, T. (2012). Focus-on-form instruction and student learning in Japanese junior high schools. In A. Stewart & N. Sonda (Eds.), *JALT 2011 conference proceedings* (pp. 283–303). Tokyo, Japan: JALT.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158.
- Schoonenboom, J., & Johnson, R. (2017). How to Construct a Mixed Methods Research Design. *Köln Z Soziol*, 69(2) 107–131 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11577-017-0454-1>
- Sugano, S., & Mamolo, L. (2021). The effects of teaching methodologies on students' attitude and motivation: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(3), 827– 846. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14348a>
- Suzuki, M. (2011). *Ideal L2 selves of Japanese English learners at different motivational level January*. [Unpublished MA Thesis]. Soka University
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty. & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. (pp. 64–82). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self-system among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 66-97). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). Explicit instruction and input processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15(2), 225–243. doi:10.1017/S027226310001979
- White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research*. 7(2), 133-161
- Yu, S. (2005). *The effects of games on the acquisition of some grammatical features of l2 German on students' motivation and on classroom atmosphere*. [Unpublished PhD Dissertation] Australian Catholic University.
- Zahira, Z. (2022). *Students' motivation in learning English grammar through the online classes*. [Unpublished MA Thesis] Sriwijaya University.
- Zhang, S. (2009). The role of input, interaction and output in the development of oral fluency. *English language teaching*, 2 (4) 91-100