



GSJ: Volume 9, Issue 9, September 2021, Online: ISSN 2320-9186

[www.globalscientificjournal.com](http://www.globalscientificjournal.com)

The Comparative study on the effects of Contextual and Structural methods of teaching vocabulary at Preparatory level: The case of grade 11 Jimma Zone  
,Gomma Woreda , Oromia.

*a.Tamiru Tibebe (MA student) , E-mail: tamirutibebe@gmail.com*

Department of English Language and Literature, College of Social Sciences  
and Humanities, Jimma University, Jimma, Ethiopia

**Abstract:** *The overall purpose of this study was to investigate the comparative study on the effects of contextual and structural methods of vocabulary teaching at Preparatory level: The case of Gembe preparatory school, focusing on grade 11. To achieve the objectives of this study the Quasi-experimental research design was used. The students that had been taught with contextual methods had been named as Group A and the students that had been taught with structural methods had been named as Group B. The researcher had developed 20 lesson plans for contextual and structural methods of vocabulary teaching (10 for each group). The lessons had been validated by getting the opinions of the experts. On the basis of the above analysis, the findings of this study were identified. The finding of this study was the students that have been taught in the contextual (experimental) group test scores show significant differences from the students that have been taught by the structural method in the post-test. However, the scores of pretest there was no significant differences, the test scores of the students those who have been taught by the contextual vocabulary greater than the test scores of students those who have been taught by the structural vocabulary teaching method, the structural vocabulary has very small significance on Learner's academic achievement and the Contextual method of teaching vocabulary more effective than structural vocabulary teaching method.*

**Key Words:** *contextual and structural vocabulary teaching, case processing summary, inter-item correlations, , and inter-Item Correlation Matrix Person product moment correlation, and Vocabulary instruction*

## 1. Introduction/ Background of the study

The method of language teaching has been changing from grammar-translation to direct method then to the communicative approach. But it was only during the communicative approach that the prominent role of vocabulary knowledge in second or foreign language learning has recognized by researches in the field. The current popular communicative approach of language learning has emphasized meaningful interactive over form. It also recognized that the vocabulary teaching and learning strategies that student uses have great importance on the success of their vocabulary knowledge (Hatch and Brown, 1995)

Languages are based on words (Thombury, 2002). It is almost impossible to learn a language without words; even communication, between human beings, is based on words. Therefore, teaching these words is a crucial aspect of teaching-learning a language. Both teachers and students agree that acquisition of the vocabulary is a central factor in teaching a language (Walter,2004). However, there were no clear strategies on how to teach vocabulary. Early teaching methods, for example, the direct method and the Audio lingual method, concentrated on grammar rather than vocabulary. Recently, the communicative language teaching method (CLT) was the advent of thinking about teaching vocabulary more extensively (Nation, 2001).

Language is the most powerful and central tool in achieving our educational goals. When it comes for examining language, words are focal points and we begin our investigation of language structure by looking at words from four of the following perspectives: these perspectives are their parts should be meaningful, their sounds of syllables that make them up, the principles that organize them into phrases and sentences and the semantic relationships that link them in sets. It is only through language, a person tries to express his/her thought, feelings, moods, aspiration which influences the ultimate and deepest foundation of the society (Nelson and Stage, 2007).

Knowledge and skill of using words in different context play a crucial role in the comprehension of new concepts, ideas, feelings, and principles. Learners are greatly benefited in their learning that has got experience in the use of words a different context. Laufer (1997) indicates that vocabulary teaching is one of the most important aspects of language learning and language use in different context. It is generally divided into active and passive vocabulary.

In language teaching and learning, vocabulary is a basic issue since words play a significant role in expressing our feelings, emotions, and ideas to others. This means without vocabulary no amounts of grammatical or other types of linguistic knowledge can be obtained in a second language and is of great significance to language learners (Zimmerman,1997). Words are significant components of a language since they name objects, actions, ideas without which people cannot convey the intended meanings. Vocabulary is important to access knowledge, express our ideas, communicate effectively, and learn

about new concepts. Therefore having good knowledge of vocabulary is mandatory in order to understand or convey a message in communication and to pursue and succeed in one's learning. Harmer (1991) said that if language structure makes up the skeleton of the language then, the vocabulary provides the vital organs and the flesh. Harmer further states that an ability to manipulate grammatical structure does not have any potential for expressing meaning unless words are used. In order to improve students' vocabulary, it has to be taught as the most essential aspect of the language. The students' vocabulary knowledge is strongly linked to their academic success because students who have sufficient knowledge of vocabulary can understand new ideas and concepts more quickly than students with limited knowledge of vocabulary.

In light of this, the purpose of this study is to investigate the comparative study on the effect of contextual and structural methods of vocabulary teaching to grade 11 students of Gembe preparatory school in focus.

## **2. Objectives of the study**

### **1.3.1. General objective**

The main objective of this study was to investigate the comparative study on the effect of contextual and structural teaching of vocabulary in Gembe preparatory focusing on grade 11.

### **1.3.2. Specific objectives**

Based on the above general objective the specific objectives were identified as follows;

1. Examining the effect of structural method of teaching vocabulary.
2. Find out the effect of contextual method of teaching vocabulary.
3. Compare whether the contextual or the structural teaching of vocabulary methods are equally effective.
4. Find out which method of teaching vocabulary is more effective.

## **2.1. Research Hypotheses**

Based on the objectives of this study the basic null hypotheses were designed as follows.

1. There is no significance difference between the mean scores of the students that will be Taught using the contextual and structural methods of teaching vocabulary
2. The mean scores of the students that were taught using contextual teaching method of vocabulary greater than students that were taught with structural teaching method of Vocabulary
3. Structural method of teaching vocabulary does not have any significant effect on Learner's academic achievement

4. Contextual method of teaching vocabulary is more effective than structural vocabulary teaching vocabulary method.

### **3. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

#### **3.1. Concepts of vocabulary**

Graves (as cited in Taylor, 1990) defines vocabulary as the entire stock of words belonging to a branch of knowledge or known by an individual learner. He also states that the lexicon of a language is its vocabulary knowledge, which includes words and expressions. Krashen (as cited in Herrel, 2004) extends Graves' definition further by stating that the lexicon organizes the mental vocabulary in the speaker's mind. In relation to this, vocabulary is the glue that holds stories, ideas, and content together... making comprehension accessible for students (Rupley; Logan & Nichols, 1998/1999). Therefore, vocabulary is central to language and of critical importance to the typical language learner. On the other hand, vocabulary is the words we must know to communicate effectively both productive and receptive vocabulary.

#### **3.2. Historical overview of teaching and learning vocabulary**

Reviewing the literature on the history of vocabulary of foreign language teaching, it becomes clear that vocabulary has been treated differently throughout the periods of different approaches. Despite the fact that vocabulary teaching and learning have been central in both the teaching and learning process, there were periods when this vital area of teaching was virtually neglected (Cecelce-Murcia, 2001).

The proponents of structural linguistics, particularly Fries (as cited in Cecelce-Murcia, 1994) held the view that grammar was the very starting point of the language learning process. Advocating behaviorists' viewpoints, Fries considered language as a process of developing a set of habits through drilling. As far as much emphasis was put on grammatical and phonological structures of a language the introduced vocabulary was rather simple. In the 1960s, Chomsky, developing a theory called transformational –generative grammar, rejected viewpoints of both behaviorists and structuralist. The proponents of these approaches claimed that language learning was a mental process rather than a process of developing habits (Nunan, 2003). In contrast to behaviorism and structural linguistics, generative linguistics paid more attention to vocabulary.

#### **3.3. The Implication of Teaching Vocabulary in EFL class**

In dealing with teaching vocabulary, one thing that is important to know and understand how students learn and develop vocabulary. Thornbury (2002) declares the implications of teaching vocabulary regarding how learners learn and develop vocabulary as follows:

- A. learners need tasks and strategies to help them organize their mental lexicon by building networks of associations.
- B. teachers need to wean themselves off reliance on direct translation from their mother tongue.
- C. words need to be presented in their typical contexts so that learners get a feel for their meaning, their register, their collocation, and their syntactic environments.
- D. teacher should direct attention to the sound of new words, particularly the way they are stressed.
- E. learners should aim to build a threshold vocabulary as quickly as possible.
- F. learners need to be involved in the learning of words.
- G. learners need multiple exposures to words and they need to retrieve words from memory repeatedly.
- H. memory of new words can be reinforced if they are used to express personally relevant meaning.
- I. not all the vocabulary that the learners need can be taught: learners will need plentiful exposure to talk and text as well as training for self-directed learning.

### **3.4. Vocabulary teaching and Its Importance**

Words are the building blocks in a language. By learning the lexical items, we start to develop knowledge of the target language. Based on our experience of being a language learner, we seem to have no hesitation in recognizing the importance of vocabulary in L2 learning. Meara (1980) points out those language learners admit that they encounter considerable difficulty with vocabulary even when they upgrade from an initial stage of acquiring a second language to a much more advanced level. Language practitioners also have reached a high degree of consensus regarding the importance of vocabulary. The findings in Macaro's survey (2003) indicate that second language teachers view vocabulary as a topic they most need research to shed light on to enhance the teaching and learning in their classrooms. Therefore, it may be claimed that the role of vocabulary in L2 learning is immediately recognized and implications for teaching from substantial research are in great demand.

Vocabulary is obviously a very important element within a language as the overwhelming majority of meaning is carried lexically; and, therefore, something to be taken into consideration both in Second and Foreign Language Teaching. ((McCarthy 1990). Vocabulary teaching is one of the most important components of any language class. The main reason is the fact that it is a medium, which carries meaning; learning to understand and express the meaning is what counts in learning languages. As pointed out by Harmer (1992,p.14), "Words are the building blocks of language and having a good supply of them is very important for students' right from the beginning of their English learning." (Krashen, 1998, p. 33) clearly states: Vocabulary is basic to communication. If acquirers do not recognize the meanings of the key words used by those who address them, they will be unable to

participate in the conversation. And if they wish to express some ideas or ask for information, they must be able to produce lexical items to convey their meaning.

### **3.5. The essential components of vocabulary instruction**

Students can also learn vocabulary through indirect and direct exposure to words in a variety of language contexts. For example, students can learn vocabulary indirectly when they engage in conversations with others, through reading aloud, and through independent reading (Armbruster, Lehr, & Osborn, 2001). Students can learn vocabulary directly when teachers target individual words and promote word-learning strategies (Armbruster et al., 2001). According to Michael Graves (2006), there are four essential components of vocabulary instruction listed below.

- Providing rich and varied language experiences
- Teaching individual words explicitly
- Teaching word-learning strategies
- Fostering word consciousness

### **3.6. Characteristics of good vocabulary teaching**

Vocabulary instruction that improves comprehension generally has the following characteristics :

- multiple exposures to instructed words,
- exposure to words in meaningful contexts,
- rich or varied information about each word ,
- the establishment of ties between instructed words and
- Students' own experience and prior knowledge
- and an active role by students in the word-learning and teaching process.

### **3. 7. The Current Status of Vocabulary Teaching**

During the last three decades, the outlook on vocabulary has radically changed and researchers have shown outpouring interests towards this area. Therefore, the movement toward effective methodologies for teaching vocabulary has emerged and researchers and language teachers have also suggested many strategies and techniques for vocabulary learning, which are dependent on the efforts of each learner (Cohen & Macaro, 2007; Mizumoto & Takeuchi, 2009). Nowadays it is generally accepted that vocabulary teaching should be part of the syllabus, and taught in a well-planned and regular basis. Some authors, led by Lewi (1993) argue that vocabulary should be at the Centre of language teaching, because 'language consists of grammaticalised lexis, not lexicalized grammar'. Therefore, the incorporation of vocabulary into the curriculum is essential for increasing students' literacy skills, not only in the EFL classroom but in all areas.

Thus, Vocabulary instruction that improves comprehension generally has the following characteristics: multiple exposures to instructed words, exposure to words in meaningful contexts, rich or varied information about each word, the establishment of ties between instructed words and students' own experience and prior knowledge and an active role by students in the word-learning process. On the other hand, Hunt and Beglar (2002) suggest that learners need to be taught strategies for inferring words from contexts as well as those which can help them retain the words they have encountered.

### **3.8. Contextual and structural methods of teaching vocabulary**

According to Weatherford (1990), the Context-Based Approach of vocabulary learning is the most effective, and it saves a lot of time for the learner that is wasted in going to the dictionary again and again. Contextual evidence helps the learner to find out the meanings of the new words. It is based on teaching the meanings of new words by having them used in different contexts surrounding the words. There are two types of context: Pedagogical context/ Instructional context and natural context. The instructional context refers to sentences specifically written to introduce the meanings of the new words. The natural context refers to text sentences written to communicate the ideas of the text. To understand the meanings of the new words, the students need to know the information related to the topic in which the words are embedded. Difficult words can also be explained by giving a summary of it. For example, she speaks without break and does not give chance to anybody else to speak in the meeting. She is really a loquacious lady. In this respect, referent words, synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, definitions, alternative and reach the meanings of the words restatement help to.

The context-based approach not only helps the reader to know the meaning of the words but also helps and facilitates the use of them. It develops independent learning habits, inculcates a problem solving approach, and promote active learning process. The words that have got different meanings with the same spellings and pronunciation are very difficult to be learned without a context-based approach. For example, the word pen is also used as a noun and a verb, and at the same time, it has also got the meanings a shed where poultry birds are kept. In the same way, the sentence such as his fur coat was coated with ice. He left her alone on the left bank of the river. There is no point in drying your clothes if they are already dry. She pointed at me and made a very pointed remark. She drew the curtains to make the room lighter and then lighted her cigarette with a lighter. After he had drunk the whisky, the drunk was very drunk indeed. The referee who refereed the match matched the toughness of the player. It is very difficult to memorize the meanings of the words without any context. The contextual information helps the learner to understand the meanings of the words that have got different meanings. Every word

has its own usage context. It is ineffective for students to master words from the concrete situation if the teacher explains them monotonously and abstractly. Lack of context makes vocabulary learning difficult. Words taught in isolation are generally not remembered. Therefore the background knowledge of words is very important in vocabulary teaching. Coady(1987) suggests that background knowledge may serve as compensation for certain syntactic deficiencies. Students pay attention to the content and show much interest in background knowledge. Some related words are remembered effectively and firmly.

#### **4. Research Design**

The study was conducted to investigate the comparative study on the effect of contextual and structural methods of teaching vocabulary in English at the preparatory level. It was an experimental study in which the pre- posttest design was used. Methods of teaching vocabulary and academic achievement were two variables of this study. Methods of teaching were independent variables and academic achievement was dependent variable. The students that were taught with the contextual method were named Group A and the students that were taught with the structural methods were named Group B. The researcher had developed 20 lesson plans for contextual and structural methods of vocabulary teaching (10 for each group). The lessons were validated getting the opinions of the experts. The significant differences between the mean scores of the groups were tested.

##### **4.1 Target population**

The target populations for this study were grade 11 preparatory students of Gembe. The sample selected students for the experimental and control group in the pre-post were subjects for this study to provide their answers for the questions that had been designed as an examination to test them. The reason behind selecting this target population, the researcher has been teaching in this school in grade 11 and as well as the researcher works his regular work since has been self-sponsor of himself to his M.A. This helped him to get current knowledge of students in vocabulary and it is also easy to collect data since he got the sample students at school.

##### **4.3. Sample size and sampling technique**

A systematic random sampling technique was used to select the sample respondents. The total populations of the students in grade 11 are 149. Of these total populations of students, 75 students were selected as the sample respondents from the attendance list. In this systematic simple random sampling technique, the total population (149) students divided for seventy-five (75) sample students. Therefore,  $K = N/n = 149 \div 75: 1.98$  so that the sample respondents were selected at two intervals and purposive sampling was used to select the school in which this study was conducted. The selected sample students

were grouped into 38 and 37 students in A group B group respectively and had been taught the contextual vocabulary method and structural vocabulary method for one month.

#### **4.4. Study cite**

This study was conducted in Jimma Zone Gomma woreda. Gomma woreda has location and bordering woredas that bordering in different directions in the east it is boarded by Yebu woreda, in the west it is boarded with Gera and Toba woredas, in the north it is bordered by Limmu and Babo woerdas and in the south it is boarded with Santana woreda. The particular cite of this study is Gembe preparatory school focusing on grade 11 students.

#### **4.5. Instrument of data collection**

##### **4.5.1. Testing**

The vocabulary proficiency test was designed to obtain information regarding the students' proficiency in vocabulary teaching methods to identify student's current academic success in relation to contextual and structural methods of vocabulary teaching. The researcher has used the Alberta K-12 ESL proficiency benchmark which was developed by Alberta Education (2012) and modified it as a suit to students' level of understanding. So that this test comprised 50 items and it was distributed to the students within one hour to complete it.

Questions had been designed and used for the two groups those who taught in contextual and structural differences. 50 questions were prepared on the basis of standard questions from the contextual and structural vocabulary teaching contents that were taught for one month. The questions were prepared using the contextual vocabulary teaching to know the achievement of students through the results test scores. Then the contextual and structural vocabulary questions were prepared to test the two groups separately and on the basis of the results that had been achieved on the test scores were identified for each group to compare their difference so that either of the methods was identified as the effective method in teaching vocabulary.

#### **4.6. Method of Interventions**

The program of teaching the contextual and structural vocabulary teaching method for one month had been arranged and addressed for the school principals and students who were involved in the sample respondents of this study to get permission from the school and students. The program was arranged in the form of the tutorial by convincing that this study will be important for the future for the performance of students since these experiences will be used for the vocabulary teaching and learning methods.

### 3.7. Data collection procedures

Registers and licenses are particularly valuable for complete enumeration that was written as the recommendation paper for the Gemebe preparatory school. On the basis of the recommendation paper, the researcher got permission from the school. The researcher had selected the sample respondents after he got permission from the school. The selected students were grouped in Group A and B. Pre-test questions were prepared for sample students on the basis of contextual and structural teaching vocabulary methods which were controlled by a grade 11 English textbook. The pre-test questions were corrected and the scores were documented. After that, the researcher developed 20 lesson plans for contextual and structural methods of vocabulary teaching (10 for each). The lessons were validated getting the opinions of the experts. Finally, the post-test questions were prepared on the basis of the above lesson plans, and the two groups were tested, corrected and the scores were documented were become ready for the analysis.

### 4.8. Reliability and Validity of Instrument

Whether the test suits to students' level of understanding or not it was piloted in Agaro, preparatory school with special reference of grade eleven students. The question was piloted on 40 students (20 for each). The pilot study lasted for one week and it was done in the classroom in the form of pre-test. As a result of pilot testing, a few of the items and instructions were modified and deleted. To see the validity of the questions the opinions of 4 English language experts were also obtained to validate test.

Accordingly, the researcher has accepted their suggestions and comments and made some modifications to some language. In order to check the reliability of the pilot tests, the research employed Cronbach alpha. Accordingly, the results were (.801) which implies that high internal contingency coefficient.

This indicates that the data collection instrument is reliable and valid for the actual research.

Development of valid and reliable questions involves several steps taking considerable time and gets the English language experts to evaluate and comment the questions that used for data collection through test scores.

**Face validity:** Face validity simply means that the validity is taken at face value. As a check on face validity, test items will be sent to teachers or English subject matter experts to obtain suggestions for modification. While discussing the validity of a theory, lacily and Jansen (1994) define validity as making common sense , and being persuasive and seeming right to the reader. For Polkinghorne (1988), validity of a theory refers to results that have the appearance of truth or reality.

**Reliability:** Reliability is defined as the extent to which measurement procedure produces the same results on repeated trials. In short, it is the stability and consistency/ homogeneity/ of results over time or across raters. Reliability plays a significant role in providing information on whether the data collection instruments for the present study on vocabulary strategies are consistent or accurate suggesting that the same thing is repeated under similar conditions. The extent to which items of data collection instruments are agree on the results for each contestant is an indication of reliability. Similarly, the degree to which respondent's responses on a pre and posttest would stay the same over time is also a sign of reliability (Allen and Yen, 1979).

**Pre- and post-tests** are used to measure knowledge gained from participating in the contextual and structural vocabulary teaching methods. The pre-test is a set of questions given to students before the teaching begins in order to determine their knowledge level of contextual and structural vocabulary content. After the completion of the lessons of contextual and structural vocabulary contents that will be designed for one month teaching, students will be given a post-test to answer the same set of questions, or a set of questions of comparable difficulty. Comparing students' post-test scores to their pre-test scores enables the researcher to see whether teaching contextual vocabulary or structural teaching will be successful in increasing the students vocabulary knowledge content.

This provided the researcher with information on when and how to use pre- and post-tests, tips for developing good questions, instructions for how to validate and administer pre- and post-tests, and description of how to analyze results. As the first step in the validation process, the researcher asked Gemebe Secondary School and Gembe preparatory English language teacher's staff to take the test. Ask them to mark any questions that were unclear to them when they were taking the test. Have staff discuss with the researcher their answer to the questions, ensuring that their understanding of the test questions were the same as what were intended.

#### **4.9. Methods of data analysis**

Descriptive statistics analysis was used to analyze the results of the two test scores from the two groups that were collected quantitatively and discussed qualitatively in text explanation. In the descriptive statistical analysis total result sum, average, mean, standard deviation, standard error, Pearson correlations and T-test were used.

#### **5. Data Analysis and Discussions**

In this part of the study the data that collected for this study were analyzed and presented under each sections of the analysis.

### 5.1. Analysis on the experimental and controlled group in SPSS 20 software

In this part of the analysis, the pre - post-test scores on the contextual vocabulary teaching method were analyzed. First, the pre-test was given on the basis of the contextual vocabulary contents and the scores were presented for 38 selected students. After that, the contextual vocabulary lessons were designed to teach the selected students for a month using the contextual vocabulary teaching method and students had been taught. The content of these contextual vocabulary lessons was selected and designed on the basis of the Alberta K-12 ESL benchmark and suit as students' level of understanding. The test that was given in the pretest was given as the post-test and the test score was analyzed for each student in SPSS 20 software.

**Table.1. Reliability Statistics for pilot test for experimental groups**

| Cranbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .872             | 25         |

Reliability in statistics and psychometrics is the overall consistency of a measure. A measure is said to have high reliability if it produces similar results under consistent conditions. "It is the characteristic of a set of test scores that relates to the amount of random error from the measurement process that might be embedded in the scores. Scores that are highly reliable are accurate, reproducible, and consistent from one testing occasion to another. That is, if the testing process were repeated with a group of test-takers, essentially the same results would be obtained. Various kinds of reliability coefficients, with values ranging between 0.00 (much error) and 1.00 (no error), are usually used to indicate the amount of error in the scores. The pilot test was statistically reliable since the Cronbach alpha .872 for the 25test items that used to test the students for the pilot test.

**Table 2.Case Processing Summary for experimental group**

|                      | N  | %     |
|----------------------|----|-------|
| Cases Excluded Valid | 38 | 100.0 |
| Total                | 0  | .0    |
|                      | 38 | 100.0 |

The case processing summary was analyzed to identify the valid, excluded cases by computing the number of students for the contextual group. All the selected students were sat for the pretest and post

test and the scores were analyzed. Therefore, no one was excluded from the case in that 38(100%) selected were valid and 0 was invalid in the above case processing summary.

**Table .3. Inter-Item Correlation Matrix on the experimental test items**

|    |     |     |
|----|-----|-----|
|    | B1  | B2  |
| B1 | .45 | .25 |
| B2 | .25 | .45 |

Inter-item correlations are an essential element in conducting an item analysis of a set of test questions. inter-item correlations examine the extent to which scores on one item are related to scores on all other items in a scale. It provides an assessment of item redundancy: the extent to which items on a scale are assessing the same content (Cohen and Swerdlik, 2005). Ideally, the average inter-item correlation for a set of items should be between .20 and .40, suggesting that while the items are reasonably homogenous, they do contain sufficiently unique variance so as to not be isomorphic with each other. As we saw the result of the above statistics the inter-item correlation of the questions designed for the contextual vocabulary test was between .25 and .45. Therefore, the homogeneity of the test item questions was very confidential to measure the student's achievements in contextual vocabulary testing.

**Table .4. Analysis on the test scores in mean, Std. Deviation and Std. Error.**

|    | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|----|----|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| A1 | 38 | 66.50 | 8.645          | 1.402           |
| A2 | 38 | 74.87 | 6.321          | 1.025           |

The pretest mean was 66.50 and the posttest mean was 74.87. The standard deviation of the pretest in the experimental group was 8.645 and the standard deviation of the post test was 6.321. Std. Error Mean of the pretest was 1.402 and Std. Error Mean posttest was 1.025.

**Table.5. Analysis on the confidence interval of the mean difference**

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
|  | Test Value = 0 |
|--|----------------|

|    | T      | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |       |
|----|--------|----|-----------------|-----------------|---|-------|
|    |        |    |                 |                 | Lower                                     | Upper |
| A1 | 47.416 | 38 | .000            | 66.500          | 63.66                                     | 69.34 |
| A2 | 73.014 | 38 | .000            | 74.868          | 72.79                                     | 76.95 |

The mean difference between the pretest the post-test for the experimental group was analyzed in the above table and the mean difference was identified. Before the mean of the pretest and post were separately identified for each. Thus the mean value of the pretest was 66.5 and the mean value of the post was 74.86 and the mean difference between the pretest and posttest was 8.36. This result is almost the same with the result that analyzed in the above table 2. There was a 95% confidence interval of the difference between the lower and upper mean in the pretest in that lower was 63.66 and the upper was 69.34 and posttest in that the lower was 72.79 and the upper was 76.95. The mean difference between the lower in the pretest and the post-test was 9.13 and the mean difference in the upper in the pretest and post was 7.61.

### 5.2. Analysis on results of controlled group

In this part of the analysis the pretest and posttest analysis of the result of the 37 selected students were involved in the control group and tested on the structural vocabulary teaching method. First, the pre-test was given on the basis of the structural vocabulary contents and the scores were presented for 37 selected students. After that, the structural vocabulary lessons were designed to teach the selected students for a month using the structural I vocabulary teaching method and students had been taught. The content of these structural vocabulary lessons was selected and designed on the basis of Alberta K-12 guidelines. The test that was given in the pretest was given as the post-test and the test score was analyzed for each student in SPSS 20.0 software.

**Table 6. Case Processing Summary for control group**

|                   | N  | %     |
|-------------------|----|-------|
| Cases Valid Total | 37 | 100.0 |
| Exclude           |    |       |

|                |    |       |
|----------------|----|-------|
| d <sup>a</sup> | 0  | .0    |
|                | 37 | 100.0 |

The case processing summary was analyzed to identify the valid, excluded cases by computing the number of students for the controlled group. All the selected students were sat for the pretest and post test and the scores were analyzed. Therefore, no one was excluded from the case in that 37(100%) selected were valid and 0 was invalid in the above case processing summary.

**Table .7. Inter-Item Correlation Matrix for items in the tests**

|    | B1  | B2  |
|----|-----|-----|
| B1 | .50 | .35 |
| B2 | .35 | .50 |

Inter-item correlations are an essential element in conducting an item analysis of a set of test questions. inter-item correlations examine the extent to which scores on one item are related to scores on all other items in a scale. It provides an assessment of item redundancy: the extent to which items on a scale are assessing the same content (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2005). Ideally, the average inter-item correlation for a set of items should be between .20 and .40, suggesting that while the items are reasonably homogenous, they do contain sufficiently unique variance so as to not be isomorphic with each other. As we saw the result of the above statistics the inter-item correlation of the questions designed for the structural vocabulary test was between .35 and .50. Therefore, the homogeneity of the test item questions was very confidential to measure the student's achievements in structural vocabulary testing.

**Table.8. Reliability Statistics of pilot test for control group**

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cranabch's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|------------------|--|------------|
| .857             | .857   | 25         |

The alpha coefficient for the 25 items is .857, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal consistency. (Note that a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered "acceptable" in most

social science research situations.) The 25 items cronbach Alpha statistics of the pilot test for this study was .857. The reliability of the test items of the test for the structural test was confidential to measure.

**Table.9. Analysis on the results of the structural test scores in mean, Std. Deviation and Std. Error Mean.**

|    | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|----|----|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| B1 | 37 | 67.81 | 8.442          | 1.388           |
| B2 | 37 | 68.95 | 7.597          | 1.249           |

The mean of the pretest was 67.81 and the mean of the post test was 68.95. The difference between the pretest and post test was 1.14. The standard deviation of the pretest scores was 8.442 and the standard deviation of the post test scores was 7.597. The standard error of the pretest was 1.388 and the standard of the post test was 1.249.

**Table.10. Analysis on the confidence interval of the mean difference**

| Test Value = 0 |        |    |                 |                 |   |       |
|----------------|--------|----|-----------------|-----------------|---|-------|
|                | t      | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |       |
|                |        |    |                 |                 | Lower                                     | Upper |
| B1             | 48.860 | 36 | .000            | 67.811          | 65.00                                     | 70.63 |
| B2             | 55.201 | 36 | .000            | 68.946          | 66.41                                     | 71.48 |

The mean difference between the pretest the post-test for the control group was analyzed in the above table and the mean difference was identified. Before the mean of the pretest and post were separately identified for each. Thus the mean value of the pretest was 67.811 and the mean value of the post was 68.946 and the mean difference between the pretest and post-test was 1.135. This result is almost the same with the result that analyzed in the above table 2. There was a 95% confidence interval of the difference between the lower and upper mean in the pretest in that lower was 65.00 and the upper was 66.41 and post-test in that the lower was 70.63 and the upper was 71.48. The mean difference between the lower in the pretest and the post-test was 1.41 and the mean difference in the upper in the pretest and post was 0.85.

Correlation between sets of data is a measure of how well they are related. The most common measure of correlation in stats is the Pearson Correlation. The full name is the Pearson Product Moment Correlation or PPMC. It shows the linear relationship between the contextual and structural vocabulary teaching methods in their effectiveness in teaching vocabulary. The range of relations, high correlation: .5 to 1.0 or -0.5 to 1.0, *medium correlation*: .3 to .5 or -0.3 to .5., *low correlation*: .1 to .3 or -0.1 to -0.3. The significance and the level relations between the contextual and structural methods in their effectiveness has been determined on the basis of the above scales in the following table

**Table.11. Analysis on the relations of the effects of vocabulary teaching between contextual and structural methods**

|    |                     | B1     | B2     |
|----|---------------------|--------|--------|
| A1 | Pearson Correlation | 1      | .975** |
|    | Sig. (2-tailed)     |        | .000   |
|    | N                   | 37     | 37     |
| A2 | Pearson Correlation | .975** | 1      |
|    | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000   |        |
|    | N                   | 37     | 37     |

**Table.11. Analysis on the relations of the effects of vocabulary teaching between contextual and structural methods**

|    |                     | B1     | B2     |
|----|---------------------|--------|--------|
| A1 | Pearson Correlation | 1      | .975** |
|    | Sig. (2-tailed)     |        | .000   |
|    | N                   | 37     | 37     |
| A2 | Pearson Correlation | .975** | 1      |
|    | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000   |        |
|    | N                   | 37     | 37     |

There were relations between the contextual and structural vocabulary teaching method in their effectiveness in teaching vocabulary. The relation between them was ranged between .5 and 1.0 in that the relation between them was .975. This implies that the two vocabulary teaching methods were effective for teaching vocabulary. This did not mean that they are absolutely equal in their effectiveness in teaching vocabulary. There was a very slight difference in their effectiveness to teach vocabulary as indicated in the data that analyzed in table 2 in that in the result in the post scores were increased in the two teaching methods in contextual teaching method the average of the student results was increased by 8.31 and in the structural teaching method, the average of student result was increased by 1.22. The difference between them was 7.07. The rate of effectiveness in the contextual vocabulary teaching method the results of students was more improved although the rated effectiveness was not by far from the structural vocabulary teaching method.

**Table.12. Summary of the analysis for contextual and structural test scores in the pre- post-test**

| No | Experimental group | Average | mean  |
|----|--------------------|---------|-------|
| 1  | Pretest            | 66.55   | 66.5  |
|    | Posttest           | 74.86   | 74.87 |
|    | Difference         | 8.31    | 8.37  |

|   |   |                     |                |                |
|---|---|---------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 2 | Control group   | Pretest             | 67.72          | 67.81          |
|   |   | Post test           | 68.94          | 68.95          |
|   |   | Difference          | 1.22           | 1.14           |
| 3 | Experimental and control group differences              | In pretest          | 1.22 control G | 1.31 control G |
|   |   | In post test        | 5.92 Exp       | 5.92Exp        |
| 4 | Relationships between contextual and structural groups. | Pearson correlation |                |                |
|   |   | .975                |                |                |

The analyzed data were summarized for the experimental group and control group in the above table side by side and the rate of their effectiveness was identified. As was presented in the above table in the pretest scores the control group greater than the experimental group by an average of 1, 22, and by the mean difference it was greater by 1.14. However, after the two groups were taught and tested by the post-test, the experimental group test scores were greater than the control group by 5.92. However, when we saw the result of test scores the pretest and posttest scores differences in each group the results of the experimental increases by 8.31 on average and 8.37 by mean difference. Whereas, the results of the control group increase by 1.22 on average and 1.14 in mean difference. When we compare the rate of increase in mean and average for the two groups, the rate of increase by the experimental group was greater than the control group by 7.09 on average and 7.17 by mean difference.

## 6. Conclusions

The main objectives of the study were to assess the comparative study on the effects of contextual and structural teaching of vocabulary in Gembe preparatory focusing on grade 11. To achieve the intended objectives of this study the experimental method was used for this study. In this experimental method, the subjects of the study were divided into Group A( experimental group) and group B( controlled group). The experimental group was assigned for the contextual vocabulary teaching method and the controlled group was assigned for the structural vocabulary teaching method. The pre-post tests were designed for the two groups. The pretest was given for the two groups before the students had been taught the two methods separately. The pretest results were analyzed from 50 test items for each group. In this pretest, experimental groups were tested on contextual vocabulary test items and the control groups were tested on the structural test items and analyzed out of 100% for each group. The

experimental groups were taught vocabulary lessons for a month by the contextual vocabulary teaching method and the students in the control groups were taught vocabulary lessons for a month by the structural vocabulary teaching method.

Finally, the same test items, the structural test items that were given for the control group pretest were given in the post test and the scores were analyzed out 100%. The contextual test items that were given for the experimental groups were given in the post test and analyzed out of 100%.The data were analyzed in total results, in standard deviations, standard error, mean and mean differences.

## **7. The finding of this study**

Based on the analysis made of this study the findings of this study were identified and presented as follows side by side with the research null hypothesis to prove the null hypothesis.

The first null hypothesis was designed to identify the absence of a significance difference between the mean scores of the students that have been taught using the contextual and structural methods of teaching vocabulary. The result of this study indicated that the students that have been taught in the contextual (experimental) group test scores show significant differences from the students that have been taught by the structural method in the post-test. However, the scores of pretest there were no significant differences.

The second null hypothesis designed was to identify the mean scores of the students that have been taught using contextual teaching method of vocabulary greater than students that have been taught with structural teaching method of Vocabulary. The findings of this study indicated that the test scores of the students those who have been taught by the contextual vocabulary greater than the test scores of students those who have been taught by the structural vocabulary teaching method.

The third null hypothesis designed was to identify the non-effectiveness of the Structural method of teaching vocabulary to bring a significant effect on learners' academic achievement. Since the results of the control group increase by 1.22 on average and 1.14 in the mean difference in the post-test scores, the structural vocabulary has very small significance on Learner's academic achievement.

The last null hypothesis designed was to identify the more effectiveness of the Contextual method of teaching vocabulary than the structural vocabulary teaching vocabulary method. Since the results of the experimental group (those taught by contextual vocabulary teaching method) increase by 8.31 on average and 8.37 by mean difference, the Contextual method of teaching vocabulary more effective than the structural vocabulary teaching vocabulary method.

## 8. Recommendations

Based on the conclusions made of this study the following recommendations are given in this study as follows:

Instruction in vocabulary involves far more than looking up words in a dictionary and using the words in a sentence. Word-learning strategies include dictionary use, morphemic analysis, and contextual analysis. The morphemic analysis is the process of deriving a word's meaning by analyzing its meaningful parts, or morphemes. Such word parts include root words, prefixes, and suffixes. The contextual analysis involves inferring the meaning of an unfamiliar word by scrutinizing the text surrounding it. Instruction in contextual analysis generally involves teaching students to employ both generic and specific types of context clues.

- Therefore, since both the structural and contextual vocabulary teaching methods are very important to teach vocabulary the enough contents of contextual and structural vocabularies should be taught through these methods to increase the vocabulary power of students.
- The structural vocabulary teaching method should be implemented in teaching to make this method equally effective with contextual vocabulary teaching method.
- The with text vocabulary meaning analysis can be achieved through the contextual vocabulary teaching in which clues that leads to the meaning have been identified and used as the leading direction to the meaning that we have addressed to tell the meaning of the given words.
- Therefore, contextual vocabulary teaching method should be used in advance to teach vocabulary.

## Acknowledgements

Above all, I commend my Almighty God on his throne for his indescribable help from my birth till today. Next, I am greatly indebted to several people who have contributed to the completion of this study in one way or another. First, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my principal research advisor Andinet Shimelis (Ph.D.), and co-advisor Daniel Taye (Ph.D.) for their invaluable professional assistance, constructive comments, and unreserved guidance throughout the course of the study.

I would like to extend my acknowledgment to Desalegn (the principal of Gembe Preparatory School) for his kindness to cooperate and to organize the participants of this study through offering his advice and to all grade 11th selected students those who had involved in the pretest, attending lessons and sat for the post-test without reluctance as well as to those who help me during my study in the university in one another.

## References

1. Alberta Education, (2012). *Inspiring Action on Education*. (<https://ideas.education.alberta.ca/>). Retrieved in April , 2016.
2. Allen, M. J., and Yen ,W.M., (1979). *Introduction to measurement theory*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
3. Armbruster, B., Lehr,F., and Osborn,J. (2001). *Put reading first: The research building blocks for teaching children to read*. Jessup, MD: National Institute for Literacy.
4. Biemiller, A., and Slonim, N. (2001). Estimating root word vocabulary growth in normative and Advantaged populations: Evidence for a common sequence of vocabulary acquisition. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93, 498-520.
5. Celce- Murcia, M. (1988). *Techniques and Resources in Teaching Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press..
6. Coady, J. (1987) *Research on ESL/EFL Vocabulary Acquisition: Putting it in Context*. New York: Oxford University Press
7. Cohen,R.J.,andSwerdlik,M.E.,(2005). *Introduction to tests and measurements*(6<sup>th</sup> ed.)New York: McGraw.Hill
8. Cohen,A. (2003). *Strategy training for second language learners*. Eric Digest. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
9. Cronbach,.L. (1951). *Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests*. *Psychometrika* ,31 ,93-96
10. Harmer , (1991). *The practice of English language teaching*. United Kingdom: Longman.
11. Herrel.A.L.(2004). *Fifty strategies for teaching English language learners*. An ESL Teacher's Tool Kit. 2<sup>nd</sup>ed. Canada. Penguin publisher.
12. Hatch,E and Brown, c.(1995) . *Vocabulary, semantic and language education* .Cambridge Cambridge University Press.

13. Krashen ,S.(1998).*TPR:Still a very good idea.System*,5(4),82-85.
- Laufer,B.(1997).*The lexical plight in second language reading. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*
14. Lewis,M. (1993).*The LexicalApproach:TheStateofELTandaWayForward.*
15. Macaro,M. ( 2003). *Teaching and Learning Second Language. New York: Continuum.*
16. McCarten ,J. (2007).*Teaching vocabulary lesson from the corpus for the classroom(1<sup>st</sup> ed.).New York: Cambridge University Press.*
- 17 Meara, P. (1980). *Vocabulary acquisition: A neglected aspect of language teaching and Learning. Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts: 221-246.*
18. Muzmoto, A. and Takeuchi,O. (2009).*Examining the effectiveness of explicitly instruction of Vocabulary learning strategies with Japanese EFL University student's language teaching research*13 (4) ,425-449.
19. Nation, S.P.,(2001).*Learning vocabulary in another language .Cambridge :Cambridge University Press*
20. Nelson, J.R.,and Stage, S.A., (2007).*Fostering the development of vocabulary knowledge and Reading comprehension through contextually-based multiple meaning vocabulary Instruction.*
21. Nunan,D. (1989) .*Design task for the communicative classroom. Cambridge: Cambridg University Press.*
22. Ruply,W.H., Logan ,J.W,& Nichols ,W.D., (1998/99).*Vocabulary instructions a balanced reading Program. The reading teacher, 52(4).336-347.*
23. Taylor.(1990).*Teaching and learning vocabulary.herefordshire:prentice Hall International.*
24. Thornbury, S.(2002) . *How to teach vocabulary, Longman.*
25. Walter,J.M., (2004).*Teaching the use of context to infer meaning: A longitudinal survey of L1 and L2 vocabulary research: Language Teaching,37(4),pp.243-252.*
26. Weatherford,H.J., (1990). *Techniques for learning vocabulary. New York: Oxford University Press*
27. Zimmerman, C.B.,(1997). *Does reading and interactive vocabulary instruction make a Difference? An empirical study .TESOL quarterly, 31, 1, pp.121-140*