

# Assessing The Effectiveness of Grammar Instruction Methods on Enhancing Students' Writing Skills

Eno Choudup Panlook, Research Scholar, Dept. of English, Mewar University Gangrar  
Dr. Laxman Gnawali, Professor, Dept. of English, Mewar University Gangrar

## Abstract

This study investigates what grammar instruction means for auxiliary school understudies' abilities to write. Activity review, led in a Sudanese optional school during the 2017 scholastic year, filled in as the review's establishment. Members were second-year understudies. They invested a similar measure of energy studying English six years. The objective of the review was to determine whether of the two methodologies teaching grammar in "context" or "isolation" is better for helping English language students produce sythesis liberated from syntactic blunders. Two groups of understudies were framed: the control group and the experimental group. Members in the two groups took a writing-just pretest with the end goal of high estimation. The outcomes exhibited that there was no genuinely massive contrast between the experimental and control groups in the pretest, with the T-test P-esteem (0.536) being greater than the huge edge (0.05). The analysis was then directed, instructing the two groups in differing ways. Grammar was shown in isolation to the control group and in context to the experimental group. The two groups took a similar writing test toward the finish of their two-month course of instruction. The findings showed that the T-test's P-esteem (0.000) was not exactly the critical edge (0.05), indicating that the experimental and control groups in the posttest contrasted genuinely. The outcomes exhibited that teaching grammar "in context" further develops understudy writing more than teaching grammar "in isolation."

**Keywords:** Control Group; Experimental Group; Grammar in Isolation; Grammar in Context; Writing

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Policymakers, educators, academics, and even students themselves have been troubled by the topic of whether teaching grammar helps young people develop their writing skills for more than a century. For kids in England who have been subjected to a style of instruction that past evaluations and primary study have indicated is unproductive, the ghosts are real. It is intriguing that, despite the evidence, the belief in teaching formal grammar has endured. It is possible that there is an erroneous assumption that a linguistic framework portrayal, similar to sentence grammar, can be changed into teaching methods and course readings that would, one expectation, aid the writing advancement of youth. Opinions remain divided despite extensive study on the issue; some educators, journalists, and members of the general public hold the belief that this type of education is effective, while others disagree.

In 2004, the English Survey Group at the College of York and the Proof for Strategy and Practice Information and Coordinating Center (EPPI-Center) looked to respond to the following inquiry: "What is the impact of grammar teaching in English on 5-16-year-olds' exactness and quality in composed structure?" by conducting a deliberate survey. This was accomplished with two goals: first, to order a far-reaching survey of the writing on the impacts of grammar instruction on writing for English-speaking understudies matured 5 to 16; and second, to examine top to bottom two parts of the field: formal instruction in sentence grammar and linguistic structure and the teaching of a procedure called "sentence-combining" in the US. Here we offer the findings from those two complete surveys. Language reflection and conversation ought to begin sooner than was recently remembered to be plausible or attractive, according to the Branch of Instruction and English policymakers, who have had this point of view since the arrival of the Kingman Report. They likewise accept that teaching grammar to youthful ESL understudies is advantageous, as it will work on their composed English and their ability for talk. To begin, it is vital to feature that few examinations directed in the 20th century challenge this kind of thinking. According to Perera, there would probably be more damage than benefit on the off chance that students were educated decontextualized grammar in a vacuum, aside from their other language exercises. She couldn't help suspecting that youngsters were more baffled than edified by complex linguistic terms.

Grammar can possibly be a valuable instrument for examination and portrayal, however as

Wilkinson points out, "different cases made for it are virtually all without establishment." Past investigations have shown that teaching kids formal, conventional (i.e., non-groundbreaking) grammar doesn't work on their writing, doesn't further develop their structure abilities, doesn't assist them with fixing their own slip-ups in use, is frequently educated to youngsters who aren't sufficiently experienced or shrewd enough to get a handle on it, and may try and hinder their English language improvement. A new basic survey of the experimental proof on grammar training gave an outline of study investigations completed in English-speaking countries. "Teaching grammar (using a scope of models) affects improving optional understudies' writing," the survey's outcomes states.

The Bullock Report, which accentuated the need of reading, writing, speaking, and listening to fabricate language skill, influenced English approach and practice in the 1970s and 1980s. Many individuals had the perspective that educators ought to have broad training in syntactic construction so they could figure out their understudies' writing issues and give viable arrangements. A book and DVD called Grammar for Writing were given by the Public Education Methodology in 2002 for understudies matured 7-11 in Britain and Ribs. The program originally endured from 1997 to 2002, then in 2002 it was reached out to understudies matured 11-14. "All students have broad linguistic information" and that grammar-centered training helps with making this information clear. This is the underlying reason of this new methodology. These kinds of expressness, as expressed in the book and video, give youthful authors "the scope of decisions open to them when they compose," which prompts better writing. The significant spotlight is on helping understudies upgrade their sentence-forming capacities while additionally drawing regard for the distinctions among composed and spoken grammars. A focal topic of the book is composing second instruction, or what Britton called "shaping at the point of expression" in the context of schooling.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

**Huang, et al. (2020)** analyzed that in a 16-week time for testing at a four-year Chinese institution, the point of this contextual analysis was to examine the viability of Grammarly in EFL writing. In all out, 43 sophomores majoring in English participated in the review. Grammarly was utilized to evaluate understudies' writing skills and their opinions of the application using a pre-, post-, and poll. According to recorded pieces of feedback, the understudies were content with the artificial intelligence-based writing assessment instrument, and their writing abilities worked on impressively throughout the span of the 16-week intervention. This shows that using Grammarly in writing illustrations is a valuable procedure for helping EFL understudies further develop their abilities to write and let educators free from a portion of their teaching liabilities.

**Suastra et al. (2020)** explored that this study means to examine the utilization of execution assessment in teaching language abilities and the mental angles that influence its adequacy. The review involved 28 Udayana College English office understudies, who partook through interviews, polls, and writing rubrics. The outcomes showed an improvement in understudies' writing skills, interest and mindfulness, confidence, and inspiration. The review's findings recommend that experts ought to involve execution assessment to assist understudies with becoming capable scholars in English. The outcomes showed a mean post-test consequence of 78, with an increase in interest and mindfulness at 92.85%, confidence at 85.71%, and inspiration at 78.57%. The review recommends that experts ought to consider the motivation behind homeroom appraisals while evaluating understudies' language abilities.

**Pham, V. P. H. (2022)** examined that A semi experimental review looked at the impacts of errand-based instruction (TBI) and show, practice, creation (PPP) on understudies' syntactic capability. The investigation discovered that while TBI didn't beat PPP teaching, it essentially influenced understudies' syntactic accomplishments in speaking and writing. The outcomes propose that language educators ought to embrace the TBI model as it gives various open doors to language practice in grammar classes and urges understudies to take part in class exercises. This study features the significance of understanding the effect of TBI on understudies' linguistic capacities and recommends that it very well may be an important instrument for improving understudies' syntactic abilities.

**Geng, J., & Razali, A. B. (2022)** examined that the Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) software is increasingly popular in ESL/EFL writing education due to its instant automated scoring system and real-time diagnostic corrective feedback. However, there is limited study on how AWE can affect students' writing in a real classroom setting and how to best utilize it to improve their abilities, especially for undergraduate ESL/EFL students. This study reviews existing literature on the efficacy of automated feedback, focusing on eleven publications published over the last five years. The review reveals gaps in prior literature, such as the absence of a delayed post-test design, writing performance traits, and students' strategies for using the AWE program. The study concludes by examining the long-term internalized effects of advanced teaching strategies and the embedded use of automated feedback on students' analytic writing scores and overall writing performance.

**Bhavani, C. H., & Shankar, B. (2021)** examined that This study aimed to examine the impact of direct grammar teaching on students' writing abilities. Two fifth-grade instructors and 18 fifth-grade students participated, receiving weekly one-on-one coaching in grammar. The study found that half of the participants' total writing scores significantly increased after four months of direct grammar training. The study suggests that when study-based techniques like grammar teaching are included in writing training, students can make progress towards improving their writing. The study also examined the writing issues faced by primary school students in English and provided advice on how to raise their proficiency. The findings revealed that students struggle with creating English paragraphs that follow grammar rules, with limited vocabulary, poor grammar and syntax mastery, tenses dependency, lack of original ideas, writing anxiety, and a deficient structural organization being the primary causes.

**TAABLI, F. Z. (2021)** developed that the study suggests that peer evaluation can improve grammatical accuracy in English as a second language (EFL) student. Despite regular teaching of grammar rules, master English students at Biskra University struggled to apply these rules correctly in their writing, affecting syntactic categories. The study used a non-probability purposive sampling strategy and an explanatory sequential mixed method approach to gather data. The study found that the use of syntactic categories improved after peer assessment sessions, with a tremendous contrast between pre-test and post-test implies scores. The primary challenges faced by EFL students included incorrect use of punctuation, conjunctions, capitalization, pronouns, tenses, study, and adverbs. The participants expressed positive views on the use of peer evaluation and its usefulness.

### 3. IMPLICATIONS FOR STUDENTS' WRITING ABILITIES OF DIRECT GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION

Improving students' writing and speaking skills involves teaching grammar. Direct grammar education was the focus of this investigation into the effects on students' writing abilities. Taken together, the study included 18 fifth graders and 2 fifth grade teachers. A student's pre-assessment writing score on Write Score was used to inform the administration of direct grammar instruction with the goal of correcting common writing errors. Grammar tutoring is provided weekly to each student for nearly four months. After the four months were over, students were given a writing post-test to reflect on their progress. Half of the participants showed a statistically significant improvement in their overall writing scores after four months of receiving direct grammar instruction, the study found. The results show that students may improve their writing skills when writing instruction incorporates study-based methods, such as grammar instruction. In order to improve their students' writing overall, teachers should get more training in study-based writing strategies.

Students' writing abilities are greatly improved by direct grammar teaching, which gives them experience and clear awareness of language rules. According to study, children who get targeted grammar training improve their comprehension of sentence structure, punctuation, and the usage of parts of speech—all of which are essential elements of well-written work. This method encourages pupils to feel more confident in their writing skills while also assisting them in recognising and fixing their grammatical problems. Students frequently write texts that are clearer, more cohesive, and interesting when they use these grammatical rules in their works. Furthermore, direct grammar education may be customised to fit each student's unique

needs, enabling varied learning opportunities that tackle specific difficulties. Teachers can promote a more all-encompassing strategy for raising students' overall writing competency by including grammar education within the larger framework of writing practice. In the end, direct grammar education is a useful tactic for enhancing writing abilities and encouraging success in the classroom in a variety of subject areas.

#### 4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Since the exact review is more valuable, the review followed it. For the review, 52 understudies who gave their consent to partake were picked. The young ladies, who went in age from 16 to 17, had all required English classes for similar number of years. There were two groups of respondents: the experimental group and the control group. The trial was directed with the students effectively participating in it. The indistinguishable grammar-learning materials were given to understudies in the experimental and control groups. Grammar in context was educated to the experimental group of understudies, though grammar in isolation was educated to the control group.

##### 4.1. Procedure

The specialist, first and foremost, distinguished the region of the review and the dangerous issue; i.e., writing and grammar teaching. Then, a test was utilized to gather data. In this pre-test all understudies in the two groups were requested to compose three texts not in excess of 100 words in everyone. The points were including graphic what's more, account writing. The understudies' writing papers were gathered. Then the analyst started teaching the illustrations. Following multi month's instructions, the two groups were given a similar post-test. Signs of the two tests (pre-and post-tests) were examined and looked at.

#### 5. Result & Discussion

##### 5.1. Results of Pre-test

**Table 1: Probability distribution of the pupils' pre-tests**

GROUP	LEVEL			
	EXCELLENT	V. GOOD	GOOD	POOR
Experimental	2	1	4	25
Control	1	2	2	21

This table compares the two groups' performance: the experimental group and the control group. The four categories: excellent, very good, good, and poor. Of the 25 participants in the experimental group, 25 are categorized as Poor, while just 2 are Excellent, 1 Very Good, and 4 Good. Comparably, the majority of individuals (21 in the control group) are categorized as Poor, with 1 earning Excellent, 2 Very Good, and 2 Good. The majority of ratings in both groups are Poor, with the experimental group having a little better distribution at the Excellent and Good levels.

##### 5.2. Post-test Results

**Table 2: Frequency distribution of the students' post- test.**

GROUP	LEVEL			
	EXCELLENT	V. GOOD	GOOD	POOR
Experimental	2	15	8	5
Control	1	5	4	21

The table compares the Experimental and Control groups' performance on a scale from Excellent to Very Good too Good to Poor. Eight people were rated as Good, two were rated as Poor, and two were rated as Excellent in the experimental group. Among the control group, one was deemed exceptional, five were deemed very good, four were deemed decent, and a far higher number—21—was deemed bad. With more people in better categories and fewer in the worst, the Experimental group clearly outperformed the Control group.

**Table 3: Results of pre- and post-tests comparing the two groups**

Test	Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	T-value	P-value
Pre-test	Experimental	1.95	1.222	-0.353	0.536
	Control	2.22	1.153		
Pro-test	Experimental	5.56	1.306	3.111	0.005
	Control	3.65	1.522		



The table compares the pre- and post-test scores of two groups: one that is experimental and another that is control. With a T-value of -0.353 and a P-value of 0.536, the two groups were not significantly different before the intervention. The experimental group had a mean score of 1.95 (SD = 1.222) while the control group had a mean score of 2.22 (SD = 1.153). A post-test T-value of 3.111 and a P-value of 0.005 show that the experimental group was statistically substantially better than the control group. The experimental group showed considerable improvement, with a mean score of 5.56 (SD = 1.306).

## 6. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to identify any correlation between specific tactics for teaching grammar and students' ability to write essays that conform to accepted grammatical standards. A total of two groups were formed: one to conduct experiments and another to serve as a control. The effectiveness of teaching grammar in context was evaluated by pre- and post-tests. Comparing teaching grammar in isolation with teaching grammar in context, the results demonstrated a considerable difference. There is a correlation between imparting grammatical rules in isolation and subpar writing accuracy, and teaching grammar as a set of rules is inadequate for generating works free of errors. As a result of using the "in context" strategy, students improve their writing by gaining a deeper grasp of grammar and turning in more polished, error-free pieces. The following are the suggestions made in the study: Grammar taught in context is useful because it allows students to practise using the language in its proper context. The most effective method of teaching grammar is not to build on students' knowledge by focusing on specific phrases or exercises.

## References

1. Musa, F. M. (2021). *The effect of grammar teaching methods on students' writing skill. International Journal Online of Humanities*, 7(4), 27-39.
2. Huang, H. W., Li, Z., & Taylor, L. (2020, May). *The effectiveness of using grammarly to improve students' writing skills. In Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Distance Education and Learning* (pp. 122-127).
3. Suastra, I., & Menggo, S. (2020). *Empowering Students' Writing Skill through Performance Assessment. International Journal of Language Education*, 4(3), 432-441.
4. Parra G, L., & Calero S, X. (2019). *Automated writing evaluation tools in the improvement of the writing skill. International Journal of Instruction*, 12(2), 209-226.
5. Javed, M., Juan, W. X., & Nazli, S. (2013). *A study of students' assessment in writing skills of the English language. International journal of instruction*, 6(2).
6. Pham, V. P. H. (2022). *The impacts of task-based instruction on students' grammatical performances in speaking and writing skills: A quasi-experimental study. Pham, VPH, & Do, TH (2021). The Impacts of Task-based Instruction on Students' Grammatical Performances in Speaking and Writing Skills: A quasi-experimental study. International Journal of Instruction*, 14(2), 969-986.
7. Geng, J., & Razali, A. B. (2022). *Effectiveness of the Automated Writing Evaluation Program on Improving Undergraduates' Writing Performance. English Language Teaching*, 15(7), 49-60.
8. Bhavani, C. H., & Shankar, B. (2021). *A Study on Impact of Grammatical on English Written Skills. Journal of Engineering Sciences*, 14(01).
9. TAABLI, F. Z. (2021). *Investigating the Effect of Using Peer Assessment Strategy on EFL Learners Grammatical Accuracy in Writing: The Case of Master Students of English at Biskra University*.
10. Mauludin, L. A., Ardianti, T. M., Prasetyo, G., Sefrina, L. R., & Astuti, A. P. (2021). *Enhancing Students' Genre Writing Skills in an English for Specific Purposes Class: A Dynamic Assessment Approach. Mextesol Journal*, 45(3), n3.
11. Malkawi, N., Awajan, N. W., Alghazo, K. M., & Harafsheh, H. A. (2021). *The Effectiveness of Using Student-Created Questions for Assessing Their Performance in English Grammar/Case Study of "King Abdullah II Schools for Excellence" In Jordan. World*, 13(5).

12. Waer, H. (2021). *The effect of integrating automated writing evaluation on EFL writing apprehension and grammatical knowledge. Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 17(1), 47-71.
13. Movahedi, N., & Aghajanzadeh Kiasi, G. (2021). *The effect of teacher vs. learner-assessment activities on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing ability. International Journal of Research in English Education*, 6(1), 49-63.
14. Kim, Y. S. G., Yang, D., Reyes, M., & Connor, C. (2021). *Writing instruction improves students' writing skills differentially depending on focal instruction and children: A meta-analysis for primary grade students. Educational Research Review*, 34, 100408.
15. Yulianawati, I., Saleh, M., Mujiyanto, J., & Sutopo, D. (2022). *The effectiveness of writing techniques in improving students' writing ability with different self-esteem. Studies in English Language and Education*, 9(1), 30-44.

