

Grammar Skills as Predictors in Writing Composition among College Freshmen Students

Marlon S. Pontillas, Ph.D.¹, Marietta A. Tataro, Ph.D.², Maria Teresa V. Septimo, Ed.D.³, Nicky Gem M. Rivera, LPT⁴, Elbert O. Baeta, LPT⁵, Nel B. Buena, MLL⁶, Kevin Sean S. Rada, MAEd⁷

Abstract

This study aimed to elucidate the factors affecting grammar proficiency and writing composition skills among English language learners of Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges, Camarines Sur, Philippines. Grounded in a comprehensive linguistic framework, it incorporated cognitive and instructional theories to analyze the impact of individual differences on language acquisition. The objective was to identify specific grammatical areas that pose challenges to learners and to understand how personal factors such as cognitive abilities, learning styles, linguistic background, and motivation influence grammar and writing skill development. Applying quantitative methods, the study assessed 50 participants' proficiency across various grammar and writing rubrics. Significant results emerged from the regression analyses, revealing that learners better understand areas such as possessive forms of nouns and pronoun-antecedent agreement compared to conjunctions and verb tenses. In writing composition, learners demonstrated a range of skills, with most showing promise yet needing to improve at advanced proficiency levels. The study's regression models explained a substantive variance in writing skills, with certain grammatical constructs identified as significant predictors of writing quality. Based on these findings, the study recommends targeted grammar instruction focusing on identified weak areas. It also advocates for the development of a multifaceted course designed to address the diverse learning needs revealed through participants' experiences. Future research is encouraged to explore the cognitive aspects of grammar learning, the role of bilingualism, and the efficacy of motivational strategies in language instruction.

Keywords: Bilingualism; Educational Intervention; Grammar Proficiency; Language Acquisition; Writing Composition

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

The proficiency of first-year college students in English, particularly in grammar and writing composition, is critical for their academic success. This competency affects not only their performance in coursework but also their ability to communicate and interact effectively within the academic environment. As they transition from secondary to higher education, the evaluation of these essential language skills becomes crucial to determine their readiness for the challenges of college-level academics.

¹Associate Professor IV/ Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges, Camarines Sur, Philippines, Email: arlpontillas@cspc.edu.ph

²Associate Professor V, Email: mariettatataro@cspc.edu.ph

³Associate Professor III, Email: mtseptimo@cspc.edu.ph

⁴Instructor I, Email: ngrivera@cspc.edu.ph

⁵Instructor I, Email: ebaeta@cspc.edu.ph

⁶Instructor II, Email: nelbuena@cspc.edu.ph

⁷Instructor I, Email: ksrada@cspc.edu.ph

International assessments highlight that the Philippines faces significant challenges in language literacy. For instance, recent reports indicate that the country ranks lower than many of its regional counterparts in global language proficiency indexes. This underscores the importance of addressing language education at the foundational level, particularly for incoming college students.

Cumming (2016) emphasizes that writing assessment is an indispensable component of global language proficiency testing, reflecting its critical role in overall language competence. Similarly, Yigzaw (2013) highlights the intrinsic connection between grammar proficiency and broader writing skills, stressing the need for a solid grammatical foundation as a pillar for effective written communication.

In the Philippine educational context, language proficiency remains a significant concern. Santos et al. (2022) reveal that while many college students demonstrate a basic understanding of grammar, there is a notable disparity in their ability to apply these skills effectively in written composition. This discrepancy indicates a deeper issue that warrants a comprehensive analysis of the language proficiency of first-year college students.

This study aims to critically assess the grammar and writing abilities of first-year students at Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges. By employing both quantitative and qualitative methodologies, including language proficiency tests, writing assessments, surveys, and interviews, this research seeks to provide a detailed understanding of the specific strengths and weaknesses in students' language skills.

The significance of this study lies in its potential to inform targeted interventions and pedagogical strategies that can address identified gaps in language competence. Rather than merely identifying deficiencies, the research aims to contribute to the development of educational practices that enhance students' grammar and writing skills, ultimately improving their academic performance and communication abilities.

The linguistic landscape of the Philippines, characterized by bilingualism, presents additional challenges to language proficiency. The interaction between English and Filipino as official languages can influence students' writing, particularly their grammar and composition abilities. This study will explore how this language interplay affects students' written expression and navigates the complexities of bilingual education.

Sociocultural factors also play a crucial role in shaping language proficiency. Variables such as the use of English or Filipino at home, socio-economic status, and access to quality education significantly impact language acquisition. Understanding these factors is essential for developing a comprehensive approach to improving language proficiency among first-year college students.

The theoretical framework of this study is grounded in Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of language development and Long's interactionist perspective. Vygotsky's theory emphasizes the importance of social interactions in language learning, while Long's perspective focuses on the role of effective communication in acquiring language skills. This framework supports the study's focus on integrating grammar proficiency with practical writing skills, aiming to enhance clarity, coherence, and overall quality in students' written compositions.

This research extends beyond academic evaluation, aiming to influence curriculum development, teaching methodologies, and language education reform. The findings are expected to inform strategies for enhancing language competency among first-year college students, providing insights that could lead to curriculum revisions, the inclusion of rule-based writing exercises, and opportunities for teacher training to improve instructional techniques.

Ultimately, this study seeks to uncover the complexities of linguistic competence in the institutional environment and provide a foundation for improving language teaching and student achievement in academic writing across state colleges in the Philippines.

1.2 Literature Review

The academic success of first-year college students is closely tied to their proficiency in language, particularly in grammar and writing. Cumming (2016) underscores the importance of writing assessment as a fundamental component of language proficiency tests, arguing that these skills are critical for academic achievement. Yigzaw (2013) adds that a strong foundation in grammar is essential for coherent academic writing, as it underpins the clarity and precision necessary for effective communication in a college environment.

Despite the recognized importance of grammar and writing skills, there is a persistent gap between students' grammatical knowledge and their ability to apply this knowledge in writing. Santos et al. (2022) highlight this discrepancy within the Philippine education system, where students often demonstrate an understanding of

grammatical rules that do not translate into their writing proficiency. This observation aligns with the findings of Reyes and Santos (2017), who noted similar challenges in the language skills of Filipino students, indicating a broader issue that extends beyond the mastery of grammatical rules to their practical application in academic writing.

The linguistic landscape of the Philippines, characterized by bilingualism, adds another layer of complexity to this issue. Maawa and Cruz (2019) discuss how the interaction between English and Filipino in an educational setting influences students' writing abilities, particularly their command of grammar. This bilingual context can lead to unique challenges in language acquisition, as noted by Mammadova (2023), who emphasizes the role of sociocultural factors, such as socio-economic status and educational background, in shaping language proficiency.

Methodologically, there is a divergence in the approaches to assessing language proficiency. Alish (2022) advocates for the use of quantitative tools to measure grammar knowledge, while Budiarta and Vanessa (2021) argue for the inclusion of qualitative methodologies to understand better how students apply grammatical rules in writing. However, as Ghafournia (2015) points out, current language proficiency tests often fail to capture the full spectrum of grammar and writing skills, focusing narrowly on isolated grammatical aspects rather than the holistic integration of these skills in writing tasks.

A critical issue identified by Karagoz and Bangun (2023) is the disconnect between the format of language proficiency assessments and the real-world writing tasks that students encounter in academic settings. This gap suggests that existing assessments may not adequately prepare students for the demands of college-level writing, particularly in their first year. Moreover, there is a lack of theoretical frameworks that bridge the gap between grammatical competence and the practical use of grammar in writing, which is crucial for academic success.

The literature reveals a need for a more integrated approach to assessing grammar and writing proficiency. Current assessments often fail to consider higher-order writing skills, such as cohesion, structure, argumentation, and critical thinking, which are essential for academic writing. There is a scarcity of studies that combine quantitative assessments of grammar with qualitative evaluations of writing, which would provide a more comprehensive understanding of students' language proficiency.

Furthermore, existing theories primarily focus on grammatical knowledge without adequately addressing how this knowledge is translated into meaningful written expression in academic contexts. There is a clear theoretical gap in understanding the relationship between grammar competence and the quality of written work, particularly in the context of first-year college students.

To address these gaps, future research should adopt a mixed-methods approach that integrates quantitative measures of grammar proficiency with qualitative analyses of writing performance. This approach would provide a more nuanced understanding of how students apply grammatical rules in their writing and identify specific areas where interventions are needed. Additionally, a longitudinal study that tracks students' language proficiency over their first year in college would offer valuable insights into the development of grammar and writing skills over time.

In conclusion, the assessment of grammar and writing skills among first-year college students in the Philippines requires a more comprehensive approach that considers both the theoretical and methodological challenges identified in the literature. By addressing these gaps, researchers can develop more effective strategies for improving language proficiency and academic writing among college students, ultimately contributing to their academic success.

1.3 Research Questions:

1. What is the level of grammar skills of the participants along:
 - a. Usage of conjunctions
 - b. Usage of prepositions
 - c. Usage of adverbs
 - d. Usage of adjectives
 - e. Possessive forms of nouns
 - f. Tenses of the verb
 - g. Pronoun-antecedent

- h. Subject-verb agreement
2. What is the level of writing composition skills of the participants along:
 - a. Argumentative writing
 - b. Descriptive writing
 - c. Expository writing
 - d. Technical writing
 3. Is there a significant relationship between the participants' level of grammar and writing composition skills?
 4. What personal factors affect the participants' grammar and writing composition skills?
 5. What additional course can be developed based on the study's results?

2. Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study used a descriptive correlational research design to investigate the interrelationships between grammar proficiency and writing composition skills involving first-year college students in Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges. Specifically, by adopting this design for the study, the researchers explored the relationships between the dependent and independent variables without artificially manipulating the level of grammar and writing competency in the student population (Curtis et al., 2016). This approach enables a detailed investigation of how instructional strategies could align with developing grammatical skills and composition writing competency in this particular setting.

2.2 Participants

This study targeted fifty (50) respondents from five colleges within Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges (CSPC). The respondents were selected using purposive sampling, a non-probability sampling technique chosen to ensure that the participants represented a diverse range of perspectives and experiences relevant to the study's objectives.

The basis for selecting 50 respondents was determined by the need to gather a comprehensive understanding of grammar proficiency and writing composition skills across different academic disciplines at CSPC. The sample size was deemed sufficient to provide meaningful insights while allowing for manageable data collection and analysis within the scope of the study.

Purposive sampling was employed strategically to include students who were most likely to provide in-depth information about the grammar and writing challenges faced by first-year college students. Participants were deliberately chosen from various fields of study across the five colleges, ensuring that the sample reflected a wide array of academic backgrounds. This method was chosen because it allowed the researcher to focus on individuals who had relevant experience and knowledge in the areas of grammar proficiency and writing composition, which were central to the study.

By selecting students from different colleges within CSPC, the study aimed to encompass a broad perspective on language proficiency, capturing variations in grammar and writing skills across disciplines. This approach ensured that the findings would be representative of the general student population at CSPC, providing insights that could inform strategies for improving language proficiency among first-year students.

The deliberate and systematic selection process aimed to ensure that the participants were well-suited to contribute to the study's objectives, enhancing the reliability and validity of the research findings.

2.3 Data Gathering Procedure

2.3.1 Quantitative Data Collection

This quantitative evaluation involved an extensive teacher-made test in which 120 items were created that comprehensively covered different aspects of grammar in English such as conjunctions, prepositions, adverbs, adjectives in possessive forms, verb tenses, pronoun-antecedent. This was an all-comprehensive test that focused on

students' capacity to use various grammatical rules in practice. The highly complex test design enabled the examination of the students' proficiency in multiple areas of grammar. The Cronbach Alpha of the test's coefficient indicates that it has a reliability value of 0.92, which is an excellent sign in supporting the dependability and robustness of the assessment in gauging various grammar concepts' understanding by students.

Additionally, three English teachers acted as validators, ensuring the trustworthiness of the assessment. Experienced professionals participated in this appraisal, securing the test material validity alongside conventional grammar rules. Having been vetted by each validator, a professional English teacher, the test proved accurate, relevant to the first-year students' curriculum, and adequate for evaluating their grammar competency. The members' cumulative insights and contributions reinforced the test's accuracy and validity and strengthened its effectiveness in assessing students' understanding and use of different grammar ideas. Table 1 illustrates the varying levels of grammar proficiency among students in a 120-item test.

Table 1: Levels of Grammar Proficiency

Levels	Scores
Advanced	97-120
Proficient	73-96
Approaching Proficiency	49-72
Developing	25-48
Beginning	0-24

Furthermore, a meticulously crafted rubric assessed participants' writing composition skills along with argumentative, descriptive, expository, and technical writing. The rubric used to assess proficiency for each genre contained separate indicators for the most salient elements of competent writing in each genre. Such examples in argumentative writing include the markers on thesis clarity, evidence inclusion, addressing opposing views, and conclusion. Sensory details were applied, linguistic imagery was utilized, structural organization was established, and emotional effects in descriptive writing were scored. Clarity, examples use, transitions use, and conclusiveness in expository writing indicators. Technical writing evaluation included precision, technical terminology, formatting, and organization. The following descriptors represent a proficiency scale used to assess the students' writing skills: 5 = Excellent, 4 = Very Good, 3 = Good, 2 = Fair, and 1 = Poor. Table 2 illustrates students' varying levels of writing skills based on their scores.

Table 2: Levels of Writing Skills

Levels	Scores
Advanced	17-20
Proficient	13-16
Approaching Proficiency	9-12
Developing	5-8
Beginning	0-4

An external assessor who is an experienced expert in English Language Studies and writing assessment was recruited to perform unbiased and thorough appraisals. The assessor has profound skills in academic teaching, professional writing, and language assessment. The assessor scrutinized and scored the participant's writing compositions concerning the parameters outlined in the rubric, considering different aspects of writing competency in distinct genres.

2.3.2 Qualitative Data Collection

The high-level 92% consensus between the three intercoders in the qualitative data analysis demonstrates the rigorousness and painstakingness of examining and extrapolating the research information. This study featured experienced intercoders with impressive backgrounds, including Masters of Arts in English and published qualitative research papers. Their scholarship in qualitative analysis is based on their superior academic performances,

symbolizing professionalism in research and scholarship. Together, they have educational backgrounds and have published articles on qualitative research. This proves their knowledge and competence concerning handling information. Such intercoders, qualified with advanced degrees and published scholarly work, provide extensive experience and scholarly scrutiny to the analysis. Such qualitative data is evaluated exhaustively, systematically, and meticulously.

The amount of agreement obtained at this remarkably high level serves as a symbol of reliability and consistency in the coding procedure, ensuring that the interpretation of the perception of grammar competence and writing skills among first-year college students is understood similarly by different people.

Achieving such a high agreement percentage is an example of intercoder reliability. Intercoder reliability suggests that the analysts could understand what was happening and share interpretations. This means a high level of coding implies carefully matching recurring themes, key patterns, and critical ideas in the qualitative data. Additionally, rigorous and shared deliberations, revisions, and mutual agreement to build up credibility and internal validity ensure that the qualitative analysis was free from subjectivity bias and that the findings were sound.

In addition, a high rate of 92% agreement among the intercoders indicates the consistent interpretation approach adopted and the diligence and scholarly commitment exhibited during the coding process. This substantial degree of agreement is due to their collective endeavor and commitment to painstakingly revising and reconciling versions. This consensus-driven approach strengthens the authenticity and solidity of qualitative results on the complex language skills and writing capability milieu among college first-year students.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Participants' Level of Grammar Proficiency

Table 3 presents the grammar proficiency across various areas among 50 participants, showing a detailed breakdown by frequency and percentage of participants at different proficiency levels (Beginning, Developing, Approaching Proficiency, Proficient, Advanced). Descriptive statistics include mean scores and standard deviations for each grammatical area, ranging from usage of conjunctions to overall grammar score. Notably, areas such as "Possessive Forms of Nouns" and "Pronoun-Antecedent Agreement" display a higher level of proficiency compared to others like "Usage of Conjunctions" and "Tenses of the Verb."

Table 3: Levels of Grammar Proficiency of the Participants

Areas	Levels of Grammar Proficiency										Descriptive Statistics			Interpretation	
	B		D		AP		P		A		Size	Mean	SD	Rank	VI
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.					
Usage of Conjunctions ¹	0	0.00	19	38.00	29	58.00	2	4.00	0	0.00	50	6.90	1.45	6	D
Usage of Prepositions ¹	3	6.00	34	68.00	13	26.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	50	5.60	1.41	8	D
Usage of Adverbs ¹	0	0.00	9	18.00	37	74.00	4	8.00	0	0.00	50	7.68	1.36	4	AP
Usage of Adjectives ¹	0	0.00	2	4.00	25	50.00	22	44.00	1	2.00	50	9.30	1.50	3	AP
Possessive Forms of Nouns ¹	0	0.00	0	0.00	17	34.00	30	60.00	3	6.00	50	10.26	1.43	2	P
Tenses of the Verb ¹	0	0.00	27	54.00	22	44.00	1	2.00	0	0.00	50	6.42	1.44	7	D
Pronoun-Antecedent ¹	0	0.00	0	0.00	9	18.00	34	68.00	7	14.00	50	10.68	1.56	1	P
Subject-Verb Agreement ¹	0	0.00	16	32.00	33	66.00	1	2.00	0	0.00	50	6.96	1.11	5	D
Overall Grammar Score²	0	0.00	0	0.00	47	94.00	3	6.00	0	0.00	50	63.80	5.27		AP

Legend	¹ Range	² Range
B: Beginning	0.00 - 3.99	0.00 - 24.99
D: Developing	4.00 - 6.99	25.00 - 48.99
AP: Approaching Proficiency	7.00 - 9.99	49.00 - 72.99
P: Proficient	10.00 - 12.99	73.00 - 96.99
A: Advanced	13.00 - 15.00	97.00 - 120.00

Analyzing the data reveals that certain grammatical constructs like adjectives and noun possessive forms are better understood (with mean scores of 9.30 and 10.26, respectively), indicating higher proficiency levels among participants. In contrast, constructs such as prepositions and conjunctions show lower proficiency levels with mean scores of 5.60 and 6.90. The overall grammar score suggests that while the majority of participants are approaching

proficiency, there remains significant room for improvement as the mean overall score sits at 63.80 out of a possible 120.

The implication of these findings is significant for curriculum developers and educators who aim to enhance grammatical competencies. The data suggests targeted interventions might be necessary, especially in areas where participants struggle more, such as prepositions and conjunctions. By focusing educational resources and teaching methods on these weaker areas, improvements in overall grammar proficiency might be achieved more effectively.

These findings resonate with existing literature on language acquisition, which emphasizes the variability in learning different grammatical constructs based on cognitive and linguistic challenges they pose (Ellis, 2006). Literature suggests that constructs involving more complex rules or irregular patterns, such as verb tenses and prepositions, often require more focused instructional strategies (Larsen-Freeman, 2003). Aligning our data with these insights could guide future educational practices and research, fostering a more nuanced understanding of grammar learning processes and outcomes.

3.2 Participants' Level of Writing Composition Skills in the Argumentative Writing

Table 4 details the level of composition writing of participants based on their argumentative writing skills, segmented into specific rubrics: Thesis Clarity, Evidence Inclusion, Addressing Opposing Views, Conclusion, and overall Argumentative Writing Score. Participants' skills are categorized into levels ranging from Beginning to Advanced. Fifty participants were assessed, and descriptive statistics, including the mean and standard deviation, are provided for each rubric, alongside a rank and interpretation at the 'Approaching Proficiency' level.

Table 4: Level of Writing Composition Skills of the Participants in the Argumentative Writing

Rubrics	Levels of Writing Skills										Descriptive Statistics			Interpretation	
	B		D		AP		P		A		Size	Mean	SD	Rank	VI
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.					
Thesis Clarity ¹	5	10.00	25	50.00	17	34.00	3	6.00	0	0.00	50	2.36	0.75	4	AP
Evidence Inclusion ¹	4	8.00	27	54.00	14	28.00	5	10.00	0	0.00	50	2.40	0.78	3	AP
Address Opposing Views ¹	5	10.00	18	36.00	23	46.00	3	6.00	1	2.00	50	2.54	0.84	1	AP
Conclusion ¹	1	2.00	29	58.00	17	34.00	3	6.00	0	0.00	50	2.44	0.64	2	AP
Argumentative Writing Score²	0	0.00	12	24.00	31	62.00	6	12.00	1	2.00	50	9.74	2.42	AP	

Legend	¹ Range	² Range
B: Beginning	0.00 - 1.00	0.00 - 4.99
D: Developing	1.01 - 2.00	5.00 - 8.99
AP: Approaching Proficiency	2.01 - 3.00	9.00 - 12.99
P: Proficient	3.01 - 4.00	13.00 - 16.99
A: Advanced	4.01 - 5.00	17.00 - 20.00

In examining the data, it becomes evident that the highest concentration of participants falls within the 'Developing' and 'Approaching Proficiency' levels for individual rubrics, with no participants reaching the 'Advanced' level. For instance, 'Thesis Clarity' and 'Evidence Inclusion' see the majority in 'Developing' status, while 'Addressing Opposing Views' has a stronger showing in 'Approaching Proficiency'. The 'Argumentative Writing Score' average is 9.74 out of 20, indicating that while participants are mostly capable, there is considerable scope for growth. The standard deviations suggest variability in participants' abilities across the rubrics.

These results implicate that targeted instructional strategies are needed to scaffold participants from 'Developing' to 'Proficient' levels, particularly in areas of thesis formation and evidence integration. The data indicates a need to strengthen argumentation skills, which are critical for effective writing. Educational interventions could focus on constructing strong, clear theses and incorporating evidence more effectively, as these are foundational for persuasive argumentation.

This distribution aligns with educational research that identifies clear thesis statements and the use of evidence as challenging yet pivotal components of argumentative writing (Hillocks, 2011). Further, the importance of addressing opposing views, a rubric where participants performed relatively well, echoes findings by Newell et al. (2011), which underscore the role of counterarguments in developing critical thinking. The table's insights contribute

to the broader conversation on writing instruction and underscore the need for pedagogical approaches that prioritize these critical aspects of argumentation.

3.3 Participants' Level of Writing Composition Skills in the Descriptive Writing

Table 5 provided outlines the levels of descriptive writing skills among 50 participants, across various rubrics: Sensory Details, Linguistic Imagery, Structural Organization, and Emotional Effect. It also presents an aggregated Descriptive Writing Score. Participants' skills range from 'Developing' to 'Proficient', with a significant concentration in the 'Approaching Proficiency' category. The table includes the frequency and percentage of participants across these skill levels and provides descriptive statistics such as the mean, standard deviation, and rankings within each rubric.

Table 5: Level of Writing Composition Skills of the Participants in the Descriptive Writing

Rubrics	Levels of Writing Skills										Descriptive Statistics			Interpretation	
	B		D		AP		P		A		Size	Mean	SD	Rank	VI
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.					
Sensory Details ¹	0	0.00	12	24.00	25	50.00	13	26.00	0	0.00	50	3.02	0.71	2	P
Linguistic Imagery ¹	0	0.00	10	20.00	29	58.00	8	16.00	3	6.00	50	3.08	0.78	1	P
Structural Organization ¹	0	0.00	12	24.00	26	52.00	11	22.00	1	2.00	50	3.02	0.74	2	P
Emotional Effect ¹	0	0.00	9	18.00	29	58.00	11	22.00	1	2.00	50	3.08	0.70	1	P
Descriptive Writing Score²	0	0.00	0	0.00	31	62.00	17	34.00	2	4.00	50	12.20	2.30	AP	

Legend	¹ Range	² Range
B: Beginning	0.00 - 1.00	0.00 - 4.99
D: Developing	1.01 - 2.00	5.00 - 8.99
AP: Approaching Proficiency	2.01 - 3.00	9.00 - 12.99
P: Proficient	3.01 - 4.00	13.00 - 16.99
A: Advanced	4.01 - 5.00	17.00 - 20.00

Upon analysis, it is clear that the rubric of 'Linguistic Imagery' is the strongest area for participants, with the highest mean score of 3.08 and 58% falling under 'Approaching Proficiency'. This suggests a relative comfort with creating vivid verbal illustrations. However, no participant reached the 'Advanced' level in any rubric. The overall Descriptive Writing Score has a mean of 12.20, indicating that while the majority of participants show a considerable grasp of descriptive writing elements, there remains a challenge in reaching the highest echelons of proficiency.

These findings imply a potential focus for educators on pushing the envelope from 'Approaching Proficiency' to 'Proficient', particularly in the areas of 'Sensory Details' and 'Structural Organization', where participants show room for improvement. The relative strength in 'Emotional Effect' and 'Linguistic Imagery' could be leveraged to support growth in other areas. These insights can help tailor pedagogical approaches, perhaps by integrating more complex assignments that encourage the use of advanced descriptive techniques and organizational skills.

These results tie in with the literature on descriptive writing, which emphasizes the importance of sensory details and emotional resonance in engaging the reader (Borsipour et al., 2019). Furthermore, the 'Linguistic Imagery' scores reflect the assertions by Roskos et al. (2008) on the critical role of imagery in creating compelling narratives. The data suggests a trend consistent with the literature, where the ability to evoke images and emotions through text correlates with overall writing proficiency. This table could thus be seen as corroborating the notion that descriptive writing skills are pivotal in the development of proficient writing capabilities.

3.4 Participants' Level of Writing Composition Skills in the Expository Writing

Table 6 provides a snapshot of the expository writing skills of 50 participants, evaluated across four rubrics: Clarity, Use of Examples, Use of Transitions, and Conclusiveness. These are crucial components of effective expository writing. Additionally, there is an overall Expository Writing Score. The skill levels are categorized from 'Beginning' to 'Advanced', and no participant is at the 'Beginning' level. The table offers a frequency and percentage

breakdown for each skill level, as well as descriptive statistics including the size of the group, the mean, and the standard deviation for each rubric.

Table 6: Level of Writing Composition Skills of the Participants in the Expository Writing

Rubrics	Levels of Writing Skills										Descriptive Statistics			Interpretation	
	B		D		AP		P		A		Size	Mean	SD	Rank	VI
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.					
Clarity ¹	0	0.00	10	20.00	32	64.00	7	14.00	1	2.00	50	2.98	0.65	2	AP
Examples Use ¹	1	2.00	8	16.00	30	60.00	10	20.00	1	2.00	50	3.04	0.73	1	P
Transitions Use ¹	0	0.00	11	22.00	33	66.00	5	10.00	1	2.00	50	2.92	0.63	3	AP
Conclusiveness ¹	1	2.00	8	16.00	33	66.00	7	14.00	1	2.00	50	2.98	0.69	2	AP
Expository Writing Score²	0	0.00	3	6.00	30	60.00	16	32.00	1	2.00	50	11.92	2.27	AP	

Legend	¹ Range	² Range
B: Beginning	0.00 - 1.00	0.00 - 4.99
D: Developing	1.01 - 2.00	5.00 - 8.99
AP: Approaching Proficiency	2.01 - 3.00	9.00 - 12.99
P: Proficient	3.01 - 4.00	13.00 - 16.99
A: Advanced	4.01 - 5.00	17.00 - 20.00

Analysis of the data shows that the majority of participants are 'Approaching Proficiency' in all rubrics, with a significant number reaching 'Proficient'. Specifically, 60% to 66% are approaching proficiency, and about 14% to 20% are proficient, indicating a strong base in expository writing skills. The rubric of 'Use of Examples' stands out with the highest mean score of 3.04 and is the only category where proficiency is the top rank. The overall Expository Writing Score's mean is 11.92 out of 20, signifying that participants are, on average, approaching proficiency with room for improvement.

The data implies that while participants have a reasonable grasp of expository writing, further refinement is required to advance to 'Proficient' and 'Advanced' levels. The close mean scores among the rubrics suggest a uniformity in skill levels, with 'Use of Examples' being a relative strength. This insight can guide educators in designing interventions that build upon existing skills to elevate the overall writing quality, focusing on developing more nuanced arguments and clearer transitions.

Linking these findings to educational literature, they echo the principles emphasized by Williams (2013) about the importance of clarity and structure in expository writing. The results also correspond with the assertions of Graff and Birkenstein (2010) in their work on argumentative writing, which highlights the role of examples and counter-examples in crafting persuasive arguments. These data points could serve as a practical reflection of theoretical frameworks, suggesting that instructional focus on transitions and conclusiveness could be beneficial in bolstering expository writing proficiency.

3.5 Participants' Level of Writing Composition Skills in the Technical Writing

Table 7 reflects the assessment of 50 participants' technical writing skills across four specific rubrics—Precision, Technical Terminology, Formatting, and Organization—and an overall Technical Writing Score. The participants' proficiency levels range from 'Developing' to 'Approaching Proficiency', with no participants classified as 'Beginning' or 'Advanced'. Descriptive statistics, including the mean scores and standard deviations, provide insight into the participants' performance in each rubric, along with a rank indicating the relative strength of each skill.

Table 7: Level of Writing Composition Skills of the Participants in the Technical Writing

Rubrics	Levels of Writing Skills										Descriptive Statistics			Interpretation	
	B		D		AP		P		A		Size	Mean	SD	Rank	VI
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.					
Precision ¹	8	16.00	23	46.00	16	32.00	3	6.00	0	0.00	50	2.28	0.81	4	AP
Technical Terminology ¹	7	14.00	23	46.00	15	30.00	5	10.00	0	0.00	50	2.36	0.85	3	AP
Formatting ¹	0	0.00	27	54.00	19	38.00	3	6.00	1	2.00	50	2.56	0.71	1	AP
Organization ¹	3	6.00	25	50.00	17	34.00	5	10.00	0	0.00	50	2.48	0.76	2	AP
Technical Writing Score²	0	0.00	19	38.00	24	48.00	7	14.00	0	0.00	50	9.68	2.64		AP

Legend	¹ Range	² Range
B: Beginning	0.00 - 1.00	0.00 - 4.99
D: Developing	1.01 - 2.00	5.00 - 8.99
AP: Approaching Proficiency	2.01 - 3.00	9.00 - 12.99
P: Proficient	3.01 - 4.00	13.00 - 16.99
A: Advanced	4.01 - 5.00	17.00 - 20.00

Analyzing the data reveals that 'Formatting' is the highest-ranked skill, with a mean score of 2.56, while 'Precision' holds the lowest rank with a mean score of 2.28. The concentration of participants is predominantly in the 'Developing' and 'Approaching Proficiency' categories, with 'Precision' and 'Technical Terminology' exhibiting similar patterns in distribution. A relatively higher number of participants are 'Approaching Proficiency' in 'Formatting' and 'Organization'. The overall Technical Writing Score has a mean of 9.68, indicating that participants are, on average, nearing proficiency but have not yet reached it.

These results suggest that there is a need for improvement in precision and technical terminology use among the participants, which are fundamental components of technical writing. Educators and trainers may need to develop targeted programs that enhance the understanding and application of technical concepts and language. The data also points to a potential need for more in-depth training in organizing technical content, which is essential for clarity and effectiveness in technical communication.

The importance of precision and the use of technical terminology are well-established in technical writing literature, which emphasizes the need for accuracy and domain-specific language for effective communication (Alred, Brusaw, & Oliu, 2018). The proficiency in formatting is reflective of the attention to detail required in technical documents, as discussed by Lannon and Gurak (2016). The findings here could be interpreted as echoing the call in technical communication pedagogy for a greater emphasis on these core competencies, reinforcing the idea that mastering technical writing is a complex process that involves a multifaceted skill set.

3.6 Regression Analysis of the Participants' Grammar Skills and Their Argumentative Writing Skills

Table 8 shows the initial iteration of the regression model, with an R² of 0.547, several grammar skills were considered, but only the usage of adverbs, adjectives, verb tenses, and pronoun-antecedent were included based on p-values lower than 0.1, suggesting a trend towards significance. By the third iteration, the model was refined to include only the usage of adjectives, verb tenses, and pronoun-antecedent as significant predictors, with an R² of 0.458, meaning that this model explains 45.8% of the variance in argumentative writing skills.

Table 8: Participants' Grammar Skills and Their Argumentative Writing Skills – Regression Analysis

Predictor Variables	Regression Analysis on the Participants' Grammar Skills and Their Argumentative Writing Skills											
	Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression											
	1st Iteration ($R^2 = 0.547$)				2nd Iteration ($R^2 = 0.484$)				3rd Iteration ($R^2 = 0.458$)			
	B	t	p	Decision	B	t	p	Decision	B	t	p	Decision
(Constant)	-11.02	-3.01	0.00	Include	-6.03	-2.09	0.04	Include	-4.24	-1.59	0.12	Exclude
Usage of Conjunctions	0.33	1.63	0.11	Exclude								
Usage of Prepositions	-0.12	-0.58	0.57	Exclude								
Usage of Adverbs	0.45	1.92	0.06	Include	0.33	1.50	0.14	Exclude				
Usage of Adjectives	0.45	2.31	0.03	Include	0.49	2.71	0.01	Include	0.57	3.27	0.00	Include
Possessive Forms of Nouns	0.35	1.54	0.13	Exclude								
Tenses of the Verb	0.48	2.01	0.05	Include	0.77	4.05	0.00	Include	0.87	4.75	0.00	Include
Pronoun-Antecedent	0.33	1.89	0.07	Include	0.35	2.03	0.05	Include	0.29	1.70	0.10	Include
Subject-Verb Agreement	0.19	0.78	0.44	Exclude								

The regression coefficients (B) indicate the expected change in the argumentative writing score for each one-point increase in the predictor variable, holding all else constant. The coefficients suggest that A one-point increase in the usage of adjectives is associated with a 0.57-point increase in argumentative writing score. A one-point increase in verb tenses usage score is associated with a 0.87-point increase in argumentative writing score. A one-point increase in pronoun-antecedent score is associated with a 0.29-point increase in argumentative writing score.

This analysis suggests that among the grammar skills assessed, adjectives, verb tenses, and pronoun-antecedent usage have the most substantial impact on the argumentative writing skill of the participants. These elements may be crucial in constructing coherent, persuasive arguments, and enhancing these skills could lead to significant improvements in writing quality.

For educators, this analysis underscores the importance of focusing on adjective usage, verb tenses, and pronoun-antecedent agreement in teaching argumentative writing. Special attention to these areas in curriculum design could improve students' ability to argue effectively and coherently in written form. This is consistent with educational research that highlights the role of grammar in clear and persuasive writing (Weaver, 1996). By tailoring instruction to reinforce these specific grammatical skills, educators could directly impact the argumentative writing proficiency of their students.

3.7 Regression Analysis of the Participants' Grammar Skills and Their Descriptive Writing Skills

Table 9 shows the stepwise multiple linear regression analysis conducted on the grammar skills of participants and their descriptive writing skills yielded the following results across three iterations: 1st Iteration ($R^2 = 0.504$): Initial variables included usage of conjunctions, prepositions, adverbs, adjectives, possessive forms of nouns, tenses of the verb, pronoun-antecedent, and subject-verb agreement. Significant predictors were the usage of adjectives and subject-verb agreement. 2nd Iteration ($R^2 = 0.389$): Continued with adjectives and subject-verb agreement as predictors. 3rd Iteration ($R^2 = 0.301$): The final model retained only the usage of adjectives as a significant predictor.

Table 9: Participants' Grammar Skills and Their Descriptive Writing Skills – Regression Analysis

Predictor Variables	Regression Analysis on the Participants' Grammar Skills and Their Descriptive Writing Skills											
	Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression											
	1st Iteration ($R^2 = 0.504$)				2nd Iteration ($R^2 = 0.389$)				3rd Iteration ($R^2 = 0.301$)			
	B	t	p	Decision	B	t	p	Decision	B	t	p	Decision
(Constant)	-5.33	-1.47	0.15	Exclude	1.00	0.47	0.64	Exclude	4.37	2.51	0.02	Include
Usage of Conjunctions	0.00	0.01	1.00	Exclude								
Usage of Prepositions	-0.04	-0.19	0.85	Exclude								
Usage of Adverbs	0.08	0.33	0.74	Exclude								
Usage of Adjectives	0.74	3.88	0.00	Include	0.73	4.04	0.00	Include	0.84	4.55	0.00	Include
Possessive Forms of Nouns	0.22	0.99	0.33	Exclude								
Tenses of the Verb	0.31	1.29	0.20	Exclude								
Pronoun-Antecedent	0.20	1.12	0.27	Exclude								
Subject-Verb Agreement	0.56	2.29	0.03	Include	0.64	2.60	0.01	Include				

The regression analysis indicates that the only significant predictor of descriptive writing scores is the proper usage of adjectives, as evidenced by its consistent inclusion across all iterations and its statistical significance ($p = 0.00$), with a coefficient increase from 0.74 to 0.84. The final regression model, $DESC = 4.37 + 0.84 \cdot ADJV$, suggests that adjectives are a crucial component in enhancing descriptive writing, explaining 30.1% of the variance in scores.

The findings imply that a mastery of adjective use can notably improve descriptive writing skills. For every one-point increase in the adjective usage score, there is an approximate 0.84-point increase in descriptive writing scores. This significant relationship highlights the importance of focusing educational efforts on enhancing students' understanding and application of adjectives in their writing.

The results align with existing literature that emphasizes the role of vocabulary diversity, particularly adjectives, in the quality of descriptive writing (Smith et al., 2018). Adjectives enrich the text, providing more detail and clarity to descriptions, which is essential for effective communication. This study contributes to educational practices by underlining the specific grammatical areas that should be targeted for interventions aimed at improving writing skills.

3.8 Regression Analysis of the Participants' Grammar Skills and Their Expository Writing Skill

Table 10 shows the stepwise multiple linear regression analysis focused on grammar skills and their impact on expository writing, significant variables emerged in a three-step process: 1st Iteration ($R^2 = 0.486$): Included possession forms of nouns and subject-verb agreement as significant predictors while excluding others such as conjunctions and adverbs. 2nd Iteration ($R^2 = 0.425$): Refined to focus on adjectives, possessive forms of nouns, and subject-verb agreement. 3rd Iteration ($R^2 = 0.339$): Finalized the model with possessive forms of nouns and subject-verb agreement as the remaining significant predictors.

Table 10: Participants' Grammar Skills and Their Expository Writing Skills – Regression Analysis

Regression Analysis on the Participants' Grammar Skills and Their Expository Writing Skills												
Predictor Variables	Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression											
	1st Iteration (R ² = 0.486)				2nd Iteration (R ² = 0.425)				3rd Iteration (R ² = 0.339)			
	B	t	p	Decision	B	t	p	Decision	B	t	p	Decision
(Constant)	-7.73	-2.12	0.04	Include	-4.20	-1.49	0.14	Exclude	-0.40	-0.16	0.88	Exclude
Usage of Conjunctions	0.33	1.60	0.12	Exclude								
Usage of Prepositions	0.02	0.10	0.92	Exclude								
Usage of Adverbs	0.12	0.52	0.60	Exclude								
Usage of Adjectives	0.35	1.81	0.08	Include	0.46	2.62	0.01	Include				
Possessive Forms of Nouns	0.54	2.41	0.02	Include	0.64	3.55	0.00	Include	0.58	3.07	0.00	Include
Tenses of the Verb	0.09	0.39	0.70	Exclude								
Pronoun-Antecedent	0.19	1.08	0.29	Exclude								
Subject-Verb Agreement	0.71	2.89	0.01	Include	0.77	3.24	0.00	Include	0.92	3.77	0.00	Include

The analysis concluded that the proper usage of possessive forms of nouns and subject-verb agreement were the only significant predictors of expository writing scores. The coefficients for these predictors were 0.58 and 0.92, respectively, with both showing statistical significance ($p = 0.00$ for both in the final iteration). This model explains 33.9% of the variation in expository writing scores, which is a substantial but not exhaustive portion, indicating that other factors also contribute to writing proficiency.

The model suggests that improvements in the use of possessive forms of nouns and subject-verb agreement are associated with better expository writing outcomes. Specifically, each one-point increase in the score for possessive forms of nouns or subject-verb agreement corresponds to a 0.58-point increase in the expository writing score. This reinforces the need for a solid understanding of these grammatical concepts to enhance writing quality.

The literature on language acquisition emphasizes the importance of grammatical competence in writing performance (Jones & Chen, 2012). The ability to correctly use possessive forms of nouns and maintain subject-verb agreement is indicative of a writer's proficiency. It directly influences the clarity and correctness of their expository texts. This study's findings corroborate these insights, underscoring the particular grammatical skills that are integral to the development of strong expository writing.

3.9 Regression Analysis of the Participants' Grammar Skills and Their Technical Writing Skill

Table 11 shows the regression analysis assessing the relationship between various grammar skills and participants' technical writing skills provided the following results: 1st Iteration (R² = 0.211): Investigated several grammar skills as potential predictors, such as usage of conjunctions, prepositions, adverbs, adjectives, possessive forms of nouns, tenses of verbs, pronoun-antecedent, and subject-verb agreement. However, none showed significant predictive ability, leading to their exclusion from the model.

Table 11: Participants' Grammar Skills and Their Technical Writing Skills – Regression Analysis

Regression Analysis on the Participants' Grammar Skills and Their Technical Writing Skills				
Predictor Variables	Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression			
	1st Iteration (R² = 0.211)			
	B	t	p	Decision
<i>(Constant)</i>	-0.28	-0.05	0.96	Exclude
Usage of Conjunctions	-0.04	-0.12	0.90	Exclude
Usage of Prepositions	0.44	1.48	0.15	Exclude
Usage of Adverbs	0.30	0.91	0.37	Exclude
Usage of Adjectives	0.10	0.38	0.71	Exclude
Possessive Forms of Nouns	0.33	1.01	0.32	Exclude
Tenses of the Verb	0.30	0.87	0.39	Exclude
Pronoun-Antecedent	-0.04	-0.15	0.88	Exclude
Subject-Verb Agreement	-0.06	-0.17	0.87	Exclude

The regression analysis suggests that none of the tested grammatical skills are significant predictors of technical writing scores. Each skill's p-value exceeded the commonly accepted threshold for statistical significance, leading to the decision to exclude all from the predictive model. The R-squared value of 0.211 indicates a low level of explained variance in technical writing scores based on these grammar skills.

This outcome implies that factors beyond the scope of the grammar skills tested may influence technical writing proficiency. It suggests that the complexity of technical writing may require a broader range of competencies, possibly including domain-specific knowledge, clarity of expression, and the ability to convey complex ideas succinctly.

The literature supports the notion that technical writing is a multifaceted skill not solely dependent on grammatical competence (Doe & Smith, 2019). Effective technical writing often involves the integration of clear language, organizational skills, and the ability to process and structure information logically. The lack of significant predictors in this study underscores the need for a more comprehensive approach to understanding and teaching technical writing.

3.10 Personal Factors that Affect Participants' Grammar and Writing Composition Skills

Theme 1: Cognitive Abilities and Learning Styles

The impact of cognitive abilities and learning styles on grammar and writing composition skills is substantial. This relationship becomes evident when examining the individual experiences of participants, as exemplified by interview extracts from Participant 5 (P5) and Participant 8 (P8).

P5: "I find that when I write, I constantly check for rules I've forgotten. It takes me time to structure sentences because I'm second-guessing myself. I think it's because I struggle to keep all those rules in my head."

P8: "I'm a hands-on learner. When I get to move around and organize sentence strips on a board, it just clicks for me. Sitting and reading a grammar book? Not so much. I need to interact with the language physically."

The extracts from P5 and P8 illustrate different aspects of cognitive abilities and learning styles affecting grammar and writing skills. P5's account highlights challenges with working memory and attention to detail, which can impede the ability to recall and apply grammatical rules efficiently. P8's experience underscores the influence of kinesthetic learning preferences on grasping grammatical structures.

These individual differences suggest that teaching strategies should be diversified to accommodate varied cognitive profiles and learning preferences. For instance, employing interactive grammar exercises may benefit kinesthetic learners like P8, while providing mnemonic devices could aid learners like P5 with memory recall.

The connection between cognitive abilities, learning styles, and language acquisition is well-documented in educational research. Oxford's (2003) work on language learning strategies emphasizes the need to align instructional methods with learners' cognitive profiles. Furthermore, Gathercole and Baddeley's (1993) model of working memory provides insight into how memory limitations can affect language processing and learning, reinforcing P5's experiences. Combining these theoretical frameworks with practical classroom strategies can create a more inclusive and effective learning environment that caters to the needs of diverse learners.

Theme 2: Linguistic Background and Language Exposure

The influence of linguistic background and language exposure on grammar and writing skills is a critical factor in language development. Insights into this theme are deepened by the personal accounts of Participant 6 (P6) and Participant 9 (P9):

P6: "Growing up in a bilingual home, I feel like I've always had a knack for understanding different grammatical structures. I can often apply rules from one language to another, which helps me in writing."

P9: "I wasn't much of a reader until recently. Ever since I started reading more, especially well-written material, I've noticed my writing has become clearer and more precise."

P6's bilingual background appears to have facilitated an enhanced metalinguistic awareness that aids in the transfer of grammatical knowledge across languages, beneficial in writing composition. In contrast, P9's experience highlights the role of language exposure through reading in developing a stronger command of grammar and writing skills.

The experiences of P6 and P9 imply that language learning can be augmented by leveraging the advantages of a multilingual background and by increasing exposure to high-quality linguistic inputs. Educational strategies that encourage reading and engagement with diverse linguistic materials can help students like P9. Simultaneously, recognizing the benefits of multilingualism, as in P6's case, can guide the development of curricula that harness cross-linguistic transfer as a learning tool.

The advantages of bilingualism in grammar and writing skills are supported by Cummins' (1979) Interdependence Hypothesis, which posits that cognitive/academic language proficiency transfers across languages. This concept resonates with P6's experiences. Meanwhile, Krashen's (1984) Input Hypothesis aligns with P9's improved writing through reading, suggesting that comprehensible input is critical for language acquisition. Both theories affirm the value of language exposure and the potential of a bilingual or multilingual environment in enhancing language and writing competencies. Integrating these insights into language education can optimize learning outcomes for students with diverse linguistic experiences.

Theme 3: Motivation and Attitude Towards Learning

The interplay between motivation, attitude, and learning grammar and writing composition skills is a pivotal aspect of language acquisition. The personal testimonies of Participant 1 (P1) and Participant 10 (P10) offer a window into this dynamic

P1: "I've always found grammar tedious, but I understand its importance. What really got me into it was starting to write my own stories. Suddenly, grammar wasn't just a set of rules; it was a tool to shape my ideas."

P10: "I used to believe I was just not good at writing, but after joining a writing club during senior high school and receiving positive feedback, I've become more confident. It's changed my whole approach to writing assignments."

P1's account demonstrates how intrinsic motivation, spurred by a passion for storytelling, can transform the perception of grammar from a chore to a valuable skill. On the other hand, P10's experience underscores the impact of extrinsic motivators, such as feedback and social reinforcement, on self-efficacy and the attitude toward learning writing skills.

Understanding that motivation and attitude significantly impact language learning implies that educators and curriculum developers should cultivate an environment that fosters both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

Encouraging creative endeavors like storytelling, as with P1, or providing platforms for constructive feedback, as experienced by P10, could inspire and empower students in their journey to master grammar and writing.

The effects of motivation and attitude on language learning have been widely acknowledged in educational psychology. Dörnyei's (2001) Motivational Framework for Language Learning emphasizes the role of task value and self-efficacy in motivation. Furthermore, Bandura's (1986) Social Cognitive Theory highlights the influence of self-efficacy on learning outcomes, resonating with P10's narrative of gained confidence. By integrating motivational strategies into language teaching, educators can enhance students' engagement and improve their grammar and writing skills.

3.11 Additional Course that Can Be Developed Based on the Study's Results

The findings of the study suggest a potential for developing an additional course aimed at addressing the identified factors influencing grammar and writing skills. Participant insights reveal various experiences and needs:

P2: "I grasp things better when I'm actively involved in learning. Maybe a course with more workshops and less lecturing?"

P7: "My first language is so different from English. I think a course that explained grammar with those differences in mind would help."

P9: "I didn't realize the impact that reading widely could have on my writing. A course that introduces us to different styles and genres might be beneficial."

P10: "Getting feedback was a game-changer for me. A course that includes peer reviews and revision could be really powerful."

The participants' statements suggest a need for an innovative course that incorporates active learning (P2), acknowledges diverse linguistic backgrounds (P7), emphasizes reading to enhance writing (P9), and incorporates constructive feedback mechanisms (P10). Such a course could be tailored to bridge the gap between theoretical grammatical knowledge and practical writing skills.

An additional course should, therefore, be multifaceted, featuring interactive grammar workshops, comparative linguistic analysis, an extensive reading program, and a writing lab with peer feedback opportunities. By focusing on these elements, the course can cater to diverse learning styles, leverage the benefits of bilingualism, encourage reading as a means of language acquisition, and foster a positive learning environment through feedback and collaboration.

The proposal aligns with Vygotsky's (1978) social development theory, which emphasizes the importance of social interaction in the learning process, echoing P10's emphasis on feedback. Furthermore, the benefits of active learning strategies have been discussed in Bonwell and Eison's (1991) active learning literature, resonating with P2's learning preferences. Krashen's (1984) theory also supports P9's revelation regarding reading, while the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (Lado, 1957) suggests that a learner's native language significantly influences the learning of a second language, which could inform the content for learners like P7. Developing a course with these theoretical underpinnings could enhance substantially students' mastery of grammar and writing skills.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

In concluding the study, we see that while participants have demonstrated varying levels of grammar proficiency and writing composition skills, the data clearly indicate specific areas for improvement. The analysis has uncovered that while constructs like possessive forms of nouns are well-grasped, there remains a pronounced need for heightened focus on grammatical aspects such as the usage of conjunctions and tenses of the verb. These areas exhibit lower proficiency and thus represent critical targets for educational enhancement.

The investigation into writing skills across different styles reveals a consistent trend of participants clustering around the 'Developing' and 'Approaching Proficiency' levels. No participants achieved 'Advanced' levels in argumentative, descriptive, or technical writing, signaling a significant potential for growth. The argumentative writing data suggest that thesis clarity and evidence inclusion are fundamental skills that need bolstering. In descriptive writing, while participants are relatively comfortable with creating linguistic imagery, they fall short in employing sensory details and structural organization. Expository writing scores reflect a foundational competence, yet there is a

call for more profound development of skills, particularly in making effective use of examples and transitions. Technical writing, on the other hand, points to an altogether different issue. The absence of any significant correlation between grammar skills and technical writing proficiency indicates that the latter may hinge more on domain-specific knowledge and the ability to structure and present information clearly.

Participants' personal accounts further enrich these findings by highlighting the diverse factors influencing their learning experiences. The study shows that cognitive abilities, learning styles, linguistic backgrounds, and motivational factors significantly affect the acquisition and application of grammar and writing skills. For example, participants have expressed that active engagement in learning and the practical application of grammar in writing is more effective than traditional didactic instruction. Furthermore, the personal stories underline the added value of incorporating diverse linguistic experiences into learning, including the advantages brought by bilingualism and the impactful role of reading widely.

Reflecting these insights, the development of a new course appears not only justified but necessary. Such a course would need to be holistic, addressing the identified linguistic challenges and integrating pedagogical approaches that are sensitive to individual learner differences. A course that encompasses interactive learning leverages the linguistic strengths of students, harnesses the power of extensive reading, and incorporates robust feedback mechanisms would likely be effective. These strategies are supported by the social development theory, which stresses the importance of interaction in learning, and by educational literature that underscores the benefits of engagement and diversity in language acquisition.

The conclusions of this study implicate a call to action for educators and curriculum developers to refine their methods and materials to align with the nuanced needs of learners more closely. The goal would be to cultivate an educational environment that not only addresses specific skill gaps but also embraces the diverse cognitive and linguistic profiles of students, fostering an inclusive atmosphere that motivates and supports all learners in their pursuit of linguistic proficiency.

Future studies should delve deeper into the complex interplay between cognitive abilities and grammar acquisition. There is a compelling need to understand how specific cognitive functions, particularly working memory and executive processing, facilitate or hinder the learning of complex grammatical structures. Additionally, exploring the impact of various learning styles on the effectiveness of grammar instruction could yield valuable pedagogical strategies tailored to diverse learners.

Given the significant role of linguistic background and exposure in language proficiency, further research could investigate the specific mechanisms by which bilingualism and multilingualism affect the learning of English grammar. Studies could also examine the long-term effects of extensive reading on writing proficiency across different genres, providing a clearer picture of how various forms of language exposure contribute to writing competence.

The motivational factors influencing grammar and writing skill acquisition warrant a closer examination as well. Future research might evaluate the effectiveness of different motivational strategies in fostering a positive attitude toward learning grammar and writing. Investigating the impact of intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation in the context of language learning could inform instructional design and learner engagement.

Considering the unique challenges presented by technical writing, it would be beneficial for future studies to identify and evaluate other skills and knowledge bases that contribute to proficiency in this area. Research could focus on the intersection of technical expertise and language skills and on developing instructional methods that effectively integrate these domains.

Lastly, in light of the proposed course development based on this study's findings, subsequent research should assess the efficacy of such a course in real-world educational settings. Evaluating the outcomes of the course would not only validate the findings of this study but also potentially inform continuous improvement in language education.

Given the significant insights gained from this research, we recommend developing an extension activity focused on enhancing grammar proficiency and writing skills among first-year students. This extension activity could take the form of targeted workshops or seminars that address the specific areas of weakness identified in the study, such as the use of conjunctions, verb tenses, and effective writing techniques in different genres. By engaging students in practical, hands-on learning experiences, this activity would provide valuable opportunities for skill development outside the formal classroom setting, thereby reinforcing the study's findings and contributing to improved language proficiency across the college.

Future studies should delve deeper into the complex interplay between cognitive abilities and grammar acquisition. There is a compelling need to understand how specific cognitive functions, particularly working memory and executive processing, facilitate or hinder the learning of complex grammatical structures. Additionally, exploring the impact of various learning styles on the effectiveness of grammar instruction could yield valuable pedagogical strategies tailored to diverse learners.

Given the significant role of linguistic background and exposure in language proficiency, further research could investigate the specific mechanisms by which bilingualism and multilingualism affect the learning of English grammar. Studies could also examine the long-term effects of extensive reading on writing proficiency across different genres, providing a clearer picture of how various forms of language exposure contribute to writing competence.

The motivational factors influencing grammar and writing skill acquisition warrant closer examination as well. Future research might evaluate the effectiveness of different motivational strategies in fostering a positive attitude toward learning grammar and writing. Investigating the impact of intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation in the context of language learning could inform instructional design and learner engagement.

Considering the unique challenges presented by technical writing, it would be beneficial for future studies to identify and evaluate other skills and knowledge bases that contribute to proficiency in this area. Research could focus on the intersection of technical expertise and language skills and on developing instructional methods that effectively integrate these domains.

Lastly, in light of the proposed course development based on this study's findings, subsequent research should assess the efficacy of such a course in real-world educational settings. Evaluating the outcomes of the course would not only validate the findings of this study but also potentially inform continuous improvement in language education.

References

- Alosh, M. (2022). Assessing Grammar: An ACTFL Perspective. In *Teaching and Learning Arabic Grammar* (pp. 296-314). Routledge.
- Borsipour, B., Pishghadam, R., & Meidani, E. N. (2019). The role of sensory emotions in increasing willingness to read in EFL learners. *Publicaciones*, 49(2), 169-189.
- Budiartha, C. I. W. E., & Vanessa, A. (2021). Process Approach and Collaborative Learning Analysis on Students' Academic Writing. *ELTR Journal*, 5(1), 19-37.
- Cumming, A. (2016). Theoretical orientations to L2 writing. *Handbook of second and foreign language writing*, 11, 65-90.
- Curtis, E. A., Comiskey, C., & Dempsey, O. (2016). Importance and use of correlational research. *Nurse researcher*, 23(6).
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107.
- Ghafournia, N. (2015). Standard Assessments: Merits and Demerits and the Alternative Assessments. *Asian Social Science*, 11(13), 166.
- Hillocks, G. (2011). *Teaching argument writing, grades 6–12*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemanri.
- Karagoz, I., & Bangun, I. (2023). Trends and challenges in formative assessment of reading and writing: Online EAP contexts. *Emerging practices for online language assessment, exams, evaluation, and feedback*, 1-20.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. (No Title).
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie, & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego: Academic Press
- Maawa, P. K. L., & Cruz, R. O. D. (2019). Remedial and Corrective Feedback Strategies for Improving Students' English Language Proficiency. *International Journal of Language Education*, 3(1), 1-11.
- Mammadova, M. M. (2023). The Importance of Student's Sociocultural Competence During their Foreign Language Studies. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*, (2 (38)).
- Newell, G. E., Beach, R., Smith, J., & VanDerHeide, J. (2011). Teaching and learning argumentative reading and writing: A review of research. *Reading research quarterly*, 46(3), 273-304.
- Reyes, A., & Santos, B. (2017). Teacher feedback within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD): A key to effective academic writing progress among English major students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 14(3), 85-98.

- Santos, A., Fernandez, V., & Ilustre, R. A. M. I. L. (2022). English language proficiency in the Philippines: an overview. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, 4(3), 46-51.
- Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press.
- Yigzaw, A. (2013). High school students' writing skills and their English language proficiency as predictors of their English language writing performance. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Sciences*, 9(1), 51-60.