



ISSN: 1817-6798 (Print)

Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities

available online at: www.jtuh.org/**Marwan Mizher Sahab**

University of Tikrit College of Education for Humanities

* Corresponding author: E-mail :
marwanmizher@tu.edu.iq**Keywords:**Quoting,
Summarizing,
and Paraphrasing strategies,
Academic Writing Skills,
Grammatical Accuracy**ARTICLE INFO****Article history:**

Received	3 Jan 2026
Received in revised form	25 Jan 2026
Accepted	27 Jan 2026
Final Proofreading	29 Apr 2026
Available online	29 Apr 2026

E-mail t-jtuh@tu.edu.iq©THIS IS AN OPEN ACCESS ARTICLE UNDER
THE CC BY LICENSE<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities

The Effectiveness of Using Quoting, Summarizing, and Paraphrasing Strategies on EFL College Students' Grammatical Accuracy and Academic Writing

A B S T R A C T

The present study aims at examining the effect of using quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing strategies on EFL College Students Grammatical Accuracy, examining the effect of using quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing strategies on EFL College Students Academic Writing Skills, and find out the correlation between Grammatical Accuracy and Grammatical Academic Skills. The sample of the study involves sixty third-year university students from the Department of English, College of Education for Humanities / University of Tikrit for the academic year 2024-2025. The involved sample who represents 34 % of it's the original population has been divided into two equal groups, i.e. experimental and control groups. They have been equalized in terms of age, level of achievements in English in the previous academic year, parents' academic attainment, and level of achievement in the pretest. The experimental group is taught according to quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing strategies whereas the control group is taught according to the conventional method. In order to measure the effectiveness of the quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing strategies, two basic tools are used. Pre and posttest are utilized to measure the students' achievement in English. Results indicate that there are significant difference between the two groups' achievement in the posttest and in favour of the experimental group. That is because the instructional strategy emphasizes active students' engagement, interaction, and the development of higher-order thinking skills. In contrast, the traditional used method mainly depends on direct instruction and teacher-centered practice, where students play more passive role. Consequently, the use of quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing strategies is more affective in enhancing students, academic writing academic skills and grammatical accuracy compared to the conventional method.

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.25130/jtuh.33.4.1.2026.16>

فعالية استخدام استراتيجيات الاقتباس والتلخيص وإعادة الصياغة على دقة القواعد النحوية والكتابة

الأكاديمية لطلاب الجامعات دارسي اللغة الإنجليزية لغة اجنبية

مروان مزهر سحاب/ جامعة تكريت/ كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية

الخلاصة:

تهدف الدراسة الحالية الى دراسة تأثير استخدام استراتيجيات الاقتباس والتلخيص وإعادة الصياغة على دقة القواعد النحوية لدى طلاب الجامعات الذين يدرسون اللغة الإنجليزية لغة اجنبية، ودراسة تأثير استخدام

استراتيجيات الاقتباس والتلخيص وإعادة الصياغة على مهارات الكتابة الاكاديمية لدى طلاب الجامعات الذين يدرسون اللغة الإنجليزية لغة اجنبية ومعرفة العلاقة بين دقة القواعد النحوية والمهارات الاكاديمية النحوية. تتضمن عينة الدراسة ستين طالبا جامعيًا في السنة الثالثة من قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية/ جامعة تكريت للعام الدراسي ٢٠٢٤-٢٠٢٥. تم تقسيم العينة التي تمثل ٣٤% من المجموعة الاصلية الى مجموعتين متساويتين، هما المجموعة التجريبية والمجموعة الضابطة. تمت معادلة المجموعتين من حيث العمر ومستوى التحصيل في اللغة الإنجليزية في العام الدراسي السابق والتحصيل الأكاديمي للوالدين ومستوى التحصيل في الاختبار التمهيدي. يتم تدريس المجموعة التجريبية وفقا لاستراتيجيات الاقتباس والتلخيص وإعادة الصياغة، بينما يتم تدريس المجموعة الضابطة وفقا للطريقة التقليدية. من اجل قياس فعالية استراتيجيات الاقتباس والتلخيص وإعادة الصياغة، يتم استخدام اداتين أساسيتين. يتم استخدام الاختبار قبل وبعد التدريس لقياس تحصيل الطلاب في اللغة الإنجليزية. تشير النتائج الى وجود فرق كبير بين تحصيل المجموعتين في الاختبار بعد التدريس لصالح المجموعة التجريبية. وذلك لان استراتيجية التدريس تركز على مشاركة الطلاب النشطة والتفاعل وتطوير مهارات التفكير العليا، في المقابل، تعتمد الطريقة التقليدية المستخدمة بشكل أساسي على التعليم المباشر والممارسة التي تركز على المعلم، حيث يلعب الطلاب دورا أكثر سلبية. وبالتالي فإن استخدام استراتيجيات الاقتباس والتلخيص وإعادة الصياغة أكثر فعالية في تحسين مهارات الطلاب في الكتابة الاكاديمية ودقة القواعد النحوية مقارنة بالطريقة التقليدية.

الكلمات الرئيسية: استراتيجيات الاقتباس والتلخيص وإعادة الصياغة، مهارات الكتابة الأكاديمية، الدقة النحوية، اللغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية، الدقة في الكتابة الأكاديمية

1. Introduction

To prevent plagiarism, it is crucial to incorporate external information into one's writing through paraphrasing, summarizing, and quoting. Paraphrasing is rewording someone else's ideas, usually in a similar length. Summarizing, on the other hand, is the act of expressing or writing the primary ideas of another person, and it typically contains fewer words than the original text. Quoting is the use of exact words with quotation marks. Proper citation is necessary for all methods. Academic writing success necessitates that students comprehend the concepts of paraphrasing, summarizing, and quoting. This approach facilitates the students'

acquisition of those skills. Quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing are critical strategies that students can employ to enhance their reading and writing abilities once they are acquired. They can be employed by educators as effective formative assessment instruments (Buckley, 2004).

This strategy is crucial and beneficial because it is essential for the academic performance of students and has a positive effect on language acquisition. More importantly, summarizing and paraphrasing offer a superior opportunity to emphasize the assets that English-language learners and all students bring to class rather than the alleged deficits they bear. We reinforced the fact that English Language Learners (ELLs) are as intelligent as any other student in our class by demonstrating that they already frequently paraphrase and summaries, thereby assisting students in learning these concepts. It is not a matter of intellect; it is a challenge of language. It is a reminder that we can be more effective educators by remembering to view our students through the lens of assets rather than deficits (Turabian, 2017).

Summarization was recognized as a critical comprehension skill by the National Reading Panel in 2000. The significance of the finding for long-term learning has been reaffirmed by more recent research. According to research, ELL students' reading comprehension improves when they are able to paraphrase. They can concentrate more effectively on the text's main points. When students know what they want to say, they write better. Teaching summarization strategies has also been shown to provide favorable results (Colomb and Williams, 2010).

The present study aims to:

1. examine the effect of using quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing strategies on EFL college students' grammatical accuracy.
2. examine the effect of using quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing strategies on EFL college students' academic writing.
3. find out the correlation between grammatical accuracy and grammatical writing.

In order to achieve these aims, the following hypotheses are posited:

1. There is no statically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group which is taught using quoting, summarizing and paraphrasing

strategies and that of the control group which is taught using the traditional method in grammatical accuracy posttest.

2. There is no statically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group which is taught using quoting, summarizing and paraphrasing strategies and that of the control group which is taught using the traditional method in academic writing posttest.

3. There is no correlation at the significance level of 0.05 between grammatical accuracy and academic writing.

2. Literature Review

Academic writing is greatly influenced by quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing. Integrating concepts from published sources into your arguments is a common task for academic writers. Direct quotes, paraphrases, and summaries can all be used to achieve this. Condensing the original source to concentrate the reader's attention on the particular points that bolster your argument is a process of paraphrasing and summarizing. Generally speaking, summarizing and paraphrasing are seen as more complex than quoting because they require a deeper understanding of the original text than merely quoting. There are numerous approaches to teaching English-language learners and fluent speakers how to quote, summaries, and paraphrase. Many teach all three simultaneously so that they can be contrasted and compared. Students may find this tactic daunting because it requires a different approach (Murcia, 1990).

2.1 Quoting

Typically, it starts by introducing the concept of quotations and quotation marks in the context of having students write dialogue, whether that be in a story they are writing, a basic autobiographical incident essay, or a picture-word inductive model that imagines a conversation between two people in a photo. Additionally, it can teach pupils how to employ quotations when working with other people's texts through straightforward ABC paragraphs. It clarifies that quotation marks are used to convey a speaker's exact words. Additionally, it can demonstrate that it is theft if you replicate someone else's words or writings without enclosing them in quotes. Students usually grasp this idea in a short amount of time. It also clarifies that plagiarizing someone else's remarks can lead to disciplinary action at school. Still,

a lot of English language learners are afraid of making mistakes; therefore, they could still replicate exercises without giving credit or using quotation marks (Laufer & Nation, 2001).

2.2 Summarizing

Buckley (2004) defines summarizing as condensing a text to a third or a quarter of its original size while maintaining the original concept and clearly expressing the author's meaning. To provide your argument or thesis context, the goal is to succinctly summarize the main ideas of a theory or piece of writing. An essential reading ability is summarizing, which is frequently used to determine the main points in a book, article, book chapter, or sections of an article. The gist or major idea, helpful details, or important words and phrases that might support your reading goal are all included in these fundamental viewpoints. Usually, summarizing comes after reading. Nonetheless, it can be done well while reading a text (Johns, 1990).

Focusing on the main idea and key words presented in the text, identifying pertinent information or key ideas, combining details or examples that support the main ideas, and capturing key ideas in the text and putting them together succinctly and clearly are all reasons why summarizing is a crucial skill (Buckley, 2004).

After teaching students how to quote, a summary is usually presented. This usually happens after a class text is read and before a brief animated rendition of the text is shown. Instruction is reinforced during the watching by stopping sometimes to ask students to write summaries. Because kids already have enough vocabulary and contextual knowledge to grasp the story, this method works well. Explicit instruction is given at the start of the class (Johns, 1990). Through vocal explanations and gestures, the instructor demonstrates that summarizing entails reducing voluminous information to a manageable level. The phrase 'summaries' is written on the board or displayed using a document camera. Students are reminded that summarizing is a common, everyday habit, such as when they describe their school days to a parent, narrate a movie, or explain vacation activities to a classmate. The emphasis is on using one's own words to convey ideas instead of directly quoting, which highlights the difference between summarizing and quoting. To illustrate how to condense a lot of information into a more manageable and targeted style, teachers can employ visual gestures.

Additionally, students are taught that summarizing is a crucial academic ability that improves their comprehension of what they read and see (Hinkel, 2004). Teachers may give out a worksheet (such as 'Summarizing Examples') with sample texts and several summary options after this mini-lesson. By examining the first example, outlining the reasons behind each option's effectiveness or ineffectiveness, and determining the right answer, the instructor demonstrates the procedure. After that, students assess later cases on their own, choosing the best summary and debating their arguments with classmates. After that, there is a class discussion to solidify comprehension. The remaining examples carry on this guided practice. Students are then assisted by mini whiteboards and informed that they would be viewing a video version of the story they have already read. Periodically, the film is paused to allow the pupils to write succinct explanations of the parts they have watched. Students finish the assignment on their own once the teacher first demonstrates the procedure. After finishing, students give their summaries, and novices may use drawings to illustrate what they have learned. Instead of focusing on grammatical precision, feedback is given with an emphasis on understanding and using the summarizing skills (Change & Swales, 1990).

Students can make posters for a movie that is suitable for the classroom that include a textual synopsis of the story as a reinforcing exercise. Teachers may provide organized writing frameworks to facilitate learning based on students' English proficiency levels. Students gain mastery of summarizing as a crucial literacy skill through consistent practice and supervised assistance (Johns, 1990).

2.3 Paraphrasing

According to Change & Swales (1990), paraphrase is just restating the content of the original text or paragraph in your words while maintaining the same meaning. The phrase "in your own words" emphasizes that you must use alternative terms to rewrite the original text or piece in your own writing style. Writing, speaking, reading, and listening all benefit greatly from the talent of paraphrasing. No one will accuse you of plagiarism if you do it correctly. Even if you can express the same thoughts in your words, you still need to work on your ability to write and rephrase well enough to pass the plagiarism test.

According to Colomb and Williams (2010), one of the hardest academic skills to teach and develop is paraphrase. Because of this, it is often taught to pupils after they have experienced related activities, like summarizing and citing. Differentiating paraphrasing from these two approaches may help students grasp concepts more easily. Teachers may start by explaining that paraphrase is rephrasing someone else's thoughts in their words while maintaining the original meaning in a constructional context. Since people usually reformulate concepts when they lack the exact vocabulary to describe thoughts, this process represents how language is used in daily life. These illustrations assist students in identifying paraphrase as an organic communication technique that shows understanding (Turabian, 2017).

In terms of instruction, paraphrasing may be taught by first going over the idea of quoting and then showing how to turn a quote into a paraphrase. This technique not only guarantees that students grasp the source material, but it also lets readers know that they have understood it. Students are encouraged to use both paraphrases and quotes to bolster their points in academic writing (Buckley, 2004).

Teachers may use inductive teaching strategies, like concept attainment, to show students contrasting instances of successful and unsuccessful paraphrase to increase their comprehension. Students are encouraged to deduce the distinguishing features of an appropriate paraphrase by examining many instances. Appropriate paraphrases usually keep the length of the original text the same, reformulate lexical choices using synonyms, change sentence structure, reduce complicated terminology when needed, and faithfully convey the original content. Crucially, a well-written paraphrase involves accurate references to the source and does not incorporate the author's own thoughts (Buckley, 2004).

Through supervised practice exercises where they paraphrase many quotes, share their efforts with classmates, and get teacher comments, learners may further solidify these abilities. Students who participate in such exercises on a regular basis are better able to internalize the standards of successful paraphrase and differentiate it from faulty reformulation or simple summarization. These exercises help students develop the capacity to use paraphrase techniques on their own in academic writing and textual annotation over time (Lauder & Nation, 2001).

These educational decisions are deliberate, even though the teaching processes for citing, summarizing, and paraphrasing may seem straightforward. These techniques are intended to help students in achieving academic goals, foster higher-order thinking abilities, and scaffold language development. In the end, students who consistently use these techniques gain transferable academic literacy abilities that support their long-term academic achievement.

2.4 Accuracy in Academic Writing

Shaw and Liu (1998) state that many academics believe that explicit grammar training is necessary for academically focused and advanced English language learners who want to fulfil their academic and professional goals. The importance of achieving a satisfactory level of grammatical precision in academic writing is emphasized by Celce-Murcia (1999). According to her, university faculty members often find nonnative speakers' academic work undesirable due to their high rate of grammatical mistakes (8.1 errors per 100 words).

According to Laufer and Nation (2001), a wealth of research has shown that academic language competency cannot be developed by only exposing English language learners to formal written texts, vocabulary, grammar, and discourse structure. To put it another way, exposure to linguistic information by itself does not ensure language learning. The noticing hypothesis, put out by Hinkel (2002), contends that learners are more likely to absorb language aspects in the material that they actively pay attention to.

In a study of very skilled nonnative English-speaking students' speaking and writing skills, Chang and Swales (1999) found that just reading a lot and having experience in academic writing doesn't always help students develop the writing skills they need or understand the important language features of academic writing. They concluded that advanced academic writing and its features require special teaching. Ellis (1990) states They conclude that advanced academic writing and textual characteristics require specialized instruction. According to Ellis (1990), formal classroom education that places a strong emphasis on linguistic correctness encourages students to participate in planned discourse and aids in the development of the right kind of communicative competence.

According to Johns (1990), the prevailing method of teaching English for foreign writers has placed more emphasis on the writing process than the finished output. Accuracy in linguistics has so often been considered secondary. According to Hinkel (2004), problems with grammar, vocabulary, and mistakes are usually only fixed when they come up during writing exercises. It's common for learners beyond the introductory level to pick up grammar and vocabulary organically via reading and conversation.

Furthermore, Hinkel (2004) discovers that institutional and standardized evaluations of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing carried out by EFL specialists often pay little attention to the writing process itself and instead concentrate mostly on the finished output. She contends that many EFL students have suffered negative and expensive outcomes as a result of this misalignment between teaching methods and assessment standards. Students learn how to brainstorm, come up with new ideas, write drafts, and revise their work, but they only learn about academic vocabulary and formal grammatical and textual features—important language skills—once in a while.

3. Methodology

This section outlines the methods used to accomplish the goals and validate the study's assumptions. It focuses on the demographic, sampling, and research design, verifying the study test's instruments, determining its reliability, examining its items, and administering the created accomplishment test.

3.1 Research Design

According to Akhtar (2016), research design is the setting up of parameters for data collecting and analysis in a way that aims to balance economy and processes with relevance to the study's goal. By confirming that the observed results are attributable to the experimental modification, the goal is to establish causal linkages. It improves the validity of results, lessens the impact of confounding factors, and offers an organized framework for hypothesis testing (Fraenkel et al., 2019). As shown in Table 1, the current research uses a quantitative approach and a genuine experimental methodology (pretest-posttest control group design) to

determine how quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing techniques affect the academic writing and grammatical correctness of EFL students

Table 1

Experimental Design of the Study

Group	Treatment	Instrument
Experimental Group	Teaching through Quoting, Summarizing and Paraphrasing Strategies.	An achievement posttest.
Control Group	Teaching through the prescribed method	

Quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing techniques are the independent variables in this design, and only the experimental group (EG) receives therapy; the control group (CG) does not. A posttest is then administered to both groups, and their results are examined to determine the impact of the independent variable. The results will indicate whether the experimental group outperformed the control group by a large margin. The impact of citing, summarizing, and paraphrasing techniques is responsible for the improvement. By concentrating on variable control to demonstrate cause-effect correlations, this design adheres to best practices in educational research.

3.2 Population and Sampling

According to Fraenkel et al. (2019), a population is the total group of people or things that are the subject of the research and have a common trait. Concurrently, a sample is a portion of the population chosen to participate in research. According to Cohen et al. (2018), it functions as a representative group from which inferences about the whole population may be made. In this sense, third-year EFL students at the University of Tikrit's College of Education for Humanities and College of Education for Women during the academic year 2024–2025 made up the study's population. There are 258 people in the study population overall. The study's sample consists of EFL students from the University of Tikrit's College of Education for Humanities. There are 140 students in their third year. Three sections (A), (B), and (C) comprise the student body. There are forty pupils in each of sections (A) and (B) and forty in section (C). As the control and experimental groups, respectively, Sections (A) and (B) were chosen at random. Eighty people

make up 52% of the original population. Twenty students from section (C) have been chosen for the pilot project. The age, previous year's accomplishment level, academic attainment of their parents, and posttest achievement level of the two groups engaged have all been equal.

3.3 Construction and Application of the Achievement Posttest

An accomplishment posttest has been created to fulfil the study's objectives. The accomplishment assessments are restricted to certain curriculum-covered topics within each question. It may assist in allocating characteristics that a student should focus on going forward. An accomplishment test's primary function is to assess whether or not the course goals have been met (McNamara, 2000). The purpose of this study's accomplishment posttest is to assess students' thorough understanding and innovative language usage. It consists of two complementary parts: an evaluation of academic writing abilities and an assessment of grammatical correctness. These two assessments work together to assess students' ability to use language creatively and adaptably, in addition to their understanding of formal academic registers.

The accomplishment posttest consists of five equal questions (20 total points, or 100 points) designed to assess students' grammatical correctness. The first question focuses on identifying and fixing errors. The second question assesses students' proficiency with complicated phrases and sentence structure. The third question focuses on subject-verb agreement and verb tenses. Articles, prepositions, and word forms are used in question four, and students' usage of paragraph editing is the subject of question five. The exam guarantees a comprehensive assessment of students' academic writing grammatical correctness (See Appendix A).

The academic writing skills exam, on the other hand, is designed to assess students' performance over five equal questions (a total of twenty points, or one hundred marks). Coherence and cohesiveness are at issue in question 1. The second question focuses on arguments and organizing. The third question focuses on academic style and lexical diversity. Question four involves creating a thesis statement and an introduction, while question five involves creating a paragraph and conducting a critical analysis. (See Appendix B).

The constructed tests have been validated their reliability obtained and their items analyzed. They have been administrated at the end of the experiment, namely on sandy, 8th of April 2025. The posttest papers have been distributed to the involved students who have been informed about how to answer the questions of the test. After finishing the exam, the test papers are collected and scored in terms of the constructed scoring scheme.

3.4 Final Administration of the Research Instrument

After being validated, reliable the study instruments are finally administrated to the involved groups of students.

3.5. Final Administration of the Achievement Posttest

The experiment ran from February 2, 2025, until March 30, 2025. Two months passed at that time. based on the results of the test's pilot administration, which confirmed its validity and reliability. They were applied to the present study's sample at the conclusion of the experiment. The exam takes forty-five minutes to complete, and students are told to read the questions thoroughly before writing their responses on paper. After students have completed their responses, papers are gathered. The papers are corrected by a team of English professors to assess the experiment's effectiveness.

4. Presentation of the Results

The student's responses to the test and items have been analyzed statistically as follows:

4.1 Results Related to the First Hypothesis

To analyze the data related to the first hypothesis specifically: There is no statically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group which is taught using quoting, summarizing and paraphrasing strategies and that of the control group which is taught using the traditional method in grammatical accuracy posttest, the independent sample test has been used. Therefore, the first aim of the study namely: examine the effect of using quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing strategies on EFL college students' grammatical accuracy, will be achieved.

Table 2 shows that the experimental group's mean score is 53.73 and its standard deviation is 8.92. In contrast, the control group's mean scores were 32.03 with a standard deviation of 16.68. At a threshold of significance (0.05), the computed t-

value of 6.283 is greater than the tabulated t-value of 2.00 with 58 degrees of freedom. The calculated T-value of 6.283 is higher than the tabulated T-value of the field 2.00, as can be seen by looking at the calculated T-values above. Based on this, it can be said that there are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group, which is taught using quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing strategies, and the control group, which is taught using conventional methods. Thus, the first hypothesis is disproved.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviation, and t-Values of the Two Groups at Posttest in Grammatical Accuracy

Groups	N.	Mean	S.D.	T-Value		DF	Level of Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated		
Experimental	30	53.73	8.92	6.283	2.00	58	0.05

4.2 Results Related to the Second Hypothesis

To analyze the data related to the second hypothesis specifically: *There is no statically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group which is taught using quoting, summarizing and paraphrasing strategies and that of the control group which is taught using the traditional method in academic writing posttest*, the independent sample test has been used. Therefore, the second aim of the study namely: *examine the effect of using quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing strategies on EFL college students' academic writing*, will be achieved.

Table 3 presents the experimental group's mean scores, which are 58.80 with a standard deviation of 13.70. In contrast, the control group's mean score is 30.50, with a standard deviation of 13.40. At a threshold of significance (0.05), the computed t-value of 8.085 is greater than the tabulated t-value of 2.00 with 58 degrees of freedom. The calculated T-value of 8.085 is higher than the tabulated T-value of the field 2.00, as can be seen by looking at the calculated T-values above. Based on this, it can be said that there are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group, which is taught using quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing strategies, and the control group, which is taught using conventional methods. Thus, the second hypothesis is disproved.

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviation, and t-Values of the Two Groups at Posttest in academic writing

Groups	N.	Mean	S.D.	T-Value		DF	Level of Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated		
Experimental	30	58.80	13.70	8.085	2.00	58	0.05
Control	30	30.50	13.40				

4.3 Results Related to the Third Hypothesis

To determine the correlation between *"students' grammatical accuracy and academic writing."* The Pearson correlation coefficient is used to investigate the correlation between the two variables. The results reveal that the Pearson correlational value is 0.775 higher than the critical one 0.2461 at a level of significance 0.05 and degree of freedom 58. These results indicate there is correlation between *students' grammatical accuracy and academic writing*.

Thus, the third hypothesis, which states that *"There is no correlation at the significance level of 0.05 between grammatical accuracy and academic writing. ,"* is rejected, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4

The Correlation Between Students' Grammatical Accuracy and Academic Writing

Sample Size	Pearson Correlation Value	Critical Value	Level of Sig. 0.05
30	0.775	0.246	Significant

4.4 Discussion of the Results

The independent sample t-test findings provide strong proof of the value of quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing techniques in improving EFL college students' grammatical accuracy. The experimental group's mean score (53.73) and the control group's (32.03) substantial difference suggest that the teaching strategies used had a significant effect on the students' learning results.

The experimental group's high mean score and comparatively low standard deviation (8.92) indicate that students who were taught to quote, summaries, and

paraphrase were not only better able to understand grammatical concepts but also showed less variation in their performance levels. This suggests that these techniques could provide a more thorough comprehension of grammatical structures, enabling pupils to apply information more consistently. On the other hand, the control group, which used conventional teaching techniques, showed a greater standard deviation (16.68) and a much lower mean score (32.03). This implies that the traditional teaching method would not adequately meet the demands of EFL students, leading to a greater variety of performance results and perhaps exposing deficiencies in grammar rule application and understanding. The conclusion that the differences in mean scores are statistically significant is further supported by the computed t-value (6.283), which is more than the tabular value (2.00) at a degree of freedom of 58. This result not only supports the null hypothesis' rejection but also highlights the need for more engaging and language-acquisition-friendly teaching methods.

Figure 1

Mean Scores of the Two Groups at Posttest in Grammatical Accuracy



Strong proof that quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing techniques considerably improve academic writing abilities among EFL college students is shown by the results of the independent sample t-test pertaining to the second hypothesis. The findings show a significant difference between the experimental group's mean scores and those of the control group, demonstrating the effectiveness of the creative teaching strategies used.

The experimental group's mean score (58.80) was significantly higher than the control group's (30.50). This implies that students who were instructed in the use of quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing techniques enhanced their writing abilities

and accomplished so with a noteworthy level of proficiency. The experimental group's lower standard deviation (13.70) suggests that students' performance was less diverse and that they all had a more consistent understanding of academic writing techniques.

The mean score (30.50) and similar standard deviation (13.40) of the control group, on the other hand, demonstrate the shortcomings of conventional instructional strategies in developing academic writing skills. The control group's wider range of results illustrates the difficulties with traditional methods, which may not adequately engage or meet the special requirements of EFL students in the development of critical writing abilities. The conclusion that the differences observed are statistically significant is further supported by the computed t-value (8.085), which is substantially higher than the reported t-value (2.00) at a 0.05 significance level. This significant difference highlights the null hypothesis' rejection and emphasizes how crucial it is to choose instructional tactics that really improve students' academic performances.

Figure 2

Mean Scores of the Two Groups at Posttest in Academic Writing



The

results of the Pearson correlation study provide compelling proof that students' academic writing abilities and grammatical precision are significantly correlated. The computed Pearson correlation value of 0.775 indicates a strong positive association between these two variables, suggesting a tight connection between gains in academic writing competence and increases in grammatical correctness.

With 58 degrees of freedom and a significance threshold of 0.05, the correlation coefficient of 0.775 far surpasses the crucial value of 0.2461. This strong link

suggests that pupils' academic writing tends to become better as their grammatical precision increases. This finding emphasizes how important grammatical proficiency is for writing well, which is a crucial component of academic achievement.

The significance of teaching grammatical rules as part of academic writing education is shown by the substantial link discovered in this research. It implies that because knowledge of grammar may lead to improved writing results, teachers should place a high priority on grammatical correctness in their lessons. Therefore, implementing targeted grammar teaching may be a useful tactic for improving EFL students' overall writing quality.

5. Conclusion

1. The grammatical accuracy of the experimental and control groups differs statistically significantly, according to the independent samples t-test.
2. Compared to the control group (32.03), the experimental group receives a higher mean score (53.73). This demonstrates how well the quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing strategies work.
3. The experimental group's decreased standard deviation indicates more reliable performance and improved grammatical structure comprehension.
4. The crucial value (2.00) is exceeded by the computed t-value (6.283). As a result, the null hypothesis about grammatical precision is rejected.
5. The experimental group outperforms the control group in academic writing abilities (58.80 vs. 30.50).
6. The findings show that creative teaching methods greatly improve students' academic writing abilities.
7. The second null hypothesis is rejected, and statistical significance is confirmed since the computed t-value (8.085) is greater than the crucial value (2.00).
8. The person correlation coefficient ($r=0.775$) shows that there is a strong positive link between grammatical accuracy and academic writing skills.
9. The link is statistically significant because the correlation coefficient is higher than the crucial threshold (0.2461).

10. Research indicates that better grammar has a direct impact on better academic writing.

11. In general, citing, summarizing, and paraphrasing techniques are useful teaching tools for enhancing EFL College students' academic writing and grammatical precision.

Appendix (A)

Academic Writing skills Achievement Posttest

Q1 Read the following paragraph carefully and then answer questions: (20 Marks)

Many English foreign university students struggle with academic writing. They do not organize their ideas clearly. Academic writing requires logical connections. Students often utilize informal language. Writing improves with practice. Teachers should provide more feedback.

A. Identify three problems related to coherence and cohesions in the paragraph.

B. Rewrite the paragraph to improve coherence and cohesion by:

1. Adding appropriate linking devices
2. Improving logical flow
3. Ensuring smooth transitions between sentences

Q2 Write a well-organized argumentative paragraph (150-100 words) on the following: (20 Marks)

“Online learning is more effective than traditional classroom learning”

Your paragraph must include:

- A. A clear topic sentence
- B. At least two well-developed supporting arguments
- C. Logical organization and paragraph structure
- D. A concluding sentence.

Q3 A. Replace the informal words/phrases with more academic alternative: (10 Marks)

1. A lot of students fail exams because they do not try hard.
2. Children today use phones too much
3. This thing causes many problems.
4. People think social media is bad
5. The results show good stuff.

B. Rewrite the following paragraph to improve lexical variety and academic tone: (10 Marks).

A lot of people think that technology is good. It helps people do many things. But it also has bad effects. People use it a lot, and this causes problems.

Q4 Write an academic introduction (50-100 words) for the following essay: (20 Marks)

“The impact of artificial intelligence on higher education”

Your introduction should be involved:

1. Background information
2. Clear thesis statements
3. Clear indication of essay structure (outline of main points)
4. Academic tone and clarity

Q5 Read the following claim:

“University education should be free for all students”

Write one analytical paragraph (100 words) in which you:

Clearly state your position

Provide at least two supporting ideas with explanation

Use evidence / examples (real or hypothetical)

Maintain coherence and academic style

Appendix (B)

Grammatical Accuracy Achievement Posttest

Q1 Rewrite the following sentences correctly: (20 Marks)

1. The results of the study shows significant differences.
2. Many students has difficulty in writing academic essays.
3. The researcher suggested that the participants complete the survey.
4. Despite of the challenges, the project was successfully.
5. Each of the students have submitted their assignment late.

Q2 A. Combine the following pairs of sentences into one complex sentence using appropriate connectors: (10 Marks)

1. Academic writing is challenging. It requires critical thinking.
2. The experiment was expensive. It produced reliable results.
3. Students attend workshops. They improve their writing skills.
4. The policy was controversial. It was implemented quickly.
5. The data was limited. The researcher drew conclusions.

B. Rewrite the following sentences to improve grammatical accuracy: (10 Marks)

1. There are many factors influencing success.
2. The article discuss important issues.
3. If students will study harder, they will succeed.
4. The information were collected carefully.
5. She explained me the procedures clearly.

Q3 Choose the correct form of the verb: (20 marks)

1. The researcher (analyze/analyzes/analyzed) the data carefully.
2. The results (was/were/is) unexpected.

3. By the time the lecture started, the students (arrived/had arrived/arrive).
4. Each participant (receive/receives/received) a certificate.
5. The study (conducted/was conducted/conducting) in 2022.
6. Neither the teacher nor the students (was/were/is) prepared.
7. The number of applicants (increase/increases/have increased) every year.
8. If the data (is/was/were) accurate, the conclusion would change.
9. She (has completed/have completed/completed) the report already.
10. Statistics (is/are/was) an essential subject in research.

Q4 Fill in the blanks with correct form of (Article, Prepositions, and Word Forms): (20 Marks)

1. The research focuses climate change.
2. She has PhD in linguistics.
3. The study was conducted..... A small sample.
4. Academic success depends Hard work.
5. The results were different What we expected.
6. This theory is basedprevious research.
7. He is interestedimproving his writing skills.
8. The discussion provides an in-depth (analyze) of the issue.
9. The findings were highly (significance).
10. There was a lack of (accurate) in the data.

Q5 The following paragraph contains at least 8 grammatical errors. (20 Marks)

Identify and correct them

Academic writing requires careful organization and clear language. Many students struggle with grammar because they do not practice regularly. In addition, the use of inappropriate tenses

makes their writing confusing. If students will focus on improving their skills, they can achieve better results. Teacher also plays an important role in guiding students.

References

- Achatar, J. W. (2016). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed). Pearson
- Booth, W. C. Colomb. & Williamms, J.M. (2010). *The craft of research* (3rd ed.) University of Chicago Press.
- Buckley, J. (2004). *Fit to print: The Canadian students' guide to essay writing*. Thomson Nelson.
- Chang, Y. Y., & Swales, J. (1999). Informal elements in English academic writing: Threats or opportunities for advanced non-native speakers. *Writing: Texts, processes and practices*, 145-167.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018) *Research methods in education* (8th ed) Routledge.
- Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition: Learning in*
- Fraenkel, J.R., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (10th ed) McGraw-Hill Education.
- Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Johns, A. M. (1990). L1 composition theories: Implications for developing theories of L2 composition. *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*, 24-36.
- Laufer, B., & Nation, P. (2001). Passive vocabulary size and speed of meaning recognition: Are they related? *Eurosla Yearbook*, 1(1),7-28.
- Murcia, H. (1990). A comparative study on the awareness of grammar instructional approach by EFL teachers and learners. *English Teaching*, 60(1), 69-96.
- Shaw, P., & TING-KUN LIU, E. (1998). What develops in the development of second-language writing? *Applied Linguistics*, 19(2), 225-254.
- the classroom: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Turabian, Kate, L. (2017). *Student Guide to Writing College Papers*. 4th ed. London : The university of Chicago press.