



## Utilizing the 4Es Instructional Model to Optimizing EFL Learners' Achievement in English Grammar at University Level

F M Salih<sup>1</sup> S F Mohammed<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of English, College of Education for Humanities, University of Mosul, Nineveh, Iraq.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Chemical and Petroleum Industries Techniques Engineering, Technical Engineering College of Mosul, Northern Technical University, Nineveh, Iraq.

### Article information

#### Article history:

Received: 20 June 2025

Revised: 21 July 2025

Accepted: : 31 July 2025

#### Keywords:

English Grammar;  
4Es Instructional Model;  
Inductive Approach;  
Deductive Approach; EFL  
University Students;  
Grammar Achievement.

#### Correspondence:

Firas Muayyad Salih,  
[firasmuayyad@uomosul.edu.iq](mailto:firasmuayyad@uomosul.edu.iq)

### Abstract

Grammar has been an essential aspect of language teaching for years. To enable learners to achieve communicative competence, they require to master its constituent parts, with grammar competence being a key element. Therefore, this study aims at investigating the effectiveness of utilizing the 4Es instructional model on enhancing first-year EFL university students' learning and achievement in English grammar. The population of the present study was all first-year EFL university students enrolled at Northern Technical University/Technical Engineering College of Mosul (TECM) with a total population of (758) students distributed across seven major departments for the first course of the academic year 2024-2025. To proceed, one department, viz. The Department of Chemical and Petroleum Industries Techniques Engineering, was chosen randomly to be the sample of the study, which composed of (52) participants: Group A (25), and Group B (27). Thereafter, Group A was randomly assigned as the experimental group, and Group B as the control group. The experimental group was instructed according to the 4Es instructional model, whereas the control group was instructed according to the prescribed method, i.e. the deductive approach to teaching English grammar. After conducting the experiment for precisely (10) weeks and five days; it was concluded that the 4Es instructional model, which involves activities that promote grammar noticing and selecting, consciousness-raising, practicing, and evaluation were proved to be effective in optimizing first-year EFL university students learning and achievement in English grammar.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69513/jnfh.v4.i2.a8> ©Authors, 2026, College of Education, Alnoor University.

This is an open-access article under the CC BY 4.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## توظيف إنموذج 4Es التعليمي لتحسين تحصيل متعلمي اللغة الإنكليزية بوصفها لغة أجنبية في قواعد اللغة الإنكليزية على مستوى الجامعة

فiras مؤيد صالح<sup>1</sup> سندس فلاح محمد<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>قسم اللغة الإنكليزية، كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية، جامعة الموصل، نينوى، العراق.

<sup>2</sup>قسم هندسة تقنيات الصناعات الكيماوية والبترولية، كلية الهندسة التقنية في الموصل، الجامعة التقنية الشمالية، نينوى، العراق.

### الخلاصة

لطالما كانت القواعد النحوية ركناً أساسياً في تعليم اللغات. ولتمكين المتعلمين من تحقيق الكفاءة التواصلية، يتعين عليهم إتقان عناصرها التركيبية، إذ تُعد الكفاءة النحوية عنصراً أساسياً. لذلك، تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى دراسة فعالية استخدام أنموذج 4Es التعليمي في تحسين تعلم طلبة الصف الأول الجامعيين الذين يدرسون اللغة الإنكليزية بوصفها لغة أجنبية وتحصيلهم في قواعد اللغة الإنكليزية. تكون مجتمع الدراسة من جميع طلبة الصف الأول الدارسين للغة الإنكليزية بوصفها لغة أجنبية والمسجلين في الجامعة التقنية الشمالية/ كلية الهندسة التقنية في الموصل (TECM) والبالغ عددهم الكلي (758) طالباً موزعين على سبعة أقسام رئيسة للفصل الدراسي الأول من العام الدراسي 2024-2025. وللمضي قدماً، تم اختيار قسم هندسة

تقنيات الصناعات الكيماوية والبتروولية عشوائياً ليكون عينة الدراسة. تكونت عينة الدراسة من (52) مشاركاً: المجموعة A (25) مشاركاً، والمجموعة B (27) مشاركاً. بعد ذلك، اختيرت إحدى المجموعتين (المجموعة A) عشوائياً كمجموعة تجريبية، والأخرى (المجموعة B) كمجموعة ضابطة. دُرست المجموعة التجريبية وفقاً لنموذج 4Es التعليمي، بينما دُرست المجموعة الضابطة وفقاً للطريقة المقررة، وهو المنهج الاستنتاجي لتدريس قواعد اللغة الإنكليزية. بعد إجراء التجربة لمدة عشرة أسابيع وخمسة أيام تحديداً، خلصت الدراسة إلى أن نموذج 4Es التعليمي - الذي يتضمن أنشطة تُعزز ملاحظة القواعد واختيارها، وزيادة الوعي بها، والممارسة، والتقييم - قد أثبتت فعاليتها في تحسين تعلم طلبة الصف الأول الجامعيين والذين يدرسون اللغة الإنكليزية بوصفها لغة أجنبية وفي تحصيلهم في قواعد اللغة الإنكليزية.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** قواعد اللغة الإنكليزية؛ أنموذج 4Es التعليمي؛ المنهج الاستقرائي؛ المنهج الاستنتاجي؛ طلبة الجامعة الذين يدرسون اللغة الإنكليزية بوصفها لغة أجنبية؛ التحصيل في النحو الإنكليزي.

## 1. Introduction

English, in today's fast-growing world, is the medium of international communication, the language of trade and business, science and technology, and the key to accessing a vast amount of entertainment, the internet, and education. English is now dominated as a global language. It is the target language that is most widely taught as a FL in most world-wide countries, and in most of these countries it is emerging as the chief FL to be found in schools, often displacing another language in the process (Crystal, 2003: 5). English has been classified as the most widely learnt language around the world, with more second-language speakers than native speakers.

To learn any language, one needs to master its skills and its constituent components, one of which is grammar. Being a key component, grammar has been an essential aspect of language teaching for years. It also plays a vital role in language learning, and scholars of applied linguistics have debated its importance extensively. Mastering English grammar is essential not only for academic success, but also for everyday interactions, especially if learners intend to speak the target language and produce well-formed sentences.

In the realm of language learning, teaching English grammar plays a pivotal role in EFL teaching and learning and in facilitating effective communication and comprehension. Grammar has been proven to be the cornerstone in mastering a new language, and many methods in teaching grammar have emerged as a promising avenue for enhancing pedagogical practices. For a significant period of time, grammar and its instruction has been the main concern for both language teachers and learners alike. Some perceive it as an indispensable component to language teaching as Ellis (2002), while others view it as a hinderance to language teaching and learning as Krashen (1982). However, Ellis (2009: 105) has concluded in his empirical study that "grammar instruction can help learners enhance both their language proficiency and

accuracy. It also facilitates the internalization of the syntactic system of the ESL/EFL, and supports the development of fluency". Therefore, the importance and value of teaching English grammar explicitly has never been disputed (Aarts et al., 2012: 3).

In Iraq, conventional grammar instruction methods have typically followed a one-size-fit-all approach, failing to adapt to the requirements of each learner and his/her unique idiosyncrasy and diversity as well as keeping up with the recent developments in the teaching methods in general, teaching grammar in particular.

Recognizing these limitations in grammar instruction, educators have increasingly turned towards new ways and techniques in grammar teaching that leverage new approaches and theories, one of which is the 4Es instructional model, i.e. Expose; Exercise; Execute; and Evaluate.

### 1.1. Statement of the Problem

Grammar is essential to language and it is regarded the most important language component. Without it, there is no language (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 1). Due to this important role in language, it is considered a crucial aspect of foreign language teaching. As good knowledge of English grammar has always been an essential part of the course aiming at improving communicative competence in listening, speaking, reading and writing respectively. In the end, language learners must achieve grammatical competence as it is a key element of their overall communicative competence (Hadjih, 2017: 16).

Despite its crucial role in language learning, grammar is considered a significant issue for most EFL learners, and much previous research has indicated its problematic nature (Alzu'bi, 2015; Brown and Lee, 2016; El-Tanani et al., 2011; Hadjih, 2017; Kolat, 2009; Lafta, 2019; and Mallia, 2014). Grammar provides the necessary rules for organizing words into meaningful sentences, as it forms the backbone of effective communication (Adda, 2025: 1). That's why EFL learners often struggle to express themselves clearly, coherently,

and confidently without a solid understanding of sentence structure, tenses, and syntax. According to Ellis et al. (2009: 144), there are three criteria that respectively determine the learning difficulty of grammatical features as implicit and explicit knowledge, and they are: difficulties associated with the linguistic environment (e.g. input frequency); difficulties related to linguistic factors, i.e. the nature of the grammatical features; and difficulties due to psychological factors, i.e. learnability.

To learn English grammar effectively, EFL learners need a great deal of instruction in order to assimilate basic grammatical materials. However, nothing in the field of language pedagogy has sparked as much debate as teaching of grammar. The controversy has consistently revolved around whether grammar should be taught explicitly through a formal presentation of grammar rules or implicitly through natural exposure to meaningful language use (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 1).

A highly debated and unanswered question in grammar learning is whether language learners should first learn the grammatical rules before using the structural forms (the deductive approach or DA), or before applying them; or if they should use the grammatical structures in functional practice sessions before learning the grammatical rules (the inductive approach or IA) (Hadjih, 2017: 2).

At the university level, grammar instruction has consistently posed significant challenges. Such challenges persist in the realm of grammatical structure instruction, as evidenced by the difficulties and challenges encountered by undergraduate EFL students in grasping fundamental grammatical concepts (Ahmed et al., 2020: 420). This is clear and obviously observed in many EFL classrooms, have a look at the results of the English subject at schools and universities and one can understand what we mean.

Based on these discussions and observations, the researchers, and from their observations and experiences, have noticed that EFL students experience difficulties in grammar learning, and this is obvious when EFL learners attempt to perform the productive skills, i.e. they experience difficulties in applying what they have learned to producing accurate English sentences (See Al-Sinbesy, 2012; Brown and Lee, 2016; and El-Tanani et al., 2011). The result of this is that language proficiency, including grammar knowledge, among EFL students seems to be on the decline. The study problem has been identified, and can be coined as: Although its

significance is well-acknowledged and recognized, there remains a notable gap in the literature concerning finding effective methods and approaches for grammar instruction to enhance learners' grammar proficiency and engagement.

### 1.2. Aims of the Study

This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of utilizing the 4Es instructional model on the grammar learning and achievement of first-year EFL university students enrolled at the Department of Chemical and Petroleum Industries Techniques Engineering, Technical Engineering College/ Mosul, Northern Technical University; as well as their overall proficiency in the English language. On the basis of these two primary goals, the following specific objectives have been already drawn:

- (1) To measure the baseline grammar proficiency of first-year EFL university students enrolled at the Department of Chemical and Petroleum Industries Techniques Engineering, Technical Engineering College/ Mosul, Northern Technical University;
- (2) To evaluate the effectiveness of utilizing the 4Es instructional model on the grammar achievement of first-year EFL university students;
- (3) To analyze the differences in grammar achievement between the experimental group (EG) and the control group (CG) after the implementation of the 4Es instructional model;
- (4) To compare the 4Es instructional model with the prescribed instructional approach, i.e. the DA; and finally,
- (5) To assess the overall English language proficiency of first-year EFL university students.

### 1.3. Questions of the Study

The present study seeks to address key questions about the effectiveness of utilizing the 4Es instructional model, aiming to enhance further understanding and contribute valuable insights. The study questions are as follows:

- (1) Is the grammar learning and achievement of first-year EFL university students optimized as a consequence of utilizing the 4Es instructional model?
- (2) To what extent is the 4Es instructional model effective in optimizing English grammar achievement of first-year EFL university students?
- (3) How do the 4Es instructional model and the prescribed method, i.e. the DA; differ from each other?

- (4) Is the overall English language proficiency of first-year EFL university students improved?

#### 1.4. Significance of the Study

Once again grammar teaching has regained its importance in language teaching and learning, akin to its former prominence. Grammar teaching is now a crucial aspect in language learning. In addition to the importance of teaching grammar in language learning, many scholars have emphasized the importance of teaching grammar in context (See Brown, 2007; Ellis, 2006; Larsen-Freeman, 2003; Nunan, 1991; and Thornbury, 1999). Each one of those scholars endorse teaching grammar in context, but with different approaches, and this augments the effectiveness of grammar teaching approaches and techniques that require contextual teaching and application of grammatical rules. This necessitates the use of 4Es in teaching English grammar that could be of great benefit in addressing these challenges and difficulties. Therefore, the integration of the 4Es in grammar teaching can enhance EFL learners' understanding and application of grammatical rules as well as addressing different challenges and difficulties in language learning. By exposing EFL learners to natural TL context; noticing the rule; applying what they have discovered and unveiled; and finally being evaluated to measure their understanding and progress, language teachers can create a more autonomous, interactive, effective and engaging learning environment where EFL learners are participating actively in the process and being responsible for their own learning and becoming more autonomous. Accordingly, the theoretical and practical significance of the present study arises from what follows:

- (1) There are no experimental studies conducted to experiment the effectiveness of 4Es instructional model on grammar learning and achievement of first-year EFL university students in the Iraqi context;
- (2) The instructional model, daily-lesson plans, and the instruments of the investigation might be of benefit to all EFL stakeholders;
- (3) The study might pave the way to other researchers to investigate the effectiveness of using 4Es in improving English grammar to different academic levels;
- (4) Particularly, this study can help EFL learners being aware of the instructional approach that can greatly enhance their grammatical

competence and guide them in recognizing what works best for them;

- (5) This study is likely to provide language educators and stakeholders with valuable insights about the most effective method for teaching English grammar to EFL learners; and
- (6) Consequently, the current study aims to contribute to the field of foreign language education research.

#### 1.5. Hypotheses

For experimental purposes, the subsequent null hypotheses are formulated. The  $\alpha$ -level is fixed at 0.05:

**H<sub>01</sub>:** "There will be no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the EG and those of the CG in the grammar achievement posttest".

**H<sub>02</sub>:** "There will be no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the EG and those of the CG in the overall English language proficiency posttest".

#### 1.6. Limits of the Study

The study is limited to the followings:

- (1) The four main separate stages included in the 4Es instructional model to teaching grammar, viz. Exposure, Exercise, Execution, and Evaluation;
- (2) A sample of first-year EFL university students enrolled at the Northern Technical University Departments in the first course of the academic year 2024-2025; and
- (3) English Language Module 1 designed specifically for the first-year EFL university students of the Northern Technical University.

#### 1.7. Key Terms and their Definitions

For the sake of terminological clarity and preciseness, the following key-terms are defined:

1. **4Es Instructional Model:** Laor (2014, 0:10) defines the 4Es as "a set of steps that you can use when you are planning on teaching a grammar point or a grammar structure to the students. These steps can be taken in order to make sure that the lesson is structured accordingly and that the students are being exposed to the grammar properly and are getting enough practice using it".
- The operational definition of the 4Es instructional model: 4Es is an instructional model of four distinct separate stages, i.e. 'Exposure', 'Exercise', 'Execution', and 'Evaluation', which are utilized by the researchers to optimize grammar learning and

achievement of the first-year EFL university students.

2. **English Grammar:** Grammar is all the rules that govern the language. Greenbaum and Nelson (2002: 1) describe grammar as “the set of rules that allow us to combine words in our language into larger units.” Also, Brown (2014: 373) defines grammar as “descriptions of linguistic systems; rules that account for linguistic performance”.
- The operational definition of English grammar: English grammar is the ability of first-year EFL university students to produce accurate English sentences in various contexts using the right rules and structure.
3. **Grammar Achievement:** The operational definition of grammar achievement is the score each first-year EFL university student receives in both groups, experimental and control, in the posttest of grammar, and this posttest measures various aspects of grammar, and it is administered immediately upon the completion of the experiment.

### 2.1. Grammar Instruction

Grammar instruction has been developed across time and transformed from ‘conventional’ to ‘contemporary and modern approaches’. It is regarded as a dynamic process. It actually serves to demonstrate how language works. Accurate and effective grammar instruction leads learners to know how to use the language correctly and communicatively (Alem, 2021: 8). Salman et al. (2022: 298) have stated that most instructors are supporting the idea of giving only a few examples with no using practical exercises for applying the grammatical rules; whereas Azar (2007: 3) has focused on the pedagogical value of grammar instruction as “One important aspect of grammar teaching is that it helps learners discover the nature of language. Without grammar, we would have only individual words or sounds, pictures, and body expressions to communicate meaning. Grammar is the weaving that creates the fabric”. Teachers’ beliefs on the fact how students can easily learn the material and what the instructional model for deep learning is being used can be regarded as the main determinants of what teachers choose in class according to “curriculum, pedagogy, assessment and classroom management” (Aman, 2020: 2). In accordance with grammar instructions, grammar can be taught in various methods:

- (1) via following explicit teaching in which students are clearly exposed to rules attracting their attention (Aman, 2020: 2);
- (2) via following implicit teaching in which teachers do not point out to the rules, i.e. rules can be comprehended implicitly throughout using various forms of exposure (Aman, 2020: 2);
- (3) following a DA in which students firstly learn rules (Aman, 2020: 2);
- (4) following an IA in which students themselves determine the patterns by examining some given examples (Aman, 2020: 2);
- (5) separately, in which the grammatical rules are taught to students in isolation (Aman, 2020: 2); or
- (6) integratedly, in which students learning the grammatical rules are taught with other different learning activities (Aman, 2020: 2).

However, irrespective of whether the practice is controlled, in context, or communicative, it will be characterized by the following:

- (1) Attempts are made to “isolate a specific grammatical feature for focused attention” (Ellis, 2002: 168).
- (2) Learners have to come up “with sentences containing the targeted feature” (Ellis, 2002: 168).
- (3) Opportunities will be provided for learners to repeat the intended feature (Ellis, 2002: 168).
- (4) Learners are expected to perform the structural feature properly (Ellis, 2002: 168).
- (5) Feedback is provided on whether “learners’ performance of the grammatical structure is correct or not. The teacher’s feedback may be on-the-spot or delayed” (Ellis, 2002: 168).

In Iraq, more specifically in the Departments of English throughout Iraqi Universities, most of them follow the DA to teaching English grammar. In this traditional approach, the teacher presents and explains a specific grammar rule to the students, and then provides them with some examples. Clearly, by employing this method, the teacher can effectively help students in learning grammar items through explanation and guided practice (Lafta, 2019: 56).

As evidenced by the discussion above, the primary objective of grammar instruction is to help language learners achieve grammatical competence. Grammar knowledge serves as a tool for learners to understand, and produce oral/written discourse in efficient, effective, and appropriate manner according to the context on the situation. So, effective grammar instruction should bridge the

gaps between understanding grammar rules and applying them in practical, various communicative social contexts, aligning with these theoretical perspectives (Huang, 2005: 28).

## 2.2. Inductive and Deductive Approaches

Grammar has certainly received significant attention in EFL pedagogy and research. Reviewing previous-related literature on grammar (teaching and learning) in the ESL/EFL context reveals that several key issues have been emphasized. One of these issues is whether to teach grammar inductively or deductively. IA and DA are considered two of the fundamental approaches used to present language items, here in this study teaching grammar (Gower et al., 1995: 135). Brown (2014: 423) has posed the following controversial pedagogical grammar question: “Should grammar be presented inductively or deductively?”. To answer this question properly, and to choose which grammar teaching approach is more appropriate, one needs to delve deeper, discussing and explaining each grammar teaching approach in thorough detail.

Before discussing and explaining each grammar teaching approach in detail, the IA resembles the way how individuals acquire their first language; simply through exposure to a considerable amount of input of the regularities and patterns of the language without conscious study and explicit rule formulation. “Induction or learning through experience is seen as a natural way to learn, and it is strongly associated with methods of second language instruction, such ‘the Direct Method’ and ‘the Natural Approach’, which model themselves on first language acquisition” (Thornbury, 1999: 49).

First, let’s explain the two approaches to teaching grammar. In an IA to teaching grammar, “the teacher provides the context, in the written or spoken form, and shows examples; but learners are left to figure out the grammatical rule on their own”. Conversely, in a DA, “learners are provided with the grammatical rule first by the teacher, and then practice various instances of language to which the rule applies” (Walter, 2015: 3).

The DA and IA are regarded as two-grammar-teaching processes. Deductive-grammar-teaching process is a more traditional style of teaching in which “students learn a rule and then apply it in practice exercises” (Ur, 2012: 298). In contrast, the inductive-grammar-teaching process, which is a discovery approach and a more modern style “in which the teacher provides students with language

data, from which they work out the rule themselves” (Ur, 2012: 299).

When the IA is employed, “a context is established first by the teacher from which the target structure is drawn. Therefore, the approaches described under visual/oral contexts, texts and short dialogues could be referred to as inductive” (Gower et al., 1995: 135). Conversely, “the DA starts with an example of a structure and the grammatical rule is given first, followed by language practice, as described under giving or working out the ‘rule’” (Gower et al., 1995: 135).

The DA to teaching grammar entails the use of metalinguistic information presented explicitly by the teacher to the language learners at the beginning of the lesson (Mallia, 2014: 222). This generally involves from the outset the presentation of the concept to be taught directly by the teacher. Learners have no problem understanding the concept as the teacher explained it. Then, and to reinforce this digestion, the teacher writes examples of the taught concept on the board. Lastly, the teacher encourages learners to produce their own examples and share their findings with the class (Al-Kharrat, 2000: 3-4). Harmer (2007: 203) maintains that these “Explanation and practice sequences are usually PPP-like”, where PPP-Method is a widely-used instructional approach that stands for “present, practice and produce”, and where learners learn in sequential, step-by-step manners.

Nevertheless, while there are merits and demerits of both approaches to teaching grammar, and while a combination of both DA and IA is likely to happen, but there is no universal agreement on which approach is more effective in teaching grammar in an EFL context, and the debate is still raging in this regard (See Hadjih, 2017; Haight et al., 2007; Hird, 2015; Mallia, 2014; Nunan, 2003; and Şahinkaya, 2023).

So to answer the question ‘Which approach works best?’, one can say that both DA and IA have advantages and disadvantages and which grammar teaching approach is deemed appropriate to use with your students depends on several factors, including age and learner characteristics; the nature of the language under instruction; what the teacher and learners prefer the most; language proficiency level; grammar-point complexity; classroom time and setting; and teacher’s role and teaching philosophy. It remains, however, likely commonly accepted that a combination of both grammar teaching approaches, DA and IA, is ideally appropriate for the

EFL classroom (Hird, 2015: 1-2). As Nunan (2003: 158) concludes that an eclectic approach integrating both approaches, DA and IA, can be combined together.

### 2.3. The 4Es Instructional Model

The 4Es is a model of instruction consisting of four separate stages, viz. Exposure; Exercise; Execution; and Evaluation. In this study, it is utilized and modified to teach English grammar to first-year EFL university students. Each E in the paradigm denotes a distinct, separate step. It is in essence an IA to teaching grammar, but with some modifications. Teachers who teach the language inductively show learners a number of examples and non-examples, and then lead them towards noticing a grammar pattern in order to come up with a generalization or concept rule. It is a 'bottom up' approach, and based on trial and error, or experiment. Learners learn by experimenting different things, evaluating what works, and what does not. Through this process, they discover the grammatical rules, then teachers evaluate their understanding and application of the grammar rule (Mountone, 2004 cited in Hadjih, 2017: 44).

In her video, Noga Laor (2014) who is the academic director at Rennert School, an English language school at NYC, introduces the 4Es, a four-step-instructional model, which stands for Expose, Exercise, Execute, and Evaluate. She (2014) explains that this model helps make grammar instruction more engaging and effective by guiding EFL/ESL students through different stages of grammar learning. These steps are:

- (1) Exposure: EFL/ESL students are exposed to grammar structure through a written or spoken form, a 'story or a dialogue' that they can look at, and spot the structural rule(s) (Laor, 2014).
- (2) Exercise: EFL/ESL students are given a set of tasks that permit them to "notice and select the grammar pattern, the pattern of the grammar structure" (Laor, 2014, 1:13). This should be done under the guidance of their teacher.
- (3) Execute: EFL/ESL students use the grammar rule in real-life contexts, such as writing a paragraph, or engaging in a conversation. It is worth mentioning that "there should be a mirror between the execution stage and the exposure stage, but the teacher can incorporate other skills in there as well" (Laor, 2014, 2:50).
- (4) Evaluate: EFL/ESL students are given a homework assignment, "which will allow them to practice the grammar at home on their own; or

a quiz which can be conducted outside class or the next day in class". This quiz helps the EFL/ESL teacher to evaluate the progress of the students, and "how well they have understood the grammar structure and can use it" (Laor, 2014, 3:22).

In brief, the 4Es is a four-stage-instructional model. Each stage begins with a letter 'e', viz. Expose, Exercise, Execute, and Evaluate. In this study, it is utilized and modified to teach English grammar to first-year EFL university students. Each E in the paradigm denotes a distinct, separate step, and represents a specific aspect of the grammar teaching process.

### 2.4. Previous Related Studies

After reviewing the related literature on teaching English grammar using the 4Es instructional model, it is found that there is no study similar to the present one. Therefore, the previous studies investigating topics relevant to the present one will be discussed chronologically to provide a clear overview of the research developments in this field. Therefore, below are some academic studies, which were conducted in the region that have investigated the effect of the IA and DA to teaching English grammar at university level.

- (1) **Kolat's (2009)**: The first study is Kolat's (2009), which was conducted in Istanbul, Turkey. She (2009) compared between the two approaches, i.e. the IA and DA, and sought to determine whether teaching English grammar deductively or inductively is more effective for EFL university students enrolled at Istanbul Aydin University. To fulfill the goals of her investigation, she selected two-different classes, each consisting of 25 EFL university students with elementary proficiency in English. One class was instructed according to the IA to teaching English grammar, and the other was taught according to the DA. After applying the experiment, both groups were posttested. The results of her study were that the DA is more beneficial for EFL university students with elementary-level English proficiency.
- (2) **Mallia (2014)**: Next, a study implemented by Mallia (2014) in Sudan, which intended to examine "adult learners' perceptions on IA and DA of teaching English grammar; evaluating the written performance of the two study groups, one was taught according to the IA, and the other was taught according to the DA; and finally deciding whether using the IA, DA, or both approaches

was the most feasible for resident or visiting teachers” (Mallia, 2014: 224). The sample of the study consisted of 50 adult-Sudanese EFL participants, 7 females and 43 males. The participants of the study were exposed to both approaches to teaching grammar for a three-month course in general English.

The results of data analysis showed that learners preferred the DA over the IA, but “slight differences between the inductive and deductive groups’ performance were found. However, tasks that promote grammar-noticing and consciousness-raising, i.e. inductive tasks, were broadly found effective, if local contextualization was adopted” (Mallia, 2014: 221). He concluded that teachers should not feel restricted to predominately use the DA to teaching grammar, assuming it is more suitable for non-BANA countries.

**(3) Alzu’bi (2015):** Then, a study carried out by Alzu’bi (2015) in Jordan. One of the purposes of this study was to investigate the comparative effectiveness of teaching English grammar by employing the DA and IA. It further seeks to estimate which of these two approaches has a statistically significant improvement on the grammar achievement of Jordanian EFL learners at universities and schools. To achieve the aims of the study, two programmes were designed based on the IA and DA for each level based on its syllabus. The sample consists of 180 participants; 80 EFL freshman university students that were assigned randomly into two groups, experimental one (by using the IA) and two (by using the DA); and 100 elementary EFL pupils that were assigned randomly into two groups, experimental one (by using the IA) and two (by using the DA). Two grammar achievement tests (pretest and posttest) were constructed and administrated to the study groups.

At the end of the treatment period, relevant posttests are administered to the students of both the groups. The results of the study revealed that there were significant statistical differences among the grammar performance means of both groups at both levels due to the IA.

After a month of daily intensive grammar instruction, the results obtained from the posttest showed that the IA is effective in enhancing English grammar learning and achievement in EFL classrooms of both university and

elementary levels. The researcher concluded that the IA, especially for adult students in academic settings, is beneficial to EFL students and emphasized its wide-scale application in various academic institutions.

**(4) Hadjih (2017):** Another study was performed by Hadjih (2017) in Algeria, at University of Mohammad Kheider. The purposes of this study were to estimate the effectiveness of using IA versus DA to teaching English grammar on EFL second-year university students’ grammatical competence enrolled at Mohammad Kheider University of Biskra in Algeria; and to explore their attitudes towards learning grammar via these two grammar teaching approaches. To proceed, two questionnaires were designed and administered to two groups, Group One that consists of 8 EFL university teachers; and Group Two that consists of 60 EFL second-year university students.

The results demonstrated the crucial role of grammar in learning the foreign language. Also, the findings revealed that adopting an eclectic approach may lead to the development of learners’ grammar proficiency better than the use of each single approach in isolation.

**(5) Lafta (2019):** Finally, a study was carried out by Lafta (2019) in the University of Thi-Qar, Iraq. This study aimed to examine and compare the effectiveness of utilizing the DA versus IA on learning English grammar. The subjects of the research totalled 70 first-year EFL university students enrolled in the Department of English, College of Arts, University of Thi-Qar for the academic year 2018-2019. They were chosen randomly and distributed into two equal groups, each consisting of 35 participants. The instrument of the research was a grammar achievement test, which was constructed by the researcher. After the instruction, the subjects were posttested. The results revealed that there were slight statistically significant differences between the two groups and in favour of the EG that was taught according to the DA. On the basis of the results obtained, the researcher concluded that the DA was a beneficial teaching approach that has more positive effect on EFL grammar teaching, satisfaction, and helped EFL students improve their achievement in English grammar.

One can conclude that teaching English grammar through an IA or DA has been found to yield positive results. However, there is no conclusive evidence on

the best approach to teaching English grammar to EFL/ESL learners, as these studies have shown varying results.

### 3.1. Experimental Design of the Study

The experimental design selected herein in the current investigation is a “**Quasi-Experimental Design: The Matching-Only Posttest-Only Control Group Design**” (Fraenkel et al., 2012: 275). This design is an experimental one that does not use a pretest. It is used to eliminate testing effects, in which participants’ scores on a measure change because they have already been exposed to it. The following is a paradigm for this design.

Table-1: The Matching-Only Posttest-Only Control Group Design

Gr.	Matching	Treatment	Posttest
EG	M	X	O
CG	M	C	O

### 3.2. Population of the Study

The population of the present study targeted all the first-year EFL university students enrolled at Northern Technical University/Technical Engineering College of Mosul (TECM) whose population is (758) students distributed over seven major departments for the first course of the academic year 2024-2025.

#### 3.2.1 Sample Population of the Study

Once the study population has been identified, questions of sampling emerge instantly. Thus, the sample of the study includes:

#### 3.2.2. Department

The Department of Chemical and Petroleum Industries Techniques Engineering was chosen randomly to be the study sample, which consists of (84) first-year EFL university students.

#### 3.2.3. Participants

At the outset, the study sample comprised of (84) male and female participants of the total number of (758) ones, each of (42) first-year EFL university students. Then, one of the groups (Group A) was randomly assigned as the EG, and the other (Group B) as the CG. Participants who failed to meet the inclusion criteria were excluded from the study, (17

from Group A, and 15 from Group B), to maintain the safety of the experiment. Therefore, the final complete number of the participants in the investigation was (52) students. The EG consisted of (25) first-year EFL university students; and the CG consisted of (27) ones.

Table-2: Number of Repeaters, Multilingual, Negative-Effect EFL Students, and the Overall Number of the Study Sample

Gr.		Before Refining Stage	Repeaters	Multilingual	Negative-Effect Students	The Sample
Group A	EG	42	1	8	8	25
Group B	CG	42	1	7	7	27

### 3.3. Parity between the Study Groups

This experimental investigation is intended to measure the extent to which the causal variable “using the 4Es instructional model” causes changes in the effect variable: their achievement on the grammar posttest. Therefore, both groups of the study were matched in respect of almost all factors, except for the exposure to the experimental variable in order to increase the sensitivity of the experiment and thereby increase the probability of detecting the effects evidenced in the results. Matched groups procedures are the most effective to use in achieving equivalence between participant groups in the non-experimental variables. Thus, both groups, viz. EG and CG, were matched with regard to:

- (1) the age counted in months;
- (2) the general average of the participants in the general baccalaureate examinations in the academic year 2023-2024;
- (3) the achievement scores of the participants in English subject for the academic year 2023-2024; and
- (4) the achievement scores of the participants in the grammar proficiency pretest.

The data were obtained from the College Registration Office, and by requesting first-year university students to fill in their information in a Google Form specifically designed for this purpose. Data analysis was performed using SPSS, applying “the t-test for two independent samples”. As Table 3 shows, there was no statistically significant

- It is worth mentioning that Technical Engineering College of Mosul (TECM) includes seven major departments, i.e. Geomatics Techniques Engineering; Medical Instrumentations Techniques Engineering; Electrical Power Techniques Engineering; Power Mechanic Techniques Engineering; Building and Construction Techniques Engineering; Chemical and Petroleum Industries Techniques Engineering; and Applied Mechanics Techniques Engineering.
- Seventeen students were eliminated from the treatment group (Group A) because: one student is a repeater; eight students are bilingual; seven students enrolled in the course when the experiment was underway; and one student is from Al-Mutamayyizeen Secondary School. Fifteen students were eliminated from the comparison group (Group B) because: one student is a repeater; seven students are bilingual; six students joined the course when the experiment was underway; and one student is from Al-Mutamayyizeen Secondary School.
- English Grammar Proficiency Pretest: It is designed and administrated to ensure that all first-year EFL university students have a similar starting point or baseline, researchers must standardize the proficiency level across the sample.

difference between the EG and the CG in each variable, since the computed t-values are lower in value than the tabulated t-value, which is 2.009 at 0.05, the  $\alpha$ -level of significance, under 50, the df. In other words, both groups were statistically equivalent before the treatment as far as these variables are concerned (see Table 3).

Table-3: The Mean, Standard Deviation of Each Group, with the Computed and Tabulated "T" Values of Matching Variables

Matching Variables	Gr.	The $\bar{X}$	The SD	"t" Values	
				Computed t-value	Tabulated t-value
Age Counted in Months	EG	236.200	13.463	1.395	2.009 Under 50 df
	CG	230.852	14.128		
General Average of the Participants in the General Baccalaureate Examination	EG	72.920	5.438	1.387	
	CG	74.741	3.967		
Achievement Scores in English	EG	73.560	12.858	1.081	
	CG	69.597	13.557		
Achievement Scores in the Grammar Proficiency Test	EG	49.200	17.776	1.768	
	CG	41.667	12.710		

### 3.4. Extraneous or Intervening Variables

The necessity for control is essential in experimental research, thus this control was carried out to establish the internal validity of the experiment in terms of using the same instructional material; the same lecturer; teaching aids; the distribution of the lectures; and the duration of the experiment; instrumentation; and the selection of the participants. As for the external validity of the experiment, it was also established as the same experimental producers were applied to both groups; and the experiment was executed in the same facility; both groups were selected from the same university of the same environment and settings. In other words, the settings were identical to a great extent. Accordingly, this variable, the classroom environment, was also controlled.

### 3.5. Data-gathering Instruments of the Study

To achieve the aims of the study and verify its hypotheses, the following instruments were utilized:

#### 3.5.1. Instructional Material

English Language Module 1 is the prescribed material designed specifically to first-year EFL university students at Northern Technical University, especially for Technical Engineering College/ Mosul. The material consists of three units. These units cover different language areas and skills and are divided into six main topics: grammar, vocabulary, reading and writing in addition to listening and speaking. One of the pillars of the module is to understand how to build a correct English sentence. It contains basic grammatical rules and different technical vocabularies with using typical examples to explain the structure and the meaning of any word or expression. The first section

of each unit covers basic grammar and structures, which is the main subject of our investigation.

#### 3.5.2. Behavioural Objectives of the Instructional Material

The researchers identified and derived the behavioural objectives of the first three units of the material. These specific behavioural objectives are grounded on Bloom's Taxonomy of cognitive processes, which are only the five levels, viz. "Remember, Understand, Apply, Analyse, and Evaluate". They were submitted with the daily-model-lesson plans for review to a panel of ten jurors who are specialists in the fields of EFL and education. They were kindly requested to read the items of the behavioural objectives and provide their opinions concerning their suitability and efficiency and whether they formally include the overall observable behaviour of the learning outcome. Also, they were requested to make any modification, addition, deletion, or change any item they see inappropriate. As a consequence, the specific behavioural objectives proved to be valid and encompass the entire instructional materials involved since they obtained the approval of all the ten jurors, i.e. 100% agreement of the jury members.

#### 3.5.3. Lesson Plans

The researchers had previously prepared the necessary daily-lesson plans for both groups as well as the daily-model-lesson plans for teaching English grammar. For the treatment group, the daily-model-lesson plans were reconstructed in compliance of the independent variable, viz. teaching grammar on the basis of 4Es (see the Appendix). As for the CG, the daily-lesson plans for teaching grammar were prepared according to the prescribed method, which is the DA.

The daily-model-lesson plans were also submitted with the specific behavioural objectives to a panel of jurors who are specialists in the fields of EFL and education. They were kindly requested to read thoroughly the daily-model-lesson plans and give their opinions concerning their suitability and efficiency. Also, they were requested to make any modification, addition, deletion, or change anything they see inappropriate. As a consequence, the daily-model-lesson plans were acknowledged as methodologically valid and approved except for some modifications related to the timing and the number of activities, which were taken into high consideration. It is worth mentioning that these plans granted the approval of (9) of the ten of the

jury members, i.e. 90% agreement of the overall number of the jurors.

#### 3.5.4. Dependent Measures

The participants of the investigation in the EG were taught grammar inductively by using the 4Es instructional model, and their progress was measured in two ways, in a formative way by using homework assignments and daily quizzes. and by a summative way through the gains on the grammar achievement test. In order to carry out the predetermined aims; an achievement posttest was utilized in this study. This test was a grammar achievement test in which the participants had to answer 20 MC items. It was administrated to the participants of the two groups at the end of the intervention.

#### 3.5.5. Grammar Achievement Posttest

The purpose of this researcher-made test was to assess the progress of the EG in answering the grammar questions after being taught through the new instructional model based on the 4Es model, compared with the CG in order to validate the importance of employing such a model in teaching English grammar to enhance grammar learning and make students actively engage in the grammar activity. Thus, an achievement test was constructed in order to test this language component. This test gives the students practice in answering structure questions to fulfil the aims of the study and confirm or refute its hypotheses. What follows are the milestones of constructing the test:

##### (1) Designing the Test

The grammar posttest consists entirely of 20 MC items. These 20 items are intended to measure the acquired achievement in grammar according to the specific behavioural objectives and the test table of specifications. The test items comprise different grammar categories from tenses and aspects, parts of speech to making questions as detailed in Table 4 below:

Table-4: Classification of the Posttest Items

Item No.	Grammar Category
1; 2; 3; 5; 6; 12; and 14.	Tenses and Aspects
4; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11; 13; 15; and 16.	Parts of Speech
17; 18; 19; and 20.	Making Questions

##### (2) Scoring Rubric of the Test

As mentioned previously, the test is composed of MC items that were used to prompt three types of cognition. They are objective items, so its scoring scheme is a binary grading scale, assigning 0 or 1

based on whether each response is incorrect or correct. Accordingly, the maximum score of the test is 20.

#### 3.6. Validity of the Study Instrument

To ensure test validity, the test must demonstrate fitness for the purpose. There are several types of validity but there are just two types that are considered highly important for achievement tests, content and face validity. Therefore, both types were addressed to evaluate the test and come out with a validated test that yields truthful and accurate results.

##### (1) Content Validity

This type of validity was secured after the researchers had constructed the items of the test in harmony with the specific behavioural objectives that were identified and derived previously by the researchers themselves and granted approval by the jury members.

##### (2) Face Validity

To establish this type of validity, the initial version of the test had been submitted to a panel of jurors in the field of EFL and education. Each member was asked to read the items and give his/her remarks and suggestions concerning whether they fulfill the aims of the study and measure students' grammar proficiency, its suitability and efficiency, and whether the scoring scheme is appropriate or not. They were also asked to make addition, deletion, and modification to any item they see inappropriate. They all agreed that the test is adhered to the accepted standards and suitable for first-year EFL university students, and the test items measured grammar. As a consequence, the test was acknowledged valid and measurable since it granted the approval of (8) out of the total ten jury members, i.e. 80% agreement. A number of modifications were taken into consideration.

#### 3.7. Piloting the Test

After establishing the test validity, it was administrated to a sample of 25 first-year EFL university students at the Department of Geomatics Techniques Engineering. The purposes behind piloting the test were to:

- (1) secure clarity of the test instructions, and items;
- (2) check whether the test level is appropriate, i.e. neither too easy nor too difficult; and
- (3) estimate the reliability coefficient of the test.

Good examination conditions were provided for the testees and complete control was exercised to ensure that no extraneous factors might interfere as a possible variable in the administration of the test.

The instructions on how to answer the test items were explained by the researcher. These instructions were explained in Arabic to avoid any possible misunderstanding or ambiguity. The researchers themselves marked the responses.

Based on piloting results, no serious ambiguity was found concerning the test instructions, and items. The test pitched the students' level, the reliability of the test will be explained in the subsequent paragraph.

### 3.8. Reliability Coefficient of the Test

The Alpha coefficient was found to be 0.81, which is considered within the acceptable index that ranges from 0.50 and higher up to 1.00. This means that the items are measuring the same underlying construct effectively. This index is sufficient and means that the test was ready to adopt, then to apply.

### 3.9. Experiment

The experiment started on 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2024 and ended on 30<sup>th</sup> January, 2025. The experiment spanned a duration of precisely 10 weeks and 5 days. The instruction of both groups was undertaken by the researcher herself to control the teacher variable during the investigation.

### 3.10. Final Administration of the Dependent Measure

In light of the obtained results, the different procedural steps came out with a valid and reliable grammar achievement posttest. The final version of the grammar test reflected the essential psychometric features of a good test: content and face validity, and satisfactory reliability coefficient, so the grammar achievement posttest was deemed suitable for administration.

Upon completion of the instructional period, the first-year EFL university students of the EG and the CG were posttested on 2<sup>nd</sup> February, 2025. After handing out the copies of the test to the participants, the researcher clarified in Arabic the instructions on how to respond on the test items. The testees were allotted 60 minutes to complete the test; and they were informed that the test scores would be taken into consideration in the assessment of their class effort. Moreover, proper assessment conditions were provided and rigorous control was practised to eliminate any possible interference as a possible variable in the discrimination of the test. The researchers themselves marked the students' test papers.

### 4.1. Results and Analysis

In this Section, the results of the study will be analyzed statistically, interpreted and then discussed

in relation to the aims and hypotheses posed in Section One.

#### 4.1.1. Testing the First Main Hypothesis

**H0<sub>1</sub>:** "There will be no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the EG and those of the CG in the grammar achievement posttest".

To verify this hypothesis, a grammar achievement posttest was constructed and administrated to both groups, EG and CG, at the end of the experiment. The results yielded by the grammar achievement posttest were analyzed statistically to reveal whether or not the difference between the two study groups was statistically significant. Accordingly, the mean scores of the EG and the CG were compared. "The t-test for the two independent samples" was used. The test results are illustrated in Table 5 below.

Table-5: The t-test Results of

the Participants' Achievement Scores in the Grammar Achievement Posttest

Gr.	No.	The $\bar{X}$	The SD	"t" Values		$\alpha = 0.05$
				Computed t-value	Tabulated t-value	
EG	25	63.200	22.771	2.481	2.009	Significant Difference
CG	27	49.074	18.189		Under 50 df	

As illustrated in Table 5, the EG achieved markedly better gains on the grammar achievement posttest. The results demonstrate that the difference between the two study groups at 0.05, the  $\alpha$ -level of significance, under-50, the df, was statistically significant in favour of the EG due to the study independent variable, viz. the 4Es instructional model; as the computed t-value is 2.481, which is higher in value than the tabulated t-value, which is 2.009.

So, the first study null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is automatically confirmed, viz. "There will be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the EG and those of the CG in the grammar achievement posttest".

#### 4.1.2. Testing the Second Main Hypothesis

**H0<sub>2</sub>:** "There will be no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the EG and those of the CG in the overall English language proficiency posttest".

To test this second main hypothesis, an English language proficiency posttest was designed and planned to be administrated to both study groups at the end of the intervention to determine whether or

not the difference between the two groups of the study was statistically significant in different aspects of the FL. The results acquired from the proficiency posttest were statistically analyzed. Thus, the mean scores of the two groups, the EG and the CG, were compared. “The t-test for the two independent samples” was also used. The test results are summarized in Table 6.

Table-6: The t-test Results of the Participants' Achievement Scores in the English Proficiency Posttest

Gr.	NO.	The $\bar{X}$	The SD	"t" Values		$\alpha = 0.05$
				Computed t-value	Tabulated t-value	
EG	25	89.600	11.719	0.328	2.009	No Significant Difference
CG	27	88.519	11.995			

Table 6 signifies that both groups, i.e. the EG and CG, made nearly the same test gains in the overall proficiency posttest in the English language. The results indicate that the difference between the mean scores of the two groups, the EG and CG, at 0.05, the  $\alpha$ -level of significance, under 50, the df, was not found statistically significant, because the computed t-value is 0.328, which is lower in value than the tabulated t-value, which is 2.009.

The second main null hypothesis, resultantly, is validated and confirmed, i.e. “There will be no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the EG and those of the CG in the overall English language proficiency posttest”.

#### 4.2. Discussion of the Results

It could be argued that the modest gains achieved by the EG were owing to the fact that first-year EFL university students had more exposure to English, and this exposure was contextualized in spoken and written English, as a result of the effectiveness of the 4Es instructional model, and participating actively and interactively in the lesson with homework assignments and/or quizzes; while the CG had taught grammar through the prescribed instruction, which is DA. The participants of the CG were passive and had little or no role during the lesson period; while the members of the EG were actively engaged in the lesson period through four-stage model that involved grammar-noticing, consciousness-raising, practicing and evaluation. This active involvement stood in stark contrast with the CG where the participants' engagement was

passive, i.e. they were only listening to their lecturer. The results obtained from the present investigation are in consonant with those of other studies, e.g. Alzu'bi, 2015; Hadjih, 2017; Haight et al., 2007; and Vogel et al., 2011.

As the results of this study unveil, the 4Es instructional model and the manner the teacher approaches the first-year EFL university students influence positively their learning and their achievement in the English grammar of the FL.

#### 5.1. Conclusions

Grammar is a fundamental component of language and its instruction as well; it is thus important in the process of teaching and learning any language. Effective communication requires constructing grammatically correct sentences to convey the intended meaning. Educators have proposed a variety of ways for teaching grammar to language learners. Among the different grammar teaching methods, the 4Es instructional model.

Consequently, the present study is quantitative in nature, and quasi-experimental in design. Its aims were to estimate the effectiveness of utilizing the 4Es instructional model on the first-year EFL university students and examine the extent to which it can enhance the students' learning and achievement in English grammar. Therefore, it seems reasonable to deduce that:

- (1) Both DA and IA have a common goal, which is teaching grammar, but in two different ways. Which approach to use is contingent largely upon different factors, such as their age; background; learning style; the grammatical point being taught; preference, time, and so on. Teachers' decisions will also be affected by learners understanding of the grammatical areas taught. These decisions are also influenced by learners' motivation levels, self-confidence, and their willingness to participate in grammar-related classroom activities.
- (2) The 4Es instructional model that involves tasks that promote grammar-noticing, consciousness-raising, practicing and evaluation was proved to be effective in optimizing first-year EFL university students learning and achievement in English grammar.
- (3) The results of the posttest show that the EG has achieved slight progress in the grammar posttest, which corroborates the effectiveness of the 4Es

- It is worth mentioning that the overall proficiency posttest is the mid-term exam that was conducted on 11<sup>th</sup> February, 2025. It is based on the course material, English Language Module 1, which includes three units. These three units cover different language areas and skills, viz. grammar, vocabulary, reading and writing in addition to listening and speaking.

instructional model based upon the IA to teaching English grammar used in the experiment.

- (4) The 4Es instructional model was ineffective in enhancing the first-year EFL university students' overall language proficiency as indicated in the results of the proficiency posttest. This is potentially due to short instructional period, and to make significant improvements, much instructional time is needed.
- (5) Finally, teaching grammar in a natural authentic context can lead to more success for learners. This model, which allows for natural exposure to the language, results in better understanding and retention. Additionally, engaging learners in real-life tasks is the best way to develop their grammatical competence.

## 5.2. Recommendations

In view of the aforementioned results and conclusions, a number of recommendations may be put forward.

- (1) The 4Es instructional model can be applied to EFL learners at any level of instruction in order to improve their grammar learning.
- (2) The 4Es instructional model seems to be more suitable and effective than the DA in catering for the needs of the Iraqi EFL university students in teaching grammar of the English language.

- (3) Teachers should involve learners in the lesson to promote their active participation and interaction.
- (4) Teachers should take into consideration their learners' needs and preferences in choosing the best approach to teaching grammar.
- (5) Grammar teaching does not have to be dull or book-bound. Therefore, teachers need to adopt motivating activities and tasks to engage learners and captivate their interest.

## 5.3. Suggestions for Future Research

In light of the results of the present study and its hypotheses, several directions for future research emerge.

- (1) It may be worthwhile to examine the effectiveness of the 4Es instructional model at different levels of learning under controlled experimental conditions.
- (2) Research may be conducted to verify whether or not there are significant differences between male and female students at different levels of learning after the application of the 4Es instructional model.
- (3) Research is needed to figure out the effect of the 4Es instructional model on EFL learners' motivation, attitudes, and interests towards English at different levels of learning.

## References

- Aarts, B., Clayton, D., and Wallis, S. (2012). Bridging the Grammar Gap: Teaching English Grammar to the iPhone Generation1: University College London. *English Today*, 28(1), 3-8.
- Adda. (2025). English Grammar. Retrieved from [https://www.adda247.com/school/english-grammar/?srsltid=AfmBOopyZMxrgFbH4QsyL\\_GO1UAQhRbdK\\_kJfHPHgrT702sK-i90Y9KB](https://www.adda247.com/school/english-grammar/?srsltid=AfmBOopyZMxrgFbH4QsyL_GO1UAQhRbdK_kJfHPHgrT702sK-i90Y9KB)
- Ahmed, G., Shah, S. and Nisar, M. (2020). Problems in Grammatical Structure: A Case Study of B. Ed. Student at the Education Department. *SJESR*, 3(2), 420-425.
- Alem, D. (2021). Teaching Grammar: In the View of Conventional vs Contemporary Approach. *NEW ACADEMIA: An International Journal of English Language, Literature and Literary Theory*, Vol. X, Issue II, p.p. 1- 42.
- Al-Kharrat, M. (2000). Deductive & Inductive Lessons for Saudi EFL Freshmen Students. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 6(10): 6.
- Al-Mekhlafi, A., and Nagaratnam, R. (2011). Difficulties in Teaching and Learning Grammar in an EFL Context. *International Journal of instruction*, 4(2).
- Al-Sinbesy, F. (2012). Iraqi EFL Advanced Learners' Common Writing Errors. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333644797\\_all\\_Iraqi\\_EFL\\_Advanced\\_Learners'\\_Common\\_Writing\\_Errors](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333644797_all_Iraqi_EFL_Advanced_Learners'_Common_Writing_Errors)
- Alzu'bi, M. (2015). Effectiveness of Inductive and Deductive Methods in Teaching Grammar, *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6 (2), 187-193.
- Aman, N. (2020). Teaching Grammar: Issues and Challenges. *Journal of English Language Teaching Innovations and Materials*, 2(1), 1-13.
- Azar, B. (2007). Grammar-Based Teaching. A Practitioner's Perspective. *TESL-EJ*. Vol (11), No (2). P.p. 1-12. Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/ej42/a1.pdf>
- Brown, H. and Lee, H. (2016). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*, 4th Ed. New York: Pearson Education Press.
- Brown, H. (2014). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching: A Course in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Derakhshan, A., and Karimian, R. (2020). An investigation of the Iranian EFL learners' perceptions towards the most common writing problems. *Sage Open*, 10(2), 2158244020919523.
- Ellis, R. (2002). The Place of Grammar Instruction in the Second/Foreign Language Curriculum. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second/Foreign Language Curriculum*. "New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms. Routledge, 2001. 27-44.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264512>
- El Tanani, A., Afana, E., and Al-Masri, N. (2011). "Teaching Grammar Communicatively for Sixth Graders in Gaza Strip: A Suggested Framework. *Gaza Strip: The Islamic University*."

- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., Elder, C., Erlam, R., Philip, J. and Reinders, H. (2009). *Implicit and Explicit Knowledge in Second Language Learning, Testing and Teaching*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., and Hyun, H. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gower, R., Phillips, D., and Walters, S. (1995). *Teaching Practice Handbook*, new edition. England: Heinemann.
- Greenbaum, S., and Nelson, G. (2002). *An Introduction to English Grammar*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Hadjih, N. (2017). *An Exploratory Study on the Effect of Deductive and Inductive Grammar Instructions on Learners' Grammatical Competence Case Study of Second Year Students of English at Biskra University*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: Mohamed Kheider University.
- Haight, C., Herron, C., and Cole, S. (2007). The Effects of Deductive and Guided Inductive Instructional Approaches on the Learning of Grammar in the Elementary Foreign Language College Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(2), 288-310.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Hird, J. (2015). *Inductive and Deductive Grammar Teaching: What is it, and does it Work*. English Language Teaching Global Blog. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <https://teachingenglishwithoxford.oup.com/2015/04/24/inductive-and-deductive-grammar-teaching/>
- Huang, Z. (2005). Grammar Teaching as Product or as Process?. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 2 (11), 27-31.
- Huseynova, S. (2019). *Assessing English Grammar Assessment and Feedback: A Case Study of King Khalid University (KKU) Students*. Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue: The Dynamics of EFL in Saudi Arabia.
- Klímová, B., and Toman, J. (2020). Effectiveness of the Blended Learning Approach in Teaching and Learning Selected EFL Grammar Structures at a University Level-A Case Study. In *Blended Learning, Education in a Smart Learning Environment: 13th International Conference, ICBL 2020, Bangkok, Thailand, August 24–27, 2020, Proceedings 13* (pp. 227–236). Springer International Publishing.
- Kolat, H. (2009). Deductive vs. Inductive Approach on English Grammar Teaching for Elementary Students. *Anadolu Bil Meslek Yüksekokulu Dergisi*, (13), 89-98.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*.
- Lafta, N. (2019). The Effect of Deductive and Inductive Approaches on Iraqi EFL College Students Learning of Grammar. *University of Thi-Qar Journal*, 14(3), 55-66.
- Laor, N. (2014). *EFL/ESL Teaching Tip: Teaching Grammar*. YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1KXzQ1S3wqM>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching Language from Grammar to Grammmaring*. Boston, MA Thompson-Heinle.
- Listia, R., and Febriyanti, E. (2020). EFL Learners' Problems in Using Tenses: An Insight for Grammar Teaching. *IJET (Indonesian Journal of English Teaching)*, 9(1), 86-95.
- Mallia, J. (2014). *Inductive and Deductive Approaches to Teaching English Grammar*. Arab World English Journal, 5(2).
- Mountone, P. (2004). *How to Use Examples Effectively: Deductive vs. Inductive Approaches*, University of California, Santa Barbara. cited in Hadjih, 2017.
- Nassaji, H., and Fotos, S. (2011). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context*. Routledge.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teacher*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Şahinkaya, H. (2023). Explicit vs. Implicit teaching in EFL Classrooms: A Literature Review, *International Journal of Academic Research in Education*, 9(1), 14-26.
- Salman, Z., Hazem, A., Kamil, D., and Kanaan, M. (2022). *Teaching Grammar to Iraqi EFL Students of Al-Hamdaniya University during COVID-19 Pandemic: Problems and Solutions*. *World Journal of English Language*, 12(5).
- Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to Teach Grammar?* Oxford: Pearson Education.
- Ur, P. (2012). *A Course in English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vogel, S., Herron, C., Cole, S., and York, H. (2011). Effectiveness of a Guided Inductive versus a Deductive Approach on the Learning of Grammar in the Intermediate-Level College French Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 44(2), 353-380.
- Walter, C. (2015). *Teaching Grammar Inductively*. Retrieved from [https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/teaching\\_grammar\\_inductively2.pdf](https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/teaching_grammar_inductively2.pdf)

### **The Appendix: The Daily-Lesson Plan Based on the 4Es Instructional Model to Teaching Grammar Structures and Rules to First-Year EFL University Students**

**Lesson Plan Title:** [Teaching Simple Tense: The Past Simple Tense](#)

**Lesson Behavioural Objectives:** At the end of the lesson, students will be able to:

- identify the form and usage of the simple past tense;
- construct sentences using the simple past tense;
- apply the simple past tense in both written and/or spoken contexts; and
- assess their understanding through comprehension activities and quizzes.

1. **Exposure (15 mins):** The teacher exposes the students to the past simple tense and its usage. Here are the suggested activities:
  - 1.1 **Written Form:** The teacher provides the students with a short story or dialogue containing the past simple tense. Then, the teacher asks them to read and identify examples of this structure.
  - 1.2 **Spoken Form:** The teacher narrates a story or plays a recording of a dialogue in the past simple tense, has the students listen and note down examples of the structure.
  
2. **Exercise (10 mins):** The teacher provides a worksheet with questions related to the story or dialogue. These questions should guide the students to notice the past simple sentences. For example, The teacher asks the students to underline the target structure in the sentences or answer questions that highlight the grammar usage. Here are suggested activities:
  - 2.1 **Worksheet:** The teacher starts distributing the worksheet with fill-in-blank exercise focusing on the past simple tense.
  - 2.2 **Pair Work:** The teacher has the students work in pairs to complete the worksheet, negotiating their answers with each other.
  - 2.3 **Interactive Activity:** The teacher checks the answers and provides immediate spoken or written feedback.
  
3. **Execution (15 mins):** The teacher encourages the students to apply the past simple tense in real-life contexts and narrative texts. Here are the suggested activities:
  - 3.1 **Writing Task:** The teacher asks the students to write a very short paragraph about the events and short stories using the past simple tense.
  - 3.2 **Speaking Activity:** The teacher organizes a “**Find Someone Who...**” activity where the students practice forming different questions with the past simple tense through engaging in a speaking exercise where they seek out classmates who match given descriptions of the given characteristics, and it is perfect for the class who are getting to know each other.
  - 3.3 **Group Discussion:** The teacher facilitates a group discussion where the students share their paragraphs and characteristics.
  
4. **Evaluation (10 mins):** The teacher assesses the students’ understanding and application of the past simple tense. Here are the suggested activities:
  - 4.1 **Homework:** The students are required to write a short diary entry (3-5 sentences) about a memorable day, using the past simple tense.
  - 4.2 **Quiz (Next Day):** The teacher administers a short quiz on the past simple tense that mirrors that exposure activity to assess students’ learning and grasp of the tense.