

EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATIVE APPROACH IN TEACHING SYNTACTIC FEATURES

DOI 10.5281/zenodo.13842393

Carl Jay P. Diamante

Instructor, Cebu Technological University, Philippines

<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-6646-3380>

Rosalie S. Soronio

Teacher III, Sibonga National High School

<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7869-7420>

Angelica B. Raut-Raut

Admin Aide VI, Philhealth Region VII, Philippines

<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7866-7520>

Abstract

This study determined the effectiveness of the integrative approach in teaching syntactic features using Leo Tolstoy's select short stories at Teodoro Dela Vega Memorial National High School during A.Y. 2016-2017. Based on the data gathered the following findings were drawn: (1) the students' level of competence is both beginning in identifying sentence pattern and sentence structure and developing in identifying sentence usage; (2) the students' level of competence after using the integrative approach is both beginning in identifying sentence pattern and sentence structure but proficient in identifying sentence usage in teacher only; they are proficient in identifying sentence pattern, approaching proficiency in identifying sentence structure, and advanced in identifying sentence usage in paired group; they are both approaching proficiency in identifying sentence pattern and sentence structure and proficient in identifying sentence usage in student only; (3) the hypothesis of no significant difference in students' competence in the syntactic features is rejected. Based on the aforementioned findings, it is concluded that the integrative approach is proven effective as it influenced the teaching of the syntactic features. Anchored on the conclusion of the study, the following are recommended: (1) varied learning activities be provided on syntactic features such as pattern, structure, and use; (2) integrative approach be used in teaching of other language features; (3) the proposed syntactic learning activities be adopted to boost students' competence

Keywords: Integrative Approach, Syntactic Features, Education

Introduction

Integrative learning stimulates learners to coalesce knowledge from a wide range of sources, drawing from both theory and practice, and forming essential links between concepts and application (Lombardi et al., 2024). This method of imparting and acquiring knowledge is vital in today's world, where applied science and globalization continually transform learning practices in educational institutions and professional settings. The fast-paced and far-reaching changes in society require a workforce that is both confident and highly skilled, necessitating that educators update themselves with current and varied teaching approaches to remain competent and effective in the teaching-learning process.

For years, quality education has been the central focus of Philippine education. In line with this, integrative and interactive teaching-learning approaches were emphasized under the Basic Education Curriculum (BEC) and further strengthened by the K-12 curriculum. This curriculum aims to equip learners with life skills essential for future employment, especially as the country focuses on preparing students for globalization. Former President Benigno Aquino highlighted this approach, emphasizing that quality education is a long-term solution to poverty (Barrot, 2023).

Moreover, an integrative approach that incorporates literary texts provides learners with strategies to analyze language in context. This approach helps develop not only linguistic and communicative skills but also fosters a deeper understanding of language across various discourse types. Carter & Mc Rae(2014) posits that literary texts serve as powerful pedagogic tools, as literature provides meaningful content for language study, with language itself as the medium of expression. In fact, it is peculiar that language and literature were ever separated in the first place, as one cannot exist without the other (Derrida & Attridge, 2017).

Throughout history, writers have expressed their emotions and worldviews through literary works, profoundly impacting readers who engage with literature. One commonly discussed genre is the short story, a form that allows readers to immerse themselves in the author's world and view life from the writer's perspective (Allott, 1974).

One of the most prominent writers whose influence endures today is Leo Tolstoy, an iconic figure in Russian literature (Maguire, 2024). The late 1870s marked a turning point for Tolstoy, during which he experienced a spiritual crisis that prompted him to reevaluate both his privileged life and literary pursuits. His philosophy of non-violent resistance is reflected in several of his works, such as *God Sees the Truth, But Waits* (1872), *Ilyás* (1885), and *Alyosha the Pot* (1905).

These short stories, finely crafted by Tolstoy, explore themes such as forgiveness, love, and contentment. Tolstoy's works are renowned, and British poet and critic Matthew Arnold aptly described them as "not just works of art, but pieces of life" (Arnold, 1895). Tolstoy's stories can be used effectively in teaching syntactic features—such as sentence patterns, structures, and usage—helping language learners incorporate these elements into their daily social interactions.

Thus, it is essential to examine literary texts, with language as the medium through which meaning is constructed, as language and literature are inseparable (Lvovich, 2021). Through a critical analysis of language, learners can better understand how literature is crafted, thereby enhancing their linguistic and literary competence.

Research Questions:

1. What are the pre-test scores of the students as to the following syntactic features
 - 1.1 sentence pattern
 - 1.2 sentence structure
 - 1.3 sentence use
2. Using the integrative approach, what are the post-test scores of the students as to the aforementioned variables with the:
 - 2.1 teacher only,
 - 2.2 paired group, and
 - 2.3 student only?
3. Is there a significant improvement of students' competence?

Literature Review

Integrative learning has emerged as a powerful pedagogical approach, enabling students to synthesize knowledge from diverse sources and apply it across various contexts. Lombardi et al. (2024) highlight that this method of teaching encourages the coalescence of theory and practice, an essential strategy in today's globalized and rapidly changing educational landscape. The Philippines' Basic Education Curriculum (BEC) and K-12 reforms emphasize such integrative and interactive approaches, preparing students with vital life skills for employment and equipping them to succeed in a globalized economy (Barrot, 2023). In language education, integrating literary texts with grammar instruction fosters linguistic competence, encouraging deeper engagement with both the structure and meaning of language. Carter & McRae (2014) support this view, arguing that literary texts provide rich, contextualized material for studying syntactic features, while Derrida & Attridge (2017) emphasize the inseparability of language and literature, making the integration of the two in the classroom crucial for comprehensive language learning.

Despite these benefits, teaching syntactic features through an integrative approach poses challenges. Studies reveal that students often struggle to master sentence patterns, particularly complex structures like the S-TV-IO-DO pattern. Aini et al. (2022) and Adriani & Bram (2021) emphasize that these difficulties point to a need for grammar teaching that is both flexible and responsive to students' needs, incorporating diverse instructional materials to enhance their understanding of syntax. Furthermore, Al-Seghayer (2021) stresses the importance of integrating macro-skills into grammar instruction, ensuring that students can apply their syntactic knowledge in meaningful, communicative contexts. Yangambi (2022) reinforces this by arguing that mastery of sentence structures is critical for grammatical accuracy and communicative competence, underscoring the need for engaging and practical teaching experiences.

Pedagogical strategies, such as group work and case studies, have proven effective in improving student engagement and learning outcomes. Gess-Newsome et al. (2019) and Dixson (2010) suggest that these collaborative approaches make classrooms more interactive, encouraging students to apply sentence patterns in both written and spoken communication. However, consistent practice is crucial for students to achieve proficiency in syntax. Mustafa (2021) and Chew & Serbin (2021) emphasize the importance of repetitive drills and exposure to complex syntactic structures, allowing students to internalize grammar rules and improve their language fluency.

Addressing deficiencies in syntactic understanding remains a key challenge for educators. Research by Amiri & Fatemi (2014) shows that students often struggle with complex and compound-complex sentences, highlighting the need for differentiated instruction and additional support. Rustipa (2017) advocates for targeted enrichment activities to

help students overcome these difficulties, while Yu (2021) underscores the value of corrective feedback in refining students' sentence construction skills.

Research Method

This study employed a descriptive research design to investigate the influence of the integrative approach on teaching syntactic features, specifically focusing on sentence patterns, structures, and usage. Data were collected using a questionnaire as the primary tool, with statistical measures applied to analyze and interpret the results. The study was conducted at Teodoro Dela Vega Memorial National High School in Sibonga, Cebu, during the academic year 2009-2010. The participants were 48 Grade 10 students from two randomly selected heterogeneous sections, IV-Pearl and IV-Sapphire, composed of 29 boys and 19 girls. Two instruments were used: the first was adapted from Julia McMeans' (Test-Teacher Created Resources Inc.) assessment, consisting of 30 items across three parts—identification of sentence patterns, sentence structures, and sentence usage. The second instrument was a researcher-designed test based on three of Leo Tolstoy's short stories (*God Sees the Truth, But Waits*, *Alyosha the Pot*, and *Ilyás*). Pre-test and post-test data were collected and analyzed using statistical means to determine students' overall scores. To assess the significance of improvement in syntactic competence, a t-test was applied to compare pre-test and post-test results.

Findings and Discussion

1. What is the pre-test scores of the students as to the following syntactic features
 - 1.1 sentence pattern
 - 1.2 sentence structure
 - 1.3 sentence use

Table 1
Mean Performance Scores of Students in Sentence Pattern

Pattern (n=48)	Average Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Percentage Score	Verbal Description
1. S-IV	0.44	0.65	22%	Beginning
2.S-LV-SC	0.42	0.58	21%	Beginning
3.S-TV-DO	0.54	0.62	27%	Beginning
4.S-TV-IO-DO	0.25	0.44	13%	Beginning
5.S-TV-DO-OC	0.58	0.54	29%	Beginning

The range of scores is classified as follows: 90-100 is considered **advanced**, 85-89 is **proficient**, 80-84 is **approaching proficiency**, 75-79 is **developing**, and 74 or below is categorized as **beginning**.

The students demonstrated a lack of proficiency in identifying correct sentence patterns, as all of them achieved only the lowest level, "beginning," with particularly low performance in recognizing the S-TV-IO-DO pattern, obtaining a mere 13% score. This finding aligns with Aini et al. (2022) study, which revealed deficiencies in students' abilities to express ideas through proper sentence structure and word order. Aini et al.(2022) suggested that students must master basic sentence patterns and understand how each element and constituent functions within sentence constructions. Similarly, Adriani & Bram (2021) research supported these findings, highlighting students' struggles with English syntax. Adriani & Bram (2021) emphasized that to teach grammar rules effectively, language teachers should integrate materials that enrich students' understanding of language rules and usage, addressing their learning needs.

The results also indicate that the teaching-learning experiences provided to the students were not sufficiently meaningful, motivating, or challenging. According to Zubeide et al., (2021), English language learning should be a functional endeavor, encouraging students to be active communicators and engage with the language regularly through authentic materials, such as newspaper clippings and articles, to enhance their learning experiences.

Table 2
Mean Performance Scores of Students in Sentence Structure

Structure (n=48)	Average Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Percentage Score	Verbal Description
1. Simple	1.46	0.90	49%	Beginning
2 .Compound	1.17	0.66	58%	Beginning
3. Complex	1.04	0.71	35%	Beginning

4.Compound-complex	0.83	0.63	42%	Beginning
--------------------	------	------	-----	-----------

The students struggled to identify complex sentences, as evidenced by their lowest mean percentage score of 35%. In contrast, their mean percentage score for identifying compound sentences was higher, at 58%. While their scores showed some improvement compared to the previous test, they still remained at the beginning level and did not reach the standard score. This finding is consistent with Al-Seghayer (2021) results, which revealed that students' level of achievement was below the expected 75%. Al-Seghayer further emphasized that lessons should focus on the integrated development of the four macro skills, rather than solely on grammar instruction. Additionally, grammar teaching should be updated, and teachers should stay informed about new trends and approaches in language instruction.

It can be inferred that teachers need to reinforce instruction on the four sentence structures, as language teaching is a continuous process that incorporates new linguistic structures into students' repertoire, helping them develop language fluency. Fumiro & Tibi (2020) study supports this view, affirming that language proficiency includes knowledge of phonology, syntax, and morphology, as well as the ability to apply this knowledge in real communication. Proficiency in a language is demonstrated by the ability to use grammatical rules in practice rather than merely state them.

Table 3
Mean Performance Scores of Students in Sentence Use

Use (n=48)	Average Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Percentage Score	Verbal Description
1. Declarative	2.52	0.62	84%	Approaching proficiency
2. Interrogative	1.75	0.56	88%	Proficient
3. Imperative	1.83	0.60	61%	Beginning
4. Exclamatory	1.63	0.57	81%	Approaching proficiency

The students achieved their highest mean percentage score of 88% in identifying interrogative sentences. However, their lowest mean percentage score, 61%, was in identifying imperative sentences. These results suggest that further practice is required for mastery, as competence can only be achieved through extensive practice. Moreover, grammatical knowledge can only be developed when learners repeatedly use grammatical structures and apply them in language use (Aka, 2020). It can be inferred that the students were proficient in identifying interrogative sentences, approaching proficiency in declarative and exclamatory sentences, and at the beginning level in identifying imperative sentences.

Additionally, the goals of language learning include the ability to produce original sentences that follow the rules of the language, express one's own meaning, and understand the utterances of others (Zhang, 2022). Furthermore, communicative competence is enhanced when students feel they are developing communicative skills and practicing language functions within a social context, rather than merely accumulating knowledge of vocabulary and sentence structure (Junn,2023).

2. Using the integrative approach, what is the post-test scores of the students as to the aforementioned variables with the:

- 2.1 teacher only,
- 2.2paired group, and
- 2.3student only?

Table 4
Mean Performance Scores of Students in Sentence Pattern with the Teacher Only

Pattern (n=48)	Average Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Percentage Score	Verbal Description
1. S-IV	1.81	0.45	91%	Advanced
2. S-LV-SC	1.71	0.46	85%	Proficient
3. S-TV-DO	1.40	0.61	70%	Beginning
4.S-TV-IO-DO	0.83	0.66	42%	Beginning



5. S-TV-DO-OC	1.04	0.68	52%	Beginning
---------------	------	------	-----	-----------

The data revealed that the students demonstrated a highly remarkable performance in the S-IV pattern, achieving a mean percentage score of 91%. However, they require more practice with the S-TV-IO-DO pattern, where they obtained the lowest mean percentage score of 42%, to further develop their skills. The students were advanced in the S-IV pattern, proficient in the S-LV-SC pattern, but still at the beginning level in the S-TV-DO, S-TV-IO, and S-TV-IO-DO patterns. Therefore, it is necessary to provide additional activities to help them master these patterns.

Similarly, Yangambi (2022) argues that mastery of basic structured patterns of a language constitutes linguistic competence. It involves not only knowledge of language—verb forms, vocabulary, and basic grammatical patterns—but also the ability to use this knowledge effectively in conversational exchanges.

Moreover, the fundamental goal of linguistic competence in linguistic analysis is to distinguish between grammatical and ungrammatical sentence elements, including sentence patterns. If the sentence pattern is incorrect, the grammar is automatically incorrect as well (Wu & Lonin, 2022).

Table 6
Mean Performance Scores of Students in Sentence Structure with the Teacher Only

Structure (n=48)	Average Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Percentage Score	Verbal Description
1. Simple	2.17	0.48	72%	Beginning
2. Compound	1.13	0.39	56%	Beginning
3. Complex	1.46	0.65	49%	Beginning
4. Compound-complex	0.77	0.63	39%	Beginning

The data reveal that the respondents did not demonstrate a highly remarkable performance in identifying sentence structures. Results indicated that they were gradually improving, particularly in distinguishing simple sentences, with a mean percentage score of 72%. Conversely, they faced difficulties in identifying compound-complex sentences, specifically in using dependent and independent clauses, resulting in a low mean percentage score of 39%. It can be interpreted that all students remained at the beginning level, as none achieved the passing rate of 75% required by the Department of Education.

This finding is consistent with Amiri & Fatemi (2014) study, which found that students exposed to a content-based approach in teaching did not show highly remarkable performance. Amiri & Fatemi (2014) noted that the low performance of the students may be attributed to several limitations encountered during the experiment's implementation. Observed difficulties included limited explanations of concepts derived from subject content and the varying levels of difficulty in content lessons, which were sometimes appropriate only for a select group of capable students, leaving others struggling.

Furthermore, the findings suggest that the effectiveness of the teaching-learning process greatly depends on the effort, time, and materials provided by the teacher. Given adequate time, every individual can learn, provided they have a skilled teacher who effectively utilizes engaging, sufficient, and appropriate materials (Chew & Serbin, 2021).

Table 7
Mean Performance Scores of Students in Sentence Use With the Teacher Only

Use (n=48)	Average Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Percentage Score	Verbal Description
1. Declarative	2.90	0.37	97%	Advanced
2. Interrogative	1.81	0.49	91%	Advanced
3. Imperative	2.38	0.70	79%	Developing
4. Exclamatory	1.58	0.54	79%	Developing

The data indicate that the students exhibited outstanding performance, particularly in identifying declarative sentences, achieving the highest mean percentage score of 97%. However, results showed that they are still developing their skills in identifying imperative and exclamatory sentences, with both receiving mean percentage scores of 79%. It can be inferred that the students are advanced in identifying declarative and interrogative sentences, but they need additional practice in recognizing imperative and exclamatory sentences.

This finding aligns closely with Stavans & Zadunaisky-Ehrlich (2024) study, titled "Text structure as an indicator of the writing development of descriptive text quality, which revealed that respondents were weak in identifying interrogative and exclamatory sentences. Stavans & Zadunaisky (2024) further proposed differentiated enrichment activities to address these difficulties.

Table 8
Mean Performance Scores of Students in Sentence Pattern with the Paired Group

Pattern (n=48)	Average Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Percentage Score	Verbal Description
1.S-IV	1.96	0.20	98%	Advanced
2. S-LV-SC	1.88	0.33	94%	Advanced
3.S-TV-DO	1.92	0.28	96%	Advanced
4. S-TV-IO-DO	1.73	0.45	86%	Proficient
5.S-TV-DO-OC	1.23	0.66	61%	Beginning

It can be deduced that the respondents were advanced in identifying S-IV, S-LV-SC, and S-TV-DO patterns, while they were proficient in identifying the S-TV-IO-DO pattern; however, they were at the beginning level in recognizing the S-TV-DO-OC pattern. This result is consistent with Mustafa (2021) findings, which indicated that students did not master the operations of verbs, objects, and complements within sentences. Mustafa further recommended that students should master the proper ordering and arrangement of constituents in a sentence.

Additionally, students require urgent attention to acquire the necessary communication skills for their future work. Therefore, remedial classes are highly suggested each semester to allow students to focus on learning the syntax of the language (Mustafa, 2021).

Table 9
Mean Performance Scores of Students in Sentence Structure with the Paired Group

Structure (n=48)	Average Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Percentage Score	Verbal Description
1. Simple	2.15	0.71	72%	Beginning
2. Compound	1.92	0.28	96%	Advanced
3. Complex	2.79	0.50	93%	Advanced
4. Compound-complex	1.52	0.65	76%	Developing

The presented data indicate that students performed notably well in identifying compound sentences, achieving the highest mean percentage score of 96%. In contrast, their mean percentage score for identifying simple sentences showed only marginal improvement, with a score of 72%. This result suggests that respondents experienced difficulty and confusion in identifying simple sentences, which can include a simple subject and predicate, compound subjects, compound predicates, or a combination thereof. For instance, in the sentence "The doctor arrived and examined him," the sentence contains a compound predicate, and the word "and" does not function as a coordinating conjunction. This misunderstanding is common among students, who often assume that any sentence containing the word "and" is automatically a compound sentence.

According to Yu (2021), teachers should provide feedback that maximizes the learning opportunities from errors. This is based on three fundamental assumptions: (1) that the learner lacks understanding of the grammatical concept, (2) that the error arises from insufficient information and habits, and (3) that errors are developmental in nature. By considering these assumptions, students' errors in manipulating sentence structures can be minimized. Additionally, students require more practice with sentence structures, particularly simple sentences. Chen et al., (2023) noted that competence can only be achieved through extensive practice. Furthermore, grammatical knowledge can be developed only if learners repeatedly use grammatical structures in language.

Moreover, students' difficulty in expressing themselves in English poses a barrier to comprehension, complicating the teaching process. Therefore, students need to develop accurate, critical, and selective grammatical patterns and structures to improve their language proficiency (Hopp & Thoma, 2021).

Table 10

Mean Performance Scores of Students in Sentence Use with the Paired Group

Use (n=48)	Average Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Percentage Score	Verbal Description
1. Declarative	1.83	0.38	92%	Advanced
2. Interrogative	1.83	0.38	92%	Advanced
3. Imperative	2.96	0.20	99%	Advanced
4. Exclamatory	2.58	0.50	86%	Proficient

The data indicate a very high level of performance among students, particularly in identifying imperative sentences, with a mean percentage score of 99%. Conversely, they still need to master and practice the usage of exclamatory sentences to further enhance their skills, as evidenced by their lowest mean percentage score of 86%.

It can be inferred that the students were advanced in identifying declarative, interrogative, and imperative sentences; however, they were only proficient in identifying exclamatory sentences.

Moreover, students should develop a strong command of English, the universal language, to enhance their comprehension and communication skills, as well as their competitive advantage as professionals in the global economy (Akther, 2022).

Table 11
Mean Performance Scores of Students in Sentence Pattern with the Student Only

Pattern (n=48)	Average Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Percentage Score	Verbal Description
1. S-IV	1.88	0.33	94%	Advanced
2. S-LV-Sc	1.98	0.14	99%	Advanced
3. S-TV-DO	1.67	0.52	83%	Approaching Proficiency
4. S-TV-IO-DO	1.65	0.53	82%	Approaching proficiency
5. S-TV-DO-OC	0.96	0.68	48%	Beginning

The data revealed that students' performance significantly improved in identifying the S-LV-SC pattern, achieving a mean percentage score of 99%. Conversely, the students exhibited inadequacy in dealing with the S-TV-DO-OC pattern, receiving the lowest mean percentage score of 48%.

These findings are consistent with Yang et al.(2022) study, which identified committed errors and language deficiencies related to word order, performance with verbs, and incorrect word usage. The students' inadequacy with one structure negatively impacted their performance with other structures, as they were not familiar with complementation structures. They found these structures peculiar and struggled with sentence manipulation. This challenge can be attributed to the necessity of mastering syntactical categories, such as transitive verbs, direct objects, and objective complements, which are essential for understanding complementation. Furthermore, this particular pattern is rarely used in printed materials, making it appear new to learners. This finding is supported by Jagannath & Banerji (2023) who noted that the S-TV-DO-OC pattern is used with the least frequency in most surveyed texts. Consequently, students had difficulty identifying this pattern, which ranked first in the difficulty index encountered by the respondents. Jagannath & Banerji (2023) further recommended that students master the operations of basic sentence structures and understand how each element of these patterns contributes to sentence construction. Therefore, having sufficient knowledge of word order manipulation provides an advantage in competently handling sentences with complementation.

Moreover, Haryadi et al.(2021) asserts that mastery of basic sentence patterns is essential for success in speaking and writing the language. It is insufficient for an individual to merely learn the language without practice, guided repetition, correction, and drills. Students must familiarize themselves with and master the basic sentence patterns and grammatical structures of English to understand, speak, and write effectively.

Table 12
Mean Performance Scores in Sentence Structure with the

Student Only

Structure (n=48)	Average Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Percentage Score	Verbal Description
1.Simple	2.40	0.57	80%	Approaching proficiency
2.Compound	2.00	0.00	100%	Advanced
3.Complex	2.56	0.50	85%	Proficient
4.Compound-complex	1.31	0.62	66%	Beginning

The given data revealed that students' performance has remarkably improved in identifying compound sentences, with their mean percentage score soaring to 100%. Conversely, they demonstrated deficiencies in identifying compound-complex sentences, obtaining the lowest mean percentage score of 66%, which is categorized as beginning, as shown in the table.

This finding aligns with Rustipa (2017) study, which indicated that there remains a need to improve other areas of syntactic features, specifically in terms of compound-complex and compound sentences. She proposed differentiated enrichment exercises to address these difficulties.

Evidently, the results suggest that a series of activities should be implemented to assist students in identifying compound-complex sentences, thereby enhancing their skills and competence in this area. Bowden et al. (2021) posits that proficiency in English serves as a critical barometer for assessing student success, with many viewing competence and performance in English as indicators of readiness and adaptability.

Table 13
Mean Performance Scores in Sentence Use with the Student Only

Use (n=48)	Average Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Percentage Score	Verbal Description
1. Declarative	2.58	0.58	86%	Proficient
2. Interrogative	1.90	0.31	95%	Advanced
3. Imperative	2.73	0.45	91%	Advanced
4. Exclamatory	1.60	0.49	80%	Approaching proficiency

The given data indicate that students' performance has notably improved, particularly in identifying interrogative sentences, with a mean percentage score of 95%. Conversely, the data reveal that they obtained the lowest mean percentage score of 80% for exclamatory sentences, indicating that they are still approaching proficiency in this area. This finding is consistent with Bowdin et al. (2021) study, which revealed that respondents struggle with identifying both interrogative and exclamatory sentences. She further proposed differentiated enrichment activities to address these difficulties.

Moreover, the findings suggest that students need to be exposed to a variety of activities related to exclamatory sentences to master their usage. Thus, Shormani (2015) asserts that acquiring the syntactic system of the target language is of central importance, as inadequate knowledge of syntax severely constrains linguistic creativity and limits the capacity for communication.

RQ3.Is there a significant improvement of students' competence?

Table 14
Mean Difference of Pre-Post of Students' Competence In Sentence Pattern

Pattern	pre	post	SD	Mean Difference	T-computed	p-value
Teacher	.23	.68	.175	.679	-18.07	<.001
Paired	.23	.87	.165	.540	-27.20	<.001



Student	.23	.82	.160	.865	-25.66	<.001
---------	-----	-----	------	------	--------	-------

As reflected in Table 14, the mean differences and computed values for sentence patterns using the integrative approach are as follows: the mean difference for the teacher-only group is 0.679, with a t-computed value of -18.07 and a p-value of <0.001; the mean difference for the paired group is 0.540, with a t-computed value of -27.20 and a p-value of <0.001; the mean difference for the student-only group is 0.865, with a t-computed value of -25.66 and a p-value of <0.001. This indicates that the hypothesis of no significant improvement in students' competence regarding syntactic features is rejected, as there is a remarkable improvement in students' ability to handle sentence patterns.

It can be deduced that teachers' pedagogy has a significant impact on students' learning effectiveness. In this regard, Gess-Newsome et al. (2019) asserts that teachers should implement changes in their pedagogy to enhance student performance.

Furthermore, the importance of group work in learning is affirmed by Dixon (2010), who revealed that group work and case studies are effective teaching strategies that teachers should employ to make their classes engaging. These strategies involve learners in various aspects of effective teaching. Therefore, teachers must engage their students in academic activities that contribute to achieving desired learning objectives.

Thus, the primary role of teachers in the teaching-learning process is to act as coaches in students' learning rather than mere transmitters of content. In other words, teachers should facilitate learners' engagement (Dixon, 2010).

Table 15
Mean Difference of Pre-Post of Students' Competence in Sentence Structure

Structure	pre	post	SD	Mean Difference	T-computed	p-value
Teacher	.46	.54	.157	.871	-3.56	.001
Paired	.46	.84	.169	.842	-15.68	<.001
Student	.46	.83	.177	.921	-14.43	<.001

As displayed in Table 15, the mean differences and computed values for sentence structures using the integrative approach are as follows: the mean difference for the teacher-only group is 0.871, with a t-computed value of -3.56 and a p-value of 0.001; the mean difference for the paired group is 0.842, with a t-computed value of -15.68 and a p-value of <0.001; the mean difference for the student-only group is 0.921, with a t-computed value of -14.43 and a p-value of <0.001.

These results imply that the hypothesis of no significant difference in students' competence regarding syntactic features is rejected, as there is a very highly significant improvement in students' competence in handling sentence structures.

It can be inferred that successful instruction requires differentiated learning opportunities combined with effective pedagogical approaches. According to Heilporn et al.(2021), teaching all students according to contemporary standards necessitates visualizing how information connects across various fields and relates to everyday life experiences and shared learning within the classroom. Thus, group work activities should be emphasized, as teachers in the current curriculum act as facilitators of learning.

Table 16
Mean Difference of Pre-Post of Students' Competence In Sentence Use

Use	pre	post	SD	Mean Difference	T-computed	p-value
Teacher	.79	.86	.171	.817	-3.24	.002
Paired	.79	.92	.168	.828	-5.61	<.001

Student	.79	.88	.159	.881	-4.22	<.001
---------	-----	-----	------	------	-------	-------

The mean differences and computed values for sentence usage using the integrative approach are as follows: the mean difference for the teacher-only group is 0.817, with a t-computed value of -3.24 and a p-value of 0.002; the mean difference for the paired group is 0.828, with a t-computed value of -5.61 and a p-value of <0.001; the mean difference for the student-only group is 0.881, with a t-computed value of -4.22 and a p-value of <0.001.

These results signify that the hypothesis of no significant difference in students' competence regarding syntactic features is rejected, indicating a highly significant improvement in students' competence in handling sentence usage. It can be inferred that for students to reach their maximum learning potential, teachers must implement and deliver lessons in a meaningful and interactive manner. Effective teachers utilize techniques that best address the learning needs of their students; they understand that students learn best when new material is presented in a way that allows them to connect it to their existing knowledge and skills. Additionally, helping students learn independently and collaboratively is essential, as they benefit from opportunities to learn not only from the teacher but also from their peers. Group activities provide students with the chance to learn from and teach one another, thereby enhancing social skills and interactions.

Conclusion

The study reveal the there is a significant improvement in students' competence in identifying and utilizing sentence structures through the integrative approach. The statistical analysis demonstrates that the application of meaningful and interactive teaching methods leads to enhanced learning outcomes. Effective instruction, tailored to meet the diverse needs of students, fosters connections between new material and existing knowledge, thereby promoting deeper understanding. Moreover, collaborative learning opportunities, such as group activities, not only enrich the educational experience but also enhance social skills and peer interactions. As educators continue to refine their pedagogical strategies, it is essential to prioritize approaches that encourage active participation and foster a supportive learning environment, ultimately enabling students to achieve their full potential in language competence.

References

- Aini, N., Widayanti, D. E., & Winarto, A. E. (2022). AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' ABILITY IN WRITING CAUSE AND EFFECT ESSAY AT SMAN 1 KEDIRI. In *Journey: Journal of English Language and Pedagogy* (Vol. 5, Issue 1, pp. 64–73). IKIP Budi Utomo Malang. <https://doi.org/10.33503/journey.v5i1.1813>
- Aka, N. (2020). Incidental learning of a grammatical feature from reading by Japanese learners of English as a foreign language. In *System* (Vol. 91, p. 102250). Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102250>
- Akther, F. (2022). English for personal and career development and its importance for better employment opportunities. In *Journal of Languages, Linguistics and Literary Studies* (Vol. 2, Issue 3, pp. 95–100). Jozac Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.57040/jlls.v2i3.258>
- Al-Seghayer, K. (2021). Factors Underlying Current Saudi EFL Teachers' Approaches to Teaching the Four Macro and Micro Language Skills. In *International Journal of English Linguistics* (Vol. 11, Issue 5, p. 44). Canadian Center of Science and Education. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v11n5p44>
- Amiri, M., & Fatemi, A. H. (2014). The Impact of Content-based Instruction on Students' Achievement in ESP Courses and Their Language Learning Orientation. In *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* (Vol. 4, Issue 10). Academy Publication. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.10.2157-2167>
- Andriani, E., & Bram, B. (2021). SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS OF SENTENCE PATTERNS AND TYPES OF BBC NEWS ARTICLES. In *LiNGUA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra* (Vol. 16, Issue 1, pp. 25–34). Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University. <https://doi.org/10.18860/ling.v16i1.10832>
- Barrot, J. S. (2021). K to 12 curriculum reform in the Philippines: towards making students future ready. In *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* (Vol. 43, Issue 4, pp. 1193–1207). Informa UK Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1973959>
- Bowden, J. L.-H., Tickle, L., & Naumann, K. (2019). The four pillars of tertiary student engagement and success: a holistic measurement approach. In *Studies in Higher Education* (Vol. 46, Issue 6, pp. 1207–1224). Informa UK Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1672647>
- Chen, Y., Jensen, S., Albert, L. J., Gupta, S., & Lee, T. (2022). Artificial Intelligence (AI) Student Assistants in the Classroom: Designing Chatbots to Support Student Success. In *Information Systems Frontiers* (Vol. 25, Issue 1, pp. 161–182). Springer Science and Business Media LLC. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-022-10291-4>
- Chew, S. L., & Cerbin, W. J. (2020). The cognitive challenges of effective teaching. In *The Journal of Economic Education* (Vol. 52, Issue 1, pp. 17–40). Informa UK Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220485.2020.1845266>
- Dixson, M. D. (2010). Creating effective student engagement in online courses: What do students find engaging?. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1-13.
- Fumero, K., & Tibi, S. (2020). The Importance of Morphological Awareness in Bilingual Language and Literacy Skills: Clinical Implications for Speech-Language Pathologists. In *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in*

- Schools (Vol. 51, Issue 3, pp. 572–588). American Speech Language Hearing Association.
https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_lshss-20-00027
- Gess-Newsome, J., Taylor, J. A., Carlson, J., Gardner, A. L., Wilson, C. D., & Stuhlsatz, M. A. M. (2017). Teacher pedagogical content knowledge, practice, and student achievement. In *International Journal of Science Education* (Vol. 41, Issue 7, pp. 944–963). Informa UK Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1265158>
- Lvovich, N. (2021). Metaphors of Multilingualism: Changing Attitudes Towards Language Diversity in Literature, Linguistics and Philosophy. In *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* (pp. 1–2). Informa UK Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1926832>
- Haryadi, R. N., Endah, J., & Dalimunthe, L. (2021). The Effects of Vocabulary and Grammar Mastery on Students' Writing Skill in Descriptive Text (Surveys at Private Junior High Schools in Serang Banten). *JLE: Journal of Literate of English Education Study Program*, 2(2), 46–54. <https://doi.org/10.47435/jle.v2i2.732>
- Heilporn, G., Lakhal, S., & Bélisle, M. (2021). An examination of teachers' strategies to foster student engagement in blended learning in higher education. In *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education* (Vol. 18, Issue 1). Springer Science and Business Media LLC. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00260-3>
- HOPP, H., & THOMA, D. (2021). Effects of Plurilingual Teaching on Grammatical Development in Early Foreign-Language Learning. In *The Modern Language Journal* (Vol. 105, Issue 2, pp. 464–483). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12709>
- Hussein, S., Meena, R. S., & Ali, H. F. (2021). Integration of Literature in English Language Teaching: Learners' Attitudes and Opinions. (2021). In *Canadian Journal of Language and Literature Studies* (Vol. 1, Issue 1). MATIS Translation Services. <https://doi.org/10.53103/cjlls.v1i1.12>
- Junn, H. (2021). L2 communicative competence analysis via synchronous computer-mediated communication (SCMC) as an alternative to formal classrooms. In *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* (Vol. 17, Issue 1, pp. 15–31). Informa UK Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.1895802>
- Lombardi, D., Sinatra, G. M., Bailey, J. M., & Butler, L. P. (2024). Seeking a Comprehensive Theory About the Development of Scientific Thinking. In *Educational Psychology Review* (Vol. 36, Issue 3). Springer Science and Business Media LLC. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09911-z>
- Mustafa, F. (2021). THE USE OF PAST TENSE VERBS AND ADVERBS IN STUDENTS' RECOUNT TEXTS. In *INFERENCE: Journal of English Language Teaching* (Vol. 4, Issue 1, p. 68). Universitas Indraprasta PGRI. <https://doi.org/10.30998/inference.v4i1.6002>
- Rustipa, K. (2017). EFL Students' Sentence Writing Accuracy: Can "Text Analysis" Develop It? In *International Journal of English Linguistics* (Vol. 7, Issue 1, p. 126). Canadian Center of Science and Education. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n1p126>
- Shormani, M. Q. (2015). A Minimalist Approach to Collocation Acquisition: Integrating Syntax and Semantics. In *Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education* (Vol. 3, Issue 1, pp. 13–32). Deanship of Scientific Research. <https://doi.org/10.12785/jtte/030102>
- Zaidi, S., Yasmeen, F., Nimehchisalem, V., Kasim, Z. M., & Ali, A. M. (2024). Effects of Language Proficiency and Learning Styles on the Acquisition of Conditions and Violations of It-Cleft Constructions. In *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics* (Vol. 14, Issue 04, pp. 719–734). Scientific Research Publishing, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2024.144039>
- Yang, J., Qi, X. F., Liu, R., Wang, L., & Sun, B. (2022). A computational model of TE-dominant noticing, repetition, prior knowledge and grammatical knowledge acquisition. In *Reading and Writing* (Vol. 35, Issue 8, pp. 1953–1974). Springer Science and Business Media LLC. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-022-10275-5>
- Yu, S. (2021). Feedback-giving practice for L2 writing teachers: Friend or foe? In *Journal of Second Language Writing* (Vol. 52, p. 100798). Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100798>
- ZUBAEDI, Z., AMIN, A., ASIYAH, A., SUHIRMAN, S., ALIMNI, A., AMALIYAH, A., & AGUS KURNIAWAN, D. (2021). Learning style and motivation: gifted young students in meaningful learning. In *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists* (Vol. 9, Issue 1, pp. 57–66). Journal for Educating Gifted Young Scientists (JEGYS). <https://doi.org/10.17478/jegys.817277>
- Zhang, Z. (Victor). (2020). Learner engagement and language learning: a narrative inquiry of a successful language learner. In *The Language Learning Journal* (Vol. 50, Issue 3, pp. 378–392). Informa UK Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2020.1786712>