

INQUIRY BASED TEACHING: REDRESSING LEARNING LOSS IN ENGLISH WRITING SKILLS AMONG PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Qaisar Abbas^{*1}, Muhammad Uzair-ul-Hassan², Iram Parveen³

^{*1}PhD Scholar, Institute of Education, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

²Associate Professor, Institute of Education, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

³Assistant Professor, Institute of Education, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

^{*1}qaisarabbas.edu@gmail.com, ²uzair.hassan@uos.edu.pk, ³iram.parveen@uos.edu.pk

Corresponding Author: *

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14998255>

Received	Revised	Accepted	Published
13 January, 2025	13 February, 2025	28 February, 2025	06 March, 2025

ABSTRACT

A learning loss in English literacy skills is a loss in learning that a student faces due to breaks in regular learning activities. The study focuses on the remediation of learning loss among public primary school students in English writing skills, mainly in light of the educational challenges resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, flood disaster in 2022, and smog in 2023 in Punjab, Pakistan. In Pakistan, English is frequently taught using the traditional teaching method in public primary schools. The current study in Punjab tested the effectiveness of Inquiry-Based Teaching (IBT) in the favor of remediating learning loss in English writing skills among public primary school students. The study involved 135 students, with the experimental group taught using IBT and the control group taught using traditional method. The results showed that IBT was more effective than traditional teaching method in addressing learning losses in English writing skills. The study recommends teachers may use IBT to overcome learning loss for remedial learning in English writing skills.

Keywords: Learning Loss; Inquiry Based Teaching; Public Primary school students; English writing skills.

INTRODUCTION

The learning loss is a loss of knowledge and skills that a student faces due to breaks in regular learning activities. A loss of learning makes achievement difficult and creates differences in academic results among students' groups. The longer the closures, the more substantial the learning loss increases as the period of closing schools enlarges. The impact of learning loss on disadvantaged students is higher than privileged students (Hasudungan & Ningsih, 2021). Long periods of breaks in academic activities can be the cause of big learning losses like falling students behind with respect to their academic progress. Mostly underprivileged students experience higher level failure in learning at primary level,

educational inequalities make learning worse. Long durations of leave from the classroom may bring about a decrease student's motivation and involvement in learning (Toker, 2022).

UNICEF (2020) started a recovery program to address these issues with different catch-up programs, providing additional learning material, extending session time, summer campus, focus on individual learning to overcome the learning losses. Specific learning programs can overcome the learning loss in English writing skills. These programs consist of different reading intervention, individual tutoring and specific individualized learning strategies (Haruna et al., 2022). Studies have proved that summer learning programs in

summer vacation may reduce the learning loss in English literacy skills during long breaks from school (Kim & Quinn, 2013). The use of technology like educational apps and online material during long breaks can help to mitigate the learning loss. The formative assessment can help to address the learning gap that can be adjusted through suitable instruction by using instructional technology (Swaffield & Rawi, 2022). Through involving parents in teaching the learning process with assigning homework at home the parents can help to complete their homework to reduce learning loss in their children (Yavich & Davidovitch, 2020).

Different teaching strategies can help students to mitigate the learning loss in English writing skills. Research found that inquiry-based teaching methods are fruitful for improving students' attitude toward English language and English writing skills. The students are more motivated in learning the methods that are student centers (Alqassab, Strijbos, Panadero, Ruiz, Warrens, & To, 2023). The inquiry based method exhibited students' motivation and enthusiasm for language learning (Herro Ed. et al., 2018). When learners are involved in examining the problem they accept responsibility for learning then they are more involved and appreciate the real world application of English in the learning process (Ayish & Deveci, 2019).

The current study focuses on the remediation of learning loss among public primary school students in English writing skills, mainly in light of the educational challenges resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, flood disaster 2022 and smog 2023 in Punjab, Pakistan. The disruptions caused by school closures, remote learning, and limited access to educational resources have led to substantial learning gaps and academic setbacks for students because they could not afford technological gadgets like laptops, tabs, and internet etc due to either financial conditions or long distances.

Review of Literature

Learning Loss in English Literacy Skills

Pandemic affected education, especially primary School was affected by Covid-19 a lot (Orville, 2020). Closing of schools and transition from formal education to distance learning caused learning loss in different fields of knowledge, especially English literacy skills (Conto et al.,

2021). Document related to learning loss shows the negative impact of closing of schools and distance education on English literacy skills in public primary schools (Uğraş et al., 2023). Policy makers and educationists must prefer useful interventions and encourage systems to reduce learning loss and to develop English language proficiency among learners (Department of Education, 2018).

Long periods of vacations in schools caused learning decline among government primary school students (Brummet, 2014). Interruption in regular activities of schools due to natural disasters affected English language proficiency which leads toward learning loss (Harmey & Moss, 2023). Absence of face to face interaction with a confined approach to resources stopped learners to develop English literacy skills (Basar et al., 2021). Negative effects of educational disruption on English language literacy skills call for effective and useful intervention in education to make up learning loss (Lynch et al., 2023). During school closure, students from low income background families have to face loss in English literacy skills higher than that of high income background students (Soulen & Tedrow, 2022). Students with lack of digital literacy knowledge are destroying their English language improvement (khan & Gul, 2022).

Learning Loss in English Writing Skills

Learning loss in English writing skills numerous factors cause loss of writing skill. Prolong closure of school is one of factors which cause learning loss (Sarwat et al., 2021). Overuse of Technology leads to loss of English writing skills. Socioeconomic status is a factor which increases or decreases learning loss. Parents' interest in a child's learning is a pivotal element in enhancing students' learning and skills. Extended breaks in schools negatively affect students' academic achievement, especially writing skills. Continuous formal learning plays a very important role in improving writing skills. Over use of screen and digital devices have a negative impact on writing ability or skills. (Hammerstein et al., 2021).

Excessive use of Technology has a negative impact on academic performance. Creative and communicative teaching methodology plays a better role than traditional approaches like cramming (Echeverría et al., 2022). The students who are economically setback face more

difficulties than economically strong students (Vadivel et al., 2023). Parental environment also has a positive impact on academic performance of students. There is a positive relation between academic achievement and parents' involvement in students' learning (Đurišić&Bunijevac, 2017).

Addressing learning loss in English literacy skills through instruction

Planning and managing the process of instruction is essential to address the individual needs of students for remediating learning losses (Virca et al., 2017). Equity based instruction can be helpful for the students who are left behind in learning to face distinct challenges (Duffy, 2008). Implementation of focused reading activities like Reading Recovery Programs can enhance literacy skills of students effectively (Ross et al., 1995). These activities provide individual support for slow learners in reading. Instruction regarding phonics significantly enhances reading skills of students to overcome learning losses (Stevens et al., 2021). Giving importance to letters and their sounds is effective for young learners. Reading comprehension skills can be improved by vocabulary building in students (Mattiev et al., 2023).

Instruction on vocabulary building helps students get engaged with text more effectively which enhances comprehension skills in students. Peer tutoring is an effective approach to remediate learning losses (Baker et al., 2014). This approach enables students to learn from each other and support each other in learning to enhance literacy skills. It is essential to train teachers on evidence-based teaching (Manzon, 2022). The programs arranged for professional development of teachers enable them to frame their methodologies according to the individual needs of their students for remediating learning losses (Clark, 2007). With the support of parents, writing skills of students can be enhanced at home. Therefore using digital resources of technology can make learning more interactive and effective with more speed (Bonanati& Buhl, 2022).

English literacy skills can be enhanced by using various online programs and apps. Teachers can monitor the academic progress of students and plan accordingly by conducting regular formative assessments (Elmahdi et al., 2018). This approach may prove helpful to overcome learning losses by diagnosing weak areas of students in writing skills

where more support is needed. Well-equipped libraries provide a variety of reading materials to students which develop interest in reading and writing. Availability of a variety of reading and writing materials is necessary for development of literacy skills in students (Merga, 2019).

IBT and Basic English Writing Skills

Writing skills of middle school students improved significantly under the impact of inquiry-based teaching overtime (Kidron et al., 2014). It fostered problem solving and creativity skills in students which are essential for writing skills in language (McLaughlin & Munsell, 2012). This instructional method encourages learners to enhance their creativity and thought expression in writing through their engagement in the process of learning (Wale & Bishaw, 2020).

ESL students who were taught through IBT, demonstrated improvement in English writing skills in comparison with those who were taught through other methods (Wale & Bishaw, 2020). Inquiry-based teaching was found to improve the motivation level of students and their engagement in the learning process (Wale & Bogale, 2021). Under the impact of IBT students showed higher interest and motivation than their fellows who were involved in traditional classes of writing skills (Goetze & Driver, 2022).

There are various factors like teacher training and environment of classes which influence the effectiveness of IBT. Professional development of teachers is important to implement IBT in classes of English writing skills (Wale & Bogale, 2021). Availability of sufficient resources and planning time to implement inquiry-based teaching are the challenges that are associated with the execution of IBT in the activities of writing skills in English language therefore, it is essential to address the challenges for maximizing the utility of this approach (Quigley et al., 2011).

IBT and Basic English Writing Skills Regarding Gender

Critical thinking, problem-solving and engagement in students was enhanced significantly in the process of learning under the impact of inquiry-based instructional method of teaching (Quigley et al., 2011). This method motivates learners to build up concepts, raise questions and reach deep understanding of the subject under study. IBT has potential to improve

writing skills in English both in boys and girls students (Pedaste et al., 2015). This methodology provides opportunity for students to freely explore ideas and express themselves; therefore it reduces gender disparities in the learning of English literacy skills (Kasuba et al., 2023).

All the students feel at liberty to share and contribute their ideas as IBT creates a supportive and inclusive environment for learning (Pedaste et al., 2015). In history girls faced gender biases in the expression of their thoughts and ideas therefore; this method of teaching plays an important role in addressing gender disparities (Tabassum & Nayak, 2021). Both boys and girls students showed significant enhancement in writing performance after being taught through IBT (Langerock et al., 2021).

Research shows that students become well aware of the issues related to gender difference when motivated to raise questions and analyze text critically (Kraver, 2013). The awareness of these differences leads to well-balanced participation and expression of social issues in writings. Teachers may face challenges to implement IBT for creating gender equity in writing classes. They need training to take care of their own genders to create a bias-free environment in classes so that students can discuss gender related topics with comfort (Kraver, 2013). For adopting this method effectively teachers need professional development and continuous support (Darling-Hammond & Gardner, 2017).

IBT and Basic English Writing Skills Regarding Locality

In recent years IBT has gained significant attention as a teaching method that supports critical thinking and problem solving abilities in students (Darling-Hammond, Hyer, & Gardner, 2017). This instructional approach enables students to engage actively in the process of learning and learn about new topics as per their own interests therefore, it can enhance results in various results including English writing skills (Wale & Bogale, 2021). It makes learning experience more specific and meaningful for the students belonging to different localities having diverse needs and interests. Adopting IBT according to the local needs of a specific area can enhance students' concept building in writing skills which are related to the local culture and real-world situations (Dolin & Evans, 2018).

Language proficiency can be achieved when IBT was implemented to teach grammar and vocabulary in English writing classes because when students were motivated to express ideas on their self-selected topics about community and personal experiences in their writings freely, they showed more enthusiasms (Dolin & Evans, 2018). IBT fills the gap between classroom learning and practical use of the language in daily life. Students perform fieldwork and collect information through interviews for writing on different topics (Lee, 2020). In this way this method creates awareness about local culture and heritage along with enhancing writing skills of English language (Khan et al., 2023).

Students develop metacognitive skills like evaluation, synthesis, analysis and application when teachers use IBT in classes. They are motivated to explore diversity of ideas by raising questions that lead to better pieces of writing with respect to grammar and understanding. They become able to excel in writing skills due to the collaborative aspect of IBT which leads to better academic results and adopting careers (Shanmugavelu et al., 2020).

Objectives of the Study

To compare the inquiry based teaching method and traditional teaching method for remediation of learning losses in English writing skills of public primary school students

To compare the inquiry based teaching method and traditional teaching method for remediation of learning losses in English writing skills of public primary school students' w.r.t gender

To compare the inquiry based teaching method and traditional teaching method for remediation of learning losses in English writing skills of public primary school students' w.r.t Locality

Research Hypothesis

H01: There is no difference in mean score between experimental group taught through inquiry based teaching method and control group taught through traditional teaching method in the acquisition of students' English writing skills on post-test.

H02: There is no difference in mean score between experimental group taught through inquiry based teaching method and control group taught through traditional teaching method in the

acquisition of students' English writing skills w.r.t gender on post-test.

H03: There is no difference in mean score between experimental group taught through inquiry based teaching method and control group taught through traditional teaching method in the acquisition of students' English writing skills w.r.t locality on post-test.

Research Method and Design

In this research the researcher manipulated the core content related to Basic English writing Skills through Inquiry Based Teaching Method (IBTM) and Traditional Teaching Method (TTM) as an independent variable to explain the impact of treatment on remediation of learning loss in English writing Skills. The researcher applied non-equivalent (pretest-posttest) control group design. This design is suitable for this study because the effects of treatment were investigated by comparing pretest and posttest.

The Government Model Elementary School Chah Chmni Bhakkar was selected for the experiment. There were three sections of class 5th of the school in each section 45 students were enrolled. The intact group technique of sampling was used to select the sample. The treatment group A taught through inquiry based teaching (IBT) and treatment group B taught through traditional teaching method. Control group C also taught through traditional teaching method (Grammar translation Method). The total 135 students of grade 5 were selected from Government Model Elementary School Chah Chmni Bhakkar as sample.

A Self-constructed Basic English literacy test (BELT) was used that consists of English writing skills. The teacher took writing test through a simple topic like my classroom, my school, my teacher, Self introduction to write five simple sentences on it. The researcher collected the data through the Basic English Literacy Test (BELT). The Basic English Literacy Test (BELT) assessment tool was used in pre-test and post-test for collection of data.

Study Delimitation

The current study was delimited to Basic English writing skills.

The only grade fifth students from the public sector.

Study is delimited to district Bhakkar.

Procedure of the experimental study

The Basic English Literacy Test (BELT) was taken from the control group and the experimental groups before starting the experiment.

The experiment involved 24 planned lessons for experimental groups, focusing on English writing skills.

In the control group, a traditional teaching method was employed.

The experimental group A was taught through inquiry-based teaching (IBT) methodology and experimental group B and C was taught through traditional teaching methodology. The researcher took two experimental groups to check whether traditional teaching method is sufficient to overcome learning losses or inquiry based teaching method is better than traditional methods for remediation of learning loss.

After closing the treatment the post-test on Basic English literacy test was taken from control group and experimental groups.

Results

For data analysis descriptive and inferential statistics was used. The tools for descriptive statistical data analysis mean and standard deviation were used. The inferential statistic tool; one-way ANOVA to compare the mean score of three groups (A, B, and C), and further Post Hoc Multiple Comparison Test (Tukey) was applied to compare the mean score of said groups if the difference was significant. The independent sample t-test was applied to compare mean scores with respect to gender (girls and boys) and locality (urban and rural) on pretest and posttest. The paired sample t-test was applied to compare the score of pretest and posttest of each group.

Table 1
ANOVA among Three on English Writing Skills in post test

Group	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	147.21	2	73.60	61.89	.000
Within Groups	156.97	132	1.18		
Total	304.19	134			

Table 1 presents a comparison of English writing skills. The total sum of squares is 304.19, the sum of squares within groups is 156.97, and the sum of squares across the three groups is 147.21. While degrees of freedom (df) 2 is between groups, 132 degree of freedom within groups, and 134 degree

of freedom overall. The mean square is 1.18 within groups and 73.60 between groups. The p-value is .000 and the F ratio is 61.89. Hence the p-value is less than .05 ($p < 0.05$), the differences between the three groups are statistically significant.

Table 2
Multiple Comparisons of Groups on English Writing Skills in post test

Groups	Control and Experimental	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
A (Experimental)	B (Experimental)	1.75*	.22	.000
	C (Control)	2.48*	.22	.000
B (Experimental)	A (Experimental)	-1.75*	.22	.000
	C (Control)	.733*	.22	.005
C (Control)	A (Experimental)	-2.48*	.22	.000
	B (Experimental)	-.73*	.22	.005

Table 3 presents a comparison of English writing skills. The experimental groups A and B have a mean difference of 1.75, a standard error of 0.22, and a p-value of 0.000. Hence the p-value is less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$), the difference between the said groups is statistically significant. The A (Experimental) and C (Control) groups' mean differences are 2.48, with a standard error of 0.22 and a p-value of 0.000. Hence the p-value is less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$), the difference between the said groups is statistically significant.

The experimental group B and A have a mean difference of -1.75, a standard error of 0.22, and a p-value of 0.000. Hence the p-value is less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$), the difference between the said groups is statistically significant. The B

(Experimental) and C (Control) groups' mean differences are 0.73, 0.22 is the standard error, and 0.005 is the p-value. Hence the p-value is less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$), the difference between the said groups is statistically significant.

The C (Control) and A (Experimental) groups' mean differences are -2.48, with a standard error of 0.22 and a p-value of 0.000. Hence the p-value is less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$), the difference between the said groups is statistically significant. Between the C (Control) and B (Experimental) groups, the mean difference is -0.73, the standard error is 0.22, and the p-value is 0.005. Hence the p-value is less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$), the difference between the said groups is statistically significant.

Table 3
Comparison of PreTest and Post Test on English Writing Skills

Group	Pre test		Post test		t(89)	P
	M	SD	M	SD		
A	1.42	0.96	4.02	1.46	12.41	0.000
B	1.43	0.89	2.22	0.85	4.35	0.000
C	1.53	0.78	1.63	0.60	1.38	0.173

Table 3 presents a comparison of English writing skills. The pretest mean score for English writing skills in Experimental group A was 1.42, with a standard deviation of 0.96. The English writing

skills post-test had a mean score of 4.02 and a standard deviation of 1.46. In the two-tailed test, the t-value was 12.41 and the P-value was 0.000. Pre- and post-test results showed a statistically

significant difference, as indicated by the p-value of 0.000 being less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$).

The pretest mean score for English writing skills in Experimental group B was 1.43, with a standard deviation of 0.89. The post-test English writing skills mean score was 2.27, with a standard deviation of 0.85. In the two-tailed test, the t-value was 4.35 and the P-value was 0.000. Pre- and post-test results showed a statistically significant difference, as indicated by the p-value of 0.000 being less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$).

The pre-test mean score for English writing skills in Control group C was 1.53, with a standard deviation of 0.78. The English writing skills post-test mean score was 1.63, with a standard deviation of 0.60. In the two-tailed test, the t-value was 1.38 and the p-value was 0.17. There was no statistically significant difference between the pre- and post-test results, as indicated by the p-value of 0.17, which was greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$).

Table 4

Comparison of Mean Score on Post test Regarding English Writing Skills w.r.t Gender

Group	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig(2-tailed)
A	Boys	33	4.15	1.37	0.97	0.333
	Girls	12	3.66	1.72		
B	Boys	33	2.20	0.88	-0.70	0.483
	Girls	12	2.40	0.91		
C	Boys	33	1.30	0.62	-0.61	0.543
	Girls	12	1.44	0.52		

Table 4 presents a comparison of English writing skills with respect to gender. Boys in Experimental group A had a mean score of 4.15 and a standard deviation of 1.37 on the post-test for English writing skills. Girls students' post-test mean score on English writing skills was 3.66, with a standard deviation of 1.72. In the two-tailed test, the t-value was 0.97 and the P-value was 0.333. Because the p-value of 0.333 was greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$), there was no statistically significant difference between the post-test results for boys and girls students.

Boys in Experimental group B had a mean score of 2.20 on the post-test for English writing abilities, with a standard deviation of 0.88. In the post-test, girls students' mean score on English writing skills was 2.40, with a standard deviation

of 0.910. In the two-tailed test, the t-value was -0.70 and the P-value was 0.483. Because the p-value of 0.483 was greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$), there was no statistically significant difference between the post-test results for boys and girls students.

The post-test mean score of boys in Control group C on English writing skills was 1.30, with a standard deviation of 0.62. Girls students' post-test mean score on English writing skills was 1.44, with a standard deviation of 0.52. In the two-tailed test, the p-value was 0.543 and the t-value was -0.61. Because the p-value of 0.543 was greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$), there was no statistically significant difference between the post-test results for boys and girls students.

Table 5

Comparison of Mean Score on Posttest Regarding English Writing Skills w.r.t Locality

Group	Locality	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig(2-tailed)
A	Urban	30	3.56	1.61	-4.52	0.062
	Rural	15	3.93	1.25		
B	Urban	30	2.30	0.91	0.35	0.727
	Rural	15	2.20	0.86		
C	Urban	30	1.43	0.62	1.60	0.117
	Rural	15	1.13	0.51		

Table 5 presents a comparison of English writing skills with respect to locality. Urban students' post-test mean score on English writing abilities in Experimental group A was 3.56, with a standard

deviation of 1.61. In the post-test, Rural students' mean score on English writing skills was 3.93, with a standard deviation of 1.25. In the two-tailed test, the t-value was -4.52 and the P-value

was 0.062. The post-test results for urban and rural students did not show a statistically significant difference, as indicated by the p-value of 0.062, which was less than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$).

Urban students' post-test mean score on English writing skills in Experimental group B was 2.30, with a standard deviation of 0.91. In the post-test, rural students' mean score on English writing skills were 2.20, with a standard deviation of 0.86. In the two-tailed test, the t-value was 0.35 and the P-value was 0.72. The post-test results for urban and rural students did not show a statistically significant difference, as indicated by the p-value of 0.727, which was greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$).

Urban students' post-test mean score on English writing skills was 1.43 in Control group C, with a standard deviation of 0.62. In the post-test, rural students' mean score on English writing skills was 1.13, with a standard deviation of 0.516. In the two-tailed test, the t-value was 1.60 and the p-value was 0.12. The post-test results for urban and rural students did not show a statistically significant difference, as indicated by the p-value of 0.12, which was greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$).

Finding of the study

Findings Regarding English Writing Skills

According to table 4.29 regarding English Writing skills in posttest there was significant difference measured ($t=61.89$ & $p=0.000$ where $p < 0.05$) among the three groups participating in the study (Control Group C, Experimental Group B, and Experimental Group A). It means that the inquiry based method of teaching and traditional method of teaching has a different impact on remediation of students' learning loss in English Writing skills. According to table 4.30 regarding English Writing skills in posttest there was significant difference measured ($MD=1.75$ & $p=0.000$ where $p < 0.05$) between the Treatment Group A and Treatment Group B and there was also significant difference measured ($MD=2.48$ & $p=0.000$ where $p < 0.05$) between the Treatment Group A and Control Group C. There was significant difference measured ($MD=-1.75$ & $p=0.000$ where $p < 0.05$) between the Treatment Group B and Treatment Group A and there was also significant difference measured ($MD=0.73$ & $p=0.000$ where $p < 0.05$) between the Treatment Group B and Control Group C. There was significant difference measured ($MD=-2.48$ & $p=0.000$ where $p < 0.05$) between the Control Group C and Treatment

Group A and there was also significant difference measured ($MD=-0.73$ & $p=0.005$ where $p < 0.05$) between the Control Group C and Treatment Group B. It means that there is statistically significant difference in the mean score of three groups with respect to each other. IBTM and TTM have different impacts on remediation of learning loss in English writing skills.

According to table 4.31 regarding Writing skills in Experimental Group A; there were significant differences measured ($t=12.41$ & $p=0.000$ where $p > 0.05$) between the pretest ($M=1.42$) and posttest ($M=4.02$). In Experimental Group B there was a statistically significant difference measured ($t=4.35$ & $p=0.000$ where $p > 0.05$) between the pretest ($M=1.43$) and posttest ($M=2.27$). In Control Group C there was no statistically significant difference measured ($t=1.386$ & $p=0.173$ where $p > 0.05$) between the pretest ($M=1.53$) and posttest ($M=1.63$). It means that the IBT is the most suitable methodology for remediation of learning loss in Basic English writing skills because the mean of the group A is highest among three groups.

According to table 4.32 regarding English Writing skills in Experimental Group A; there were no significant differences measured ($t=0.97$ & $p=0.333$ where $p > 0.05$) between the boys ($M=4.15$) and girls ($M=3.66$) students on posttest. In Experimental Group B; there were no significant differences measured ($t=-0.70$ & $p=0.48$ where $p > 0.05$) between the boys ($M=2.20$) and girls (2.40) students on posttest. In Control Group C there were no significant differences measured ($t=-0.61$ & $p=0.54$ where $p > 0.05$) between the boys ($M=1.30$) and girls ($M=1.44$) students on posttest. It means that the IBT methodology is suitable for boys and girls students for remediation of learning loss in English writing skills of public primary school students.

According to table 4.33 regarding English Writing skills in Experimental Group A; there was no significant difference measured ($t=4.52$ & $p=0.062$ where $p > 0.05$) between the urban ($M=3.56$) and rural ($M=3.93$) students on posttest. In Experimental Group B; there were no statistically significant differences measured ($t=0.35$ & $p=0.727$ where $p > 0.05$) between urban ($M=2.30$) and rural ($M=2.20$) students on posttest. In Control Group C; there were no statistically significant differences measured ($t=1.601$ & $p=0.117$ where $p > 0.05$) between urban

(M=1.43) and rural (M=1.13) students on posttest. It means that the IBT methodology is suitable for urban and rural students for remediation of learning loss of public primary school students in English writing skills.

Discussion Regarding English Writing Skills

The results of the current study indicated that IBT is found to be more effective than traditional teaching methods to overcome learning losses in writing skills of students. These findings are aligned with results of the earlier study conducted by Quigley et al. who also demonstrated that IBT was found to be more effective for enhancing writing skills of students as comparison to traditional teaching methods. The findings of the current study and previous study indicate that IBT is more suitable for remediating learning losses in writing skills of students than traditional teaching methods (Quigley et al., 2011).

The findings of the current study show that there was no statistically significant difference measured in the effectiveness of IBT in overcoming learning losses of writing skills for boys and girls students. These results are in favor of the previous research conducted by Kusuba et al. (2023) who also found no disparities of gender regarding the effectiveness of IBT in remediating learning losses of writing skills. The results of the current study and previous study depict that IBT is equitably effective for overcoming of learning losses in writing skills for both boys and girls students (Kasuba et al., 2023).

The findings of the current study show that there was no significant difference found in the effectiveness of IBT for remediating learning losses of writing skills in English of urban and rural students. These results are consistent with the results of earlier research conducted by Dolin and Evans (2018) who also found that IBT is equally effective for remediating learning losses of writing skills in English across urban and rural settings. The finding of the study and previous research are evident that IBT is equitably effective to overcome learning losses in writing skills of students in English for both rural and urban students when comparison with traditional method of teaching (Dolin Ed. & Evans Ed., 2018).

Conclusion

According to the findings regarding English Writing Skills in posttest there was significant difference measured among the three groups participating in the study (Control Group C, Experimental Group B, and Experimental Group A). It means that the intervention for remediation of learning loss has an impact. The mean score of A group; who taught through Inquiry Based Teaching (IBT) was highest among three groups. It means that the inquiry Based Teaching Method is most suitable for implementing the material for remediation of learning loss in writing skills. There was no statistically significant difference measured between the mean score of boys and girls students. It can be concluded that this methodology is suitable for both boys and girls students. There was no statistically significant difference measured in urban and rural students in posttest; it means that the IBT is suitable for remediation of learning loss for urban and rural students.

REFERENCES

- Alban Conto, C., Akseer, S., Dreesen, T., Kamei, A., Mizunoya, S., & Rigole, A. (2021). Potential effects of COVID-19 school closures on foundational skills and Country responses for mitigating learning loss. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102434>
- Alqassab, M., Strijbos, J. W., Panadero, E., Ruiz, J. F., Warrens, M., & To, J. (2023). A Systematic Review of Peer Assessment Design Elements. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09723-7>
- Ayish, N., & Deveci, T. (2019). Student Perceptions of Responsibility for Their Own Learning and for Supporting Peers' Learning in a Project-based Learning Environment. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 31(2).
- Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). *Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in*

- Elementary and Middle School. IES Practice Guide. NCEE 2014-4012. What Works Clearinghouse.
- Basar, Z. M., Mansor, A. N., Jamaludin, K. A., & Alias, B. S. (2021). The Effectiveness and Challenges of Online Learning for Secondary School Students - A Case Study. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 17(3).
<https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v17i3.14514>
- Bonanati, S., & Buhl, H. M. (2022). The digital home learning environment and its relation to children's ICT self-efficacy. *Learning Environments Research*, 25(2).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09377-8>
- Brummet, Q. (2014). The effect of school closings on student achievement. *Journal of Public Economics*, 119.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2014.06.010>
- Clark, C. (2007). Why it is important to involve parents in their children's literacy development. National Literacy Trust.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97-140.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
- Department of Education, U. (2018). Creating Educational Technology for English Learners. Developer Toolkit. Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, US Department of Education.
- Dolin, J., & Evans, R. (Eds.). (2018). Transforming Assessment: Through an Interplay between Practice, Research and Policy. Contributions from Science Education Research (Vol. 4). Contributions from Science Education Research.
- Duffy, H. (2008). Meeting the needs of significantly struggling learners in high school. Retrieved March, 2004 (Ld).
- Đurišić, M., & Bunijevac, M. (2017). Parental Involvement as an Important Factor for Successful Education. Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal, 7(3).
<https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.291>
- Echeverría, M. P. P., Pozo, J. I., & Cabellos, B. (2022). Analysis of Teaching Practices During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Teachers' Goals and Activities in Virtual Classrooms. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.870903>
- Elmahdi, I., Al-Hattami, A., & Fawzi, H. (2018). Using Technology for Formative Assessment to Improve Students' Learning. *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 17(2).
- Goetze, J., & Driver, M. (2022). Is learning really just believing? A meta-analysis of self-efficacy and achievement in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 12(2), 195-221.
<https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2022.12.2.4>
- Hammerstein, S., König, C., Dreisörner, T., & Frey, A. (2021). Effects of COVID-19-Related School Closures on Student Achievement-A Systematic Review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.746289>
- Harmey, S., & Moss, G. (2023). Learning disruption or learning loss: Using evidence from unplanned closures to inform returning to school after COVID-19. *Educational Review*, 75(4).
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2021.1966389>
- Haruna, H. A., Kabara, M. Y., & Enriquez, A. (2022). Face-to-face, online, or hybrid learning in post COVID-19 recovery? Scrutinizing Nigerian students' Preferences. *Journal of Educational Management and Instruction (JEMIN)*, 2(2).
<https://doi.org/10.22515/jemin.v2i2.5026>
- Herro, D., Arafah, S., Ling, R., & Holden, C. (Eds.). (2018). Mobile Learning: Perspectives on Practice and Policy. Digital Media and Learning. IAP - Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Huong, L. T., & Jatturas, T. N. (2020). The COVID-19 induced learning loss: What is

- it and how can it be mitigated? The Education and Development Forum, 1(1).
- Kasuba, B., Sudirman, A., & Subekti, N. B. (2023). Exploring an Inquiry-based Approach to Enhance English Vocabulary Learning: Academy Students' Perspectives. *IJORER: International Journal of Recent Educational Research*, 4(5). <https://doi.org/10.46245/ijorer.v4i5.383>
- Khan, I. U., Ahmed, A., & Saeed, K. (2023). Analyzing the Models of Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) and Constructivist EFL Pedagogy: A Review Study. *Journal of Communication and Cultural Trends*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.32350/jcct.51.07>
- Kidron, Y., Lindsay, J., & (Ed.), R. E. L. A. (2014). The Effects of Increased Learning Time on Student Academic and Nonacademic Outcomes: Findings from a Meta-Analytic Review (REL 2014-015). Regional Educational Laboratory Appalachia, July.
- Kim, J. S., & Quinn, D. M. (2013). Summer learning loss: What is it, and what can we do about it? *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3).
- Kraver, J. R. (2013). Engendering Gender Equity: Using Literature to Teach and Learn Democracy. *The English Journal*, 96(6).
- Langerock, N., Sposito, G., Hautekiet, C., & Vergauwe, E. (2021). Inhibition-of-return-like effects in working memory?
- Lee, J. (2020). Designing an inquiry-based field work project for students using mobile technology and its effects on students' experience. *Review of International Geographical Education Online*, 10(SpecialIssue1). <https://doi.org/10.33403/rigeo.637666>
- Lynch, K., An, L., & Mancenido, Z. (2023). The Impact of Summer Programs on Student Mathematics Achievement: A Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 93(2). <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543221105543>
- Mattiev, J., Salaev, U., & Kavsek, B. (2023). Word Game Modeling Using Character-Level N-Gram and Statistics. *Mathematics*, 11(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/math11061380>
- McLaughlin, J. S., & Munsell, D. S. (2012). Evolving On-Line Pedagogy. *International Journal of Online Pedagogy and Course Design*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijopcd.2012010101>
- Merga, M. K. (2019). How do librarians in schools support struggling readers? *English in Education*, 53(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/04250494.2018.1558030>
- Orville, H. (2020). COVID-19 causes unprecedented educational disruption: Is there a road towards a new normal? *Prospects*, 49(1-2), 69-75. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09475-0>
- Quigley, C., Marshall, J., Deaton, C., Cook, M., & Padilla, M. (2011). Challenges to inquiry teaching and suggestions for how to meet them. *Science Educator*, 20(1), 41-49.
- Rommel Pascual Manzon. (2022). Evidence-based teaching strategy. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR)*. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra9827>
- Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., Casey, J., & Slavin, R. E. (1995). Increasing the academic success of disadvantaged children: An examination of alternative early intervention programs. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(4), 743-775. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032004773>
- Sarwat, S., Ullah, N., Anjum, H. M. S., & Bhuttah, T. M. (2021). Problems and factors affecting students English writing skills at elementary level. *Elementary Education Online*, 20(5), 2864-2874.
- Shanmugavelu, G., Parasuraman, B., Ariffin, K., Kannan, B., & Vadivelu, M. (2020). Inquiry Method in the Teaching and Learning Process. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v8i3.2396>
- Silm, G., Tiitsaar, K., Pedaste, M., Zacharia, Z. C., & Papaevripidou, M. (2017). Teachers' readiness to use inquiry-based learning: An investigation of teachers' sense of efficacy and attitudes toward inquiry-based learning. *Science Education International*, 28(4).

- Soulen, R. R., & Tedrow, L. (2022). Students' frequency of access to school library materials in transformative times. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 54(4).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/09610006211037721>
- Stevens, E. A., Austin, C., Moore, C., Scammacca, N., Boucher, A. N., & Vaughn, S. (2021). Current State of the Evidence: Examining the Effects of Orton-Gillingham Reading Interventions for Students With or at Risk for Word-Level Reading Disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 87(4).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0014402921993406>
- Swaffield, S., & Rawi, R. (2022). Assessment for learning. In *International Encyclopedia of Education: Fourth Edition*.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818630-5.09011-4>
- Tabassum, N., & Nayak, B. S. (2021). Gender Stereotypes and Their Impact on Women's Career Progressions from a Managerial Perspective. *IIM Kozhikode Society and Management Review*, 10(2).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2277975220975513>
- TOKER, T. (2022). Detecting Possible Learning Losses due to COVID-19 Pandemic: An Application of Curriculum-Based Assessment. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 9(1).
<https://doi.org/10.33200/ijcer.985992>
- Uğraş, M., Zengin, E., Papadakis, S., & Kalogiannakis, M. (2023). Early Childhood Learning Losses during COVID-19: Systematic Review. In *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 15(7).
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su15076199>
- Unicef. (2020). *Guidance: Assessing and Monitoring Learning During the Covid-19 Crisis*. Eapro, April.
- Virca, I., Oancea, R., & Gligorea, I. (2017). ADVANTAGES TO USE ELEARNING PLATFORM IN THE FIELD OF TECHNICAL SYSTEMS. 13th International Conference ELearning and Software for Education, 1.
<https://doi.org/10.12753/2066-026x-17-018>
- Wale, B. D., & Bishaw, K. S. (2020). Effects of using inquiry-based learning on EFL students' critical thinking skills. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00090-2>
- Wale, B. D., & Bogale, Y. N. (2021). Using inquiry-based writing instruction to develop students' academic writing skills. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 6(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00108-9>
- Yavich, R., & Davidovitch, N. (2020). Homework: At Home or at School?—Attitudes of Teachers, Parents and the General Public: A Case Study. *International Education Studies*, 13(6).
<https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v13n6p170>