



# Impact of Blended Learning through Learn Smart Classroom on English Academic Writing Accuracy among School Students of FGEI Pakistan

## Research Article

|                 |                                                         |                                                                                      |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Correspondence: | Zeeshan Hadir<br><zeeshanhadir792@gmail.com>            | MPhil Scholar, Department of English,<br>University of Okara, Okara, Pakistan.       |
|                 | Dr. Muhammad Ilyas Mahmood<br><ilyas.mahmood@ok.edu.pk> | Assistant Professor, Department of English,<br>University of Okara, Okara, Pakistan. |
|                 | Tayyab Wakeel<br><rtayyaba854@gmail.com>                | MPhil Scholar, Department of English,<br>University of Okara, Okara, Pakistan.       |

## Publication Details

**Received:** July 25, 2025**Accepted:** August 20, 2025**Published:** September 30, 2025

## Abstract

This study compares and contrasts the Learn Smart Classroom (LSC) model of blended learning for improving academic writing accuracy in English as a foreign language (EFL) for secondary school students in Pakistan's Federal Government Educational Institutions (FGEI) network. Using a mixed-methods concurrent triangulation methodology, the study analyses how digital scaffolds might overcome the limits of rote-based grammar-translation procedures, interlingual L1 transfer, and informal digital shorthand in academic writing. Qualitative/descriptive data from a comprehensive sample of English language teachers ( $N_t=41$ ) with their FGEI campuses was cross-referenced with quantitative data from a cleaned and validated secondary school student sample ( $N_s=276$ ). Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory, Sweller's Cognitive Load Theory, and Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis guide the research. Descriptive statistical research shows that lecture-based writing instruction promotes grammatical, lexical, and syntactical errors, while the LSC's digital scaffolding and quick feedback loops greatly minimize writing errors. The considerable



mismatch between high self-reported confidence in paragraph writing ( $M=4.00$ ) and high syntactic and lexical mistakes, backed by educator feedback, prompts the investigation of students' competency. The study found that the LSC model's low-stakes, self-paced, and participatory setting helps overcome this emotional filter. These empirical findings indicate systemic integration, professional teacher training, and local curriculum modification to maintain the formal academic register of writing.

**Keywords:** Blended Learning, Learn Smart Classroom, English Academic Writing Accuracy, EFL Learners, Digital Scaffolding, L1 Interference, FGEI Pakistan

---

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background of the Study

English academic writing is an objective, formal, complex, and precise mode of communication that demands precision, syntactic control, and lexical appropriateness (Zaman et al., 2026). The academic register does not allow using informal slang, digital abbreviations, and broken syntactical patterns (Juraeva, 2025). For the educational system in Pakistan to be accurate, the accuracy in English academic writing becomes a prime concern, since the system of written examination in Pakistan is mostly based on essay and paragraph writing tasks to evaluate and assign grades for student performance (Siddiqui, 2012).

In the past, the ESL pedagogy in secondary schools in Pakistan has been characterized by a teacher-centric approach, with an emphasis on grammatical rules and isolated learning, rather than on contextual and communicative competence (Khan & Sadia, 2025). In schools, students are unable to produce original and grammatically correct texts because schools tend to focus on rote learning to cater to the washback effects of the exams (Siddiqui, 2012). This pedagogical failure is exacerbated by the variety of multilingual backgrounds of learners in public educational systems like the Federal Government Educational Institutions (FGEI) network in Pakistan. The FGEI classrooms are very diverse in terms of students' languages, with first languages such as Punjabi, Pashto, Saraiki, Urdu, etc. This linguistic diversity leads to serious interlingual transfer errors since learners often tend to incorporate the syntactic, morphological, and semantic aspects of their L1 into the L2 academic writing. It can be inferred from the above that these students do not have an environment at home where they can be surrounded by formal English writing structures, so they do not have the opportunity to learn them more actively, as suggested by Dar and Khan (2015). The teachers cannot provide constructive feedback that is individualized to correct transfer errors in large overcrowded classes, usually more than 50 students, which can lead to students' incorrect writing habits and raise their writing anxiety (Shamim, 2011).

With the tremendous growth of digital technologies has come an additional level of complexity for students' writing and for educational and linguistic purposes. The informal digital shorthand (slang, shortened vocabulary, inconsistent word capitalization, and phonetic spelling) has become commonplace on social media and instant messaging applications. As secondary learners internalize these informal digital patterns, they reproduce them in formal, written assessments and there is a profound shift towards the informal register of the language of assessment.

While these informal practices can be driven by generic digital platforms and unguided online tools, structured blended learning models offer a promising alternative, offering a blend of face-to-face learning and digital scaffolding that is structured and curriculum-mapped. The FGEI network has responded to these complex issues by adopting a structured approach to educational technology—the Learn Smart Classroom model developed by Knowledge Platform. LSC is a worldwide blended learning solution that offers contextualized digital lesson plans, interactive educational games, immediate automated feedback, and a personal learning trajectory with direct linking to the national curriculum. The LSC provides students with multimedia cognitive scaffolds rather than traditional passive instruction to acquire grammar and vocabulary in real communication activities. This study aims to analyze the effect of the LSC blended learning model on the accuracy of writing academic writing in English by students of secondary schools in the FGEI network to overcome the problems of traditional classroom learning, L1 interference and digital shorthand patterns.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Secondary school pupils in Pakistan's FGEI network struggle with English academic writing correctness. They commonly make long-term grammatical, syntax, and vocabulary mistakes during formal writing tests. This systemic inaccuracy stems from standard teaching techniques that emphasize grammar-translation approaches (GTM) and passive memorization of linguistic meaning rather than context-based language acquisition. Negative interlingual transfer occurs due to the pupils' regional mother tongue, the absence of a supportive English-speaking home environment, and the influence of informal digital shorthand from social media, all of which lower their formal writing register. Changing instructional methods is the only way to address the shortcomings. A generic teacher in a large classroom cannot give personalized instruction or immediate error correction. Public education has yet to test structured uses of technology-mediated blended learning to address these multi-layered difficulties.

## **1.3 Research Objectives**

This study seeks to achieve three primary academic objectives:

- To evaluate the impact of the Learn Smart Classroom model of blended learning on developing grammatical, lexical, and syntactical accuracy in English academic writing among secondary school students of FGEI Pakistan.
- To examine the role of the Learn Smart Classroom in enhancing student motivation, writing confidence, and learner autonomy.
- To analyze and cross-reference teacher and student perceptions regarding the operational effectiveness of the Learn Smart Classroom compared to traditional teaching methodologies in mitigating L1 interference and digital slang.

## **1.4 Research Questions**

This study has three primary research questions to respond to the research objectives:

1. To what extent does the Learn Smart Classroom model of blended learning develop grammatical, lexical, and syntactical accuracy in English academic writing among school students compared to traditional, lecture-based teaching methodologies?
2. How does the integration of the Learn Smart Classroom model influence student motivation, academic confidence, and self-directed practice habits?
3. What are the perceptions and pedagogical alignments of English language teachers regarding the efficacy of the Learn Smart Classroom over conventional lecturing in addressing student writing inaccuracies?

### **1.5 Rationale and Significance of the Study**

The findings of this study should help Pakistani educational reformers, curriculum developers, and politicians move from rote to conceptual skill-based education. This research helps the Knowledge Platform with the Learn Smart Classroom, which is applicable to public schools, rather than blended learning assessment. Due to Pakistan's multilingual student population, this study's results on L1 interference and confusion in digital registers apply to various L1 networks in the public and low-cost private sectors. This study concludes by examining how technology, sociolinguistic variables, and psychology affect second language teacher learning in resource-constrained classrooms.

### **1.6 Delimitations and Limitations of the Study**

The target population is confined to secondary school students and teachers enrolled or employed in the network of Federal Government Educational Institutions in Pakistan (Majeed & Rehan Dar, 2022). This evaluation focuses solely on the accuracy of academic writing in English. Finally, the technology-mediated blended learning element is strictly limited to the Learn Smart Classroom model developed by Knowledge Platform and does not include other generic learning management systems or generative artificial intelligence tools.

Limitations of this study include that the quantitative findings are restricted to the final sample size of verified student survey responses ( $N_s=276$ ), which was determined after the data-cleaning procedures removed duplicate and incomplete logs. Although the sample is highly representative of trends in the participating FGEIs, the generalizability of the findings may be limited by localized variations in digital infrastructure, reliability of internet bandwidth, and baseline digital literacy among students and teachers across urban, semi-urban, and rural FGEI campuses. In addition, the study collected self-reported questionnaire data for students' perceptions of writing motivation, autonomy, and confidence, and thus the data may be subject to social desirability bias. To counter these limitations, the study used concurrent triangulation of teacher descriptive feedback.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Blend Learning Paradigms and Technology Integration in ESL**

Blended learning is now an essential pedagogical tool in today's English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom, as it combines effective face-to-face lessons with flexible digital environments (Majeed & Rehan Dar, 2022). Learn Smart Classroom provides dynamic, curriculum-aligned learning environments with gamified assessments, automatic correction algorithms, and

personalized learning experiences (Peng & Raman, 2026). Static LMSs are content-based digital libraries. Research on ESL students in underdeveloped countries found that technology-mediated scaffolds improved grammar, syntactical organization, and language competency (Majeed & Rehan Dar, 2022). In another study, Mahmood et al. (2024) found that ESL learners' paragraph construction, vocabulary retention, and coherence improved significantly when taught through blended learning in Pakistan.

Blended models' primary pedagogical benefit is that they provide learning opportunities beyond the confines of traditional classrooms. They create learning spaces where learners can learn at their own pace, thus enhancing learner autonomy and minimizing writing anxiety (Vonny & Aras, 2025). It would be easier for the teacher to provide structured and immediate feedback and for the students to practice writing happily and track their progress if it could be integrated with platforms such as Google Classroom (Challob et al., 2016). Miyazoe and Anderson (2010) also concluded that use of a collaborative digital environment has a positive effect on reducing students' writing apprehension and facilitating students' mastery of micro-aspects and macro-aspects of writing. Blended models combine face-to-face teacher-led instruction with online collaborative activities to create an active, constructivist approach to learning and offer a viable alternative to conventional classrooms that are often time-limited and only provide students with a small window for learning collaboratively (Banditvilai, 2016; Chomchaiya, 2014).

## **2.2 The Legacy of the Grammar-Translation Method and Rote Learning in Pakistan**

The traditional grammar-translation method is still the most prevalent one used by public schools in Pakistan for teaching English as a foreign language, although blended learning in communication remains flexible (Roma, 2021). The GTM is based on the deductive teaching of grammar, memorization of abstract syntactical rules, and mechanical translation of literary sentences (Roma, 2021). GTM has been criticized for failing to consider active communication skills, yet the ongoing adoption of it in public secondary schools represents both an adaptive and rational response on the part of teachers because of the emphasis on the reproduction of memorized essays, rather than original ones, within the national examinations (Khan & Sadia, 2025). Because teachers have already prepared their students to excel in the conventional way of rote learning, this has a strong washback effect, in that the English is taught as a detached academic subject. The structural mechanics of GTM, however, are suitable for maintaining order in large and overcrowded classrooms in the public sector, but not for fostering active learners who can write even one coherent paragraph of original English (Roma, 2021). Richards and Rodgers (2014) note that the method is very precise and heavily based on deductive memorization of rules, which might result in students not applying the rules to the contexts they encounter in actual communication. This longstanding and rote-based method provides little opportunity for students to experience the use of the language and can make it difficult for them to write independent academic paragraphs. Moreover, in traditional classroom settings, teachers' written feedback is often given at the end of the writing process since they cannot address the multiple papers (Shamim, 2011). This set-up encourages incorrect language habits and helps correct up syntactical and lexical errors.

### **2.3 Interlingual Transfer in Multilingual Environments**

However, with regard to the presence of linguistic diversity within public educational systems, it leads to interlingual transfer/cross-linguistic influence (Dar & Khan, 2015). Lado's (1957) contrastive analysis hypothesis states that the L2 learner brings the grammatical/syntactic, the morphological and the semantic patterns of the mother tongue to the target language. When the structure of the two languages is different, errors will be prone to being made and will be persistent. However, interlingual syntax transfer is one of the significant problems in achieving accuracy in academic writing in the Pakistani classrooms where students are instructed in regional languages such as Punjabi, Pashto and Saraiki along with Urdu (Amin & Ahmed, 2025). The Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) structure of Urdu and regional languages and the Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) structure of English are fundamentally different, resulting in awkward phrasing, incorrect verb tenses, or literal translations (Amin & Ahmed, 2025).

Syntactic interference is sometimes considered a cause of grammatical errors. For example, Pakistani ESL learners always face problems with English articles and prepositions, as these linguistic categories are either absent or different in Urdu and regional languages. Students speaking Urdu and Punjabi tend to omit indefinite articles or misuse prepositions due to direct translation of Urdu postpositions, as pointed out by Ikram et al. (2024). In English-speaking home environments, the negative transfer is worsened, forcing students to fall back on direct translation as a means of compensating for their lack of vocabulary (Hashim et al., 2024). L1 syntax is a double-edged sword, as it is beneficial in the initial planning of ideas but damages the accuracy of syntax in formal writing, thus showing a clear need for a targeted digital scaffolding (Yasir et al., 2023).

### **2.4 Digital Register Degradation and the Impact of Netspeak on Academic Writing**

The use of digital communication further complicates the current issue of teaching English academic writing (Mujeeb et al., 2026). The popularity of Netspeak, or textism (Mujeeb et al., 2026), an informal register, is due to the widespread use of social media and instant messaging. This digital dialect is characterized by quick and informal communication, involving abbreviations, vowel deletions, alphanumeric homophones, and simplified grammar, to enable faster interaction (Shoaib & Zahid, 2025). These patterns have advantages in terms of the speed with which they can help people communicate socially, but they also present difficulties in sustaining formal academic writing registers. Excessive use of social media is negatively correlated with the accuracy of academic writing, as empirical studies have revealed in Pakistan that students do transfer informal social media patterns into formal academic writing (Shoaib & Zahid, 2025). Khatoon et al. (2018) report the degradation in the register. They found that there were several different types of spelling and syntactic errors in the formal student assignments in the form of SMS, such as the disappearance of vowels and the use of non-standard capitalization. As students lose the ability to recognize the formal register required for exams, their knowledge of spelling, sentence structure, and punctuation is all lost in this habituation, according to Zubair and Umaina (n.d.). Hence, scholars emphasize the need to raise awareness of registers and structured educational technology scaffolds that can help students differentiate between informal communication in digital media and formal academic writing (Mujeeb et al., 2026).

## **2.5 Theoretical and Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework of this study is based on three main theories of education and psychology, which are Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, Sweller's cognitive load theory, and Krashen's affective filter hypothesis.

### **2.5.1 The Zone of Proximal Development and the Sociocultural Theory**

According to Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory, cognitive development, including language acquisition, is considered a socially mediated process that takes place in the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). The ZPD is the distance between a child's actual development, determined by how well he or she can solve problems on his or her own, and his or her potential development, determined by adult guidance or collaboration with another, more capable child, to solve problems. The digital platform with automated corrective algorithms, interactive game-based diagnostic exercises, and contextual scaffolds serves as a technological "More Knowledgeable Other" (MKO) and is integrated into the Learn Smart Classroom. The LSC is a dynamic scaffold that provides instant and automated feedback, personalizes to the learner's input, and takes them from grammatical mistakes to autonomous writing proficiency in the ZPD, facilitating structural internalization.

We apply Sweller's cognitive load and working memory ideas. Sweller (1988) presented the cognitive load theory of working memory constraints. Students must perform mental acrobatics to memorize rules, equivalents, and logical phrases in traditional grammar lessons/translation approaches.

The LSC approach uses dual-coding to circumvent this cognitive bottleneck via audio, visual, and text-based interactive curriculum-related elements. The LSC reduces extraneous cognitive load by presenting grammatical structures in rich, contextualized communicative settings rather than as isolated mathematical formulas. Such offloading allows the brain's limited working memory capacity to be freed up for schema construction and for integrating lexical and syntactical rules into long-term memory.

### **2.5.2 Krashen's Hypothesis of Affective Filter**

Socio-emotional variables, such as anxiety, motivation, and self-confidence, can either facilitate or impede language acquisition, as proposed in Krashen's (1982) Affective Filter Hypothesis. A high affective filter, consisting of severe writing anxiety, low self-efficacy, and fear of public peer humiliation in the teacher-led error correction, is a psychological barrier that prevents linguistic input from reaching the language acquisition device. In Pakistan's traditional, crowded public classrooms, this high filter often results in student disengagement and a fear of writing. The LSC's interactive, personalized interface supports a low-stakes, self-paced learning environment. Shifting the correction process from a public verbal evaluation to a private and objective digital interface lowers students' affective filters. This reduction in anxiety leads to real confidence in writing, to seeing mistakes as positive learning steps, and to greater independence in self-regulated learning.

### 3. Research Methodology

This study employed a mixed-method concurrent triangulation design to explore the pedagogical impact of the LSC blended learning model. Quantitative data obtained through self-administered Likert-scale questionnaires were augmented with qualitative and descriptive data derived from English-language educators to provide a comprehensive depiction of the instructional environment.

The research population was the FGEI Directorate Pakistan public secondary school network. For the two sets of responders, sampling was different. The first was a student sample (N=276) from a preliminary sample of 318 respondents following intensive data cleaning. The assessment of log entries identified 42 incomplete or repeated/duplicate entries and 276 validated unique student answers. This multilingual group would speak Urdu (47.46%), Punjabi (40.58%), Pashto (4.71%), bilingual Urdu-Punjabi (4.71%), and Saraiki (2.54%). The second group comprised FGEI English language instructors who gave detailed input on classroom instruction and curriculum efficiency.

Students and teachers completed web-based structured surveys. Both surveys employed a 5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree = 5, Agree = 4, Neutral = 3, Disagree = 2, and Strongly Disagree = 1). The student questionnaire had 23 structured items on five operational constructs: traditional teaching approach (Q5–Q8), linguistic and academic writing errors (Q9–Q11), sociolinguistic interferences (Q12–Q13), L2 writing motivation and learner autonomy (Q14–Q17), and Learn Smart Classroom pedagogical effectiveness (Q18–Q23). The instructors' questionnaire included pedagogical alignment, student mistakes, grammatical structure transfer from L1, and LSC's contextualization abilities.

We used SPSS's descriptive statistics to evaluate quantitative data. Analyzing student and instructor answers included the number of pupils who replied, their percentage, the mean (M), and the standard deviation (SD) for each item statement. We used the usual research report to triangulate student and instructor perceptions.

### 4. Results and Analysis

The descriptive statistical analysis evaluated student perceptions and teacher observations across five variable constructs, structured around the actual items from the questionnaires.

#### 4.1 Demographic Profile of Student Respondents

The cleaned, validated student sample (Ns=276) was analyzed for gender, grade level, regional first language, and home device access, as detailed in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Validated Student Respondents (Ns=276)

| Demographic Variable       | Classification      | Frequency (f) | Percentage (%) |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Gender</b>              | Female              | 164           | 59.42%         |
|                            | Male                | 112           | 40.58%         |
| <b>Grade / Class Level</b> | Middle (Grades 6–8) | 230           | 83.33%         |
|                            | High (Grades 9–10)  | 46            | 16.67%         |
| <b>Mother Tongue (L1)</b>  | Urdu                | 131           | 47.46%         |
|                            | Punjabi             | 112           | 40.58%         |

|                           |                            |     |        |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----|--------|
| <b>Home Device Access</b> | Pashto                     | 13  | 4.71%  |
|                           | Bilingual (Urdu & Punjabi) | 13  | 4.71%  |
|                           | Saraiki                    | 7   | 2.54%  |
|                           | Yes                        | 269 | 97.46% |
|                           | No                         | 7   | 2.54%  |

The demographic distribution reflects the diverse sociolinguistic background of the student population within the FGEI network in Pakistan, highlighting a balanced representation of regional mother tongues.

### Construct 1: Traditional Teaching Methodologies

This construct evaluated student experiences with traditional, lecture-focused methods, isolated memorization of rules, and delayed feedback loops. Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for items Q5 to Q8.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Traditional Teaching Methodologies (Construct 1)

| Item ID   | Questionnaire Item Statement                             | Strongly Agree (f) | Agree (f) | Neutral (f) | Disagree (f) | Strongly Disagree (f) | Missing (f) | Mean (M) | SD (SD) |
|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|----------|---------|
| <b>Q5</b> | I memorize rules of grammar and then apply them.         | 59                 | 151       | 33          | 20           | 0                     | 13          | 3.95     | 0.815   |
| <b>Q6</b> | My teacher mainly uses the lecture method in class.      | 59                 | 131       | 26          | 39           | 7                     | 14          | 3.75     | 1.056   |
| <b>Q7</b> | I do not receive correction of my errors immediately.    | 39                 | 72        | 46          | 85           | 13                    | 21          | 3.15     | 1.204   |
| <b>Q8</b> | I learn English without understanding its practical use. | 20                 | 79        | 52          | 79           | 26                    | 20          | 2.95     | 1.169   |

The data reflect a strong, traditional teacher-centered pedagogy approach. For Item Q5 ("memorize rules of grammar and then apply them"), 76.08% of the students (210 of 276) agreed or strongly agreed that they need to memorize the grammar rules first before they can apply them ( $M=3.95$ ,  $SD=0.815$ ). This is an indication of high emphasis on rote learning at the system level. Similarly, 68.84% of the students agree or strongly agree that the main method used by the teacher in class is 'Lecture' ( $M=3.75$ ,  $SD=1.056$ ) when dealing with Q6.

The requirement for delayed error correction is reflected in the item Q7 (“I do not receive corrections of my mistakes straight away”). The results showed that 40.21% of the students agreed that they do not receive immediate correction of their errors ( $M=3.15$ ,  $SD=1.204$ ). As for Item Q8 (“learn English without understanding its practical use”), 35.87% of the students answered that they learn English without understanding its practical use, which shows that the teaching of grammar is abstract ( $M = 2.95$ ,  $SD = 1.169$ ).

Teacher responses validate these results extensively. In the Teacher Column 8 (“Students often memorize rules of grammar...”), all the educators, such as Kirn Kashaf, M. Khalid Jalil, Shahbaz Safdat, Umar Hayyat, Saida Kausar and Ayesha Chaudhary, agreed or strongly agreed that grammar learning is characterized by rote memorization. Moreover, in Teacher Column 9 (“Mostly teachers mainly use lecture method...”), Nadeem Shahzad, Tariq Usman, Mrs. Nasira Iftikhar, Samreen Akhtar, Tahir Muhammad Ilyas and Farzana Bashir strongly agreed that lecture is still the main method of teaching in classrooms.

## Construct 2: Linguistic and Academic Writing Inaccuracies

This construct evaluated self-reported grammatical, lexical, and syntactical difficulties. Table 3 details items Q9 to Q11.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Linguistic and Academic Writing Inaccuracies (Construct 2)

| Item ID | Questionnaire Item Statement                              | Strongly Agree (f) | Agree (f) | Neutral (f) | Disagree (f) | Strongly Disagree (f) | Missing (f) | Mean (M) | SD (SD) |
|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|----------|---------|
| Q9      | I make grammatical mistakes in writing.                   | 26                 | 98        | 59          | 59           | 13                    | 21          | 3.26     | 1.093   |
| Q10     | I feel difficulty in forming correct sentence structures. | 20                 | 124       | 52          | 39           | 13                    | 28          | 3.40     | 1.028   |
| Q11     | I find it difficult to use appropriate vocabulary.        | 20                 | 124       | 72          | 26           | 13                    | 21          | 3.44     | 0.969   |

Students reported major problems with grammar, syntax and vocabulary. For Item Q9 (“I make grammatical mistakes in writing”) 44.93% of students acknowledged making frequent grammatical errors ( $M=3.26$ ,  $SD=1.093$ ). The syntactic challenges are revealed in item Q10 (“I feel difficulty in forming correct sentence structures”). 52.17% of students reported that they found it difficult to construct correct sentences ( $M=3.40$ ,  $SD=1.028$ ). Similarly, Item Q11 (“I find it difficult to use appropriate vocabulary”) shows that 52.17% of students have problems in vocabulary selection ( $M=3.44$ ,  $SD=0.969$ ).

These self-reports were strongly supported by teachers. In Teacher Column 12 (“They often make grammar mistakes in English academic writing”), Column 13 (“Students make mistakes in forming

sentence structure.”) and Column 14 (“Students find it difficult to use appropriate vocabulary.”), educators including Mrs. Nasira Iftikhar, Tariq Usman, Kirn Kashaf and Tahir Muhammad Ilyas agreed or strongly agreed that secondary school students show serious writing inaccuracies in these three important areas.

### Construct 3: Sociolinguistic Interferences

This construct examined the impact of regional first languages and informal digital communication on academic writing. Table 4 displays statistics for items Q12 and Q13.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Sociolinguistic Interferences (Construct 3)

| Item ID | Questionnaire Item Statement                                                                                                        | Strongly Agree (f) | Agree (f) | Neutral (f) | Disagree (f) | Strongly Disagree (f) | Missing (f) | Mean (M) | SD (SD) |
|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|----------|---------|
| Q12     | My writing is influenced by my mother tongue (e.g., Punjabi and Pashto sentence patterns).                                          | 20                 | 98        | 52          | 72           | 13                    | 21          | 3.15     | 1.113   |
| Q13     | Students make mistakes because they use informal language from WhatsApp or social media in academic writing (e.g., "AoA" or "bro"). | 79                 | 111       | 46          | 13           | 7                     | 20          | 3.95     | 0.999   |

Results show that the student writing is influenced by regional mother tongues as well as by digital communication. Item Q12 (“My writing is influenced by my mother tongue”) showed 42.75% of students confessed that their English sentence structure is influenced by their mother tongue, which reflects interlingual transfer ( $M=3.15$ ,  $SD=1.113$ ). Item Q13 (“Students make mistakes because they use informal language from WhatsApp or social media”) has a higher agreement rate, with 68.84% of students agreeing or strongly agreeing that informal social media abbreviations and slang diminish their formal writing register ( $M=3.95$ ,  $SD=0.999$ ).

Teachers showed even more agreement on these interferences. Teacher Column 15 (“Their writing is influenced by their mother tongue...”) Kirn Kashaf, Haiqa Shakeel, and Muhammad Akram Shakir strongly agreed that L1 postposition and syntactic structures break student writing. In Teacher Column 16 (“Students make mistakes because they use informal language from WhatsApp...”), the majority of teachers, like Safdar Ali, Shahbaz Safdat, Mrs. Nasira Iftikhar, Farzana Bashir and Ayesha Chaudhary, strongly agreed that habitual digital shorthand causes persistent register confusion in formal written exams.

#### Construct 4: L2 Writing Motivation and Learner Autonomy

This construct investigated writing motivation, self-directed practice, and student confidence. Table 5 presents findings for items Q14 to Q17.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for L2 Writing Motivation and Learner Autonomy (Construct 4)

| Item ID | Questionnaire Item Statement                                    | Strongly Agree (f) | Agree (f) | Neutral (f) | Disagree (f) | Strongly Disagree (f) | Missing (f) | Mean (M) | SD (SD) |
|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|----------|---------|
| Q14     | I make errors in writing English which decreases my motivation. | 13                 | 104       | 46          | 52           | 33                    | 28          | 3.05     | 1.229   |
| Q15     | I practice English writing on my own outside of class.          | 39                 | 117       | 33          | 46           | 13                    | 28          | 3.50     | 1.157   |
| Q16     | I know what my writing mistakes are and how to correct them.    | 52                 | 137       | 39          | 13           | 0                     | 35          | 3.95     | 0.743   |
| Q17     | I am confident writing English paragraphs without help.         | 85                 | 98        | 33          | 26           | 0                     | 34          | 4.00     | 1.027   |

The data shows an interesting contrast. For Item Q14 I make errors in writing English which decreases my motivation, 42.39% of students reported that they make errors in writing which decreases their motivation (M=3.05, SD=1.229). However, Item Q15 (“I practise English writing on my own outside of class”) indicates that 56.52% of students report practicing writing on their own outside of class (M=3.50, SD=1.157). Furthermore, Item Q16 (“I know what my writing mistakes are and how to correct them”) indicates that 68.48% of students believe that they can identify and self-correct their errors (M=3.95, SD=0.743). 66.30% of students were confident to write English paragraphs without help under Item Q17 (“I am confident to write English paragraphs without help”) (M=4.00, SD=1.027).

This high self-perceived writing confidence is a profound illusion of competence when compared with student performance and teacher ratings. Teachers strongly disagreed with the student self-reports in Teacher Column 11 (“They practice English writing on their own...”) and Teacher

Column 12 ("They know what their writing mistakes are..."). There was a disagreement among Kirn Kashaf, Nadeem Shahzad, Shahbaz Safdat and Tahir Muhammad Ilyas about students' practicing independently or self-correction skills. Most importantly, Teacher Column 13 ("Students are confident to write English paragraphs without help.") found that Kirn Kashaf, Tariq Usman, Umar Hayyat, Imtiaz Ali and Ambreen Sabir strongly disagreed/disagreed with the students' claims of independent paragraph writing confidence. This contrast illustrates the students' confidence to reproduce the memorized textbook paragraphs, but teachers do not perceive any real independent writing competence.

### Construct 5: Pedagogical Efficacy of the Learn Smart Classroom

This construct evaluated student perceptions of the LSC platform, focusing on corrective feedback, contextual grammar instruction, and preference over lecture-based instruction. Table 6 details items Q18 to Q23.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for Pedagogical Efficacy of the Learn Smart Classroom (Construct 5)

| Item ID | Questionnaire Item Statement                                     | Strongly Agree (f) | Agree (f) | Neutral (f) | Disagree (f) | Strongly Disagree (f) | Missing (f) | Mean (M) | SD (SD) |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|----------|---------|
| Q18     | Learn Smart Classroom provides authentic learning material.      | 78                 | 105       | 33          | 13           | 7                     | 40          | 4.00     | 0.986   |
| Q19     | I get immediate feedback on my writing exercises in LSC.         | 72                 | 111       | 33          | 7            | 7                     | 46          | 4.03     | 0.954   |
| Q20     | LSC helps me understand grammar in context, not by rote.         | 72                 | 111       | 26          | 13           | 0                     | 54          | 4.09     | 0.830   |
| Q21     | I can practice writing happily using LSC.                        | 72                 | 92        | 39          | 20           | 0                     | 53          | 3.97     | 0.968   |
| Q22     | LSC has reduced my errors in grammar, vocabulary, and structure. | 59                 | 118       | 26          | 13           | 7                     | 53          | 3.94     | 0.922   |
| Q23     | I prefer LSC over traditional teaching methods for writing.      | 79                 | 98        | 33          | 7            | 13                    | 46          | 3.97     | 1.150   |

The data show a high level of positive agreement about the effectiveness of the LSC platform. Sixty-six. 30% of students agreed or strongly agreed that LSC offers authentic learning resources (M=4.00, SD=0.986) in item Q18. Likewise, 66.30% responded that LSC provides timely,

constructive writing comments ( $M=4.03$ ,  $SD=0.954$ ) (Q19). The most positive response was for contextual grammar learning (Q20): LSC helps them to learn grammar in context rather than by rote ( $M=4.09$ ,  $SD=0.830$ ); 66.30% agreed.

Students' initial feedback on the LSC platform suggests an impact from this work in the areas of writing and feeling. LSC showed a positive effect on student affect for Q21, as 59.42% of students reported that they practice writing happily with LSC ( $M=3.97$ ,  $SD=0.968$ ). Sixty-four percent reported that LSC decreased grammatical, lexical, and syntactical errors ( $M=3.94$ ,  $SD=0.922$ ) in Q22. Furthermore, for Q23, 64.13% liked LSC better than traditional teaching methods ( $M=3.97$ ,  $SD=1.150$ ).

Teachers strongly agreed with the students' findings. Teachers including Zeeshan Haider, Kirn Kashaf, Tariq Usman, Mrs. Nasira Iftikhar, Farzana Bashir, Saeeda Bibi, and Samia confirmed that LSC provides high-quality grammar teaching and practice at a student's pace. In addition, teachers such as Tariq Usman, Mrs. Nasira Iftikhar, Farzana Bashir, and Ayesha Chaudhary had a strong preference for LSC over the conventional lecture method.

## 4.2 Discussion

The results of the students and teachers together are quite solid for the study of the factors that influence students' writing competence in English. To understand the issue more deeply, we examine student responses to questions regarding self-perceptions and teacher feedback to determine how the shift from conventional lectures to blended learning platforms impacts student learning.

Traditional English teaching in public secondary schools extensively adopts the deductive teaching method, as indicated by the descriptive results. Students indicated that their English classrooms are characterized primarily by rote memorization of grammar rules ( $M=3.95$ ) and teacher-fronted lectures ( $M=3.75$ ). Sweller's Cognitive Load Theory states that secondary school learners have an immense cognitive load placed on their working memory when memorizing grammar rules in isolation. Students are asked to generate original academic paragraphs. They are also expected to remember abstract syntactic rules, select vocabulary, and organize ideas, which creates a cognitive load (Dar & Khan, 2015). Overloading causes learners to make many grammatical ( $M=3.26$ ), sentence structure ( $M=3.40$ ), and vocabulary ( $M=3.44$ ) errors. This study boosts typical classroom pupils' confidence. Students are confident in writing paragraphs ( $M=4.00$ ) and realize their faults ( $M=3.95$ ), while professors disagree. Students struggle to write basic paragraphs and cannot rectify their mistakes. Traditional education and assessment in Pakistan relies on pupils memorizing or duplicating essays from guidebooks, which they mistake for writing talent (Siddiqui, 2012). They exhibit major structural and grammatical errors while writing original compositions under test pressure (Zaman et al., 2026).

The LSC concept seeks to bridge the confidence gap between students' self-assessed writing skills and the use of productive digital tools with minimal reference to rules ( $M=4.09$ ). LSC uses a combination of spoken and visual methods to teach L2 grammar in authentic contexts so that the students can develop a clear understanding of the grammar without having to remember everything (Mayer, 2001). Students ( $M=3.15$ ) said that slow error correction is a big problem in regular FGEI

classes. The reason for this issue is that the classes in Pakistan are generally filled to capacity with more than 50 students, and the teacher is unable to give feedback on a timely basis to all the students (Shamim, 2011). Students continue to make the same grammatically incorrect errors when they are not instantly corrected (Dar & Khan, 2015). This is solved by LSC with automated feedback in real time ( $M=4.03$ ). Using a constructivist perspective, this digital tool is consistent with Vygotsky's theory, in which technology can be used to lead students. LSC provides targeted and timely feedback to students while they are in the learning zone to correct their mistakes while they are still writing to prevent them from fixing their writing, resulting in faster and better writing ( $M=3.94$ ).

In addition, giving feedback privately, using a computer rather than in front of others, will have a positive impact on easing student anxiety in writing (Majeed & Rehan Dar, 2022). LSC offers a slower, more relaxed, and self-paced method to practice ( $M=3.97$ ) and reduces fear of writing and embarrassment. There is a positive change in feelings towards LSC compared to the old lecture approach: Students ( $M=3.97$ ) and teachers.

### 4.3 Strategic Recommendations

Based on the empirical results and the collaborative insights from both teachers and students, the following targeted recommendations are proposed for educators, FGEI administrators, and educational policymakers:

**Implementing and Integrating LSC:** The FGEI Directorate and other relevant education bodies are encouraged to scale the Learn Smart Classroom model from the pilot phase to full implementation across middle and high schools. Expansion should focus on replacing general passive digital platforms with LSC's interactive, curriculum-aligned digital lessons to achieve a consistent learning environment.

**Change to Contextualized Grammar Teaching:** EFL instructors should use LSC multimedia materials to switch from grammar translation to contextual grammar instruction. Keep the cognitive burden low in the classroom and use LSC's visual and interactive tools to help students learn grammar rather than memorize it.

**Professional Teacher Training: Learning Analytics:** FGEI should create comprehensive training programs focused on teacher technology and instructional skills. Training must enable instructors to use LSC's real-time analytics to detect group and individual needs and provide targeted in-person support for challenging students.

**Equitable Access and Robust Infrastructure:** FGEI should establish enough digital infrastructure on all campuses to achieve equitable educational outcomes across urban and semi-urban campuses. This means giving pupils racially and economically diverse computer laboratories and learning places without internet access and offering high-speed internet at the school.

## 5. Conclusion

This study investigated the impact of blended learning, particularly the Learn Smart Classroom model, on the accuracy of English academic writing in Pakistani FGEI network schools.

Traditional teaching methods based on memorizing grammatical rules and teacher classroom discussions still lead to grammatical, syntactical, and lexical errors, according to student survey data and teacher response data analyzed by descriptive statistical analysis. Additionally, the syntactic transfer of regional languages from the first language and the transfer of informal social media abbreviations from formal to informal language complicate and impair formal academic writing (Dar & Khan, 2015).

The Learn Smart Classroom methodology tackles these multi-layered issues with real learning content, context-based grammar instruction, and quick corrective feedback. The findings confirm the notion that LSC enhances students' grammar acquisition in meaningful communicative situations rather than rote memorization, reducing student-reported grammatical, lexical, and syntactical mistakes. As this study shows, LSC has created a positive learning environment where students learn at their pace, reducing writing anxiety and boosting learner autonomy, confidence, and motivation. Students and instructors prefer LSC to lectures; hence, it should be in the national curriculum. Since students and instructors choose LSC over lectures, digital educational platforms in the national curriculum might bridge the gap between rote-generated self-confidence and academic writing skill.

**Funding:** This study was not funded in any shape or form by any party.

**Conflict of Interest:** The author declares that he has no conflict of interest.

#### **Bio-note:**

**Zeeshan Hadir** is an MPhil Scholar in the Department of English at the University of Okara, Okara, Pakistan. His academic interests include English language teaching, applied linguistics, second language acquisition, and language pedagogy. His research focuses on contemporary approaches to English language learning and teaching, particularly in the Pakistani educational context.

**Dr. Muhammad Ilyas Mahmood** is an Assistant Professor in the Department of English at the University of Okara, Okara, Pakistan. His research interests encompass applied linguistics, English language teaching, second language acquisition, language pedagogy, and educational technology. He is engaged in research and teaching related to contemporary issues in English language education and linguistics.

**Tayyab Wakeel** is an MPhil Scholar in the Department of English at the University of Okara, Okara, Pakistan. His academic and research interests include applied linguistics, English language teaching, second language learning, and language pedagogy. His research interests particularly relate to emerging approaches to English language education in the Pakistani context.

#### **References**

Adhami, N., & Taghizadeh, M. (2024). Integrating inquiry-based learning and computer-supported collaborative learning into flipped classroom: Effects on academic writing performance and

- perceptions of students of railway engineering. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(3), 521–557.
- Ali, M. M. (2024). *Technology-based teaching and learning in Pakistani English language classrooms*. CRC Press.
- Amin, M., & Ahmed, T. (2025). The influence of Urdu (L1) syntax on the English (L2) syntax in writing English at the university level in Lahore. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 8(4), 1559–1568.
- Banditvilai, C. (2016). Enhancing students' language skills through blended learning. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 14(3), 220–229.
- Challob, A. I. (2021). The effect of flipped learning on EFL students' writing performance, autonomy, and motivation. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(4), 3743–3769.
- Ikram, M., Shahbaz, A., & Tahir, M. S. (2024). A comparison of Urdu and Punjabi first language interference on English as a second language. *Panacea Journal of Linguistics & Literature*, 2(2), 334–343. <https://doi.org/10.59075/pjll.v2i2.346>
- Juraeva, F. (2026). *From dependence to diversification? The evolution of Russian-Tajik migration relations from Soviet collapse to the post-2022 expulsion regime*.
- Keshta, A. S., & Harb, I. I. (2013). The effectiveness of a blended learning program on developing Palestinian tenth graders' English writing skills. *Education Journal*, 2(6), 208–221.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. University of Michigan Press.
- Liu, J. (2026). Optimization and effect analysis of college English blended teaching system based on artificial intelligence algorithm. *International Journal of High Speed Electronics and Systems*, 35(4), 2540614.
- Mahmood, S., Sharif, H., & Aleem, F. (2024). Learning paragraph writing electronically: An insight into the impact of blended learning strategies on ESL learners in Pakistan. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(1), 2057. <https://doi.org/10.59400/fls.v6i1.2057>
- Majeed, M., & Rehan Dar, F. (2022). Investigating the efficacy of blended learning in ESL classrooms. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 2133500. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2133500>
- Miyazoe, T., & Anderson, T. (2010). Learning outcomes and student perceptions in online and blended learning environments. *System*, 38(2), 185–199.

- Mohamadi Zenouzagh, Z. (2020). Syntactic complexity in individual, collaborative and e-collaborative EFL writing: Mediating role of writing modality, L1 and sustained development in focus. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68(6), 2939–2970.
- Mujeeb, N., Lodhi, M. A., Akram, S., & Ali, A. (2026). Beyond cyber slang: Netspeak and academic writing practices in Generation Z higher education. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 8(4), 112–125.
- Peng, Z., & Raman, A. (2026). Systematic literature review on the effects of blended learning in EFL education. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 18(1), e631. <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/17924>
- Prihatini, N., Sudar, S., Tusino, T., & Masykuri, E. S. (2023). The impact of using blended learning to improve reading comprehension. *Scripta: English Department Journal*, 10(1), 128–139.
- Raja, F. U., Panhwar, F., & Memon, R. A. (2025). Exploring undergraduate students' perceptions on the use of blended learning method for the development of their academic skills. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 8(3), 1978–1991.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Shoaib, S., & Zahid, Z. (2025). Impact of social media communication on formal written English language: A study at the intermediate level in Sadiqabad, Pakistan. *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, 6(1), 504–518. [https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2025\(6-I\)44](https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2025(6-I)44)
- Siddiqui, S. (2012). *Language, gender, and power: The politics of language and development in Pakistan*. Oxford University Press.
- Smit, A. (2025). *Grade 10 Computer Applications Technology learners' experience of the blended learning approach*. University of Johannesburg.
- Sulisworo, D., Rahayu, T., & Rifai, N. A. (2016). The students' academic writing skill after implementing blended learning using Facebook. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools*, 56(6), 176.
- Tao, Y., Yu, L., Luo, L., & Zhang, H. (2024). Effect of blended teaching on college students' EFL acquisition. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1264573.
- Torabi, S. (2021). Blended learning (B-learning) via Google Classroom (GC) and Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy: Effects and percepts. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal*, 22(3), 183–199.

- Topping, K. J., Douglas, W., Robertson, D., & Ferguson, N. (2022). Effectiveness of online and blended learning from schools: A systematic review. *Review of Education*, 10(2), e3353.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wahyuni, S. (2018). The effect of blended learning model towards students' writing ability. *J-SHMIC: Journal of English for Academic*, 5(2), 97–111.
- Wang, Y., Wu, J., Chen, F., & Li, J. (2024). Analyzing teaching effects of blended learning with LMS: An empirical investigation. *IEEE Access*, 12, 42343–42356.