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#### Abstract

: The purpose of this study was to determine the usefulness of vocabulary awareness in strengthening the writing abilities of undergraduate engineering students. The investigation was carried out at Hyderabad's Vidya Jyothi Institute of Technology. The inquiry began with the selection of 120 Computer Science Engineering students acquiring English Language communication skills in the Advanced Communication Skills Lab during their third year first semester (2018-19). To perform the research, the teacher divided the students into two equal groups.


Key Words: Vocabulary awareness, writing ability, language devices

## Introduction:

Students face a variety of challenges during their learning process, with writing being one of the most challenging. This is due to the fact that writing incorporates all characteristics and techniques of the language, such as syntax, semantics, lexical objects, and punctuation. It has been observed that the capacity to write successfully is dependent on possessing a sufficient vocabulary even more than the ability to read [1]. Students who have learnt to decode words may be able to read and utilise a wide range of unfamiliar words. They may even be able to identify the correct meanings of unknown words merely by looking at the context in which they are spoken[2]. It has been observed that the capacity to write successfully is dependent on possessing a sufficient vocabulary even more than the ability to read. Students who have learnt to decode words may be able to read and utilise a wide range of unfamiliar words [3]. They may even be able to identify the correct meanings of unknown words merely by looking at the context in which they are spoken.
The current study's major goal is to reveal the efficiency of vocabulary awareness in increasing writing abilities among undergraduate engineering students, as well as to achieve the following goals:

1. To improve pupils' writing skills by increasing their language knowledge.
2. To assist pupils in producing correct written work.

Statement of the Issue Vocabulary has a significant influence on students' writing abilities. That is, most English language learners struggle to select the appropriate lexical elements in any writing activity, which impacts their written performance [4]. Thus, the purpose of this research article is to examine and look for more tactics and recommendations for teaching and learning vocabulary approaches to raise students' language awareness and assist them overcome the writing issues they confront.
Questions and Hypotheses for Research The current study's major goal is to determine the efficiency of word awareness in enhancing engineering undergraduates' writing skills. As a result, the following questions must be addressed in order to achieve this goal:

1. To what degree may vocabulary knowledge motivate pupils to improve their writing skills?
2. How does learners' vocabulary awareness help them produce correct written work?

The hypotheses that have been developed in order to find solutions to the aforementioned problems are as follows:
H1: Vocabulary awareness motivates pupils to improve their writing skills.

H2: Learners' vocabulary awareness aids in the production of correct written work.
The significance of writing According to Hedge (1988), much writing in the English classroom is done to assist students retain new bits and pieces of language, for example, to reinforce the acquisition of new structures reflected in general or technical terminology [5]. Writing's position in this context differs from its role in each technical topic and the terminology it employs; it helps students to see how they are going and receive feedback from the instructor, while also allowing teachers to monitor and identify issues.
Students must demonstrate their English proficiency in the ACS lab by completing Imaginative Conversations in English, Letter Writing, Report Writing, Portfolio Writing, or Resume. It has been observed that a significant number of students have no identifiable needs for written English other than the need to attempt their exam, but who still enjoy writing and are motivated to use their language resources in producing descriptions, reviews, and essays, simply to practise and improve their English. The Writing Ability Frith, J, (2009) emphasised that learning English necessitates the integration of four skills: hearing, speaking, reading, and writing [6]. The latter is a crucial ability that must be cultivated because it reflects the learner's performance in a foreign language. As a result, the instructor has been seeking for successful ways and approaches to teaching writing in order to improve Learners' written productivity. This paper will explain the writing talent and focus on the most frequent methods for teaching it. The goal is to learn about the best writing style that can be taught [7].
Finally, the duties of both instructors and students were examined. Writing is a challenging ability for a student to acquire; both native and non-native speakers may lack the competency required to become strong writers since learners cannot successfully convey their thoughts without this competence. Within this context, Tribble (as mentioned in Frith, J, 2009) contends that mastery of writing is the means by which a person becomes completely successful in an intellectual organisation, not just in the administration of daily operations but also in the expressing of ideas and arguments.
Some authors use the term "proficiency" to substitute "competency" when referring to what students should achieve in writing. Nunan (1988) agrees that proficiency is "the ability to perform real-world tasks with a pre-specified degree of skill." According to Lewis (2000), proficiency is defined as three characteristics: accuracy, fluency, and complexity. First, the researcher must weigh correctness vs fluency; under the communicative method, accuracy is secondary as long as it does not impede meaning conveyance.
As a result, discussing the 'accuracy/fluency' argument in terms of teaching techniques and methodologies is a bit challenging. As a result, the instructor must first foster the learner's fluency, and then correctness will arrive at the conclusion of the writing process. Second, according to Lewis (2000), "complexity" is the progress of students' writing, particularly at higher levels in their main disciplines. Vocabulary Explanation According to Kamil and Hiebert (2007), vocabulary is the understanding of words and their meanings; nevertheless, vocabulary is more complicated than this definition implies. First, there are two kinds of words: oral and written. Oral vocabulary refers to the words we recognise and use when listening and speaking. Print vocabulary refers to the words we recognise and use when reading and writing.

According to Farrell (2009), research has shown that humans store words semantically rather than alphabetically like in a dictionary; that the more we use a term, the simpler it is to recall; and that we remember the most recently used word faster. It is frequently recommended that kids read as much as possible in order to broaden their vocabularies. English teachers may play an essential role in pushing students to expand their vocabulary banks by intervening personally and teaching them how to do so.

## Instrumentation

The exam was utilised as a data gathering instrument in this article. It was made up of five questions. Each question was carefully constructed to measure the pupils' vocabulary knowledge. The first question is a gap filler, in which students were given 20 words to fill in the blanks of a paragraph. The second question is a multiple-choice exercise designed to assess pupils' vocabulary size. Each word comes in the context of a phrase in this question, and students select the proper definition from four options.
Procedure The test was utilised as a data gathering instrument, with specific methods and actions used to obtain data. All subjects were completed in around 60 minutes. Students from two groups were taught as one experimental group during the experiment.
Data examination Certain statistical procedures were employed in this data analysis. In the analysis of the data generated by the created tool, these tools were frequency, percentage, one sample t-test, paired sample t-test, independent sample t-test using SPSS, Statistical Package for Social Sciences. The results of both exams were gathered and counted in order to verify their outcomes, which let the researcher ensure the efficacy of vocabulary awareness and the development of students' writing abilities.

One sample t-test for the first hypothesis

| Expect <br> ed <br> mean | Mea <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | St.d <br> • | $\mathbf{t}$ <br> value | d.f | $\mathbf{p}$-value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | 7.08 | 1.90 | -18.27 | 49 | 0.000 |

The p -value equals ( 0.000 ), which is less than the significance level ( 0.05 ), indicating that there is a significant statistical difference between the predicted mean (12) and the actual mean (7.08). When the actual mean is lower than the predicted mean, these differences support the first hypothesis, which states that "vocabulary awareness boosts students' willingness to improve their writing skills."
T-test with Paired Samples for Students Skill Test class

| Skill | Test <br> Class | Mean | St.d | t-value | d.f | p-value |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2^{\text {nd }}$ Class |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | Pre | 1.88 | 1.604 | -10.422 | 39 | 0.000 |
|  | Post | 3.53 | 1.935 |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Pre | 6.15 | 2.143 | -10.422 | 39 | 0.000 |


|  | Post | 8.63 | 2.361 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q3 | Pre | 12.98 | 1.687 | -6.811 | 39 | 0.000 |
|  | Post | 14.83 | . 675 |  |  |  |
| Q4 | Pre | 4.13 | 1.202 | -8.241 | 39 | 0.000 |
|  | Post | 5.60 | 1.277 |  |  |  |
| Q5 | Pre | 3.15 | 1.748 | -9.297 | 39 | 0.000 |
|  | Post | 4.68 | 1.591 |  |  |  |
| TOTAL |  | 28.35 | 6.100 | -17.541 | 39 | 0.000 |
|  |  | 37.25 | 5.271 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3rd } \\ & \text { Class } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Q1 | Pre | 2.53 | 1.853 | 7.722 | 39 | 0.000 |
|  | Post | 4.70 | 2.574 |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Pre | 8.35 | 2.045 | 7.911 | 39 | 0.000 |
|  | Post | 9.88 | 2.151 |  |  |  |
| Q3 | Pre | 13.80 | 1.829 | 2.414 | 39 | 0.021 |
|  | Post | 14.45 | 1.867 |  |  |  |
| Q4 | Pre | 4.23 | 1.776 | 5.596 | 39 | 0.000 |
|  | Post | 6.00 | 1.754 |  |  |  |
| Q5 | Pre | 3,65 | 2.155 | -6.914 | 39 | 0.000 |
|  | Post | 4.88 | 1.786 |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | Pre | 32.18 | 6.968 | -13.358 | 39 | 0.000 |
|  | Post | 40.08 | 6.955 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Discussion According to the data, students did better in the final post-test, where they outperformed their pre-test results. According to this comparison of pre-test and post-test data, it was clearly demonstrated that vocabulary awareness had a beneficial influence on enhancing undergraduate engineering students' writing skills. All participants in both groups were exposed to the same quantity of vocabulary knowledge teaching materials prior to the experiment, as well as all English Communication Skills learning in the ACS Lab as a practical topic. As a result, they were practically considered to have the same degree of language competence; nonetheless, their abilities were compared
based on the before and post test results. Conclusion The importance of vocabulary as for learners of the CSE A\&B sections of the third year first semester English language Communication skills enhanced the teacher's knowledge for this article as well as to look for effective methods and strategies by which learners' vocabulary awareness standards could be developed.
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