Mastering Grammar in a Second Language via Effective Learning Strategies: A Research Agenda

Dr. Venkanna. K[1*]

[1*]Degree Lecturer in English, TTWR Degree College (M) Sangareddy Affiliated to Osmania University, Telangana, India.

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Despite significant progress in Language Learning Strategies (LLS) research, several topics have shockingly received less attention from experts. This certainly pertains to the ways in which students improve their grasp and learning of grammatical principles, as well as their capacity to use grammatical structures in real-time processing, which is essential for impromptu speech. "Grammar Learning Strategies (GLS)" are the subject of this article's research strategy. Three particular aspects need to be explored: (1) the identification and assessment of GLS, (2) the evaluation of variables that influence the use of GLS, and (3) the application of strategies-based instruction to GLS. While these three domains partially represent the primary subjects of empirical investigations in LLS research, I want to illustrate how advanced theoretical and empirical advancements might be used to examine GLS. I suggest doing research projects in each of the three categories, which have the potential to further GLS research. **Keywords:** Grammar, Second language, Learning strategy, Skills, Pedagogical implications.

1. Introduction

Since Bialystok (1981)[1] defined the characteristics of competent language learners, research on Learning Language Skills (LLS) has proceeded at a rapid pace. Among the many beneficial results that have resulted from the discovery of various strategic devices in various situations is the establishment of main LLS categories that emphasize Target Language (TL) abilities and subsystems. A variety of characteristics affecting strategy usage have been discovered, new data-collecting technologies have been developed, and the effects of strategies-based instruction (SBI) have been confirmed.[2-7] Nevertheless, this field of study has recovered from severe criticism.[8][9] It is again thriving because of the incorporation of "complex dynamic systems theory (CDST)"[10] and the discovery of new research avenues.[11][12] Although there are valid concerns about research on LLS, especially regarding its future directions and methodological challenges, both educational psychologists[13][14] and experts in second and foreign language learning (L2) believe that "the skilful use of strategies is essential for achieving self-regulation." This provides a strong justification for continuing to examine this concept, especially since the results are more likely to have a meaningful impact on teachers and can be applied to practical teaching strategies compared to studies focusing on currently popular subjects like "working memory, emotions, or identity." However, in order for this to happen, two things must be in place. First, studies examining LLS use should be more focused on specific domains like subsystems or skills. Second, because LLS use is highly contextual and individual-dependent, it is necessary to supplement inventories, which can only capture broad patterns, with situated studies that test LLS use in specific learning tasks.[15]

Considering the extensive and thorough research on LLS, "it was unexpected to find a scarcity of research on the techniques learners use to acquire grammar, also known as GLS, while I was preparing for my first study in this field."[16] "My interest in GLS," which refers to the intentional thoughts and actions that students use to improve their control over grammar structures, originated from my participation in research on "form-focused instruction (FFI), including corrective feedback (CF), individual differences (ID), and studies that aimed to understand how ID influences FFI." From the beginning, it was evident to me that proficient use of GLS, whether for acquiring rules, automating said rules, or capitalizing on CF, is crucial in achieving mastery of TL grammar. One important point to note is that, like other identification variables, the use of GLS is likely to moderate the impact of any instructional choices that instructors may decide to rely on.[17][18] Furthermore, it is crucial to note that achieving proficiency in grammar, similar to second language acquisition as a whole,

requires a significant level of independence, which is primarily cultivated via the effective use of Grammar Learning Strategies (GLS)[19]

Considering the potential advantages of the deliberate acquisition of grammar knowledge, I often need clarification on the seeming disregard for Grammar Learning Strategies (GLS). The prevalence of communicative approaches may be partially responsible, but it does not fully explain the situation. Grammar teaching has never been "questioned or abandoned in foreign language contexts, and the emphasis on form is considered essential in content-based instruction." A superficial examination of papers related to LLS reveals that there have been little changes. Despite the growth in research, the inquiries posed have largely stayed the same, with a primary emphasis on identifying GLS. Therefore, further research in this area is clearly required to both build upon previous successes in studying LLS and to progress the field by exploring new routes of study. The paper humbly attempts to provide a research plan that might provide researchers with suggestions for investigating how GLS could aid in the acquisition of target language grammar in various contexts. The following analysis focuses on three specific areas of research: (1) the identification and quantification of GLS, (2) the investigation of factors that influence the usage of GLS, and (3) the targeting of GLS in SBI. The first two categories are dominated by academic inquiry and theoretical exploration, whereas the third is mostly concerned with improving classroom teaching through the use of empirical evidence. Although these study directions build on prior work in LLS, the objectives I propose go beyond that to pave the way for further investigations into GLS.

"2. Identification and quantification of GLS"

The primary focus of previous empirical studies has been on identifying and describing GLS, which is due to the fact that the discipline is still in its early stages of development. Studies that have specifically addressed GLS are particularly interesting, even if techniques for learning grammar were included in studies looking at general characteristics of LLS usage.[20] The results of this research[21-25] are not definitive, but they indicate a dependence on a small number of classic GLS methods and a clear influence of prevailing instructional and evaluation methodologies. However, there is a lack of solid empirical evidence at the moment; Our understanding of how students learn and use grammatical structures is still in its early stages. The information we now possess is insufficient to provide a solid foundation for well-founded educational recommendations. It is unfortunate that progress in the other two areas of study, which I will discuss later, becomes challenging in the absence of unambiguous definitions and quantifications of GLS and their application. Specifically, it is not possible to confidently make definitive statements about the relationship between the use of GLS and academic achievement, individual differences (ID factors), or contextual variables. Additionally, it is challenging to determine the effectiveness of intervention in GLS due to the difficulties involved in comparing the initial and final states. However, it is important to acknowledge the limits of the tools available to us while still making efforts to use them.

Given the reasons mentioned above, it is crucial to prioritize the recognition and quantification of GLS in research. However, it is important to consider the many significant difficulties that may arise while doing these activities. **First and foremost,** while utilizing GLS, one must differentiate between "explicit and implicit, or at the very least, highly automatized [26-28] knowledge of TL grammar." As I said before, there is a big difference between understanding the principles and using them in timed exercises without constraints and employing the structures of the target language in natural conversation. This must be considered in "the GLS taxonomies" and data-gathering methods; otherwise, a crucial component of strategic grammar learning may need to be considered.

Second, it is very difficult to compare the results since the research that is currently accessible has used a variety of categorization schemes and data-gathering methods. Typically, these modifications have been based on "Oxford's (1990)[29] taxonomy of LLS and her Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)." However, these adaptations were not specifically intended to include the intricacies of learning grammar. In an attempt to bring order to the field, Hinkel (2016)[30] distinguished between strategies for implicit learning, which help one notice features of the target language in conversation by concentrating on form, [31] and strategies for explicit inductive learning, which help one discover rules, and strategies for explicit deductive learning, which help one understand rules. This division, however, was not intended to function as an exhaustive taxonomy but rather to encourage more discussion and empirical study. I built on top of this paradigm and came up with the sole comprehensive classification that divides GLS into four categories: cognitive, emotional, social, and metacognitive.[32] In the final grouping are strategies that deal with;

(1) guiding the development and comprehension of "grammar in communication" activities,
(2) fostering "explicit knowledge,"
(3) fostering "implicit knowledge," and
(4) overseeing the provision of "corrective feedback on grammar use."

This is the basis upon which I built a 70-item, five-point Likert scale assessment tool for grammar learning called "the Grammar Learning Strategy Inventory (GLSI)." Given the abundance of data collected from investigating its properties, I believe the GLSI to be the only study instrument for GLS that is both theoretically and experimentally driven.[33] Therefore, its usage is recommended as a benchmark for the tasks presented below. It is important to remember that the categorization of GLS and the development of accurate and

dependable tools are ongoing tasks. This is because there may be alternative effective methods that may be recognized; current instruments have their own limitations, and they may not be suitable for every situation. Furthermore, it is important to consider the limits of even the most carefully crafted inventories when planning research and evaluating their findings.[34]

Third, prior research has largely focused on college students, with an emphasis on ESL majors, which severely limits the study's relevance and generalizability. Less competent pupils in other educational contexts, such as CBI, where grammar teaching is not the main emphasis, are likely to employ LLS[35-38] and GLS that are substantially different from those used by more competent, older, and cognitively mature students. Evidently, persons of this kind, rather than English majors, constitute the bulk of language learners.

Fourth, considering its importance in international communication, it makes sense that the majority of research done so far has focused on GLS used by L2 English learners. However, this further limits the generalizability of their results. While it is true that certain General Language Skills (GLS), such as planning and "paying attention to what others say, can be applied universally when learning different Target Languages (TLs)," it is important to note that the unique characteristics of each TL may require the use of specific strategies. This was demonstrated by Cohen, Pinilla-Herrera, Thompson, and Witzig when they developed "a strategy website specifically for learning Spanish grammar". This suggests that while general tools like the GLSI may provide useful information on how strategies are used, it is necessary to create inventories that are unique to each language in order to meet better the requirements of different groups of learners, particularly those with different first language (L1) backgrounds.

Fifth, while this field has just recently started to be investigated,[39][40] there is value in examining variations "in GLS usage in a second, third, or fourth language." On one hand, this might aid us in understanding how to support learners in mastering the grammatical structures of various languages while considering their goals and motivations. On the other hand, it could eventually simplify the process of generating inventories tailored to each language. Insights about this matter may be anticipated based on studies on multilingualism [41] or "the theory of the ideal language self."[42]

Sixth, researchers have mostly disregarded the contextual, situational character of GLS as they are used in particular tasks, which somewhat reflects prevailing views in the general study of LLS.[43][44] While examining GLS, it is important to consider both a broad viewpoint, which involves using well-designed tools for large groups of people, and a detailed perspective, which focuses on the specific strategies used in learning tasks. This is due to the fact that significant variations are likely to be seen, such as when using several GLS in concentrated communication activities "where the use of a grammatical feature is required for task completion" and controlled exercises (such as paraphrasing sentences)[45]

Seventh, the use of GLS is bound to vary over time due to "complex interactions with other IDs and contextual variables, regardless of the theoretical position adopted as a justification (e.g., complex dynamic systems theory[46])" This has been shown with motivation.[47] Nevertheless, I am only familiar with a single research that has specifically examined the dynamic aspect of LLS,[48] and it did not specifically concentrate on GLS. It is necessary to address this deficiency. I consider it important to study the temporal fluctuations in GLS, both across extended periods and in relation to the accomplishment of particular tasks.

Lastly, shedding light on the issues mentioned above may necessitate novel research designs, procedures, and data collection tools. Nevertheless, the most important thing is that this project could need the expert use of well-known research tools to evaluate different parts of GLS usage, including interviews, narratives, surveys, and think-aloud procedures. Quantitative strategy surveys, according to Oxford (2017), [49] should not be evaluated using simplistic frequency tables and conventional strategy categories. The complexities of language acquisition and strategy application are beyond the scope of this method. My colleague and I have integrated a macro- and micro-perspective in our study on "willingness to communicate" (WTC). Oxford's stance should remind us of the relevance of doing the same in GLS research. However, I do not think it is necessary or appropriate to forsake conventional methodologies entirely. [50]

The eight concerns above serve as a benchmark for the study objectives outlined below. As a whole, they want to shed light on the strategies' role in "task performance," provide reliable resources for using GLS in many settings, and ensure that future studies use a macro and micro approach.

2.1. Research task -1:
Construct a tool to assess the extent to which secondary school students use GLS.

As previously indicated, the majority of the limited research on GLS focuses on university students who are studying a second language, particularly English and are expected to attain a high level of proficiency in the grammar of the target language. However, it is not possible to apply the findings of this research to other educational levels, and the techniques used to gather data may not be suitable since L2 majors have an extensive understanding of linguistics, language acquisition, and language instruction. Hence, it is essential to modify current tools in order to make them appropriate for learners in different settings. Acquiring a second language (L2) at the secondary school level is particularly suitable for this purpose since, in most educational settings, the study of grammar is an essential component of foreign language courses. The instrument should be intended to be applicable to several second languages (L2s) and should include strategies for developing both explicit and implicit knowledge, "which is highly automatized. The points of reference are the

categorization of GLS and the instrument produced by Pawlak." [51] [52] While originally intended for English majors, these are the only documented alternatives that follow "a rational approach to the study of GLS."

The initial step would include giving the GLSI to a group of high school students, collecting data for different sections, breaking it down by item, and checking students' understanding via interviews. Next, we'll look for ideas that may help this group but weren't in the GLSI by using qualitative approaches like interviews and diaries. Afterward, parts of the GLSI may be changed, added to, or removed. Incorporating additional categories or developing an entirely original research instrument may also be a part of this procedure. Patterns of GLS usage might be revealed by administering this newly developed exam to a large sample of high school students.

2.2. Research task-2:
Construct a tool for facilitating the acquisition of a foreign language other than English by learners from diverse linguistic backgrounds, with a focus on GLS.

Although the use of "metacognitive, social, affective, or motivational strategies," and more recently, meta-social, meta-affective, or meta-motivational strategies, is likely not to affect the target language (TL), the use of "cognitive General Language Strategies" (GLS) is expected to depend on the particular linguistic system being used. This is influenced by various factors, including the employment of different processing strategies.[53] Learning English grammar presents distinct problems compared to learning Spanish grammar, which is further complicated by the characteristics of the native language (L1) and its resemblance to the target language (L2). The descriptive grammar of the selected target language (TL) and relevant research on linguistic typology or cross-linguistic impact, such as that of Alonso (2016), must be carefully reviewed as a first step in developing a language-specific instrument. By keeping these fundamentals in mind, we may begin to understand how different types of learners (e.g., those with varying degrees of schooling) use quantitative and qualitative approaches to build their implicit and explicit knowledge of the structures of the target language. For instance, "German learners" who are studying English may be assigned a translation work that requires them to rely on a variety of grammatical structures. During the procedure, participants may be instructed to verbalize their thoughts, which will be recorded. After completing the task, they will be asked to answer a series of Likert-scale questions that are specifically designed to measure the use of GLS in translation. Questions about their awareness of word ends and their capacity to draw parallels to related forms in their L1 are just a few examples. To provide a more complete picture of GLS usage, the resulting inventory may combine the GLSI's more general categories with questions that employ 5-point Likert scales.

2.3 "Research task-3:"
Verify the suitability of the present instruments for use with GLS.

Preference may be given to the GLSI or the tools developed in Research Tasks 1 and 2. Because it is the only comprehensive tool for evaluating GLS at the moment, the GLSI is a valid tool to use. Pawlak[54] was the first to assess it in a Polish setting, and despite its limits, it shows promise for revealing how students tackle the challenges of second-language grammar. For instance, the test may be field-tested among English majors from nations other than Poland to ensure its reliability and validity. To determine the instrument's validity and reliability, use the steps given by Griffee (2012).[55] Computing correlations using similar instruments (e.g., GLSI) is one approach. Another is to evaluate test-retest reliability. Finally, to acquire data indicating internal consistency dependability, one may tabulate Cronbach alpha values for scales and subscales. You may use factor analysis to either find more categories or reduce the number of existing ones. This groundwork may then be used to create the final tool version and make it available to many people in digital or printed form. After that, you may run confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis again.

2.4. "Research task-4:"
Compare how GLS is used in English & another TL to complete grammatical tasks.

To compensate for the macro-perspective's limitations (e.g., the dominance of form or meaning, planning time, etc.) and to shed light on the mediating effects of a specific action, it is essential to supplement the macro-perspective with a micro-perspective. This will ensure that all potential strategies and contexts for GLS are considered. Another intriguing possibility is learning how the L2 mediates these task effects. The task's stated goal is to illuminate situated GLS use while simultaneously shedding light on how their application may be contingent upon factors such as the nature of the learning task, the traits of a specific TL, the impact of cross-linguistic influences, the sequence in which languages are acquired, and intrinsic motivation. The ideal course of action would be to concentrate on a particular aspect of both languages (for example, the passive voice) rather than focusing on disparate grammatical structures. Two activities that put different demands on working memory and attentional resources might be created in both TLs. For example, students would have to paraphrase sentences that rely heavily on explicit knowledge or describe a location using cues, both of which would mostly need the use of implicit (very automated) information. Researchers may utilize a range of quantitative and qualitative methodologies to compile data on language-related events (LREs), where students talk about the grammatical elements they employed. Some examples of these techniques are think-aloud procedures, conversation records, think-scale goods sourced from current stock, and real-time reporting. [56]

Analysing the differences between the two tasks and languages might help us better understand how contextualized GLS use varies depending on the language system.

2.5. "*Research task-5:*"
Examine the use of GLS in an English-medium instruction course (EMI).

"The use of GLS" is pertinent in scenarios when learners are attempting to master the material in a second language in addition to diverse language courses. This is consistent with the counterbalanced method,[57][58] which redirects focus from content to form either reactively (via instructor questions or CF) or proactively ("through observing, awareness, guided practice, and communicative practice"). The goal of the task is to investigate how GLS may be used in an EMI course, for example, to teach "statistics to Erasmus students. Such usage may be operationalized in terms of the decisions and behaviors made by students" on the grammatical structures they should use while reading, writing, and presenting answers to statistical issues in class. At the conclusion of many courses, information might be gathered via brief accounts that highlight the preparation tasks completed for the class or while it was in session. Interview data from a subset of students on how they approached understanding and learning and then using grammatical structures to explain and explain statistical ideas may be added to this.

2.6. Research task-6:
Examine how GLS usage has changed over time in terms of both quantity and quality.

In line with the present trend to investigate the dynamics of ID factors like motivation, it is worthwhile to investigate the temporal fluctuations in GLS use at different timeframes, whether this is done within the CDST framework or another paradigm.[59] With the exception of a study by Benson and Gao (2008)[60] that examined fluctuations in the functions of techniques for learning new words, more research needs to be conducted in this area. That is why this line of inquiry is fascinating. Over long periods, the proposed activity seeks to understand changes in the usage of cognitive, emotional, social, and metacognitive techniques, maybe incorporating compensatory strategies as well. This can be addressed by employing a mixed-methods strategy, which entails gathering quantitative data on GLS use (using the GLSI or another inventory) and qualitative data (through interviews, narratives, or diaries) at different points in time (e.g., at the beginning, middle, and end of a three-year Bachelor of Arts program for English majors). Retrodictive qualitative modeling (RQM) is one technique that has been established to study motivational dynamics; Feroyok (2010) [61] states that although RQM has not been used for learning strategy research, it is still necessary to attempt. In order to identify the factors that have influenced its usage and any changes in it over time, this would include analyzing "GLS at a specific moment in time with a specific set of learners." There would be three steps that must be taken: The process involves three steps:
1) "Identifying key learner types, or archetypes, related to GLS use (such as regular users of traditional GLS or moderate users of GLS to support grammar learning in communication),
2) Choosing the students who most closely match each archetype and
3) Interviewing those students to shed light on the forces and dynamics previously mentioned."

3. Determining the factors influencing the utilization of GLS

One of the most active areas of research has always been the examination of the variables affecting LLS usage. "Age, ability, motivation, personality, learning styles, learning objectives, culture, experience, and the language learned are some of the moderating factors that researchers have examined."[62-65] Additionally, they have investigated the function of proficiency, considering it from two perspectives: as a factor driving the usage of LLS and as a result of its use. Both scenarios have shown strong positive correlations.[66-70] Overall, nevertheless, the study results have been contradictory and uneven. Additionally, research to date provides valuable insights for comparable empirical studies of GLS:
1) Cause-effect relationships, especially when it comes to proficiency, cannot be fully explained by correlational studies;
2) Results may differ significantly based on the methods used to operationalize attainment (e.g., "grades, examination scores");
3) The same is true for ID factors; for instance, the type of tools used depends on the theoretical model used to conceptualize motivation;
4) Not all ID variables have been studied; WTC is an example of this.
5) The impact of moderating variables on LLS use in learning tasks is not well understood; for example, Pawlak [71] discusses pronunciation strategies.
6) Despite the inevitable complexity of factors interacting with each other, no studies have examined this aspect.

Limited to a few research concentrating on "proficiency, experience, educational background, gender, or age, there is little empirical data about the influence of mediating factors on the application of GLS, and the results are inconsistent."[71][72] This has to change because if there isn't proof of a direct connection between GLS usage and achievement in terms of TL grammar and other areas, then questions about the efficacy of pedagogical interventions may be raised. Even in the event that a link is found, a variety of factors are likely to

regulate the amount and quality of GLS usage. These factors may impact not just the results of GLS-focused training but also the impacts of certain grammatical teaching choices. Oxford and Lee (2007),[73] for instance, note that a number of ID factors, including "age, development stage, gender, L1, educational level," and objectives, may influence how well the instructional modality and GLS usage match together. The importance of learning style is emphasized by Oxford[74] who states that it "influences learners' responses to the way grammar is presented in L2 classes and textbooks, as well as helps to shape learners' choice of grammar learning strategies." According to some, research should concentrate on factors that are most relevant to the usage of GLS because, for instance, attitudes will matter regardless of a skill or subsystem.

Furthermore, although studies focusing on single or dual variables are informative, the majority of revealing research would focus on groups of factors, providing much-needed insight into the complexities of GLS usage. It seems that combining the macro- and micro-perspectives is most advantageous. Keeping in mind all of these disclaimers, I propose two research projects meant to investigate "the mediating influences on GLS usage."

3.1. "*Research task-7:*"
Explore the potential connections between, for instance, the use of GLS, attitudes toward grammar learning, passion, WTC, learning styles, and achievement.

Three factors inspired the completion of this task:

(1) Despite the "lack of research on moderating influences on GLS use, the general literature on strategies shows that there is a relationship between LLS and learner-related variables like motivation, learning style, or attainment;"[75]

(2) certain factors, like beliefs or WTC, have not been examined in LLS research but may be relevant to GLS use; and

(3) given the complexity of GLS use, studies that examine interactions between multiple variables yield more insightful results than those that concentrate on single variables.

The assignment takes a broad view and requires "a large sample (several hundred participants)" representing a range of linguistic origins ("e.g., L1 Telegu and L2 English"). The GLSI or other specially designed surveys might be used to gather information on GLS usage ("see Research Tasks 1 and 2 above").

Regarding the other "variables," researchers would decide how to operationalize them; nonetheless, I provide several options:

(1) "Course grades, self-assessment, or, if feasible, test scores could be used to gauge proficiency;

(2) beliefs regarding grammar instruction could be influenced by the Pawlak[76] tool, which addresses various aspects of FFI (such as the introduction of grammar structures and syllabus type);

(3) motivation could be viewed in terms of the L2 motivational self-system and influenced by a tool designed specifically for this purpose."[77][78]

(4) A number of instruments could be used to measure WTC,[79][80] but I would prefer to use the "Willingness to Communicate Inventory (WTCI)," which was created specifically for the Polish context[81] and;

(5) An inventory of language learning styles (ILLS)[82],or the Learning Style Survey (LSS),[83] could be used to determine learning style profiles.

The instruments may be used electronically or on paper, and the data may be analyzed using multiple regression, correlation analysis, or analyses of variance. If any of the variables are identified as independent, the latter method would enable directionality to be established. Most importantly, the study needs to go beyond the general usage of GLS and instead include particular GLS categories as well as various ID construct dimensions (such as various aspects of motivation).

3.2. Research task-8:
Examine how IDs function as a mediator while using GLS to carry out a certain task.

Recognizing the need to investigate situational, strategic language acquisition, this project takes a micro-perspective, in contrast to Research Task 7. This exercise, Task, is open to students of all grade levels and is designed to help them better understand the role of ID variables as mediators when it comes to GLS implementation. The process entails practicing either a specific grammatical feature (such as the passive voice) or a set of elements (such as narrative tenses) in action. Tasks like coming up with a story based on given prompts might need the use of either explicit (such as translating language fragments) or implicit (such as highly automated) information. Student pairs would be formed according to a variety of criteria, including gender (males vs. females, males versus mixed), level of proficiency, learning style (varying degrees of introversion and extraversion as measured by the LSS, for instance), motivation, and WTC (high vs. low for specific scale components). Possible methods for determining competency include self-evaluation, test results, and course grades.

In contrast, the instruments listed in Research Task 7 could be used to evaluate the other factors. "Likert-scale items (such as some of those found in the GLSI), open-ended questions, or interviews" could be used to gather data on GLS use upon task completion. Think-aloud protocols and audio recordings of interactions could also be used in the case of more regulated tasks, allowing for the "analysis of LREs (see Research Task 4 for clarification)." Understanding how environmental and individual characteristics mediate GLS, which task would be possible by identifying its use for certain dyads. Even though comparable techniques may be

used for "tasks in which learners are not matched, it might be challenging to identify recurring patterns of strategy application in these situations."[84]

4. GLS teaching

Though theoretically motivated and perhaps able to shed light on how, for example, skill learning theory[85] suggests that "the application of strategies leads to the automatization of declarative knowledge," research on GLS should, in my opinion, be primarily pedagogically oriented, with the goal of facilitating the learning and use of L2 grammar.[86] Put differently, the empirical data derived from studies that concentrate "on GLS identification" and those that strive to clarify the function of "mediating variables" should be used to build educational strategies that improve the skillful application of these tactical tools. Based on Plonsky's (2011)[87] meta-analysis of 61 studies, SBI is moderately effective; factors such as "age, proficiency, educational level, number and type of LLS, duration of intervention, learning context, and outcome variables moderate its effects." While various SBI models have been put forth, it is generally agreed upon that this type of instruction should include a number of essential steps, including bringing existing LLS to light, introducing and demonstrating novel approaches, offering plenty of opportunity for practice, and encouraging "self-evaluation of LLS use and their transfer to new tasks."[88] Oxford[89] emphasizes the significance of differentiation, considering students' interests or objectives, cognitive styles, competency, and sensory preferences. In response, Chamot (2018)[90] discusses the significance of personality, motivation, competency, cultural, educational, socioeconomic background, and knowledge. Furthermore, I would contend that research aiming to evaluate the effectiveness of SBI should consider the degree to which improved strategy use results in achievement, either generally or in relation to "TL skills and subsystems, both implicit and explicit (highly automatized) knowledge."

Existing empirical data limited to a few research studies is lacking when it comes to teaching students how to utilize GLS. For instance, Cohen et al. (2011)[91] found that students found a website dedicated to Spanish grammar strategies to be beneficial and useful, while "Trendak (2015)[92] showed that SBI targeting emphasis in English was successful for memory and cognitive strategies, with positive effects lasting over time. There is no alternative method to confirm if the somewhat beneficial benefits of SBI, as shown by Plonsky[93] extend to this subsystem, which is why I think studies of instruction in GLS should be conducted." Furthermore, I firmly believe that the advantages of SBI outweigh the need for GLS instruction, especially in contexts where grammatical proficiency is valued highly. I address GSL education concepts for English majors in Pawlak et.al., (2019),[94] emphasizing the need to follow general SBI principles. But I also highlight the need to teach learners the value of utilizing "grammar structures in real-time communication, emphasizing cognitive GLS, applying GLS to the structures being taught," coming up with clever solutions for troublesome features, creating connections between program-related classes, and encouraging an independent approach. These guidelines are meant "for university students majoring in foreign languages, but they may be applied broadly to other educational settings and levels as well. Nonetheless, it is important to stress the need for differentiation in SBI, even within a single setting."[95] These factors are considered in the study project that I suggest below.

4.1."*Research task-9:*"
"*Development of a module that includes GLS teaching for university students who are specializing in a foreign language.*"
Grammar proficiency will always be of the utmost importance to foreign language majors who want to pursue careers as teachers, translators, or interpreters. However, using grammar correctly, meaningfully, and responsibly may be quite difficult,[96] particularly in real-time communication when a high degree of automated translation expertise is necessary. Therefore, this setting is ideal for evaluating the effectiveness of GLS training. The lessons learned may be transferred to other settings where a smaller variety of structures are taught, and less emphasis is placed on mastery of these structures. Although "the benefits of SBI on the use of GLS" are not well-supported by empirical research, Plonsky's (2011)[97] meta-analysis demonstrates that SBI is generally advantageous and that there is no risk involved in using it with students for whom grammatical proficiency is a requirement. The proposed intervention for this task would be most beneficial if it concentrated on just one TL feature (passive voice, for example), spread over a longer period (like an academic year), and integrated into the program's regular grammar classes (or other classes, if grammar instruction is not taught in separate classes). SBI might largely adhere to "Chamot's (2005)[98] Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (i.e., preparation, presentation, practice, self-evaluation, expansion, and assessment) and is best limited to cognitive GLS that is directly engaged in learning and utilizing TL grammar. The GLSI, notebooks, interviews, and open-ended questions about activities completed to gauge mastery of the intended framework are some ways to access GLS usage." To assess implicit (highly automatized) and explicit knowledge, such activities should elicit both controlled and spontaneous TL usage.

A questionnaire may also be created to evaluate students' autonomy in learning grammar. Still, the data-collecting techniques may be employed during the full year. Still, the GLSI, assessments, and autonomy surveys should be given at least three times—before, during, and after the intervention. On the one hand, this would make it possible to assess how much SBI causes people to use GLS more often, if this higher usage results in a better grasp of the desired feature, and whether it encourages grammar learning autonomy. Conversely, it

would provide an understanding of the dynamics of GLS usage and advancements throughout time. The results indicate that strategic intervention must always be tailored to the unique circumstances of a given learning environment, including the beliefs of instructors and students, as well as the available time. As such, the findings may serve as "a point of reference for SBI" for different groups in a range of scenarios.

5. Conclusion

According to Cohen and Pinilla-Herrera [99] acquiring different grammatical forms requires intentional effort rather than merely happening by accident. (…) Therefore, it is evident that there is a need to assist students in effectively using ways to remember and use the grammatical forms they come across and need for language proficiency. I fully endorse this notion, but I firmly believe that we need a more comprehensive understanding of GLS in order to provide learners with highly customized support of this kind. In this work, I have outlined a plan for future study in the areas of identifying and measuring GLS (Grammar Learning Strategies), examining factors that impact their utilization, and developing techniques for targeting SBI (Specific Business English) in grammar learning. Although the study objectives I have proposed do not fully explore all the potential ways to further our knowledge of GLS, they provide important indications of the paths that future empirical studies may pursue. The most recent advancements must influence this study in LLS studies as a whole. However, it should also go beyond these achievements by acknowledging the unique nature of "learning grammar" and the consequent need to create "new research" tools. Simultaneously, it is important to exercise caution in avoiding the tendency to blindly and unquestioningly adopt popular trends in LLS (Language Learning and Strategies) "research, such as the utilization of dynamic systems, excessive focus on the dynamic nature of strategy use, or the assertion that strategies cannot be categorized in advance." Although these advancements provide us with a fresh perspective on LLS and a deeper understanding of the factors that drive their use, future research on GLS should aim to skillfully integrate traditional and modern approaches, effectively using the advantages of both macro- and micro-level. Analysis.

6. References

1. Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, *65*(1), 24-35.
2. Pawlak, M. (2020). Grammar learning strategies as a key to mastering second language grammar: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, *53*(3), 358-370.
3. Pawlak, M. (2013). Researching grammar learning strategies: Combining the macro-and micro-perspective. In *Perspectives on foreign language learning* (pp. 193-211). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
4. Pawlak, M. (2009). Grammar learning strategies and language attainment: Seeking a relationship. *Research in language*, *7*, 43-60.
5. Kemp, C. (2007). Strategic processing in grammar learning: Do multilinguals use more strategies?. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *4*(4), 241-261.
6. Gürata, A. (2008). *The grammar learning strategies employed by Turkish university preparatory school EFL students* (Master's thesis, Bilkent Universitesi (Turkey)).
7. Benati, A., & Schwieter, J. W. (2019). Pedagogical interventions to L2 grammar instruction. *The Cambridge handbook of language learning*, 477-499.
8. Dornyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge.
9. Mercer, S., Ryan, S., & Williams, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Psychology for language learning: Insights from research, theory and practice*. Springer.
10. Cameron, L., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (2007). Complex systems and applied linguistics. *International journal of applied linguistics*, *17*(2), 226-240.
11. Oxford, R. L. (2016). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context*. Routledge.
12. Oxford, R. (2018). Language learning strategies. *The Cambridge guide to learning English as a second language*, 81-90.
13. Winne, P. H., & Perry, N. E. (2000). Measuring self-regulated learning. In *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 531-566). Academic Press.
14. Zimmerman, B. J., & Moylan, A. R. (2009). Self-regulation: Where metacognition and motivation intersect. In *Handbook of metacognition in education* (pp. 299-315). Routledge.
15. Pawlak, M., & Oxford, R. L. (2018). Conclusion: The future of research into language learning strategies. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *8*(2), 525-535.
16. Ibid.cit.no.4
17. Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue: A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *32*(2), 335-349.
18. Bitchener, J. (2017). Why some L2 learners fail to benefit from written corrective feedback. In *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 129-140). Routledge.

19. Fenner, A. B., Trebbi, T., & Aase, L. (1999). Mother tongue and foreign language teaching and learning-A joint project. *Bells: Barcelona English language and literature studies*, 133-143.
20. Phillips, V. (1991). A look at learner strategy use and ESL proficiency. *CaTESoL journal*, *4*(1), 57-67.
21. Sarıçoban, A. (2005). Learner preferences in the use of strategies in learning grammar. *Atatürk University Journal of the Institute of Social Sciences*, *5*, 319-330.
22. Kemp, C. (2007). Strategic processing in grammar learning: Do multilinguals use more strategies?. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *4*(4), 241-261.
23. Mónos, K. (2004). Learner strategies of Hungarian secondary grammar school students.
24. Pawlak, M. (2008). *Investigating English language learning and teaching*. Faculty of Pedagogy and Fine Arts in Kalisz, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań.
25. Applebee, A. N. (1999). Building a foundation for effective teaching and learning of English: A personal perspective on thirty years of research. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *33*(4), 352-366.
26. Ibid cit.no.17
27. Loewen, S., & Sato, M. (Eds.). (2017). *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (p. 1). New York: Routledge.
28. Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2013). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. Routledge.
29. Oxford, R. L. (1990). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle
30. Hinkel, E. (Ed.). (2016). *Teaching English grammar to speakers of other languages*. New York, NY: Routledge.
31. Bialystok, E., & Smith, M. S. (1985). Interlanguage is not a state of mind: An evaluation of the construct for second-language acquisition. *Applied linguistics*, *6*(2), 101-117.
32. Ibid.cit.no.15
33. Pawlak, M. (2018). Grammar learning strategy inventory (GLSI): Another look. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *8*(2), 351-379.
34. Ibid.cit.no.12
35. Takeuchi, O., Griffiths, C., & Coyle, D. (2007). Applying strategies: The role of individual, situational, and group differences. *Language learner strategies*, 69-92.
36. Donato, R., & MacCormick, D. (1994). A sociocultural perspective on language learning strategies: The role of mediation. *The modern language journal*, *78*(4), 453-464.
37. Oxford, R. L. (1989). Use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. *System*, *17*(2), 235-247.
38. MacIntyre, P. D., & Noels, K. A. (1996). Using social-psychological variables to predict the use of language learning strategies. *Foreign language annals*, *29*(3), 373-386.
39. Haukås, Å. (2015). A comparison of L2 and L3 learners' strategy use in school settings. *Canadian modern language review*, *71*(4), 383-405.
40. Dmitrenko, V. (2017). Language learning strategies of multilingual adults learning additional languages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *14*(1), 6-22.
41. Mitits, L., & Gavriilidou, Z. (2014). Effects of gender, age, proficiency level and motivation differences on monolingual and multilingual students' language learning strategies. In *Studies in Greek linguistics, Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics* (pp. 285-299).
42. Campbell, E., & Storch, N. (2011). The changing face of motivation: A study of second language learners' motivation over time. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *34*(2), 166-192.
43. Ibid.cit.no.1
44. Trendak, O. (2015). *Exploring the role of strategic intervention in form-focused instruction*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
45. Guangwei, H. U. (2003). Task-based Language Learning and Teaching. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, *13*, 125-129.
46. Cameron, L., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (2007). Complex systems and applied linguistics. *International journal of applied linguistics*, *17*(2), 226-240.
47. Dörnyei, Z., Henry, A., & MacIntyre, P. D. (Eds.). (2014). *Motivational dynamics in language learning* (Vol. 81). Multilingual Matters.
48. Benson, P., & Gao, X. (2008). Individual variation and language learning strategies. *Language learning strategies in independent settings*, 25-40.
49. Ibid.cit.no.11
50. Mystkowska-Wiertelak, A., & Pawlak, M. (2017). *Willingness to communicate in instructed second language acquisition: Combining a macro-and micro-perspective* (Vol. 110). Multilingual Matters.
51. Ibid.cit.no.3
52. Ibid.cit.no.15
53. Cook, V., & Singleton, D. (2014). *Key topics in second language acquisition* (Vol. 10). Multilingual matters.
54. Pawlak, M. (2018). Grammar learning strategy inventory (GLSI): Another look. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *8*(2), 351-379.

55. Griffee, D. T. (2012). An introduction to second language research methods. *TESL-EJ Publications*.
56. Collins, L., & White, J. (2019). Observing language-related episodes in intact classrooms. *Doing SLA research with implications for the classroom: Reconciling methodological demands and pedagogical applicability*, *52*, 9.
57. Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2013). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. Routledge.
58. Byram, M. (2002). *Routledge encyclopedia of language teaching and learning*. Routledge.
59. Ibid.cit.no15
60. Benson, P., & Gao, X. (2008). Individual variation and language learning strategies. *Language learning strategies in independent settings*, 25-40.
61. Feryok, A. (2010). Language teacher cognitions: Complex dynamic systems?. *System*, *38*(2), 272-279.
62. Oxford, R. L. (1989). Use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. *System*, *17*(2), 235-247.
63. O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Kupper, L., & Russo, R. P. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *Language learning*, *35*(1), 21-46.
64. MacIntyre, P. D., & Noels, K. A. (1996). Using social-psychological variables to predict the use of language learning strategies. *Foreign language annals*, *29*(3), 373-386.
65. Griffiths, C. (2012). Learning styles: Traversing the quagmire. In *Psychology for language learning: insights from research, theory and practice* (pp. 151-168). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
66. Anderson, N. J. (2005). L2 learning strategies. In *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 757-771). Routledge.
67. Rivera-Mills, S. V., & Plonsky, L. (2007). Empowering students with language learning strategies: A critical review of current issues. *Foreign language annals*, *40*(3), 535-548.
68. Gu, P. Y. (1996). Robin Hood in SLA: What has the learning strategy researcher taught us. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, *6*(1), 1-29.
69. Griffiths, C. (2015). Language learning strategies: An holistic view. *Studies in second language learning and teaching*, (3), 473-493.
70. Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. *The modern language journal*, *90*(3), 320-337.
71. Tılfarlıoğlu, F., & Yalçın, E. (2005). An analysis of the relationship between the use of grammar learning strategies and student achievement at English preparatory classes. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *1*(2), 155-169.
72. Zekrati, S. (2017). The relationship between grammar learning strategy use and language achievement of Iranian high school EFL learners. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, *3*(2), 129-138.
73. Oxford, R. L., Lee, K. R., & Park, G. (2007). L2 grammar strategies: The second Cinderella and beyond. *Language learner strategies*, *30*, 117-139.
74. Ibid.cit.no.11. p. 246
75. Ibid.cit.no.35
76. Pawlak, M. (2011). Research into language learning strategies: Taking stock and looking ahead. *Individual differences in SLA*, 17-37.
77. Pawlak, M. (2012). The dynamic nature of motivation in language learning: A classroom perspective. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *2*(2), 249-278.
78. Ryan, S. (2009). Self and identity in L2 motivation in Japan: The ideal L2 self and Japanese learners of English. *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*, *120*(143), 9781847691293-007.
79. MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Clément, R., & Conrod, S. (2001). Willingness to communicate, social support, and language-learning orientations of immersion students. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *23*(3), 369-388.
80. Peng, J. E., & Woodrow, L. (2010). Willingness to communicate in English: A model in the Chinese EFL classroom context. *Language learning*, *60*(4), 834-876.
81. Pawlak, M. (2017). Individual difference variables as mediating influences on success or failure in form-focused instruction. *At the crossroads: Challenges of foreign language learning*, 75-92.
82. Griffiths, C. (2012). Learning styles: Traversing the quagmire. In *Psychology for language learning: insights from research, theory and practice* (pp. 151-168). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
83. Cohen, A. D., Oxford, R. L., & Chi, J. C. (2001). Learning Style Survey. Recuperado el4 de diciembre de 2019dehttps. *carla. umn. edu/maxsa/documents/LearningStyleSurvey_MAXSA. pdf*.
84. Ibid.cit.no.54
85. DeKeyser, R. (2020). Skill acquisition theory. In *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 83-104). Routledge.
86. VanPatten, B., & Williams, J. (2007). *Theories in second language acquisition*. New York, NY: Routledge.
87. Plonsky, L. (2011). The effectiveness of second language strategy instruction: A meta-analysis. *Language learning*, *61*(4), 993-1038.
88. Chamot, A. U. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues and research. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, *25*, 112-130.
89. Ibid.cit.no.11

90. Chamot, A. U. (2018). Preparing language teachers: New teachers become ready to teach learning strategies in diverse classrooms. *Language learning strategies and individual learner characteristics: Situating strategy use in diverse contexts*, 213-235.
91. Cohen, A. D., Pinilla-Herrera, A., Thompson, J. R., & Witzig, L. E. (2011). Communicating grammatically: Evaluating a learner strategy website for Spanish grammar. *Calico Journal*, *29*(1), 145-172.
92. Ibid.cit.no.44
93. Ibid.cit.no.87
94. Pawlak, M., Chamot, A. U., & Harris, V. (2019). Grammar learning strategies instruction in the foreign language classroom: The case of English majors. *Learning strategy instruction in the language classroom: Issues and implementation*, 107-120.
95. Ibid.cit.no.90
96. Ibid.cit.no.46
97. Ibid.cit.no.87
98. Ibid.cit.no.88
99. Ibid.cit.no.91, pp.63-66**************