
GRAMMAR LEARNING STRATEGIES IN PRIMARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

Anuar Gómez García

Supervisor:

Maria Juncal Gutierrez

Degree in English Studies

2020/2021

**Department of English Philology, German Philology and Translation and
Interpretation.**

I wish to extend my special thanks to: my supervisor Maria Juncal Gutierrez, the primary school Allende Salazar, all the teachers taking part in the whole process of the investigation (with a special mention to Sandra Martínez), as well as to the students, my friends and my family.

Abstract

The field of Language Learning Strategies (LLS) is a well-researched topic in language acquisition (Oxford, 1986; Larsen-Freeman, 1995; Chamot, 2001; Oxford, Lee & Park, 2007). The importance of LLSs is highlighted in Chamot's (2001:25-26) definition, in which LLSs are defined as the "techniques or procedures that facilitate a learning task". LLSs support the student in the learning process, and help the learner become more successful in the study (Chamot, 2001). Despite the wide variety and numerous definitions for LLSs, the study of Grammar Learning Strategies (GLS) has been relegated to a secondary plane. GLSs are understood as "deliberate thoughts and actions students consciously employ for learning and getting better control over the use of grammar structures" (Cohen & Pinilla-Herrera, 2010:66). The importance of the study of such a field resides in the fact that grammar is an essential element that forms a language system (Zhou, 2017). In addition, the scant studies conducted up to day on GLSs have taken as an object of study secondary school or university students (Zhou, 2017; Pawlak, 2018). These studies have revealed that secondary school learners reported using cognitive strategies with the highest frequency, then metacognitive and finally social/affective strategies (Zhou, 2017), while university students reported using social strategies with the highest frequency, followed by cognitive, metacognitive and affective strategies (Pawlak, 2018). The present paper aims to contribute to the small number of studies on GLSs by exploring grammar learning strategies reportedly used by an under-researched group of participants: fourth grade primary school Basque/Spanish bilingual child learners of L3 English. The 69 (28 males and 41 females) participants completed a linguistic background test, as well as the 70 questions included in Pawlak's (2018) Grammar Learning Strategy Inventory (GLSI) questionnaire. Results indicate that primary school students reported using social strategies with the highest frequency, followed by metacognitive strategies, with affective strategies coming next and cognitive strategies ranking last. The results of the present study differ with those offered by Zhou (2017), in terms of general strategy usage, since secondary school students have reported using cognitive strategies with the highest frequency, while in the case of primary school students the most frequently used ones were social

strategies. However, the data presented in Pawlak's (2018) study and the results obtained in our paper seem to indicate that university and primary school students reported using social strategies with the highest frequency. Moreover, our study supports the findings of Zhou (2017) from the gender perspective -in which the data has shown that female students reported a higher frequency in strategy usage in contrast to their male counterparts, findings which would have to be further investigated in similar studies with similar populations.

Key words: Language Learning Strategies, Grammar Learning Strategies, Grammar Learning Strategy Inventory, primary school students, grammar.

Index:

1. Introduction	1
2. Literature review	3
3. Research question and hypotheses	12
4. The study	13
4.1. Participants	13
4.2. Materials	15
4.2.1. Procedure	15
5. Results & Discussion	17
6. Conclusion	26
7. References	27
Appendix	30

1. Introduction

The field of Language Learning Strategies (LLS) has been in study over the last decades (Oxford, 1986; Larsen-Freeman, 1995; Chamot, 2001; Oxford, Lee & Park, 2007). Chamot (2001:25-26) defined LLS as the “techniques or procedures that facilitate a learning task” and claims that the “two major goals in language learning strategy research are to (1) identify and compare the learning strategies used by more and less successful language learners, and (2) provide instruction to less successful language learners that helps them become more successful in their study”. Oxford (1986) stresses that the importance of second Language Learning Strategies resides in the fact that they make language performance better, they support the learner’s autonomy, they are teachable, and enhance the role of the teacher. However, the wide range of features covered by LLSs leaves some research areas aside. This is the case, among others, of the Grammar Learning Strategies (GLS). GLSs are defined as “deliberate thoughts and actions students consciously employ for learning and getting better control over the use of grammar structures.” (Cohen and Pinilla-Herrera, 2010:66). Moreover, Stavre and Pashko (2016:445) describe GLSs as “compensatory tools to help learners fill voids in their structural use of foreign language patterns”, which are claimed “to develop into tools that help the learner draw a planned learning pathway towards reaching their learning outcomes”. In fact, Oxford (2017) points out that the discipline of GLSs has been relegated to a secondary place when compared to the study of any of the L2 learning strategies, even labelling the field of GLS as the ‘Second Cinderella’ of Language Learning Strategy (LLS) investigation (Oxford, Lee, & Park, 2007). Pawlak (2018), in turn, clarifies that the lack of study in this field is due to the scarce tools to promote the study of such a field. Moreover, Zhou (2017) claims that, in the past, investigation on GLSs used to put the spotlight on teachers, while learners occupied a secondary status. However, in the last decades, the shift from teaching to learning has gained more importance, in line with claims by Larsen-Freeman (1995) that language acquisition has had a direct effect on language pedagogy, incentivizing learner-centered teaching which has influenced and remodelled the field of language teaching.

Therefore, the present paper aims to contribute to the field of GLS by providing data from an under-researched group: namely young children. In contrast to most of the studies conducted in the field, which have investigated adults, what is of added interest in this paper is that the students are in early adolescence, and come from a multilingual environment. The results obtained in this paper will serve as a complement to the research already done, since it will serve as a starting point to understand how young L2 learners process and understand the issues regarding grammar learning -and which are the strategies reported in the process of learning the different grammar points-. Considering that it is that basic formation the one that takes up the ground level of the 'building' of language learning, the present study will give voice to those primary school students who are set in the foot of the pyramid. To do so, I will use the data collection tool proposed by Pawlak (2019) named "Grammar Learning Strategy Inventory" (GLSI), since as we will see in the literature review section, the instrument designed by Pawlak offers the most complete data collection tool. Even if it was meant to be used with high school or university level students on its origins, it also allows the use with younger participants.

This paper is divided into five parts. Starting with the literature review section, I will focus on the research conducted so far so as to underscore the results obtained by different scholars in the field of GLSs, and I will offer their results on the most and least frequently used strategies by the students in those studies. I will then move onwards into the research questions and hypotheses. Focusing on the study itself, the following section will offer details on my object of study, along with a description of the steps followed in the adaptation of the linguistic background test -and the minimum adaptation of the questionnaire itself which required, as well, a translation into Basque and Spanish-. This section will be followed by the results obtained by the GLSI, as well as with the background test. To conclude, the paper will offer a discussion and conclusion section in which I aim to offer an interpretation of the collected data, and a view on the best and least used GLSs of primary school children, together with some reflections on the short-comings and further research lines.

2. Literature review

The various attempts to define the concept of Language Learning Strategies (LLS), leaves us a rich environment of proposals (e.g. Oxford, 2018; Cohen, Pinilla Herrera, Thompson & Witzig, 2009). Considering, on the one hand, Oxford's (2018:81) view, LLS are defined as "(...) purposeful mental actions (sometimes accompanied by observable behaviors) used by a learner to regulate his or her second or foreign language (L2) learning". Moreover, Oxford (2018) understands that these learning strategies cover essential aspects in language learning, and their usage aids the learner in accomplishing voluntarily marked goals. Among the learning objectives, Oxford (2018) highlights the fact of succeeding in getting over a learning barrier, completing an L2 exercise, improving the L2 proficiency and improving self-regulation.

With regards to the different types of Language Learning Strategies, Oxford (1999:114) differentiated six different Language Learning strategy groups, which included memory related strategies, cognitive, compensatory, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. As seen in Oxford (1999:112), *Memory Strategies* are described as "(...) cognitive strategies that serve the special function of embedding new information into long-term memory". Moreover, Oxford (1999:112) explains that *Cognitive Strategies* are those internalized by the learner (such as "analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating"). In terms of *Compensatory Strategies*, Oxford (1999:112) claimed that the compensatory strategies "compensate for or make up for missing knowledge". *Metacognitive Strategies* are said to be those which include "Planning, guiding, and monitoring, along with organizing and evaluating (...)" (Oxford, 1999:112). With respect to *Affective Strategies*, Oxford (1999:112) suggests that the strategies of this group are those which " (...) help learners manage their emotions and motivation". Finally, social strategies are those that involve "asking questions, requesting assistance, and collaborating with others via language, or social speech -talking with others-".

Despite the emphasis on research of LLSs, the scant study conducted in the field of GLS leaves a poor variety of definitions of the concept itself. As it is verbalized by Pawlak (2009), few efforts have been made to propose a definition on the activities learners use when learning grammar.

In addition to the lack of a clear definition of what GLSs are, a second gap in the field of LLSs is that Grammar Learning Strategies have been given little attention, especially considering that grammar is an essential element that forms a language system.

In this respect, Pawlak (2018) points out that there is an insufficiency of empirical investigations, as well as a small range of studies which, many times, lead to contradictory findings with respect to GLSs.

One of the biggest issues regarding the study of GLS was the categorization and evaluation of L2 GLSs (Pawlak, 2018). In the early years of GLS investigation, researchers employed Oxford's (1990) tool named "Strategy Inventory for Language Learning" (SILL) as a data collection tool. However, the SILL does not investigate GLSs, but LLSs (Oxford, 1996; Oxford, 1999; Lee & Oxford, 2008). The SILL is composed of 50¹ Likert-scaled items which reflect one particular strategy. Participants are asked to rank their use of each item as follows: 1-5, ranging from "never or almost never" (1) to "always or almost always" (5) (Oxford, 1999:114). However, Lee & Oxford (2008) suggest that the periodicity of LLS use should be classified from: 5.0-3.5 (which indicate those strategies which are frequently used), 3.4-2.5 (which indicates the strategies used sometimes) and 2.4-1.0 (which indicates the strategies which are rarely used). Moreover, Oxford (1999:114) claimed that the SILL is grouped in six categories: memory related, cognitive, compensatory, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. In light of this grouping, Oxford (1999:114) explains that the first three categories belong to the "direct" strategies -since they involve using the language in question (the language being learned)-, while the last three are called "indirect" strategies -since they do not involve the language itself, and they allow self-management (with regard to planning, organizing, learning with others...)-.

As shown by Pawlak (2018), the following scheme offered by Oxford et al. (2007) served as a basis for the discussion on GLS assessment. The scheme adopted a general approach based on "form-focused instruction²" (Oxford et al.,

¹ As seen in Lee and Oxford (2008:28), version 7.0 of the SILL -containing 50 items- was "designed for speakers of other languages learning English", while version 5.1 "contains 80 items and was originally designed for native English speakers learning other languages".

² Kellem and Halvorsen (2018) explained that form-focused (or focus-on-forms) instruction " (...) has options of explicit and implicit instruction".

2007). In this approach, Oxford et al. (2007) drew a line between implicit (meaning oriented learning) and explicit learning (intentional learning, which includes memorizing...). The former (implicit learning), may contain “exclusive focus on meaning”, “occasional focus on form”, while the latter may be “deductive and inductive”. All in all, Oxford et al. (2007) emphasized in their framework three groups of Learning Strategies which are as follows:

- 1) *Implicit learning* strategies containing an emphasis on form (e.g. imitation, remembering oral structures -along with the pitch, intonation...- or noting down new structures -which appear to be important/frequent).
- 2) *Explicit inductive* LS (e.g. guessing how a rule works, the creation of hypotheses on how the TL functions -as well as the verification of the hypotheses-...)
- 3) *Explicit deductive* LS (e.g. checking the structures to be covered in a lesson in advance, creating sentences containing the new rules...)

The need for the development of such a tool gave rise to a variety of proposals, one of which was put forward by Cohen and Pinilla Herrera (2010). The tool launched by Cohen and Pinilla Herrera (2010) was meant to show the strategies used successfully by learners of Spanish (as a L1 or L2), and showed the suggested strategies of those who had performed successfully. To do so, Cohen and Pinilla Herrera (2010) created online questionnaires not only for learners, but also for instructors. Different questionnaires were designed to the end of covering the grammar forms that students found problematic (e.g., Spanish verb tenses), followed by interview sessions (in order to test the respondents' accuracy in the use of the grammar form in which they employed a given strategy). Confined to provide examples of strategies (which were found successful by the learners) to learn Spanish grammar, it failed to offer a competitive instrument since it was language exclusive, this is, it was limited for the learning of Spanish grammar (and, therefore, it cannot be employed to investigate the grammar learning strategies of other languages). In this aspect, Pawlak (2019) claims that the instrument to be used should be ‘non-language specific’, so that it can be applied with different L2s -or by a wider range of L2s-.

Therefore, Pawlak (2013) built up a series of four principles to be covered by his own tool, which are as follows:

- 1) The classification should be universal and appropriate to any TL, and not “language-specific”.
- 2) It should employ present-day classifications of LLS.
- 3) It should be based upon the divisions of the “methodological options in teaching TL grammar”.
- 4) It should be kept updated with the data obtained in the current research on GLS -as well as the trials to classify the strategies.

The modifications implemented by Pawlak (2018) filled the gap left by Oxford et al.’s (2007) proposal, accomplishing what it is understood by Pawlak (2018) as a comprehensive classification, and adjusts to the ‘actions and thoughts’ that learners employ in the process of mastering TL grammar. The inventory created by Pawlak (Grammar Learning Strategy Inventory (GLSI)) is the tool employed for the collection of data in the present paper and catalogues the grammar learning strategies into four groups (Pawlak, 2018:360,361):

- 1) *Metacognitive strategies*, which are utilised to oversee and direct the learning of the L2 grammar through the procedure of planification, organization, monitorization and self-evaluation.
- 2) *Cognitive strategies*, which are implicated in the (TL) grammar learning process, divided into four different subcategories:
 - a) GLS employed to back up the elaboration and understanding of grammar in a ‘communication task’ (e.g. making use/trying to use particular grammar structures in casual oral production).
 - b) GLS employed to improve the *implicit knowledge* of grammar -which could be separated into two groups-:
 - i) GLS used for *deductive learning* (e.g. making an effort to understand every rule of grammar-.
 - ii) GLS used for *inductive learning* (e.g. finding out rules by examining examples).
 - c) GLS employed to improve *implicit knowledge* of grammar -which could be separated into two groups-:

- i) GLS used for understanding grammar (e.g. listening or reading activities containing a specific grammar structure).
 - ii) GLS used for the production of grammar in both, *controlled* (e.g. the application of new rules in sentence formation) and *communicative* (e.g. employing those rules in the appropriate context) practice.
- d) GLS employed to cope with *corrective feedback* on grammar production errors (e.g. paying attention to the teacher's feedback on the appropriate usage of the specific grammar structure, making an effort to recognize and autocorrect the errors made in a grammar practice activity...)
- 3) *Affective strategies* (with the objective of 'self regulating' emotions and encouragement when it comes to learning the TL grammar). E.g., trying to keep calm when facing understanding or grammar usage problems, self-motivation to practicing demanding grammar structures...
- 4) *Social strategies* which require collaboration or interplay with the teacher -or any proficient student- with the goal of improving the grammar learning process. (It is, as well, included the trial to assist the others who undergo complications in the learning or usage of grammar structures, working with classmates in grammar learning oriented exercises, or asking the teacher for help if any trouble with a given grammar point).

The GLSI consists of a 70 5-point Likert statements which illustrate the classification above, and which constitute the different GLSs -along with its subdivisions and subcategories-.

If we consider that many GLS are universal and that they can be employed in the grammar learning process of different target languages (TL), the exclusive characteristics of those TL grammars may require the utilization of rather specific strategies (Pawlak, 2019). This shows that even if general tools such as the GLSI can contribute with helpful perceptions of the reported use, it is necessary to create language-specific inventories that adapt better to the necessities of the learner groups -taking into consideration, as well, their L1 background-.

Pawlak (2019:2) asserted that the 'skillful use of GLS', no matter if it is meant to understand or learn rules, to take advantage of CF (corrective feedback), or to

automatize the rules, is crucial for the comprehension and skilful use of TL grammar (Pawlak, 2019).

Palwak (2018) stated that the examples examined by the SILL data collecting tool can hardly contribute to the investigation of GLS -as the goal of such a tool was to analyze LLS-. However, Pawlak (2018) agrees that with some pertinent modifications, this instrument could serve to obtain information on indirect strategies (e.g. metacognitive, social and affective strategies), but those can't be understood as essential for the learning of L2 grammar.

In order to test the reliability of the GLSI and correlate the inventory with Oxford's (1990) SILL, Pawlak (2018) collected data from 106 (76 females and 30 males) university students majoring in English as a foreign language from two universities in Poland in two ways, in paper or electronically. Results showed -by Pearson's correlation (which is used in statistics to measure the correlation between two sets of data)- that the correlation of both tools was positive (64% of the variance), which was taken by Pawlak (2018) as a strong indicator that both tools "measure a similar construct", concluding therefore, that the GLSI is a good instrument for the measurement of strategic learning.

In terms of the means obtained for each of the categories, results of the GLSI show that the most frequently reported use of GLS by university students was in one of the subgroups for cognitive strategies, more precisely those dealing with corrective feedback (with a mean of 4.00/5). Social strategies ranked high in the table (with a mean of 3.69/5), while affective strategies ranked last with a mean of a 2.97/5. However, when considering the mean for cognitive strategies as a single group -this is, leaving the subdivisions aside-, the mean use is of a 3.62. Given this case, it would be social strategies the most frequently used strategies. Pawlak (2018) stated that the results obtained with his group of study by means of the GLSI were satisfactory, testing positively the reliability of the tool.

Considering the subgroups identified by Pawlak (2018) for the cognitive category in detail, Pawlak (2018) offered a view on the frequency in which his target group used each of the subgroups. Results show that cognitive strategy B4 ranked highest, followed by B1, B3, and with B2 classified last. Considering that

cognitive strategy B4 obtained a high mean, the finding suggests that the university students used cognitive strategies often.

Among the few studies conducted on GLSs with high school students, Zhou (2017) investigated the reported use of GLS in English as an L2 by 176 grade one high school students in Hubei (province of China). Zhou (2017) understands that exploring the usage of English Grammar Learning Strategies by high school students is important to help to improve high school teaching quality. Zhou (2017) tested the GLSs of high school students by means of questionnaires, test papers and interviews designed specifically for this purpose. To this end, Zhou (2017) adapted Cheng's (2002) questionnaire, and employed Oxford's (1990) grading system³ -as Pawlak did-. The results showed that the participants' reported using cognitive strategies with the highest frequency. In words of Zhou (2017) this may be because high school students are used to memorizing and, therefore, they are effective at using learning methods related to cognitive strategies. In terms of the least frequently used strategies, it was social/affective strategies the ones ranking last. Zhou (2017) explained that this could indicate that the students had difficulties in communicating with others (communicative skills), since they are not used to conversing with others to the end of learning grammar.

So as to offer a gender-oriented perspective to the end of analyzing the possible differences in the frequency usage for each of the strategies by males and females, Zhou (2017) analysed the results obtained by gender. This gender-oriented focus on the data is of great interest since it offers an insight on the frequency of the strategy usage by male and female learners.

The results from the 89 male and 87 female students showed that the average reported use of the strategies by the female students was higher than the males'. In other words, female students used -on average- all the GLSs⁴ (this is, cognitive, metacognitive and social/affective) more frequently. Furthermore, the data shows that male and female adolescents agreed on the most and least frequently used strategies, showing that it was cognitive strategies the most commonly used ones,

³ The periodicity of GLS use is classified from: 5.0-3.5 (frequently used), 3.4-2.5 (used sometimes) and 2.4-1.0 (rarely used).

⁴ Based on the proposal of O'Malley and Chamot (1990:88) for Learning Strategies, in which they identified 3 groups of strategies (cognitive, metacognitive and social/affective -this last one as a single strategy group-).

with meta-cognitive strategies being next, and social/affective strategies coming last.

Zhou (2017) concluded that this result (female students reporting a higher average use of the strategies) could be due to the females being very meticulous in learning, and their being used to manipulating language in a conscious way (as suggested by the high frequency in the cognitive strategy use). Moreover, Zhou (2017) concludes that, since female students had a higher reported usage rate of social/affective strategies, they would actively communicate with other students (or teachers), exchange experiences etc. Focusing on the higher frequency reported by the female students in metacognitive strategies, Zhou (2017) claims that their objectives and the wish to improve in grammar learning is clearer. In terms of cognitive strategy usage, Zhou (2017) states that the results show that female learners are more effective in using learning methods (to improve proficiency) in the learning process, and that they mark and learn from the mistakes in the exercises, while male students (in Zhou's (2017) interpretation) don't.

As for the personal interviews conducted by Zhou (2017), the results showed that female students were more inclined to grammar learning than male learners, and that they deliberately involved themselves in grammar learning, as well as regularly enjoying the grammar learning challenges. Moreover, the scores in social/affective learning strategies showed that female students were more willing to communicate with others -teachers and classmates- for a better grammar performance. With a higher metacognitive strategy use (3.1 female, 2.8 male), and showing a better performance in 'effective learning methods' of the cognitive strategies (with a mean of 3.4 -female-, 3.2 -male-) that makes them more efficient than males in the grammar learning strategy usage, female students appear to perform better in the learning process. Furthermore, Zhou (2017) concluded that females tended to learn cautiously, and keep an eye on the mistakes -marking them and writing down the correct answer with different colours-, which reflects a higher use of cognitive strategies. In this aspect, data shows that males hardly ever do so, just 'scanning' or running through the mistakes.

Keeping in mind the proposal by Oxford (1990) read in Lee & Oxford (2008) for the evaluation of the results -which has been adopted by Zhou (2017)-, the periodicity of GLS use was classified from: 5.0-3.5 (frequently used), 3.4-2.5 (used sometimes) and 2.4-1.0 (rarely used). In this aspect, Zhou (2017) remarks that out of the ten best used items, Q33 (“First review the grammar points, and then do grammar exercises”), Q6 (“When I’m learning grammar, I pay attention to understanding and caring for other people’s feelings”), and Q24 (“I pay attention to my progress and weak points in learning grammar”) are the ones that have a higher mean than 3.5, indicating that students frequently employ those two strategies (both strategies indicate that students often review and practice a given grammar point). According to Zhou (2017) the high mean of the given items indicates that the strategies in question are effective learning strategies. In this aspect Zhou (2017) highlights that high school students often review grammar exercises, which can help them in the learning process. What is more, the higher standard deviation of Q2 (“I have a positive attitude toward learning grammar”) and Q43 (“Before grammar class, key points and difficulties are singled out and given special attention to in class”) signifies that learners have dissimilarities with regards to the attitude towards grammar learning, and they perform differently when dealing with challenging points.

Turning into the ten least frequently used items (questions (Q) Q20, Q19, Q18, Q16, Q10, Q11, and Q17 are included in the social/affective strategies), Zhou (2017) states that the results highlight that learners hardly ever use social/affective strategies in the learning process. Therefore, commenting on the results obtained by Zhou (2017), the data indicates that -male and female- high school students hardly ever use social/affective strategies, since within the 10 least frequently used strategies, 7 belong to that category. In Zhou’s view this indicates that the students rarely cooperate with classmates or friends to learn grammar, and they communicate with teachers only on rare occasions.

In light of the findings of both, Zhou (2017), and Pawlak (2018), adult and adolescent learners seem to differ in the reported strategy usage. The adolescents in Zhou’s (2017) study reported a more frequent usage of cognitive strategies,

while the adult learners in Pawlak's (2018) reported a higher mean in the usage of social strategies.

3. Research question and hypotheses

Understanding and learning how primary school L2 English learners act towards grammar learning, and focusing on the strategies they use in the learning process, this study aims to offer a view on the behaviors or habits of young learners -a population which has not been investigated so far-. The results of the present study may help understand how this group of study acts in the grammar learning process. Getting to know the strategies employed by this selected part of the population will fill the gap left by the rest of the papers or studies conducted so far.

Taking into consideration the results reported in previous studies on the use of GLS, our research questions are as follows:

RQ1: What is the reported frequency of use of GLSs of school-age child learners of English as a foreign language?

RQ2: Which will be the most frequently used GLSs by school-aged child learners?

The hypotheses for both research questions are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: School-age child learners of English as a foreign language will report the same frequency of use of the strategies as described in Zhou's (2017) study, since the learners of both groups are closer in age -in comparison to university students-.

Hypothesis 2: School-age child learners of English as a foreign language will report social strategies as the most frequently used strategies, as in Pawlak's (2018) study because the educational culture in China is more different to the one in Spain or Poland -difference between Europe and Asia-.

4. The study

4.1. Participants

69 primary school students (28 male; 41 female) took part in the present study. The participants were all 4th grade students (9/10 year olds) from a school set in the Basque Autonomous Community in Spain in the province of Biscay. All the learners study in a trilingual educational center, being generally Basque or Spanish their L1 and L2 respectively (this is, the learners are Basque/Spanish bilinguals) and at the time of data collection had been learning English as a foreign language for about 4 or 5 years.

The results shown by Zhou (2017), in which female learners report using GLS more frequently than males was also considered in my study, in which the results obtained by male and female learners were separated to analyse if the data collected from males and females still remained changing the target group (this is, focusing on the data obtained from primary school students).

Data on the participants' linguistic background was collected by means of a background questionnaire (Appendix 1). The main characteristics of the participants are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Main characteristics of the participants.

	Male	Female
Number of participants	28	41
Age of participants (mean and sd)	9.5 (0.5)	9.4 (0.5)
Number of participants whose L1 is Spanish	6 (21.4 %)	3 (7.3%)
Number of participants whose L1 is Basque and Spanish	17 (60.7%)	32 (78.1%)
Number of participants whose L1 is Basque and Spanish and other	5 (17.9%)	6 (14.6%)
Age of first exposure to English (mean and sd)	4.2 (1.3)	3.8 (0.8)
Years of exposure to English (mean and sd)	5.3 (1.5)	5.6 (0.9)
English proficiency	Pre A1	Pre A1

The information about the average proficiency level of the students was offered by the center itself. After having given the teachers different choices of placement tests for the students, I was told that none of them were suitable for the needs of the learners. Therefore, after having consulted with the teachers of English, they all agreed that having firsthand information was more straightforward and more effective than using a placement test, since, they argued, they were who better knew the learners-. Therefore, the average level of the pupils is, in the words of the different teachers, **pre A1**.

4.2. Materials

For my study I adapted and translated into Basque and Spanish the GLSI -grammar learning strategy inventory- designed by Pawlak (2018). The positive results obtained in the validation of the tool made it an adequate instrument for the analysis of GLSs. Despite the fact that it was initially designed for university level students with a high level of language (and who are mature and experienced learners), Pawlak suggested that with some pertinent modifications or rephrasing, it could be adapted to younger age and lower-level students (Pawlak, 2018).

The original GLSI questionnaire was formed by 70 questions divided into 4 parts: **Part A** took up eight of the seventy questions which belonged to the metacognitive grammar learning strategies (Q1-Q8). **Part B**, separated into 4 subsections, makes up the bulk of the work with fifty questions corresponding to cognitive strategies. **Part B1** (10 questions, items Q9-Q18) studies the GLS utilised for the support of the ‘production’ and understanding grammar in conversational assignments, **Part B2** (24 questions, items Q19-Q42) focuses on the GLS employed to improve the ‘explicit grammar knowledge’, **Part B3** (10 questions, items Q43-Q52) puts the stress on the GLS applied to improve the ‘implicit grammar knowledge’ and finally, **Part B4** (6 questions, items Q53-Q58) emphasizes on the GLS utilised to cope with ‘corrective feedback’ on the mistakes or inaccuracies in the ‘production of grammar’. **Part C**- includes seven questions of the questionnaire from the category of affective grammar learning strategies (items Q59-Q65). Finally, **Part D**, includes five questions from the social grammar learning strategies category (Q66-Q70) (Pawlak, 2018). Following Pawlak (2018), the responses to each question are classified into 5 frequencies of use from 1 (used very rarely/never) to 5 (very frequently used) (see Appendix 2 for the actual questionnaire used).

4.2.1. Procedure

The linguistic background test was administered in printed version and the students were given 15 to 20 minutes to answer the 9 questions that form the test. Even if at first we developed the background test in English, it was then translated

into Basque and Spanish so that the learners could opt for the option that best met their wishes.

With respect to the GLSI, to the end of making the use of such a tool possible for my study in a primary school center in Spain, and so that each of the points of the questionnaire were clear to all the learners, I translated the 70 questions in the GLSI to both Spanish and Basque (to facilitate the comprehension of the items in the tool, and to let a double choice for the student to decide the language in which he/she feels more comfortable with for the test). Moreover, in some of the listed points of the set of questions I had to add some more examples that made clearer what it was being asked -since, again, the level of understanding of primary school students is far lower than the one of secondary school students, or university level students-. This was done for items Q6, Q7, Q9, Q13, Q18, Q22, Q28, Q36, Q50 and Q65 highlighted in blue in Appendix 2. Moreover, the 70 questions of the questionnaire were randomized to the end of having all the different grammar learning strategies mixed together.

Even if my first idea was to hand in the GLSI questionnaire in a printed version, the data collection appointed dates coincided with the covid-19 pandemic (January-February 2021) so that I had no choice but modify my initial plans and opted instead, with the approval of the teachers and parents, for delivering the GLSI online. For this purpose, we transformed the printed version into Google Forms format. In a similar note, the time proposed by Pawlak (2018) to complete the questionnaire was 20 minutes -approximately-. However, that was meant to be the case for university level students who are supposed to be faster in processing the questions (as well as faster in reading and understanding what they are being asked). Therefore, and following the teachers' recommendations, the amount of time destined to the 'activity' for primary school students was set for one hour.

The participants were instructed to answer the questions individually and honestly.

As for the analysis of the results of the GLSI, we followed Oxford's (1990) analysis in which the reported frequency of each category was classified as follows:

Mean responses ranging from **5.0-3.5: high use**

Mean responses ranging from **3.4-2.5: used sometimes**

Mean responses ranging from **2.4-1.0: rarely used**

5. Results & Discussion

As regards to the results obtained in the use of the GLSI, Table 2 presents the average usage, as well as the standard deviation (SD) of each of the strategies for male and female students by category.

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation obtained for each strategy (mixed both, male and female)

STRATEGIES	Mean	Standard deviation
Metacognitive (A)	3.51	0.69
Cognitive (B)	3.40	0.56
(B1)	3.02	0.62
(B2)	3.05	0.50
(B3)	3.44	0.46
(B4)	4.08	0.65
Affective (C)	3.5	0.71
Social (D)	3.79	0.68

For the purposes of this study we only report on descriptive statistics (we did not carry out any inferential statistical analyses) so our interpretation of the results is limited and needs to be further supported by inferential statistical analyses. As shown in Table 2, the general results seem to indicate that the participants reported using social strategies with the highest frequency, followed by

metacognitive strategies, with affective strategies coming next and cognitive strategies ranking last. The high frequency usage of social strategies may be an indicator that at the primary school stage it may be more effective for teachers to direct the teaching towards a cooperative scenery (this is, making the students involve in the grammar learning process with communication tasks etc. in such a way that the teaching is more 'easy going').

When compared to the data collected in Pawlak's (2018) study -in which there is no differentiation between the results obtained from male and female students-, the results show that primary school learners seem to coincide just in the most frequently used strategies with Pawlak's (2018) university students⁵, with social strategies being the reportedly highest frequency GLS. In terms of the least frequently used strategies, results indicate that university students reported using affective strategies with the least frequency (with a mean of 2.97). In this case, the data obtained from university level students and primary school learners does not match, since the results obtained from primary school students indicates that their least frequently used strategies are cognitive strategies -which ranks in the second position in Pawlak's table-. This may be as a consequence of the age of the target groups. Cognitive strategies involve a deliberate manipulation of the language which, as shown in the data, is not frequent in school-aged children.

It is of great importance to highlight that Zhou (2017) did not distinguish between the four different subcategories for cognitive strategies, since the tool employed in the data collection process was different to the one used by Pawlak (2018) and myself.

In terms of the subdivision for the cognitive category (and considering both, male and female learners), results show that primary school students and university level students majoring in a L2, agree -again- in the most frequently used strategy (this is, B4). However, the results of my study classify the frequency usage for the subdivisions of the cognitive strategies as follows: B4, B3, B2 and B1 (in both cases, in male and female learners). Therefore we can conclude that Pawlak's

⁵ University students in Pawlak's (2018) study reported using social strategies with the highest frequency, with the cognitive strategies coming next, followed by the metacognitive strategies, and with the affective strategies ranking last.

(2018) group of study, and my target group solely agree in the strategy that carries the highest mean.

Table 3: Mean and standard deviation (in parenthesis) obtained for each strategy.

STRATEGIES	Males (n= 28)	Females (n= 41)
Metacognitive (A)	3.48 (0.85)	3.54 (0.56)
Cognitive (B)	3.29 (0.65)	3.47 (0.48)
(B1)	2.89 (0.69)	3.11 (0.56)
(B2)	2.93 (0.63)	3.12 (0.38)
(B3)	3.38 (0.56)	3.49 (0.38)
(B4)	3.94 (0.72)	4.17 (0.59)
Affective (C)	3.40 (0.80)	3.6 (0.63)
Social (D)	3.68 (0.72)	3.86 (0.64)

When gender is taken into account, the results (Table 3) show what could be interesting differences in the group of children. The highest reported mean in both, the male and female groups, was social strategies. However, the males chose metacognitive strategies as the second in frequency while for the females the second most frequent strategy was affective strategies. Moreover, the male students reported affective strategies as the third in frequency, while in the case of the female learners, it was metacognitive strategies the third most frequent strategies. In terms of the lowest reported mean in both, male and female groups, was cognitive strategies.

These results suggest that both, male and female students prefer social strategies (which involve asking questions or interaction with other students/teachers in the TL) over the rest. This learning strategy makes the student take an active role in

the learning process while interacting with classmates or teachers. Therefore, cooperation with others, aiding those who find problems in the learning process, asking the teacher or classmates for help, or practicing grammar structures with other learners, plays a key role in the grammar learning process of these young children. The preference of social strategies may be due to the instruction received in the learning process, where the teachers may have encouraged the children to collaborate with each other or because they may feel more comfortable when using this specific strategy. In terms of the SD, the average in which the individual answers of the male participants separate from the mean is 0.72 (for the male), and 0.64 (for the female). This can be considered as a low deviation, which indicates that the individual responses are close from the mean value.

In contrast to my findings, in which the participants reported a higher use of social strategies, in Zhou's (2017) research, cognitive strategies occupied the leading position of the table for the best used learning strategies. This result may be as a consequence of the differences in the educational culture between China and Spain -data shows that primary school learners seem to be more similar to the adults studied in Pawlak's (2018) study than to the adolescents in Zhou's (2017) study, maybe because Spain and Poland have a more similar educational culture, while the educational culture in China is different (since Chinese learners reported using cognitive strategies with a higher frequency, while Spanish and Polish -European- learners reported using social strategies more frequently).

Moving into the least frequently used strategies, considering the data in Table 2, results show that the frequency in which primary school students use cognitive strategies is the lowest (mean: 3.40), followed by affective strategies (3.5). Moreover, the data in Table 3 shows that both male and female primary school students employ cognitive strategies to a lower degree in comparison to the remaining categories. Still, the mean for cognitive strategies (B), is high (3.29/5 for male, and 3.47/5 for female). This information may indicate that, on average, learners are not used to manipulating the language in the learning process in a 'mechanical' way (this is, repeating grammar structures, imitating what more proficient learners / teachers say, using colours / pictures / drawings to remember the grammar structure...) -in contrast to the other strategies-. Concerning the SD,

there is a variation from the mean value of a 0.65 (in the case of the male students), and a variation of a 0.48 (in the case of female students), which can be understood as a low deviation (and, therefore, it shows that the individual responses are close from the mean value).

All in all, the data obtained when comparing male and female results in this preliminary study seems to indicate that female learners report a higher use of GLS than males. This result supports Zhou (2017)'s findings where female students also reported higher means in all GLS than males. The results of the present study seem to corroborate Zhou's (2017) conclusions (which was that female learners use GLSs more frequently than their male counterparts) and might indicate that this difference between male and female use of GLSs is already active/present by age 9 and 10. This is a finding that would need to be followed up in future studies.

So as to have a clearer idea on the most and least frequently used strategies by primary school students, and following with the analysis proposed by Zhou (2017) in which he differentiates between the 10 best and least used grammar learning items (Q), results in Tables 4,5,6 and 7 hold the data obtained in our study.

Table 4⁶: Most frequently reportedly used items (Male):

ITEM	MEAN	SD	RANK		ITEM	MEAN	SD	RANK
Q44	4.46	1.03	1		Q66	4.27	0.78	6
Q30	4.42	0.64	2		Q45	4.27	0.87	7
Q35	4.40	1.08	3		Q52	4.23	0.82	8
Q69	4.38	0.98	4		Q21	4.23	0.99	9
Q11	4.35	0.75	5		Q25	4.22	0.97	10

The data from the primary school children shows that the highest mean reported in any item by the primary school students was 4.46 (Q44) for the males, and

⁶ The number corresponding to each question is the one resulting from the randomization. See **Appendix 3** to check the corresponding question in the GLSI.

4.65 (Q21) for the females, corresponding both to effective learning strategies. In this respect, it is important to keep in mind that the chart for the 10 most frequently used items for male and female students does not contain the same items. Therefore, in the coming paragraphs I will offer a more detailed explanation of the results shown in Table 3.

Identifying each of the items and matching them with their corresponding category, the result clearly shows that in the set for the highest frequently used -individual- strategies, cognitive strategies are predominant with a total of 8/10 strategies (Q44, Q30, Q35, Q69, Q66, Q52, Q21 and Q25), with the two remaining ones falling in the metacognitive category (Q11 and Q45). Even if cognitive strategies were the least frequently used strategies (as seen in table 3), they are very frequent in the 10 most frequently used strategies by male students. This finding suggests that male primary school students seem to use more often the given items corresponding to cognitive strategies. Among the most frequently used elements we encounter items dealing with corrective feedback in the learning process, which shows that the young learners frequently learn from the errors or from the corrections. This aspect may mean that the learners are willing to master the grammar structure in question learning from their mistakes.

Putting the emphasis on the mean for each of the ten most frequently used items, results clearly show that the male primary school students reported a high frequency usage in the given items, being Q25 the one ranking last with 4.22/5. Considering that the mean for Q25 is relatively high being the least frequently used one, we can conclude that the students very often use those items. In terms of the SD, Q21, Q25 and Q69 lie aside from the mean (with a 0.99, 0.97 and 0.98 respectively), being the case that Q35 (1.08) and Q44 (1.03) overcome variation of '1' from the mean value (which can be understood as a high deviation). This high deviation indicates that the individual responses provided by the learners were, to some extent, separated from the mean (and therefore, portrays a difference between the students).

In light of the data collected in Zhou's (2017) research, the classification for the 10 most frequently used items, which is not divided by gender, shows that just three of the items (Q33, Q6 & Q24) obtain a higher mean than 3.5 (being three of

the most frequently used elements), and they present a high standard deviation (0.97, 0.98 and 1.03 respectively). This high mean indicates that the students often use the given strategies, but that the individual answers provided by the learners differ (this is, it shows a difference between the students).

The data in Table 5 clearly shows that, as seen in the case of male students, there is a predominance of cognitive strategies with 8 out of the total 10 selected items (Q21, Q44, Q69, Q14, Q25, Q34, Q38 and Q30). Out of the two remaining items, one falls in the metacognitive category (Q11), and the other one in the social strategies (Q37).

Table 5: Most frequently reportedly used items (Female):

ITEM	MEAN	SD	RANK		ITEM	MEAN	SD	RANK
Q21	4.65	0.53	1		Q25	4.40	1.01	6
Q44	4.64	0.62	2		Q34	4.35	0.70	7
Q69	4.62	0.58	3		Q38	4.33	0.85	8
Q11	4.62	0.70	4		Q30	4.29	0.77	9
Q14	4.40	0.89	5		Q37	4.24	0.88	10

Obtaining a high mean in all the 10 cases, being Q37 the one ranking last with an average of 4.24/5, results show that the reported best-liked items by female students are very often used. Focusing on the SD, the data presents a low deviation overall. Q14, with a variation of 0.89, steps away from the mean (but it can not be still considered a high deviation), while Q25 -with a variance from the mean of a 1.01-, is the only one which is really separated from the mean value. This high deviation suggests that in Q25, the answers provided by the learners differ.

Table 6: Least frequently reportedly used items (Male):

ITEM	MEAN	SD	RANK		ITEM	MEAN	SD	RANK
Q13	1.24	0.93	1		Q67	1.58	1.10	6
Q70	1.38	1.13	2		Q39	1.60	1.19	7
Q6	1.42	0.90	3		Q59	1.60	1.29	8
Q10	1.56	1.05	4		Q50	2.00	1.70	9
Q22	1.56	1.37	5		Q54	2.08	1.29	10

The data collected in Table 6, in turn, offers the results for the least frequently reportedly used items by male students. Evaluating the data under the same criterion, in this table the listed elements appear classified from ‘1’ -least used-, to ‘10’ -better used-.

A tentative comparison of the results from the present study to those reported in Zhou’s (2017) research it seems to be the case that for male and female primary school students it is cognitive strategies the rarely used ones -accumulating a total of 7 out of the 10 items of the table-. This may indicate that primary school learners and high school students differ in the category for the least frequently used strategies. The low frequency usage of cognitive strategies shown in the table indicates that the children are not used to learning grammar in a conscious and mechanical way (even if in some of the cases, cognitive strategies also ranked high in the frequency usage).

Matching the questions with their corresponding category, the collected data shows -as it happened with the most frequently used strategies- that there is a predominance of cognitive strategies, accumulating a total of 7/10 items. From the remaining three questions, Q39 corresponds to metacognitive strategies, and Q70 and Q22 belong to social strategies. Since cognitive strategies are divided into four subdivisions, and given the fact that it is cognitive strategies the ones that complete the vast part of the GLSI (50 out of the 70 questions), they are present among the most frequently used strategies, as well as within the least frequently

used ones. Therefore, it is expectable to find cognitive strategies among the best and least used items.

With respect to the mean of the ten least used items (Table 6), results show that in the given cases the average use of the corresponding strategies is very low. Q54, with the highest average on the table, holds a mean value of 2.08 -which indicates a low use of the item-. Regarding the SD, results present a high deviation overall. With 8 out of the 10 listed items exceeding the variation of ‘1’ from the mean value (Q70, Q10, Q22, Q67, Q39, Q59, Q50 and Q54), and the remaining two elements coming close to the ‘1’ with a 0.93 for Q13, and 0.90 for Q6, we can conclude that the individual answers provided by the learners were far from the mean value (which indicates that the responses obtained from the learners differ in a large extent).

Table 7: Least frequently reportedly used items (Female):

ITEM	MEAN	SD	RANK		ITEM	MEAN	SD	RANK
Q13 & Q70	1.07	0'46	1		Q10	1.43	1'19	6
Q59	1.10	0'43	2		Q6	1.83	1'45	7
Q39	1.14	0'68	3		Q24	2.31	1'57	8
Q22	1.19	0'77	4		Q55	2.43	1'20	9
Q50	1.36	1'03	5		Q60	2.5	1'58	10

Grouping together the questions with their corresponding category, the results show that cognitive strategies hold 7 out of the 10 items on the table. The remaining three elements belong to metacognitive strategies (Q39), and social strategies (Q70 and Q22).

Evaluating the mean use for each of the cases, the data presents a low use of the given components. Q60, with an average use of 2.5, takes the leading position holding the highest mean of the table. This information indicates that female learners hardly ever use the items in table 7. As for the SD, Q50, Q10, Q6, Q24, Q55 and Q60 exceed the variation of ‘1’ from the mean value -indicating that the answers provided by the learners are far from the mean, showing that the

individual responses differ-. However, the remaining elements present a low deviation -which manifests that the answers gather close from the mean value-.

All in all, the research has shown that primary school students reported using social strategies with the highest frequency. This indicates, as previously seen, that primary school learners prefer cooperating with others, aiding those who find problems in the learning process, asking the teacher or classmates for help, or practicing grammar structures with other students in the learning process.

To conclude, while hypothesis 1 (“School-age child learners of English as a foreign language will report the same frequency of use of the strategies as described in Zhou’s (2017) study, since the learners of both groups are closer in age -in comparison to university students-”) was tested wrong, hypothesis 2 (“School-age child learners of English as a foreign language will report social strategies as the most frequently used strategies, as in Pawlak’s (2018) study because the educational culture in China is more different to the one in Spain or Poland -difference between Europe and Asia-”) was proved right. In the first of the cases, school-aged learners had reported using social strategies with the highest frequency, while the data in Zhou’s (2017) study showed that high-school learners reported using cognitive strategies with the highest frequency. In light of the findings, hypothesis 1 was tested wrong. The different educational culture in China -when compared to Spain- may have influenced that Spanish primary school learners reported using social strategies with a higher frequency, while Chinese high school learners opted, instead, for cognitive strategies. Focusing on the second of the hypotheses, hypothesis 2 was tested right since school-aged children reported using social strategies with a higher frequency -as shown in Pawlak’s (2018) study-.

6. Conclusion

The results shown in Table 2 of the present study indicate that the school-aged learners reported using social strategies with the highest frequency. This more frequent usage of the social strategies may be as a consequence of the Spanish

educational culture, in which the teachers seem to direct the teaching towards a cooperative scenery. This aspect was also highlighted by the students in Pawlak (2018), which may indicate that the European educational culture is more directed towards the cooperative learning scenery. However, this will have to be further investigated in future studies.

Moreover, the results of the research presented in this study suggest that the frequency usage of GLSs by female students is higher with respect to their male counterparts. This aspect, which had also been portrayed in Zhou's (2017) study, shows that female learners are reportedly more effective users of GLSs -with respect to the males-.

The results obtained in the present paper have contributed to the field of GLS providing data from an unresearched group, and have been helpful to know about the GLSs employed by school-aged children. However, this will have to be further investigated in similar studies with similar object of studies so as to have a more complete perception of the GLS usage of primary school learners. This study can, therefore, serve as a basis for future discussion on the topic with this given group of learners.

7. References

- Chamot, A. (2001). The role of learning strategies in second language acquisition. In M. Breen, *Learner Contributions to Language Learning: New Directions in Research* (pp. 25-26). New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, A., & Pinilla-Herrera, A. (2010). Communicating Grammatically: Constructing a Learner Strategies Website for Spanish. In *A New Look at Language Teaching and Testing: English as Subject and Vehicle* (p. 66). Retrieved from https://carla.umn.edu/about/profiles/CohenPapers/communicating_grammatically.pdf

- Cohen, A., Pinilla-Herrera, A., Thompson, J., & Witzig, L. (2009). Communicating Grammatically: Evaluating a Learner Strategy Website for Spanish Grammar. *CALICO Journal*, (p.146). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292720640_Communicating_grammatically_Constructing_a_learner_strategies_website_for_Spanish
- Kellem, K., & Halvorsen, A. (2018). *Understanding and Utilizing FormFocused Instruction in the Language Classroom* [PDF] (p. 28). Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1180080.pdf>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1995). On the Teaching and Learning of Grammar: Challenging the Myths. In F. Eckman, D. Highland, P. Lee, J. Mileham & R. Rutkowski Weber, *Second Language Acquisition Theory and Pedagogy* (p. 135). New York: Routledge.
- Lee, K., & Oxford, R. (2008). Understanding EFL Learners' Strategy Use and Strategy Awareness. *The Asian EFL Journal*, (1). Retrieved from https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/March_2008_EBook.pdf
- O'Malley, M., & Uhl Chamot, A. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition* (4th ed., p. 88). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1986). *Second Language Learning Strategies: Current Research and Implications for Practice* [PDF] (p. 5). California. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED278273.pdf>
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston.
- Oxford, R. (1996). *Employing a Questionnaire to Assess the Use of Language Learning Strategies* [PDF]. Lidia Woytak. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.469.351&rep=rep1&type=pdf#page=28>
- Oxford, R. (1999). Relationships between Second Language Learning Strategies and Language Proficiency in the Context of Learner Autonomy and self-regulation. *Revista Canaria De Estudios Ingleses*, (38), 114.
- Oxford, R., Lee, R. L., & Park, G. (2007). L2 grammar strategies: The Second Cinderella and beyond. In A. D. Cohen & E. Macaro, *Language learner strategies: Thirty years of research and practice* (pp. 117-139). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Oxford, R. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context*. (2nd ed., p. preface XV). New York: Routledge.
- Oxford, R. (2018). Language Learning Strategies. In A. Burns & J. Richards, *The Cambridge Guide to Learning English as a Second Language* (pp. 81-82). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pawlak, M. (2009). *Grammar Learning Strategies and Language Attainment: Seeking a Relationship* [PDF] (pp. 44-45). Kalisz. Retrieved from <https://dspace.uni.lodz.pl/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11089/9557/v10015-009-0004-7.pdf;jsessionid=DBA1EC51E315314622AE32742A86DEB0?sequence=1>
- Pawlak, M. (2013). *Researching grammar learning strategies: Combining the macro- and microperspective* [PDF]. Kalisz. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/225149863.pdf>
- Pawlak, M. (2018). *Grammar Learning Strategy Inventory (GLSI): Another look* [PDF]. Kalisz. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326152286_Grammar_Learning_Strategy_Inventory_GLSI_Another_look
- Pawlak, M. (2019). *Grammar learning strategies as a key to mastering second language grammar: A research agenda* [Ebook]. Konin. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335610388_Grammar_learning_strategies_as_a_key_to_mastering_second_language_grammar_A_research_agenda
- Stavre, B., & Pashko, A. (2016). *Introducing Grammar Learning Strategies in A2 and B1 classes of English as a foreign language: an Albanian case study* [PDF] (p. 445). Prague. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309091496_INTRODUCING_GRAMMAR_LEARNING_STRATEGIES_IN_A2_AND_B1_CLASSES_OF_ENGLISH_AS_A_FOREIGN_LANGUAGE_AN_ALBANIAN_CASE_STUDY
- Zhou, Z. (2017). *The Investigation of the English Grammar Learning Strategy of High School Students in China* [Ebook]. Nanchang. Retrieved from <http://www.academypublication.com/issues2/tpls/vol07/12/11.pdf>

Appendix

Appendix 1:

Linguistic background test⁷:

- 1) **Zein da zure jaiotza data?** (Which is your birthday?)
- 2) **Zein da/dira zure ama hizkuntza(K) -etxean zure gurasoekin ikasitakoa(K)?** (Which is/are your mother tongue/s?)
- 3) **Zenbat hizkuntza hitzegiten dituzu? Zein/Zeintzuk da/dira eta noiz ikasi zenuen/zenituen?** (How many languages do you speak? Which are they and when did you learn them?)
- 4) **Zenbat urterekin hasi zinen ingelesa ikasten?** (How old were you when you started learning English?)
- 5) **Ingelesezko eskolaz kanpoko klaseetara joaten zara? Erantzuna baietz izanez gero, noiztik (noiz hasi zinen)? Astean zenbat ordu?** (Do you attend English extracurricular lessons? If so, when did you start? How many hours per week?)
- 6) **Ingelesezko udaleku edo kanpamenturen batera joan al zara inoiz? Erantzuna baietz izanez gero, noiz? Zenbat urteetan zehar?** (Have you ever attended an English summer camp? If so, when was it?)
- 7) **Telebista ingelesez ikusteko aukera izanez gero, ingelesez ikusten al duzu -subtituluekin, errazago jarraitzeko, eta ahalik eta gehiago ulertzeko-?**

⁷ The linguistic background test was handed in in Basque.

Erantzuna baietz izanez gero, ze maiztasunekin? (Do you watch television or Youtube in English -with or without subtitles-? If so, how frequently?)

8) **Musika ingelesez entzuten al duzu? Erantzuna baietz izanez gero, letra errepikatzen saiatzen zara? Ze maiztasunekin?** (Do you listen to music in English? If so, do you try to imitate the lyrics? How frequently?)

9) **Ingeleseko klase orduan zure taldekideekin ingelesez hitzegiten al duzu?** (In class, do you speak in English with your teacher and classmates?)

Appendix 2:

GLSI Questionnaire (translated and adapted version)

Part A - Metacognitive GLS

1.	Klasera joan aurretik, ikasgelan landuko ditugun gramatika atalak errepasatu egiten ditut. I preview the grammar structures to be covered in a lesson.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Irakurtzen edo entzuten nagoenean, momentuan lantzen ari garen gramatika atalei arreta jartzen diet. I pay attention to grammar structures when reading and listening.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Gramatika atal ezberdinak lantzeko, esaldi ezberdinak erabiltzen saiatzen naiz. I look for opportunities to practice grammar structures in many different ways.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Gramatika ikasteko niretzat eraginkorrek diren moduak bilatzen saiatzen naiz. I try to find more effective ways of learning grammar.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Gramatika aldetik ondo eta gaizkiago menperatzen ditudan puntuak ezagutzen ditut. I know my strengths and weaknesses when it comes to grammar.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Gramatika helburu ezberdinekin ikasten dut (hobeto hitzegiteko, hobeto ulertzeko...).	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Gramatika errebasoak antolatzen ditut aldez aurretik (atal edo puntu gramatikalak aldez aurretik birpasatzen ditut).	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Gramatikari arreta jartzen diot ingeleses hitz egiten edo idazten dudanean. I pay attention to grammar structures in my own speaking and writing.	1	2	3	4	5

Part B - Cognitive strategies

Part B1 - GLS used to assist the production and comprehension of grammar in communication tasks.

9.	<p>Hitzegiterakoan, momentuan ikasten ari garen gramatika erabiltzen saiatzen naiz (Adibidez, istorio bat kontatzen nagoela, iragana erabiltzen dut).</p> <p>I try to use specific grammar structures in communication (e.g. telling a story).</p>	1	2	3	4	5
10.	<p>Telebista ingeleses ikusi, eta ingeleses irakurtzen dut gustatzen zaidalako, eta gramatika atalak hobetzeko laguntzen didalako.</p> <p>I read for pleasure and watch television to improve my knowledge of grammar</p>	1	2	3	4	5
11.	<p>Esanahi aldetik, edo komunikazioan arazoak sortu dizkidaten atal gramatikalak gogoratzen ditut.</p> <p>I notice (or remember) structures that cause me problems with meaning or communication.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
12.	<p>Testu batean sarri (askotan) errepikatzen diren gramatika atalak gogoratzen ditut (edo atal horiek errepikatu direla konturatzen naiz).</p> <p>I notice (or remember) structures that are repeated often in the text.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
13.	<p>Testu batean azpimarratuta, negritaz, edo kurtsiban agertzen diren gramatika atalak gogoratzen ditut (edo atal horiek errepikatu direla konturatzen naiz). Adibidez: <i>Egun polit bat: "A beautiful day"</i> -<u>Adjektiboa + izena</u>-</p> <p>I notice (or remember) structures that are highlighted in a text by italics, boldface, underlining, etc.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
14.	<p>Intonazio edo errepikamenen bidez hitz egiterako orduan nabarmentzen diren gramatika atalak gogoratzen ditut (edo atal horiek errepikatu direla konturatzen naiz).</p> <p>I notice (or remember) structures that are emphasized orally through pitch, repetition, etc.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
15.	<p>Denbora gutxian sarri errepikatzen diren egiturei arreta jartzen diet. Adibidez: lehenaldiaren erabilera iraganean gertaturiko gertaerei buruz hitzegiteko.</p> <p>I notice structures that are repeated extremely frequently in a short</p>	1	2	3	4	5

	period of time (e.g. the past tense in a series of stories over the course of a few lessons).					
16.	Ni baino ingeles maila altuagoa duten pertsonen azalpen, edo gauzak esateko erari arreta jartzen diet, eta gero horiek imitatzen saiatzen naiz. I pay attention to how more proficient people say things and then imitate.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Nire hitz egiteko edota idazteko era, ni baino maila altuagoa duten klasekideekin konparatzen dut nire maila hobetzeko helburuarekin. I compare my speech and writing with that of more proficient people to see how I can improve.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Zalantzarik izanez gero, interneten kontsultatzen dut/ditut arazoak sortzen dizkidan/dizkidaten gramatika atala(k). Adibidez: <u>a/an</u> artikuluen erabilera: A pencil // An apple). I use Google or other search engines to see how a specific grammar structure is used in meaningful contexts.	1	2	3	4	5

Part B2 - GLS used to develop explicit knowledge of grammar.

19.	Irakasleak azaltzen dituen araei, eta liburuan agertzen diren horiei arreta handia jartzen diet. I pay attention to rules provided by the teacher or coursebook.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Arau gramatikal guztiak ulertzen saiatzen naiz. I try to understand every grammar rule.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Sarri erabiltzen diren gramatika atalen arauak buruz ikasten ditut. Adibidez: Orinaldia. I memorize rules about frequently used linguistic forms/structures (e.g. formation and use of the passive).	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Egitura gramatikalak formaz aldatzeko bete beharreko arauak buruz ikasten ditut. Adibidez: Adjektibo batetik aditzondo batera pasatzeko: easy (erraza) -adjective- / easily (errez) - adverb-). I memorize rules about how structures change their form (e.g. form an adjective to an adverb).	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Ikasitako gramatika atalak errez ikusteko moduan azpimarratzen ditut. Adibidez: koloreekin, azpimarratuz...	1	2	3	4	5

	I mark new grammar structures graphically (e.g. colors, underlining).					
24.	Azaltzen dizkidaten arau gramatikalak nire hitzetan jartzen ditut, horrela errazago ulertzen ditudalako. I paraphrase the rules I am given because I understand them better in my own words.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Taulak, marrazkiak etab. egiten ditut arau gramatikalak adierazteko. I make charts, diagrams or drawings to illustrate grammar rules.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Informazio gramatikala agertzen den fitxa edo liburu orrialdeari esker gogoratzen dut. I remember grammar information by location on a page in a book.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Abesti edo errima ezberdinak erabiltzen ditut arau gramatikal berriak gogoratzeko. I use rhymes or songs to remember new grammar rules.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Ikasten ditudan gramatika atal berriak fisikoki irudikatzen ditut. Adibidez: marrazkien bidez. I physically act out new grammar structures.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Koaderno / txartel / folioak erabiltzen ditut arau berriak eta adibideak idazteko. I use a notebook/note cards for new rules and examples.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Egitura gramatikalak leku berdinean taldekatzen ditut, horrela hobeto gogoratzeko. I group grammar structures to remember them better (verbs followed by gerund and infinitive).	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Gramatika gaiak birpasatzen ditut, arauak hobeto gogoratzeko. I review grammar lessons to remember the rules better.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	Klaseko liburuan agertzen diren gramatika atalak birpasatzen ditut egitura bakoitza hobeto erabiltzen ikasteko. I use grammar reference books, grammar sections of coursebooks or grammatical information in dictionaries.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Nire ama hizkuntza, edo menperatzen ditudan beste hizkuntza batzuk erabiltzen ditut gramatika egiturak hobeto ulertu eta gogoratzeko.	1	2	3	4	5

	I use my mother tongue or other languages I know to understand and remember grammar rules.					
34.	Adibideak aztertzen saiatzen naiz, horrela arau gramatikalak hobeto ulertzeko (edo nola erabiltzen diren hobeto ulertzeko). I try to discover grammar rules by analyzing examples.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	Egitura gramatikal ezberdinen funtzionamentuari buruzko teoriak sortzen ditut, eta gero frogatu egiten ditut zuzenak diren ikusteko. I create my own hypotheses about how structures work and check these hypotheses	1	2	3	4	5
36.	Baliabide elektronikoak (ordenagailua, telefonoa...) erabiltzen ditut arauak hobeto ulertzeko, edo arau berriak ikasteko. I use electronic resources (e.g. English websites, corpora) to figure out rules.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Nire klasekideekin lan egiten dut -klase ordutik kanpo- klasean irakaslearekin landutako testuak birpasatzeko, eta horrela gramatika atala(k) ere berrikusteko. I work with others to reconstruct texts read by the teacher which contain many examples of a particular structure.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Taulak, marrazkiak... aztertzen ditut gramatika hobeto ulertzeko. I analyze diagrams, graphs and tables to understand grammar.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	Nire klasekideekin arau gramatikalak ulertu eta aztertzeko lan egiten dut. I work with others to discover grammar rules.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	Konturatu egiten naiz gramatika atal bat gaizki erabiltzen dudanean, eta irakasleak zuzendu, edo erantzun zuzenera heltzeko laguntzen didanean. Gero, gaizki egitera eraman nauten arrazoiei buruz pentsatzen dut. I notice when the teacher leads me into overgeneralization error (e.g. saying broken) and then I think about what went wrong.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	Adierazpen edo esaera zehatzak dituzten esaldiak buruz ikasten ditut. I memorize whole phrases containing specific language forms.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	Hitz zehatz bat zein kategoria gramatikalekoa den ziur ez nagoenean, hitz horren kategoria, forma eta testuingurua, kontuan hartzen ditut. When I do not know the part of speech, I consider such clues as	1	2	3	4	5

form, meaning and context.					
----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Part B3 - GLS used to develop implicit knowledge of grammar.

43.	Buruz ikasteko helburuarekin, arauak eta adibideak behin eta berriro nire buruari errepikatzen dizkiot. I repeat the rules and examples to myself or rewrite them many times.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	Gramatika praktikatzeko, ariketa asko egiten ditut. I do many exercises to practice grammar (e.g. paraphrasing, translation, multiple-choice).	1	2	3	4	5
45.	Ikasitako arau berriak esaldi zehatzetan erabiltzen saiatzen naiz. I try to apply new rules carefully and accurately in specific sentences (e.g. to complete a gap).	1	2	3	4	5
46.	Ikasi berri ditudan arauak, esaldi berriak sortzeko erabiltzen ditut. I use newly learnt rules to create new sentences (to write about my plans).	1	2	3	4	5
47.	Ikasitako arau gramatikalak ahalik eta arinen erabiltzen saiatzen naiz (hitz egiterakoan, edo idazterakoan). I try to use grammar rules as soon as possible in a meaningful context (e.g. use them in my speech and writing).	1	2	3	4	5
48.	Ingelesa ikasterakoan, egitura zehatzak dituzten esaldiak erabiltzen saiatzen naiz. I try to use whole phrases containing specific structures in my speech.	1	2	3	4	5
49.	Arreta deitu didan / dizkidan egitura(k) gogoratzen ditut, eta azpimarratu/koloreztatu egiten dut/ditut. I notice (or remember) a structure which, when I encounter it, causes me to do something, like check a box, choose a drawing or underline a structure.	1	2	3	4	5
50.	Atzerriko hizkuntzaren (kasu honetan inglesaren) arau gramatikalak egoki erabiltzen saiatzen naiz hitz egiterakoan, eta idazterakoan. I try to adjust the way I process spoken and written language in accordance with L2 spoken and written rules (e.g. in the case of some passive voice sentences).	1	2	3	4	5

51.	Egitura edo atal gramatikal zehatz baten adibide asko dituen testuak irakurtzen ditut. I listen to and read texts containing many examples of a grammar structure.	1	2	3	4	5
52.	Idatzi edo hitz egiterako orduan gramatika egoki erabiltzeko era nire gramatika erabiltzeko erarekin konparatzen dut. I compare the way grammar is used in written and spoken language with how I use it.	1	2	3	4	5

Part B4 - GLS used to deal with corrective feedback on errors in the production of grammar.

53.	Gramatika erabiltzeko dudan erari buruz, irakaslearen azalpenak eta zuzenketak arretaz entzuten ditut. I listen carefully for any feedback the teacher gives me about the structures I use.	1	2	3	4	5
54.	Gramatika ariketetan irakasleak egiten dizkidan zuzenketei arreta jartzen diet, eta erantzun zuzena errepikatzen saiatzen naiz. I pay attention to teacher correction when I do grammar exercises and try to repeat the correct version.	1	2	3	4	5
55.	Gramatika ariketak egiten nagoela, nire akatsak identifikatu eta zuzentzen saiatzen naiz. I try to notice and self-correct my mistakes when practicing grammar.	1	2	3	4	5
56.	Erabili beharreko gramatika atal egokiari buruz zalantzarik izanez gero, irakaslearekin hitz egiten dut erantzun zuzenera heltzeko helburuarekin. I try to negotiate grammar forms with the teacher when give a clue (e.g. a comment about the rule).	1	2	3	4	5
57.	Klasean nire gramatika zuzentzen didatenean konturatu egiten naiz. I notice when I am corrected on grammar in spontaneous communication (e.g. when giving opinions)	1	2	3	4	5
58.	Nik erabilitako bertsioa, eta bertsio zuzenaren arteko ezbertintasunei arreta jartzen diet, hobetu eta ikasteko helburuarekin. I try to notice how the correct version differs from my own and improve what I said.	1	2	3	4	5

Part C - Affective GLS.

59.	Gramatika atalen bat ikasteko arazoak izanez gero, lasaitzen saiatzen naiz. I try to relax when I have problems with understanding or using grammar structures.	1	2	3	4	5
60.	Arazoak sortzen dizkidaten atal gramatikalak errepasatzeko nire burua animatu egiten dut. I encourage myself to practice grammar when I know I have problems with a structure.	1	2	3	4	5
61.	Nahiz eta egitura gramatikal baten erabilera zuzena zein den ziur ez egon, erabiltzen saiatzen naiz. I try to use grammar structures even when I am not sure they are correct.	1	2	3	4	5
62.	Gramatika ariketak ondo egiten ditudan bakoitzean, nire burua zoriondu eta saritu egiten dut. I give myself a reward when I do well on a grammar test.	1	2	3	4	5
63.	Ikasterako orduan, edo gramatika egitura ezberdinak erabiltzerako orduan urduri nagoenean igerri egiten dut. I notice when I feel tense or nervous when studying or using grammar structures.	1	2	3	4	5
64.	Jendearekin, gramatika ikasteari buruz nola sentitzen naizen hitz egiten dut. I talk to other people about how I feel when learning grammar.	1	2	3	4	5
65.	Gramatika ikasteko daramaten prosezuari buruz idatzi egiten dut (koaderno, eguneroko... batean). I keep a language learning diary where I include comments about language learning.	1	2	3	4	5

Part D - Social GLS

66.	Zerbait ulertzen ez badut, irakasleari errepikatzeko eskatzen diot.	1	2	3	4	5
------------	---	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

	I ask the teacher to repeat or explain a grammar point if I do not understand.					
67.	Nire klasekideei, edo irakasleei laguntza eskatzen diet gramatika hobeto ulertzeko. I ask the teacher or more proficient learners to help me with grammar structures.	1	2	3	4	5
68.	Akatsen bat eginez gero, norbaitek zuzentzea gustatzen zait. I like to be corrected when I make mistakes using grammar structures.	1	2	3	4	5
69.	Gramatika nire klasekideekin birpasatu egiten dut. I practice grammar structures with other students.	1	2	3	4	5
70.	Gramatika ulertu edo erabiltzerako orduan arazoak ditueni laguntzen saiatzen naiz. I try to help others when they have problems with understanding or using grammar.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix 3:

Items from the GLSI in random order:

1. 45. Ikasitako arau berriak esaldi zehatzetan erabiltzen saiatzen naiz.
2. 63. Ikasterako orduan, edo gramatika egitura ezberdinak erabiltzerako orduan urduri nagoenean igerri egiten dut.
3. 4. Gramatika ikasteko niretzat eraginkorrak diren moduak bilatzen saiatzen naiz.
4. 26. Informazio gramatikala agertzen den fitxa edo liburu orrialdeari esker gogoratzen dut.
5. 39. Nire klasekideekin arau gramatikalak ulertu eta aztertzeke lan egiten dut.
6. 11. Esanahi aldetik, edo komunikazioan arazoak sortu dizkidaten atal gramatikalak gogoratzen ditut.
7. 46. Ikasi berri ditudan arauak, esaldi berriak sortzeke erabiltzen ditut.
8. 33. Nire ama hizkuntza, edo menperatzen ditudan beste hizkuntza batzuk erabiltzen ditut gramatika egiturak hobeto ulertu eta gogoratzeko.
9. 67. Nire klasekideei, edo irakasleei laguntza eskatzen diet gramatika hobeto ulertzeko.
10. 35. Egitura gramatikal ezberdinen funtzionamentuari buruzko teoriak sortzen ditut, eta gero frogatu egiten ditut zuzenak diren ikusteko.
11. 53. Gramatika erabiltzeke dudana erari buruz, irakaslearen azalpenak eta zuzenketak arretaz entzuten ditut.
12. 25. Taulak, marrazkiak etab. egiten ditut arau gramatikalak adierazteke.
13. 13. Testu batean azpimarratuta, negritaz, edo kurtsiban agertzen diren gramatika atalak gogoratzen ditut (edo atal horiek errepikatu direla konturatzen naiz). Adibidez: Egun polit bat: “A beautiful day” -Adjektiboa + izena-

14. 29. Koaderno / txartel / folioak erabiltzen ditut arau berriak eta adibideak idazteko.
15. 52. Idatzi edo hitz egiterako orduan gramatika egoki erabiltzeko era nire gramatika erabiltzeko erarekin konparatzen dut.
16. 27. Abesti edo errima ezberdinak erabiltzen ditut arau gramatikal berriak gogoratzeko.
17. 58. Nik erabilitako bertsoa, eta bertso zuzenaren arteko ezbertintasunei arreta jartzen diet, hobetu eta ikasteko helburuarekin.
18. 8. Gramatikari arreta jartzen diot ingeleses hitz egiten edo idazten dudanean.
19. 66. Zerbait ulertzen ez badut, irakasleari errepikatzeko eskatzen diot.
20. 14. Intonazio edo errepikameneren bidez hitz egiterako orduan nabarmentzen diren gramatika atalak gogoratzen ditut (edo atal horiek errepikatu direla konturatzen naiz).
21. 50. Atzerriko hizkuntzaren (kasu honetan ingelesaren) arau gramatikalak egoki erabiltzen saiatzen naiz hitz egiterakoan, eta idazterakoan.
22. 42. Hitz zehatz bat zein kategoriatan gramatikalekoa den ziur ez nagoenean, hitz horren kategoriatan, forma eta testuingurua, kontuan hartzen ditut.
23. 64. Jendearekin, gramatika ikasteari buruz nola sentitzen naizen hitz egiten dut.
24. 49. Arreta deitu didan / dizkidan egitura(k) gogoratzen ditut, eta azpimarratu/koloreztatu egiten dut/ditut.
25. 57. Klasean nire gramatika zuzentzen didatenean konturatu egiten naiz.
26. 32. Klaseko liburuan agertzen diren gramatika atalak birpasatzen ditut egitura bakoitza hobeto erabiltzen ikasteko.
27. 65. Gramatika ikasteko daramaten prozesuari buruz idatzi egiten dut (koaderno, eguneroko... batean).
28. 23. Ikasitako gramatika atalak errez ikusteko moduan azpimarratzen ditut. Adibidez: koloreekin, azpimarratuz...
29. 12. Testu batean sarri (askotan) errepikatzen diren gramatika atalak gogoratzen ditut (edo atal horiek errepikatu direla konturatzen naiz).
30. 56. Erabili beharreko gramatika atal egokiari buruz zalantzarik izanez gero, irakaslearekin hitz egiten dut erantzun zuzenera heltzeko helburuarekin.

31. 69. Gramatika nire klasekideekin birpasatu egiten dut.
32. 34. Adibideak aztertzen saiatzen naiz, horrela arau gramatikalak hobeto ulertzeko (edo nola erabiltzen diren hobeto ulertzeko).
33. 38. Taulak, marrazkiak... aztertzen ditut gramatika hobeto ulertzeko.
34. 2. Irakurtzen edo entzuten nagoenean, momentuan lantzen ari garen gramatika atalei arreta jartzen diet.
35. 68. Akatsen bat eginez gero, norbaitek zuzentzea gustatzen zait.
36. 55. Gramatika ariketak egiten nagoela, nire akatsak identifikatu eta zuzentzen saiatzen naiz.
37. 21. Sarri erabiltzen diren gramatika atalen arauak buruz ikasten ditut. Adibidez: Orainaldia.
38. 54. Gramatika ariketetan irakasleak egiten dizkidan zuzenketei arreta jartzen diet, eta erantzun zuzena errepikatzen saiatzen naiz.
39. 30. Egitura gramatikalak leku berdin batean taldekatzen ditut, horrela hobeto gogoratzeko.
40. 16. Ni baino ingeles maila altuagaoa duten pertsonen azalpen, edo gauzak esateko erari arreta jartzen diet, eta gero horiek imitatzen saiatzen naiz.
41. 44. Gramatika praktikatzeko, ariketa asko egiten ditut.
42. 24. Azaltzen dizkidan arau gramatikalak nire hitzetan jartzen ditut, horrela errazago ulertzen ditudalako.
43. 7. Gramatika errebasoak antolatzen ditut alde aurretik (atal edo puntu gramatikalak alde aurretik birpasatzen ditut).
44. 41. Adierazpen edo esaera zehatzak dituzten esaldiak buruz ikasten ditut.
45. 43. Buruz ikasteko helburuarekin, arauak eta adibideak behin eta berriro nire buruari errepikatzen dizkiot.
46. 59. Gramatika atalen bat ikasteko arazoak izanez gero, lasaitzen saiatzen naiz.
47. 28. Ikasten ditudan gramatika atal berriak fisikoki irudikatzen ditut. Adibidez: marrazkien bidez.
48. 47. Ikasitako arau gramatikalak ahalik eta arinen erabiltzen saiatzen naiz (hitz egiterakoan, edo idazterakoan).
49. 62. Gramatika ariketak ondo egiten ditudan bakoitzean, nire burua zoriondu eta saritu egiten dut.

50. 20. Arau gramatikal guztiak ulertzen saiatzen naiz.
51. 9. Hitzegiterakoan, momentuan ikasten ari garen gramatika erabiltzen saiatzen naiz (Adibidez, istorio bat kontatzen nagoela, iragana erabiltzen dut).
52. 5. Gramatika aldetik ondo eta gaizkiago menperatzen ditudan puntuak ezagutzen ditut.
53. 48. Ingelesa ikasterakoan, egitura zehatzak dituzten esaldiak erabiltzen saiatzen naiz.
54. 18. Zalantzarik izanez gero, interneten kontsultatzen dut/ditut arazoak sortzen dizkidan/dizkidaten gramatika atala(k). Adibidez: a/an artikuluen erabilera: A pencil // An apple).
55. 10. Telebista ingeles ikusi, eta ingeles irakurtzen dut gustatzen zaidalako, eta gramatika atalak hobetzeko laguntzen didalako.
56. 60. Arazoak sortzen dizkidaten atal gramatikalak erreparatzeko nire burua animatu egiten dut.
57. 6. Gramatika helburu ezberdinekin ikasten dut (hobeto hitzegiteko, hobeto ulertzeko...).
58. 40. Konturatu egiten naiz gramatika atal bat gaizki erabiltzen dudanean, eta irakasleak zuzendu, edo erantzun zuzenera heltzeko laguntzen didanean. Gero, gaizki egitera eramanez nauten arrazoiei buruz pentsatzen dut.
59. 51. Egitura edo atal gramatikal zehatz baten adibide asko dituen testuak irakurtzen ditut.
60. 3. Gramatika atal ezberdinak lantzeko, esaldi ezberdinak erabiltzen saiatzen naiz.
61. 1. Klasera joan aurretik, ikasgelan landuko ditugun gramatika atalak erreparatu egiten ditut.
62. 19. Irakasleak azaltzen dituen arauak, eta liburuan agertzen diren horiei arreta handia jartzen diet.
63. 36. Baliabide elektronikoak (ordenagailua, telefonoa...) erabiltzen ditut arauak hobeto ulertzeko, edo arau berriak ikasteko.
64. 17. Nire hitz egiteko edota idazteko era, ni baino maila altuagoa duten klasekideekin konparatzen dut nire maila hobetzeko helburuarekin.
65. 31. Gramatika gaiak birpasatzen ditut, arauak hobeto gogoratzeko.

66. 61. Nahiz eta egitura gramatikal baten erabilera zuzena zein den ziur ez egon, erabiltzen saiatzen naiz.
67. 37. Nire klasekideekin lan egiten dut -klase ordutik kanpo- klasean irakaslearekin landutako testuak birpasatzeko, eta horrela gramatika atala(k) ere berrikusteko.
68. 15. Denbora gutxian sarri errepikatzen diren egiturei arreta jartzen diet. Adibidez: lehenaldiaren erabilera iraganean gertaturiko gertaerei buruz hitzegiteko.
69. 70. Gramatika ulertu edo erabiltzerako orduan arazoak ditueni laguntzen saiatzen naiz.
70. 22. Egitura gramatikalak formaz aldatzeko bete beharreko arauak buruz ikasten ditut. Adibidez: Adjektibo batetik aditzondo batera pasatzeko: easy (erraza) -adjective- / easily (errez) - adverb-).