GLOTTODIDACTICA LII/1 (2025)
ADAM MICKIEWICZ UNIVERSITY PRESS POZNAŃ
https://doi.org/10.14746/gl.2025.52.1.10

Mirosław Pawlak
*Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland*
*University of Applied Sciences, Konin, Poland*

Mariusz Kruk
*University of Zielona Góra, Poland*
*Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland*

# Exploring the effects of strategic intervention in fostering autonomy in learning grammar

Abstract. The present paper reports the findings of a quasi-experimental study which investigated the effects of strategy-based instruction targeting grammar learning strategies (GLS) on the development of autonomy in learning English grammar. Participants were 55 Polish university students, English majors in the first year of a three-year BA program, divided into an intervention group (43 students) and a control group (12 students). The intervention focused on different types of GLS and was implemented in eight 30-minute segments during regularly scheduled classes over one academic semester. The data were collected on the pretest, posttest and delayed posttest by means of the *Grammar Learning Autonomy Scale* (GLAS), a research instrument specifically created for the purpose of the study. Analysis of variance failed to show statistically significant differences within and between the two groups, indicating that the intervention failed to impact autonomy in learning grammar among the participants. Item-level analysis provided evidence for a positive effect of the treatment with respect to the belief that progress in learning L2 grammar depends on the teacher. Limitations of the study are presented and directions for future research are outlined.

Keywords: strategy-based instruction, grammar learning strategies, autonomy in learning grammar, quasi-experimental study.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Achieving mastery of the grammar of an additional language is an arduous and demanding process which many learners find exceedingly difficult. One reason why learning grammar poses such a formidable challenge is the fact that the knowledge of this target language (TL) subsystem is multidimensional, comprising three interrelated facets of *form* (i.e. the structural dimension), *meaning* (i.e. the semantic dimension) and use (i.e. the pragmatic dimension). When

*Glottodidactica 52(1), 2025: 187–204. © The Author(s). Published by Adam Mickiewicz University Press, 2025.*

viewed in this way, grammar can no longer be regarded as a static product but as a dynamic process or a skill, whereby learners engage in *grammaring*, using grammar structures accurately, meaningfully and appropriately to express their messages in the way they intend to do so (Larsen-Freeman 2001, 2003). Moreover, there is a huge difference between understanding how a grammar feature is formed, what it means and how it is used, and actually employing it successfully in various contexts. This brings us to the key distinction between explicit and implicit (automatized) grammar knowledge. At the risk of oversimplification, the former is conscious and declarative, and can only be accessed when there is sufficient time to fall back on relevant rules, as when working on traditional exercises as part of homework assignments. The latter is tacit and procedural or at least automatized to such a degree that it can be employed under time pressure, as required in spontaneous interactions (DeKeyser 2017; Ellis 2009; Pawlak 2019b, 2021). Even if fully grasping explicit knowledge of the structures taught is admittedly challenging for many learners, automatizing such knowledge so that it can be drawn upon in unplanned, real-time communication might be an unachievable goal for the majority of students.

While the place of grammar in different language programs obviously varies, it is evident from the above considerations that even high-quality grammar instruction is unlikely to ensure mastery of TL grammar in many cases unless learners are able to best capitalize on it but also to effectively work on this subsystem in their own time. For this to happen, however, students need to be able to manifest a considerable degree of autonomy in learning grammar. While the present authors are aware of the complexity of the concept of autonomy in L2 learning and the different shapes it can take (Benson 2011; Little 2022), following the classic definition put forward by Holec (1981), it is understood here as the ability to take charge of learning TL grammar and assume responsibility for different aspects of this process. As Pawlak (2016) illustrates, there are different ways in which autonomy in learning grammar can be fostered including, among others, promoting a discovery approach, familiarizing students with additional resources, raising students' awareness of issues involved in learning and teaching grammar, encouraging the use of new technologies (which right now would surely also include artificial intelligence), and undertaking pedagogical interventions intended to encourage learners to more adeptly use grammar learning strategies (GLS). However, research that would gauge the effectiveness of different ways of fostering autonomy in learning L2 grammar is scarce and the existing studies represent a mixed bag in terms of their foci and methodology (e.g. Asgari & Mal Amiri 2024; Cooke 2012). To the best knowledge of the present authors, no empirical investigation conducted thus far has examined the contribution of strategy based instruction (SBI) targeting GLS to the development of an

autonomous approach to learning TL grammar. Such a situation is unfortunate since showing that appropriately tailored SBI translates into greater autonomy in learning this TL subsystem could provide a crucial impulse for reconsidering instructional practices and ultimately contribute to greater mastery of grammar features. This is the gap that the study reported in this paper sought to address.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The existing scholarship on GLS is scarce and it is thus not surprising that few attempts have been made to properly define the construct or to put forward comprehensive, dedicated classifications of these strategic devices. An early definition of the concept was put forward by Oxford et al. (2007: 120), who, extrapolating from Oxford's (1990) general definition of language learning strategies (LLS), described GLS as "actions and thoughts that learners consciously employ to make language learning and / or language use easier, more effective, more efficient, and more enjoyable." In a recent publication which portrays LLS within the context of self-regulation (Zimmermann & Schunk 2011) and complex dynamic systems (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron 2008), Oxford (2017: 244) defines strategies for learning grammar as "[…] teachable, dynamic thoughts and behaviors that learners consciously select and employ in specific contexts to improve their self-regulated autonomous L2 grammar development for effective task performance and long-term proficiency." While this definition is enlightening in that it seeks to capture all the important features of GLS, it does not do justice to the complexity of learning L2 grammar. For this reason, in the present paper, GLS are viewed as deliberate actions and thoughts that students fall back upon to learn and gain better control over the use of grammar structures (Cohen & Pinilla-Herrera 2010). The strength of this definition is that it more or less directly recognizes the fact that GLS can contribute not only to the development of explicit knowledge but can also facilitate the process of automatizing this knowledge so that grammar features can be employed in the right way as well in spontaneous interactions.

A necessary condition for research into GLS to provide useful insights concerning the role of these strategies in the process of learning grammar and offer implications for more effective L2 grammar instruction is reliance on a valid and reliable framework that can be applied in tapping into their use. However, comprehensive, dedicated frameworks of this kind are hard to come by. A number of studies in this area, including more recent ones, have approached GLS as just another type of general LLS, adopting as a point of reference the leading classifications proposed by Oxford (1990) or O'Malley and Chamot

(1990), introducing slight modifications to the wording of specific items to make them relevant to learning grammar (e.g. Sarıçoban 2005; Zhou 2017). The main problem with this approach, though, is that it largely ignores the complexity and distinctiveness of learning and using grammar structures. The first coherent descriptive scheme for GLS was introduced by Oxford et al. (2007), who, drawing on research on form-focused instruction (Doughty & Williams 1998), divided these strategies into three groups: (1) *strategies for implicit learning with a focus on form* (e.g. attending to how more proficient TL users produce utterances and then imitating), (2) *strategies for explicit inductive learning* (e.g. participating in rule-discovery discussions in class), and (3) *strategies for explicit deductive learning* (e.g. previewing a lesson to identify key structures to be covered). While this scheme represented an important step forward and provided a so-much-needed impulse for further research on GLS, it does not reflect all important processes involved in learning L2 grammar, placing insufficient emphasis on different types of practice (Pawlak 2013).

In order to improve on this preliminary attempt to categorize GLS, Pawlak (2013, 2018) proposed a dedicated classification that strives to take into account a much broader repertoire of strategies that can be utilized when learning and using TL grammar. Drawing on the taxonomy of LLS put forward by Cohen and Dörnyei (2002), the division of instructional options in teaching grammar developed by Ellis (1997) and later modified by Pawlak (2006), as well as the findings of existing studies, Pawlak (2013, 2018) proposed a four-pronged classification of GLS encompassing four main categories: (1) *metacognitive*, applied to manage grammar learning (e.g. looking for more effective ways of learning and using grammar structures), (2) *social*, which involve learning grammar in collaboration with the teacher or other students (e.g. trying to help others to understand and use grammar), (3) *affective,* which serve the purpose of dealing with emotions and motivations involved in learning grammar (e.g. encouraging oneself to practice more when encountering problems with a given grammar feature), and (4) *cognitive*, which support the mental operations directly involved in learning L2 grammar. Since the strategies included in the last group represent the backbone of the classification, they are further divided into four subcategories: (1) *GLS involved in using grammar in communication or focus on form* (e.g. comparing one's speech and writing with that of more proficient people to see how to improve), (2) *GLS facilitating the development of explicit knowledge* through deduction and induction (e.g. remembering grammar information by location on a page in a coursebook), (3) *GLS facilitating the development of implicit (automatized) knowledge* (e.g. using newly learnt grammar features to create sentences), and (4) *GLS used to process corrective feedback* (CF) on grammar errors (e.g. trying to notice and self-correct mistakes when practicing grammar). This classification was used as a basis for

creating the *Grammar Learning Strategy Inventory* (GLSI), a research tool that includes 70 5-point Likert-scale items representing different types of GLS (Pawlak 2013, 2018). The instrument has been validated in several studies and its overall underlying structure has been confirmed (e.g. Wang et al. 2024).

Moving on to research into GLS, it should be underscored that it is still in its nascent stages. The vast majority of empirical investigations conducted to date have aimed to identify patterns of use of such strategies in different contexts and the participants have typically been English majors. Most studies that have drawn upon general LLS classification and/or related data collection tools, such as those conducted by Gürata (2008), Sarıçoban (2005), Pawlak (2008) or Alsied et al. (2018), have found most frequent reported use of cognitive strategies. On reflection, such findings should not come as a huge surprise in view of the fact that strategies in this group are directly involved in learning grammar and different types of these strategic devices could not be differentiated based on general LLS taxonomies. A more complex picture emerges from empirical investigations that have relied on dedicated frameworks for GLS. For example, Pawlak (2012) used a questionnaire comprising Likert-scale items developed on the basis of Oxford et al.'s (2007) descriptive scheme and open-ended questions analyzed with reference to this scheme. While quantitative data showed the most frequent reliance on GLS related to implicit grammar learning with a focus on form, qualitative analysis painted a different picture, with the participants reporting the predominance of cognitive GLS reflecting controlled practice (e.g. paraphrasing, translating). The results of studies drawing upon Pawlak's (2013, 2018) classification and the GLSI have been inconclusive. For instance, Pawlak (2019a) in the Polish context and Nakachi (2021) in the Japanese setting found most frequent use of cognitive GLS involved in using grammar structures in communication and processing CF on grammar errors. However, Zarrinabadi et al. (2021) reported that their Iranian participants used more metacognitive, affective and cognitive GLS facilitating the development of explicit and implicit knowledge when learning English as a second rather than third language.

Studies of GLS with other foci are few and far between. When it comes to the link between GLS use and TL attainment, Tilfarlioğlu (2005) did not report significant differences between more and less proficient university students in Turkey, a result that was corroborated by Pawlak (2009) for English majors in Poland. The latter study also looked at the relationship between the mastery of grammar and the specific categories of GLS but only revealed a very weak correlation between strategies involved in explicit deductive learning and final grades in a grammar course. Pawlak and Csizér (2023), in turn, found that GLS use by Polish and Hungarian students in degree programs in English accounted for 13% and 15% of the variability in self-reported attainment, with strategies

facilitating the use of grammar structures in spontaneous interactions being the most important predictor. There is almost no research examining the link between the use of GLS and other individual difference factors, a notable exception being the study by Zarrinabadi et al. (2021), who revealed that Iranian students' employment of all categories of strategies in the GLSI was positively predicted by growth mindsets. What is the most disconcerting, though, there are almost no studies investigating the effects of SBI targeting GLS, an issue that is the most relevant to the research project reported in this paper. One rare contribution to this area was made by Trendak (2015), who examined the effectiveness of a pedagogical intervention focusing on cognitive and memory strategies in terms of overall LLS use as well as the mastery of English among Polish learners. The six-week-long intervention, which assumed the form of awareness-raising activities, resulted in more frequent use of the targeted strategies as well as more accurate use of the targeted feature, with the training focusing on memory strategies producing better results.

As can be seen from the overview provided above, research on GLS remains in its infancy, both in terms of quantity and scope. In particular, almost no attention has been given to the effects of SBI aimed at enhancing the use of GLS, also with respect to the effects of such an intervention on grammar attainment. More specifically, to the best knowledge of the present authors, no study conducted to date has looked into the contribution of SBI targeting GLS to autonomy in learning grammar, which is unfortunate given the fact that some degree of independence is indispensable if learners are expected to develop both explicit and implicit (automatized) knowledge of grammar structures. The study reported below sought to address this important gap by seeking an answer to the following research question:

*What is the effect of SBI targeting GLS on English majors' autonomy in learning TL grammar?*

## 3. METHOD

The present study represents one part of a larger-scale research project examining the impact of SBI targeting GLS on English majors' use of these strategies and their mastery of grammar. The research followed a pretest-posttest design, with participants being assigned to either the treatment or control condition. In order to adhere to ethical guidelines, the students in both groups were informed about the purpose of the study, assured of the confidentiality of their responses, and asked to provide informed consent. Additionally, they

were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any point if they chose to do so.

### 3.1. Participants

The study included 55 participants, 8 males and 47 females, all of whom were first-year English majors of Polish nationality. The prevalence of female students in the sample represents typical sex distribution in degree programs in foreign languages across Polish institutions of higher education. Participants ranged in age from 17 to 24 years ($M$ = 19.25, $SD$ = 1.21) and had been learning English for an average of 11.60 years ($SD$ = 3.58). They also assessed their TL skills using a 6-point scale (1 = lowest, 6 = highest), reporting an overall mean self-evaluation score of 3.98 ($SD$ = 1.03). Participants were recruited from intact classes, randomly assigned to two conditions, and they were divided into two groups based on their pre-existing class assignment, with 43 in the intervention group (IG) and 12 in the control group (CG). The IG included 6 males and 37 females, aged 18 to 24 years ($M$ = 19.35, $SD$ = 1.25), with an average of 11.58 years ($SD$ = 3.72) of English learning experience. Their mean self-evaluation of TL skills was 3.93 ($SD$ = 1.10). The CG consisted of 2 males and 10 females, aged 17 to 21 years ($M$ = 18.92, $SD$ = 0.99), with an average of 11.67 years ($SD$ = 3.20) of English learning experience and a mean TL self-evaluation score of 4.14 ($SD$ = 0.74). No significant differences were revealed between the students in both groups.

### 3.2. Strategic intervention

The SBI spanned one semester and consisted of eight 30-minute sessions, integrated into normally scheduled TL classes included in an intensive English course. The teachers of the intact student groups involved in the study were tasked with delivering the intervention and were given detailed instructions on how to do it. Each session focused on different GLS categories, as outlined in Pawlak's (2018) classification, with a special emphasis on strategic devices facilitating the use of grammar structures in spontaneous interactions. Detailed description of all the sessions falls beyond the scope of this article but two illustrative examples are in order. In Session 3, the students first discussed in pairs the things they can do to use grammar structures taught in spontaneous communication, then they completed a focused communication task which necessitated reliance on the passive voice and, finally, they talked about the structure they had used

when performing the task and the errors they had committed. The first task in Session 6 involved a small-group discussion about different ways in which errors in the use of grammar structures can be corrected and introduction of concrete examples of how this can be done. This was followed by an information-based task in which two students were requested to react to their grammar errors when reconstructing a story based on pictures while a third was tasked with jotting down instances of errors and related corrections. As a homework assignment, the students were instructed to make a recording of a short speech and then listen to it, writing down grammar errors and contemplating the ways in which they could be corrected. The participants in the control group received no treatment and simply continued with their regular curriculum. Apart from the treatment sessions, the content covered in both groups was similar as was the overall instructional approach adopted by the teachers.

### 3.3. Data collection

The data were collected through an online questionnaire administered through Google Forms. The instrument consisted of demographic questions (e.g. age, sex, experience in learning English, self-assessment of TL skills and subsystems) the *Grammar Learning Autonomy Scale* (GLAS), which was developed for the purpose of the present study based on previous tools (e.g. Pawlak 2004). The GLAS was piloted before the study and some minor modifications were made to the wording of several items. The final tool comprised 24 statements intended to assess various behaviors, preferences, and attitudes reflecting an autonomous approach to L2 grammar learning (Appendix 1). To minimize response bias and encourage thoughtful engagement, some items were key-reversed. Participants rated each statement using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = "strongly disagree", 5 = "strongly agree"). The GLAS was administered at three time points: at the beginning of the semester (pretest), at the end of the semester (posttest 1 – posttest), and 12 weeks later (posttest 2 – delayed posttest) to track changes in autonomy over time. The internal reliability of the GLAS was assessed on the pretest using Cronbach's alpha, yielding a coefficient of .71, indicating an acceptable level of reliability (Dörnyei 2007).

### 3.4. Data analysis

Statistical analyses were conducted at both the group level and item level to assess differences between the IG and CG and to examine within-group changes

over time. At the group level, a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with a between-subjects factor was conducted to examine the effects of time (pretest, posttest, delayed posttest) and group (IG vs. CG) on autonomy scores. Time was treated as a within-subjects factor, while group served as the between-subjects factor. Assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance were verified using the Shapiro-Wilk test and Levene's test, respectively. As both assumptions were met ($p > .05$), parametric tests were applied. Post hoc pairwise comparisons were conducted using Tukey's HSD test, with Bonferroni correction applied to control for multiple comparisons. Descriptive statistics (i.e. means and standard deviations), based on aggregated autonomy scores, were calculated for each group at each time point.

At the item level, analyses focused on identifying between-group differences for individual items and assessing within-group changes over time. Independent samples *t*-tests were conducted to compare the specific items in the IG and CG at the three time points point. The Shapiro-Wilk test was used to assess normality; for items violating this assumption, the Mann-Whitney *U* test, a non-parametric alternative to the independent samples *t*-test, was applied. Within-group changes were analyzed separately for the IG and CG using paired-samples tests. Paired-samples *t*-tests were conducted for normally distributed items, while the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test, a non-parametric alternative, was used for non-normally distributed items.

## 4. RESULTS

A repeated measures ANOVA with a between-subjects factor was conducted to determine whether autonomy scores differed significantly across time points (pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest) and whether this pattern of change varied between the IC and CG. The results revealed no significant main effect of time, $F(2, 108) = 0.36$, $p = .698$, $\eta^2 = .006$, indicating that autonomy scores did not change significantly over time. The main effect of group was also not significant, $F(1, 54) = 1.00$, $p = .319$, $\eta^2 = .017$, suggesting no overall difference in autonomy scores between the IG and CG. Additionally, the interaction effect between time and group was not significant, $F(2, 108) = 0.67$, $p = .512$, $\eta^2 = .012$, confirming that changes in autonomy scores over time were similar for both groups. Post hoc pairwise comparisons using Tukey's HSD test revealed no significant differences between time points ($p > .05$), reinforcing the finding that autonomy scores remained stable over time. Descriptive statistics for autonomy scores at each time point are presented in Table 1, with standard deviations calculated based on aggregated autonomy scores per participant.

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics for autonomy scores by group and time point

| Group | Pretest *M*(*SD*) | Posttest 1 *M*(*SD*) | Posttest 2 *M*(*SD*) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Intervention | 3.04 (0.40) | 3.05 (0.39) | 3.03 (0.37) |
| Control | 2.90 (0.40) | 3.03 (0.42) | 3.01 (0.27) |

Source: own study.

Further item-level analyses yielded two statistically significant findings. A Mann-Whitney *U* test revealed a significant between-group difference in Item 11 ("I make little progress in learning English grammar thanks to the teacher") on delayed posttest, $U = 378.5$, $p = .011$, with the IG scoring higher than the CG ($r = .33$, small to moderate effect). Additionally, a Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test indicated a significant within-group change from the pretest to the posttest in the case of Item 22 ("I use new technology/software (e.g. grammar checkers, Grammarly) when learning English") in the CI, $W = 7.0$, $p = .032$, showing a moderate to large effect ($r = .58$). No other significant differences were found at the item level, and results remained stable across other test points (see Appendix 2 for means and standard deviations for all items the pretest, posttest and delayed posttest).

## 5. DISCUSSION

The present study probed into the effect of SBI targeting GLS over one academic semester on English majors' autonomy in learning grammar. Descriptive statistics revealed minute within- and between group differences in the means on the GLAS on the pretest, posttest and delayed posttest. Given such results, it is not surprising that repeated-measures ANOVA failed to uncover statistically significant differences between the IG and the CG at any of the three measurement points as well as between these points. In addition, finer-grained item-level analysis revealed only two statistically significant differences: (1) the participants in the IG scored significantly higher than their CG counterparts on item 11 on posttest 2 (i.e. "I make little progress in learning English grammar thanks to the teacher"), and (2) in the CG, the increase in the mean for item 22 ("I use new technology/software [e.g. grammar checkers, Grammarly]") from the pretest to the posttest proved to be statistically significant.

Looking at the findings, it can be concluded that the SBI did not have any effect on participants' autonomy in learning L2 grammar on a general level and its contribution with respect to specific attitudes, behaviors and perceptions in this respect was extremely limited. These findings are evidently disappointing

considering the time and effort that was invested in the implementation of the SBI and the need to overcome the numerous logistical problems that arose along the way. One plausible explanation for these results is the fact that the participants were English majors with quite high TL proficiency, many of whom might have already decided on their tried-and-tested or most suitable ways of learning grammar, even if these GLS were suboptimal. As a result, some of the treatment sessions may have been viewed as marginally useful by at least some of the students, which could have influenced their responses on the GLAS. Another reason for the failure of the intervention to affect autonomy levels in learning L2 grammar may have been the contribution of individual difference factors that were not taken into account in this study. Specifically, differences in beliefs about how TL grammar should most beneficially be taught and learnt, learning styles or positive and negative emotions could have impacted learners' reception of the intervention, which in turn may have affected their engagement and ultimately their autonomous approach to learning grammar. There is also the question as to the extent to which participants perceived the need for manifesting autonomy in the BA program in which they were enrolled. Being first-year students, many of whom had much to catch up on when it comes to the intricacies of English grammar, they might have believed that it was mainly the responsibility of their university teachers to ensure that all the important grammar points were covered in dedicated grammar classes. This belief may have been strengthened by the prospect of having to take a demanding end-of the-year exam in English which laid much emphasis on accurate use of grammar structures.

The beneficial effect of the SBI could only be observed in the fact that the IG students were more likely than their CG counterparts to attribute progress in learning English grammar to themselves rather than the teacher on the delayed posttest. Although many factors could have contributed to this stance over the course of the semester, it could reasonably be argued that the SBI made the participants aware that at the end of the day the extent to which they would master grammar hinged upon their own actions and thoughts rather that the activities orchestrated by teachers. Much more difficult to explain is the fact that the participants in the CG became considerably more willing to fall back on new technologies in learning grammar from the pretest to the posttest even though they had not benefited from any kind of treatment. Perhaps the small number of participants in this group (12) is key to understanding this unexpected change because, even if just a couple of students became ardent believers in the value of computer-assisted language learning, or perhaps in particular the utility of artificial intelligence, this could have easily inflated the means for this item on the GLAS.

Like any other empirical investigation, the present study is not free from limitations. First, the influence of SBI on autonomy in learning grammar was only examined based on quantitative data and it is evident that this construct is far too complex to be reduced to a list of statements without gaining deeper insights into how the attitudes, behaviors and perceptions represented by these statements actually manifest themselves in the process of learning L2 grammar. For example, when a student shows a high degree of agreement with the item "I practice English grammar even when it is not required for my university classes", it is not clear how often he or she engages in this type of practice or what form it takes. It should be stressed, however, that this study constitutes one part of a larger-scale research project exploring the effectiveness of GLS-oriented SBI which involved collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. Second, the disparity in the number of participants between the IG and the CG was considerable and there should have admittedly been more balance in this respect. Even though, to ensure that as many students as possible would benefit from the intervention, fewer participants were included in the CG from the get-go, but these students were hit the hardest by attrition that simply could not be avoided during an intervention-based study that spanned several months. Third, due to its length, the intervention inevitably took a toll on the implementation of regular curricular goals in the IG, which could have had a detrimental impact on participants' engagement in the treatment sessions and negatively influenced the overall effectiveness of the intervention. Fourth, while the GLAS had been piloted before the study, its underlying structure had not been properly investigated through exploratory factor analysis, which prevented analysis of the data in terms of broader variables underlying the concept of autonomy in learning grammar. While this is unlikely to have changed much with respect to the impact of the SBI, it would have allowed taking the analyses to the next level.

## 6. CONCLUSION

The quasi-experimental study reported in this paper examined the effects of a strategic intervention targeting the use of strategies for learning grammar on English majors' autonomy in learning this TL subsystem. Quantitative analysis failed to show statistically significant differences both within and between groups on the pretest, posttest and delayed posttest. The beneficial contribution was only revealed in the case of an item that focused on the role of the teacher in determining progress in learning L2 grammar. While these findings surely fall far short of the expectations of the present researchers, it

should be kept in mind that this is the first study exploring the role of a pedagogical intervention focusing on the use of GLS in fostering an autonomous approach to learning grammar structures. More empirical investigations are therefore needed in this important area. In particular, such research should target L2 learners who are not language majors as well as students at lower educational levels (e.g. secondary school), it should rely on a combination of both quantitative and qualitative methodologies (e.g. questionnaire data should be complemented with interviews or diaries) and, perhaps, it should encompass shorter but more intensive interventions, which would reduce the danger of participant attrition or the influence of extraneous variables. More broadly, it would also make sense to conduct well-designed intervention-based studies that would incorporate other steps that can enhance autonomy in learning grammar, such as raising students' awareness of the issues involved in learning and teaching this subsystem or promoting more directly the use of new technologies (see Pawlak 2016). The results of such research would be invaluable for teachers who could then promote a more autonomous approach to learning and using grammar features in various settings, in particular in spontaneous interactions. Given the complexity of grammar and the limited time that can be devoted to this TL subsystem in the classroom, only in this way can we increase the likelihood that not only will learners better understand the intricacies of different grammar features but will also be able to use these features successfully to precisely get their meanings across in real-life communication outside the classroom.

## Funding acknowledgement

The study reported in this paper represents a contribution to the research project No. 2020/39/B/HS2/00501 (2021-2024) funded by the National Science Centre, Poland.

## REFERENCES

Alsied, S.M. / Ibrahim, N.W. / Pathan, M.M. (2018). The use of grammar learning strategies by Libyan EFL learners at Sebha University. *ASIAN TEFL, 3*(1), 37–51.

Asgari, L. / Mal Amilir, B. (2024). The impact of autonomous tasks on grammar achievement among EFL learners. *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics, 14*(1), 60–75. https://doi.org/10.15282/ijleal.v14i1.10081

Benson, P. (2011). *Teaching and researching: Autonomy in language learning*. London / New York: Routledge.

Cohen, A.D. & Dornyei, Z. (2002). Focus on the language learner: Motivation, styles and strategies. In: N. Schmitt (ed.), *An introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 170–190). London: Edward Arnold.

Cohen, A.D. / Pinilla-Herrera, A. (2010). Communicating grammatically: Constructing a learner strategies website for Spanish. In: T. Kao / Y. Lin (eds.), *New look at language teaching and testing: English as subject and vehicle* (pp. 63–83). Taipei: The Language Training and Testing Center.

Cooke, S. (2012). Developing learner autonomy in a grammar class. *The Language Teacher, 36*(4), 49–53.

DeKeyser, R.M. (2017). Knowledge and skill in SLA. In: S. Loewen / M. Sato (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 15–32). London and New York: Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Doughty, C.J. / Williams, J. (1998). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In: C.J. Doughty / J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on form in classrooms second language acquisition* (pp. 197–261). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009). Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge and instruction. In: R. Ellis / S. Loewen / C. Elder / R. Erlam / J. Philp / H. Reinders (eds.), *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching* (pp. 3–25). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Gürata, A. (2008). *The grammar learning strategies employed by Turkish university preparatory school EFL students* (Unpublished MA thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara).

Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford / New York: Pergamon Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Boston, MA: Thomson & Heinle.

Larsen-Freeman, D. / Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex systems and applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, L. (2001). Teaching grammar. In: M. Celce-Murcia / D.M. Brinton / M.A. Snow (eds.), *Teaching English as a second of foreign language* (pp. 257–279). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.

Little, D. (2022). Language learner autonomy: Rethinking language teaching. *Language Teaching, 55*(1), 64–73. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000488

Nakachi, K. (2021). Grammar learning strategy use by English-major university students: An investigation with grammar learning strategy inventory (GLSI). *Nagoya JALT Journal, 2*(1), 53–70. https://doi.org/10.37546/jaltchap.nagoya2.1-3

O'Malley, J.M. / Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R.L. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context*. New York: Routledge.

Oxford, R.L., Lee, R.L. & Park, G. (2007). L2 grammar strategies: The Second Cinderella and beyond. In: A.D. Cohen & E. Macaro (eds.), *Language learner strategies: Thirty years of research and practice* (pp. 117–139). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pawlak, M. (2004). Autonomia studenta anglistyki – deklaracje a rzeczywistość. In: M. Pawlak (ed.), *Autonomia w nauce języka obcego* (pp. 173–191). Kalisz / Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University Press.

Pawlak, M. (2006).*The place of form-focused instruction in the foreign language classroom*. Poznań / Kalisz: Adam Mickiewicz University Press.

Pawlak, M. (2008). Advanced learners' use of strategies for learning grammar: A diary study. In: M. Pawlak (ed.), *Investigating English language learning and teaching* (pp. 109–125). Poznań / Kalisz: Adam Mickiewicz University Press.

Pawlak, M. (2009). Grammar learning strategies and language attainment: Seeking a relationship. *Research in Language, 7,* 43–60.

Pawlak, M. (2012). Instructional mode and the use of grammar learning strategies. In: M. Pawlak (ed.), *New perspectives on individual differences in language learning and teaching* (pp. 263–287). Heidelberg / New York: Springer.

Pawlak, M. (2013). Researching grammar learning strategies: Combining the macro- and micro-perspective. In: Ł. Salski / W. Szubko-Sitarek / J. Majer (eds.), *Perspectives on foreign language learning* (pp. 191–220). Łódź: University of Łódź Press.

Pawlak, M. (2016). The role of autonomy in learning and teaching foreign language grammar. In: M. Pawlak / A. Mystkowska-Wiertelak / J. Bielak. (eds.), *Autonomy in second language learning: Managing the resources* (pp. 3–19). Heidelberg: Springer.

Pawlak, M. (2018). Grammar Learning Strategies Inventory (GLSI): Another look. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 8*(2), 351–379. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.2.8

Pawlak, M. (2019a). Grammar learning strategies: Patterns of use. In: A. Uberman, & M. Trinder (eds.), *Text – Sentence – Word* (pp. 66–77). Rzeszów: University of Rzeszow Press.

Pawlak, M. (2019b). Tapping the distinction between explicit and implicit knowledge: Methodological issues. In: B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (ed.), *Contacts & contrasts in educational contexts and translation* (pp. 45–60). Cham: Springer Nature.

Pawlak, M. (2021). Psychology of learning vs. acquisition. In: T. Gregersen / S. Mercer (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of the psychology of language learning and teaching* (pp. 406–418). London / New York: Routledge.

Pawlak, M. / Csizér, K. (2023). Investigating the use of grammar learning strategies in Hungary and Poland: A comparative study. *Applied Linguistics, 44,* 347–369. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amac038

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.

Tilfarlioğlu, Y. (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*, 155–169.

Trendak, O. (2015). *Exploring the role of strategic intervention in form focused-instruction.* Cham: Springer.

Wang, Y. / Derakhshan, A. / Pawlak, M. / Mehdizadeh, M. (2024). Exploring the psychometric properties of the Grammar Learning Strategy Inventory in the Chinese EFL context. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 14*(3), 515–543. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.39357

Zarrinabadi, N. / Rezazadeh, M. / Chehrazi, A. (2021). The links between grammar learning strategies and language mindsets among L2 and L3 learners: Examining the role of gender. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 20*, 347–364. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1871356

Zhou, Z. (2017). The investigation of the English grammar learning strategy of high school students in China. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 7*(12), 1243–1248. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0712.11

Zimmerman, B.J. / Schunk, D.H. (2011). Self-regulated learning and performance: An introduction and an overview. In: B.J. Zimmerman / D.H. Schunk (eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 1–12). New York and London: Routledge.

## APPENDIX 1

### *Grammar Learning Autonomy Scale (GLAS)*

1. I look for additional materials (e.g. books, Internet resources) when learning English grammar.
2. The teacher should present a grammar syllabus and choose grammar exercises to be taught.
3. I plan my learning of English grammar in advance.
4. I feel more secure when the teacher tells me what resources I should use to learn grammar.
5. I try out different ways of learning grammar to find the most useful ones.
6. When I do not understand a grammar structure or I do not know how to use it, I ask the teacher for help.
7. I know what I need to focus on in learning English grammar.
8. I know how to best organize learning English grammar (when, where and how).
9. I can objectively self-evaluate the progress I make in learning English grammar.
10. I know what goals I want to achieve in learning English grammar this semester.
11. I make little progress in learning English grammar thanks to the teacher.
12. I like learning grammar with others (e.g. in groups, using social media).
13. I prefer when the teacher tells me what I should improve when learning English grammar.
14. When I make a mistake when using English grammar, I try to correct it by myself.
15. Getting poor grades on tests discourages me form learning English grammar.
16. I feel anxious when I have to use grammar structures in communication.
17. I practice English grammar even when it is not required for my university classes.
18. I practice my English grammar mostly when a test or examination is coming.
19. I look for opportunities to use English grammar structures in speaking and writing.
20. I analyze how grammar is used when watching movies or shows in English.
21. I like to receive frequent feedback on learning grammar from the teacher (tests, quizzes).
22. I use new technology/software (e.g. grammar checkers, Grammarly) when learning English.
23. When I fail a grammar test, I try to better organize my work in the future.
24. I like to compare my grammar learning achievements with those of my colleagues.

Items 2, 4, 6, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 21 were reverse-coded to reduce bias and encourage thoughtful responses.

## APPENDIX 2

*Means and standard deviations for each item by group and administration*

| Item | Pretest | Pretest | Posttest | Posttest | Delayed posttest | Delayed posttest |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Intervention group | Control group | Intervention group | Control group | Intervention group | Control group |
| 1 | 4.14 (0.83) | 3.83 (1.19) | 3.91 (1.04) | 3.75 (1.36) | 3.67 (1.08) | 3.67 (1.23) |
| 2 | 2.05 (0.72) | 2.25 (0.62) | 1.81 (0.70) | 2.25 (0.97) | 2.07 (1.08) | 2.08 (0.90) |
| 3 | 2.67 (1.29) | 2.50 (1.31) | 2.84 (1.11) | 2.75 (1.22) | 2.58 (1.14) | 2.67 (1.15) |
| 4 | 1.81 (0.98) | 2.00 (0.95) | 1.77 (0.95) | 1.92 (1.08) | 2.05 (1.09) | 1.92 (1.00) |
| 5 | 3.35 (1.13) | 3.42 (1.00) | 3.37 (1.16) | 3.25 (1.14) | 3.44 (1.01) | 3.50 (1.00) |
| 6 | 2.72 (1.18) | 2.75 (1.29) | 2.44 (1.16) | 2.67 (1.30) | 2.51 (1.26) | 2.33 (0.89) |
| 7 | 3.74 (0.88) | 3.67 (0.89) | 3.74 (1.00) | 3.58 (1.31) | 3.67 (0.89) | 3.50 (0.90) |
| 8 | 2.93 (0.94) | 2.67 (1.30) | 3.07 (1.10) | 2.92 (1.24) | 3.07 (1.06) | 3.17 (0.83) |
| 9 | 3.53 (0.85) | 3.50 (0.90) | 3.47 (1.05) | 3.83 (1.11) | 3.53 (1.05) | 3.58 (1.08) |
| 10 | 3.28 (1.26) | 3.25 (0.97) | 3.60 (1.090) | 3.67 (1.15) | 3.33 (1.19) | 3.75 (0.87) |
| 11 | 3.07 (1.30) | 2.33 (1.37) | 2.79 (1.49) | 2.25 (1.14) | 2.95 (1.43) | 1.75 (1.06) |
| 12 | 3.05 (1.25) | 3.33 (0.98) | 3.37 (1.33) | 3.58 (1.24) | 3.12 (1.18) | 3.58 (1.24) |
| 13 | 1.88 (0.82) | 2.17 (0.94) | 1.98 (0.99) | 2.08 (0.90) | 2.07 (1.14) | 1.92 (1.00) |
| 14 | 4.33 (0.75) | 3.83 (1.11) | 4.23 (0.81) | 4.0 (0.95) | 4.07 (0.96) | 4.00 (0.85) |
| 15 | 2.77 (1.25) | 3.08 (1.44) | 2.81 (1.35) | 2.58 (0.90) | 2.72 (1.33) | 2.75 (1.42) |
| 16 | 2.88 (1.16) | 2.83 (1.40) | 2.91 (1.29) | 3.17 (0.83) | 2.95 (1.00) | 3.33 (0.89) |
| 17 | 2.84 (1.25) | 2.75 (1.22) | 2.74 (1.29) | 2.83 (1.19) | 2.93 (1.30) | 2.75 (1.48) |
| 18 | 1.98 (0.94) | 1.67 (0.89) | 2.09 (1.06) | 2.08 (1.00) | 2.07 (1.14) | 1.83 (0.83) |
| 19 | 3.44 (1.01) | 3.50 (0.80) | 3.58 (1.07) | 3.50 (0.80) | 3.44 (1.10) | 3.67 (0.89) |
| 20 | 3.84 (1.11) | 3.33 (1.61) | 3.93 (1.12) | 3.58 (1.16) | 3.77 (1.19) | 3.67 (0.98) |
| 21 | 2.35 (0.92) | 2.25 (1.22) | 2.42 (1.12) | 1.83 (0.94) | 2.47 (1.14) | 1.92 (0.90) |
| 22 | 3.30 (1.35) | 2.67 (1.37) | 3.56 (1.31) | 3.67 (1.23) | 3.42 (1.33) | 4.00 (0.95) |
| 23 | 3.63 (1.00) | 3.25 (1.29) | 3.47 (1.30) | 3.50 (1.45) | 3.28 (1.30) | 3.58 (1.38) |
| 24 | 3.33 (1.17) | 2.75 (1.42) | 3.35 (1.36) | 3.42 (1.31) | 3.47 (1.24) | 3.17 (1.11) |

**Received:** 14.02.2025; r**evised:** 14.03.2025

**Badanie wpływu interwencji strategicznej na rozwijanie autonomii w nauce gramatyki**

Abstrakt. Niniejszy artykuł przedstawia wyniki quasi-eksperymentalnego badania dotyczącego wpływu nauczania opartego na strategiach, ukierunkowanego na strategie uczenia się gramatyki (Grammar Learning Strategies, GLS), na rozwój autonomii w nauce gramatyki języka angielskiego. W badaniu wzięło udział 55 polskich studentów pierwszego roku trzyletnich studiów licencjackich na kierunku filologia angielska, podzielonych na grupę interwencyjną (43 osoby) oraz grupę kontrolną (12 osób). Interwencja obejmowała różne rodzaje GLS i była realizowana w ośmiu 30-minutowych segmentach podczas regularnych zajęć w trakcie jednego semestru akademickiego. Dane zostały zebrane za pomocą Skali Autonomii w Nauczaniu Gramatyki (Grammar Learning Autonomy Scale, GLAS), specjalnie opracowanego narzędzia badawczego, w trzech pomiarach: przed interwencją, po jej zakończeniu oraz z opóźnieniem. Analiza wariancji nie wykazała istotnych statystycznie różnic wewnątrz grup ani między grupami, co sugeruje, że interwencja nie wpłynęła na autonomię uczestników w nauce gramatyki. Analiza poszczególnych pozycji skali wykazała jednak pozytywny efekt interwencji w odniesieniu do przekonania, że postępy w nauce gramatyki języka obcego zależą od nauczyciela. W artykule przedstawiono również ograniczenia badania oraz kierunki dalszych badań.

Słowa kluczowe: nauczanie oparte na strategiach, strategie uczenia się gramatyki, autonomia w nauce gramatyki, quasi-eksperymentalne badanie.

MIROSŁAW PAWLAK
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland
University of Applied Sciences, Konin, Poland
miroslaw.pawlak@amu.edu.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7448-355X

MARIUSZ KRUK
University of Zielona Góra, Poland
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland
mkruk@uz.zgora.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5297-1966