

GRAMMAR LEARNING STRATEGIES APPLIED BY ENGLISH FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDENTS

^{#1}Ari Prasetyaningrum, ^{*2}Maman Asrobi, ^{*3}St Ayu Surayya, ^{*4}Siti Maysuroh

^{#1}English Lecturer, faculty of language, art and humaniora, Hamzanwadi University, NTB, Indonesia

^{*2}English Lecturer, faculty of language, art and humaniora, Hamzanwadi University, NTB, Indonesia

^{*3}English Lecturer, faculty of language, art and humaniora, Hamzanwadi University, NTB, Indonesia

^{*4}English Lecturer, faculty of language, art and humaniora, Hamzanwadi University, NTB, Indonesia

Corresponding Author Email: rheafanny1981@gmail.com

ABSTRACTS

The purpose of this research was to find out types of learning strategies applied by students of English education study program at Hamzanwadi University. The subjects of research taken were 75 students of the first semester who took basic English grammar course. Descriptive quantitative was used to obtain and analyze data. The research result showed that the most dominant learning strategy in studying grammar was metacognitive (20, 93%), followed by cognitive (18, 49%), social (17, 83%), affective (16, 48%), memory (15, 97%) and the least applied by the students was compensation (10, 25%). Furthermore, the reason why the students tend to apply metacognitive strategy in learning grammar because it enables them to pay attention on a particular grammar pattern, try to understand and relate it to the previous materials which have been familiar to the students' minds. Thus, it is implied to the teachers to understand the types of learning strategies then guide the students during their study for a better learning outcome.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: February, 2023

Revised: May, 2023

Published: June, 2023

Keywords:

Grammar,
Learning Strategy,
English Foreign Language,

How to cite: Prasetyaningrum, A., Asrobi, M., Surayya, S., & Maysuroh, S. (2023). Grammar Learning Strategies Applied by English Foreign Language Students. *Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching) Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa & Seni Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP*, 10(1), 26-39. doi:<https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v10i1.7168>

INTRODUCTION

Grammar relies with the structure of a language and plays a role to produce sentences. The ability to perform the correct sentence order in as a part of basic writing skills, is significant in English instruction process teaching. Therefore, it is necessary that grammar learning should be done from a very simple lesson and the most proper strategy. Studies on grammar should be emphasized in the goal that the lecturers may find the types of grammar learning strategies which the students usually apply to understand lessons during teaching and learning process which is usually paid little attention by lecturers as well as learners. This study is expected to offer both lecturers and learners certain beneficial implications. Academics are interested in learning strategies since it has recently become a key issue in the teaching of English as a second language, (McDonough, 2017; Syukur & Setiyana,

2021). In order to understand the method utilized by English learners in various nations, numerous studies have been undertaken. A crucial cognitive process in which pupils have the right to direct their own learning is the language learning approach. (Cohen & Henry, 2019; Fitria, 2020). Learning strategies facilitate students to take over the L2 learning by themselves and become more independent learners. (Cohen & Henry, 2019) asserted that learning styles and learning strategies give a good impact not only for the students as they can learn better, but also for the teachers so they can adjust their instruction in order to get more students' competency. Lately, the study of language learning strategies has been narrowed to specific skills such as grammar (Bruen, 2020; Huang et al., 2022; Mulugeta & Beyour, 2019).

The current study focuses on grammar learning strategies and how to put them into practice. The use of a language learning strategy is an instrument to gain the purpose. Learning strategies are procedures preferred by students to improve their learning goals. The students who want to master English have to be aware that learning strategy is a part of their necessities. In order to get detail into learning strategies, the researcher conducted research about learning grammar. The lecturer should assist the students to understand grammar rules as well as the structure of grammar patterns, and the learner understands the particular approach and be selective in the use of strategies that work best for them. Because grammar enables us to comprehend how sentences are constructed, the types of words used, and the word groupings that make up sentences, grammar, and language are interdependent.. Based on conversations with some students in the Basic English Grammar course, they face some difficulties learning grammar and are unaware of the critical role that effective learning strategies play in learning the language. Many students require guidance in order to identify and pick up their own grammar-learning techniques. The students should be aware of their strategies and know how to assess and improve the methods' efficacy. Each learner can choose a different method of instruction. Learners need a method to be considered successful learners and to grasp grammar.

The research problem proposed in this study was which types of learning strategies were employed by students from the most dominant to the least when studying grammar in a similar setting. The research purpose that guides the gathering and evaluation of data is to find out the strategies used frequently by students who took Basic English Grammar classes of English Language study program at Hamzanwadi University.

A number of researchers, including Bayou (2015), Kunasaraphan (2015), Zekrati (2017), Zhou (2017), and Pawlak (2020) have studied the methods for learning grammar. These research settings, as previously indicated, were in nations other than Indonesia. The purpose of this study, which was carried out in Indonesia, specifically at a private university, was to identify the common learning styles employed by the students to learn grammar. According to Pawlak (2020) asserted Grammar is a framework that describes the target language's structures and its communication function. (Djurayeva et al., 2020) added that Without grammar, language would be useless because it is used to produce words and construct sentences based on its rules. Furthermore, (Larsen-Freeman & DeCarrico, 2019) explained that Grammar is significant in all languages, not just English. Another research conducted by Harmer (2001; as cited in Juniar & Carissa, 2020) asserted that grammar is about word formations and how they are used to produce sentences. He emphasized that grammar is about how straightforward sentences are put together and how varied word choices can maintain the same structure. But grammar is not just about following rules. Gaining better linguistic and communicational alignment is the primary goal of grammar instruction.

According to Alhaysony (2017) he critical role that learning techniques play in helping L2 students understand the process of acquiring a language as well as the abilities

they get from studying EFL or ESL. Oxford (1990; as cited in Wael et al., 2018) classified language learning strategies into direct and indirect strategies. Direct strategies discussed the acquisition of knowledge or the production of the target language. Direct strategies are divided into three groups. The first is memory strategies. These strategies let students use a variety of memory techniques to learn and remember grammatical principles. Then, there are cognitive methods that enable learners to manipulate the grammatical rules by heavily applying grammatical rules. Learners can practice grammatical principles in a variety of ways, including by routinely repeating or writing them, listening to them again, rehearsing them, and mimicking native speakers. The final one is compensatory techniques, which involve using the language for production or comprehension when there is little available information. Since it provides language cues connected to grammatical understanding, this strategy necessitates learners' prior knowledge.

According to Cahyono & Widiati (2015), Direct strategies are made possible by indirect techniques, which also enhance their effectiveness. These tactics fall into three groups. The first is metacognitive strategies, which enable students to assess their own grammar learning patterns and plan their own learning activities. Metacognitive strategies assist students in focusing on specific grammar assignments in order to review concepts and connect them to prior knowledge. The second is affective strategy, which has an impact on how well students learn a language by enabling them to gain control over and modify their own feelings, attitudes, and values. Good language learners are aware of how to control their attitudes and emotions while learning grammar. The final category is social methods, which provide students a chance to practice communicating with other language learners. By enquiring about or getting clarification from individuals who are fluent in the language, learners can obtain the proper grammatical norms.

When people hear the word "grammar," they frequently have negative thoughts. Based on its rules, grammar is used to produce words and construct sentences. (Larsen-Freeman & DeCarrico, 2019). Kemp (2007) conducted a research where 144 participants involved in the study, each of whom knew between two and twelve languages, were asked to complete a Grammar Learning Strategies questionnaire. The results revealed a correlation between the number of languages a participant knows and the number of items they answered, the number of languages a participant knows and the mean ratings across the 40 techniques, and the number of individuals who provide additional strategies.

According to Pawlak (2020) the connection between English language proficiency and the application of grammar learning methodologies. There were 142 participants; 67 were in the first year of the BA program in English, 38 were in the second year, and 37 were in the third year. The usage of grammar learning tools and attainment did not appear to have a strong, positive link in this study. Additionally, he discovered that although students who performed better in the grammar course did use these strategies a little more frequently, there were no statistically significant differences between the usage of Grammar Learning Strategies reported by upper- and lower-level students.

Bayou (2015; as cited in Alsied et al., 2018) explored Students in grade 11 at Medhanealem Preparatory School used grammar learning techniques that focused on the distinctions between the sexes. 277 pupils made up the study's sample population. According to his research, learners chose Compensation Strategies above Affective Strategies as a category of strategy. He claimed that the preferred grammar-learning methods of male and female students are different. Additionally, he discovered that the results of the independent samples t-test showed no statistically significant difference between males and females in the use of the six taxonomies of grammar learning techniques as well as the total grammar learning strategies.

According to Kunasaraphan (2015) undertook a study to determine how frequently, given their English proficiency, first-year International College, Suan Sumandha Rajabhat University students employ direct and indirect strategies. The findings indicate that students who had higher levels of English proficiency employed language learning strategies more frequently, properly, and successfully than did students who had lower levels of English proficiency. Metacognitive, social, and cognitive techniques are those that are employed by great achievers.

According to Zekrati (2017) who conducted a study to examine the connection between 230 high school EFL students' grammar learning methodologies and language proficiency. The outcome revealed that the cognitive technique is the most frequently employed strategy. Similar to (Zekrati, 2017), (Zhou, 2017) through questionnaire surveys and interviews, 176 high school students in China were asked about their grammar learning practices. The results demonstrated that the most popular strategy is cognitive.

Due to the importance of understanding students' learning strategies for grammar classes, the following study question is put forth: What kinds of grammar learning strategies are applied by Hamzanwadi University students enrolled in the English education study program in the second semester?

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

In keeping with the goal of this study, which is to identify the different types of grammatical strategies used by students enrolled in an English education study program during their first semester. This research employs quantitative and qualitative data as stated by Cohen et al. According to (Cohen & Macaro, 2009) the nature of the data, type, and technique of analysis in case studies at one point is typically qualitative while at the other typically quantitative data due to characteristics of the data. Based on the objective and the problems of this research, the writer decided to use the survey study method. A survey study involves systematically gathering enough information about a particular person, social setting, or event, to permit the researcher to effectively understand the process and conclusion of the research. The purpose of this study was to identify several grammatical learning strategies.

Subject

The subjects in this study were 75 students from Hamzanwadi University in Nusa Tenggara Barat, Indonesia, who took a basic English grammar course in the first semester from Hamzanwadi University's English study program, 37 students were taken from 1a class and 38 were from 1b class.

Instruments

A questionnaire from Oxford that had been altered by Kemp (2007) and Bayou (2015) was used as the study's instrument for data collection. The Oxford (1990) original questionnaire served as a reliable tool for determining the participants' grammatical preferences. This inventory was chosen as a gauge to identify various grammatical techniques since correlational and factor analysis have established its high reliability and validity.

Data Collection Procedures

Before the questionnaire was distributed to the participants, the writer did a piloting to the 75 students. The purpose of this piloting was to see whether the participants have difficulties in filling out the questionnaire. After the piloting was done, the questionnaire was distributed to the participants after their classes ended. The writer made an appointment with the students before the grammar class that there will be research on grammar strategy, then

the researcher explained about metacognitive, cognitive, social, affective, memory, and compensation. The questions were translated into Indonesian to help the participants understand them better. The participants were asked to put a check marks to identify the strategy that they use mostly. Thus, the participants would not be confused when they fill out the questionnaire.

Data Analysis

The questionnaire had 32 items with the following response options: 1 for strongly disagree, 2 for disagree, 3 for neither agree nor disagree, 4 for agree and 5 for agree (strongly agree). The breakdown of items into the following six categories is as follows: cognitive, metacognitive, social, emotive, compensatory, and memory techniques. In analyzing the data, the author followed some procedures as follows:

1. Reading up on Grammar Learning Strategies was the first step.
2. The instrument, a modified version of the Oxford (1990) questionnaire, was used by Kemp (2007) and Bayou (2015) to measure grammar learning strategies.
3. Double-checked each question on the questionnaire to make sure the meaning could be understood.
4. Had the 75 participants in the English Education study program's Basic English Grammar Class distribute the questionnaire sheet. The questionnaire has 32 items in all. To prevent biases, the researcher helped the students fill out the surveys for almost an hour.
5. Sorting the question or response into some classifications like: cognitive, metacognitive, social, affective, compensatory, and memory. Cognitive strategies are represented by items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, metacognitive strategies by items 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, social strategies by items 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, affective strategies by items 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, compensation strategies by items 25, and memory strategies by items 28, 29, 30, and 32.
6. The questionnaire, which was based on Oxford (1990) and amended by Kemp (2007) and Bayou (2015) and contained 32 statements, was analyzed to determine the most prominent grammar strategy used by the students. By multiplying each counting result by each questionnaire point, the pupils' responses are first examined. The survey's 32 responses, which range from 1 (never), 2 (rarely), 3 (sometimes), 4 (frequently), and 5, on a five-point Likert response scale (always). The overall score was added up to determine the percentage after the result was multiplied by the Likert-point scale. The majority was selected as the primary method for learning grammar.
7. Drawing conclusions after performing data analysis on the collected information. The author determines the common grammar strategies used by the participants by examining the questionnaire.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

Types of grammar strategy

This section tries to address the study topic of what methods are typically employed by learners of grammar in comparable situations. The author uses responses to 32 statements about students' use of grammar learning strategies based on Kemp (2007) and Bayou (2015) questionnaires, which are divided into six parts: cognitive, metacognitive, social, affective, compensation, and memory, to determine the overall result as well as the percentage of each type. To address the research question of the type of grammar strategies most respondents preferred most, the data of the questionnaire were grouped into Cognitive strategy, Metacognitive Strategy, Social Strategy, Affective strategy, Compensation strategy, and Memory Strategy which were based on the items of the questionnaire. Cognitive was

indicated by items number 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 (6 items), Metacognitive was indicated by items number 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 (6 items), social was indicated by items 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 (6 items). Affective was indicated by items number 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 (6 items). Compensation was indicated by items number 25, 26, 27 (3 items), and memory was indicated by items number 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 (5 items number).

Table 1
Total Percentage of Each Grammar Strategy

No	Grammar strategy	Total score of each category	Percentage
1	Metacognitive	1646	20.93%
2	Cognitive	1454	18.49%
3	Social	1402	17.83%
4	Affective	1296	16.48%
5	Memory	1256	15.97 %
6	Compensation	806	10.25%
Total		7863	100%

The data results are displayed according to each class and the total result. Based on data gathered via questionnaire to 75 students, it is evident that metacognitive strategy has the highest percentage (20.93%), cognitive strategy is in second place (18.49%), social strategy is in third place (17.83%), followed by memory strategy (15.97%), and compensation strategy has the lowest percentage (10.26%).

Result of Each Category of the Questionnaire.

The table below displays the overall score and percentage result for the metacognitive category based on the information gathered from the participants.

Table 2
Total Score and Percentage of Metacognitive Strategy

No	Total score of Each Item	Percentage of Each Item
META1	324	19.68%
META2	303	18.40%
META3	194	11.78%
META4	226	13.73%
META5	305	18.52%
META6	294	17.86%

The metacognitive approach that students may take when learning grammar is described in the graph above. The first statement (META1), "understanding the rules explained by the teacher or reference materials," has the highest average. 19 or 68%.

The second is META 5, which has a rate of 18.52% and focuses on learning strategies for improving grammar comprehension. Later, META2, which is seeing unfamiliar grammar rules that emerge in listening to or reading text, follows the third. with 18.40. META 6 comes next, which is looking for English-speaking contacts to converse with in order to increase grammatical skills with 17.86%. The fifth comes next, which is META 4, which is looking for my grammatical errors and comparing them to the proper version. with 13 or 73%. Then, with 11.78% of students examining the grammar material prior to class, META3 has the lowest average. This leads to the conclusion that the respondents generally pay attention to the guidelines that their teachers or dictionaries present.

Table 3
Total Score and Percentage of Cognitive Strategy

No	Total score of Each Item	Percentage of Each Item
COG 1	197	19.68%
COG 2	164	18.40%
COG 3	214	11.78%
COG 4	253	17.40%
COG 5	329	22.62%
COG 6	297	20.42%

One form of learning method that students employ to study more effectively is cognitive strategy. Repetition, structuring new language, summarizing meaning, inferring meaning from context, and employing imagery to help with memorizing are a few of these strategies. All of these techniques purposefully manipulate language to enhance learning. The cognitive technique that students might employ when learning grammar is described in the graph above.

The statement number 5 (COG5), "Read various books and watch TV shows and/or movies in English to learn how to use correct grammar" (examples: magazines, newspapers, fictions, etc.), has the highest average with 22.62%. The second is COG6, which asks for 20.46% of participants to complete grammar exercises at home. Following the third is COG4, which is underlining, using various colors, or capitalizing the key phrases in grammatical explanations. with 3.66. The fourth comes after that, and then COG2, which assigns a 3.65 to its classification of the language structure into groups of related objects. Then comes COG3, which scores 3.57 when comparing the structure of English grammar to that of the original tongue. The COG6 group, which completes grammar practice at home, has the lowest average (3.22). It can be inferred from the aforementioned statements that students frequently link a new grammar structure to a previously taught one.

Table 4
Total Score and Percentage of Social Strategy

No	Total score of each item	Percentage of each item
SOC 1	189	13.48%
SOC 2	185	13.19%
SOC 3	214	15.26%
SOC 4	240	17.11%
SOC 5	288	20.54%
SOC 6	286	20.39%

The social technique that students may employ as they study grammar is depicted in the graph above. The statement number 5 (SOC5), which reads, "I ask proficient English speakers to fix my grammar when I communicate," has the highest average. twenty, 54 percent. The second is from SOC6, and it is to motivate myself to speak English even when I'm worried about using the right grammar. 20.39% of the total. The third is SOC4, where I pay attention to any criticism my teacher may have about the organization I utilize. a 17.1% percentage. SOC3, which is studying grammar with a friend or relative, comes after the fourth. with 15% and 26%. Then comes SOC1, where I ask my teacher to repeat a new structure's explanation if I don't understand. 13 with 48%. Finally, SOC2 has the lowest average, with the statement If I do not comprehend my teacher's description of a new structure, I ask a friend to explain it to me. with 13% of the total. This indicates that when a

student finds the teacher's explanation unclear, they typically contact someone else for clarification.

Table 5
Total Score and Percentage of Affective Strategy

No	Total score of each item	Percentage of each item
AFF1	275	21.21%
AFF2	292	22.53%
AFF3	229	17.66%
AFF4	136	10.49%
AFF5	188	14.50%
AFF6	176	13.58%

The emotive method that students may employ when studying grammar is depicted in the above chart. The statement with the highest average, number 2 (AFF2), tells me to go above my fear of making mistakes and employ the rules I've learned in my speech. 53% with 22, please. The second is from AFF1, which tries to calm down anytime it feels anxious about using an improper statement (21.21%). AFF3, which stands for "give myself a reward when I perform well in English grammar," comes after the third. with 17.66% of the total. The fourth was AFF, which is to talk to a teacher, friend, or family member about how I feel when learning grammar, comes after the fourth with 14.50%.

The sixth is AFF6, which asks my teacher questions regarding his or her corrections of my grammatical errors, which comes next. 50% with 14, please. Then, AFF4 has the lowest average, which indicates whether or not I am tense or anxious when I am learning grammar. ten, forty-nine percent. The pupils attempt to utilize grammar rules in their speech despite their fear of making mistakes, it may be inferred from this.

Table 6
Total Score and Percentage of Memory Strategy

No	Total score of each item	Percentage of each item
1. MEMO 1	274	21.76 %
2. MEMO 2	232	18.42%
3. MEMO 3	286	22.71%
4. MEMO4	233	18.50%
5. .MEMO5	231	18.34%

The memory technique that students may employ when learning grammar is described in the graph above. The statement in number three (MEMO3), "I try to recall English grammar facts by using their location on the page in the textbook," has the highest average. 22 out of 71%. The second is MEMO1, which instructs students to employ new sentence structures to help them remember them. with 21.76% of the total. The fourth lesson, MEMO4, which periodically reviews grammatical lessons, comes after the third with 18, 50%. MEMO3, which periodically reviews grammatical lessons, comes after the fourth. with 3.33. The lowest overall score was achieved on MEMO5, which required me to visualize a scenario in which I may employ a new structure that I had learned. accompanied by 18.34%. The pupils attempt to retain English grammar material by using their position on the page in the textbook, it can be inferred.

Table 7
Total Score and Percentage of Compensation Strategy

No	Total score of each item	Percentage of each item
1. COMP 1	242	30.02%
2. COMP 2	254	31.51%
3. COMP 3	310	38.46%

The compensatory technique that students may employ while they learn grammar is described in the graph above. The statement with the greatest average is number 3 (COMP3), which is reducing grammatical errors by 38.46%. Then, COMP2 comes in second place, employing a different speech pattern and scoring 31.51%. With a 30.02% success rate in identifying the underlying grammatical rules, COMP1 has the lowest average. As a result, the students accept criticism from others when they make grammatical errors in order to become better writers.

Discussion

As written previously, the author chose a questionnaire consisted of 32 items to decide which grammar strategy do the students applied dominantly as the main instrument in collecting the data. The purpose of the questionnaire was used to find out the types of grammar learning strategies applied by the participants. The author answered the research question which focuses on what is the types of grammar learning strategies preferred by EFL undergraduate learners. The subject were taken from the first semester of the study program of English education at Hamzanwadi University who took basic English grammar course which is a prerequisite for the next stage of grammar courses namely intermediate English grammar and advanced English grammar. Therefore, in order to gain better ability in the next stage of the grammar course, the learners are expected to manage their own learning strategies in which a lot of lecturers have issues in designing interesting teaching techniques and strategies. In line with that, during the basic English grammar course, the learners are expected to employ their best-fit grammar learning strategies into their grammar learning activities in the aim to complete the learning competency standard and be ready for the next grammar course.

Grammar is a vital part of all languages. Thus, it is essential for the students to choose the most proper strategies to achieve the best score. Furthermore, grammar is not just about spelling or punctuation since it is a part of language element with various rules which need to be cope by applying proper strategy. Appropriate use of grammar is an integral part of a language because it allows them to construct sentences and write coherently. Moreover, it can also help learners in other areas such as speaking or understanding what others are trying to communicate. The better they get with the hold of grammar the more confident they will feel when speaking or writing in English. It will also help to avoid common mistakes that may cause confusion or annoyance for others listening or reading what they say.

This research only took the first semester as the research participants that is still beginners in learning English. Thus, there is still a lot of inhibition in understanding the rules of grammar even in the simple structure. It may happen because it is the first time they learn grammar intensively and detail and grammar rules in English and Indonesian are different completely due to improper learning strategy usage. Due to the limited scope of research, the next researchers are expected to conduct grammar research on larger scope not only in Hamzanwadi University but also at other universities.

At Hamzanwadi University in Nusa Tenggara Barat, in the second semester of the English education study program, this study aims to identify the different types of grammar

learning methodologies used by participants. Based on data gathered via questionnaire to 75 students, it is evident that metacognitive strategy has the highest percentage (20.93%), cognitive strategy is in second place (18.49%), social strategy is in third place (17.83%), followed by memory strategy (15.97%), and compensation strategy has the lowest percentage (10.26%).

Metacognitive strategies become the most dominant grammar learning type. Ali & Razali (2019) and Mitsea & Drigas (2019) have listed a number of different learning techniques, including problem-solving, planning, predicting, analyzing existing knowledge, choosing the best strategies, monitoring comprehension, monitoring strategy use, and evaluating the learning process. The first method used by pupils to learn grammar is metacognitive, which is an indirect technique along with emotive and social. Tanewong (2019) presents metacognitive tools that enable students to assess their own grammar learning patterns and coordinate the learning process. These strategies also assist students in focusing on specific grammar tasks in order to review concepts and connect them to prior knowledge.

Cognitive grammar learning is the second primary method. One kind of learning approach that students might employ to learn more effectively is cognitive. Idris et al., (2022) and Tunga (2021) state that grammar is a language aspect that requires adequate practice and that cognitive strategies for memorizing include repetition, organization of new language, summarizing meaning, inferring meaning from context, and using imagery. All of these techniques purposefully manipulate language to enhance learning. Furthermore, Jovanović et al., (2017) When students use cognitive strategies, they mean the purposeful actions they take after obtaining knowledge. The actions could include visualization, transfer, organizing, summarizing, deducing, and elaboration.

The third main strategy used by students in learning grammar is social. To encourage students to develop conversation with speakers of the target language is one of the most crucial roles played by social language acquisition methodologies in the teaching of a foreign language (Mohammed, 2018). The social methods serve a variety of purposes, including asking inquiries in a foreign language, getting responses, correcting errors, fostering cooperation, and attempting to understand the emotions and ideas of those from the target culture (Hyland, 2019). Grammar skills must be developed in order to communicate effectively in a foreign language. The social strategies' primary contribution to the study of grammar is their emphasis on the value of interpersonal interaction and spoken communication. The setting for instruction and learning is social. The teacher is crucial in this setting for fostering dialogue among the students. The success of language education and the students' adaptability to the language they learn both heavily depend on the students' perceptions of their own sense of self-worth. Additionally, it is possible to foster student cooperation skills. When students share their knowledge with a teacher and other students, they can learn more quickly.

The fourth technique for learning language is called the emotional technique, and it deals with controlling both good and negative emotions. A favorable affective environment aids learning generally, while the relationship between affective strategy and learning is unclear. Yulianti (2018) defined affective strategies are the methods that give students the ability to manage their emotions, drives, and mindsets when studying the language. Managing emotions to accept such challenging teachings will be crucial because grammar deals with a lot of structure and patterns that call for intense focus and understanding. Lestari & Wahyudin (2020) recognized three main categories of affective techniques: reducing anxiety, supporting yourself, and measuring emotional state.

Memory techniques, also known as mnemonics, were the fifth grammar learning strategy used by the participants. These techniques are clearly more effective when the learner uses both affective and metacognitive techniques at the same time, such as paying

attention and calming down by taking deep breaths. Koç (2017) states different forms of material are frequently paired as memory strategy. It is possible to link the verbal and visual in language learning by giving verbal labels to images or by creating visual representations of words or phrases. Amirbakzadeh Kalati & Memari (2017) says memory strategies frequently couple various kinds of information. It is possible to integrate the verbal and the visual in language acquisition by giving verbal labels to pictures or by creating visual representations of words or phrases. This is beneficial for language learning for four reasons: First, the mind can store more visual information than it can verbal information. Second, visual representations are the most effective way to transfer information into long-term memory. Third: The most effective method for helping people remember verbal information may be visual pictures. Fourth, a sizable portion of students prefer visual learning.

The least grammar strategy employed by the students was the compensation strategy. According to Amirbakzadeh Kalati & Memari (2017) compensation strategies are defined as ones that "allow learners to use the new language for either comprehension or production despite knowledge limitations." The purpose of compensation strategies is to compensate for a limited vocabulary and grammar repertoire. In order to make up for missing information or knowledge, particularly in oral encounters, compensation tactics are a variety of techniques that include guessing, utilizing synonyms, using motions and pausing words, etc. Teaching students compensation strategies can thereby improve their motivation and learning ability.

The result of this research was also strengthened by the relevant research conducted by Çetinkaya & Tilfarlioğlu (2020) in which the findings of the study demonstrated that items 18–36 of the questionnaire are those that pertain to metacognitive grammar learning strategies. Both successful students (mean 3.35) and unsuccessful students (mean: 3.33) employ metacognitive grammar learning strategy. According to Oxford's frequency table (1990), all of the students occasionally exhibited metacognitive strategy. The individuals did not use the compensation or memory strategies, making metacognitive the greatest strategy after cognitive and social/affective.

Another research conducted on grammar strategy was carried out by Juniar & Carissa (2020), but the outcome was different since it reveals that social strategy, rather than memory strategy, is the one that Intermediate English Grammar students utilize more frequently. This study suggests that there is a chance that students in Intermediate English Grammar classes have a propensity to learn with their friends. Because this research was conducted after the pandemic covid-19 era when students were still adapting from pure online to learning systems in their grammar courses, so further studies on how the students are used to blended learning are necessary. Nevertheless, this study still has limitations since this study only focuses on beginner students who follow the basic level of grammar course, it does not discuss the level of grammar ability, anxiety, and causes of grammar anxiety. This study also could further be extended to measure the effectiveness of the cognitive, metacognitive, social, affective, compensation, and memory strategies listed above.

In light of the findings of this study, it can be concluded that students typically evaluate their own grammar learning style and coordinate their own learning activities. Metacognitive strategies also assist students in focusing on specific grammar tasks in order to review concepts and make connections to prior learning.

CONCLUSION

As the first grammar research conducted at Hamzanwadi University, this study may provide more empirical data about grammar learning strategies that students employ when they deal with Basic Grammar Courses after the Covid 19 pandemic. Lecturers may practice the concepts and understanding related to learning strategy for understanding the learners better. The result of the study is to provide a contribution to the lecturers about the students'

grammar learning strategies. Furthermore, the result of this study is to give support to the lecturers to know more about what kind of strategies that students use. In addition, the study is intended to help the students to be aware of the strategies they currently use, and monitor the effectiveness of strategies they use. The benefits for the students may practice the concepts for understanding and learning English in order to get satisfactory results. Finally, other researchers may practice or choose kinds of strategies to study and evolve, rove, criticize, and check out other sides related to the kinds of learning strategies. The goal of this study was to identify the various grammar learning strategies used by first-semester English education study program students who took a basic English grammar course. Kemp (2007) and Bayou (2008) employ the learning strategy hypothesis. Metacognitive strategy, cognitive strategy, social, affective, memory, and compensatory strategy are the six categories that learning strategies fall under. The researcher distributed a questionnaire in order to get answers to their questions. The researcher then analyzed and examined the Grammar Learning Strategies that the students had used. Based on the research's findings, the participants in the subsequent basic English grammar course used every learning strategy. The results of a survey showed that the most popular learning technique is metacognition, which is followed by cognitive, social, affective, and memory. Compensation was the least popular strategy. Because students prefer to review their own errors and attempt to contrast them with the right answers, metacognitive becomes the first approach used. Additionally, metacognitive skills assist students in organizing and confirming learning objectives, selecting a learning strategy, and assessing and giving feedback on learning results. Students that applied metacognitive techniques typically have better self-management, self-monitoring, and preparation skills, which enable them to exercise additional metacognitive strategies.

REFERENCES

- Alhaysony, M. (2017). Language learning strategies use by Saudi EFL students: the effect of duration of English language study and gender. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 7(1).
- Ali, A. M., & Razali, A. B. (2019). A Review of Studies on Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies in Teaching Reading Comprehension for ESL/EFL Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 12(6), 94–111.
- 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 Journal of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 37–51.
- Amirbakzadeh Kalati, E., & Memari, M. (2017). Investigating language learning strategies in ELT. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 8, 210–220.
- Bayou, Y. (2015). *Grammar Learning Strategies Use of Grade 11 Students at Medhanealem Preparatory School: Gender in Focus*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Bruen, J. (2020). Language learning strategies for reading comprehension: assessing the strategy use of young adults at beginners' level taking Chinese, German, Japanese or Spanish as foreign languages at university. *The Language Learning Journal*, 48(2), 170–186.
- Cahyono, B. Y., & Widiati, U. (2015). The teaching of EFL vocabulary in the Indonesian context: the state of the art. *TEFLIN Journal*, 19(1), 1–17.
- Çetinkaya, İ. G., & Tilfarlioğlu, F. Y. (2020). Three Factors Affecting Language Learning: Grammar Learning Strategies, Self-efficacy, and Learner Autonomy. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(7), 2929–2936.
- Cohen, A. D., & Henry, A. (2019). Focus on the language learner: Styles, strategies and motivation 1. In *An introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 165–189). Routledge.

- Cohen, A. D., & Macaro, E. (2009). Language learner strategies: 30 years of research and practice. *Language*, 13(2).
- Djurayeva, Y., Ayatov, R., & Shegay, A. (2020). Current Problems and Resolutions of Teaching English Grammar. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, 3, 572–576.
- Fitria, T. N. (2020). Spelling Error Analysis in Students Writing English Composition. *Getsempena English Education Journal*, 7(2), 240–254.
- Huang, W., Hew, K. F., & Fryer, L. K. (2022). Chatbots for language learning—Are they really useful? A systematic review of chatbot-supported language learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 38(1), 237–257.
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing*. Cambridge university press.
- Idris, N., Isa, H. M., Zakaria, N. N. N., & Mohd, N. A. (2022). An Investigation of the Use of Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies in Foreign Language Learning. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 12(2), 70–89.
- Jovanović, J., Gašević, D., Dawson, S., Pardo, A., & Mirriahi, N. (2017). Learning analytics to unveil learning strategies in a flipped classroom. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 33(4), 74–85.
- Juniar, R., & Carissa, D. (2020). A survey of grammar learning strategies used by EFL learners in Indonesia. *International Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 2(1), 160–171.
- Kemp, C. (2007). Strategic Processing in Grammar Learning: Do Multilinguals Use More Strategies?. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 241–261.
- Koç, H. K. (2017). The Preferences of In-Service ELT Teachers' Language Learning Strategies in Their Own Language Learning Process. *Online Submission*, 5(1), 359–376.
- Kunasaraphan, K. (2015). English learning strategy and proficiency level of the first year students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 1853–1858.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & DeCarrico, J. (2019). Grammar. In *An introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 19–34). Routledge.
- Lestari, M., & Wahyudin, A. Y. (2020). Language learning strategies of undergraduate EFL students. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 25–30.
- McDonough, S. (2017). *Applied linguistics in language education*. Routledge.
- Mitsea, E., & Drigas, A. (2019). A Journey into the metacognitive learning strategies. *International Journal of Online & Biomedical Engineering*, 15(14).
- Mohammed, M. H. (2018). Challenges of learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL) by non-native learners. *International Journal of Social Science and Economic Research*, 3(4), 1381–1400.
- Mulugeta, F., & Beyour, Y. (2019). Grammar learning strategies use of preparatory school students: gender in focus. *The Ethiopian Journal of Education*, 39(2), 115–144.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Pawlak, M. (2020a). 17 Grammar and Good Language Teachers. *Lessons from Good Language Teachers*, 219.
- Pawlak, M. (2020b). Grammar learning strategies as a key to mastering second language grammar: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 53(3), 358–370.
- Syukur, R. S., & Setiyana, R. (2021). Exploring Teaching and Learning English at SMAIT Nurul Fikri. *Getsempena English Education Journal*, 8(2).
- Tanewong, S. (2019). Metacognitive pedagogical sequence for less-proficient Thai EFL listeners: A comparative investigation. *RELC Journal*, 50(1), 86–103.
- Tunga, S. G. (2021). Cognitive Strategies Utilized in Reading Critically by High and Low Achievers. *Lectio: Journal of Language and Language Teaching*, 1(1), 1–12.

- Wael, A., Asnur, M. N. A., & Ibrahim, I. (2018). Exploring Students' Learning Strategies in Speaking Performance. *International Journal of Language Education*, 2(1), 65–71.
- Yulianti, D. B. (2018). Learning strategies applied by the students in writing English text. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 8(1), 19–38.
- Zekrati, S. (2017). The relationship between grammar learning strategy use and language achievement of Iranian high school EFL learners. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 3(2), 129–138.
- 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.