

Punctuation Learning Techniques and Language Structure Learning Procedures: Would They Say They are Connected?

Dr. S. Ramesh^{1*}, Dr. P. Jeyasankar², Mr. S. Rajasekar³

ABSTRACT

This study answers various calls for research on Sentence structure Learning Systems (GLS), a region that has been dismissed for quite a long time. The examination reveals insight into the connection between language structure learning or informative methodologies and understudies' use of GLS doled out to foster express and understood information on punctuation. Two sub-classifications of Pawlak's (2018) Punctuation Learning Procedure Stock (GLSI) were utilized to survey GLS use in these two sub-classifications by understudies who favor express sentence structure learning and the people who lean toward verifiable language learning. A Pearson connection coefficient test was led to look at this relationship. The review uncovered a moderate utilization of GLS for creating unequivocal and implied punctuation information. Moreover, it saw as an immaterial, delicate, and negative relationship between punctuation learning or informative methodologies and GLS used to foster express information on sentence structure. Additionally, an immaterial, extremely feeble, and negative relationship was accounted for between language structure learning or educational methodologies, and GLS used to foster implied information on syntax. The review talks about factors affecting language learning and GLS use and features the limits.

Keywords: *Reveals, Structure Learning, Doled, Understudies, Immaterial, Extremely Feeble*

Syntax is a basic part of language getting the hang of, working with the securing of right language structures vital for powerful correspondence in the objective language. It is urgent in developing lucid composed and spoken texts, laying out an establishment for significant language use. Therefore, syntax has turned into a point of convergence in learning and educating language.

Language learners commonly employ Language Learning Strategies (LLS) to enhance their proficiency in foreign or second language (L2) acquisition. Grammar learning is intricately connected to other language skills, such as reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Research in this field has demonstrated that language learners utilize diverse LLS that significantly contribute to their overall language learning (Oxford, 1990, 2011, 2017; Cohen, 2011; Cohen

¹ Assistant Professor of English, NPR college of Engineering and Technology, Natham, Tamilnadu

² Assistant Professor of Tamil, NPR college of Engineering and Technology, Natham, Tamilnadu

³ Assistant Professor of English, NPR college of Engineering and Technology, Natham, Tamilnadu

*Corresponding Author

Received: May 28 2025; Revision Received: June 14, 2025; Accepted: June 20, 2025

Punctuation Learning Techniques and Language Structure Learning Procedures: Would They Say They are Connected?

& Griffiths, 2015; Chamot, 2004, 2005; Grenfell & Harris, 1999; Griffiths & Oxford, 2014; Griffiths, 2013; Macaro, 2001, 2006, 2009). As a result, language learners are presumed to employ specific LLS dedicated to controlling their grammar learning process.

While LLS have been extensively discussed concerning reading, writing, listening, speaking, and vocabulary, there is a notable gap in understanding Grammar Learning Strategies (GLS). Scholars in the field, including Cohen (2011), Cohen and Macaro (2007), Oxford (2011), Oxford et al. (2007), and Pawlak (2018), have highlighted this deficiency, calling for more in-depth investigations into GLS. Drawing a parallel with Vandergrift's (1997) characterization of listening strategies as the 'Cinderella of strategies' due to insufficient studies, Oxford et al. (2007) termed GLS as the 'Second Cinderella' for a similar reason.

In addition to the scarcity of studies in this area, GLS have not been adequately integrated into well-known LLS surveys, such as O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) survey, Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), or Cohen et al.'s (2002) Language Strategy Use Survey (LSUS). This remained the case until Oxford et al. (2007) addressed this gap with their groundbreaking review of GLS, presenting an initial list based on grammar learning or instruction approaches.

This initial list inspired Pawlak (2013, 2018) to classify GLS and develop the first valid and reliable Grammar Learning Strategy Inventory (GLSI). The GLSI marks a significant advancement in the field of GLS, offering a structured framework for further research and preventing the abandonment of LLS in favor of broader concepts such as self-regulation (Dörnyei, 2005).

While the setting of the current review is affected by the informative language showing approach, underlining implied syntax guidance, some language instructors actually advocate for express punctuation educating, particularly for grown-up students who might profit from grasping syntactic guidelines before reasonable application. In Saudi schools, where the communicative language teaching approach faces challenges (Althaqafi, 2018), grammar is taught explicitly in dedicated classes using specialized textbooks (Aljohani, 2012; Almuhammadi, 2020; Al-Seghayer, 2011). This aligns with Ellis's (2002) observation that the grammar-translation method continues to be widely employed globally.

In opposition to the affirmation by Oxford et al. (2007) that there is no connection between language structure learning or guidance techniques and system use, the current review expects to investigate this contention. The scientist challenges this point of view, setting that the decision among unequivocal and understood syntax learning and guidance techniques might influence students' use of GLS to foster express and verifiable language information. Thusly, this study examines whether punctuation learning or guidance approaches impact the utilization of GLS by understudies from an Arabic language and social foundation presented to blended sentence structure guidance draws near. This examination will zero in on two sub-classes of Pawlak's (2018) GLSI, and a Pearson connection coefficient will be utilized to determine the connection between punctuation learning or guidance strategies and the utilization of GLS relegated to foster express and certain information on language structure. The ensuing segment gives definitions and surveys of GLS, unequivocal and verifiable language structure guidance, and learning techniques, remembering the level of awareness for every strategy. Factors affecting language learning (sentence structure learning specifically), grouping, and inventories of GLS are additionally looked into.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Although GLS were neglected or included within LLS major categories and definitions, Oxford (2017, p. 244) defined GLS 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." This definition is based on the updated version of the LLS definition, which existed after a long debate in the field of LLS on what a strategy is (See Oxford, 2017). To all the more likely comprehend GLS, it is important to have a brief glance at showing sentence structure inside significant language educating approaches. The sentence structure interpretation strategy, in which L2 students are given an equivalent measure of language and jargon, was one of the earliest techniques for educating punctuation. It was followed by the audio-lingual method in which learners should acquire particular grammatical patterns from their everyday language (Bade, 2008). After a while, the Communicative Language Teaching approach, balancing attention to language communication and structure (Littlewood, 1992), has become the most common approach in teaching grammar.

The grammar-translation method focuses mainly on grammatical parsing, where the form and inflection of words are explained (Celce-Murcia, 1991). This approach was broadly reprimanded as it brought about the powerlessness of language students to impart properly in the objective language. This approach was snubbed by the open methodology, which basically relies upon empowering students to convey in the objective language through pretends and gathering work. The content of taught materials should be grammatical structures and include reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills (Celce-Murcia, 1991). Although this approach is now considered one of the most effective ways of teaching L2 grammar, it might have an unseen impact on using GLS. From their point of view, Oxford et al. (2007, p. 117) trust that "... most scientists who have become notable in the L2 student technique region, maybe impacted by the position of safety of sentence structure in the open language showing approach, have either disregarded syntax systems or slid them into the more broad 'mental methodology' class, in this manner accidentally concealing these procedures from view." They summed up that punctuation can be educated certainly or expressly, as made sense of underneath.

Under the implied mode, there are two methods of guidance: Spotlight on Significance and Spotlight on Structure. In Spotlight on Importance, the essential spotlight is on significance, and language structure is kept away from in the homeroom. Students are neither provided with syntactic principles nor coordinated to actuate them in this mode. Besides, the objective structure isn't upgraded or made unequivocal. It isn't exceptionally unique, yet in Spotlight on Structure, there is as yet an emphasis on significance. Furthermore, students are not provided with syntactic principles or coordinated to actuate them. In this mode, the objective structure isn't made unequivocal yet upgraded or perceptible. Under the express mode, there are two methods of guidance: inductive and rational. In the inductive mode, the essential spotlight is on the structure, albeit the objective structure is neither improved nor made unequivocal. In this mode, syntactic standards are not provided, however students are coordinated to actuate them. In the logical mode, the essential spotlight is on the structure where the objective structure is recognizable, improved, and made unequivocal. In this mode, grammatical rules are supplied to learners. In an inductive activity, a student infers a grammatical rule based on examples he or she passes by; however, in a deductive activity, a student is given the grammatical rule where he or she practices it in examples (Larsen-Freeman, 2001).

Punctuation Learning Techniques and Language Structure Learning Procedures: Would They Say They are Connected?

Language structure gaining can't be confined from punctuation guidance. There are two methods of punctuation learning, verifiable and express, which can't be isolated (Suzuki et al., 2023). Certain learning is "input handling without such a goal, occurring unknowingly," nonetheless, unequivocal learning is "input handling with the cognizant aim to see if the information data contains normalities and, assuming this is the case, to figure out the ideas and rules with which these consistencies can be caught" (Hulstijn, 2005, p. 131). Cognizance is a fundamental component in separating among understood and express learning. A few specialists (DeKeyser, 1994; Hulstijn, 2005) accept that understood learning happens unknowingly, albeit a few scientists (Ellis, 1995; Schmidt, 1995) think there is a level of cognizance in certain learning. Going against the norm, unequivocal learning requires cognizance. To be sure, cognizance assumes a fundamental part in characterizing LLS, as most of researchers in the field concur that there is a metacognitive part in any technique where a student deliberately and purposefully joins in, breaks down, designs an errand, and screens the most common way of learning (Cohen, 2007; Griffiths, 2013, and Oxford, 2017). Those researchers are as yet uncertain of "... how aware of and mindful of their language ways of behaving students should be for those ways of behaving to be viewed as methodologies" (Cohen, 2007, p. 43). This implies that language students have a sort of cognizance while sending techniques, however the level of that awareness is as yet unknown. Accordingly, the presence of GLS inside verifiable learning is exceptionally restricted or even missing (Oxford et al., 2007). Be that as it may, unequivocal learning, with its cognizant nature, can be viewed as the appropriate learning mode, where GLS can be best conveyed.

Since unequivocal learning is fitting for sending language procedures, we ought to inspect its inductive and rational learning modes. DeKeyser (1994, p. 188) characterizes inductive advancing as "rules are surmised from models introduced (first)." Thus, in this educational experience, students deliberately search for normality's in the info and how these consistencies work utilizing cognizant tasks to grasp the design (Oxford et al., 2007). Insightful learning, then again, signifies "rules are given before any models are seen" (DeKeyser, 1994, p. 188). In this mode, syntactic standards are given to students and plainly showed where students ought to initially comprehend them and afterward apply them in occasions — remembering that many variables might impact the connection between language structure learning or guidance techniques and GLS use, like orientation, age, instructive level, formative stage, ethnic or racial foundation, convictions, learning styles, values, and objectives (Oxford et al., 2007) as examined beneath.

Concerning that impact GLS use, the current review needs to analyze the contention that punctuation learning or guidance strategies don't affect the utilization of GLS. The current review centers around how language structure learning or guidance strategies (unequivocal and understood) may impact GLS used to foster express and certain information on syntax. Oxford et al. (2007) accept that informative strategies for language structure don't control L2 syntax learning. They gave a few factors that assume a fundamental part in learning language structure. One of these elements is the age at which grown-up students could require express learning in which they will focus harder on structures to control the given linguistic decide in a manner that is unique in relation to how youthful students learn punctuation. Another variable is learning style inclinations, where L2 students with various learning styles will learn L2 syntax in various ways. As per them, the elements that impact learning styles (e.g., age, racial foundation, orientation, and instructive level) in a roundabout way impact the decision of GLS. Notwithstanding students' convictions, they accept that the objectives and upsides of the foundation and educator are among the elements that could impact GLS utilize

Punctuation Learning Techniques and Language Structure Learning Procedures: Would They Say They are Connected?

more than the technique for guidance (Oxford et al. (2007)). They sum up that "age, phase of L2 improvement, nature of the L2, nature of the L1, and important inconsistencies between the L2 and L1" are among different elements that influence GLS use (p. 124).

Prior, it was referenced that the open language showing approach had affected the presence of GLS, as specialists in the field of LLS disregarded them or classified them under broad mental procedures. Thusly, there was no scientific classification for GLS for quite a while; be that as it may, a few researchers sorted LLS in various ways. A few researchers in the field of LLS created scientific categorizations in light of the reason they intend to achieve and introduced LLS in various studies. A well-known illustration of this sort of survey is the Methodology Stock for Language Learning (Ledge), planned by Rebecca Oxford in 1990. This study included 80 things covering six classes of procedures: memory techniques, mental systems, pay methodologies, metacognitive procedures, emotional techniques, and social methodologies. GLS were not alluded to under a syntax class in this review. Different researchers classified LLS in view of language abilities. An astounding illustration of this scientific categorization is Cohen et al. (2002), who addressed this scientific categorization in a review known as the Language Methodology Use Overview (LSUS). This overview included 89 things covering tuning in, talking, perusing, composing, jargon, and interpretation. A more limited rendition of this overview is intended for youthful students. Once more, GLS were not taken a gander at in this overview, in spite of the fact that jargon had its part. Different scientific categorizations were deciphered into different overviews like Anderson and Vandergrift (1996), Public Capital Language Asset Center (NCLRC) (2000), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), Vandergrift et al. (2006), and others in which GLS were completely ignored. As of late, Oxford et al. (2024) fostered the Indicative Stock for Self-Directed Language Learning (DISLL) to survey the utilization of self-controlled learning systems among students of English as an extra language.

While trying to gather and sort GLS, Pawlak (2013) presented his GLSI, which incorporates 70 things separated into four classifications as follows: 8 metacognitive methodologies; 50 mental procedures conveyed into four subcategories: A-10 GLS used to further develop sentence structure perception and creation during correspondence; B-24 GLS used to foster students' express information on punctuation, which were utilized in the current review; C-10 GLS used to foster students' verifiable information on syntax, which were likewise utilized in the current review; D-6 GLS used to treat students' mistakes and remedial criticism during language creation; 7 emotional techniques; and 5 social systems. This scientific categorization, as the principal order of GLS, depends on past scientific categorizations like Oxford's (1990) Ledge and O'Malley and Chamot's (1990), which were subsequently upheld by Cohen and Dörnyei (2002), who arranged LLS into metacognitive, mental, social, and emotional techniques. GLSI is presently utilized in many examinations to gauge GLS use (Pawlak, 2024).

Sooner than Pawlak (2013), Oxford (2011) introduced her Essential Self-guideline Model in which she grouped LLS into three areas: metacognitive, social, and emotional. This model was refreshed when Oxford (2017) added another area, the inspirational space. In the two models, GLS, specifically, were not highlighted yet were contained inside the four spaces or classifications, and because of the nature and capacity of LLS to exist in more than one classification, Oxford (2017) stressed the significance of system ease and the trouble of confining a methodology to exist just in one class. This applies to GLS as they underlie LLS. Applying the idea of technique ease by Oxford (2017), it is currently direct to comprehend

Punctuation Learning Techniques and Language Structure Learning Procedures: Would They Say They are Connected?

the definition and how LLS are arranged. Oxford (2017, p. 158) highlighted the significance of methodology arrangements just to convey about LLS. Notwithstanding, she called for additional adaptability and ease with regards to system order as she states, "Despite the fact that we want formal classes and names to have the option to impart about procedures, we should perceive those techniques have a remarkable approach to wriggling beyond our most finely made marks and classifications." The accompanying area represents the procedure used to investigate the connection between language learning or guidance draws near and the utilization of GLS doled out to foster express and implied information on sentence structure. Research questions, the information assortment instrument utilized, and members' depictions are likewise given.

1. To research the connection between language structure learning or guidance draws near and the use of GLS doled out to foster express and certain information on syntax, two sub-classes of Pawlak's (2018) GLSI were utilized. These subcategories planned to gauge GLS utilized by understudies who favor express punctuation learning and the individuals who favor verifiable syntax learning. In a web-based overview directed through Google Structures, members were approached to demonstrate their inclination for learning punctuation unequivocally or verifiably prior to finishing the GLSI. This starter question was fundamental for processing the relationship between language structure learning or guidance strategies and utilizing GLS to foster unequivocal and implied information on syntax.

2. Research Questions

The review looked for replies to the accompanying examination questions:

- (1) Is there a critical connection among express and verifiable language structure learning or guidance approaches and utilizing GLS to foster unequivocal information on punctuation?
- (2) Is there a critical connection among express and verifiable language structure learning or guidance approaches and utilizing GLS to foster understood information on punctuation?

Survey

To evaluate understudies' utilization of GLS, a web-based review utilizing Google Structures was led by sending the overview connect to the members on the Board stage. The study included two sub-classes of Pawlak's (2018) GLSI, zeroing in on mental systems utilized by L2 students to foster unequivocal and verifiable information on language structure. The main sub-class contained 24 GLS showing how unequivocal information on language structure is created, while the second sub-classification included 10 GLS demonstrating how understood information on syntax is created. A five-point Likert scale was applied in the overview where 1 (it doesn't concern me by any stretch of the imagination) and 5 (it impeccably concerns me) sequentially show the low and high utilization of the GLS.

Participants

The members in this study were 172 male first year undergrads, matured somewhere in the range of 17 and 21, selected at NPR School of Designing and Innovation. These understudies were embraced an English One course lined up with A1 and A2 levels, and later, in the subsequent semester, they were supposed to advance to an English Two course (B1 and B1 In addition to) following the Normal European System of Reference (CEFR) for dialects. The language of guidance for their school review was English. Members went to 21 English language classes each week, including 15 language abilities classes and separate classes for

Punctuation Learning Techniques and Language Structure Learning Procedures: Would They Say They are Connected?

sentence structure and jargon. The program, considered serious in Saudi Arabia, involved express syntax guidance utilizing an assigned course book and implied guidance through an abilities course reading covering perusing, composing, tuning in, and talking undertakings. Following 15 weeks of study, members were supposed to arrive at the A2 capability level. Members were educated about the review, given the choice to take an interest or pull out whenever, and guaranteed of the privacy of their reactions for research purposes. Their willful overview finish demonstrated their consent to take part in the review.

RESULTS

The Factual Bundle for the Sociologies (SPSS) was utilized for information investigation. The graphic measurements in Table 1 show that out of 172 members, 62 (36%) members favored learning language expressly, while 110 (64%) favored learning syntax certainly. The general method for utilizing GLS allotted to foster express and implied information on syntax (Table 2) filled in as reliant factors. Interestingly, sentence structure learning or guidance draws near (express and certain) were viewed as the autonomous factors. The Pearson connection coefficient was used to investigate the connection between syntax learning or guidance approaches and utilizing GLS assigned to foster express and implied punctuation information.

Table 1. Participants' grammar learning methods

Grammar learning or instruction method	N	Percent
Express	62	36%
Certain	110	64%
Total	172	100%

Table 2 displays the overall means of GLS used to develop explicit and implicit knowledge of grammar, indicating medium values ($M = 3.02$ (express) and $M = 3.21$ (certain) based on Oxford's (1990) calculation, ranging between High ($M = 3.50 - 5.00$), Medium ($M = 2.50 - 3.49$), and Low ($M = 1 - 2.49$). While further analysis of GLS use could be conducted, it is beyond the scope of the present study.

Table 2. Overall means of GLS use

	GLS for express knowledge	GLS for certain knowledge
Overall means (M)	3.02 (Medium)	3.21 (Medium)

1. Research Question 1

Is there a huge connection among express and certain language structure learning or guidance approaches and utilizing GLS to foster unequivocal information on punctuation?

A Pearson connection coefficient was registered to investigate this relationship. Table 3 uncovers a frail and negative connection ($r = -0.070$) between these factors. The p-esteem is 0.363, surpassing the standard importance level of 0.05, it isn't measurably vital for show that the connection.

**Punctuation Learning Techniques and Language Structure Learning Procedures: Would They Say
They are Connected?**

Table 3. Correlation between express and certain grammar learning or instruction approaches and GLS used to develop explicit knowledge of grammar

Grammar learning or instruction approaches	GLS explicit knowledge
Pearson correlation	-0.070
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.363
N	172

2. Research Question 2

Is there a huge connection between express language learning or guidance approach and utilizing GLS to foster unequivocal and implied information on punctuation?

Additionally, the Pearson connection coefficient was directed to investigate the connection among express and implied punctuation learning or guidance draws near, and GLS used to foster certain information on language structure. Figures in Table 4 show a feeble and negative connection ($r = -0.033$) and a genuinely immaterial connection ($p = 0.670$). Table 4. Correlation between grammar learning or instruction approaches and GLS used to develop implicit knowledge of grammar

Table 4

Express grammar learning or instruction approach	GLS verifiable knowledge
Pearson correlation	-0.033
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.670
N	172

In rundown, the outcomes recommend no genuinely critical connection among express and understood sentence structure learning or guidance draws near and the utilization of GLS assigned to foster unequivocal and implied language information in this example of 172 male undergrads.

Conversation

The aftereffects of this study line up with the affirmation made by Oxford et al. (2007) that syntax learning or guidance approaches don't fundamentally impact the utilization of GLS. Because of the main exploration question, the frail negative connection ($r = -0.070$) between language learning or guidance draws near and the 24 GLS used to foster unequivocal information on sentence structure was not genuinely critical ($p = 0.363$). Essentially, for the subsequent examination question, the frail negative connection ($r = -0.033$) between language structure learning or guidance draws near and the GLS used to foster implied information on syntax was likewise not measurably huge ($p = 0.670$). Accordingly, syntax learning or guidance draws near (express or certain) don't anticipate utilizing GLS to foster unequivocal and implied information on punctuation.

In spite of the specialist's underlying presumptions that express syntax learning could impact the utilization of GLS for unequivocal information and verifiable punctuation learning could influence the utilization of GLS for understood information, the discoveries didn't uphold these suspicions. The immaterial relationship proposes that adjustments of punctuation learning or guidance approaches are not emphatically connected with changes in that frame of mind of GLS in this specific situation. This builds up Oxford et al's. (2007: 135) affirmation that "students come up with and utilize procedures in light of their own

Punctuation Learning Techniques and Language Structure Learning Procedures: Would They Say They are Connected?

convictions, objectives, and sociocultural variables, as opposed to being exclusively impacted by educational approaches."

A few variables might add to the current review's noticed medium utilization of GLS. However not estimated, members' convictions about language learning could assume a part. Past examination by Yang (1999) and Park (1995) recommends that students' convictions impact their methodology use, and trust in learning English might bring about more dynamic language use. They accept that students' convictions decide their way of behaving. Accordingly, educators ought to consider this to support positive convictions that lead to more compelling LLS use overall and GLS use specifically. Acquainting language learning approaches with understudies may be smart to raise their consciousness of punctuation learning. Recognizing ways to deal with sentence structure learning permits understudies to find out about their favored approaches to learning and gives them chances to pick and endeavor alternate methods of syntax learning. In the meantime, this may emphatically add to their convictions about language structure learning and GLS use.

Instructors' convictions and educational techniques may likewise affect the members' utilization of GLS. Ellis (2008) features the significance of adjusting students' and instructors' convictions to improve language learning. The possible befuddle among understudy and educator convictions needs further investigation, albeit not examined in this review. In this way, educators' positive convictions about punctuation learning and GLS use might be passed on to understudies to help their language learning. Then again, understudies might secure these positive convictions and actually convey them while learning. Educators' convictions about the viability of GLS assume a vital part in upgrading their understudies' convictions about their language learning and understudies' utilization of GLS on the off chance that they have adequate experience, aim, and will.

Understudies' objectives in language acquiring could focus on abilities over syntax, affecting their utilization of GLS. Chamot (2004) underscores the impact of students' objectives on system decision, and in the current review, understudies' essential objective might be passing English courses to finish their examinations. This objective can be put suitably in acquainting understudies with GLS through overviews like GLSI, Ledge, or LSUS to find out about their ongoing technique use or through leading system guidance programs that raise understudies' information on the most proficient method to expand their collection of LLS, which ideally brings about better and more effective language learning. Getting some information about their other minor objectives of learning English can likewise be invaluable by empowering them to endeavor various ways to deal with syntax learning (assuming they favor unequivocal learning, they may be urged to attempt verifiable learning as well as the other way around) or conveying new LLS that could upgrade their language learning.

Learning style may be another basic element influencing members' GLS use in the current review. A few understudies with concrete-consecutive learning style will have a low capacity to bear uncertainty. Along these lines, they require unequivocal guidelines and bearings or bit by bit clarifications; nonetheless, instinctive arbitrary students endure equivocalness and attempt to find new linguistic standards themselves (Oxford, 2017). This lines up with Richards and Rappen (2014), who highlight students' learning styles and inclinations while learning sentence structure. They accept some language students feel awkward in the event that they don't grasp something, while others can coexist with equivocalness, attempting to verifiably learn syntax. Consequently, understudies' learning styles might impact their

Punctuation Learning Techniques and Language Structure Learning Procedures: Would They Say They are Connected?

utilization of GLS to foster express and understood information on punctuation. The medium utilization of GLS in the current review could demonstrate that members' learning styles addressed the previously mentioned learning styles in a nearby rate. Recollect that raising understudies' familiarity with their learning styles advances their insight about themselves and their learning inclinations, emphatically influences their language learning, and urges them to extend their learning styles, if conceivable, to utilize new GLS.

The plans and objectives of the members' English organization might add to their GLS use, with the members conceivably following the showing approaches underscored in their English program. Oxford et al. (2007) stress the job of establishments in forming understudies' GLS. The absence of methodology guidance in the members' English program might have affected members' procedure use. Consequently, drawing in language foundations to LLS guidance programs and different variables (students' convictions, objectives, punctuation learning approaches, systems, and styles) may uphold them in reevaluating their educational plans, objectives, and plans for educating language. They might foster new and important bits of knowledge that will assist them with assessing their language programs.

The degree of L2 advancement is another element that could impact GLS use in the current review. Oxford et al. (2007) accentuated the phase of L2 improvement as a fundamental element impacting students' utilization of GLS. Since members were all at the A2 level and their GLS use was medium in both GLS used to foster express and understood information on language, it would be significantly more persuading on the off chance that B1 or B1 in addition to understudies participated in the current review. This is an idea for one more near study to look at GLS use among understudies in various language levels.

The fair methodology of unequivocal and verifiable language guidance in the current review, pushed by researchers like Ellis (2006) and Oxford (2017), may add to the noticed medium utilization of GLS. Regardless of the frail negative connection, the review shows that utilizing a decent methodology doesn't emphatically influence the utilization of GLS. Subsequently, more examination is as yet expected to see what GLS students could use while learning language structure, whether deliberately or unwittingly. This may be directed utilizing verbally process conventions while students execute language activities or study punctuation in a reading material.

Taking everything into account, while the underlying target of this study was to challenge Oxford et al's. (2007) attestation that language learning or informative methodologies don't influence GLS, the outcomes went against this test. All things being equal, they confirmed Oxford et al's. (2007) contention, showing that singular factors like students' and educators' convictions, learning objectives, learning styles, institutional plans and objectives, and level of L2 improvement assume a huger part in molding the utilization of GLS than the picked punctuation learning or educational methodologies. Thus, this study upholds Oxford et al's. (2007) guarantee. Further examination that investigates this multitude of elements with regards to the current review will give savvy and far-reaching data about the connection between GLS use and these powerful factors.

CONCLUSION

The review examined the connection between language structure learning or guidance approaches and utilizing GLS to foster unequivocal and certain information on punctuation. The discoveries upheld the contention that no critical relationship exists between these

Punctuation Learning Techniques and Language Structure Learning Procedures: Would They Say They are Connected?

methodologies and utilizing GLS. The general method for members' GLS use for unequivocal and certain information were medium. The review acquainted GLS with understudies through the GLSI, possibly expanding their consciousness of language learning systems. Such mindfulness could decidedly influence understudies' convictions about language learning and ensuing GLS use. Instructors are liable for proceeding to bring issues to light through comparable reviews or methodology guidance programs. Bringing GLS into language showing rehearses requires a nuanced comprehension of how these techniques converge with verifiable and unequivocal informative methodologies. Pawlak's (2013) GLSI, intended to gauge GLS use, addresses a critical stage towards efficiently incorporating GLS into language learning research.

Honestly, tending to GLS in language educational plans requires the improvement of materials and educational strategies that unequivocally target LLS overall and GLS specifically. Task plan and homeroom exercises ought to be adjusted to encourage the advancement of unequivocal and certain language information. Educators assume a vital part in directing students in the cognizant utilization of GLS, cultivating metacognitive mindfulness, and working with key decisions that line up with students' mental styles and inclinations. In any case, the review had a few constraints. It zeroed in exclusively on male undergrads in a single language establishment, and further examination including female understudies or extra language foundations could give a more exhaustive comprehension. The review didn't investigate understudies' convictions, learning objectives, and learning styles, which could impact GLS use. Investigating these elements among understudies will help with investigating the connection among them and the utilization of GLS.

The current review is fundamentally quantitative, albeit future exploration integrating subjective information assortment techniques like meetings, center gatherings, and journal studies is prescribed to acquire bits of knowledge into understudies' convictions about their language learning and GLS use. Locating techniques builds the legitimacy of the discoveries and gives a more far-reaching comprehension of the connection between language learning or guidance strategies and GLS use. Fundamentally, the review adds to the continuous investigation of the connection between language learning approaches and students' GLS decisions. It underscores the need to definitively figure out student convictions, educator convictions and practices, and institutional objectives. It plans to exhaustively distinguish the elements impacting the utilization of GLS in language learning settings.

REFERENCES

- Aljohani, M. A. S. (2012). Grammar beliefs of in-service teachers. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 11(1), 96-108.
- Almuhammadi, A. (2020). Teaching grammar: Professional needs of Saudi EFL instructors. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10(3), 14-20. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n3p14>
- Al-Seghayer, K. (2011). *English teaching in Saudi Arabia: Status, issues, and challenges*. Hala.
- Althaqafi, A. S. (2018). A Critical Review of Grammar Teaching Methodologies in the Saudi Context. *English Language Teaching*, 11(11), 65-73. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n11p65>
- Anderson, N. J., & Vandergrift, L. (1996). Increasing metacognitive awareness in the L2 classroom by using think-aloud protocols and other verbal report formats. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies around the World: Crosscultural*

Punctuation Learning Techniques and Language Structure Learning Procedures: Would They Say They are Connected?

- Perspectives* (pp. 176-192). University of Hawai'i Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780824897376-002>
- Bade, M. (2008). Grammar and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (pp. 266-281). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511497667.016>
- Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.). (1991). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (2nd ed.). Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 1(1), 14-26.
- Chamot, A. U. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 112-130. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190505000061>
- Cohen, A. D. (2007). Coming to terms with language learner strategies: Surveying the experts. In A. D. Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds.),
- Cohen, A. D. (2011). *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Cohen, A. D., & Dörnyei, Z. (2002). Focus on the language learner: Motivation, styles and strategies. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *An introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 170–190). Edward Arnold.
- Cohen, A. D., & Griffiths, C. (2015). Revisiting LLS research 40 years later. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(2), 414-429. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.225>
- Cohen, A. D., & Macaro, E. (Eds.) (2007). *Language learner strategies: Thirty years of research and practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, A. D., Oxford, R. L., & Chi, J. C. (2002). Language Strategy Use Survey. *Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota*. Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1nGerc0LJV1ZWT2BwZms4iTAKRbq0ads/view>
- DeKeyser, R. (1994). Implicit and explicit learning of L2 grammar: A pilot study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 188-194. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587210>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Erlbaum. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.19.05dor>
- Ellis, N. C. (1995). Consciousness in second language acquisition: A review of field studies and laboratory experiments. *Language Awareness*, 4(3), 123-146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.1995.9959876>
- Ellis, R. (2002). Methodological options in grammar teaching materials. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms*. (pp. 155-179). Erlbaum.
- Ellis, R. (2006). The methodology of task-based teaching. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(3), 19-45.
- Ellis, R. (2008). Learner beliefs and language learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 10(4), 7-25.
- Grenfell, M., & Harris V. (1999). *Modern languages and learning strategies: In theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Griffiths, C. (2013). *The strategy factor in successful language learning*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847699428>
- Griffiths, C., & Oxford R. L. (2014). The twenty-first century landscape of language learning strategies: Introduction to this special issue. *System*, 43, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.009>
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2005). Theoretical and empirical issues in the study of implicit and explicit second-language learning: Introduction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(2), 129-140. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050084>

Punctuation Learning Techniques and Language Structure Learning Procedures: Would They Say They are Connected?

- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). Teaching grammar. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 3, 251-266.
- Littlewood, W. (1992). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Macaro, E. (2009). Developments in language learner strategies. In V. Cook & L. Wei (Eds.), *Contemporary Applied Linguistics* (pp. 10-36). Continuum.
- National Capital Language Resource Centre (NCLRC) (2000). *Elementary immersion students' perceptions of language learning strategies use and self-efficacy*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED445521.pdf>
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524490>
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Heinle and Heinle/Cengage. Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies*. Longman.
- Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315719146>
- Oxford, R., Gu, P., Gunning, P., & Hernández González, T. (2024). Considerations in designing and validating the Diagnostic Inventory for Self-Regulated Language Learning (DISLL): Status of the process. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 41, 4-20. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2024.41.02>
- 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 University Press.
- Park, G. (1995). *Language learning strategies and beliefs about language learning of university students learning English in Korea*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Pawlak, M. (2013). Researching grammar learning strategies: Combining the macro- and micro-perspective. In L. Salski, W. Szubko-Sitarek, & J. Majer (Eds.), *Perspectives on foreign language learning* (pp. 191–220). University of Łódź Press.

Acknowledgment

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Ramesh, S., Jeyasankar, P. & Rajasekar, S. (2025). Punctuation Learning Techniques and Language Structure Learning Procedures: Would They Say They are Connected?. *International Journal of Social Impact*, 10(2), 288-300. DIP: 18.02.028/20251002, DOI: 10.25215/2455/1002028