

UDC 371.3+372.88

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/87-3-50>**Liliia SHOLUDKO,***orcid.org/0009-0006-5858-9518**Senior Lecturer at the Department of Romance-Germanic Languages
National Academy of the Security Service of Ukraine
(Kyiv, Ukraine) sholudkoliliya@gmail.com*

GRAMMAR IN ACTION: TEACHING ENGLISH TO MILITARY CADETS THROUGH GRAMMAR ANALYSIS

The article explores the grammar analysis role of teaching English grammar to the military cadets, highlighting the need to develop teaching strategies to address the linguistic challenges that arise during military operations. Since military communication requires clarity, accuracy, and rapid comprehension, this study focuses on how grammar teaching can be adapted to meet these demands. Effective communication in a military context is critical not only to mission success, but also to personnel safety and coordination. Given the changing nature of the military environment, cadets and service members must have a deep understanding of both military vocabulary and grammar in order to function effectively in a variety of operational scenarios.

One of the central arguments of the article is that teaching English grammar to cadets must be linked to military realities. The study highlights the importance of learning through military scenarios, such as operational orders and situation reports, so that cadets can apply grammar concepts in practical settings. Military materials, such as maps, diagrams and action assessments, are used to make grammar learning interesting and relevant. The article also highlights the role of simulations and role-playing as tools to strengthen language skills and improve comprehension.

Grammar analysis is conducted in the context of a CELTA course, where understanding and analysing grammatical structures is crucial for both effective lesson planning and learner engagement. The article highlights that grammar analysis is a practical tool that helps military English teachers anticipate potential student questions, explain complex structures and correct errors in a systematic and pedagogically correct manner.

It also examines the importance of pronunciation, especially in terms of military terminology and acronyms unique to the field. It provides examples of how specific stress patterns and articulation can affect the clarity of communication in military environments. The emphasis is on ensuring that cadets can pronounce terms correctly, as incorrect pronunciation can lead to misunderstandings during combat operations.

The study concluded that careful grammatical analysis in lesson planning is essential in training military English use, improving both the academic performance of cadets and their effective use of the language in real operational situations.

Key words: *grammar analysis, military English, concept questions, terminology, contextualized learning, communicative skills, pronunciation practice.*

Лілія ШОЛУДЬКО,*orcid.org/0009-0006-5858-9518**старший викладач кафедри романо-германських мов
Національної академії Служби Безпеки України
(Київ, Україна) sholudkoliliya@gmail.com*

ГРАМАТИКА В ДІЇ: ВИКЛАДАННЯ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ ДЛЯ ВІЙСЬКОВИХ КУРСАНТІВ ЧЕРЕЗ ГРАМАТИЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ

Стаття досліджує як граматичний аналіз покращує викладання граматики англійської мови для військових, підкреслюючи необхідність розробки стратегій навчання для вирішення лінгвістичних проблем, що виникають під час військових операцій. Оскільки військове спілкування вимагає ясності, точності та швидкого розуміння, це дослідження зосереджується на тому, як викладання граматики може бути адаптовано для задоволення цих вимог. Ефективне спілкування у військовому контексті має вирішальне значення не лише для успіху місії, але й для безпеки та координації особового складу. Враховуючи мінливий характер військового середовища, курсанти та військовослужбовці повинні глибоко розуміти як військову лексику, так і граматику, щоб ефективно функціонувати в різних оперативних сценаріях.

Один із центральних аргументів статті полягає в тому, що навчання граматики англійської мови для військових має бути пов'язаним з військовими реаліями. Дослідження підкреслює важливість навчання через військові сценарії, такі як оперативні накази та звіти про ситуацію, щоб кадети могли застосовувати граматичні поняття в практичних умовах. Військові матеріали, такі як карти, діаграми та оцінки дій, використовуються для того, щоб зробити навчання граматики цікавим та актуальним. Крім того, у статті підкреслюється роль симуляцій та рольових ігор як інструментів для зміцнення мовних навичок та покращення розуміння.

У статті представлені приклади того, як елементи військової мови, такі як акроніми, пасивні конструкції та спеціалізована термінологія, можна розбити на компоненти для легшого викладання та вивчення. Цей аналіз проведено в контексті курсу CELTA, де розуміння та аналіз граматичних структур є вирішальним як для ефективного планування уроків, так і для зацікавлення здобувачів освіти. У статті наголошується, що граматичний аналіз – це практичний інструмент, який допомагає викладачам англійської у військових передбачати потенційні запитання студентів, пояснювати складні структури та систематично і педагогічно правильно виправляти помилки.

Крім того, досліджується важливість вимови, особливо з точки зору військової термінології та акронімів, унікальних для цієї галузі. Воно наводить приклади того, як специфічні моделі наголосу та артикуляція можуть впливати на чіткість спілкування у військових середовищах. Акцент робиться на забезпеченні того, щоб курсанти могли правильно вимовляти терміни, оскільки неправильна вимова може призвести до непорозуміння протягом бойових дій.

В ході дослідження зроблено висновок, що ретельний граматичний аналіз при плануванні занять, є важливим у тренуванні вживання англійської мови для військових, покращуючи як академічну успішність курсантів, так і ефективно використання мови для реальних оперативних умов.

Ключові слова: граматичний аналіз, англійська мова для військових, концептуальні запитання, термінологія, контекстуальне навчання, комунікативні навички, практика вимови.

Problem statement. Effective communication is crucial in military operations, where clarity and precision in language can significantly influence mission success and personnel safety. This underscores the necessity of grammar instruction tailored to the specific linguistic demands of military English. Given the evolving nature of combat scenarios, a comprehensive understanding of military vocabulary and grammar is vital for both cadets and service personnel. This study investigates the nuances of military English, particularly how language analysis can enhance comprehension and foster clearer communication in operational contexts. By evaluating various linguistic elements, including meaning, form, and pronunciation, the study aims to identify effective instructional strategies that incorporate contextual learning, modeling, and authentic assessment.

Many teachers pursuing CELTA certification discover that, in addition to inputs, observations, and lesson planning, analyzing the language items they teach is fundamental. This aspect of language analysis transcends a mere assignment; it plays a vital role in lesson planning and should be an ongoing practice for every English teacher, regardless of background. Effective teaching hinges upon the ability to communicate grammatical concepts, vocabulary, functions, and other language features clearly.

There are two broad categories of teachers in the English Language Teaching (ELT) field: native speakers and non-native speakers. Native speakers may struggle with declarative knowledge about grammar, which can hinder their ability to explain grammatical concepts effectively. Conversely, many non-native speakers benefit from extensive study in English grammar, phonetics, and linguistics, often equipping them with the vocabulary and understanding necessary for thorough language analysis and teaching (Chorna, 2022).

Research analysis. Grammar analysis is the process of examining and breaking down the components of a language's grammatical structures to understand their form, meaning, and function. This concept involves systematically studying how different ele-

ments of grammar, such as syntax (sentence structure), morphology (word forms), and phonology (pronunciation), work together to create meaning within a specific context. The goal of grammar analysis is not only to identify the rules governing these structures but also to understand how they are used in communication, allowing both teachers and learners to apply this knowledge effectively in real-world scenarios.

In language teaching, grammar analysis typically involves:

Form: Identifying the structure or construction of a grammatical item (e.g., verb tense, word order).

Meaning: Understanding of the grammatical item in a given context (e.g., what the sentence or phrase conveys).

Pronunciation: Analysing the phonetic elements of grammatical structures, ensuring that they are articulated correctly in spoken language.

Function: Exploring how a grammatical item is used in communication to achieve specific purposes, such as making requests, giving commands, or describing actions.

Through grammar analysis, teachers can clarify complex language concepts, anticipate student difficulties, and provide targeted teaching strategies to support language acquisition.

The study of grammar instruction within military English is supported by a range of theoretical frameworks and instructional approaches. Research on language analysis has been influenced by a variety of educational theorists, such as L. Fontaine, who highlights the importance of integrating grammar into meaningful contexts to ensure effective language learning (Fontaine, 2012). These researchers emphasize that language acquisition should not merely focus on isolated grammatical rules but should also involve understanding how those rules function in real-world communication, particularly in specialized fields like military English.

J. Harmer suggests that language analysis involves understanding the form, meaning, and use of grammar structures, a principle that aligns with the unique needs of military English, where clarity, precision,

and situational awareness are crucial (Harmer, 2007). M. Celce-Murcia advocates for a context-based approach to teaching grammar, which she believes helps students comprehend the functional role of grammatical structures, making them more relevant and practical for real-life scenarios, such as military operations (Celce-Murcia, 2014). In military contexts, language use must adapt to specific communicative needs, where understanding the purpose and nuances of military terms, commands, and structures is essential.

According to J. Scrivener, effective language instruction requires not only a focus on grammar rules but also on how these rules are applied in communicative practices (Scrivener, 2011). The context in which language is used plays a crucial role in determining how grammatical structures should be taught. In military English, this includes addressing imperatives, passive voice, and military-specific terminology. For example, imperatives convey direct orders, while the passive voice is often used in reports and official communications to focus on actions rather than individuals. This dual emphasis on grammatical accuracy and contextual relevance is central to understanding and teaching military English.

Furthermore, the approach to error correction and feedback in military English education also draws on the theories of S. Thornbury, who advocates for error analysis and systematic correction as a means of improving language proficiency (Thornbury, 2017). Military English requires teachers to provide precise, contextually appropriate feedback to ensure that cadets can effectively use the language in high-pressure and real-time situations. R. Ellis also highlights the importance of anticipating common errors that learners might encounter and tailoring feedback to address these issues, especially in a specialized context like military English (Ellis, 2006).

The aim of the research is to analyse the role of language analysis in teaching military English, focusing on how grammar instruction can be adapted to meet the specific linguistic needs of military personnel. This research seeks to evaluate the ways in which contextualized grammar analysis can enhance both the understanding of language structures and the practical application of those structures in military communication. By *focusing on grammar, form, pronunciation, and function*, the study aims to identify effective teaching strategies that can improve cadets' proficiency in military English and prepare them for real-world military situations.

Presentation of the main material. A structured grammar analysis of military English consists of the following parts: *meaning, form, pronunciation and function*, as advised by Cambridge University methodologists in the CELTA course (Chorna, 2022).

Meaning explanation is essential in the teaching of military vocabulary and grammar. The use of concept questions proves particularly beneficial in evaluating students' understanding. For instance, after introducing

the term «ROE» (Rules of Engagement), educators can pose the question: "If a soldier sees an enemy combatant, what should they do before engaging? Explain what factors dictate their decision." This approach delves into the implications of ROE beyond its mere definition. This is why Eli Hinkel emphasizes the importance of understanding context when learning the language (Hinkel, 2019). In the grammar analysis of military English, understanding meaning is enhanced through contextualized instruction, simulations, and authentic assessment. Contextualized instruction employs maps, images, and real-world scenarios to help students grasp the significance of military terminology and grammatical structures. Authentic assessments engage students in tasks that mirror real-world military scenarios, ensuring that their understanding of grammatical forms aligns with practical use.

Example of Meaning part for grammar analysis:

The sentence: "The coordinates were targeted by the HIMARS (High Mobility Artillery Rocket System) during the operation"

Meaning: using the passive voice to emphasize the action of targeting rather than the agent performing it. This structure highlights the importance of the coordinates as the focus of the action, crucial in military communication where the recipient of the action is often more significant than the actor.

CCQs for Passive Voice:

Were the coordinates targeted? – Yes.

Were the coordinates the focus of the action? – Yes.

Is the agent specified as performing the action? – No.

Was the action completed during the operation? – Yes.

Context:

The topic is "Military Operations."

After discussing or reading about recent military actions, the teacher says:

"During the last operation, the Ukrainian artillery group received intelligence on enemy positions from foreign partners. They were given a command. The target was successfully destroyed by HIMARS during the operation. This was critical to ensuring that the subsequent offensive operations were carried out with minimal casualties."

Anticipated Problems with Meaning:

1. Students may have difficulties identifying the lack of focus on the agent performing the action.
2. Students may misunderstand the implications of the passive voice and may struggle to grasp its significance in military contexts.

Solutions to Anticipated Problems with Meaning:

1. Provide clear explanations of passive versus active voice, using timelines, video or Power Point presentation to illustrate the focus on the action rather than the actor.
2. Emphasize the relevance of passive voice in military communication by providing contextually rich examples, highlighting scenarios where the outcome is more critical than who performed the action.
3. Online exercises using the Cure Code with automatic checking for the transformation of active sentences into passive forms to reinforce understanding.

Form entails the examination of grammatical structures prevalent in military communications. This

includes the use of imperatives for direct commands, such as “Secure the perimeter!” Additionally, the passive voice frequently appears in reports to emphasize actions rather than the actors involved, exemplified by phrases like “The objective was achieved.”

Acronyms and abbreviations, such as NATO, IED, FOB, and CAS, require careful decoding and explanation for proper understanding and application. For example, the phrase “an IED exploded” conveys that an «improvised explosive device» was about to go off, which could refer to various scenarios, such as an attack, training, or an operational report. As Douglas Bieber, Susan Conrad, and Randi Reppen point out, the correct interpretation of the phrase demonstrates how the passive voice can shift the focus to the action, motivating cadets to use these structures with an understanding of their form and meaning (Douglas Bieber, Susan Conrad, and Randi Reppen, 2020).

Example of Form part for grammar analysis:

<p>Form</p> <p>Include: The marker sentence: "The coordinates were targeted by the HIMARS (High Mobility Artillery Rocket System) during the operation."</p> <p>Ensure: This rule applies to all sentences that use the passive voice in the simple past tense, emphasizing the action or the recipient of the action rather than the doer.</p> <p>Rule:</p> <p>(+): S + were + V3 (past participle) + (by + agent) Example: The coordinates were targeted by the HIMARS.</p> <p>(-): S + were + not + V3 (past participle) + (by + agent) Example: The coordinates were not targeted by the HIMARS.</p> <p>(?): Were + S + V3 (past participle) + (by + agent)? Example: Were the coordinates targeted by the HIMARS?</p>
<p>Anticipated Problems with Form</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Students may struggle with the correct use of the passive voice and might inadvertently use active constructions instead (e.g., "The HIMARS targeted the coordinates"). Students may confuse the structure and omit the auxiliary verb "were," leading to incorrect sentences (e.g., "The coordinates targeted by the HIMARS"). There might be confusion about the correct placement of “by the agent” in passive constructions, which could impact clarity (e.g., incorrect order or omission). <p>Solutions to Anticipated Problems with Form</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Provide clear explanations of the passive voice, including examples that highlight the differences between active and passive constructions. Use visual aids or timelines to illustrate the concept. Engage students with concept-checking questions (CCQs), such as "Is the focus on the action or the actor?" Follow up with structured drills to practice identifying and transforming sentences. Conduct targeted practice sessions focused on identifying the correct usage of auxiliary verbs in passive constructions. Reinforce instruction through controlled practice exercises, moving to freer practice where students create their own sentences.

Pronunciation is an essential component of grammar analysis, where clear pronunciation is critical for

effective communication. Specific stress patterns in acronyms and military terminology are crucial for intelligibility. For instance, cadets can drill the pronunciation of “HUMINT” (human intelligence) and “SIGINT” (signals intelligence) to reinforce correct articulation. Marianne Celce-Murcia and Diane Larsen-Freeman advise teachers to emphasize clear and concise speech while addressing common pronunciation issues associated with military expressions, such as the distinct sound patterns related to trisyllabic acronyms (Celce-Murcia and Diane Larsen-Freeman, 2016).

Example of Pronunciation part for grammar analysis:

<p>Pronunciation</p> <p>Marker Sentence: "The coordinates were targeted by the HIMARS (High Mobility Artillery Rocket System)."</p> <p>Transcription in IPA: /ðə kə:ɪˈdɪnəts wɜː ˈtɑːɡɪtɪd baɪ ðə ˈhaɪ.mɑːrz/</p>
<p>Anticipated Problems with Pronunciation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Sentence stress: key words such as "targeted," "HIMARS," and "coordinates" receive primary stress. Ss may mispronounce the phrase "were targeted" (the final /r/ in "were" connects smoothly to the initial /t/ in "targeted," resulting in a fluid transition: /wɜː ˈtɑːɡɪtɪd/. Schwa Sounds: "the" is pronounced as /ðə/ before consonant sounds (like "coordinates"). <p>Solutions to Problems with Pronunciation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Write the sentence on the board, mark linking, “bubble” stressed words, model and drill. End Sound Practice: Identify any mispronounced endings and provide correct transcriptions above them (e.g., [ɪd] for "targeted"). Conduct drills that focus specifically on the sounds and endings to ensure clarity. Distinguish schwa sounds on the board with a different colour or marker. Guide students in practicing the sentence with an emphasis on accurate pronunciation of schwa in unstressed syllables, enhancing their fluency.

An understanding of the **function** of language items within military contexts is of utmost importance. Military communication serves diverse purposes, such as operational orders, situation reports, or informal communications. For example, the meaning and tone of the phrase “Stand down” can vary drastically depending on its use by different personnel in various situations, altering its interpretation from a command to a signal to cease action. As mentioned by Larsen-Freeman understanding context is key to interpreting the function and meaning of specific terms in military discourse (Larsen-Freeman, 2018).

The meaning of military terminology often hinges on precise, context-dependent interpretations; hence, ambiguity can pose severe risks. For instance, distinguishing between terms related to casualties – such as “killed in action,” “wounded in action,” and “missing in action” – is essential. Furthermore, differentiating between a firefight and a planned military operation, as well as understanding the multifaceted meanings

of “target” within a military context, is crucial for effective communication. This aligns with Schneider’s observations about how terminology can vary in implications based on the situational context (Schneider’s, 2021).

Textbooks often provide scenarios illustrating this difference, such as the formal language used in an operational briefing versus the colloquial speech among peers during downtime. De Silva supports this by addressing the necessity of adapting language instruction to fit the specific communicative contexts encountered by military personnel (De Silva, 2020).

Additionally, the correct pronunciation of technical terms like “anti-tank guided missile” and “close air support” is essential to ensure safe and effective communication within military environments. Exercises from Thornbury that involve repeating terms can provide students with the necessary practice to master their pronunciation (Thornbury, 2017).

The distinction between written and spoken grammar is significant; it is essential to teach the differences between formal written orders and concise spoken instructions, such as stating, “... both teams should be back at the camp before last light at 1700 hours” (Mellor-Clark, Baker de Altamirano, 2009: 23). Ensuring clarity of concepts before introducing complex military terms – like “collateral damage” and “kinetic engagement” – is also vital in preventing misunderstandings, particularly with similar-sounding terms (e.g., “reconnaissance” and “recognition”) or those that carry multiple meanings depending on the context.

Regarding function and meaning, various grammatical structures serve distinct roles in military communication. The imperative mood typically indicates commands, while passive voice constructions often feature in official reports. Context can lend layers of meaning to succinct phrases, such as “The objective

was secured,” which may imply specific information contingent upon the situational context of the military operation. Providing scenarios where students must interpret such phrases in context can enrich their understanding of how.

Conclusion. This study highlights the importance of a structured approach to lesson preparation by military English teachers through the use of grammar analysis. By focusing on effective teaching methods adapted to the unique demands of military English, the research illustrates the critical role that grammar plays in ensuring transparent and accurate communication within the contexts of military planning, direct execution, and training exercises with foreign partners. The findings underscore the necessity of understanding the meaning, form, and pronunciation of military language, particularly emphasizing the use of passive voice, imperatives, and specialized terminology.

The study offers a comprehensive framework for enhancing cadets’ language proficiency through the teacher’s prior analysis of the grammatical material to be taught in practical lessons. By utilizing authentic military communication as a basis for learning, cadets gain insights into the practical application of grammar, developing essential skills to navigate effectively in real-world military situations.

Moreover, language analysis empowers teachers to prepare for student questions, fostering confidence and establishing them as knowledgeable authorities in the classroom. A solid understanding of language structures enables teachers to explain how to construct and utilize various language items, which is crucial for students’ comprehension and effective communication. Additionally, a systematic approach to error analysis equips teachers to provide specific, constructive feedback, aiding students in recognizing and correcting their mistakes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Chorna Y. Language analysis for CELTA and beyond Grade University. URL: <https://grade-university.com/blog/language-analysis-for-celta-and-beyond>
2. Harmer J. The Practice of English Language Teaching. Harlow : Longman, 2007. 246 p.
3. Fontaine L. Analyzing English grammar: A systemic functional introduction. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2012. 16 p.
4. Celce-Murcia M., Brinton D., Snow A. Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. 4th ed. Boston, MA : Heinle ELT, 2014. 11 p.
5. Yule G. Explaining English grammar. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1998. 12 p.
6. Baker A. Ship or sheep: An intermediate pronunciation course. 3rd ed. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2013. 48 p.
7. Boyle C. Campaign : English for the military, teacher’s book 2. Macmillan, 2009. 10 p.
8. Mellor-Clark S., Baker de Altamirano Y. English for the military, student’s book 2. Macmillan, 2009. 23 p., P. 84–93.
9. Workman G. Concept questions and timelines. Chadburn Publishing, 2005. 22 p.
10. Cohen E. A. The United States Military and the Challenge of Change. Foreign Affairs. 2002. P. 123–129.
11. Hinkel E. Grammar and Composition : Strategies for Teachers and Learners. TESOL Quarterly. 2019. Vol. 53, No. 2. P. 27087–91.278.

12. Halliday M. A. K., Matthiessen C. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London : Routledge, 2014. 69 p.
13. Schneider G. *Analyzing Grammar in Context : A Comparative Study of Academic Writing in Different Disciplines*. Linguistics and Education, 2021. 60 p.
14. Basturkmen H. *Developing Courses in English for Specific Purposes*. Language Teaching Research, 2018. P. 315–335.
15. Celce-Murcia M., Larsen-Freeman D. *The Grammar Book: An ESL / EFL Teacher's Course*. National Geographic Learning, 2016. 343 p.
16. Thornbury S. *How to Teach Grammar*. Pearson Education Limited, 2017. 63 p.
17. Biber D., Conrad S., Reppen R. *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2020. 55 p.
18. Larsen-Freeman D. *Grammar : A Path to the Teaching of Language*. Language Teaching Research, 2018. P. 135–146.
19. De Silva A. *Language for Specific Purposes in Higher Education : A Grammar –Based Approach*. Journal of Academic Language and Learning, 2020. P. 56–72.

REFERENCES

1. Yulia Chorna. *Language analysis for CELTA and beyond*. Grade University. URL: <https://grade-university.com/blog/language-analysis-for-celta-and-beyond>
2. Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Longman. 246.
3. Fontaine, L. (2012). *Analysing English grammar: A systemic functional introduction*. Cambridge University Press, 16.
4. Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D., & Snow, A. (2014). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle ELT. 11.
5. Yule, G. (1998). *Explaining English grammar*. Oxford University Press, 12.
6. Baker, A. (2013). *Ship or sheep: An intermediate pronunciation course* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press, 48.
7. Boyle, C. (2009). *Campaign: English for the military, teacher's book 2*. Macmillan, 10.
8. Mellor-Clark S., Baker de Altamirano Y. (2009). *English for the military, student's book 2*. Macmillan, 23, 84-93.
9. Workman, G. (2005). *Concept questions and timelines*. Chadburn Publishing, 22.
10. Cohen, E. A. (2002). "The United States Military and the Challenge of Change." *Foreign Affairs*, 81(5), 123-129.
11. Hinkel, E. (2019). "Grammar and Composition: Strategies for Teachers and Learners." *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(2), 270-278.
12. Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Routledge, 69.
13. Schneider, G. (2021). "Analyzing Grammar in Context: A Comparative Study of Academic Writing in Different Disciplines." *Linguistics and Education*, 60.
14. Basturkmen, H. (2018). "Developing Courses in English for Specific Purposes." *Language Teaching Research*, 22(3), 315-335.
15. Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (2016). *The Grammar Book: An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course*. National Geographic Learning. 343.
16. Thornbury, S. (2017). *How to Teach Grammar*. Pearson Education Limited. 63 p.
17. Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (2020). *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use*. Cambridge University Press. 55.
18. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2018). "Grammar: A Path to the Teaching of Language." *Language Teaching Research*, 22(2), 135-146.
19. De Silva, A. (2020). "Language for Specific Purposes in Higher Education: A Grammar-Based Approach." *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 14(1), 56-72.