

УДК 81'36:81'243:37.016

<https://doi.org/10.31861/gph2026.858-859.292-302>**FROM RULES TO DEVELOPMENT: GRAMMAR AND SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION****Roman CHEPYSHKO**

Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University

r.chepyshko@chnu.edu.ua<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6174-3284>

This article examines the role of grammar in second language (L2) learning and teaching by critically reviewing major theoretical and empirical developments in second language acquisition (SLA) research. It argues that traditional approaches to grammar instruction, often grounded in rule memorization and decontextualized practice, fail to adequately reflect how grammatical knowledge develops in the learner's mind and how it is gradually integrated into communicative use. The article first explores competing conceptions of grammar, including traditional, structuralist, generative, usage-based, and functional perspectives, highlighting how each frames grammatical knowledge in fundamentally different ways. It then reviews key SLA theories concerning interlanguage development, input and intake, implicit and explicit knowledge, and the relationship between consciousness and acquisition, with particular attention to how these frameworks conceptualize learning mechanisms. The article argues that although explicit instruction and attention to form may support certain aspects of linguistic performance and metalinguistic awareness, durable grammatical development depends primarily on sustained exposure to meaningful input and repeated engagement with language in communicative contexts over time. It further suggests that gains observed in controlled instructional settings do not necessarily translate into spontaneous language use. The discussion concludes by emphasizing the need for conceptually coherent and evidence-based pedagogical approaches that clearly distinguish between teaching grammatical descriptions and fostering genuine grammatical development in second language learners.

Keywords: *second language acquisition, grammar instruction, explicit and implicit learning, explicit and implicit knowledge, form-focused instruction*

Chepyshko R. From Rules to Development: Grammar and Second Language Acquisition. *Науковий вісник Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича. Германська філологія*. Чернівці: Чернівець. нац. ун-т ім. Ю. Федьковича, 2026. Вип. 858-859. С. 292-302. <https://doi.org/10.31861/gph2026.858-859.292-302>

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University



This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

I. INTRODUCTION

Grammar is widely regarded as a central concern in second language learning and teaching. However, decisions about how grammar should be taught and learned are often guided more by intuition and long-standing pedagogical traditions than by systematic engagement with contemporary research. In many instructional contexts, grammar teaching is treated as largely unproblematic, as if its underlying assumptions, goals, and methods were self-evident (Celce-Murcia, Larsen-Freeman, & Williams, 1983). Yet a growing body of research in second language acquisition suggests that traditional approaches are not only inadequate in promoting durable grammatical development but may also impede acquisition. While sharing the general conviction that grammar matters in L2 learning, this article aims to synthesize key theoretical, empirical, and methodological developments relevant to grammar instruction and to argue for a conceptually clear, evidence-based approach that prioritizes effectiveness and minimizes unintended negative consequences.

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

What is grammar?

Any discussion of grammar teaching presupposes a particular conception of what grammar is. Grammar, however, is not a unitary object as it can be understood in different ways, each highlighting distinct dimensions of linguistic knowledge and use (Larsen-Freeman, 2003; Odlin, 1994). When these conceptions remain unarticulated, pedagogical debates may become misplaced, as disagreements about teaching practices can obscure deeper differences concerning the nature of grammar itself.

Traditional grammar refers to a historically established approach to language description originating in classical Greek and Latin traditions and later applied to modern languages (Robins, 1967). It consists of grammatical categories and rules and is often used prescriptively to guide correct language use. Most speakers encounter this conception in school through the classification of parts of speech such as nouns, verbs, and prepositions, along with rules governing their proper use (Crystal, 2018).

A different conception of grammar emerged in structuralist linguistics (Bloomfield, 1933; de Saussure, 1916/1959), which treats language as an abstract object of scientific inquiry. From this perspective, grammar is a self-contained system in which linguistic elements are defined by their relations to one another. To illustrate, consider the sentence *I saw the man with the telescope*. This sentence is ambiguous because the phrase *with the telescope* can attach to different parts of the sentence structure. If it connects to the verb *saw*, the meaning is that I used a telescope to see the man. If it connects to the noun phrase *the man*, the meaning is that the man had the telescope. Structuralist analysis explains this ambiguity not in terms of vague meaning, but in terms of different possible structural relationships within the sentence. The same words are involved, but their grammatical organization leads to different interpretations. Within the generative linguistics tradition, grammar is modeled as a formal system of rules operating over abstract symbols, comparable to mathematical or computational systems (Chomsky, 1957, 1965). Grammar is generative because a finite set of principles is assumed to account for an unlimited number of well-formed sentences. These rules are understood as theoretical hypotheses about speakers' underlying grammatical knowledge rather than as direct descriptions of observable behavior. For instance, rules such as $S \rightarrow NP + VP$ and $NP \rightarrow (Det) + (Adj) + N$ formalize regularities in speakers' ability to produce and interpret declarative sentences and noun phrases. Usage-based and emergentist approaches construe grammar as a structured inventory of form–meaning pairings that develops through language use (Bybee, 2006, 2010; Tomasello, 2003). Like generative linguistics, these approaches adopt a cognitive perspective, treating grammar as part of speakers' mental representations. Grammatical knowledge is assumed to emerge gradually from repeated exposure to recurring patterns in communication, with frequency

playing a central role (Ellis, 2002). For example, learners may first acquire expressions such as *How are you?*, *How do I get there?*, and *How do you say this?*, from which a more general pattern (*How do + subject + verb*) gradually emerges and can be extended to new utterances such as *How do they fix this?*. Functional and sociolinguistic approaches understand grammar as a resource for making meaning in social interaction rather than as an autonomous formal system (Halliday, 1985; Hymes, 1972). From a functional perspective, grammatical structures reflect communicative purposes such as organizing information, as illustrated by the alternation between *I gave the book to Maria* and *I gave Maria the book* (Thompson, 2014). Sociolinguistic approaches further emphasize that grammatical choices vary with social context and speaker identity, as in the use of *gonna* versus *going to* or *He don't know* versus *He doesn't know* (Labov, 1966, 1972). From these perspectives, knowing grammar involves knowing not only which forms are possible, but when and in what contexts they are appropriately used.

These different conceptions of grammar can be understood as complementary theoretical tools, each developed for particular descriptive and analytical purposes. The problem, however, is that in discussions of L2 grammar learning and teaching these distinctions are rarely made explicit. Instead, the various conceptions are frequently blended together, often uncritically, resulting in conceptual confusion with real pedagogical consequences. Pedagogical grammar, typically a simplified adaptation of traditional grammar, continues to dominate textbooks and classroom practice and is commonly assumed to lead to the acquisition of grammatical knowledge necessary for fluent and accurate language use (R. Ellis, 2006; Westney, 1994). Yet this assumption is difficult to sustain. While pedagogical grammar may create an impression of progress and understanding for both teachers and learners, it often amounts to little more than learning how to talk *about* the language (Krashen, 1982). Such instruction tends to privilege overt rule description and terminology over the cognitive processes involved in learning, thereby conflating instructional activity with grammatical development itself. A more serious engagement with learners' grammar development, therefore, requires closer attention to learning contexts and a more informed view of human cognition, as well as pedagogical approaches that are aligned with how grammatical knowledge develops and functions in the learner's internal linguistic system.

A closer look at an L2 learner

One of the clearest differences between first language (L1) acquisition and L2 learning is how grammar develops. Under normal conditions, children acquire the grammar of their L1 quickly and with remarkable uniformity, without instruction or structured training (Guasti, 2017). L2 learners, by contrast, typically progress much more slowly, show considerable variation, and often do not reach fully target-like competence (Birdsong, 2006). Non-target-like forms may persist for years, even among advanced learners (Han, 2004).

Early approaches to L2 teaching tended to interpret these forms as deficiencies or bad habits that needed to be corrected (Skinner, 1957). Grammar learning was therefore organized around intensive practice and repetition (Brooks, 1964). Learners rehearsed sentences such as *I have a pen*, *I have a car*, and *I have a book* in the hope that repeated exposure would turn correct structures into automatic responses. While this approach often produced accurate performance in controlled exercises, learners frequently struggled to use these forms in spontaneous communication and were generally unmotivated by the repetition of decontextualized examples (Rivers, 1964).

The cognitive turn in the second half of the twentieth century led to a different way of thinking about learners' language. Errors were no longer viewed simply as failures but as meaningful evidence of an underlying developing system. A pivotal contribution to this shift was Corder's (1967) argument that learner errors are important precisely because they reveal how learners are actively constructing hypotheses about the target language. Building on this idea, Selinker (1972) introduced the notion of *interlanguage*, proposing that L2 learner language constitutes a systematic linguistic system in its own right, shaped by processes such as crosslinguistic influence, overgeneralization, and strategic language use.

Later theoretical work strengthened this view by showing that grammatical development in an L2 is constrained by internal developmental factors. Krashen's (1982) Natural Order Hypothesis suggested that learners tend to acquire grammatical structures in a relatively stable sequence, regardless of the order in which they are taught. From a different but complementary perspective, Pienemann's (1998) Processability Theory argued that learners can only produce structures that their current processing capacities make possible. Certain forms, therefore, cannot emerge until earlier stages have been mastered.

Taken together, these perspectives support the view that L2 grammar is not a collection of isolated rules learned through instruction, but a developing system that changes over time (Ortega, 2009). From this standpoint, learner errors are not signs of failure or poor learning, but a natural and necessary part of the acquisition process, reflecting the state of the learner's grammatical system at a particular moment (Lightbown & Spada, 2013).

A closer look at L2 learning

We learn from experience. When we talk about learning, we often rely on a computer metaphor, in which the term *input* refers to environmental evidence, such as speech or written text, that can (potentially) serve as primary data for the development of learners' mental structures (*language processors*), enabling them to comprehend and produce language (*output*). Despite the apparent simplicity of the input → processor → output chain, leaving these terms underspecified can lead to confusion and obscure the explanatory value of this otherwise useful metaphor. After all, environmental data (speech or text) that fluent speakers readily recognize as representative samples of a particular language may amount to little more than meaningless noise for a novice language learner and, as such, cannot directly drive internal learning.

To capture this, Corder (1967) introduced a distinction between *input*, external environmental data, and *intake*, defined as the subset of that data actually processed by the learner's internal learning mechanisms. Put more simply, learning is not a matter of copying external data but of developing an internal language system. From this perspective, a central challenge for L2 research is to identify which types of environmental data, and under what conditions, are likely to promote learning. Correspondingly, this raises the question of what teachers can do and how to facilitate learners' engagement with input in ways that support the development of their internal linguistic systems.

Research on second language acquisition has addressed the input–intake relationship through a range of theoretical perspectives that differ in how they conceptualize learners' access to and use of linguistic information. Within Krashen's (1985) *Comprehensible Input Hypothesis*, input is considered the primary driver of acquisition, provided it is understandable and contains structures that slightly exceed the learner's current level of development ($i+1$). For example, learners may acquire tense or aspectual distinctions by understanding stories in which temporal reference is conveyed through contextual cues, lexical items, or discourse structure, even if grammatical markers are not yet fully mastered. In contrast, *Input Processing theory* (VanPatten, 1996) emphasizes the role of learners' limited processing resources during comprehension, arguing that learners tend to allocate attention to meaning-bearing elements before formal features. *Processing Instruction* (VanPatten, 1996) is designed to alter these default processing tendencies by requiring learners to rely on grammatical form to successfully interpret meaning, such as tasks in which verb morphology rather than word order determines who did what to whom. Other approaches focus on modifying the distribution or presentation of forms in the input itself. *Input Enhancement* (Sharwood Smith, 1993) attempts to increase the perceptual availability of specific grammatical features through typographical or acoustic manipulation, for instance, by visually marking inflectional endings in written texts, while *Input Flood* (Trahey & White, 1993) increases the frequency of a target structure by embedding it repeatedly in meaningful discourse, such as reading materials densely populated with a particular syntactic construction. Finally, *interactionist approaches* (e.g., Long, 1996) view input as dynamically shaped through communicative exchange: conversational adjustments such as repetition, reformulation, or clarification requests can simplify or restructure input in response to learner

difficulty, thereby making particular aspects of linguistic form and meaning more accessible during comprehension. Collectively, these approaches illustrate how L2 researchers have conceptualized intake not as a direct consequence of exposure, but as an outcome mediated by processing constraints, input characteristics, and communicative context.

L2 grammar knowledge

Most, if not all, of what we know when we know a language lies beyond conscious awareness. The grammatical regularities that support comprehension and production operate without speakers deliberately applying them (Chomsky, 1965). We routinely make fine-grained distinctions in form and meaning, such as choosing one phrasing over another or ordering words so they sound right in context, without being aware of the constraints guiding those choices (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). These processes are highly efficient and automatic, functioning largely outside voluntary control. This intuitive competence is referred to as *implicit knowledge*, whereas *explicit knowledge* consists of facts about language that we can consciously recognize and articulate (R. Ellis, 2004). A clear illustration is found in English i-a-o ablaut reduplication, where the first vowel in a reduplicated consonant-vowel sequence is always *i*, followed by *a* or *o*. Speakers follow this rule automatically, producing forms such as *ping-pong* or *tick-tock* but never *pong-ping* or *tock-tick*, while explicit knowledge allows them to identify and describe the pattern (Pinker, 1994). The rule works because it reflects a natural phonological preference: the high vowel /i/ comes first, followed by the lower vowels /æ/ or /oʊ/, creating a smooth, rhythmically balanced sequence that is easy to produce and perceive (Crystal, 2018). This ordering also aligns with general tendencies in English reduplication, where the “lighter” sound precedes the “heavier” one, giving expressions a natural, playful, and memorable quality.

A large body of research has shown that learners can acquire complex linguistic regularities without conscious access to the underlying rules or patterns that give rise to them. This type of learning, commonly referred to as *implicit learning*, involves the gradual acquisition of structured regularities through exposure and use, rather than through deliberate hypothesis testing or rule formation (Reber, 1993). Pioneering studies by Reber in the 1960s used artificial grammar learning tasks to investigate how people pick up patterns in structured systems. In these experiments, participants were first exposed to strings of letters generated according to specific grammatical rules, for instance, sequences in which certain letters could only follow others in particular positions, but they were not informed about the rules themselves. Crucially, participants were later asked to judge new letter strings they had never encountered before. Despite having no explicit knowledge of the grammar, they were able to determine whether these unfamiliar strings conformed to the underlying system. For example, they could correctly identify that a sequence such as *XTQF* was well-formed, while *QTXF* violated the structural constraints. Their reliable performance on novel items indicated that they had acquired a form of grammatical competence that generalized beyond memorized examples, even though they were unable to articulate the rules or explain the basis for their decisions (Reber, 1967). In contrast, *explicit learning* involves conscious attention to form and the deliberate acquisition of rules that learners can articulate and reflect upon (Hulstijn, 2005). Learners are typically provided with metalinguistic explanations or are encouraged to form and test hypotheses about linguistic structure. For example, learners may be taught the explicit rule that in English declarative clauses the third-person singular present tense requires the suffix *-s* (e.g., *she walks*, *he runs*) and then apply this rule intentionally when producing sentences or judging grammaticality (DeKeyser, 2003).

It is relatively uncontroversial that the central objective of second language learning and teaching is the development of implicit linguistic knowledge (R. Ellis, 2009). Implicit learning is generally regarded as the primary mechanism through which learners develop complex regularities of language, many of which are not readily accessible to conscious articulation and resist comprehensive explicit description. What remains controversial is the role of explicit learning in the

development of this implicit system. This issue is often framed in terms of possible “interfaces” between explicit and implicit knowledge (N. Ellis, 2005).

Krashen (1982) drew a strict non-interface distinction between *learning* (explicit knowledge) and *acquisition* (implicit knowledge), arguing that only acquisition results in genuine competence. In his view, explicit knowledge functions merely as a Monitor and is available for conscious editing under limited conditions but is incapable of contributing directly to implicit competence. From an emergentist perspective, as articulated by N. Ellis (2002), language acquisition is fundamentally a process of implicit statistical learning driven by exposure to frequency distributions, form–meaning contingencies, and usage patterns in the input. Linguistic structure gradually emerges from domain-general learning mechanisms sensitive to distributional regularities. On this view, explicit knowledge does not transform into implicit competence. Rather, it may facilitate learning indirectly by directing attention and shaping the learner’s engagement with the input, while the underlying system primarily develops through implicit pattern extraction. In contrast, DeKeyser’s (2007) Skill Acquisition Theory, grounded in cognitive skill theory, assigns a more central role to explicit knowledge in adult L2 learning. While not claiming that declarative rules are simply converted into implicit representations, the theory posits that learning often begins with consciously accessible, declarative knowledge of linguistic rules. Through repeated, meaningful practice, this knowledge undergoes proceduralization and gradual automatization, leading to increasingly fluent and efficient performance. The developmental trajectory is thus from controlled, attention-demanding processing toward automaticity. In this view, explicit knowledge can serve as the starting point of skill development, with practice restructuring performance mechanisms over time.

Importantly, none of the interface positions assume that the explicit learning of grammatical rules is either necessary or sufficient for L2 acquisition. Krashen rejects any direct role for explicit knowledge in competence. Emergentist accounts treat explicit knowledge as facilitative but not constitutive of implicit development. Skill Acquisition Theory views declarative knowledge as a possible starting point whose effectiveness depends on sustained practice and proceduralization. Across frameworks, there is broad agreement that rule learning alone does not produce language competence. The debate concerns the degree and mechanisms of interaction between explicit and implicit knowledge, rather than whether explicit grammar instruction by itself constitutes language learning. Moreover, despite their theoretical differences, these accounts converge on one central assumption: durable L2 development depends on sustained engagement with target forms in meaningful contexts. Whether framed as comprehensible input, usage-based exposure, or practice leading to proceduralization, all perspectives emphasize repeated encounters with forms across varied situations and sufficient frequency to stabilize and strengthen target representations.

The Noticing Hypothesis and form-focused instruction

The Noticing Hypothesis brings together several of the themes discussed in the preceding sections. It addresses one of the most unsettled issues in contemporary SLA research: the role of consciousness and attention in second language learning. The hypothesis originated in Schmidt’s diary study of his own learning of Brazilian Portuguese (Schmidt & Frota, 1986). During his stay in Brazil, Schmidt kept a detailed journal in which he commented on linguistic features he encountered and made audio recordings of his daily conversations. The analysis suggested that certain grammatical features, even when frequent in the input, failed to appear in his production if he had not consciously registered them. By contrast, forms that he clearly remembered noticing and reflecting upon in his diary were more likely to emerge in his subsequent speech (Schmidt, 1990).

From the outset, the Noticing Hypothesis did not argue that L2 learners must master or explicitly understand grammatical rules. Rather, it focused on a more subtle question: how environmental input becomes intake during L2 development (Corder, 1967). Schmidt’s central claim was that, for input to become intake, specific linguistic forms must be noticed by the learner. The term noticing is used in a technical sense that differs from its everyday meaning. It refers to a distinct level of awareness, distinct from both simple exposure and full metalinguistic understanding. In this

framework, learners must consciously register a grammatical form in the input without necessarily being able to articulate the rule governing it. In its original formulation, the hypothesis makes a strong claim: noticing is the necessary condition for environmental input to become intake and thus to be available for acquisition. Noticing is the gatekeeper of L2 acquisition.

Although the original, strong version of the Noticing Hypothesis attracted substantial criticism from cognitive psychology and linguistics (e.g., Tomlin & Villa, 1994; Truscott, 1998) and was later revised so that noticing was no longer treated as strictly necessary but rather as facilitative (Schmidt, 2001), the proposal continues to enjoy wide acceptance. Much of its appeal lies in its intuitive plausibility. However, this plausibility is sustained in part by a slippage between everyday and technical interpretations of the term noticing. It is intuitively reasonable to say that a learner may notice (or fail to notice) the third person singular *-s* in present tense verbs. Yet this formulation risks obscuring an important challenge. Categories such as “third person singular agreement” or “present tense declarative without a modal” are abstract grammatical constructs. They are not directly given in the perceptual stream during real-time language processing. Rather, they are analytical categories that emerge from linguistic description or metalinguistic reasoning. As such, they are either not perceptually available in any straightforward sense, or they belong to the level of explicit grammatical analysis. In either case, they do not neatly correspond to the type of conscious registration that the Noticing Hypothesis posits as crucial for acquisition (Truscott, 1998; Truscott & Sharwood Smith, 2011).

Although the Noticing Hypothesis has played an important role in stimulating discussion about the relationship between consciousness, attention, and second language acquisition, many of its central assumptions remain theoretically and empirically unresolved. While the proposal succeeded in opening a productive line of inquiry within SLA research, further investigation is necessary to develop more comprehensive theoretical models and empirically grounded accounts of how input becomes intake in second language development (Leow, 2015).

The Noticing Hypothesis also played a central role in the development of form-focused instruction (FFI). Form-focused instruction was proposed as an alternative to both purely meaning-based communicative approaches and traditional grammar drills (Spada, 1997). Long (1991) distinguished between *focus on forms* (isolated grammar teaching) and *focus on form* (brief, reactive attention to linguistic features within meaning-oriented interaction). In this framework, the pedagogical goal is not the systematic presentation of grammatical paradigms detached from communication, but rather the temporary redirection of learners' attention to linguistic features that arise during communicative activity. In practice, FFI can take many forms. Teachers may provide corrective feedback during conversation, for example by reformulating a learner's incorrect utterance (“He go to school yesterday” → “Oh, he *went* to school yesterday”), a technique commonly referred to as a recast (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Other approaches include clarification requests (“Could you say that again?”), explicit correction or metalinguistic comments (R. Ellis, 2001). More proactive forms of FFI include task-based instruction in which communicative tasks are deliberately designed to elicit particular grammatical structures (R. Ellis, 2003). A classroom discussion about past experiences, for example, may naturally encourage the use of past tense forms, allowing the teacher to briefly draw attention to relevant morphology when difficulties arise.

Empirical research on form-focused instruction generally shows positive effects, particularly in controlled experimental settings (Norris & Ortega, 2000). However, a recurring finding is that many measurable gains appear in tasks requiring controlled production, grammaticality judgments, or metalinguistic explanation. Improvements are often stronger in short-term post-tests than in delayed measures, and transfer to spontaneous communication can be variable (Mackey & Goo, 2007). This has led some scholars to suggest that form-focused interventions may primarily enhance explicit or metalinguistic knowledge, which can influence performance under monitored conditions without necessarily restructuring the underlying implicit linguistic system (Krashen, 1982; Truscott, 1996). Additional concerns extend beyond cognitive mechanisms. Intensive attention to form,

particularly when implemented through corrective practices or evaluative feedback, may affect learners' affective states. For some learners, persistent correction can contribute to anxiety, avoidance of risk-taking, or reduced willingness to communicate (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994; Truscott, 1996). Motivation may be undermined if form becomes foregrounded at the expense of meaning or personal expression. These affective dimensions do not invalidate form-focused approaches per se, but they complicate strong claims about their uniformly positive effects (R. Ellis, 2009).

Pedagogical implications

If grammar is understood not as a set of rules to be transmitted but as a developing cognitive system, then grammar instruction must be re-evaluated accordingly. The evidence reviewed here suggests that acquisition does not proceed through the accumulation of explicitly learned rules. Rather, it reflects gradual changes within an evolving interlanguage system constrained by processing capacities, developmental sequences, and exposure to meaningful input. Pedagogical practice must therefore distinguish between the teaching of grammatical descriptions and the fostering of grammatical development.

First, instruction should align with learners' developmental readiness. Research on natural orders and processability indicates that certain structures cannot be acquired simply by being taught. Second, meaningful exposure remains central. Across theoretical traditions, whether framed as comprehensible input, usage-based frequency effects, or skill proceduralization, there is convergence on the importance of sustained engagement with target forms in communicative contexts. Repeated encounters across varied situations appear more conducive to durable development than isolated rule explanation. Third, form-focused instruction should be used judiciously. Brief, contextually embedded attention to form may be helpful under certain conditions. However, improvements on controlled tasks or short-term post-tests should not be taken as evidence of grammar acquisition. Teachers must therefore interpret measurable gains cautiously and avoid conflating metalinguistic awareness with acquisition. Finally, affective consequences deserve careful consideration. Intensive correction and persistent foregrounding of form can undermine motivation, increase anxiety, and reduce learners' willingness to communicate. An evidence-based pedagogy must weigh potential benefits against possible unintended harm.

III. CONCLUSION

Grammar is central to second language learning, but it is not a static body of rules to be transmitted. It is a dynamic cognitive system that develops gradually through experience, constrained by internal processing mechanisms and shaped by meaningful engagement with language. The theoretical perspectives reviewed here converge on a common insight: durable L2 development depends on sustained interaction with meaningful input, repeated exposure to target forms across contexts, and sufficient frequency to support new representations. Instruction can support these processes, but it cannot replace them. An evidence-based approach to grammar teaching, therefore, requires conceptual clarity, developmental sensitivity, and pedagogical restraint. Guided by the principle of "do no harm," grammar instruction should aim not to impose structures from the outside, but to create conditions under which learners' internal linguistic systems can develop naturally, steadily, and with minimal interference.

REFERENCES

- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Birdsong, D. (2006). Age and second language acquisition and processing: A selective overview. *Language Learning*, 56(S1), 9–49.
- Brooks, N. (1964). *Language and language learning: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Bybee, J. (2006). From usage to grammar: The mind's response to repetition. *Language*, 82(4), 711–733.
- Bybee, J. (2010). *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Celce-Murcia, M., Larsen-Freeman, D., & Williams, H. A. (1983). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(4), 161–170. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161>
- Crystal, D. (2018). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DeKeyser, R. (2003). Implicit and explicit learning. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 313–348). Blackwell.
- DeKeyser, R. (Ed.). (2007). *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, N. C. (2002). Frequency effects in language processing: A review with implications for theories of implicit and explicit language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24(2), 143–188.
- Ellis, N. C. (2005). At the interface: Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(2), 305–352.
- Ellis, R. (2001). Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning*, 51(S1), 1–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.2001.tb00013.x>
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2004). The definition and measurement of L2 explicit knowledge. *Language Learning*, 54(2), 227–275.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83–107. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264512>
- Ellis, R. (2009). *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L2119054>
- Guasti, M. T. (2017). *Language acquisition: The growth of grammar* (2nd ed.). MIT Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Han, Z. (2004). *Fossilization in adult second language acquisition*. Multilingual Matters.
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2005). Theoretical and empirical issues in the study of implicit and explicit learning, determinantal to second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(2), 129–140.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.
- Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaticizing*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. Longman.
- Leow, R. P. (2015). *Explicit learning in the L2 classroom: A student-centered approach*. Routledge.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). John Benjamins.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>

- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning*, 44(2), 283–305. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01103.x>
- Mackey, A., & Goo, J. (2007). Interaction research in SLA: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 407–452). Oxford University Press.
- Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50(3), 417–528. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00136>
- Odlin, T. (Ed.). (1994). *Perspectives on pedagogical grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Hodder Education.
- Pienemann, M. (1998). *Language processing and second language development: Processability theory*. John Benjamins.
- Pinker, S. (1994). *The language instinct*. William Morrow.
- Reber, A. S. (1967). Implicit learning of artificial grammars. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 6(6), 855–863.
- Reber, A. S. (1993). *Implicit learning and tacit knowledge: An essay on the cognitive unconscious*. Oxford University Press.
- Rivers, W. M. (1964). *The psychologist and the foreign-language teacher*. University of Chicago Press.
- Robins, R. H. (1967). *A short history of linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Saussure, F. de. (1916/1959). *Course in general linguistics*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
- Schmidt, R. W. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, R. W., & Frota, S. N. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237–326). Newbury House.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10(3), 209–231.
- Sharwood Smith, M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA: Theoretical bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15(2), 165–179.
- Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal behavior*. Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Spada, N. (1997). Form-focussed instruction and second language acquisition: A review of classroom and laboratory research. *Language Teaching*, 30(2), 73–87. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800012624>
- Thompson, G. (2014). *Introducing functional grammar* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tomlin, R. S., & Villa, V. (1994). Attention in cognitive science and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16(2), 183–203. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100012870>
- Trahey, M., & White, L. (1993). Positive evidence and preemption in the second language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15(2), 181–204.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327–369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>
- Truscott, J. (1998). Noticing in second language acquisition: A critical review. *Second Language Research*, 14(2), 103–135. <https://doi.org/10.1191/026765898667623641>
- Truscott, J., & Sharwood Smith, M. (2011). Input, intake, and consciousness: The quest for a theoretical foundation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 33(4), 497–528. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263111000305>
- VanPatten, B. (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction in second language acquisition*. Ablex Publishing.
- Westney, P. (1994). Rules and pedagogical grammar. In T. Odlin (Ed.), *Perspectives on pedagogical grammar* (pp. 72–96). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ВІД ПРАВИЛ ДО РОЗВИТКУ: ГРАМАТИКА ТА ЗАСВОЄННЯ ДРУГОЇ МОВИ**Роман ЧЕПИШКО**

У статті розглянуто роль граматики в процесах опанування та викладання другої мови (L2) крізь призму критичного аналізу ключових теоретичних і емпіричних здобутків у галузі засвоєння другої мови (SLA). Обґрунтовано, що традиційні підходи до навчання граматики, засновані на механічному запам'ятовуванні правил та ізольованій від контексту практиці, не відображають реальних механізмів формування граматичного знання у свідомості здобувача освіти та його подальшого функціонування в комунікативній практиці. У роботі спершу проаналізовано основні теоретичні парадигми осмислення граматики, зокрема традиційний, структурний, генеративний, когнітивно-дискурсивний (usage-based) і функціональний підходи, з увагою до особливостей концептуалізації граматичного знання в межах кожного з них. Далі розглянуто засадничі теорії SLA щодо розвитку інтермови, співвідношення понять input та intake, взаємодії імпліцитного й експліцитного знання, а також ролі свідомості в процесі мовного розвитку. Стверджується, що, попри позитивний вплив експліцитного навчання та фокусування на мовній формі (focus on form) на розвиток метамовної обізнаності, стійке формування граматичної компетентності передусім зумовлюється тривалою експозицією до змістовного мовного інпуту та систематичним залученням до комунікації в реальних контекстах. Окрему увагу приділено проблемі обмеженого перенесення знань, здобутих у контрольованих умовах, у спонтанне мовлення. У висновках наголошено на необхідності впровадження концептуально узгоджених педагогічних стратегій, які чітко розмежовують засвоєння формальних граматичних описів і розвиток автентичної граматичної компетентності осіб, що вивчають другу мову.

Ключові слова: засвоєння другої мови, граматика, імпліцитне та експліцитне навчання, імпліцитне та експліцитне знання, навчання зорієнтоване на граматичні форми

Дата надходження до редакції / Submitted: 10.04.2026

Дата прийняття до публікації / Accepted: 27.04.2026