Sveučilište u Zagrebu

Filozofski fakultet

Odsjek za anglistiku

Katedra za metodiku

LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES OF PRIMARY EFL LEARNERS: A
DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE

Diplomski rad

Studentica: Maja Pasariček

Mentor: dr. sc. Renata Geld, docent

Zagreb, 2016.

University of Zagreb

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department of English

TEFL Section

LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES OF PRIMARY EFL LEARNERS: A
DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE

Graduation Thesis

Student: Maja Pasariček

Supervisor: Assistant Professor Renata Geld

Zagreb, 2016

Examining Committee:

Stela Letica Krevelj, PhD, postdoc.

Marina Grubiši , PhD, postdoc.

Assistant professor Renata Geld

Contents

Abstract

The aim of this study was to analyze the frequency with which primary school EFL learners used language learning strategies for listening, speaking, reading, writing, translating and learning vocabulary. The study was carried out on 53 students, divided into two age groups (fifth- and seventh-graders). Data was collected using a modified version of Cohen and Oxford's (2002) *Young Learners' Language Strategy Use Survey,* and then subject to statistical analysis using R software. The results showed that both groups of participants used translation strategies equally frequently, while the fifth-graders were more frequent users of all other groups of strategies. Both groups of participants used vocabulary strategies less frequently than those for listening. In the individual strategies within the six strategy groups, differences were found in only three subgroups. Finally, the main findings of the study were used to discuss possible implications for teaching.

Key words: strategies, four skills, EFL, primary learners

1 Introduction

When we talk about the field of second language acquisition (SLA), what we can notice is that the last decades of research in the field have been characterized by quite a radical shift. Namely, researchers have stopped focusing on teachers and the teaching process, and instead, they have chosen to put emphasis on learners and their learning process (Abed, 2011). Having shifted their focus to the learner, researchers have become more interested in finding out more about various learner characteristics or individual differences (IDs) that could explain the variation that exists in the outcomes of learning a language (Dörnyei, 2005). One of the most intriguing ID variables that could explain why some learners have more success than others in acquiring a second (L2) or foreign language (FL) are language learning strategies (LLSs). In the light of this, the main interest of LLSs researchers has become to find out in what way learners process new information to which they are exposed and what types of LLSs they use along the way to learn, understand and store that new information (Abed, 2011).

Although many controversies have arisen around the concept of second or foreign LLSs, many researchers agree that they are indeed an important factor in the process of acquiring a new language (e.g. Oxford, 1990 and 2001; Cohen and Weaver, 2006). Research has confirmed that, if trained to use LLSs, learners can become better at learning (Abed, 2011), and, at the same time, LLSs can help learners gain more autonomy and enhance their self-efficacy (Oxford, 2001).

Another important aspect of LLSs is the fact that they are an ID variable we can influence on because strategies can be taught to FL/L2 learners (Medved Krajnovi , 2010). Since LLSs are teachable, L2 teachers should be familiar with them in order to facilitate their learners' learning process and help them develop communicative competence in listening, reading, speaking and writing (the so-called four skills) of the L2, which is the main goal of the modern Communicative Approach (Abed, 2011). It was probably this teachable aspect of LLSs that made the concept of LLSs so appealing to researchers (Medved Krajnovi , 2010), as it will be briefly presented in the next chapter.

2 Theoretical background

2.1 Defining LLSs

The concept of LLSs was first introduced in the field of L2 research in the late 1970s and, as Dörnyei (2005) explains it, both researchers and teachers found it very interesting from the very beginning. In its initial phase, the research focused on the concept of the "good language learner", i.e. what it was that some learners had that enabled them to have more success at learning an L2 when compared to less successful language learners. The results showed that the reason for which some learners were better than the others did not lie in aptitude and motivation only, but it also had to do with the fact that more successful learners actively and creatively participated in the learning process by applying the learning techniques that were particularly useful to them (Dörnyei, 2005). These early findings laid ground for numerous additional studies on second LLSs in the 1980s and 1990s, making them one of the most promising areas in SLA research at the time (Medved Krajnovi , 2010). This phenomenon was mainly due to the fact that LLSs gave researchers an opportunity to finally scratch below the surface and have a look at the mechanisms that were a part of the quite complex process of learning a language (Dörnyei 2005).

However, the popularity and appeal of the concept, combined with a large amount of research, created a confusion in the area of LLSs. O'Malley and Chamot (1990, p. 1) defined LLSs as "the special thoughts or behaviours that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information", Oxford (1990, p. 1) as "steps taken by learners to enhance their own learning", which just shows how researchers tackling this concept often conceived LLSs in different ways. They were defined either as skills, behaviors, methods, techniques, actions, thoughts, emotions, or some kind of a combination of those, which eventually resulted in many different taxonomies (Medved Krajnovi , 2010). Precisely because of all this, the construct of LLSs has still not been theoretically defined in a clear and precise way (Dörnyei, 2005). Among many researchers who gave their best to try to define LLSs and its components, apart from O'Malley and Chamot (1990) and Oxford (1990), were Bialystok (1978), Tarone (1983), Weinstein and Mayer (1983), Mayer (1988), Wenden and Rubin (1987), Stern (1992), etc. Even though there have been many attempts to define and classify LLSs, many of these theories remain at a somewhat superficial basis that revolves mainly around taxonomy and which does not provide a unique definition of LLSs (Medved

Krajnovi , 2010). Furthermore, all these attempts to classify LLSs revolve around more or less the same categories, and they do not bring about any profound change (Abed, 2011). Alongside this, it is often quite hard to detect the exact strategies that learners use, especially because they are often used even outside the classroom (Oxford 1990). Another issue with LLSs is the problem of assessment, which will be briefly presented in the next chapter.

2.2 Assessment of LLSs

In their attempts to measure the use of LLSs, researchers have to look into learners' mental processes, which is not that simple and easy to do (Oxford 1990, Mihaljevi Djigunovi 1999). Cohen (1998) lists six major methods for researching LLSs, and these are observation, verbal report, oral interviews and written questionnaires, diaries and dialogue journals, computer tracking and recollection studies (as cited in Mihaljevi Djigunovi 1999). When it comes to written questionnaires, they are usually self-report questionnaires which ask for generalization of actions in various situations (Dörnyei, 2005). Initially, they were directed at older language learners, and some of the most prominent questionnaires are Ehrman's (1996) *Motivation and Strategies Questionnaire*, Cohen and Chi's (2001) *Language Strategy Use Survey*, Tseng et al.'s (2006) *Self-Regulating Capacity in Vocabulary Learning Scale* (*SRCvoc*), Vandergrift et al.'s (2006) *Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire* (*MALQ*), Nakatani's (2006) *Oral Communication Strategy Inventory* (*OCSI*), Oxford's (1990) *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning* (*SILL*), and so on. Only recently have questionnaires for younger language learners started being developed, such as Cohen and Oxford's (2002) *Young Learners' Language Strategy Use Survey*, which is actually based on the items from Oxford's (1990) questionnaire SILL. Given the fact that the questionnaire we used in our study was precisely *Young Learners' Language Strategy Use Survey*, Oxford's questionnaire, alongside the accompanying taxonomy, are of much interest to us.

Oxford's SILL was developed in 1990 and is considered to be one of the most frequently used instruments for assessing the use of LLSs (Dörnyei, 2005). The questionnaire is divided into six parts (Part A-Part F) that correspond to six categories of strategies that are part of Oxford's LLSs taxonomy (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social, respectively). There is a 5-point rating Likert scale in it, ranging from 'never or almost never true of me' to 'always or almost always true of me' and it is used for computing mean scale scores. As Dörnyei (2005) claims, this is somewhat problematic because the

questionnaire itself would suggest that what matters here is the quantity of strategies employed, even though there is agreement that, when it comes to LLSs, it is, in fact, quality that matters. Together with Cohen, Oxford (2001) developed a similar LLSs questionnaire aimed at young learners, entitled *Young Learners' Language Strategy Use Survey*, which we used for our study. Composed originally of 76 language learning strategies that are divided into six groups of skills and parts of language (listening, speaking, reading, writing, vocabulary and translation), it asks young learners to mark a plus, a check or a minus, depending on whether a particular strategy really, somewhat or not at all describes them. According to Rubin et al. (2008), the questionnaire offers practical exemplifications and various visual resources to make it possible for the learners to better understand their preferences for dealing with language tasks. Having briefly presented Oxford's two questionnaires, we will deal with the corresponding taxonomy in the following chapter.

2.3 Oxford's strategy classification system (1990)

In her book entitled *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know* (1990), Rebecca Oxford presents one of the most famous LLSs classification systems. According to Oxford, language learning strategies can be defined as "…specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques that students use to improve their own progress in developing skills in a second or foreign language. These strategies can facilitate the internalization, storage, retrieval, or use of the new language." (Oxford, 1999, p. 518, as cited in Dörnyei, 2005, p. 163). Oxford (1990) claims that her strategy classification system does differ from other systems because it is much more detailed and comprehensive, it links both individual strategies and strategy groups with all the four language skills, and it also uses terminology that is not that technical in nature. Before presenting Oxford's classification system, we will first present the features of LLSs.

2.3.1 Features of LLSs

Language learning strategies are important in enhancing the learning process of learners. According to Oxford (1990), by teaching learners how to rely less on their teacher and more on themselves, as well as by training them to use strategies that are appropriate to them, learners become involved in the process of learning in an active and self-directed way. At the same time, this gives teachers roles that are more creative and varied- by identifying their

learners' LLSs and by training them to use the appropriate strategies, teachers help their learners take more responsibility and become more independent (Oxford, 1990). Thus, by assuming a more active role and by being aware of their own learning process, learners can no longer attribute success to mere luck or accident, but to careful planning and usage of strategies that are useful to a particular individual (Cohen, 1991). LLSs, as Oxford (1990) states, involve more than just the cognitive aspects of the learner, they are goal-oriented and often conscious, even though they can become unconscious or automatic with time, which is a desirable outcome. Furthermore, LLSs support learning in both direct and indirect way, they are influenced by many other factors (such as age, sex, motivation, personality traits, culture etc.), and they are quite flexible, which means they can rarely be found in predictable patterns (Oxford 1990).

Finally, LLSs can be taught to learners through strategy training, and proper strategy use can lead to a much greater self-confidence, improved level of proficiency and, last but not least, development of the communicative competence (Oxford, 1990). In order for the communicative competence to be developed, according to Oxford, (1990), learners need to participate in authentic communication in which they should use language that is both meaningful and contextualized, and language learning strategies are of much significance in such communication.

2.3.2 The system

When we talk about Oxford's LLSs classification system itself, it is made up of two major classes- direct and indirect strategies, of which each is further divided into three subclasses. Namely, direct strategies consist of cognitive, memory and compensation strategies, while the indirect class is made up of metacognitive, social and affective strategies, which in total equals to 19 strategy sets with 62 individual strategies. What is important here is the fact that, as Oxford (1990) states, each group of strategies can connect with every other group to mutually support each other, at the same time putting more responsibility for the learning on the learners themselves. Oxford also developed her own instrument for assessing LLS use, *SILL*, which has already been discussed. Having stated all this, let us now briefly summarize all the six categories that make up this system.

2.3.2.1 *Direct strategies*

To start with, the reason why this class of strategies is named *direct* is the fact that these strategies directly involve the target language (TL) at hand. As Oxford (1990) states, all the strategies in this group require mental processing of the TL, but each of them requires it in a somewhat different way and for different purposes.

The first group of direct strategies, which is very important, if not essential in the process of learning a language, are cognitive strategies, or the so-called "higher thinking skills" (Oxford, 2001, p. 167). These are the strategies that are used by learners for various types of manipulation and transformation of the TL (Oxford, 1990) and, among the most widely used ones are analyzing, guessing from the context, reorganizing information, reasoning inductively or deductively, summarizing, taking notes, and so on (Oxford, 1990 and 2001). According to Oxford's (2001) findings, it is precisely these strategies that are most popular with the learners.

The next group of direct strategies, which is very similar to the aforementioned one, are memory strategies, known also as mnemonics. These are the strategies that make it possible for the learner to mentally store verbal material, and then retrieve it later on when it is needed for communication because memory strategies help move information to the level at which knowledge is more automatic and procedural (Oxford, 1990). These strategies also help learners link an item that is new to something that they already know (Oxford, 2001), and this is done by making associations, arranging things in order, reviewing, using keywords or physical response, etc. (Oxford, 1990). It is important to note, though, that all these principles involve some kind of meaning, so all the arrangements and associations that learners make need to have a personal meaning to the learner, Oxford (1990) states.

Having presented these two direct strategies, it has to be said that, although Oxford separates cognitive strategies from memory strategies in her classification system, this is a somewhat controversial issue. As Dörnyei (2005) points out, memory strategies are a subclass of cognitive strategies, so it is not logical to separate them and treat them as if they were independent of one another. In spite of all the criticism of this kind, Oxford (2001) reasons that there is indeed a difference, given the fact that cognitive strategies form deep associations in the mind, whereas memory strategies can only form associations on a superficial level.

Finally, the last group of direct strategies are compensation or communication strategies. As Oxford (1990) explains, these are the strategies that learners use in speaking and writing to

compensate for the gap in their knowledge when it comes to both grammar and vocabulary, so these strategies help learners to continue using the language and to practice even more. Some of the ways learners can compensate for the lack of the appropriate word or term are using synonyms and paraphrases, gesturing and miming, or even selecting the topic they will talk or write about (Oxford, 1990). As it was the case with memory strategies, compensation strategies have also been put to criticism. According to Cohen (1997, as cited in Oxford, 2001), compensation strategies are strategies whose goal is language use, and not language learning, and they should thus not be considered language learning strategies. Oxford (2001) does not agree, claiming that language use provides learners with the opportunity to learn the language incidentally, and that because of this precisely compensation strategies deserve to be included in the classification.

Even though compensation strategies are the last component of the direct strategies class, we have to remember that this entire class is also supported by the other one, or the indirect strategies class, that will be presented in the next chapter.

2.3.2.2 Indirect strategies

Unlike direct strategies for language learning, indirect strategies may not directly involve the TL at hand. Nevertheless, their importance lies in the fact that they manage and support the process of learning a language (Oxford, 1990).

To start with, one group of indirect strategies that is very helpful are metacognitive strategies, which enable learners to effectively plan, arrange, coordinate and evaluate their process of learning (Oxford, 1990). It is easy to see their importance if we take into account the fact that, as Oxford (1990) puts it, learners often lose their focus when they are presented with a lot of new language material, and they can easily regain it by consciously using metacognitive strategies such as paying attention, organizing, setting goals and objectives, overviewing, etc. More precisely, metacognitive strategies have a threefold function: they help learners manage themselves as learners, by using self-knowledge strategies such as deciding about one's needs, interests and learning style; they aid learners in the general process of learning, for example when learners decide to find an appropriate place to study, set a study schedule or identify the resources that are available to them; and finally, they include strategies that are also very useful for a specific learning task at hand, such as

planning the steps necessary to accomplish a particular task, paying attention to it and monitoring mistakes that are made during the task (Oxford, 2001).

Besides being able to effectively control and manage their learning process, learners should also know how to deal with their attitudes, emotions and motivation that are all exerting influence on their process of learning, as well. This is where the affective strategies group comes in handy because it makes it possible for learners to identify their own feelings and to recognize which learning tasks or situations provoke them (Oxford, 2001). The influence of learners' attitudes and beliefs on their learning process should not be underestimated- as Oxford (2001) points out, having negative attitudes and beliefs reduces learners' motivation and damages the entire learning process. It is precisely because of this that it is essential for learners to learn how to deal with these negative emotions and change them into attitudes that will have a more positive effect. Some of the strategies learners can apply, according to Oxford (1990), are strategies for lowering anxiety, such as deep breathing and meditation techniques or using music and laughter. Furthermore, self-encouragement is another useful strategy that consists of making positive statements or rewarding oneself, as is the strategy of taking one's emotional temperature, which consists of writing various checklists or language learning diary, or even listening to one's body and its needs (Oxford, 1990).

As we have stated, getting to know oneself and one's emotions, attitudes and beliefs is essential in the language learning process. Alongside this, it is also important to learn how to effectively socialize with others in the process of learning and to understand the culture of the TL, as well (Oxford, 2001). This results from the fact that language is in fact communication, and this communication is something that happens between people, so using appropriate social strategies is important throughout the process (Oxford, 1990). Social strategies consist of asking questions, be it for clarification, verification or correction, of cooperating with peers or with users of the TL who are more proficient, and of developing empathy by becoming aware of other people's feelings and emotions and by being able to understand their culture, which is key to successful communication (Oxford, 1990).

To conclude, all the strategy groups in Oxford's classification system mutually support one another, as it has already been mentioned earlier. According to Oxford (1990), language learning strategies are directed towards the goal of developing communicative competence, which involves all the four language skills. It is important to mention here that, among various other ways of classifying LLSs, they can be classified by skill area, as well (Cohen and

Weaver, 2006). This classification would include various strategies or "methods to learn language that are related to a specific language ability area" (Cohen and Weaver, 2006, p. 44). Given the fact that in our study we looked at the LLSs from the point of view of the four language skills and vocabulary and translation as parts of language, they will be discussed in the following part of the paper.

2.4 The four skills

As it has already been stated in the previous part of the paper, the four language skills are reading, listening, speaking and writing. Reading and listening are also known as the receptive skills because they refer to all the different ways in which people extract meaning from the things they hear or see, while on the other hand, speaking and writing are known as the productive skills (Harmer, 2001). We should mention translation and vocabulary learning here as well because they are seen as parts of language or "skill-related strategies that cut across all four skill areas" (Cohen and Weaver, 2006), and also because they are part of the questionnaire we used. Having stated all this, we will start our discussion with the receptive skills or, more precisely, with reading.

2.4.1 Reading

When it comes to reading as a skill, there is a threefold view to it- namely, it can be seen as a practice, a product or a process. According to Wallace (2001), when viewed as a practice, reading is analyzed not only in the context of schooling but in the context of everyday practices, as well. Reading as a product focuses more on analyzing the constituent parts of a text, as well as its meaning and form, while reading as a process, which is the most interesting to us, puts emphasis on the reader and the strategies that they employ while they are processing a text and constructing meaning from it (Wallace, 2001). It is important to mention here that, in the initial phases of research, reading was seen as quite a passive skill. In the 1980s and 1990s, according to Wallace (2001), this view was challenged when it was realized that, during the process of reading, the reader was actually involved in the process of extracting meaning from the text. This was when the role of the reader shifted from passive to a more active one. Recently, reading has started being seen not only as an active, but rather an interactive activity, given the fact that, during reading, readers negotiate meaning (Wallace, 2001).

The majority of research related to reading as a skill has to do with the L1 so, when it comes to L2 studies, an interesting question that has arisen is whether reading can be seen as a reading or a language problem (Alderson, 1984, as cited in Wallace, 2001). The general consensus is that the crucial factor here is the L2 proficiency- the lower the L2 proficiency, the less important the L1 reading ability for reading in L2 (Wallace, 2001). More precisely, in order for L2 learners to be able to transfer their L1 reading abilities into the L2, they need to have a "minimum threshold level of general L2 language competence" (Wallace, 2001, p. 22). Finally, according to Harmer (2001) in order for L2 learners to have the maximum benefit from reading, they should be exposed to both extensive and intensive reading activities. The first type would include all the reading that is done for pleasure, outside class while the latter would include the reading activities that are chosen by the teacher and done during class (Harmer, 2001). In order to make the process of reading as effective as possible, it is important to present learners with the strategies that could help them improve their reading ability, such as those for summarizing the material in a strategic way or skimming the text to get the main idea (Cohen and Weaver, 2006).

2.4.2 Listening

Of all the four skills, listening is the most widely used one, but it is rarely used on its own- we often use it together with the other three skills (Rost, 2001). Due to the fact that the grammar-translation model was the predominant way of teaching languages for quite a while, it took some time before it was realized how important listening truly was in the process of learning an L2.

According to Rost (2001), the rising of the audiolingual method in the 1940s was accompanied by a growing conscience of the importance of listening. In the late 1960s and 1970s listening was recognized as the primary source of L2 input, and since 1980 it has been viewed as a primary means of learning a language (Rost, 2001). The linguistic input for FL learners lies in the so-called 'linguistic environment' that is made up of the TL speakers and their speech to the FL learners, be it in social or academic situations. The understanding of this speech is partially enabled by the native speakers' efforts to make their speech comprehensible, but also by various strategies that learners apply to understand the input they are exposed to (Rost, 2001). It is important to mention here that learners do not benefit from just any kind of input. In order for language learning to take place, according to Krashen (1982, as cited in Rost 2001), the input to which learners are exposed needs to be

comprehensible, i.e. at a level that is just above the current level of their knowledge. As it is the case with reading, it is important to expose learners to both intensive and extensive listening activities. In this way, they are given the opportunity to hear varied voices (and not just their teacher's), and it also helps them establish good speaking habits while at the same time improving their pronunciation (Harmer, 2001). According to Cohen and Weaver (2005), language learning strategies come in handy here as well, because they enable learners to become familiar with the sounds of the TL and to listen to a conversation in that language.

2.4.3 Speaking

Even though nowadays we know how important speaking is in the process of learning a foreign language, only in the last three decades has it started being recognized as a branch of learning and teaching in its own right (Bygate, 2001). This is not at all strange if we take into account the historical developments in the SLA field and many issues with regard to speaking. This late awakening of speaking, according to Bygate (2001), is the result of the influence of the grammar-translation approach, which neglected the development of communicative skills, but it is also due to technology because it took quite some time before tape-recording became cheap enough for classroom use. Furthermore, it was much easier for teachers and linguists to concentrate on studying written than oral language, and speaking was often falsely treated as the main means of learning instead as a skill in its own right, Bygate (2001) claims. The importance of speaking started being recognized with the audiolingual approach, and, more importantly, in the 1970s with the development of the nowadays dominant communicative approach (Bygate, 2001).

In order for L2 learners to speak fluently, it is not enough to just have sufficient knowledge of the language. According to Harmer (2001), learners also need to be able to use connected speech fluently, as well as use some commonly used lexical phrases, such as those for agreeing or disagreeing. Furthermore, they should be able to vary the volume, speed, stress, pitch and other suprasegmental features of their utterances, and to be able to structure what they want to say and seek clarification when needed (Harmer, 2001). Another type of skills necessary for efficient communication are the skills necessary for mental and social processing. They include language processing skills for producing comprehensible and meaningful language, skills necessary to interact with other human beings, as well as those for processing the information the moment we get it (Harmer, 2001). Thus, in order to help their students get the maximum benefit from speaking activities, teachers should try to integrate

fluency, accuracy and complexity activities in their lessons (Bygate, 2001). Alongside this, according to Cohen and Weaver (2005), learners should also be familiar with strategies that can help them engage in conversations, practice speaking and keep talking even when they lack certain expressions that are necessary for the conversation.

2.4.4 Writing

For a very long period of time writing was not considered to be a language skill that needed to be taught to learners, but it was rather viewed as a support skill in the process of learning a language, used merely for writing dictations or answering to various reading or grammar exercises (Reid, 2001). This view continued well into the 1970s, when English L2 writing courses were, in fact, grammar courses in which learners copied sentences, modifying only small parts of them. According to Reid (2001), the underlying teaching philosophy here stemmed from the audiolingual method and the purpose of such structured writing practice was to prevent learners from making errors, which was supposed to lead to accuracy in writing. The next decade brought about a gradual acceptance of errors as useful tools for language development, as well as the realization of the importance of writing in academic environment. These new findings naturally led to a shift from controlled writing to a more guided one, as Reid (2001) explains.

In the last decades, the importance of L2 writing has been recognized in schools worldwide. According to Reid (2001), this can be clearly seen in the fact that many standardized EFL proficiency exams now include tests that are directly aimed at testing learners' writing skills. Furthermore, modern L2 writing courses have become more learner-centered, with a greater emphasis put on the classroom community itself and the responsibilities that learners have in that community. As Reid (2001) states, these responsibilities would include various peer response activities, as well as the role of the learners in selecting both the topics for writing and the criteria according to which it would be evaluated. To make it possible for learners to become effective writers, they should be taught various strategies that could help them in this process, such as those for planning their paper, writing it and reviewing it through multiple drafts (Cohen and Weaver, 2006).

2.4.5 Vocabulary and translation as parts of language

We have already stated that vocabulary and translation are skill-related strategies that cut across the four language skills. When it comes to vocabulary, its importance is undoubtedly clear. As Lightbown and Spada (2006) state, learners can get their message across even if they mispronounce a word or use it in a wrong place in a sentence, but they will have difficulties in communicating if they use a completely wrong word. Carter (2001) lists two key questions with regard to learning vocabulary. The first one is what it really means to learn a word, and much research on this topic has dealt with the issues of memorization. The second one tackles the issue of how words are learned, i.e. whether they are better learned explicitly, through translation equivalents and world lists, or implicitly, through reading real texts and being exposed to new vocabulary in context. One of the particularly influential theories is the strong-explicit learning hypothesis proposed by Craik and Lockhart (1972, as cited in Carter 2001), which emphasizes the importance of the so-called cognitive depth. What they claim is that, in the process of vocabulary learning, it is important to employ various metacognitive strategies, so that the processing is not done on a superficial level only. Thus, the deeper the processing, the superior and more long-term the vocabulary learning and recall will be. Carter (2001) also points out that the majority of researchers agree that, at the beginning levels and for learning the superficial forms of basic words, explicit learning is more useful, while for learning semantic properties of abstract, less frequent words at more advanced levels, implicit learning and inferential strategies would better suit pupils.

When it comes to translation, on the other hand, its role in FL context is a matter of hot debate. According to Alroe and Reinders (2015), with the emergence of the communicative approach in the SLA field, what has appeared is the belief that translation into L1 does not contribute much to the process of acquiring an FL, even though there are researchers who believe this claim has no foundation. Nevertheless, learners often employ translation strategies in both learning and using the TL, especially at lower levels, as Cohen and Weaver (2005) claim, and it is important for learners to be acquainted with strategies that can help them translate back into their native language when needed, in order to both understand and retain new information.

2.5 Previous research on LLSs

2.5.1 Previous research on LLSs in FL/L2 studies

To the best of the author's knowledge, the research on language learning strategies has mostly been carried out on young adult or adult FL or L2 learners, which means that we still lack valuable insight into strategies that are used by young L2 language learners. Among the few studies that have dealt with young language learners in ESL or EFL contexts are the ones done by Wong Fillmore (1976), Chesterfield and Chesterfield (1985), Chamot and Beard El-Dinary (1999), Coyle and Valcárcel (2002), Vrettou (2009), Gürsoy (2010), Kaur and Embi (2011), Yusuf (2012) and Wu (2014).

In her study from 1976, Wong Fillmore researched five Mexican children aged five to seven who were learning English in the USA. Each child was paired with a native speaking child, and their interactions were recorded and then analyzed. The data showed the importance of social strategies in learning the L2, given the fact that the children's primary reason for learning English was to establish friendship with their native speaking friends. Cognitive strategies identified here had to do with language production and use, and not so much with metacognitive awareness of the language (Wong Fillmore, 1976, as cited in Coyle and Valcárcel, 2002). Chesterfield and Chesterfield (1985, as cited in Coyle and Valcárcel, 2002) carried out a research on fourteen children aged five to six, in a bilingual context, to identify both the strategies used and the order in which they emerged over a period of time. Their findings showed that there indeed was a natural order in which learning strategies emerged in young children, starting with receptive, independent strategies, leading all the way up to strategies of metacognitive awareness or those for which greater linguistic competence was needed.

Chamot and Beard El-Dinary (1999) did a research on language learning strategies in elementary FL French, Spanish and Japanese immersion classrooms, the age range being from kindergarten to age six. They used think-aloud data to gather information about strategies that more- and less-effective learners employed for writing and reading tasks in the TL. Their findings showed that there were differences in terms of the appropriateness of certain strategies for the task at hand between more- and less-effective learners. Namely, more effective learners tended to use background knowledge strategies, such as elaborations, predictions and inferences, while less effective learners relied more on phonetic decoding.

Furthermore, more effective learners were more flexible in their use of strategies and would focus on the task as a whole, while less effective learners tended to get slowed down by details and were not as good in monitoring and adapting strategies as their more effective fellows were (Chamot and Beard El-Dinary, 1999). Coyle and Valcárcel's (2002) research focused on eight children aged eight and nine who were native speakers of Spanish and learners of English as an FL, and who were all deemed effective language learners. By using classroom observation, retrospective and think-aloud interviews, the researchers tried to identify and classify the language learning strategies employed by those children. The results showed that effective language learners were highly motivated and confident, managed their learning well, monitored their FL use, cooperated with peers, paid attention to English even outside the classroom and looked for opportunities in which they could use the FL. They also relied on their background knowledge and tended to infer meaning from context, and they used techniques to compensate for the lack of knowledge when needed (Coyle and Valcárcel, 2002).

When it comes to more recent research, by using an adapted version of Oxfords's (1990) *SILL* questionnaire on 763 Greek EFL primary school learners, Vrettou (2009) discovered that young learners mostly used metacognitive and social strategies, while the least used ones were compensation strategies, probably due to quite low vocabulary range and limited world knowledge of the young learners. Alongside this, very highly-motivated learners reported using more strategies, as did the female participants. In another study carried out on 54 Turkish children aged nine to eleven, Gürsoy (2010) found that young EFL learners used not only many of the strategies that had already been identified in Oxford's taxonomy, but also some additional ones that had not been mentioned before (e.g. children reported using pronunciation strategies not restricted only to practicing, and drawing a picture of the word they did not know how to say or write). Kaur and Embi's (2011) research focused on the frequency with which 60 Malaysian primary EFL learners used skill-related LLSs. By using an adapted version of Cohen, Oxford and Chi's (2002) *LSUI*, the researchers found that the most frequently used strategies were those for reading, followed by writing and listening LLSs. Speaking LLSs were the least frequently used ones. The most frequently employed strategy was using a dictionary to understand the meaning of a word, while the least frequently used strategy was making ongoing summaries of a text during reading. The researchers also found that girls used LLSs more often than boys. In another study, Yusuf (2012) used observations and analysis of pieces of written work of two young Indonesian girls

who were learning English as an L2 in the USA. She found that the girls' excellent results were due to their good strategies, namely, their constant practice and use of English in communication, risk-taking, good guessing and practicing their pronunciation. Finally, Wu (2014) used a custom-made questionnaire to study strategies employed by 700 Chinese primary school EFL learners. The strategies that were most employed by the learners were cognitive and metacognitive ones while the least employed ones were the social/affective strategies. Nevertheless, Wu (2014) stated the results were not so optimistic, given the fact that even the most frequently used strategies were, in fact, rarely used.

2.5.2 Previous research on LLSs in Croatia

As was the case with research on primary school learners' LLSs use worldwide, there has not been much research on that topic in Croatia either. One of the few examples is the research that Vrhovac (1998) carried out on 74 Croatian learners of French, aged ten to eleven. Learners were given a reading and writing test, with the aim of determining their level of linguistic consciousness and strategic competence. Vrhovac (1998) found that young learners were very successful in self-reflection and that they were able to reason about their linguistic knowledge and talk about the strategies they used when they encountered difficulties in solving the test. Young learners tried to solve the task at hand and they did not avoid the problems they encountered, even if that meant producing an incorrect answer. The strategies they used were those of generalization, elimination, semantic avoidance and selecting elements from the model (Vrhovac, 1998).

Two more studies have been conducted but, among other variables, they compared LLSs of young learners to those of older learners. Mihaljevi Djigunovi (1999) carried out a research on 362 learners, of which 137 were primary school learners (eighth-graders). By using the Croatian translation of Oxford's *SILL*, Mihaljevi Djigunovi (1999) found that there was not much difference in the use of strategies between younger and older learners, and that the use of LLSs was culture-specific. Looking at the whole sample, she also found that female learners used LLSs more frequently, as did the higher achieving students.

Finally, Kosti -Bobanovi and Ambrosi-Randi (2006) did a study on 833 Croatian EFL learners, of which 330 were primary school learners, in which they tried to find a relationship between various IDs variables (including LLSs) in different EFL education levels. When it comes to LLSs, they used a custom-made questionnaire to test the use of strategies for oral

communication. They found that younger learners used more strategies than their older fellows, and that they rarely used compensation strategies (Kosti -Bobanovi and Ambrosi-Randi , 2006). They also found a significant relation between self-concept, language anxiety and previous language learning experience with LLSs.

3 The study

3.1 The Aim

The study aimed at analyzing the frequency with which Croatian primary school EFL learners (the fifth- and the seventh-graders) used LLSs. More precisely, the aim of the study was to find out for which of the four language skills and two parts of language the learners, both the fifth- and the seventh-graders, used LLSs most frequently, and to see whether there was any statistically significant difference in the use between the two groups of participants. The second aim of the study was to see whether we could identify any differences in the frequency of use of individual LLSs within the abovementioned six groups of language skills and parts of language between our two groups of participants.

3.2 Sample

A total of 53 Croatian primary school learners participated in this study, of which 27 were fifth-graders and 26 were seventh-graders. For each grade, two random classes were chosen. Primary school learners were chosen because not much research on LLSs has been done on young language learners, especially in Croatia. All the participants in the study had the same number of English classes a week (three), and they had all been having compulsory English classes since the first grade. Both the fifth- and the seventh-graders had been taught English by the same teacher since their fifth-grade. The grade point average in the school year in which the study was carried out was 4.12 for the fifth-graders and 3.81 for the seventh-graders. Different grades were chosen to see if the use of strategy changed with the learners' age. Classes taught by the same English teacher were chosen to ensure that the strategy training the learners were getting, if any, was provided by the same teacher. The fifth- and the seventh-graders were chosen because the English teacher willing to participate in the study was teaching precisely those grades at the time of conducting the study. All the participants willing to participate did so voluntarily. Eleven students declined to participate in the study.

3.3 Procedure and instrument

Given the fact that the present study involved primary school children, we had to take all the necessary steps regarding child participation in research that are prescribed by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA)[1]. A written request and description of the study, as well as the instrument (the questionnaire), were submitted to the school's director, from whom we got the ethical approval to carry out the study. Following the school director's approval, a written consent request was submitted to parents of all the children from the classes that were chosen for the study. Both parents and children were informed about the nature of the study, i.e. they were familiar with the fact that it was anonymous, done on a voluntary basis and that children could withdraw from the study at any given moment. Only those children whose parents gave the approval for their child's participation in the study eventually took part in it. The data was gathered in May 2015, during the participants' regular English lessons. Both the English teacher and the researcher were present while the participants were filling in the questionnaire. The students were informed about the purpose of the study and were also given instructions on how to fill in the questionnaire before it was distributed to them. The time needed to complete the entire questionnaire was around 25 minutes. The participants who had not gotten their parent's approval for participating in the study were given some language tasks to do during that time.

When it comes to the instrument used in the study, it was a modified version of Cohen and Oxford's (2002) *Young Learners' Language Strategy Use Survey*, which was already mentioned in the previous part of the paper. The questionnaire was translated into Croatian because of the young age of our participants, who would certainly have much difficulty with understanding the English version of the questionnaire. The items in our questionnaire were formulated in a way that made it clear that they all referred to LLSs used for learning the English language. Furthermore, the items from the original questionnaire were modified in order to make them as comprehensible as possible to our participants. Namely, the items were simplified and exemplified wherever possible (e.g. the original Item 55 "If the alphabet is different, I practice writing it." was modified to "I especially practice writing the letters which do not exist in Croatian (e.g. x, y, w, etc.).". Given the fact that the circumstances have changed since the time the questionnaire was originally published, the items had to be made more modern, i.e. we had to take into account the technological development and the

accessibility of various technological devices and applications to young learners on everyday basis. For example, the original Item 1 "I listen to the radio in the language." was modified to "I listen to music in English (e.g. on YouTube, on my mobile phone, etc.)."); the original Item 58 "I write letters to other people in the language." was modified to "I write messages in English, e.g. on Facebook, Viber, Twitter etc.", and so on.

Our next modification regarded the way in which the participants had to mark their answers. The original questionnaire asked the participants to mark a plus (+), a check (x) or a minus (-), depending on whether a particular strategy really, somewhat or not at all described them, but we concluded that this way of marking their answers could be troublesome to our young participants. So, to make answering easier, we decided to use smiley faces that the participants had to circle depending on how often they employed certain LLSs. Thus, if they used a particular strategy rarely, they had to circle one happy smiley face (☺), if they used some strategy from time to time, they had to circle two happy smiley faces (☺☺), and for strategies used very often, they were supposed to circle three happy smiley faces (☺☺☺). Our original idea to use a sad (☹), neutral (:-/) and happy (☺) smiley face for each of the three possible answers was discarded so that our participants would not think that sad and neutral smiley faces were a representation of unsatisfactory or inadequate answers. Thus, the final decision was to include only the happy smiley faces in the questionnaire. Alongside making it easier and faster to understand and mark the answers, the presence of these smiley faces made the questionnaire more visually attractive to our participants, as well.

The original questionnaire had titles for each of the six groups of LLSs that were tested, which were removed from our questionnaire since we did not want our participants to think that a certain amount of points had to be scored in each of these groups. Another thing that was included in the original questionnaire were the open-ended questions after each subgroup of LLSs, in which the participants could add other strategies they used and which had not been mentioned in the questionnaire. We decided to remove these open-ended questions because our questionnaire was quite long as it was (77 items in total), so as not to additionally tire our young participants. Our final modification of the questionnaire regarded the second subgroup of LLSs used for translating. Since that particular subgroup was quite abstract ("What I do to think in the language") and since it contained only two items, we added two more items to make it easier for the participants to understand that particular subgroup of LLSs. The items that were added were Item 76 "Mentally, I talk to my teacher in English."

and Item 77 "Mentally, I retell myself some story in English that I heard." (see Appendix B for the entire questionnaire).

Items 1-17 were labeled as belonging to listening strategies group, items 18-25 to vocabulary strategies group, items 26-38 to speaking strategies group, items 39-54 to reading strategies group, items 55-70 to writing strategies group, and items 71 to 77 to translation strategies group. Listening strategies group was further divided into four subgroups (items 1-4, items 5-8, items 9-11 and items 12-17), speaking, writing and reading strategies groups into three subgroups each (items 26-29, items 30-33 and items 34-38 for speaking; items 55-59, items 60-66 and 67-70 for writing; items 39-42, items 43-52 and 53-54 for reading), while translation strategies group was divided into two subgroups (items 71-73 and 74-77). This, in total, made sixteen subgroups of LLSs.

Cronbach's alpha for the reliability of our questionnaire was calculated in Siegle's *Excel Spreadsheet to Calculate Instrument Reliability Estimate*. The rest of the data was analyzed in R software for statistical computing. In order to find out which of the six groups of strategies the fifth- and the seventh-graders used most frequently, mean and standard deviation was calculated for each group of LLSs. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to see whether there were any statistically significant differences in the frequency of use of these six groups of strategies for each group of participants. Tukey-HSD post hoc test was performed to reveal statistically significant differences in mean levels of groups of strategies and every two categories were compared separately at a 95% confidence interval. Additional *t*-tests were performed on borderline intervals. To identify statistically significant differences in the frequency of use of the six groups of strategies between two groups of participants, mean and standard deviation was calculated for each participant's answer in every skill-related group and *t*-tests were run. In order to see whether there was any difference in the frequency of use of individual LLSs within the six groups of language skills and parts of language between our two groups of participants, mean and standard deviation was calculated for each subgroup of LLSs and Mann-Whitney U test was performed, which is a nonparametric analog to the *t*-test. The significant level was set at p< .05.

3.4 Results and discussion

Before presenting the results of the study, it has to be said that the internal reliability of our strategy questionnaire was high with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.902, indicating that the items in our questionnaire were well correlated with one another.

3.4.1 The frequency of use of the six groups of LLSs by the fifth- and the seventh-graders

When it comes to the fifth-graders, the results of ANOVA (F=2.61, p= .027) disproved the research question which stated that there was no difference in the frequency of use the six groups of LLSs in favor of the alternative research question which stated that there was a difference in their frequency of use. Tukey-HSD post hoc test revealed that, looking at a 95% confidence interval, there were only two borderline intervals- the one regarding the use of vocabulary and listening LLSs (p= .058) and the other one regarding the use of vocabulary and speaking LLSs (p= .099). Additional *t*-tests were run to see if there were any statistically significant differences in the frequency of use of those three groups of LLSs. The results showed a statistically significant difference in the frequency of use of vocabulary LLSs, which the fifth-graders used less often than listening (p= .002) and speaking (p= .008) LLSs. There was no statistically significant difference in the frequency of use of listening and speaking LLSs (p= .801). The final conclusion would be that the fifth-graders used vocabulary LLSs less often than listening and speaking LLSs, while we could not disprove the research question which stated that they used all the other groups of LLSs equally frequently. Each of the six groups' mean and standard deviation (SD) was as follows:

Table 1. 5th-graders' LLSs use

	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Translation	Writing	Vocabulary
Mean	2.10	2.08	2.03	1.94	1.90	1.85
SD	0.78	0.79	0.78	0.78	0.83	0.80

When it comes to the seventh-graders, the results of ANOVA (F=2.97, p= .014) once again disproved the research question which stated that there was no difference in the frequency of use the six groups of LLSs in favor of the alternative research question which stated that there was a difference in the seventh-graders' frequency of use of the six groups of LLSs. Looking at a 95% confidence interval, there was only one borderline interval, the one

regarding the frequency of use of vocabulary and listening LLSs (p= .065). The additional *t*-test revealed that the seventh-graders used vocabulary strategies less frequently than the listening ones (p= .005), while we could not disprove the research question which stated that they used all other groups of LLSs equally frequently. Each of the six groups' mean and standard deviation (SD) was as follows:

Table 2. 7th-graders' LLSs use

	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Translation	Writing	Vocabulary
Mean	1.91	1.88	1.87	1.86	1.69	1.66
SD	0.78	0.78	0.80	0.77	0.75	0.82

So, when analyzing each group of participants separately, the results showed that we could not disprove the research question which stated that both the fifth- and the seventh-graders used listening, speaking, reading, translation and writing strategies equally frequently. The reason for this could be the fact that Croatian curriculum puts emphasis on the equal development of the four language skills in English classes, which means that our participants were probably exposed to various activities that promoted the use of those four language skills equally frequently. The development of all four skills should also be equally promoted by textbooks, and the textbooks used by our fifth- and seventh-graders were part of the same series. Thus, equal exposure to the four skills in class could have resulted in equal use of the skill-related strategies. Even though translation is usually not that much supported by neither the curriculum nor the textbooks, the fact that both groups of participants used translation strategies as frequently as those for listening, speaking, reading and writing could be attributed to their young age and their inability to 'turn off' Croatian from their mind while learning English.

Furthermore, the results also showed that both the fifth- and the seventh-graders used vocabulary strategies less frequently than listening strategies. Given the fact that the participants were most frequently exposed to English in the form of listening (e.g. they listened to their teacher and class CDs during their English lessons, they listened to music in English, they heard English in TV shows and films, etc.), they probably grew accustomed to employing a wider range of strategies to grasp the meaning of all the auditory input they were exposed to. On the other hand, using strategies for learning vocabulary significantly less frequently could mean that the participants were used to rote learning the new vocabulary, which is still quite typical for FL learning in Croatia, and that they were unaware of other

types of strategies they could use for easier memorization of new vocabulary. This is supported by the fact that among the most frequently employed strategies in our questionnaire for both groups of participants were reading the new words several times while studying (Item 24, M=2.41 and M=1.92 for the fifth- and the seventh-graders, respectively) and revising previously learned words later on in the process of studying (Item 25, M=2.52 and M=2.27 for the fifth- and the seventh-graders, respectively).

The results of our study also showed that the fifth-graders used vocabulary strategies less frequently than speaking strategies. This could be explained by the fact that they just finished with their early FL learning, which lasted from the first until the fourth grade. In that period they were probably allowed to use more Croatian when speaking. Given the fact that the fifth grade marks the beginning of a more serious period of schooling (the upper primary school), participants were now expected to start relying more on English in speech, which was a new thing to them and as such demanded a more frequent use of various strategies that could help them improve their speaking skills and pronunciation.

When it comes to statistically significant difference in the frequency of use of the six groups of LLSs between the fifth-and the seventh-graders, *t*-tests disproved the research question which stated that both groups of participants used LLSs with equal frequency in favor of the alternative research question which stated that the fifth-graders used LLSs more often. More precisely, *t*-tests showed that the fifth-graders used LLSs more frequently in listening, speaking, reading, writing and vocabulary groups. Thus, the only category for which we could not disprove our research question which stated that both groups of participants used LLSs with equal frequency was the one regarding translation LLSs. The results can be seen in the following table:

Table 3. Difference in the frequency of use(5th- and 7th-graders)

	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Translation	Writing	Vocabulary
p-value	.004	.008	.045	.448	.005	.041

On one hand, the fifth-graders' more frequent use of the abovementioned LLSs could be the result of them taking the questionnaire more seriously than the seventh-graders. The fifth-graders were still quite new to their English teacher and the whole upper primary school system, so it is possible that they were more enthusiastic and that they were trying harder than the seventh-graders. It could be the case that the fifth-graders, being younger than the seventh-graders, were still trying out different ways of learning and were thus applying

various strategies along the way. They were starting to experience a new level in their awareness regarding all the things they had previously learned, so everything suddenly seemed important to them. Contrary to them, the seventh-graders could have already discovered which particular strategies worked best for them, so it could be the case that they were just being selective and using only those strategies that suited them better. Given the fact they gained more language practice than the fifth-graders, certain LLSs could have become automatic to them as well, so they were maybe using them instinctively and without thinking. The only group of skill-related LLSs for which there was no statistically significant difference in the frequency of use between the two groups of participants were translation strategies. The reason behind this could be our participants' young age, which prevented them from using English without the help of translating into their native language when needed and using appropriate translation LLSs along the way.

Finally, it should also be noted that the fifth-graders' GPA in English was higher than that of the seventh-graders' (4.12 and 3.81, respectively), so we cannot rule out the possibility that their better grades were a result of their more frequent use of LLSs.

3.4.2 The differences in the frequency of use of individual LLSs within the six groups of language skills and parts of language between the two groups of participants

The fifth-graders

The following table presents the fifth-graders' most and least frequently used LLS in each of the four subgroups of listening LLSs:

Table 4. Listening LLSs (5th-graders)

Listening LLSs		Mean	SD
What do you do to listen English more often?		**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 2 (I watch TV shows in English, either on TV or on my computer.)	2.59	0.57
Least frequent	Item 3 (I go to the cinema to watch movies in English).	2.07	0.73
What do you do to better understand English sounds inexistent in Croatian?		**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 6 (I try to remember the unfamiliar sounds I hear.)	2.22	0.80
Least frequent	Item 5 (I look for Croatian sounds that are similar to those in English.)	1.48	0.58
What do you do to better understand things you hear in English?		**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 10 (I listen for what seems interesting.)	2.70	0.47
Least frequent	Item 11 (I listen for words that are repeated.)	2.15	0.67
What do you do when you still don't understand what		**Mean**	**SD**

	someone said in English?		
Most frequent	Item 14 (I ask s question, or I say that I don't understand.)	2.29	0.61
Least frequent	Item 15 (I try to guess the meaning from the person's tone, such as angry or happy.)	1.44	0.70

As can be seen from the table, the fifth-graders used listening strategies that were quite appropriate to their age, such as listening for what seemed interesting rather than concentrating on the words that were repeated, which was probably not as easy for them to do. Similarly, they tended to explicitly state that they did not understand something they heard instead of trying to guess the meaning of the utterance from someone's tone, probably due to their limited knowledge of English which made it more difficult for them to note the nuances in people's voices that could help them grasp the meaning of a particular utterance.

In the next table, the fifth-graders' most and least frequently used vocabulary LLSs are presented:

Table 5. Vocabulary LLSs (5th-graders)

	Vocabulary LLSs		
	What do you do to better memorize new English words?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 25 (Later in the process of studying I go to remind myself about words I learned earlier.)	2.52	0.70
Least frequent	Item 18 (I group the words by type, e.g. nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.).	1.37	0.63

These results once again show that the fifth-graders were more prone to rote learning the new vocabulary and revising the words during the process of studying. On the other hand, we can also see that they rarely tried to group the words by type, which is not at all surprising if we take into account their young age, for which that particular strategy was cognitively too demanding.

When it comes to speaking strategies, the next table presents the fifth-graders' most and least frequently used one in all the three subgroups:

Table 6. Speaking LLSs (5th-graders)

	Speaking LLSs		
	What do you do to get more practice in speaking and pronouncing English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 28 (I say new expressions over and over to myself.)	2.44	0.70
Least frequent	Item 29 (I practice using new grammar forms when I talk.)	2.00	0.74
	What do you do to talk to people in English more?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 32 (I plan what I am going to say.)	2.18	0.79

Least frequent	Item 33 (I ask my interlocutor to correct me when I talk.)	1.85	0.77
	What do you do when you can't think of a word or expression in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 35 (I try to say what I want in a different way.)	2.41	0.69
Least frequent	Item 37 (I use Croatian words, but with the English accent.)	1.37	0.49

We can see once again that the fifth-graders preferred the memory strategy of saying new expressions over and over to themselves, similarly to their most frequently used vocabulary strategy. They did not frequently use new grammar forms when talking in order to practice them, which was probably a cognitively too demanding strategy for their age. They also frequently planned in advance what they were going to say, most likely to gain more confidence, and they did not like to be corrected when talking probably because of the same reason. As for the compensation strategies, they preferred paraphrasing to pronouncing Croatian words with the English accent, probably because they were already experienced enough to know the latter strategy would not work.

The following table presents the fifth-graders' most and least frequently used LLS in each of the three subgroups of reading LLSs:

Table 7. Reading LLSs (5th-graders)

Reading LLSs			
	What do you do to read more in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 41 (I find things that interest me to read in English, e.g. sport, fashion, celebrities, etc.)	2.37	0.74
Least frequent	Item 42 (I look for things to read in English that are not too hard.)	1.93	0.62
	What do you do to better understand what you're reading in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 46 (I look at the pictures and what is written under them.)	2.41	0.75
Least frequent	Item 51 (I mark the reading in different colors to help me understand.)	1.52	0.80
	What do you do when you don't understand what you're reading in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 54 (I use a dictionary to find the meaning of the unknown words.)	2.29	0.82
Least frequent	Item 53 (I try to understand the meaning from context.)	2.04	0.66

Even when reading, the fifth-graders used strategies appropriate to their age, such as relying on pictures to better understand written texts, and choosing things of interest for reading. They also used the dictionary to find the meaning of the unknown words more frequently than

they relied on the context, most likely because of their limited vocabulary range which made it more difficult to grasp the meaning by using only the context.

In the following table, the most and the least frequently used LLS in each of the three subgroups of writing LLSs is shown:

Table 8. Writing LLSs (5th-graders)

Writing LLSs			
	What do you do to write more in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 59 (I write the words that I don't know, e.g. from a dictionary, mobile dictionary, textbook, etc.)	2.15	0.77
Least frequent	Item 56 (I take class notes in English, e.g. during History or Science classes.)	1.37	0.63
	What do you do to write better in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 62 (When I am done with writing, I read what I wrote to see if it is good.)	2.22	0.85
Least frequent	Item 61 (I use a dictionary.)	1.89	0.85
	Item 65 (I use the spell-checker on the computer.)	1.89	0.93
	What do you do when you cannot think of a word or phrase you want to write in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 67 (I ask someone to tell me the word or phrase I need.)	2.26	0.59
Least frequent	Item 70 (I use Croatian words, but I add English suffixes.)	1.41	0.75

As was the case with listening where the participants explicitly stated when they did not understand something they heard, they used a similar strategy in writing as well- asking someone to tell them the word they needed, which was probably the easiest thing for them to do. We can also see that they rarely took notes in English during other classes, most likely because their proficiency in English was too low for them to be able to use that particular strategy.

Finally, the fifth-graders' most and least frequently used translation LLSs were as follows:

Table 9. Translation LLSs (5th-graders)

Translation LLSs			
	What do you do when you translate?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 72 (While I am reading something in English, I translate it (mentally or out loud) to make sure I understand it.)	2.30	0.67
Least frequent	Item 71 (I plan what I want to say or write in Croatian, and then I translate it into English.)	2.07	0.78
	What do you do to "think" more in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 74 (I try to write, listen, speak, etc. in English, without translating into Croatian.)	2.11	0.80
Least frequent	Item 76 (Mentally, I talk to my teacher in English.)	1.52	0.64

The results showed that the fifth-graders frequently employed the strategy of translating while reading to make sure they understood the text. It could be the case that, by using that particular strategy, they wanted to make sure they really understood a particular text, which made them more confident in the end. On the other hand, when they wanted to "think" more in English, they preferred trying to write or speak without translating into Croatian rather than mentally talking to their teacher, probably because the latter strategy was not that interesting to them.

The seventh-graders

The following table presents the seventh-graders' most and least frequently used LLS in each of the four subgroups of listening LLSs:

Table 10. Listening LLSs (7th-graders)

	Listening LLSs		
	What do you do to listen English more often?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 1 (I listen to music in English (e.g. on YouTube, on my mobile phone, etc.)	2.37	0.79
Least frequent	Item 4 (If I hear someone speaking English, I listen).	1.77	0.87
	What do you do to better understand English sounds inexistent in Croatian?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 6 (I try to remember the unfamiliar sounds I hear.)	2.15	0.78
Least frequent	Item 7 (I ask the person who pronounced a particular sound to pronounce it again.)	1.35	0.56
	What do you do to better understand things you hear in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 10 (I listen for what seems interesting.)	2.42	0.76
Least frequent	Item 11 (I listen for words that are repeated.)	1.81	0.57
	What do you do when you still don't understand what someone said in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 14 (I ask s question, or I say that I don't understand.)	2.00	0.85
Least frequent	Item 16 (I try to guess the meaning from the person's body language, e.g. their hand or body movements.)	1.58	0.58

The results showed that the seventh-graders used quite similar listening strategies to those that the fifth-graders used, even though there were certain differences that could be attributed to age difference and the corresponding amount of exposure to English. For example, the seventh-graders listened to music in English more frequently than the fifth-graders, who preferred watching TV shows in English, probably because the seventh-graders did not need the visual input that much anymore to understand the meaning of the spoken language they were exposed to. They also did not tend to ask the person who pronounced a particular sound

in English to pronounce it one more time, most likely because they were already used to all the English sounds inexistent in Croatian.

In the next table, the seventh-graders' most and least frequently used vocabulary LLS is presented:

Table 11. Vocabulary LLSs (7th-graders)

Vocabulary LLSs			
	What do you do to better memorize new English words?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 25 (Later in the process of studying I go to remind myself about words I learned earlier.)	2.27	0.87
Least frequent	Item 20 (I use rhymes to remember new words.)	1.15	0.54

As it was the case with the fifth-graders, the seventh-graders also frequently employed the strategy of revising previously learned words in the process of studying. This could be an indicator that both groups of participants were exposed to insufficient training in vocabulary LLSs, because of which they were mostly relying on memory strategies like learning by heart or repetition. It is also interesting to note the extremely low frequency with which the seventh-graders used the strategy of using rhymes to remember new words, most likely because they had already outgrown that particular strategy.

The next table presents the seventh-graders' most and least frequently used LLS in each of the three subgroups of speaking LLSs:

Table 12. Speaking LLSs (7th-graders)

Speaking LLSs			
	What do you do to get more practice in speaking and pronouncing English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 28 (I say new expressions over and over to myself.)	2.23	0.76
Least frequent	Item 29 (I practice using new grammar forms when I talk.)	1.61	0.70
	What do you do to talk to people in English more?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 30 (I start conversations in English.)	2.31	0.84
Least frequent	Item 31 (I change the subject if I don't have the words I need.)	1.58	0.76
	Item 33 (I ask my interlocutor to correct me when I talk.)	1.58	0.70
	What do you do when you can't think of a word or expression in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 35 (I try to say what I want in a different way.)	2.31	0.68
Least frequent	Item 37 (I use Croatian words, but with the English accent.)	1.23	0.51

The results showed that the seventh-graders used the same LLSs most and least frequently as the ones the fifth-graders did for practicing speaking and pronunciation and for compensating for the lack of certain words and expressions, most likely for the same reasons. However, they did use different strategies for talking more in English, namely, they started conversations in English more frequently than the fifth-graders did and they did not change the subject if they lacked the words necessary for the conversation. This could be due to the fact they were a couple of years older, which means they got more opportunities to practice speaking in English, because of which they probably had a bit more confidence than the fifth-graders.

The following table presents the seventh-graders' most and least frequently used LLS in each of the three subgroups of reading LLSs:

Table 13. Reading LLSs (7th-graders)

Reading LLSs		
What do you do to read more in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent Item 41 (I find things that interest me to read in English, e.g. sport, fashion, celebrities, etc.)	2.38	0.64
Least frequent Item 42 (I look for things to read in English that are not too hard.)	1.73	0.72
What do you do to better understand what you're reading in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent Item 46 (I look at the pictures and what is written under them.)	2.23	0.71
Least frequent Item 51 (I mark the reading in different colors to help me understand.)	1.42	0.76
What do you do when you don't understand what you're reading in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent Item 53 (I try to understand the meaning from context.)	2.04	0.87
Least frequent Item 54 (I use a dictionary to find the meaning of the unknown words.)	1.58	0.81

In order to read more in English and to better understand what was being read, the seventh-graders used the same strategies as the fifth-graders. However, unlike the fifth-graders, when they did not understand what they were reading, they relied on context more frequently than they used a dictionary to look up new words. This was probably due to their higher vocabulary range which made it easier for them to infer meaning from context, and which decreased the need to stop the reading process and go find a word in a dictionary.

In the following table, the most and the least frequently used LLSs in each of the three subgroups of writing LLSs are shown:

Table 14. Writing LLSs (7th-graders)

Writing LLSs			
	What do you do to write more in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 58 (I write messages in English, e.g. on Facebook, Viber, Twitter etc.)	2.15	0.78
Least frequent	Item 56 (I take class notes in English, e.g. during History or Science classes.)	1.19	0.40
	What do you do to write better in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 62 (When I am done with writing, I read what I wrote to see if it is good.)	2.31	0.79
Least frequent	Item 64 (I rewrite what I wrote to make it better.)	1.46	0.58
	What do you do when you cannot think of a word or phrase you want to write in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 67 (I ask someone to tell me the word or phrase I need.)	2.11	0.71
Least frequent	Item 70 (I use Croatian words, but I add English suffixes.)	1.38	0.70

The results once more showed quite a lot of similarities in the choice of strategies between the fifth-and the seventh-graders. Interestingly, where the fifth-graders chose to write down the words they did not know from a dictionary or their textbook in order to write more in English, the seventh-graders used the strategy of writing messages in English on Facebook, Twitter, Viber, etc. Being older than the fifth-graders, it is possible they had more access to various social media platforms and applications and were thus using them more frequently, so they also used them to obtain more writing practice in English at the same time.

The final group of LLSs are translation strategies, and the seventh-graders' most and least frequently used ones are shown in the following table:

Table 15. Translation LLSs (7th-graders)

Translation LLSs			
	What do you do when you translate?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 72 (While I am reading something in English, I translate it (mentally or out loud) to make sure I understand it.)	2.31	0.74
Least frequent	Item 73 (While I'm listening to someone speaking English, I translate parts of what they're saying into Croatian to help remember it.)	1.88	0.77
	What do you do to "think" more in English?	**Mean**	**SD**
Most frequent	Item 74 (I try to write, listen, speak, etc. in English, without translating into Croatian.)	2.08	0.74
Least frequent	Item 75 (I try to put Croatian out of my mind.)	1.50	0.65

The results showed that, when looking at the most frequently employed translation strategies, the seventh-graders used the same ones as the fifth-graders did. Interestingly, when they

wanted to "think" more in English, they did not try to put Croatian out of their mind, which could be an indicator of them relying too much on translation in the process of learning and using the TL.

Comparison of the fifth- and the seventh-graders

When it comes to statistically significant difference in the use of these sixteen subgroups of LLSs by the fifth- and the seventh-graders, Mann-Whitney U test identified it in only three subgroups: in the speaking subgroup 'What do you do to get more practice in speaking and pronouncing English?' (W=493.5, p= .005), in the reading subgroup 'What do you do when you don't understand what you're reading in English?' (W=496, p= .004), and in the writing subgroup 'What do you do to write better in English?' (W=491.5, p= .006). The test disproved the research question which stated that both groups of participants used LLSs with equal frequency in favor of the alternative research question which stated that the fifth-graders used these subgroups of LLSs more frequently.

As we have previously mentioned, the first subgroup where a statistically significant difference in the frequency of use was found was the speaking subgroup 'What do you do to get more practice in speaking and pronouncing English?'. The reason why the fifth-graders used strategies from this subgroup more frequently than the seventh-graders did could be the fact that the fifth-graders were younger and as such did not receive as ample speaking opportunities as the seventh-graders did. Thus, they probably had to use various strategies more frequently in order to practice more and to improve their speaking and pronunciation skills.

The second subgroup with a statistically significant frequency of use, the reading-related one 'What do you do when you don't understand what you're reading in English?', offered only two strategies - using context to understand (Item 53) and using a dictionary to find the meaning of the unknown words (Item 54). The first strategy was the most frequently employed one by the seventh-graders (M=2.04), and the latter one by the fifth-graders (M=2.29). Because of the fifth-graders' younger age, it was probably easier for them to just look up the new words in a dictionary than to rely on context, which would explain why they preferred the former strategy to the latter one. Furthermore, the fifth-graders used both of these strategies much more frequently than the seventh-graders did. These results were not so surprising, given the fact that the fifth-graders' vocabulary range was certainly lower than that of their older colleagues, which means they probably encountered unknown words more often

while reading. On the other hand, the seventh-graders' higher vocabulary range could have resulted in less frequent overall use of these reading strategies.

The final subgroup that showed statistically significant difference in the frequency of use was the writing related one 'What do you do to write better in English?', and for which the fifth-graders once again showed a higher frequency of strategy use. The reason for this could be the fact that writing assignments start getting more serious from the fifth grade. So, unlike the seventh-graders, who already had some experience in those writing assignments and probably handled them with more ease, the fifth-graders were new to this and felt the need to plan their writing more carefully. This can be seen from the fact they quite frequently used the strategies for planning their writing in advance (Item 60, M=2.04, unlike the seventh-graders' 1.81), rewriting something to make it better (Item 64, M=2.04, unlike the seventh-graders' 1.46) and asking someone to correct what they wrote (Item 63, M=1.96, unlike the seventh-graders' 1.62).

Summary of results

In sum, the results of our study showed that, when analyzing each group of participants separately, they both used vocabulary-related strategies less frequently than those for listening. This was not that surprising, given the fact that our participants were probably frequently exposed to English in auditory form, because of which they were used to employing a wider range of listening strategies. Their less frequent use of vocabulary-related strategies could be an indicator that they were relying mostly on memory strategies for learning new vocabulary, such as rote learning and repetition. The fifth-graders also used speaking strategies more frequently than the vocabulary-related ones, probably because they lacked experience and confidence for speaking in English. The results also showed that the fifth-graders were more frequent users of LLSs for listening, speaking, reading, writing and learning vocabulary, either because they were younger and more inexperienced than the seventh-graders, which made everything seem important to them, or because they might have taken the questionnaire (and maybe even the English classes) more seriously. The research question stating that both groups of participants used translation strategies equally frequently could not have been ruled out, showing that both groups equally frequently relied on their native language while learning or using English, probably due to their limited proficiency in English. Looking at the individual LLSs within the six groups of language skills and parts of language, there were often quite a lot of similarities between the types of strategies employed and their frequency of use by the two groups of participants. The only subgroups where a

statistically significant difference was found were those that included the strategies for getting more practice in speaking and pronouncing English, for dealing with the things the participants did not understand while reading and for writing better in English. The fifth-graders' more frequent use of the abovementioned strategies could have been caused by their lower vocabulary range and the fact they did not get as ample speaking, reading and writing opportunities as the seventh-graders, which created the need to use various strategies more frequently along the way as a coping mechanism.

4   Conclusion and implications for teaching

Despite many inconsistencies that have arisen in both theory and research on LLSs, they still represent a variable that affects the way in which students deal with learning and using an L2. As such, it also has an effect on how successful the entire process of acquiring an L2 will be. Although a certain rise in interest and amount of research on strategies used by young language learners has been seen lately, much more research is needed in that particular area. With the present study, we tried to make a contribution to that area by investigating the frequency with which Croatian primary EFL learners used LLSs related to listening, speaking, reading, writing, learning vocabulary and translating. The results of our study showed that the participants' frequency of use of translation-related strategies did not decrease with age, and that they mostly relied on somewhat old-fashioned memory strategies when learning new vocabulary. The results also showed that the seventh-graders reported a lower frequency of strategy use in all the big groups of strategies, except for the translation-related one. All this could be an indicator that what is needed is awareness raising regarding LLSs, which would enable learners to become fully aware of the strategies they are using and to see whether they are appropriate to them. This would be especially useful to those learners who are not aware of the particular strategies they are using. It would also be useful for teachers to include strategy training in their lessons, as well, and thus present learners with a larger array of strategies to choose from. Doing so could help learners, for instance, choose other types of strategies for learning vocabulary, or even help them rely less frequently on translation and think more in the TL. Strategy awareness raising and adequate training would help learners become more self-directed and autonomous, and would make the process of acquiring an L2 more successful.

Finally, the present study has some limitations. Firstly, it was carried out on only 53 participants from two grades and age groups, while it would have been useful to have had a much larger sample and more than just two age groups for comparison. Furthermore, the only method that was used to collect data was the questionnaire, based on which generalizations were made. It would have been better if we had used a combination of methods to gather data, as the results would have certainly been more reliable. Nevertheless, we believe that our study provides a valuable insight into LLSs used by young learners, and hope it can help promote more enjoyable and successful learning.

References

Abed, A. Q. (2011) Teachers' Awareness of Second Language Learning Strategies Adopted and Used by Their Students: A Questionnaire. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies,* vol. 1, no. 3, pp 205-218.

Alderson, J.C. (1984) Reading: A language problem or a reading problem? In Alderson, J.C. and Urquhart, A.H. (Eds.) (1984) *Reading in a Foreign Language*. London: Longman.

Alroe, M.J. and Reinders, H. (2015) The role of translation in vocabulary acquisition: A replication study. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 1, pp. 39-58.

Bialystok, E. (1978) A theoretical model of second language learning. *Language Learning, 28,* pp. 69-83.

Bygate, M. (2001) *Speaking*. In Carter, R. and Nunan, D. (Eds.) (2001) *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.* Cambridge University Press, pp. 14-20.

Carter, R. (2001) *Vocabulary.* In Carter, R. and Nunan, D. (Eds.) (2001) *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.* Cambridge University Press, pp. 42-47.

Chamot, A. U., Beard El-Dinary, P. (1999) Children's Learning Strategies in Language Immersion Classrooms. *Modern Language Journal*, vol. 83, no. 3, pp. 319-338.

Chesterfield, R. and Chesterfield, K. B. (1985). Natural order in children's use of second language learning strategies. *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 45-59.

Cohen, A. D. (1991) *Strategies in second-language learning: Insights from research*. In Phillipson, R., Kellerman, E., Selinker, L., Sharwood Smith, M. and Swain, M. (Eds.) (1991) *Foreign/second language pedagogy research: A commemorative volume for Claus Faerch*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 107-119.

Cohen, A. D. (1997) *Language learning strategies and language use strategies.* Lecture, Strategies-Based Instruction Workshop, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

Cohen, A. D. (1998) *Strategies in learning and using a second language.* London and New York: Longman.

Cohen, A. D. and Chi, J. C. (2001) *Language Strategy Use Survey*. http://carla.acad.umn.edu/profiles/Cohen-profile.html.

Cohen, A. D. and Oxford, R. L. *Young Learners' Language Strategy Use Survey.* In Cohen, A. D. and Weaver, S. J. (Eds.) (2006) *Styles and Strategies-Based Instruction: A Teachers' Guide.* Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.

Cohen, A. D. and Weaver, S. J. (Eds.) (2006) *Styles and Strategies-Based Instruction: A Teachers' Guide.* Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.

Coyle, Y. and Valcárcel, M. (2002) Children's learning strategies in the primary FL classroom. *CAUCE, Revista de Filología y su Didáctica*, no. 25, pp. 423-458.

Craik, F.I.M. and Lockhart, R.S. (1972) Levels of processing: A framework for memory record. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviour,* vol. 11, pp. 671-684.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005) *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z. (2010) *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing (2nd ed.)*. London: Routledge.

Ehrman, M. E. (1996) *Understanding second language learning difficulties.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gürsoy, E. (2010) Investigating Language Learning Strategies of EFL Children for the Development of a Taxonomy. *English Language Teaching,* vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 164-175.

Harmer, J. (2001) *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Kaur, M. and Embi, M.A. (2011) Language Learning Strategies Employed by Primary School Students. *European Journal of Educational Studies,* vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 473-479.

Kosti -Bobanovi , M. and Ambrosi-Randi , N. (2006) Language learning strategies in different English as a foreign language education levels. *Društvena istraživanja,* Vol. 17, No. 1-2, pp. 281-300.

Krashen, S. (1982) *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Lightbown, P. and Spada, N. (Eds.) (2006) *How Languages are Learned.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mayer, R. (1988) *Learning Strategies: An Overview*. In Weinstein, C. E., Goetz, E.T. and Alexander, P.A. (Eds.) (1988) *Learning and Study Strategies: Issues in Assessment, Instruction, and Evaluation*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 11-22.

Medved Krajnovi , M. (2010) *Od jednojezi nosti do višejezi nosti: Uvod u istraživanja procesa ovladavanja inim jezikom*. Zagreb: Leykam international.

Mihaljevi Djigunovi , J. (1999) Language learning strategies and Croatian EFL Learners. *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia (SRAZ),* Vol. 44, pp. 275-286.

Nakatani, Y. (2006) Developing an oral communication strategy inventory. *Modern Language Journal,* 90, 151–168.

O'Malley, J. and Chamot, A. (Eds.) (1990) *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. L. (1990) *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning*. In Oxford, R. L. (1990) *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Oxford, R. L. (1990) *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Oxford, R. L. (1999) *Learning strategies.* In Spolsky, B. (Ed.) (1999) *Concise encyclopedia of educational linguistics.* Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 518-522.

Oxford, R. L. (2001) *Language learning strategies.* In Carter, R. and Nunan, D. (Eds.) (2001) *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.* Cambridge University Press, pp. 166-172.

Reid, J. (2001) *Writing*. In Carter, R. and Nunan, D. (Eds.) (2001) *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.* Cambridge University Press, pp. 28-33.

Rost, M. (2001) *Listening*. In Carter, R. and Nunan, D. (Eds.) (2001) *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.* Cambridge University Press, pp. 7-13.

Rubin, J., Chamot, A. U., Harris, V. and Anderson, N. J. (2008) *Intervening in the Use of Strategies*. In Cohen, A. D. and Macaro, E. (Eds.) (2008) *Language learner strategies*. Oxford University Press.

Siegle, Del. *Excel Spreadsheet to Calculate Instrument Reliability Estimates*. Retrieved 10 May, 2016 from the World Wide Web: http://researchbasics.education.uconn.edu/excel-spreadsheet-to-calculate-instrument-reliability-estimates/

Stern, H. H. (1992) *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tarone, E. (1983) *Some Thoughts on the Notion of Communication Strategy*. In Faerch, C. and Kasper, G. (Eds.) (1983) *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman, pp. 61-74.

Tseng, W.-T., Dörnyei, Z., & Schmitt, N. (2006) A new approach to assessing the strategic learning: The case of self-regulation in vocabulary acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 78–102.

Vandergrift, L., Goh, C. C. M., Mareschal, C. J., and Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2006) The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire: Development and validation. *Language Learning*, 56, 431–462.

Vrettou, A. (2009) Language Learning Strategy Use by Elementary School Students of English in Greece. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics,* vol. 25, pp.407-429.

Vrhovac, Y. (1998) Young Learners Discover Their Learning Strategies. *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia (SRAZ),* Vol. 43, pp. 41-49.

Wallace, C. (2001) *Reading.* In Carter, R. and Nunan, D. (Eds.) (2001) *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.* Cambridge University Press, pp. 21-27.

Weinstein, C. and Mayer, R. (1983) *The Teaching of Learning Strategies*. In Wittrock, M.C. (1985) *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3rd edition.). New York: Macmillan, pp. 315-327.

Wenden, A. and Rubin, J. (Eds.) (1987) *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Wong Fillmore (1976) *The second time around: Cognitive and social strategies in second language acquisition*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.

Wu, J. (2014) Characteristics of Chinese Primary School Students' EFL Learning Strategies. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies,* vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 1266-1272.

Yusuf, S. (2012) Language Learning Strategies of Two Indonesian Young Learners in the USA. *International Journal of English Linguistics,* vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 65-72.

Sažetak

Cilj ovog diplomskog rada bio je istražiti u estalost upotrebe strategija u enja engleskog jezika u osnovnoškolaca. Istraživanje je provedeno na 53 u enika i u enica, polaznika petog i sedmog razreda jedne osnovne škole. U istraživanju je korišten upitnik u kojem su sudionici trebali ozna iti svoje odgovore na pitanja zatvorenog tipa. Analiza njihovih odgovora pokazala je da obje skupine u enika jednako esto koriste strategije u enja jezika prilikom prevo enja, dok polaznici petog razreda eš e koriste strategije u enja jezika prilikom itanja, pisanja, slušanja, govorenja i u enja novih rije i. U individualnim sastavnicama ve ih grupa strategija razlika u u estalosti korištenja prona ena je u samo tri kategorije. Analizom rezultata obje skupine sudionika tako er je utvr ena rje a upotreba strategija za u enje novih rije i od strategija korištenih prilikom slušanja. Uz rezultate istraživanja, u radu je predstavljena i njihova mogu a prakti na primjena u nastavi.

Appendix A

Appendix B

UPUTE: Sve izjave koje slijede odnose se na stvari koje radiš **vrlo rijetko**, **ponekad** ili **često** kako bi lakše naučio **engleski jezik**. Za svaku izjavu odaberi i zaokruži odgovarajućeg smješka, odnosno:

☺	→ ako ono što piše radiš **vrlo rijetko**
☺☺	→ ako ono što piše radiš **ponekad**
☺☺☺	→ ako ono što piše radiš **često**

	vrlo rijetko	ponekad	često
Što radiš da bi što češće slušao/la engleski jezik?			
1) Slušam glazbu na engleskom (npr. na YouTube-u, na mobitelu...).	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
2) Gledam serije na TV-u ili kompjuteru koje su na engleskom.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
3) Idem u kino gledati filmove na engleskom jeziku.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
4) Ako čujem da netko govori na engleskom, slušam što govori.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
Što radiš da bolje razumiješ glasove u engleskom jeziku, a kojih nema u hrvatskom?			
5) Tražim glasove u hrvatskom koji su slični glasovima u engleskom.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
6) Pokušavam zapamtiti nepoznate glasove koje čujem.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
7) Tražim osobu koja je koja je izgovorila taj glas da ga ponovno izgovori.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
8) Slušam promjene u jeziku (ritam, koje riječi su glasnije izgovorene, itd.).	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
Što radiš da bolje razumiješ ono što čuješ na engleskom jeziku?			
9) Koncentriram se na važne riječi.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
10) Koncentriram se na ono što mi se čini zanimljivim.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
11) Koncentriram se na riječi koje se ponavljaju.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
Što radiš ako i nakon svega što smo spomenuli ne razumiješ što je netko rekao na engleskom?			
12) Zamolim osobu da ponovi to što je rekla.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
13) Zamolim osobu da sporije priča.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
14) Postavim pitanje, tj. kažem da mi nešto nije jasno.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
15) Pokušam pogoditi značenje iz tona glasa te osobe (npr. ljutog ili veselog tona glasa).	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
16) Pokušam pogoditi značenje pomoću govora tijela te osobe (npr. kako se kreće, što pokazuje rukama...).	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
17) Pokušam pogoditi značenje na temelju onoga što sam čuo/čula ranije.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
Što radiš da bi bolje zapamtio/la nove riječi na engleskom jeziku?			
18) Grupiram riječi po vrsti (imenice, glagoli, pridjevi...).	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
19) Povezujem izgovor nove riječi s izgovorom neke riječi koju već znam.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
20) Smišljam rime da zapamtim novu riječ.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
21) Zamislim sliku nove riječi u svojoj glavi.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
22) Smislim rečenicu u kojoj mogu upotrijebiti novu riječ pa ju napišem.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
23) Napišem novu riječ na komadić papira.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
24) Kada učim, prvo pročitam sve nove riječi nekoliko puta.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
25) Kasnije tokom učenja pokušam se prisjetiti riječi koje sam naučio/la ranije.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
Što radiš da bi više vježbao izgovor i govorenje na engleskom jeziku?			
26) Izgovaram engleske glasove sve dok ih dobro ne uvježbam.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
27) Imitiram način na koji govore Englezi ili Amerikanci.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
28) Više puta si izgovorim nove riječi i izraze.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
29) Dok govorim, koristim nove stvari koje sam naučio/la iz gramatike da ih usput vježbam.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
Što radiš da bi više govorio/la s drugim ljudima na engleskom jeziku?			
30) Započinjem razgovore na engleskom.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺

	vrlo rijetko	ponekad	često
31) Ako ne znam neke riječi koje mi trebaju za razgovor, promijenim temu.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
32) Isplaniram unaprijed ono što ću reći.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
33) Zamolim osobu s kojom razgovaram da me ispravlja dok govorim.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺

Što radiš kada se ne možeš sjetiti riječi ili izraza na engleskom koji ti treba?

34) Zamolim osobu s kojom razgovaram da mi pomogne.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
35) Pokušam reći to što želim na drugačiji način.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
36) Kada ne znam neku riječ na engleskom, kažem ju na hrvatskom.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
37) Koristim riječi iz hrvatskog, ali s engleskim naglaskom.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
38) Pokušavam objasniti što želim reći rukama ili mimikom.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺

Što radiš da što više čitaš na engleskom jeziku?

39) Čitam puno toga na engleskom jeziku..	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
40) Čitam stvari na engleskom jeziku iz zabave.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
41) Za čitanje na engleskom tražim stvari koje me zanimaju (npr. nešto o sportu, modi, poznatim osobama…).	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
42) Tražim nešto za čitanje na engleskom što mi neće biti preteško.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺

Što radiš da bolje razumiješ ono što čitaš na engleskom jeziku?

43) Brzo preletim tekst da vidim o čemu se radi.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
44) Tražim bitne činjenice u tekstu.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
45) Ono što čitam pročitam najmanje dva puta.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
46) Gledam slike i ono što piše ispod njih.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
47) Čitam naslove i podnaslove.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
48) Razmišljam o tome što bi se moglo dalje dogoditi u tekstu.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
49) Povremeno stanem da razmislim o onome što sam pročitao/la do tog trenutka.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
50) Podcrtavam dijelove teksta koji mi izgledaju bitno.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
51) Označavam tekst raznim bojama da ga bolje shvatim.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
52) Provjeravam koliko sam shvatio/la (npr. postavljam si pitanja ili pokušavam prepričati tekst).	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺

Što radiš kada ne razumiješ ono što čitaš na engleskom jeziku?

53) Pokušavam razumjeti pomoću ostatka odlomka.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
54) Koristim rječnik da shvatim značenje nepoznatih riječi.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺

Što radiš da bi više pisao/la na engleskom jeziku?

55) Posebno vježbam pisati slova kojih nema u hrvatskom (npr. x, y, w…).	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
56) Na nastavi pišem bilješke na engleskom jeziku (npr. na satu povijesti ili prirode zapišem nešto na engleskom jeziku).	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
57) Izvan nastave pišem razne bilješke na engleskom jeziku.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
58) Pišem poruke na engleskom (npr. na Facebooku, Viberu, Twitteru…).	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
59) Ispisujem riječi koje ne znam (iz rječnika, rječnika na mobitelu, udžbenika, itd.).	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺

Što radiš da bi bolje pisao/la na engleskom?

60) Unaprijed isplaniram ono što ću napisati.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
61) Koristim rječnik.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
62) Kada završim, pročitam ono što sam napisao/la da vidim je li dobro.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
63) Zamolim nekoga da ispravi to što sam napisao/la.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
64) Ponovno napišem to što sam napisao/la kako bi ovaj put bilo još bolje.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
65) Koristim provjeru pravopisa na računalu ('spell-check').	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
66) Koristim provjeru gramatike na računalu.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺

Što radiš ako se ne možeš sjetiti riječi ili izraza koji želiš napisati na engleskom jeziku?

67) Zamolim nekoga da mi kaže tu riječ/izraz.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺

	vrlo rijetko	ponekad	često
68) Pokušam to reći na drugačiji način.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
69) Koristim riječi iz hrvatskog kada ne znam kako se nešto kaže na engleskom.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
70) Koristim riječi iz hrvatskog, ali im dodam engleske nastavke.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺

Što radiš kada prevodiš?

	vrlo rijetko	ponekad	često
71) Pripremim što želim reći/napisati na hrvatskom pa to onda prevedem na engleski.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
72) Dok čitam nešto na engleskom, prevodim si (naglas ili u glavi) da budem siguran/na da razumijem.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
73) Dok slušam nekoga tko govori na engleskom, prevodim si dijelove na hrvatski da lakše zapamtim.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺

Što radim da više „mislim" na engleskom jeziku?

	vrlo rijetko	ponekad	često
74) Pokušavam pisati, slušati, govoriti, itd. na engleskom, bez prevođenja na hrvatski.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
75) Pokušavam „izbaciti" iz glave hrvatski.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
76) U glavi razgovaram s profesoricom na engleskom.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺
77) U sebi pričam na engleskom neku priču koju sam čuo/la.	☺	☺☺	☺☺☺