The Relationship between Grammar Learning Strategies and Risk-taking in EFL learners

Vuković, Klara

Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet

Diplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti

Klara Vuković

Relationship Between Grammar Learning Strategies and Risk-taking in EFL Learners

Diplomski rad

Mentor: prof. dr. sc. Višnja Pavičić Takač

Osijek, 2015

Content

1. Introduction

The topic of my diploma paper is the relationship between grammar learning strategies and risk-taking in learning English as a foreign language (EFL). I have chosen this topic because it is important to investigate the ways students learn grammatical structures, which grammar learning strategies students use the most and how these strategies correlate with their willingness to take risk in EFL. Grammar has always been one of the hardest aspects of language teaching and learning. It is very important for teachers to get an insight into ways students learn grammar so they could adapt their teaching. There are many strategies students can use in learning. Some students prefer learning on a daily basis and that way "play safely", while others are willing to take a risk of being wrong. This study investigates which grammar learning strategies students use when they decide to take a risk and which strategies they use when they are least willing to take a risk in learning English.

The study consists of two parts, a theoretical and experimental. In the theoretical part the terms *language learning strategies (LLS), grammar learning strategies (GLS)* and *risk-taking* are defined and explained, classification of grammar learning strategies is presented, factors influencing risk-taking are mentioned and relationship between second language learning (L2) and risk-taking is explained. At the end, earlier research on GLS and risk-taking in EFL is briefly presented.

The study aims at finding out which GLS learners of Grammar School in Osijek use, if there is a relationship between these strategies and risk-taking, if there is a difference between male and female learners in their use of grammar learning strategies and risk-taking, the relationship between risk-taking and success in learning English as a foreign language.

2. Language Learning Strategies

2.1. Definition of LLS

Learning strategies are important tool when it comes to learning a foreign language. Use of adequate learning strategies facilitates learning and enables students to become more effective learners. According to Oxford (2003) the word strategy comes from the ancient Greek word *strategia*, which means actions taken for the purpose of winning a war. Language learners employ LLS in order to make their own learning as successful as possible. If learner chooses strategies that fit his or her own learning style they become helpful for active and conscious learning.

Learning strategies have been defined as ”specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques such as seeking out conversation partners, or giving oneself encouragement to tackle a difficult language task used by students to enhance their own learning” (Scarcella and Oxford, 1992, as cited in Oxford, 2003:2). Cohen (2014:7) defines language learning strategies as ” thoughts and actions, consciously chosen and operationalized by language learners to assist them in carrying out a multiplicity of tasks from the very onset of learning to the most advanced levels of target-language performance.” Wenden (1987, as cited in Liang, 2009) refers to ‘strategies’ as specific actions or techniques, adding that they do not refer to learners’ general approach like reflecting and risk-taking. In the literature in cognitive science in general or language learning in particular, the term ‘strategy’ has been referred to as a small range of synonyms such as ‘technique’, ‘tactic’ and ‘skills’ (Liang, 2009).

Oxford (1990) mentions the following features of language learning strategies: they contribute to the communicative competence, allow learners to become more self-directed, expand the role of teachers, are problem-oriented, support learning both directly and indirectly, are not always observable, can be taught, are flexible and influenced by variety of factors. LLS are important in learning a language because they play a cognitive role in learning, they facilitate and optimize processes, especially in new tasks, and they play an affective-motivational role in learning, because they are tools in the learners’ hand that they can use on their own (Mariani, 2002). Language learning has to be internalized and strategies are in fact problem-solving mechanisms used by learners to cope with the complex process of learning (Palacios Martínez, 1996).

2.2. Classification of LLS

There are several classifications of learning strategies. According to Oxford (1990) learning strategies can be classified into two domains: direct strategies that directly involve target language and indirect strategies groups that provide indirect support for language learning through focusing, planning, evaluating, seeking opportunities, controlling anxiety, increasing cooperation and empathy. The three groups of direct strategies are: cognitive, memory-related and compensatory strategies. Cognitive strategies enable the learner to manipulate the language material through reasoning, analysis, note-taking, summarizing, synthesizing, outlining, reorganizing information, practicing in naturalistic settings, and practicing structures and sounds formally. Memory-related strategies help learners link one second language item or concept with another but do not necessarily involve deep understanding. Various memory-related strategies enable learners to learn and retrieve information in an orderly string, while other techniques create learning and retrieval via sounds, images, a combination of sounds and images, body movement or location. Compensatory strategies help the learner make up for missing knowledge. Examples of compensatory strategies are guessing from the context in listening and reading, using synonyms, gestures or pause words. Types of indirect strategies are: metacognitive, affective and social strategies. Metacognitive strategies such as identifying one's own learning style preferences and needs, planning for an L2 task, gathering and organizing materials, arranging a study space and a schedule, monitoring mistakes, and evaluating task success are employed for managing the learning process overall. Affective strategies include identifying one's mood and anxiety level, talking about feelings, rewarding oneself for good performance, and using deep breathing or positive self-talk. Social strategies (e.g., asking questions to get verification, asking for clarification of a confusing point, asking for help in doing a language task, talking with a native-speaking conversation partner, and exploring cultural and social norms) help the learner work with others and understand the target culture as well as the language (Oxford, 1990).

Rubin (1987, as cited in Liang, 2009), states that there are three kinds of learner strategies: learning strategies, communication strategies, and social strategies. Learning strategies and communication strategies are named as direct strategies in that they make direct and primary contribution to language learning, by means of obtaining, storing, retrieving and using language, as opposed to the indirect way in which social strategies contribute to language learning.

Cohen (2014:13-17) classifies learning strategies in the following way: strategies for language learning (include strategies for identifying the material that needs to be learned, repeating the material and committing it to memory), strategies by language skill area (strategies as means used to operationalize receptive skills of listening and reading and productive skills of speaking and writing), and strategies according to function (metacognitive, cognitive, affective and social).

2.3. Factors Influencing the Choice of LLS

The choices of strategies used by second language learners play a vital role in second language learning (Khamkhien, 2010). According to Oxford (1990) the variables that seem to influence language learning strategy choice include age, sex, attitudes, motivation, language learning goals, motivational orientation, learning style, aptitude, career orientation, national origin, language teaching methods, task requirements, language being learned, duration, and degree of awareness. MacIntyre (1994, as cited in Green and Oxford, 1995) highlights the importance of affective factors and links the use of a given language learning strategy with task demands, proficiency, aptitude, situation, attitude, motivation, previous success, anxiety, self-confidence, sanctions against strategy use, goals, and criteria for success. Oxford and Nyikos (1989) state that factors influencing the choice of LLS help students to keep on learning even if they are no longer in classroom.

Number of research studies has shown that female students use learning strategies more than their male counterparts (Khamkhien, 2010). Another important factor in learning a language is motivation. The learners with high motivation to learn a language will likely use a variety of strategies (Oxford and Nyikos, 1989). Learning style plays a huge role in the choice of LLS. Studies showed a strong relationship between LLS use and learning style where extroverts show a strong preference for social strategies and introverts use metacognitive strategies more frequently (Ehrman and Oxford, 1990, as cited in Rahimi et al., 2008). Students of different ages use different strategies and older students use strategies more frequently and effectively than younger students. Experience in studying a language, such as studying or staying abroad, is one of the important factors affecting the choices of language learning strategies (Purdie and Olive, 1999, as cited in Khamkhien, 2010). LLS do not operate by themselves but are related to other factors such as learners' attitudes, interests, social contexts, and personality, among many others (Prakongchati, 2007)

2.4. LLS Use and Proficiency in EFL

The use of LLS is related to students' proficiency and achievement in EFL. The findings in the area of LLS have demonstrated that the use of language learning strategies leads to better proficiency in mastering the target language (Lee, 2003, as cited in Zare, 2012). 'Good' language learners are those who take responsibility for their own learning, are able to organize information about language, they are creative, experiment with language grammar and words, create opportunities for practice in a way they use their language inside and outside the classroom, use memory strategies to recall what has been learned, learn from their own mistakes, learn from context, learn how to use tricks to keep conversations going (Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975; Rubin and Thompson, 1994, all cited in Zare, 2012).

The results of many studies have confirmed the relationship between LLS use and proficiency. O' Malley et al. (1985) found that successful language learners use more and wider range of learning strategies than less-successful students. Green and Oxford (1995) reached the same conclusion on the basis of their study which showed that LLS of all kinds were used more frequently by more proficient students. Griffiths' study (2004) has discovered a strong positive correlation between learning strategy use and language proficiency. Chamot's (2005, as cited in Mohammadi, 2009) summary of some other studies that compared more and less effective language learners, revealed that less successful learners do use learning strategies, sometimes even as frequently as more successful peers, but that their strategies are used differently. Effective L2 learners are aware of the strategies they use and why they use them and manage to tailor their strategies to the language task and to their own personal needs as learners (Green and Oxford, 1995).

There are many studies that have found a positive relationship between LLS use and proficiency in learning a foreign language. All students should use learning strategies in order to become more successful in target language. It is important to learn how to use particular learning strategies. Language instructors should take their students learning strategies into considerations and try to recognize and identify students' learning strategies in order to support less successful student to achieve success and master the target language (Zare, 2012).

3. Grammar Learning Strategies

3.1. Definition and Classification of GLS

GLS are part of language learning strategies which we defined as ”specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques, such as seeking out conversation partners, or giving oneself encouragement to tackle a difficult language task , used by students to enhance their own learning” (Scarcella and Oxford, 1992, as cited in Oxford, 2003:2). According to Griffiths (2008, as cited in Pawlak, 2009) GLS possess distinctive characteristics, which she summarizes as follows: GLS are what learners do, which indicates an active approach, the application of GLS is partly conscious, they are optional which means that learners choose which strategies they will use, their use entails purposeful activity, learners apply them in order to regulate and control the process of learning and to facilitate the process of learning.

Classification of GLS is a useful point of departure for their investigation (Pawlak, 2009). Oxford et al. (2007, as cited in Pawlak, 2009) make a distinction between three categories of GLS: 1) GLS reflective of implicit learning that includes a focus on form, such as noticing grammatical structures that cause problems with meaning and communication, paying attention to how more proficient people say things, noticing correction of erroneous utterances 2) GLS facilitating explicit inductive L2 learning, such as participating in rule-discovery discussions in class, creating and testing hypotheses about how target structures operate, checking with more proficient peers whether a given rule interpretation is correct 3) GLS applicable to explicit deductive learning, such as previewing the lesson to identify the key grammatical structures to be covered, paying attention to rules provided by the teacher or the coursebook or memorizing how structures change their form.

3.2. Grammar Teaching and Learning

Grammar is important because it names the types of words and word groups that make up sentences in any language and it is the language that makes it possible for us to talk about language (Yalcin and Yalcin, 2005). Through grammar the learner can make words effective and become a master of his own communicative environment (Rutherford, 2014). According to Widdowson (1990: 86) ”grammar is not a constraining imposition but a liberating force: it frees us from a dependency on context and a purely lexical categorization of reality.”

The way the teacher presents grammar in classroom influences its understanding between learners. According to Ellis (2006) grammar teaching is traditionally viewed as presentation and practice of grammatical structures but it need not. Intensive grammar teaching refers to instruction over a sustained period of time concerning a single grammatical structure and extensive grammar teaching refers to instruction concerning a whole range of structures within a short period of time so that each structure receives only minimal attention in any one lesson (Ellis, 2006). Ellis (2006) suggests the following ways of teaching grammar: the grammar taught should emphasize not just form but also the meanings and uses of different grammatical structures, teachers should focus on those grammatical structures that are known to be problematic to learners rather than try to teach the whole of grammar, grammar is best taught to learners who have already acquired some ability to use the language level rather than to beginners, grammar can be taught through corrective feedback as soon as learners begin to use the language.

Learning grammar often means learning the rules of grammar and having an intellectual knowledge of grammar (Al-Mekhlafi and Nagaratnam, 2011). Learners master different grammatical structures in a relatively fixed and universal order and they pass through a sequence of stages of acquisition on route to mastering each grammatical structure (Ellis, 2006). Many studies which measure learning in terms of constrained constructed responses such as fill in the blanks, sentence joining, or sentence transformation can be expected to favour grammar teaching (Ellis, 2006). Learners do not always acquire what they have been taught and that for grammar instruction to be effective it needs to take account of how learners develop their interlanguages. Gimeno (2002) names the factors that undermine the learning of grammar in classroom, these factors are the fact that learners believe that teaching grammar means talking about terminology. Therefore, Gimeno (2002) suggests that some steps such as repetition of declarative knowledge and instruction that is essential to grammar learning should be taken. When it comes to teaching and learning grammatical structures both teachers and students face difficulties that teachers consider quite serious and serious attention needs to be paid to them (Al-Mekhlafi and Nagaratnam, 2011).

3.3. Review of Relevant Studies on GLS

This paragraph presents earlier studies on GLS. In her study Kemp (2007) intends to investigate whether multilinguals use more grammar learning strategies and are faster at learning grammar. The study investigated the use of GLS in 144 participants who knew between 2-12 languages

each, using a language background questionnaire, a set of 40 grammar learning strategies on a 5-point Likert scale and questions on other strategies. In her research she found that the more languages the learners knew the greater number of GLS they used, they used them more frequently and the greater number of participants added their own grammar learning strategies to these presented in questionnaire. The multilingual participants as a group used more than 40 strategies more than participants with knowledge of only two languages.

The research by Pawlak (2009) investigates the relationship between the use of GLS reported by 142 English Department students and target language attainment, operationalized as their performance in a practical grammar course and the end-of-the-year examination. Information about GLS use was obtained by means of a tool in which GLS are divided into three categories depending on whether they represent implicit learning, explicit inductive learning and explicit deductive learning. The results showed that there is no strong positive relationship between the use of GLS and achievement, or statistically significant differences between lower-level and higher-level participants. The highest, but weak correlation was found between the use of GLS and explicit deductive learning and grammar course grades.

The study conducted by Yalcin and Yalcin (2005) investigated the ways in which some language learners make conscious efforts to learn English grammar more efficiently, which strategies they use in language learning and the relationships between student's choice of learning strategies in grammar and foreign language achievement. The results showed that there is not a statistically significant difference between the use of GLS and students achievement. Successful second language learners are aware of the strategies they use and are capable of using these strategies for the given tasks and for their personal needs while learning a second or foreign language. Students who are less successful can identify some of these strategies but they do not know how to choose the appropriate strategies and use them in a given task.

Gürata (2008) investigated which learning strategies Turkish EFL learners use when learning and using grammar structures, and the difference in learning strategy use by several variables, such as gender, proficiency level, and achievement on grammar tests. The study was conducted at Middle East Technical University and 176 students from three different proficiency levels (pre-intermediate, intermediate, and upper-intermediate) participated in the study. The data were collected by means of a 35-item questionnaire regarding grammar learning strategies. The analysis of the quantitative data revealed that Turkish EFL learners think learning English grammar is important, and that these learners use a variety of learning strategies when they learn

and use grammar structures. The findings from this study indicated that Turkish EFL learners think learning English grammar is important and they use variety of grammar learning strategies. The study also revealed that there is a difference in learning strategy use among different proficiency levels and using GLS is influential in grammar achievement.

The study by Gimeno (2002) was based on cognitive theory of learning, that states that grammar and learning strategies are complex skills. It attempts to demonstrate how the automatization of grammar and strategies helps students learn second language. There are two hypotheses in this research. The first one is that fair and poor learners, following the grammar strategy instruction will acquire the 2nd conditional structure better than the students who do not follow this instruction. The second hypothesis is that the experimental group students, specially poor and fair learners, will transfer their way of acquiring 2nd conditionals to another grammatical structure better than the students who do not follow this instruction. The results confirmed both hypotheses. The instructional model helped unsuccessful learners to learn new grammatical structure and transfer the acquired knowledge.

Božinović's (2013) study investigated the use of GLS and its relationship with level of knowledge and target language. Participants in the study were 181 learners of Spanish, French and Italian as a foreign language at beginner and intermediate level. The study was conducted at the American College of Management and Technology in Dubrovnik. For the purposes of the study, a questionnaire based on Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (Oxford, 1990) was designed. The purpose of the study was to investigate the differences in the use of GLS between students at different levels of learning a foreign language, among students of different foreign languages, and among students of different levels of proficiency (as measured by their grade) in the foreign language. The results showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the use of GLS among students of different levels of learning: learners at the beginning level use more social-affective strategies and cognitive strategies. A statistically significant difference was also found between students at different levels of proficiency in foreign language: students with higher grade use more of social-affective strategies and strategies of remembering.

4. Risk-taking in EFL

In this chapter the term risk-taking in EFL will be defined and explained. Risk-taking is an internal property of every learner and is built in the individuals as they grow (Kusumaningputri, 2012). According to Ely (1986) language class risk-taking means to assume risks in using the L2

in the classroom. Beebe (1983, as cited in Samaranayake[1]) defines risk-taking as ”a situation where an individual has to make a decision involving choice between alternatives of different desirability; the outcome of the choice is uncertain; there is a possibility of failure.” Ely (1986) mentions the following characteristics of risk-taking in L2 learning: a lack of hesitancy about using a newly encountered linguistic element, a willingness to use linguistic elements perceived to be complex and difficult, a tolerance of possible incorrectness or inexactitude in using the language and an inclination to rehearse a new element silently before attempting to use it aloud.

Risk-taking has been identified as one of the important characteristics of successful learning in a second language and a good language learner should be prepared to take the risk of being wrong in order to succeed in L2 acquisition (Samaranayake[1]). If learners feel uncomfortable in language classroom they will avoid risk-taking (Ely, 1986). Therefore, in order to reflect the principle of risk-taking in classroom teachers should create an atmosphere that encourages students to volunteer, provide neither too easy nor too hard challenges and appreciate students' attempts to take risks (Brown, 2001). Woodward (2001) states that not only teachers but also students can help each other to achieve understanding by creating forgiving atmosphere in classroom. Many instructional contexts around the world do not encourage risk-taking; instead they encourage correctness and right answers (Brown, 2001). The learners' willingness to undertake actions that involve a significant risk is an important characteristic of successful foreign language learning and successful learners have to be willing to try out the new language and take the risk of being wrong (Zarfsaz, 2014). Students should be aware of the fact that every interaction requires the risk of failing to produce or interpret the intended meaning, of being laughed at or rejected but rewards are worth risks (Beebe, 1983, as cited in Samaranayake[1]).

4.1. Factors Influencing Risk-taking Behavior in EFL

Risk-taking behavior refers to a ”developmental trait that consists of moving toward something without thinking of the consequences” (Fadi Al Shalabi, 2003:18). Risk-taking has focused mostly on speaking rather than on the other macro skills (writing, listening, and reading) (Cervantes, 2013). In a spoken language classroom risk-taking is best manifested in learner's voluntary oral participation that involves responding to the teacher's or other students' questions, raising questions and making comments (Bang, 1999). According to Bang (1999) language learners who take risks in oral participation engage themselves in the negotiation of

[1] Available at: http://www.academia.edu/8721205/Relationship_between_L2_learning_and_risk-taking (visited on 22th Jul 2015)

comprehensible input and the formulation of comprehensible output, which are essential in the language learning process. Language learning includes factors created by the learners, the teacher and the interaction among them. Therefore, risk-taking behavior should be considered in the context of the classroom research (Bang, 1999).

The factors that derive from individual learner difference such as level of proficiency, linguistic backgrounds, culturally predisposed ways of learning, individuals' motivations and objectives in studying language, must be taken into account (Ellis, 1994). Studies related to risk-taking behavior suggest that age, gender differences among students, personality, motivation, self-esteem, class trait, teacher trait, and classroom activity constitute major factors affecting students' risk-taking behavior (Bang, 1999). Zarfsaz (2014) divides risk-taking factors in two categories: student related factors or internal factors and non-student related factors or external factors. Student related factors or internal factors are those that affect learners from the inside and include: age, gender, motivation, self-esteem, anxiety, and personality trait. Non student related factors or external factors are those that affect learners from the outside and exist in language learning environment. They include language learner's learning situation such as teacher's attitude and teaching styles, learner's cultural beliefs or practices and course related factors like class size and classroom activity. Teachers need to be sensitive to the affective factors such as anxiety about using L2 and not knowing what to do, awkwardness, restricted identity and freedom as well as general lack of confidence that inhibit or encourage risk-taking behavior (Dörnyeia and Murphey, 2003, as cited in Sachs, 2009).

4.2. Characteristics of Risk-takers in EFL

Society, family, parents, friends and environment are some considering factors which constitute personality and attitude of language learners and those who are risk takers have a good starting point to develop themselves toward success of language learning (Kusumaningputri, 2012). According to Jonassen and Grabowski (1993) **r**isk-takers are process oriented, are not afraid to use more complex structures in their production, tend to be less accurate in their productive skills, have higher tolerance for errors than cautious people and like to try out new things. On the other hand, cautious people are product oriented, possess low tolerance for errors and are do not tend to take risks. If teachers do not encourage students to feel and think that making mistakes is a part of learning process, and if they do not provide forgiving atmosphere in classroom it will provoke anxiety and risk-takers will not be mediated (Kusumaningputri, 2012). Good language learners who are willing to guess, willing to appear foolish and willing to try out new structures

even if they are not sure if they are correct , are supposed to be risk takers (Wen and Clement, 2003). Skehan (1989, as cited in Zafar and Meenakshi, 2012) states that risk-takers tend to rehearse, they tolerate vagueness, are not worried about using difficult things and getting them wrong, are not afraid to get involved in any kind of interaction with others, they engage in functional practice because they prefer what they want to say without worrying about the small details or errors. A risk-taker is more likely to be one who takes his existing language system to the limit, therefore, is more likely to change and more resistant to fossilization (Skehan, 1989, as cited in Zafar and Meenakshi, 2012).

4.3. Review of Relevant Studies on Risk-taking in EFL

The study by Dehbozorgi (2012) investigated effects of attitude towards language learning and risk-taking on EFL students' proficiency. In order to achieve the objectives of the study, three data gathering instruments were used: Attitude towards Language Learning Scale, Venturesomeness Subscale of Eysenck IVE Questionnaire, and Oxford Quick Placement Test. There were 120 participants, female and male college students majoring in English Translation at Marvdasht University. The results showed no significant relationship between proficiency level and attitude towards language learning and the middle proficient participants were higher risk-takers. The results also revealed that there was no significant difference between high and low groups and low and middle groups but there was a difference in risk-taking between high and intermediate levels. Correlational analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between attitude towards language learning and risk-taking whereas language proficiency and attitude towards language learning did not have a significant correlation.

The study conducted by Bang (1999) describes and analyzes the Korean college students' perceptions toward risk-taking behavior for oral proficiency and the factors which help and/or hinder the students' active risk-taking behavior in an EFL classroom. Participants in the study were fifteen freshmen students from different majors of study in a Korean university. The study was conducted using qualitative research techniques, diary entries, classroom observation, and personal data questionnaire. The results showed that all the participants perceived the importance of risk-taking behavior for oral proficiency in class. They responded the affective factors and socio-cultural factors contributed to regulating their risk-taking behavior.

Zafar and Meenakshi (2012) investigated the relationship between extroversion-introversion and risk-taking in SLA. Results concluded that extroverts seem to take full advantage of language-use opportunities as they tend to be sociable, and are more likely to join groups, more inclined to

engage in conversations both inside and outside the classroom. Furthermore, results have also revealed that risk takers, who are believed to be inherently extroverts, are more likely to take their existing language system to the limit. They are more likely to change and more resistant to fossilization. Language proficiency is influenced directly by classroom participation, which reflects the contributing influences of risk-taking.

In their study Zhang and Liu (2011) investigated changes in risk-taking and sociability in Chinese university EFL class over a term. For the purpose of the study, they used 10-item survey involving 934 first-year undergraduates. Findings of the study revealed that the students generally did not like to risk using English and were moderately sociable in English class both at the beginning and toward the end of the term. Moreover, the participants became significantly more risk-taking in English class over the term and male students reported being significantly more risk-taking than their female counterparts, both at the beginning and toward the end of the term. Language class risk-taking and sociability were significantly correlated with each other and the students' performance in English both at the beginning and toward the end of the term.

The research by Zarfsaz (2014) addresses Turkish students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language and tries to explain and analyze their attitudes toward risk taking and silence in the classroom. The study was conducted using a 36-item questionnaire and an interview. First, all the students at the department of English language teaching were surveyed using questionnaire and then ten students majoring at English language teaching department we chosen for conducting an interview. The study showed that most of the participants are aware of the importance of risk taking and speaking up in the classroom and have positive attitude toward class participation. The most inhibiting factors for the students were found teachers' demanding behavior, anxiety and self-esteem, and ambiguity tolerance. According to the findings of this study and in order to facilitate the risk taking behavior in English learning classroom it was suggested that class participation should be part of student grading system and teachers need to have the knowledge about learner differences and provide students with the knowledge that they are different from each other and have different strategies and ways of learning.

Majidifard et al. (2014) investigated the relationship between risk-taking, gender and oral narrative proficiency in the Iranian EFL context. There were 62 participants (31 male and 31 female) in the study. The participants had to complete the Persian version of Venturesomeness subscale of Eysenck's IVE Questionnaire and then they were asked to do two oral narrative tasks including storytelling based on a picture prompt, and storytelling based on the first day

experience at the university. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation and Point Biserial Correlation were used in the study. The findings suggest that there is not a significant relationship between risk-taking and oral narrative proficiency and no significant relationship was found between gender and narrative proficiency of the participants.

5. Exploring Grammar Learning Strategies and Risk-taking in EFL

5.1. Research Questions

The main aim of this study was to explore grammar learning strategies and risk-taking of Croatian learners of English as a foreign language. The following were the research questions:

1. Is there a difference in the use of grammar learning strategies between male and female learners?
2. What is the relationship between grammar learning strategies and risk-taking?
3. What is the relationship between risk-taking and success in learning English as a foreign language?
4. Is there a difference in risk-taking between male and female learners and between grades in which students are?

The purpose of the study is to help teachers understand the importance of risk-taking in learning a foreign language, how it influences students' achievement in EFL and to provide an insight into ways students learn grammar.

5.2. Sample

The participants in the study were 280 students from Grammar School in Osijek. There were 200 female students (71.4%) and 80 male students (28.6 %). This can be seen in Table 1. There were 44 students in first grade (15.7%), 80 students in second grade (28.6%), 93 students in third grade (33.2%) and 63 students in fourth grade (22.5%) (Table 2). Their grades in English ranged from 2 to 5, and years of learning ranged from 2 to 16. The average grade was four (3.99). (Table 3). Table 4 shows the distribution of the grades in the population.

Table 1: Gender distribution

	Frequency	Percent
male	80	28.6
female	200	71.4
Total	280	100.0

Table 2: Grade distribution

	Frequency	Percent
1	44	15.7
2	80	28.6
3	93	33.2
4	63	22.5
Total	280	100.0

Table 3: Years of learning and grade in English

	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Years of learning	2	16	10.43	1.882
Grade in English	2	5	3.99	.950

Table 4: Grade in English

	Frequency	Percent
2	19	6.8
3	70	25
4	85	30.4
5	106	37.9
Total	280	100.0

5.3. Instruments

Instruments used for collecting data were two questionnaires. Grammar Learning Strategies Questionnaire designed by Božinović (2012) consists of 48 items, which are grouped in five groups: strategies of grammar self-discovery, strategies of active grammar learning, strategies of remembering grammar, social strategies, and strategies of visual grammar learning. The questionnaire items are followed by a five-point Likert scale which measures students' use of strategies (1= never, 2= sometimes, 3= often, 4= usually, 5= always). Risk-taking Questionnaire designed by Ely (as cited in Mihaljević Djigunović, 2002) consists of six items followed by a five-point Likert scale which measures students' readiness to take risk in language learning (1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= don't know, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree). The items in the risk-taking scale had to be recoded for statistical analysis. In addition, participants were asked to answer some general questions eliciting the demographic data like gender, grade in English and years of learning.

5.4. Procedure and Data Analysis

The research was conducted in December 2014. Both questionnaires were administered to students in grades 1-4 of Grammar School in Osijek during regular classes. Students were told to read the instructions and to ask if they had any questions. They were willing to help and had no complaint. Each student had to complete both questionnaires. It took twenty minutes in each grade to complete both questionnaires. The questionnaires were anonymous.

In addition to descriptive statistics (means, frequencies percentages), Pearson correlation analysis was used to explore the relationship between GLS and risk-taking, between grade in English and risk-taking and between risk-taking and years of learning. T-test was used to determine the difference in the use of grammar learning strategies and risk-taking between good and poor learners, and male and female learners. ANOVA tests were used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the use of grammar learning strategies and risk-taking between grades. Post hoc test were conducted in case significance at $p < .05$ was indicated.

5.5. Results

In this chapter the results of statistically analyzed data are presented. The results show that the mean score of overall strategy use is 3.08. The most popular groups of strategies are strategies of grammar self-discovery (3.77) and strategies of visual grammar learning (2.46) are the least popular group (Table 5).

Table 5: The mean score of strategy use and risk-taking

	Min	Max	Mean	SD
selfdisc	1.00	5.00	3.77	.80024
activelearn	1.45	4.75	3.32	.66288
remember	1.00	4.40	3.24	.84835
social	1.14	4.71	2.59	.77118
visual	1.00	4.50	2.46	.93367
total	1.37	4.45	3.08	.56014
risk	1.17	4.83	2.86	.76751

Table 6 shows the mean score of individual items in risk-taking questionnaire. Most students agree with the statements *I don't like to use English word until I find out its real meaning (3.55), It's more important to transfer meaning that to be grammatically correct (3.16), Sometimes I prefer to pronounce sentence in silence and then out loud (3.80), I prefer to use simple sentences than take a risk of being wrong (3.24).*

Table 6: The mean score of individual items

	Min	Max	Mean	SD
I don't like to use English word until I find out its real meaning.	1	5	3.55	1.362
I don't like to use complex sentences in classroom.	1	5	2.80	1.408
I don't like to express complex ideas at this level of knowledge in English.	1	5	2.56	1.332
It's more important to transfer meaning than to be grammatically correct.	1	5	3.16	1.311

Sometimes I prefer to pronounce sentence in silence and then out loud.	1	5	3.80	1.248
I prefer to use simple sentences than take a risk of being wrong.	1	5	3.24	1.479

Pearson Correlation was used to determine if there is a relationship between GLS and risk-taking. Table 7 shows that there is a statistically significant negative correlation between risk-taking and GLSs of active learning (-.128), remembering (-.327), social strategies (-.272), visual strategies (-.279). This means that the more students use these strategies the less prepared they are to take a risk. There is a statistically significant positive correlation between grade in English and risk-taking in a way that the more students are prepared to take a risk the higher the grade (Table 8). Other correlations were not statistically significant.

Table 7: Correlation between GLS and risk-taking

	selfdisc	activelearn	remember	social	visual	total
Risk-taking	.093	-.128*	-.327**	-.272**	-.279**	-.271**

Table 8: Correlation between risk-taking and grade in English

		grade in English
Risk-taking	Pearson Correlation	.147*

In order to find out if there was a statistically significant difference between male and female learners in the use of grammar learning strategies and risk-taking, t-test was used. The results show that all students use grammar learning strategies but they use different ones. Female learners use grammar learning strategies more often than male learners. This difference is statistically significant. The mean score of strategy use for females is 3.18 and for males 2.80. When it comes to groups of strategies female learners use all five groups of strategies more often than male learners. There is a statistically significant difference between male and female

learners in their willingness to take risks in learning English in a sense that male learners are more prepared to take risks than female learners. The mean score of risk-taking for males is 3.13 and for females 2.76. This is shown in tables 10a and 10b.

Table 10a: Difference between males and females in the use of strategies and risk-taking (descriptives)

	gender	Mean	SD
selfdisc	male	3.65	.84745
	female	3.82	.77778
activelearn	male	3.01	.71464
	female	3.44	.60245
remembering	male	2.86	.90415
	female	3.39	.77794
social	male	2.42	.79974
	female	2.66	.75011
visual	male	2.08	.95834
	female	2.62	.88005
totalstrat	male	2.80	.57527
	female	3.18	.51684
risk	male	3.13	.77862
	female	2.76	.73830

Table 10b: Difference between males and females in the use of strategies and risk-taking (t-test)

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
selfdisc	-1.558	278	.120
activelearn	-4.995	277	.000
remember	-4.869	278	.000
social	-2.422	278	.016
visual	-4.503	278	.000
total	-5.381	277	.000
risk	-3.767	278	.000

Independent samples t-test was used to determine if there was a difference in the use of grammar learning strategies and risk-taking between good and poor learners. Good learners were learners with grade 5 and 4 and poor learners were learners with grade 3 and 2. Statistically significant difference was found between good and poor learners in the use of grammar learning strategies of self-discovery and active learning: good learners use these strategies more often than poor learners. The mean of strategies of self-discovery for good learners is 3.84 and mean score for poor learners is 3.62. The mean of strategies of active learning for good learners is 3.44 and mean score for poor learners is 3.05. There is a statistically significant difference between good and poor learners concerning risk-taking. Good learners are more prepared to take risk in learning than poor learners. The mean of risk-taking for good learners is 2.96 and mean score for poor learners is 2.66. The results are shown in tables 11a and 11b.

Table 11a: Difference between good and poor learners in the use of strategies and risk-taking (descriptives)

	grade in English	Mean	SD
selfdisc	> = 4	3.84	.79065
	< 4	3.62	.80442
activelearn	> = 4	3.44	.63602
	< 4	3.05	.64124
remembering	> = 4	3.18	.87779
	< 4	3.34	.77491
social	> = 4	2.59	.78332
	< 4	2.60	.74876
visual	> = 4	2.46	.96259
	< 4	2.47	.87361
total	> = 4	3.10	.55968
	< 4	3.02	.55955
risk	> = 4	2.96	.76637
	< 4	2.66	.73426

Table 11b: Difference between good and poor learners in the use of strategies and risk-taking (t-test)

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
selfdisc	2.159	278	.032
activelearn	4.838	277	.000
remember	-1.472	278	.142
social	-.105	278	.916
visual	-.051	278	.960
total	1.224	277	.222
risk	-3.095	278	.003

ANOVA tests were used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the use of grammar learning strategies and risk-taking between students from different grades. The results revealed that there is a statistically significant difference in the use of grammar learning strategies of active learning, remembering, social and visual strategies. Post hoc tests were conducted to investigate where the differences occurred. Students in the first grade use grammar learning strategies more often and students in the fourth grade are least likely to use strategies. The mean score of strategy use for students in the first grade is 3.30, for students in the second grade 3.27, for students in the third grade 2.99 and for students in the fourth grade 2.80. When it comes to risk-taking students in the third grade are the most prepared to take risks and students in the first grade are the least prepared to take risks. The mean score of risk-taking for students in the first grade is 2.67, for students in the second grade is 2.91, for students in the third grade is 3.02 and for students in the fourth grade is 2.78. There was no statistically significant difference between grades concerning risk-taking (Tables 12a and 12b).

Table 12a: Differences in strategy use and risk-taking according to grade (ANOVA)

	grade	n	Mean	SD	sig
selfdisc	1	44	3.77	.91419	
	2	80	3.80	.76601	.957
	3	93	3.74	.85353	
	4	63	3.78	.68561	
activelearn	1	44	3.70	.58930	

	2	79	3.56	.56746	.000
	3	93	3.18	.62653	
	4	63	2.94	.62115	
remember	1	44	3.45	.77625	
	2	80	3.78	.82856	.000
	3	93	3.17	.78952	
	4	63	2.87	.87800	
social	1	44	2.91	.73059	
	2	80	2.73	.78444	.000
	3	93	2.54	.75572	
	4	63	2.27	.68574	
visual	1	44	2.68	.89155	
	2	80	2.77	.91181	.000
	3	93	2.33	.91419	
	4	63	2.13	.88235	
total	1	44	3.30	.56722	
	2	79	3.27	.50978	.000
	3	93	2.99	.52230	
	4	63	2.80	.52772	
risk	1	44	2.67	.83446	
	2	80	2.91	.79774	.129
	3	93	2.97	.74139	
	4	63	2.78	.69831	

Table 12b: Difference in the use of strategies and risk-taking according to grade (post hoc)

	grade		Mean difference
selfdisc	1	2	-.03023
		3	.03749
		4	-.00685
	2	1	.03023

		3	.06772
		4	.02337
	3	1	-.03749
		2	-.06772
		4	-.04434
	4	1	.00685
		2	-.02337
		3	.04434
activelearn	1	2	-.03023
		3	.03749
		4	-.00685
	2	1	.03023
		3	.06772
		4	.02337
	3	1	-.03749
		2	-.06772
		4	-.04434
	4	1	.00685
		2	-.02337
		3	.04434
remembering	1	2	.27366
		3	.57381*
		4	.03625
	2	1	.30991
		3	.61006*
		4	-.27366
	3	1	-.30991
		2	.30015
		4	-.57381*
	4	1	-.61006*
		2	-.30015
		3	.18523
social	1	2	.18523

		3	.36720*
		4	.64121*
	2	1	-.18523
		3	.18197
		4	.45598*
	3	1	-.36720*
		2	-.18197
		4	.27401
	4	1	-.64121*
		2	-.45598*
		3	-.27401
visual	1	2	-.08731
		3	.35227
		4	.55069*
	2	1	.08731
		3	.43958*
		4	.63800*
	3	1	-.35227
		2	-.43958*
		4	.19841
	4	1	-.55069*
		2	-.63800*
		3	-.19841
totalstrat	1	2	.03214
		3	.31114*
		4	.50393*
	2	1	-.03214
		3	.27900*
		4	.47179*
	3	1	-.31114*
		2	-.27900*
		4	.19278
	4	1	-.50393*

		2	-.47179*
		3	-.19278
risk	1	2	.23617
		3	.30425
		4	.11412
	2	1	-.23617
		3	.06808
		4	-.12206
	3	1	-.30425
		2	-.06808
		4	-.19013
	4	1	-.11412
		2	.12206
		3	.19013

5.6. Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that the most popular GLS among students are self-discovery strategies and the least popular are visual GLS. The reason for this could be the fact that grammar is more abstract than other parts of the language and students need to think logically in order to understand grammatical structures. Strategies of self-discovery involve guessing from context, logical thinking and association which appears to be the easiest way for students to learn difficult grammatical structures. On the other hand, visual strategies that include highlighting grammatical structures in textbooks or rewriting them in notebooks seem to be the hardest way for learning grammar. This could be due to the fact that it takes too much time.

These research findings revealed that there is a negative correlation between GLS of active learning, remembering, social strategies, visual strategies and risk-taking. These four strategies include learning on regular basis which includes solving grammar exercises, revising, doing homework regularly, learning from examples, learning on own mistakes, translating into mother tongue, consulting with friends and learning by heart. If students use these strategies they are not willing to guess the answer but rather ”play safely” which means that they are not prepared to take risk of being wrong. By using strategies of active learning, strategies of remembering, social and visual strategies students want to confirm their knowledge and are sure about what they have

learned. Risk-taking in EFL, on the other hand, includes using complex structures without being burdened by whether it is grammatically correct; it includes improvising with language even if there is a possibility of making mistakes. Positive correlation was found between strategies of self-discovery and risk-taking. As already mentioned, strategies of self-discovery involve guessing from context, logical thinking, association and solving grammar exercises by instinct. When using these strategies students tend to improvise with their language rather than learn actively and that way they are more open to take risk.

There is a positive correlation between success in English and risk-taking. This can be interpreted in a way that the more the students are willing to take the risk of being wrong the more aware they will be of the errors they make and that way become more accurate. It is important for students to recognize their own mistakes so they could learn from them and become more successful in language learning. In my opinion, teachers should decide which errors should be corrected and in what way they could correct these mistakes. Error correction should not demotivate students from learning.

According to the results, statistically significant difference was found between male and female learners in the use of grammar learning strategies. This difference was expected because gender is one of the important factors in learning a language. When it comes to learning female learners are more organized, motivated and more active. They are interested in various methods and techniques that help them become more effective learners. Female learners make more effort while learning. The difference in the use of strategies of active learning, remembering and visual strategies could be expected because female learners are more organized, they tend to practice a lot, ask if they do not understand something, do their homework regularly and learn from their own mistakes. Male learners are more flexible when it comes to learning; they prefer logical thinking to memorizing by heart. The difference in terms of risk-taking is not surprising. Female learners try to avoid making mistakes because they are more sensitive and do not want to feel embarrassed. They learn actively and use their language when they are sure that it is correct. Male learners do not pay much attention to accuracy; they improvise with the language and are less sensitive to the possible mocking by their peers.

There is a significant difference in the use of strategies of active learning and risk-taking between good and poor learners. The reason for this difference may be the fact that good learners pay more attention in classroom, do their homework regularly, solve additional grammar exercises and practice more than poor learners. Poor learners use strategies of remembering

grammar, social and visual strategies more often than good learners. These strategies include learning by heart, revising, using mother tongue, consulting with peers. All things mentioned appear to be the easiest way for poor learners to learn grammar. They have to practice more often and ask for help if they need it in solving grammar exercises. The difference in risk-taking is expected. Good learners are more prepared to take risks because they are aware that mistakes they make are not crucial. They are more motivated by their grades, more self-confident and open to learn from their mistakes. Poor learners want to avoid being mocked in classroom because of their mistakes which is why they are less prepared to take risks. In order to avoid the pressure teachers should motivate poor learners by helping them to understand that mistakes are a part of their learning process.

As the results showed, a statistically significant difference was found in the use of grammar learning strategies between grades. Students in the first grade use learning strategies more often than students in the fourth grade. The reason for this result could be the fact that first-graders are at the beginning of their learning and are more motivated, ambitious and want to prove themselves so they make bigger efforts in learning by using learning strategies more often.

6. Conclusion

The aims of the study were to find out which grammar learning strategies students use, the correlation between GLS and risk-taking, correlation between risk-taking and success in English, if there is a difference between male and female, good and poor learners and grades in use of grammar learning strategies and risk-taking. The study has shown that all groups of grammar learning strategies are used to different extents and that there exists a negative correlation between GLS and risk-taking and a positive correlation between success in English and risk-taking. The results demonstrated a statistically significant difference between male and female learners in the use of grammar learning strategies and risk-taking. Furthermore, a statistically significant difference was found between good and poor learners in risk-taking.

As teachers play an important role in language learning, they should familiarize their students with the variety of learning strategies. The results have shown that students use different types of strategies, which means they learn in different ways. For that reason, teachers should adjust their teaching to learners in order to facilitate their learning. They should use different methods and techniques in order to make learning and teaching more productive.

Risk-taking is one of the important aspects of foreign language learning. This study showed a positive correlation between risk-taking and success. Students should be aware of the fact that errors are crucial part of language learning. Without being ready to make a mistake it would be more difficult to succeed because students should learn from their own mistakes. Correlational analysis reveals positive relationship between risk-taking and strategies of self-discovery. Teachers should become aware of the importance of risk-taking so they could create a positive atmosphere in classroom where students could express themselves without paying attention to errors. If teachers know which strategies increase students' willingness to take a risk they could advise them to use these strategies and that way take a risk from time to time.

7. Bibliography

1. Al-Mekhlafi, A.M., Nagaratnam, R.P. (2011). Difficulties in Teaching and Learning Grammar in An EFL Context. *International Journal of Instruction* 4: 69-92.
2. Bang, Y. (1999). EFL Learners' Risk-taking Behaviour. *English Teaching* 54: 49-79.
3. Božinović, N. (2013). Uporaba strategija učenja u odnosu na znanje i razinu učenja stranoga jezika. *Metodički ogledi* 19: 115-135.
4. Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Longman.
5. Cervantes, I. (2013). The Role of Risk-Taking Behavior in the Development of Speaking Skills in ESL Classrooms. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas* 19: 421-435.
6. Cohen, A.D. (2014). *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*. New York: Routledge.
7. Dehbozorgi, E. (2012). Effects of Attitude towards Language Learning and Risk-taking on EFL Student's Proficiency. *International Journal of English Linguistics* 2: 41-48.
8. Ellis, R. (2006). Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective. *TESOL* 40: 83-187.
9. Ely, C.M. (1986). An Analysis of Discomfort, Risktaking, Sociability, and Motivation in L2 Classroom. *Language Learning* 36: 1-25.
10. Fadi Al Shalabi, M. (2003). Study of Theories of Personality and Learning styles: Some Implications and Sample Activities to Support Curriculum Change in a Higher Education TESOL program in Syria. Available at: https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/1842/193/Fadi%20dissertation.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (visited on 23th Jul 2015).
11. Gimeno, V. (2002). Grammar learning through strategy training: A classroom study on learning conditionals through metacognitive and cognitive strategy training. Available at: http://www.tdx.cat/handle/10803/9779 (visited on 20th Jul 2015).
12. Green, J.M., Oxford, R. (1995). A Closer Look at Learning Strategies, L2 Proficiency, and Gender. *TESOL* 29: 261-297.
13. Griffiths, C. (2004). Language Learning Strategies: Theory and Research. Available at http://www.crie.org.nz/research-papers/c_griffiths_op1.pdf (visited on 20th Jul 2015).
14. Gürata, A. (2008). The Grammar Learning Strategies Employed by Turkish University Preparatory School EFL Students. In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Master of Arts. Available at: http://www.thesis.bilkent.edu.tr/0003607.pdf (visited on 21th Jul 2015).

15. Jonassen, D.H., Grabowski, B.L. (1993). *Handbook of Individual Differences, Learning and Instruction*. New York: Routledge.
16. Kemp, C. (2007). Strategic processing in grammar learning: Do multilinguals use more strategies? *Internation Journal of Multilingualism* 4: 241-261.
17. Khamkhien, A. (2010). Factors Affecting Language Learning Strategy Reported Usage by Thai and Vietnamese EFL Learners. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching* 7: 66-85.
18. Kusumaningputri, R. (2012). Risk-taking in Foreign Language Acquisition and Learning: Confessions from EFL Learners. *Pengembangan Pendidikan* 9: 401-410.
19. Liang, T. (2009). Language Learning Strategies-The Theoretical Framework and Some Suggestions for Learner Training Practice. *English Language Teaching* 2: 199-206.
20. Majidifard, E. et al. (2014). Risk Taking, Gender and Oral Narrative Proficiency in Persian Learners of English. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 98: 1085-1092.
21. Mariani, L. (2002). Learning Strategies, Teaching Strategies and New Curricular Demands: A Critical View. Available at: http://www.learningpaths.org/papers/paperstrategies.htm (visited on 15th Jul 2015).
22. Mihaljević Djigunović, J. (2002). *Strah od stranog jezika*. Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak.
23. Mohammadi, M. (2009). On The Relationship Between Learning Strategies and EFL Learner's Level of Proficiency. *The Journal of Modern Thoughts in Education* 3: 103-116.
24. O'Malley, J.M. et al. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *Language Learning* 35: 21-46.
25. Oxford, R. (2003). Language Learning Styles and Strategies: An Overview. Available at http://web.ntpu.edu.tw/~language/workshop/read2.pdf (visited on 15th Jul 2015).
26. Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
27. Oxford, R., Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables Affecting Choice of Language Learning Strategies by University Students. *The Modern Language Journal* 73: 291-300.
28. Palacios Martínez, I. (1996). The Importance of Language Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Teaching. *Cuadernos de Filologiha Inglesa* 5/1: 103-120.
29. Pawlak, M. (2009). Grammar Learning Strategies and Language Attainment: Seeking a Relationship. *Research in Language* 7: 43-60.

30. Prakongchati, N. (2007). Factors Related to the Use of Language Learning Strategies by Thai Public University Freshmen. Available at: http://sutir.sut.ac.th:8080/sutir/bitstream/123456789/283/1/nisakorn_fulltext.pdf (visited on 17th Jul 2015).
31. Rahimi, M. et al. (2008). An Investigation into the factors affecting the use of language learning strategies by Persian EFL learners. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11: 31-60.
32. Rutherford, W. (2014). *Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching*. New York: Routledge.
33. Sachs, G. (2009). Taking Risks in Task-based Teaching and Learning. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching* 19: 91-112.
34. Samaranayake, S. Relationship between L2 Learning and risktaking. Available at: http://www.academia.edu/8721205/Relationship_between_L2_learning_and_risk-taking (visited on 22th Jul 2015).
35. Wen, W.P., Clement, R. (2003). A Chinese conceptualization of willingness to communicate in ESL. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 16: 18-38.
36. Widdowson, H.G. (1990). *Aspects of Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
37. Woodward, T. (2001). *Planning Lessons and Courses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
38. Yalcin, F., Yalcin, E. (2005). An Analysis of the Relationship Between the Use of Grammar Learning Strategies and Student Achievement at English Preparatory Classes. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 1: 155-169.
39. Zafar, S., Meenakshi, K. (2011). A study on the relationship between extroversion-introversion and risk-taking in the context of second language acquisition. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning* 1: 33-40.
40. Zare, P. (2012). Language Learning Strategies Among EFL/ESL Learners: A Review of Literature. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 2: 162-169.
41. Zarfsaz, E. (2014). Silence in Foreign Language Learning: An Analysis of Students' Risk Taking Behaviour in an EFL Classroom. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World* 6: 307-321.
42. Zhang, W., Liu, M. (2011). A Study of Changes in Risk-taking and Sociability in Chinese University EFL Class. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 1: 1218-1221.

8. Appendices

Appendix 1: Questionnaire on GLS

UPITNIK O STRATEGIJAMA UČENJA GRAMATIKE

OPĆI PODACI

SPOL: a) žensko b) muško

FAKULTET/ŠKOLA: _____

GODINA/RAZRED: _____

Koliko dugo učite engleski jezik? _____

Koju ste ocjenu prošli semestar/godinu dobili iz engleskog jezika? _____

Ovim upitnikom želimo saznati kako učite gramatiku.

Molimo vas da pažljivo pročitate svaku rečenicu te da na ponuđenoj ljestvici uz svaku tvrdnju zaokružite broj koji označava koliko često koristite navedeni postupak (brojkama od 1 do 5). Vaši odgovori trebaju pokazati kako učite gramatiku stranoga jezika, a ne kako mislite da biste trebali ili kako netko drugi uči.

Molim Vas da odgovarate iskreno jer su nam Vaši odgovori važni. Nema točnih i netočnih odgovora!

1 = Nikada to ne činim **2 = Uglavnom** to **ne** činim **3 = Ponekad** to činim
4 = Često to činim **5 = Uvijek ili gotovo uvijek** to činim

1.	Pokušavam iz konteksta pogoditi značenja novog gramatičkog oblika.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Gramatičke oblike koje naučim nastojim što prije koristiti u razgovoru ili pisanju.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	U udžbeniku potcrtavam gramatičke oblike u određenom vremenu.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Vježbam s prijateljima kako bih bio/la uspješniji/a u gramatici.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Kad učim nepravilne glagole, nastojim zapamtiti jednu skupinu glagola, a zatim prelazim na novu skupinu glagola.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Proučavam gramatička objašnjenja koja je nastavnik stavio na internet.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Volim kada me netko ispravi ako pogrešno formuliram rečenicu.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Trudim se uočiti svoje gramatičke pogreške.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Gramatiku uvijek učim uz pomoć logike.	1	2	3	4	5

10.	Brže zapamtim gramatički oblik ako me asocira na nešto.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Glagole ponavljam više puta dok ih ne zapamtim.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Koristim se materinskim jezikom kada trebam sastaviti rečenicu.	1	2	3	4	5

13.	Markerom potcrtavam gramatičke oblike kako bih ih zapamtio/la.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Redovito posjećujem web stranice s gramatičkim objašnjenjima.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Najbolje učim i pamtim kada me nastavnik ispravi ako pogrešno upotrijebim oblik u rečenici.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Trudim se pronaći prilike za vježbanje gramatike.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Lakše zapamtim gramatički oblik koji mi se sviđa.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	U bilježnici ističem važne dijelove gramatike.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Tražim pomoć od prijatelja koji zaključuju na logičan način.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Logički pokušavam odrediti koji je oblik točan, a koji nije.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Ispisujem novi gramatički oblik da ga lakše upamtim.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Gramatiku uvijek učim sam/a.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Ako nisam shvatio/la gradivo koje je nastavnik objasnio, zamolim da ga ponovo objasni.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Nastavke glagola i nepravilne oblike učim napamet.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Ispisujem sve nepravilne glagole na papir.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Sam/a pokušavam pronaći odgovor na određeno gramatičko pitanje.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Sam/a se ohrabrujem u učenju gramatike da budem uporan/a.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Gramatiku najbolje učim dok rješavam zadatke ne gledajući rješenja.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Gramatiku redovito vježbam s prijateljima.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Pitam prijatelje za pomoć koji imaju slične navike učenja.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Gramatiku učim rješavajući domaće radove.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	Trudim se zapamtiti nastavke glagola i nepravilne oblike.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Trudim se zapamtiti pravilo kako formulirati rečenicu.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Gramatiku usavršavam vježbanjem, slušanjem i pisanjem.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	Gramatičke zadatke rješavam po sluhu.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	Koristim markere u različitim bojama kako bih naglasio/la oblike koje ne znam.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Na svojim gramatičkim pogreškama učim.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Oblik lakše zapamtim ako znam gdje se nalazi u radnom materijalu.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	Razgovaram s prijateljima kako riješiti domaći rad iz gramatike.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	Gramatički oblik prevodim na materinski jezik da bih shvatio/la što znači.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	Kada ne razumijem gramatiku, tražim pomoć od prijatelja.	1	2	3	4	5

42.	Pažljivo slušam nastavnika dok objašnjava gramatiku.	1	2	3	4	5

43.	Lakše pamtim glagole koji su međusobno slični.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	Pokušavam se prisjetiti gramatičkih pravila koja sam ranije učio/la.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	U učenju gramatike najviše mi pomažu primjeri.	1	2	3	4	5
46.	Lakše se sjetim oblika ako se sjetim situacije ili rečenice u kojem sam ga čuo/la.	1	2	3	4	5
47.	Nastojim se u potpunosti koncentrirati dok rješavam gramatički zadatak.	1	2	3	4	5
48.	Gramatiku pamtim da je povezujem s prethodnim gradivom.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix 2: Questionnaire on Risk-taking in EFL

UPITNIK O SPREMNOSTI NA RIZIK

Molimo vas da pažljivo pročitate svaku rečenicu te da na ponuđenoj ljestvici uz svaku tvrdnju zaokružite broj koji označava koliko se slažete s navedenim tvrdnjama (brojkama od 1 do 5).

Molim Vas da odgovarate iskreno jer su nam Vaši odgovori važni. Nema točnih i netočnih odgovora!

1 = uopće se ne slažem

2 = djelomično se slažem

3 = ne znam

4 = prilično se slažem

5 = potpuno se slažem

1. Ne volim upotrijebiti englesku riječ dok ne znam njezino točno značenje. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Na satu ne volim upotrjebljavati komplicirane rečenice. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Na ovom stupnju znanja engleskoga ne volim izražavati kompliciranе ideje na satu. 1 2 3 4 5

4. Važnije mi je prenijeti značenje nego brinuti o gramatičkoj točnosti. 1 2 3 4 5

5. Ponekad volim rečenicu najprije izgovoriti u sebi, a onda naglas. 1 2 3 4 5

6. Više volim upotrebljavati jednostavne rečenice nego riskirati da pogriješim. 1 2 3 4 5

Summary

This study investigates the relationship between GLS and risk-taking by male and female learners from Grammar School in Osijek. In theoretical part learning strategies particularly grammar learning strategies were explained, the term risk-taking in EFL was defined and explained, earlier studies on the topic grammar learning strategies and risk-taking in EFL were presented. In experimental part attention is paid to use of particular grammar learning strategies, how these strategies correlate with risk-taking in EFL and other variables affecting the choice of strategies. The results show negative correlation between strategies of active learning, remembering, social strategies, visual strategies and risk-taking. Positive correlation was found between strategies of self-discovery and risk-taking.

Key words: learning strategies, grammar, risk-taking

Sažetak

Ovo istraživanje bavi se odnosom između strategija učenja gramatike i spremnosti na rizik kod muških i ženskih ispitanika Jezične gimnazije u Osijeku. U teorijskom dijelu opisane su strategije učenja, s naglaskom na strategijama učenja gramatike, objašnjen je pojam spremnost na rizik te su prikazana ranija istraživanja na ovu temu. U eksperimentalnom dijelu pažnja je posvećena uporabi određenih strategija učenja gramatike, odnosu između strategija i spremnosti na rizik u učenju engleskog jezika te ostalim varijablama koje utječu na izbor strategija. Rezultati istraživanja pokazuju da uporaba strategija aktivnog učenja gramatike, strategija pamćenja gramatike, društvenih strategije učenja gramatike te strategija vizualnog učenja gramatike smanjuje spremnost na rizik. Istraživanje također pokazuje da se uporabom strategija samostalnog otkrivanja gramatike povećava spremnost na rizik.