



School of Education, Culture
and Communication

MULTILINGUALS' STRATEGIES

A qualitative study on multilingual students' use of English in Swedish upper secondary school

English for Teachers in Secondary and
Upper Secondary School: Degree Project
ENA314, 15 credits

Lara Luthardt

Supervisor: Olcay Sert

Examiner: Gül Bilge Han

Spring 2023



School of Education, Culture
and Communication

ABSTRACT

In a multilingual world, it is common for the English classroom in upper secondary schools in Sweden to be filled with more than second language learners. These multilingual students have the potential to bring their language learning strategies (LLS) to the classroom, as well as their language repertoire, which every student could benefit from. The aim of this degree project is therefore to gain a deeper understanding of the language repertoires and language learning strategies of participating students at upper secondary schools in Sweden. To explore this, a qualitative approach was employed to discover participants' language repertoires and the LLS participants report to use. Interviews were used to collect data about language use, repertoire and reported strategy use. In addition to the interviews, Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) was utilized to find out which strategies participants claimed to use in a broader sense. The results show that participant's multilingualism is not taken advantage of in school, but it blossoms outside of English class where it is used to retain connections to friends and family. The results also show that participants use cognitive, social and compensation strategies the most, by translating, practicing, and asking others for help.

Keywords: *Language learning strategies, language repertoire, LLS, multilingualism, SILL, Strategy Inventory for Language Learning, Sweden, Upper secondary school,*

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Background	2
2.1	The Swedish context	3
2.2	Multilingualism and language repertoire	4
2.3	Language learning strategies	5
2.3.1	The categories of strategies	6
2.3.2	Research into language learning strategies.....	8
3	Method.....	9
3.1	Choice of method.....	9
3.2	Participants.....	10
3.3	Data collection	10
3.4	Data analysis	11
3.4.1	Content analysis.....	11
3.4.2	Questionnaire analysis.....	12
3.5	Ethical considerations	13
3.5.1	Informed consent	13
3.5.2	Anonymizing	13
3.5.3	Other ethical considerations	13
4	Results.....	14
4.1	Attachment to languages.....	14
4.2	School and language awareness.....	15
4.3	Interacting in English.....	16
4.4	Distribution of LLS use	18
4.5	Summary	20
5	Discussion	20
5.1	Language repertoire	20
5.2	Language learning strategies	21
6	Conclusion	22
6.1	Implications	23
6.2	Limitations	23
6.3	Future research.....	23
	References.....	24
	Appendix 1 – Interview guide.....	27
	Appendix 2 – Letter of information	28
	Appendix 3 – Letter of information Swedish	29
	Appendix 4 – Questionnaire	30
	Appendix 5 – Tables	34

1 Introduction

Most English classrooms in Sweden have heterogeneous groups of first language (L1) Swedish speakers and students who have an L1 other than Swedish or English. Those students may have started learning Swedish when they arrived in Sweden as migrants or refugees, or when they started school. In such a constellation, students may have different experiences with languages, which languages they know, and in what context they use them, and how those languages are developed. How speakers use the languages they know can also be called a linguistic repertoire. Depending on the choice a speaker makes, they may express themselves informally, technically, etc. (Gumpertz, 1964 in Bush, 2012). More recently, the term language repertoire has shifted to encompass more fluidity in that speakers are no longer geographically tied to their speech communities and can be creative in how they use their languages (Bush, 2012).

Although people have learned L2s for a long time, using LLS for language learning specifically has not always been the norm. Long before Oxford (1990) described them, teaching methods such as the grammar-translation method, the audio-lingual method, and the direct method focused on different strategies (Thornberg, 2015), encompassed certain strategies, and claimed them as one method to rule them all. According to Oxford (1990), however, it was never the methods themselves that lead to language learning, but the strategies they contained. This also means that all methods and all strategies have the potential to help a learner achieve communicative competence, which is the purpose of language learning.

The multilingual student learning English as an additional language may have widely varying experiences with learning Swedish and other languages. Since all new knowledge is filtered through what the learner already knows (Thornberg, 2015), such a student might react differently to new experiences in the English classroom, as in, certain features may appear more or less familiar to them. At the same time, Skolverket (2021) writes that students should be “given the opportunity to develop their multilingualism where knowledge in different languages work together and support each other” (my translation). Since the multilingual student potentially has three or more languages in their repertoire, Swedish and English included, they may also have a greater ability to compare them and gain language awareness. At the same time, it is common for the school environment to be set in monolingual traditions (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020).

These varying language repertoires of students in the English classroom contribute to a unique amalgamation of knowledge regarding how language can be used and learned. It is important for the teacher to be able to navigate this landscape to help all students develop at the stage they are at and use the skills they may have obtained through their linguistic repertoire. It is important, because it shows students that they are seen and that the knowledge they have acquired outside of school is important and useful at school as well. Against this background, this degree project aims to discover what participating multilingual student at upper secondary school may know regarding language learning strategies based in their language repertoire that may affect the English classroom.

To do this, the following research questions will be posed:

1. How do multilingual participants' language repertoires come to fruition in and outside of the English classroom?
2. How do participating multilingual students report to use language learning strategies when using English?

2 Background

Multilingualism is closely linked to language repertoire in that every multilingual has a linguistic repertoire but not every language repertoire belongs to a multilingual. This is because the linguistic repertoire also includes the variation within a language that a speaker can have access to (Busch, 2012). A multilingual is, depending on which definition is presented, the speaker of two or more languages (Cenoz, 2013), or the speaker of three or more languages (Gorter, 2017). Most important is to distinguish multilingualism in research from the second and third language learning because the latter two often compare the second and third language speaker to the monolingual speaker (Cenoz, 2011).

More recently, multilingualism and language repertoire have become more closely linked to *translanguaging*, which Li & García (2022) clarify to encompass all languages in a repertoire, including those which transcend and go “*beyond* named languages as have been socially constructed” (p. 314). Because of the tradition of using translanguaging in the context of bilingual education (Li & García, 2022), this term will not be explored further here. Instead, emphasis will be put on Cenoz's (2011) suggestion to focus on multilinguals' linguistic repertoire and the context in which the languages are used. In this case, this means

how the languages in a repertoire support each other and in which context they are used (Cenoz, 2011).

With this in mind, the below will introduce the Swedish context regarding how multilingualism should be used according to the governing documents, as well as Swedish teachers' understanding and opinion of multilingualism as an asset in the school environment. This will be done in *2.1 The Swedish context*. In *2.2 Multilingualism and linguistic repertoire* two articles will be presented, one of which investigated multilinguals' proficiency in relation to anxiety and enjoyment (Botes et al., 2020), and one which investigated how newly arrived students in Norway use translation in the English classroom (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020). Subsection *2.3 Language Learning Strategies* will describe the categories of strategies as well as some research into how they have previously been used.

2.1 The Swedish context

According to the curriculum for English 5 at upper secondary school in Sweden, students should be given the ability to “develop their multilingualism where knowledge in different languages interact and support each other. Lessons should also contribute to students developing their language awareness and knowledge about how to learn a language inside and outside of lessons” (Skolverket, 2021, my translation). In this context, Lundberg (2019) used Q methodology to test Swedish primary teachers' understanding and pedagogy regarding multilingualism in both rural and urban schools. This was done by collecting teachers' answers regarding their understanding the subject and pedagogical action regarding multilingualism and using these answers to collect data through card-sorting (Lundberg, 2019).

The results showed that 28% of the opinions suggested that participants understood multilingualism as positive and had a positive attitude towards integrating multilingualism into their pedagogy (26%). 12% of the opinions were less positive, understanding multilingualism as a potential resource but one that makes “communicat[ing] social values more difficult (Lundberg, 2019, p. 275). This was also reflected in these teachers' opinions on corresponding pedagogy, which included the implementation of ‘Swedish only’ policies. These opinions seemed to be grounded in the belief that all students should be treated the same and everyone should receive the same schooling (Lundberg, 2019).

Out of these findings, the first “falls largely in line with the current state in educational linguistics” (Lundberg, 2019, p. 278). While this was the most commonly held opinion, the second finding served as its antithesis. Similar opposing viewpoints have been found by other

researchers in other countries, using interview methods to ask teachers about their opinions on multilingualism (Romanowski, 2022; Haukås, 2016). These teachers sometimes displayed this discrepancy as understanding multilingualism to be useful for their own language learning, but for students, who were very young when they started learning English, were not able to take that experience into account when learning an L3 (Romanowski, 2022; Haukås, 2016).

2.2 Multilingualism and language repertoire

Botes et al. (2020) reanalyzed the data collected by Deweale & MacIntyre (2014 in Botes et al. 2020) to expand on previous research into Foreign Language Anxiety (FLA) and Foreign Language Enjoyment (FLE) in relation to multilingualism and perceived proficiency. The data was collected in 2012 from 1622 foreign language learners who were learning 43 different languages.

The results confirmed two of three hypotheses, showing that multilingualism and perceived proficiency separately have a statistically significant effect on FLA and FLE respectively. This is explained by the probability of multilinguals being better at understanding communication, having “greater meta-linguistic awareness and of a wider array of strategies to absorb a new [foreign language] more quickly” (Botes et al., 2020, p. 298). These findings are understood reasonable since “[w]ith increased skill comes increased confidence” (ibid.).

The result regarding the third hypothesis stated that if the level multilingualism and level of perceived proficiency are considered together, they effect FLA statistically significantly, but only effect FLE so slightly it is described as negligible. The effect of FLA is explained by the beginner bilingual learner scoring FLA higher than the advanced pentalingual learner (Botes et al., 2020).

Beiler & Dewilde (2020) write in their introduction that translating has become a more common practice among language learners. New technology has opened new doors for translation. To learn how students used translation in English class, Beiler & Dewilde (2020) collected student texts, data from their computer screens, interviewed students, and more, from two introductory programs in Norway. The students’ teachers were also interviewed “to understand the context of students’ translation practices” (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020, p. 537).

The interviewed teachers were worried that their students would translate on a sentence level, rather than on a word level, and that their writing skills would suffer because of it. The

results showed that students' translation practices were more complex than the teachers assumed.

Out of the translation strategies found, intralingual input modification and mediational translation strategies were explored further. The former was illustrated by a participant testing several words in Polish to find a suitable translation to use in English. Another participant used a similar strategy by translating a Greek sentence into English and Albanian before choosing which English wording to use (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020). Mediational translation included translation mediums other than Google Translate such as print dictionaries, other people, or the speaker themselves. This strategy was used by one participant to verify translations through multiple tools (Beiler & Dewilder, 2020).

The conclusions drawn in Beiler & Dewilder (2020) are that students use several strategies that "build on their translanguaging repertoires" (p. 547), which means that they cross languages and use them in tandem with each other. Beiler & Dewilder (2020) also conclude whether a student considers themselves multi- bi- or monolingual in a translation situation does not affect their use of translation as a strategy. In the school environment, this means that multilingual approaches can be used to achieve the "monolingual code frequently expected of in-school English writing (Beiler & Dewilder, 2020, p. 547).

2.3 Language learning strategies

The Swedish National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2022) writes that students should get the opportunity to "use different strategies to aid in communication when language proficiency is insufficient [and...] be given the opportunities to use different aids for learning, understanding, creation and communication" (Skolverket, 2022, p. 5, my translation). It is acknowledged in Skolverket (2022) that, while important, learning strategies are rarely taught in any subject. The strategies presented in Skolverket (2012) are based on O'Malley & Chamot (1990), who define LLS 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" (p.7). Oxford (1990) defines them similarly: "specific actions taken by a learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, and more transferable to new situations" (p. 8).

Although both O'Malley & Chamot (1990) and Oxford (1990) are old, specifically Oxford (1990) has been used extensively since. Amerstorfer, citing Mizumoto & Takeuchi (2018 in Amerstorfer 2018), writes that the SILL is "the number-one data collection instrument" (p.

499) in LLS research. Its success lies in its coherent structural design and its user friendliness for language learners, teachers, and researchers (Amerstorfer, 2018). It should be noted, however, that the SILL was created as a tool for measuring L2 speakers' strategy use. As will be seen in 2.3.2 *Research into Language Learning Strategies*, below, other researchers have used the SILL on multilingual learners without changing it or adapting it to such a purpose.

What follows in the next subsection is an overview of LLS as used in Oxford (1990). Drawing on Pawlak's (2021) discussion on whether LLS should be a subject of its own or integrated into constituents (such as motivation, willingness to communicate (WTC), emotions and positive psychology, and working memory) these subjects will be briefly mentioned when relevant. This is done to better understand the strategies. Following this, some research into Language Learning Strategies will be presented to show how some scientists have used them and the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) also found in Oxford (1990). The writers of these articles have focused on multilingual students with at least two languages in their repertoire.

2.3.1 The categories of strategies

The importance of Language Learning Strategies (LLS) is that they enable the language learner to take their learning into their own hands (Oxford, 1990). It gives the learner the ability to choose what their learning should involve and how they want to go about acquiring or learning the target language. It puts both the responsibility and the result in the learner's hands, which according to Oxford (1990), can result in greater self-confidence.

The categories of LLS that Oxford (1990) presents are memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. The first three are direct strategies. These involve the target language itself as opposed to the indirect strategies – the latter three – which target the language learning process.

Memory strategies are also called mnemonics, which are strategies for remembering words, or large passages of texts. These strategies organize information and make associations that are personally meaningful to the learner (Oxford, 1990). Memory strategies rely heavily on the working memory, which refers to “those mechanisms of processes that are involved in the control, regulation and active maintenance of task-related information in the service of complex cognition” (Miyake & Shah, 1990, in Wen, 2016, p. 3). The main role of working memory in language learning lies in its chunking process which turns the new information into linguistic sequences (Wen, 2016). This is important for language learning mainly because

vocabulary must be learned by heart. Using different memory strategies may help a learner retain new information more easily.

Cognitive strategies manipulate and transform the target language by “repeating to analyzing expressions to summarizing” (Oxford, 1990, p. 43). Out of these, practicing is the most important and often neglected cognitive strategy.

Compensation strategies use intuition and inferencing to make up for the gaps in the target language that have yet to be acquired or learned.

Metacognitive strategies enable the learners to “coordinate their own learning process” (Oxford, 1990, p. 137) by centering, planning, and evaluating it. It counteracts the novelty which is an integrated part of encountering the new features of a language through an overview of familiar material (Oxford, 1990).

Affective strategies refer to emotions, attitudes, motivations, and values, and the strategies are used to gain control over them (Oxford, 1990, p. 140). Emotions are automatic responses that can be labeled on a spectrum from positive to negative. In language learning, there are four categories of emotions: Achievement, (pride to shame at success or failure); epistemic, (surprise to frustration); topic, (empathy to disgust at the subject); and social emotions, (love to contempt) (Piniel & Albert, 2018). Between the two ends of the spectrum lies ambivalence or the absence of emotion, among others. This nuance was added to the field of positive psychology as it was acknowledged that it is possible to feel confident, nervous, and anxious at the same time (MacIntyre & Mercer, 2014; see also Botes et al. 2020, above).

Another aspect of the affective strategies is motivation, which is an interaction between looking forward to expected experiences, positive and negative, and looking back at previous experiences (Ushioda, 2014). It is also possible to add the aspect of usefulness, as in, how useful is this language now? This can affect the language that a speaker chooses to use or learn (Coulmas, 2013). These dimensions are ever developing, since every experience with the target language becomes integrated into the larger picture of the learner’s history. This way it also becomes a part of the learner’s identity (Ushioda, 2014). Emotions and motivation are closely linked together with regards to language learning, for example if the learner experiences mostly negative emotions while learning, they might become less motivated to learn.

Social strategies deal with the communicatory behavior. It is done by asking questions, cooperating, and empathizing with others. Part of this can refer to a person’s situational willingness to communicate with a specific partner, their readiness to communicate at all, and willingness to deal with perceived potential consequences of the communicatory act. There

are also more transient factors that affect a person's willingness to communicate, such as their inherent confidence, their personality, and their social context, meaning whether it is socially appropriate to communicate (MacIntyre et al., 1998). Collectively, these factors help a person decide whether they are willing to communicate. This is important for language learning because if a learner has no one to speak to, or is unwilling to speak to those available, learning the target language becomes more difficult. The goal of language learning is communication, but if communication is refused, language learning becomes difficult.

2.3.2 Research into language learning strategies

Pawlak & Kiermasz (2018) asked students learning English as a second language and an additional language at the same time to take the SILL (Oxford, 1990). Four of those who had Spanish as their L3 were interviewed about differences and similarities in using strategies in their L2 and L3.

Among others, the results showed that participants used LLS in their L2 more than in their L3. It was noted, however, that this is both contrasted and mirrored by other reports (Markelbach, 2011; Mitis & Mavriilidou, 2016; Haukås, 2015, in Pawlak & Kiermasz, 2018). This was explained partly through proficiency: participants were more proficient in their L2 and were able to use more strategies because of it. The strategies in their L3 focused on finding similarities with both their L2 and L1 which caused certain specific strategies to be used statistically significantly more than others (Pawlak & Kiermasz, 2018). The discrepancy of strategy use was also explained through motivation. Participants were most likely expecting their L2 to be useful in their future careers. The opposite, then, may be true for the chosen L3 (Pawlak & Kiermasz, 2018, p. 438).

Amerstorfer (2018) uses data collected for a PhD dissertation. The participants in this study were interviewed, had their lessons observed, and took the SILL. After they had answered the SILL, participants were asked to explain why certain high and low ratings were given. Answering this question was not always easy for participants.

The results showed that the strategies used by participants partly depend on preference. Two participants rejected the use of flash cards in English because they were too time consuming to produce. Participants also suggested alternatives to the given strategies in the SILL. One participant mentions guessing instead of looking up words (Amerstorfer, 2018), which is a strategy listed in Oxford (1990), but not in the SILL. Furthermore, certain strategies are only usable in certain situations, for example when sitting down and learning vocabulary writing the word repeatedly was reasonable, but not necessarily in other situations.

Some participants also had affective responses to some strategies, calling them silly, or enjoying the sound of a certain dialect, which caused them to imitate or imagine it, i.e., using a strategy. Pawlak (2021) also reflects upon strategy use being an inherently cognitive activity because of the decision-making process it requires.

The above has given definitions of the subjects of multilingualism as it differs from bilingualism and trilingualism, and language learning strategies. From now on the term multilingualism will be used. An overview of research of the two subjects has also been given, which will be reflected in 5 *Discussion*.

3 Method

The below will describe how the data for this degree project was collected and analyzed.

3.1 Choice of method

This degree project employed a qualitative approach consisting of interviews and a questionnaire to complement it. Interviews provide deep insight into participants' thoughts and opinions that are unexpected and that allow follow up questions. It gives the researcher insight into "how people themselves experience their world" (Esaiasson, 2017, p. 262, my translation). Asking several people the same questions may also allow for patterns to appear within a distinct group of people (Esaiasson, 2017).

The research questions prompted four types of exploration: 1) how participants used their languages, 2) how participants used their languages in school, 3) which strategies participants used, and 4) how participants use those strategies. These points of interest shaped the creation of the interview guide (see *Appendix 1*). Esaiasson (2017) writes that the questions in the interview guide should be formulated using explorative questions such as "what happened in that situation?". This technique was used, although it was not explicitly described in the interview guide (see 3.3, *Data collection*).

This degree project also uses a questionnaire adapted from Oxford (1990) – the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (see *Appendix 4*) to complement the interview. The SILL consists of 6 sections each of which addresses a different type of strategy as described in 2.3.1 *The categories of strategies*. The averages of the scores indicate which types of strategies a learner is likely to employ (see also 3.4 *Data Analysis*). Each section consists of a set of questions that are answered on a Likert scale ranging from 1 meaning never or almost never, to 5 meaning always or almost always.

Most of the data will be gathered through the interviews. The SILL will be used to help answering the second research question because the perceived lack of data regarding this through the interviews. Because of this, this degree project is not considered to take a mixed method approach. Another reason for this is that not enough participants took the SILL to count it as a quantitative survey.

3.2 Participants

The criteria upon which the participants were selected was that they were students at an upper secondary school who do not have English or Swedish as their L1 and were above the age of sixteen. Teachers with whom a previous relationship had been established were contacted, who then in turn spoke with their students to request their participation in the interviews. In total twenty-one people were asked and six agreed to participate, resulting in six interviews being performed on five occasions. The participants claimed to speak three to seven languages and had learned Swedish between going to preschool and secondary school. Two participants were born in Sweden and only spoke their parents' L1 until starting school. One participant considered themselves to be a simultaneous trilingual.

3.3 Data collection

Once contact with participants had been established, an interview was scheduled with each individual at their school. The interviews were held in a teacher conference room which was quiet and private with curtains over the windows. The participants were given a letter of consent (see *Appendix 2 and 3*; and *3.5 Ethical Considerations*), which was explained to them, and which they signed. Since the participants were above the age of fifteen, no consent forms were sent to their parents or legal guardians.

The interviews were semi structured (see *Appendix 1* for the interview guide) and dealt with four categories: Participant language background, Usefulness and attitude, English in the classroom, and English outside the classroom. The questions in the first two categories aimed at discovering participants' repertoire and how they used them. This became particularly relevant when the wide-ranging use of participants' languages became obvious.

The questions in the second two categories of the interview guide aimed at discovering how more specifically participants used English and what LLS they employed when things were difficult. The interview guide allowed for follow up questions, which was often utilized to gain deeper insights into the situations which participants described.

The interviews lasted between 10 and 15 minutes which was shorter than planned. Many questions turned out to be rather straightforward and required prompting with the formulation “what do you do in this scenario?” It could be that the scenarios needed to be more tangible to be relatable, for example by having prepared different scenarios related to the different language skills: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Other than a scenario regarding reading skills, scenarios regarding writing, listening, and speaking were only posed if it was prompted by the participants’ experiences in using English.

Because the interviews were so short, the questionnaire was added to the project after two interviews had been held to allow for a broader set of strategies to be considered and to strengthen the data. Since two interviews had already been performed, the questionnaire was placed after the interviews for subsequent participants as well to retain consistency. This had the added benefit of participants only being able to discuss the strategies which they spontaneously considered, rather than being affected by the strategies found in the SILL.

An alternative would have been to use the first two interviews as pilot interviews and change the interview guide to allow for longer interviews. Because there were difficulties to find participants, this would have reduced the number of interviews by a third, which was considered to result in too few interviews instead.

3.4 Data analysis

This subsection will describe how the interviews and questionnaire were analyzed.

3.4.1 Content analysis

The interviews were analyzed using content analysis. This consists of four stages. Stage 1) Decontextualization means to familiarize oneself with the data and break it down into smaller meaning units. This can also be called coding, which means to identify the sentences and paragraphs which relate to the aim and giving it a code or name (Bengtsson, 2016). In this degree project, this was done deductively, which means a list of codes, which had been created before the analysis, was used. This was done to increase reliability. When the code list is set from the beginning of analysis, the codes are unlikely to change during the process, meaning someone else could use those codes to analyze their own data, making it repeatable.

Stage 2) is called recontextualization where the coded data is separated not only from other codes, but also from the uncoded data. A choice is required to determine whether remaining unmarked data answer research questions or not (Bengtsson, 2016).

Stage 3) Categorization means to group coded data into content areas to eliminate overlap between categories. If this step is not taken, coded data risks falling between content areas or being added to more than one (Bengtsson, 2016). In this degree project, the coded data was distilled into the following categories: 1. Attachment to language, 2. School and language awareness, 3. Interacting in English, and 4. Distribution of LLS use. The data was analyzed on three separate occasions to reevaluate and ensure that the data had been fairly coded and categorized. As Bengtsson (2016) establishes, recoding and relabeling is necessary during the analysis. However, the same codes and categories were found at the end of each analysis, increasing the reliability of this degree project even further.

Stage 4 Compilation is the writing process. Here the choice between manifest and latent analysis becomes visible. In the manifest analysis, focus remains on the text itself, whereas in the latent analysis, an attempt is made to gain deeper insight into the meaning behind the words (Bengtsson, 2016). In this degree project, a manifest analysis was used to strengthen the reliability even more and eliminate as much risk of misinterpreting participants' words as possible.

3.4.2 Questionnaire analysis

The questionnaire was analyzed using the guide for analysis in Oxford (1990). The averages of the whole questionnaire, as well as for each category of strategies were calculated giving an indication to how likely the participants were to use a specific type of strategy. The averages of each individual participant were also calculated to get an indication of how frequently they used any strategy. In both cases, scoring between 1 and 2.4 indicated that the strategy type was rarely or never used. Scoring between 2.5 and 3.4 indicated that the strategy type was sometimes used. Scoring between 3.5 and 5 indicated that the strategy type was used often or always (Oxford, 1990).

Once the interviews had been analyzed, the results were compared to individual questionnaire answers. Since the first question in the questionnaire was "what languages do you speak", it was possible to match each questionnaire answer with the participants' respective interview. When participants spoke the same languages, the order in which they answered the questionnaire aided in matching their answers with their interview. The strategies mentioned in the interviews were identified during the analysis. They were named based on Oxford (1990) and listed in an Excel document to calculate how often each participant mentioned any one strategy and how many different strategies each participant mentioned.

3.5 Ethical considerations

There are principles which must be considered according to the scientific council (Vetenskapsrådet): 1) Secrecy, 2) Personal secrecy, 3) Anonymizing and 4) Integrity. All measures which have been necessary have been taken in this degree project. The below are three noteworthy points which need to be discussed further.

3.5.1 Informed consent

Upon meeting participants for the interview, they received a letter of consent (see *Appendix 2 and 3*). This letter was read aloud to them to ensure that all points were understood. Participants were also assured that their names, age, schools, and city would not be mentioned in the degree project and that the degree project would be published in DiVA once it was passed. All participants received a copy of their signature which means they received my email address and phone number in case they had questions.

3.5.2 Anonymizing

The participants are numbered in this degree project to ensure their anonymity. Each participant was asked what they would call themselves if they could choose a different name. These names were then alphabetized. The numbers for each participant represent the order of their alphabetized aliases. The recordings were named likewise which ensures that no key exists should the data be compromised. This method was chosen to not base the numbers on the order of the interviews, which are traceable through email conversations leading up to the interviews, and to put a random factor on the order of presentation instead.

Another measure taken to ensure anonymity is that participants' languages other than Swedish and English will not be revealed. It could be possible to identify participants through the collection of languages they know. In the case of the participant who is a simultaneous trilingual, their languages will be distinguished with markings such as L1₁ and L1₂. Distinctions between participants' L2 and L3 etc. will be done through other kinds of descriptors since the order in which participants learned their languages is neither known nor relevant.

3.5.3 Other ethical considerations

One interview was held with two participants upon the participants' request. To minimize the effect on the interview, discussion between participants was not allowed and each participant

answered the questions individually. Since participants can choose to identify themselves as participants in a research project, it was not considered to be an ethical violation.

4 Results

The following section is divided into four subsections based on the categories which were found during the analysis, as well as a summary. This is done because there is overlap between the themes found in the data and how the data needs to be used to answer the research questions. Specifically, the themes found in *4.1 Attachment to languages*, *4.2 School and language awareness*, and *4.3 Interacting in English* answer the first research question, and *4.2 School and language awareness*, *4.3 Interacting in English*, and *4.4 Distribution of LLS use* answer the second. *4.5 Summary* will order the results to answer the research questions.

4.1 Attachment to languages

Participants expressed different kinds of attachment to the languages in their repertoire. It was generally accepted that English was important to know because of its global use: “If you’re going to other countries then it’s good to know English because everyone uses English, and then also social media, series, movies. Sometimes series aren’t available in Swedish so you have to have English” (Participant 2). Even participant 4, who thought English was difficult, acknowledged that it was important and useful to know: “It’s a complicated language, I mean, it’s not super difficult and not super easy. [...] everyone knows it in the whole world”.

Swedish was appreciated for being important mostly because they all lived in Sweden: “Swedish I also like since I live in Sweden” (Participant 1). Participant 6, who knew and used the most languages regularly, pointed out that this is potentially transient saying “I want to develop [Swedish] more because I want to continue studying, so that’s also important. But if I’ll know Swedish in the future, that I don’t know. It’ll depend on where I live”.

Participants had two kinds of language repertoires. Either they had learned an additional language before moving to Sweden, or they only spoke their L1 in addition to Swedish and English. Within these two groups, attachment to their languages other than Swedish and English varied. In the first group, participant 6 seemed to have the strongest connection with the languages they spoke. They spoke different languages with their family, their friends from where they went to school before coming to Sweden, and their extended family. With every language that was discussed during the interview, this participant reiterated that this language

was also important to them, or that they wanted to learn even more of it because it was important. This can be contrasted with participants 2 and 5. Participant 2 disliked their additional language and said they rarely used it, saying: “I know it, but I don’t like it”. Participant 5, on the other hand, expressed a strong connection to this additional language compared to either their L1 or any other language they knew: “I learned it from my cousins and extended family and then I came here and I continued because I love it”.

Participants 1, 3 and 4 said they knew only their L1 in addition to Swedish and English, and here too, their attachment to it varied. Where participants 3 and 4 used their L1 regularly with family in participant 3’s case, and friends and family in participant 4’s case, participant 1 was hesitant to call their L1 such because of their perceived lack of proficiency: “My native language, I wouldn’t say I have one, really. I’m not that good at [it]”. They also said they thought their L1 was very beautiful and poetic in nature. They were the only one to say that they were most proficient in English, learning a lot through their friends and hobbies which involved using English.

Most participants were attached to the languages they knew in a positive way most of the time. The exception being participant 4 and English, and participant 2 and their additional language. Participant 4 explained their less than positive attitude towards English as it being difficult and to a lack of motivation when first starting to learn it, saying “I didn’t take English seriously during secondary school, but I took it seriously when I started upper secondary school”. Participant 2 did not explain their aversion. In all other cases, participants seem to have some sort of personal connection to the languages in question.

4.2 School and language awareness

Although the interview presented a school scenario in which participants encountered English which they did not understand, little was said in connection to how teachers relate to participants’ multilingualism. When asked what their teachers did when participants asked for help or clarification, the answer was usually that the teachers tried to reformulate the passage or sentence at hand. If this did not help participants to understand, teachers would switch to explaining in Swedish. This was true for participants 2, 4, and 5. “First [the teacher] explains in English and if I don’t understand then [they] explain in Swedish” (participant 4).

Since it seemed common for participants’ teachers to translate from English to Swedish when there were issues with understanding, it may not be unrelated that participants themselves often translated when there were issues with understanding, and they chose not to ask the teacher for help. Specifically, participants translated from English to Swedish, and not

any other language, even if they considered themselves more proficient in them, compared to Swedish. This was the case for participants 1, 5 and 6. Participant 5 explained this as follows: “in Swedish I know the most important terms. For example, in [my L1] I don’t know their real meaning”. This points towards some language awareness in understanding the limitations of their different levels of proficiency in the languages they know.

This participant was also aware of the learning process and observed the difference between how they learned a language they enjoyed studying in comparison to English: “compared to my [language], then it’s good that I continue to listen because they repeat and then you understand because you’ve heard the word several times, but English maybe not as much.” This points towards awareness of how the learning of one language is taking place, and how the same is not true for the other.

Participant 6 also displayed some language awareness in that they sometimes compared the meaning of words to the meaning of words in the other languages they know. Usually when encountering a new word, they looked up synonyms, but sometimes they

think about the word, what it means. What is it in [L1₁] or what is it in [L1₂]. Not so much in [L1₃] because I don’t know it as well anymore. But if I think about the word from different languages then it can also become easier to understand sometimes.

This points towards language awareness because it requires the underlying understanding that languages are related. If a word is known in one language, unknown in another but sounds similar, it can aid in understanding that new word.

It should be noted that both participants 5 and 6 knew the most languages of all participants. The only other participant who knew more than three languages was participant 2. It remains unclear, however, whether the awareness both participants displayed was brought about through language education in school, or of it is their own insight.

4.3 Interacting in English

During the interviews, all participants mentioned listening to English in some form. Often, but not always, they heard native English speakers. Participant 3 talked about one specific friend from an English-speaking country with whom they communicate somewhat regularly: “I have a friend who lives in [English speaking country]. We used to play games together and that’s how we met and [they] only know English so we communicate that way”. The two of them did not always speak on the phone or through video chats, but also written chats. This enabled participant 3 to, if needed, look up words or expressions between one utterance and

the next. For strategy use, this means that two different strategies become readily available depending on the medium of communication, translation on the one hand, and asking for help on the other.

Participant 1 also said they play games but did not specify if the people they play with are native English speakers. They did attribute a lot of their English knowledge to playing computer games, however, because of the opportunity it gave them to speak English to others. They, compared to participant 3, did not make the same distinction between strategy use when chatting through text messages and in an oral conversation, saying:

In a situation where I use English and didn't understand it [...] I admit that I didn't understand and ask [them] to explain further. If I don't understand then I Google it really quickly. You have a mobile phone, and you can Google really quickly.

To participant 1 it was acceptable to look up words on the phone while in a conversation. It is unclear if participant 3 would agree.

Participant 4 sometimes spoke English with a friend to practice but described it as very difficult:

It's not always that we speak English because we're not used to it and it's a little weird when we say things wrong. Beyond that, it shouldn't be that way but it's really that we're not used to it and we don't like to talk about something we don't really understand.

They much preferred listening to English radio.

All participants said they listened to English through social media and other media. Platforms such as YouTube and TikTok were mentioned, as well as TV and movies. This describes a situation similar to that which is reflected in participants' opinion of English – they have a lot of access to it and because so much entertainment is available in English, they have to know it.

Despite participants hearing a lot of English, they thought the exercise in school designed to test their proficiency in listening comprehension was difficult. Participant 6 said they would rather have an oral presentation. Participant 5 said it was difficult to distinguish homophones in certain dialects. Participant 2, on the other hand, modified their dislike of listening exercises to be more focused on the questions. "I like listening to English but the questions are difficult afterwards". Participant 3 explained their issue with listening exercises as follows:

They make it much harder than it is. It's like reality, but if I were to talk to them and not understand, then I can ask 'what do you mean'. In hearing exercises, they almost do it on purpose that they talk fast or in a different accent and it's not real.

This means that while participants seem to enjoy listening to English, it is not made easy for them.

4.4 Distribution of LLS use

As can be seen in Table 1 below (see also *Appendix 5*), on average, all strategies were used sometimes. The participants varied on their individual strategy use, however.

Participant 2 rarely used strategies, also scoring a strategy the lowest with 1.8. Participants 1 and 3 used strategies often, with participant 1 scoring a strategy the highest with 4.6. They were also the one to, on average, use strategies the most. Participants 4, 5, and 6 used strategies sometimes. This means that participant 1 used both strategies the most out of the participants and used one category the most. The opposite can be noted about participant 2. Overall, this also means that social strategies, although they received the lowest score of any strategy by any participant, was not the least used strategy on average (which was memory). The contrary is more accurate since social strategies received the second highest score of any category of strategies with 3.2. Cognitive strategies received both the highest score by any participant and the highest average.

Table 1. Results from Strategy inventory of Language Learning

	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social	Average
Participant 1	3.5	4.6	4.2	4.2	2.8	4.3	4.0
Participant 2	2.1	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.2	1.8	2.3
Participant 3	2.9	4.1	4.2	4.0	3.0	3.5	3.7
Participant 4	2.3	2.6	2.2	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.6
Participant 5	3.0	2.9	3.2	2.7	3.3	2.7	2.9
Participant 6	2.5	3.6	4.3	3.1	2.5	4.0	3.3
Average	2.7	3.4	3.4	3.2	2.8	3.2	

Table 1: Each participants' average score as well as overall average and strategy average.

As can be seen in Table 2 (see also *Appendix 5*), the category of strategies mentioned the most in the interviews were cognitive strategies, with social strategies at a distant second. It should be noted, however, that only two social strategies were mentioned – to ask for clarification and cooperating with peers – which all participants except participant 6 mentioning the former more than once. Nine different cognitive strategies could be found in the interviews, however, which means that participants seemed to be aware of a wider range

of cognitive strategies. Memory, compensation, and metacognitive strategies were mentioned the same amount: four times over all interviews, and affective strategies were never mentioned. Participant 3 mentioned the most strategies as well as mentioning the largest variety of strategies. Participant 2 mentioned the least amount of strategies.

Table 2: Strategies mentioned the most and Strategy categories

Participants	1	2	3	4	5	6
Metacognitive total	1	0	2	1	0	0
Social total	3	2	2	2	2	2
Asking for clarification or verification	3	2	2	2	2	1
Cognitive total	4	3	8	4	4	7
Translating	1	2	1	1	2	1
Practicing naturalistically	1	1	2	3	1	2
Compensating total	0	0	0	3	1	0
Memory total	2	0	0	1	0	1
Total	10	5	12	11	7	10

Table 1: The strategy categories mentioned and the most mentioned strategies in their corresponding category

All participants said they practiced naturalistically, which means to practice in a setting where the language naturally occurs. This was most commonly done in the context of watching or listening to English and interacting with a video or content in some way, but this was almost always only done to ask for help, which is the second most mentioned strategy.

Asking for clarification and verification was understood to mean asking for an explanation of what was not understood. It was not only the teachers who provided these explanations. “In English class, for example, if the teacher explains in Swedish and I don’t understand what [they] mean, then I ask my friend if [they] know. If [they] listen [they] explain” (participant 4). This friend was sometimes also able to explain in participant 4’s L1. This willingness to ask for help from a friend, however, seemed to be limited to some situations. Participant 4 sometimes practiced with a friend but seemed to be more likely to stop speaking than ask for help in those situations. This would indicate a compensation strategy rather than a social one.

Almost all participants used translation as a strategy when encountering new words. Specifically, participants said they ‘look up’ the words, or ‘google it’. When asked further, they clarified meaning Google translate. Only participants 1 and 6 preferred to search

specifically for synonyms rather than translations. It is unclear, however, if participants 2, 3, 4, and 5 also used synonyms, since the Google translate function usually offers them.

4.5 Summary

The first research question reads: “How do participants’ language repertoire come to fruition in and outside of the English classroom?” Participants rarely use their language repertoires inside the English classroom despite a positive attachment and attitude towards them.

Teachers and participants translate from English to Swedish if understanding cannot be accomplished through rephrasing. Outside the English classroom, participants’ language repertoires come to more fruition because they have friends and family members with whom they speak those languages. This includes English and Swedish. Because of this perceived usefulness, some participants displayed some language awareness.

The second research question reads: “How do participating multilingual students report to use Language Learning Strategies when using English? Participants used mostly cognitive and social strategies by translating and practicing through input and asking others for help. Participants usually translate from English to Swedish and not any other language which they might consider themselves more proficient in. When asking for help, participants usually asked friends, and not through social media where they interact through English the most.

5 Discussion

The following two subsections will discuss the results based on the research questions. Since Oxford (1990) was mostly used to provide the strategies and tools for analysis, it will not be used in this discussion.

5.1 Language repertoire

Participants generally had a positive attachment to the languages in their repertoire. The greatest effect on how participants interacted with their languages seemed to rather depend on their perceived usefulness and their personal motivation to use them. The largest contrast was here between participant 1 and 6. Participant 6 knew many languages and used most of them regularly with family and friends and was motivated to get better at them to communicate better with those friends and family members. The languages they knew were useful, and they were motivated to learn more to be a better language user in the future (Coulmas, 2015).

Participant 1, on the other hand, had an appreciation for their L1, they thought it was

beautiful, but this did not seem to be motivating them to get better at that language. This can be understood as follows: Participant 1 identified as a Swedish and English user who also knew their L1. Participant 6 identified as a multi-language user, who understood that the languages they used may be fleeting and transient. If one language stopped being useful, it may be forgotten. Perhaps, if a new language becomes useful, it may be learned, too. This can also be understood with the help of Ushioda (2016). Participant 6 was motivated to learn more languages because they saw a future in which they would be useful. At the same time, they were willing to lose languages if they turned out not to be useful in the distant future, as well.

Other points of interest lie in language awareness. Participants 5 and 6 displayed some language awareness. If this is because they knew the most languages or because they had teachers in the past who taught them about language awareness, or if this is something they have understood themselves, is unclear. Since there seems to be some discrepancy between whether teachers consider multilingualism to be useful and integrated or not (Lundberg, 2020), it would require more understanding into when and how such awareness was gained. What can be tentatively said, on the other hand, is that it argues against the teachers in Haukås (2016) and Romanowski (2022) who said that participants are too young when they learn English to learn about language awareness.

Lastly, all participants used English to at least some extent outside of the English classroom, be it for entertainment or for practice. It was interesting to see how social media platforms have become partially integrated into the mechanisms of English use. The word partially is used mainly because it does not seem to translate into tangible skills in the classroom, be it proficiency or strategy use.

This brings the discussion into the English classroom where teachers, in participants' experience, seem unlikely to use participant's multilingualism to enhance understanding or teach strategies, despite Skolverket (2021) saying it should be an integrated part of English 5. Whether this is due to the negative beliefs as found in Lundberg (2019) remains unknown within the confines of this degree project. Collectively this separates participants' multilingualism from the school environment, which also means that the amount of potential practice opportunities and participants' language knowledge are not taken advantage of.

5.2 Language learning strategies

The strategies participants used were mostly cognitive and social strategies, translating and practicing through input and asking others for help. Participants use strategies sometimes on average, just like the participants in Pawlak and Kiermasz (2018). Participant 1 reported to

use the most strategies and considered themselves the most proficient in English, which can be seen as agreeing with Pawlak & Kiermasz's (2018) findings regarding high proficiency meaning high strategy use. Participant 1's enjoyment of English, their high strategy use and their perceived proficiency can also be explained by Botes et al. (2020) regarding perceived proficiency being correlated with more enjoyment. Since no other participant commented on their perceived proficiency, it is difficult to compare these results further.

Having stated what strategies participants use, it is now possible to investigate how participants use them. There are two aspects to discuss here: translation, and the social aspect of strategy use. Both may be better understood with the help of Amerstorfer (2018), and the idea of preference affecting strategy choice. This is due to the prevalence of the use of Google translate or any other translation application. As participant 1 said, everyone has a phone, meaning that translation as a strategy is not only commonly used, but also accessible. On the other hand, as Beiler & Dewilder (2020) write, translation facilitates a multilingual approach to language use which allows for a broader part of or all the language repertoire to be used. However, participants usually translated between English and Swedish, which suggests that this strategy is not used to its fullest potential. Similarly, it may also suggest a monolingual tradition being upheld (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020).

The social aspect of strategy use can be seen in the choices participants seem to make when using their preferred strategies. All participants said they used social media to listen to English. This could then be a good place to practice and learn more, but participants seem less likely to ask those whose English they listen to for help. This is similar to Beiler & Dewilde (2020) whose participants often asked others for translations. While social media is accessible, similarly to translation tools, they do not necessarily seem preferable as a strategy. This could be explained with the help of willingness to communicate (MacIntyre et al., 1998). Perhaps there is a social barrier between those who create content and those who consume it that makes social media a less accessible social strategy.

6 Conclusion

To conclude, participants' multilingualism does not seem to be being taken advantage of in school, despite the potential it brings. It does seem to come to fruition mostly outside of school in communication with those with whom those languages create a connection. Participants use cognitive, social, and compensation strategies the most, by translating, practicing, and asking others for help. They tend to ask their friends for help.

6.1 Implications

These findings are important because they are relevant for the teacher who wants to use their students' multilingualism as an advantage to further language learning. Students are capable of understanding how the languages they speak are connected and it should be used, not only because the Swedish National Agency for Education says it, but because it can help students use their full linguistic repertoire and the potential language learning strategies that exist within such a connection.

6.2 Limitations

The results and conclusions drawn in this degree project are limited. Because of the issues with how short the interviews were, their contents were not as deep and thorough as had been hoped for. Since the research questions were answered, it is deemed that the data was sufficient despite this limitation and therefore valid enough. However, the results and conclusions are not generalizable nor directly applicable to other groups of people. More research is needed to be able to say whether the above is a general trend, or whether the participants in this degree project are outliers. If this study is to be repeated, future researchers should ensure that participants receive concrete scenarios that helps them envision the situation in which they do not understand instructions, rather than relying on their imagination and memory. Since a lot of weight was put on reliability during the data collection and regarding how the data was analyzed, it is also deemed reliable despite its limitations.

6.3 Future research

For the purpose of future research, it would be interesting to take strategy accessibility into account, not only in what learners have access to as in what strategies they have encountered, but also in how easy those strategies are for the learner to perform. It would also be interesting to discuss how perceived accessibility of any strategy is affected by factors such as willingness to communicate, especially regarding online resources for language learning.

References

- Amerstorfer, C.M. (2018). Past its expiry date? The SILL in modern mixed-methods strategy research. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. 8:2 497-523. DIO: 10.14746/sslit.2018.8.2.14
- Beiler, I., R., & Dewilde, J. (2020). Translation as translingual writing practice in English as an additional language. *The Modern Language Journal*. 104:3, 533-549. DIO: 10.1111/modl.12660
- Bengtsson, M. (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open*. 2. 8-14.
- Botes, E., Dewaele, J-M., & Greiff, S. (2020). The Power to Improve: Effects of Multilingualism and Perceived Proficiency on Enjoyment and Anxiety in Foreign Language Learning. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 8:2, 279-306, <https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2020-0003>
- Bryman, A., & Nilsson, M. (2018). *Samhällsvetenskapliga metoder*. (3 ed.). Liber.
- Börjesson, L. (2012). *Om strategier i engelska och moderna språk*. Skolverket. [Hämtad 2023.04.12]. [Om strategier i engelska och moderna språk](#)
- Börjesson, L. (2022) *Om strategier i engelska och moderna språk*. Skolverket [Hämtad 2023.04.12]. [Om strategier i engelska och moderna språk \(skolverket.se\)](#)
- Cenoz, J. (2011). The influence of bilingualism on third language acquisition: Focus on multilingualism. *Language Teaching*. 46:1 71-86. DIO: 10.1017/S0261444811000218
- Cenoz, J. (2013). Defining Multilingualism. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 33, 3-18. DIO: 10.1017/S026719051300007X
- Coulmas, F. (2013). *Sociolinguistics: The study of speakers' choices*. Cambridge University Press.
- Denscombe, M. (2016). *Forskningshandboken: för småskaliga forskningsprojekt inom samhällsvetenskaperna* (3 ed.) Studentlitteratur.
- Esaiasson, P. (2017). *Metodpraktikan: konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*. (5 ed.) Wolters Kluwer.

- Gorter, D. (2017). Perspectives on linguistic repertoires in adult multilinguals: an epilogue. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. 14:1, 86-90. DIO: 10.1080/14790718.2017.125902
- Haukås, Å. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. 13:1, 1-18. DIO: 10.1080/14790718.2015.1041960
- Lundberg, A. (2019). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism: findings from Q method research. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. 20:3, 266-283, DIO: 10.1080/14664208.2018.1495373
- MacIntyre, O. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noel, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82:4, 545-562.
- MacIntyre P. D., & Mercer, S. (2014). Introducing positive psychology to SLA. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. 4:2. 153-172. DIO: 10.14746/ssllt.2014.4.2.2
- Romanowski, P. (2022). Language awareness, strategy training and the facilitative role of L2 English: Polish L3 teachers' perceptions of multilingualism. *International Journal of Multilingualism, ahead of print*, 1-19. DIO: 10.1080/14790718.2022.2082442
- Skolverket (2021). *Ämne – Engelska*. Skolverket. [Hämtad 2023.04.12].
https://www.skolverket.se/undervisning/gymnasieskolan/laroplan-program-och-amnen-i-gymnasieskolan/gymnasieprogrammen/amne?url=-996270488%2Fsyllabuscw%2Fjsp%2Fsubject.htm%3FsubjectCode%3DENG%26courseCode%3DENGENG05%26version%3D6%26tos%3Dgy&sv.url=12.5dfee44715d35a5cdfa92a3#anchor_ENGENG05
- Skolverket (2022). *Effektiva lärstrategier ett viktigt uppdrag för skolan*. Skolverket. [Hämtad 2023.04.12] <https://www.skolverket.se/skolutveckling/forskning-och-utvarderingar/artiklar-om-forskning/effektiva-larstrategier-ett-viktigt-uppdrag-for-skolan>
- Skolverket (2023). *Språkval*. Skolverket. [Hämtad 2023. 04.12].
<https://www.skolverket.se/regler-och-ansvar/ansvar-i-skolfragor/sprakval>
- O'Malley, J.M., & Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge.

- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Pawlak, M. (2021). Investigating language learning strategies: Prospects, pitfalls and challenges. *Language Teaching Research*. 25:5, 817-835. DIO: [.org/10.1177/1362168819876156](https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819876156)
- Pawlak, M., & Kiermasz, Z. (2018). The use of language learning strategies in a second and third language: The case of foreign language majors. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. 8:2, 427-443, DIO: 10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.2.11
- Piniel, K., & Albert, Á. (2018). Advanced learners' foreign language-related emotions across the four skills. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. 8:1, 127-147. DIO: 10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.1.6
- Tornberg, U. (2015). *Språkdidaktik*. Gleerups
- Ushioda, E. (2014). Motivation, autonomy and metacognition: Exploring their interactions. In D. Lasagabaster, et al., (Red.), *Motivation and foreign language learning* (p. 31-49). John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Vetenskapsrådet (2022). *God Forskningssted*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.
- Wen, Z. (2012). Working memory and second language learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 22:1, 2-22.

Appendix 1 – Interview guide

Part 1

Background – the reasons behind choosing a language

What is/are your first language(s)

When did you start learning all the additional languages you know?

Usefulness and attitudes – language choice

In what situations do you use each language?

Native language(s), Swedish, English

What do you think about each language? /Do you like these languages? Why, why not?

Native language(s), Swedish, English

Useful? Difficult? Fun?

English in the classroom

What is your favourite part of an English lesson?

Why?

What is your least favourite part of an English lesson?

Why?

What do you do when you encounter something difficult?

In what way might it be difficult?

What does the English teacher do when you tell them you don't understand something?

Hearing/Reading

What do you do when you don't understand something in class?

How (if at all) do you use your other languages in these situations?

Has there ever been a situation when you've done this, and it didn't help?

Do you ever use your other languages in these situations?

English outside the classroom

When/do you use English outside of class?

What do you do when you don't understand something?

Hearing/Reading

Do you ever use other languages in these situations?

What (if anything) do you do outside of school to learn English?

Appendix 2 – Letter of information

You are hereby asked to participate in my study.

My name is Lara Luthardt and am a teacher student who is writing their degree project in English at Mälardalens University. The aim of the study is to learn more about how multilingual students use language learning strategies in and outside of classrooms. In other words, what do you as a multilingual student do when you are learning English. The data will be collected through interviews which can be done at a place of your choosing (for example at the school), or through a digital meeting.

It is completely voluntary to participate in the study. This means that it is up to you if you want to participate or not, and you can at any time stop participating without consequences before, during or after the interview. This also means that you have the right not to answer specific questions during the interview. Your grades will not be affected.

If you consent to taking part in this interview, I would like to record our conversation so that I can transcribe the material and analyse it as a text. The recordings, transcriptions and everything you say during the interview will be confidential and saved according to the security guidelines that exist at Mälardalens University. Confidentiality means that all personal information (for example name, age, school) will be anonymous. Some parts of the transcribed material will be presented in an essay which will be published in the public digital database DiVA, after it's been passed.

To give your consent, please sign below.

Thank you for taking the time

Best wishes, Lara Luthardt

If you have any questions, please contact me at

X@student.mdu.se, 07X-XXX XX XX

Sign here for consent (name and date)

Appendix 3 – Letter of information Swedish

Du förfrågas härmed om att delta i min studie.

Jag heter Lara Luthardt och är en lärarstudent som just nu skriver ett examensarbete i engelska vid Mälardalens Universitet. Syftet med studien är att ta reda på hur flerspråkiga elever använder sig av inlärningsstrategier i och utanför engelskalektionen. Men andra ord, vad gör du som lärde dig ett annat språk än svenska eller engelska först när du lär dig engelska. Data kommer att samlas genom intervjuer vilka kan göras på en plats som du väljer (till exempel på skolan eller genom ett digitalt möte).

Det är helt frivilligt att delta i studien. Det betyder att det är upp till dig om du vill delta eller inte, du kan när som helst sluta delta utan konsekvenser före, medan, och efter intervjun. Det betyder också att du har rätt att inte svara på specifika frågor under intervjun. Dina betyg kommer inte att påverkas.

Om du ger ditt tillstånd att delta i intervjuerna skulle jag även vilja spela in vårt samtal så att jag kan transkribera materialet och analysera det som text. Inspelningarna, transkriptionerna och allt annat du säger under intervjun kommer att hanteras konfidentiellt och sparas enligt säkerhetsåtgärden som finns på Mälardalens Universitet. Konfidentialitet betyder att all personlig information (till exempel namn, ålder, skola) kommer att vara anonymt. Vissa delar av det transkriberade materialet kommer att presenteras i en uppsats som kommer att publiceras i den offentliga digitala databasen DiVA efter att den fått godkänt.

För att ge tillstånd att ta del av intervjun, var vänlig signera nedan, eller skicka ett mail till x@student.mdu.se.

Tack för att du tar dig tiden.

Med vänliga hälsningar, Lara Luthardt

Om du har några tankar eller fråga, kontakta mig gärna på

X@student.mdu.se, 07X-XXX XX XX

Signatur för tillstånd (Namn och datum)

Appendix 4 – Questionnaire

Vilka strategier använder du för att lära dig engelska?

Du kommer att vara helt anonym genom hela enkäten. Svaren kommer att presenteras i min c-uppsats. Genom att svara på enkäten ger du mig tillstånd att använda data som du anger i den.

Först får du svara på två introduktionsfrågor

1- Vilket/vilka är ditt/dina modermål?

2- Vilket av de språk du kan, tycker du att du kan bäst?

Del 1 av 6

Påståenden är generella för de tillfällen då du använder engelska. Du behöver inte begränsa dig till engelskalektionerna, bara om det bara är då du använder engelska.

Alla påståenden i delarna framöver kan besvaras på en skala 1–5:

1 = stämmer (nästan) inte alls

2 = stämmer mindre än hälften av gångerna

3 = stämmer ungefär hälften av gångerna

4 = Stämmer ungefär hälften av gångerna

5 = stämmer (nästan) alltid

1. Jag tänker på sambanden mellan vad jag redan kan och det som är nytt på engelska
2. Jag använder nya engelska ord så att jag kan komma ihåg dem
3. Jag kopplar ihop ljud och bilder av betydelsen av nya engelska ord för att komma ihåg dem
4. Jag kommer ihåg nya Engelska ord genom att skapa en mental bild av situationer som de kan uppstå i
5. Jag använder rim för att komma ihåg engelska ord
6. Jag använder Flashcards för att komma ihåg nya engelska ord
7. Jag agerar ut/skådespelar nya engelska ord
8. Jag tittar tillbaka på det vi har gått igenom på engelska lektionen ofta

9. Jag kommer ihåg nya engelska ord genom att minnas var på sidan/tavlan de stod

Del 2 and 6

1 = stämmer (nästan) inte alls

2 = stämmer mindre än hälften av gångerna

3 = stämmer ungefär hälften av gångerna

4 = Stämmer ungefär hälften av gångerna

5 = stämmer (nästan) alltid

10. Jag säger eller skriver ner nya ord flera gånger

11. Jag försöker prata med någon som har engelska som förstaspråk/modersmål

12. Jag övar på engelska ljud

13. Jag använder engelska ord som jag redan kan på olika sätt

14. Jag påbörjar samtal på engelska

15. Jag tittar på engelska TV och film

16. Jag läser skönlitteratur på engelska

17. Jag skriver anteckningar, meddelanden, eller annat på engelska

18. När jag möter en text på engelska skummar jag den först snabbt för att sen gå tillbaka och läsa mer noga

19. Jag letar efter ord i ett annat språk som jag kan som liknar nya ord i engelska

20. Jag letar efter mönster i engelskan

21. Jag letar efter betydelsen i nya engelska ord genom att dela upp dem och titta på delarna som jag förstår

22. Jag undviker att översätta ord för ord

23. Jag gör sammanfattningar av information som jag hör och läser på engelska

Del 3 av 6. Halvvägs! Den andra halvan är inte lika lång!

1 = stämmer (nästan) inte alls

2 = stämmer mindre än hälften av gångerna

3 = stämmer ungefär hälften av gångerna

4 = Stämmer ungefär hälften av gångerna

5 = stämmer (nästan) alltid

24. Jag gissar för att förstå nya engelska ord

25. När jag inte kan komma på rätt ord under samtal på engelska använder jag gester
26. Jag hittar på nya ord när jag inte kan rätt ord på engelska
27. Jag läser engelska utan att läsa varje nytt ord
28. När jag pratar med någon på engelska försöker jag gissa vad hen kommer att säga
härnäst
29. När jag inte kan komma på ett ord på engelska använder jag andra ord eller fraser som
betyder samma sak

Del 4 av 6

- 1 = stämmer (nästan) inte alls
 - 2 = stämmer mindre än hälften av gångerna
 - 3 = stämmer ungefär hälften av gångerna
 - 4 = Stämmer ungefär hälften av gångerna
 - 5 = stämmer (nästan) alltid
-
30. Jag försöker att hitta så många sätt som möjligt att använda engelska
 31. Jag lägger märke till när jag gör fel i engelska och försöker förbättra mig
 32. Jag lyssnar aktivt när någon pratar engelska
 33. Jag försöker lista ut hur jag blir bättre på engelska
 34. Jag planerar min dag så att jag har tid att plugga engelska
 35. Jag letar efter människor att prata på engelska med
 36. Jag letar efter tillfällen att läsa så mycket som möjligt på engelska
 37. Jag har tydliga mål för att förbättra min engelska
 38. Jag tänker på mina framsteg i mina engelskkunskaper

Del 5 av 6. Nästsista nu!

- 1 = stämmer (nästan) inte alls
 - 2 = stämmer mindre än hälften av gångerna
 - 3 = stämmer ungefär hälften av gångerna
 - 4 = Stämmer ungefär hälften av gångerna
 - 5 = stämmer (nästan) alltid
-
39. Jag försöker slappna av när jag är rädd för att använda engelska
 40. Jag peppar mig själv när jag är rädd för att göra fel när jag använder engelska

- 41. Jag ger mig själv beröm eller en belöning när jag har gjort bra ifrån mig i engelska
- 42. Jag märker när jag är spänd eller nervös när jag pluggar eller använder engelska
- 43. Jag skriver ner mina känslor kring språkinlärning i en dagbok
- 44. Jag pratar med någon om hur jag mår när jag lär mig engelska

Del 6 av 6. Bara 6 frågor kvar

1 = stämmer (nästan) inte alls

2 = stämmer mindre än hälften av gångerna

3 = stämmer ungefär hälften av gångerna

4 = Stämmer ungefär hälften av gångerna

5 = stämmer (nästan) alltid

- 45. När jag inte förstår något på engelska ber jag personen att säga det igen eller att säga det långsammare
- 46. Jag ber engelsktalare att rätta mig när jag pratar
- 47. Jag över på engelska med andra som lär sig engelska
- 48. Jag ber om hjälp från engelsktalare
- 49. Jag ställer frågor på engelska
- 50. Jag försöker lära mig om engelska kulturer från engelsktalare

Tack så mycket!

Så bra jobbat! Jag vet att enkäten var lång.

Tack att du hjälpte mig genom att svara på den!

Appendix 5 – Tables

Table 1. Results from Strategy inventory of Language Learning

	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social	Average
Participant 1	3.5	4.6	4.2	4.2	2.8	4.3	4.0
Participant 2	2.1	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.2	1.8	2.3
Participant 3	2.9	4.1	4.2	4.0	3.0	3.5	3.7
Participant 4	2.3	2.6	2.2	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.6
Participant 5	3.0	2.9	3.2	2.7	3.3	2.7	2.9
Participant 6	2.5	3.6	4.3	3.1	2.5	4.0	3.3
Average	2.7	3.4	3.4	3.2	2.8	3.2	

Table 1: Each participants' average score as well as overall average and strategy average.

Table 2: Strategies mentioned the most and Strategy categories

Participants	1	2	3	4	5	6
Metacognitive total	1	0	2	1	0	0
Social total	3	2	2	2	2	2
Asking for clarification or verification	3	2	2	2	2	1
Cognitive total	4	3	8	4	4	7
Translating	1	2	1	1	2	1
Practicing naturalistically	1	1	2	3	1	2
Compensating total	0	0	0	3	1	0
Memory total	2	0	0	1	0	1
Total	10	5	12	11	7	10

Table 1: The strategy categories mentioned and the most mentioned strategies in their corresponding category