Univerzita Karlova

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky

Diplomová práce

Bc. David Fojtík

Advanced Learners and Native Speakers in Czech ELT Classes

Velmi pokročilí student a rodilí mluvčí v hodinách angličtiny v českém školství

Prohlášení:

Prohlašuji, že jsem diplomovou práci vypracoval samostatně, že jsem řádně citoval všechny použité prameny a literatura a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

Souhlasím se zapůjčením diplomové práce ke studijním účelům.

I have no objections to the MA thesis being borrowed and used for study purposes.

V Praze dne 2. Srpna 2020 ....
                                                    Bc. David Fojtík

Poděkování

Za obrovskou trpělivost ochotu a především metodickou pomoc chci touto cestou moc poděkovat vedoucímu práce, PhDr. Tomáši Gráfovi, Ph.D.

Speciální poděkování patří též všem osoboám, díky kterým mohl být uskutečněn výzkum.

Klíčová slova: Vysoce pokročilí studenti, bilingvní studenti, slovní zásoba, slovní zásoba studentů, případová studie, receptivní slovní zásoba, produktivní slovní zásoba

Abstrakt

Středoškolští učitelé se čím dál více v hodinách setkávají se studenty, jež svými schopnostmi převyšují své spolužáky. Může se jednat o bilingvní studenty, studenty, jež studovali v zahraničí, nebo mimořádně nadané vysoce pokročilé studenty. I navzdory jejich pokročilé úrovni mají tito studenti však nadále povinnost docházet do hodin, čímž staví nezřídka jejich učitele před otázku na jakou oblast jazyka se při výuce zaměřit. Z dostupných výzkumů vyplývá, že jednou z potenciálních slabin těchto typů studentů je slovní zásoba. Tuto hypotézu se tato diplomová práce pokusila ověřit s pomocí sady jazykových testů slovní zásoby – Paul Nation VLT a Laufer & Nation Productive Vocabulary testu. Současně s tím bylo cílem práce sestavení typických profilů na základě výzkumného šetření. Výsledky testů potvrdily u všech dvanácti zkoumaných subjektů nedostatečnost produktivní slovní zásoby. Testy receptivní slovní zásoby nicméně u jedenácti z testovaných subjektů odhalily, že studenti mají zároveň velmi širokou receptivní slovní zásobu. Na základě těchto výsledků a zjištění získaných pomocí šetření se tak vyučujícím doporučuje studentům umožnit více pracovat samostatně, a to na zpracovávání komplikovanějších textů, a zároveň jim zadávat k vypracování rozsáhlejší písemné práce, které jim tak umožní více zapojit produktivní slovní zásobu. Práce je zpracována v anglickém jazyce.

Abstract

Secondary-school teachers at Czech schools are encountering an increasing number of students who are significantly ahead of their peers. These students are either bilinguals or advanced learners. Regardless of the students' proficiency, the Czech education system enforces these students to keep attending further English classes, which often positions their teacher before a burdening question of what to teach these students. Scientific research postulates that a potential weakness of the said type of students could be vocabulary. This hypothesis was verified in this thesis, with the aid of Paul Nation VLT and Laufer & Nation Productive Vocabulary tests. The second goal of this thesis was to set a typical profile of advanced-learner and bilingual student through a survey. Results from the tests confirmed a significant deficiency in all of twelve test-subjects' productive vocabulary. Receptive vocabulary tests nonetheless revealed large receptive vocabulary size with eleven of tested subjects. Based on these findings, the recommended method for students this advanced is to allow them more autonomy, particularly through extensive reading, and to assign them extended seminar papers through which they will apply their productive vocabulary. The thesis is written in English.

Obsah

Abbreviations

CAE – Certificate of Advanced English
CEFR – Central European Framework of Reference
CLIL – Content and Language Integrated Learning
CPE – Certificate of Proficiency in English
EFL – English as a foreign language
ELT – English language teaching
ESL – English as a second language
FCE – First Certificate of English
L1 – first language
L2 – second language
VLT – Vocabulary levels test
VST – Vocabulary size test

List of tables
Table 1
Table 2
Table 3

1 Introduction

An increasing number of EFL teachers in the Czech curriculum are encountering students who either profess a high degree of proficiency or are bilinguals or happen to be students who lived for an extended period of time in an anglophone country and whose language skills, therefore, exceed the standards. This often presents teachers with the burdening question of what to teach them, for the degree of these students' proficiencyin the language might seem so high that the normal curricular content may appear redundant for them. As a result, these students may often be neglected by the teachers or insufficiently challenged by the course materials.

The advanced students' proficiency in question may manifest through native-like fluency, pronunciation, accent, grammar accuracy and, for example, knowledge of certain idioms, but this often masks the fact that their vocabulary size may be lacking or inefficient to comprehend 90% of an authentic text (Laufer, 1997). A study by Bialystock et al., (2010), reveals that bilingual children have a smaller size of their receptive vocabulary in both languages than their monolingual counterparts. Another study confirms that adult bilinguals' vocabulary sizes are subject to vocabulary deficiency in one of the two languages of the speaker (Luk & Bialystock, 2012). These findings postulate that there is, indeed, a potential that bilingual or advanced students possess inadequate vocabulary knowledge, which provides a basis for the argument that vocabulary should be the primary focus within English classes for advanced learners and bilinguals.

This thesis is dedicated to the exploration of vocabulary knowledge of bilingual and advanced-learner students of English in the Czech curriculum through a set of vocabulary tests, and a subsequent investigation into the students' potential needs through a case study. The resulting findings are aimed to provide a basis for further discussion or potential directions for further research on what to teach bilingual or advanced students and eventually provide a set of recommendations for teachers.

The thesis is divided into eight chapters, including this introduction. The second chapter deals with vocabulary breadth, depth, size, vocabulary levels, expressive and receptive vocabulary and subsequently proceeds to present methods of measuring vocabulary

knowledge. Additionally, chapter two provides reviews of generally accessible tools for measuring vocabulary size. The third chapter clarifies potentially confusing terminology relevant to bilingualism and provides a basic typology of advanced learners. The fourth chapter introduces the research method – tests and questionnaires through which the data was acquired. The fifth chapter presents the results of the study; the first part of the fifth chapter presents results from the tests; the second presents data from the case study with a subsequent discussion. The sixth chapter presents a synthesis of data from the case study – profiles of typical features of advanced students and bilinguals. Chapter seven is a collection of recommendations for teachers who may encounter advanced learners or bilinguals. Finally, chapter eight is a brief summary of the crucial findings of the study.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: VOCABULARY AND LEARNER TYPES

2 Vocabulary

To be able to appropriately address the thesis' argument and achieve its goals, we must first delineate the fundaments of vocabulary, and later the necessary facts concerning bilingualism and advanced learners. This chapter is an exploration of the key terminology related to vocabulary researching.

2.1 Vocabulary knowledge

Proficiency in language involves many factors, but the most important one is vocabulary, for there is no grammar without vocabulary (Bates & Goodman, 2013). Consequently, without an adequate knowledge of vocabulary, there is no language use (Schmitt, 2010), and most importantly, it is essential for being able to communicate one's needs appropriately. Advanced students who are proficient in a language must know a large number of words. The question is, however, what does it mean to *know* a word?

The general stance towards vocabulary knowledge that, e.g. Read (2004), Thornbury (2002), Webb (2008) or Nation (2001) assume is that vocabulary knowledge is two-dimensional. The one dimension pertains to the <u>breadth</u> (or size) of knowledge, and the other to <u>depth</u> of knowledge.

2.2 Vocabulary size (breadth of knowledge)

In the broadest sense, 'vocabulary size' can be defined as the number of words there are in one language. In a narrower sense, vocabulary size is the number of *word families* contained within one's mental lexicon (Goulden et al., 1990; Nation, 1997). A 'word family' is a group of words with a joint base (Nation, 1997). The reason for the 'word family' approach was to eliminate all of the inflexions or direct derivates of the given word from the resulting total number of one's known words – if vocabulary knowledge meant knowledge of all the inflected forms of a word and its morphological derivates, the vocabulary of a speaker of an inflectional language would be automatically larger than

that of a non-inflectional language user. Every word family thus has its own 'headword' – the base form of the word (i.e. stripped of all its inflexions and derivations).

The number of known words (word families) can then be divided into so-called 'vocabulary levels'. Vocabulary levels are, as described by Webb & Nation (2017), the grouping of words according to their frequency in use. It is a model widely used in vocabulary size analysis and works with words grouped into levels (groups of word families) by 1000 words based on their frequency in use – *high-* and *low-* frequency words, usually with the highest level being 20,000 of word families. The first 1,000 are those that "are encountered regularly in all forms of speech and writing [and the lack of knowledge of whose] can lead to a lack of understanding and difficulty in communicating" (Webb & Nation, 2017 – 7). The division of words according to lexical levels was made possible through what is understood by the term 'relative value of words', or more precisely, thanks to Zipf's law, which Webb & Nation (ibid.) define as follows:

> [Zipf's law] reveals in statistical terms that, if we rank words according to their use, there is a patterned decline in the frequency of items. Zipf found that there are a small number of very frequent words and a very large number of infrequent words. This means that if we look at the vocabulary in any text, the majority of words will occur only once or twice. There will be a few words that occur many times in a text, but most of these will be function words such as articles, auxiliary words, etc. (2017: 7)

In other words, Zipf's law postulates that every language's vocabulary can be divided into lexical levels by a statistical operation which divides the entire vocabulary into groups of thousand words statistically stratified according to their frequency, with the most common words being the first 1,000 words. The groups of 1,000 words are referred to as "frequency word lists".

2.2.1 Vocabulary levels: uses and context

Lexical levels could be useful for teachers, for example, who could apply the data provided by results from lexical levels test when preparing a syllabus, for example: if a student with the size of approximately 6,000 word families belongs to B2 level (Meara, 1992), which means that they might struggle with texts containing vocabulary from a higher number of 1000 word families. In knowing this, the teacher is better able to find the appropriate vocabulary-level literature. Other uses in ELT are, for instance, graded readers (Paul

Nation's official website) – they are texts with complexity distributed into several levels by the groups of thousand words.

Similar distribution-based stratification is used by Oxford English Dictionary (OED) provides *frequency bands*, which is a differentiation of words based on "[their] overall frequency score" (OED online) and whose frequency range is divided into 8 levels. An alternative one is used by Cambridge Dictionary online which provides additional information about a word's level according to *Central European Framework of Reference*, CEFR, which is based on research provided for *English Vocabulary Profile Online* that draws data from *Cambridge English Corpus* that comprises of 1.5 billion words (Cambridge dictionary online).

As for L2 learning, Webb & Nation state that learners of English as a *second* language "tend to know a greater proportion of words at the first 1,000-word frequency level [...]" (Webb & Nation, 2017 – 9). They further claim, however, that within the context of English as a *foreign* language, the effects of frequency are less clear-cut due to limited exposure to the target language (ibid.).

Laufer & Geke (2010) furthermore postulate 'lexical threshold' – how many words a speaker needs to know in order to be able to orientate himself within a language. It is suggested that there are two such thresholds – "an *optimal* one, which is the knowledge of 8,000 word families yielding the coverage of 98% (including proper nouns) and a *minimal* one, which is 4,000–5,000 word families resulting in the coverage of 95% (including proper nouns)." (2010 – 15). Consequently, Nation (2006) claims that "[i]f 98% coverage of a text is needed for unassisted comprehension, then an 8,000 to 9,000 word-family vocabulary is needed for comprehension of written text and a vocabulary of 6,000 to 7,000 for spoken text" (2006: 59).

2.2.1.1 Vocabulary size: native speakers

The question remains: what is the average vocabulary size of a native speaker? According to Schmitt (2010), a monolingual native speaker of English with a completed elementary education has a vocabulary size of approximately 15,000-20,000 words on average. Similar data were also confirmed by Goulden et al. (1990), whose findings "suggest that

well-educated adult native speakers of English have a vocabulary of around 17,000 base words, [which] represents an acquisition rate of around two to three words per day"(1990: 341).

Consequently, Nagy & Anderson's (1984) research revealed that English school textbooks that they examined contained up to over 88,000 of word families. With dependence on how well the given child is able to apply morphology and context to induce meanings, "there are an average of one to three additional related words that should also be understandable to the child" (1984: 304). Their findings are an additional illustration of how complex the concept of vocabulary knowledge is. Considering that EFL learners are at the C1 level, will their vocabulary size belong at least to the minimal lexical threshold range?

To see how well an ESL (English-as-a-second-language) speaker does in vocabulary, Cobb & Horst (1999) tested students at City University of Hong Kong using a test that provides results within several levels of vocabulary size: 1,000; 2,000; up to 10k level, and an extra "academic vocabulary" level, and found that their test subjects scored rather poorly in their university-level vocabulary test, struggling already at the level of a 5,000-words test, which means that "some students may not have the word knowledge they need either to read authentic texts efficiently or to infer the meanings of the new words they encounter" (1999).

Ironically, however, it turns out that monolingual native speakers do not do so well either. Milton and Treffers-Daller (2013) used a frequency-based vocabulary size test from Goulden et al. (1990) and provided "an average figure of about 10,000 English word families emerg[ing] for entrants to university" (2013: 152). This means, they claim, that the students' lexical capacity is insufficient, rendering them "struggling" with academic texts (2013). However, it appears, judging by other research, that by the end of their studies, the primers' vocabulary size should extend by thousands, reaching the promised 15,000 words (2013); according to Cobb & Horst (1999) this number is even higher: "average native-English-speaking university student is about 17,000 word families" (1999: 1).

2.2.1.2 Vocabulary size and CEFR

In terms of vocabulary size, according to the Central European Framework of Reference (CEFR), it is rather difficult to determine which lexical levels pertain to which CEFR level. This is mainly because the scientific discussion appears to have a two-way view, differentiating between L2/EFL learners and monolinguals. Meara (1992), for example, asserts that the Cambridge C2 test – proficiency requires roughly about 8,000 words:

> Learners with a vocabulary of about 3000 words should be able to cope with an examination like the Cambridge First Certificate in English. Learners with a vocabulary closer to 5000 words would normally be classed as Intermediate level. You need seven or eight thousand words to cope with an examination at Cambridge Proficiency level. These guidelines are not hard and fast, of course: some learners with very limited vocabularies have very good coping strategies which allow them to perform better than we would expect them to. In general, however, the guidelines are fairly reliable: it would be a very exceptional learner who passed a Proficiency level examination with a vocabulary of only 4000 words. (1992: 5)

Milton & Alexiou (2009), however, claim that the successful completion of the Cambridge proficiency test requires a mastery of a minimum of 5,000 words.

Nevertheless, if C2 is to be considered a 'native speaker level' as described by the CEFR (coe.int[1]), where an average English monolingual's vocabulary size at entry-level to university is roughly 10,000 words level, it means that neither Meara's (ibid.), nor Milton & Alexiou's (ibid.) estimates are correct. Considering, that universities usually require at least CAE (C1) level for non-English speaker applicants, the numbers are bound to be higher. In a table presented in Milton & Donzelli (2013), moreover, it is stated that lexical levels starting from 8,000 words are beyond C2 level.

However, what the data provided by Meara (ibid.) or Milton & Alexiou (ibid.) and not even those by Milton & Donzelli (ibid.) do not tell us is whether those are to be of productive or receptive vocabulary. Considering that receptive vocabulary size is inevitably always larger than productive, nonetheless, we could assume that the heretofore mentioned numbers are related to receptive vocabulary. On the other hand, the website

---

[1] https://www.coe.int/en/web/portfolio/the-common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching-assessment-cefr-

universeofmemory.com claims that approximately 8,000 words is the vocabulary size of the C1 level, and C2 is approximately 16,000 words[2].

Summary: vocabulary size

To summarise, vocabulary breadth (size) is the number of words a person knows. Regardless of how many words there are within a language, thanks to a statistical operation named the Zipf's law, we know that there are 2,000 words that a person needs to be able to understand the language essentials. To be able to read a large number of texts, one must be able to understand at least 5,000 words, but this number still does not guarantee that a person will fully comprehend written documents; for that, one needs at least 8,000 words, optimally, 10,000. None of these numbers, however, compare to vocabulary sizes of fully educated native speakers, who are generally believed to have a vocabulary size of 14,000 – 16,000 words on average. With CEFR, it is unclear what vocabulary size corresponds with the levels, but experts mentioned above state that 8,000 words vocabulary size corresponds with the CPE level. Vocabulary size, however, does not adequately address the other dimension of vocabulary knowledge, which is the depth of knowledge.

2.3   Depth of knowledge

While the primary focus of this thesis is on the breadth of vocabulary; that is, how many words do our subjects know; it is still essential to consider to what extent they actually know the given word. Do they just somehow comprehend the specific word, or can they also appropriately and correctly use it?

The 'depth of knowledge' refers to the extent of details about a lexical item that the speaker is aware of. Thornburry (2006) asserts that to 'know' a word means to know its form and meaning. By the definition of Read (2004) "[depth of knowledge] defines three aspects of deep word knowledge: the precision of meaning, comprehensive word knowledge, and network knowledge." (2004: 193) The *precision of meaning* is, in short, an indicator of person's "sufficiently deep understanding of a word [that] conveys to him

---

[2] However, the website does not cite any resources so their claims can hardly be taken as valid data, although their numbers sound more logical if we consider that C2 level is supposed to be the native speaker level.

or her all of the distinctions that would be understood by an ordinary adult under normal circumstances." (2004: 212-13). *Comprehensive word knowledge* has a somewhat vague definition – it is a knowledge "[that] encompass[es] not just meaning but various other components as well." (2004 - 217). Finally, *network knowledge* is best summarised by this quote:

> The assumption is that, as a learner's vocabulary size increases, newly acquired words need to be accommodated within a network of already known words, and some restructuring of the network may be needed as a result. This means that depth can be understood in terms of learners' developing ability to distinguish semantically related words and, more generally, their knowledge of the various ways in which individual words are linked to each other. (2004 - 219)

Read's definition corresponds with Nation (2001) and Schmitt (2010). Schmitt (1998) presents several sub-elements of knowledge: *meaning, spelling, association, grammar,* which he also believes to take place in the form of a sequence. His proposed model of the sequence, however, was not confirmed (ibid.). While there are several ways of approaching the depth of vocabulary knowledge, as explained before, there is a binary model of vocabulary depth that is of particular relevance to this thesis: receptive and productive vocabulary.

2.3.1 Receptive and expressive vocabulary

Receptive vocabulary, by definition given by Burger and Chong (2011), is the overall size of one's vocabulary, an inventory of all words that a speaker knows (understands) in speech, sign or writing. It is, therefore, the overall size of one's vocabulary, including both the lexical items the given speaker can produce actively, i.e. speak it or write it correctly and appropriately (in terms of depth of knowledge, the most in-depth possible knowledge), and ones that the given speaker only knows, understands when chancing upon it in a book, for example, but often is not able to produce with writing or expressing it when prompted to (a lesser degree of depth of knowledge).

In contrast with 'receptive vocabulary', 'expressive vocabulary,' (or, as will be further referred to in this paper as 'productive vocabulary') is vocabulary that a speaker knows, understands, and is able to produce correctly, or, in other words, is able to retrieve from the lexical inventory and then produce it either in spoken or written language (ibid.)

Receptive and expressive vocabulary differ in size. The former is always bigger than the latter. Logically, one cannot is unable produce a word they do not know. This determines that a word contained within the expressive vocabulary is a word already retained in the receptive vocabulary inventory and excludes that a word contained within the receptive vocabulary is automatically contained within the productive vocabulary. Consequently, recent studies in bilingualism revealed that bilingual children have a greater gap between the knowledge of these words (Keller et al., 2015). This is known as the 'receptive-expressive gap' (Gibson et al., 2012).

Summary: depth of knowledge

To know a word does not only mean to comprehend it. It also entails knowing the spelling, for example, or knowing its pronunciation. There are several models of the depth of knowledge that imply several dimensions of knowing a word. The most relevant model to this study, however, is the receptive-productive distinction. The receptive-productive distinction asserts that there are two vocabulary sizes that are separate, where one is larger, the receptive, and the other is usually smaller, the productive. Receptive vocabulary is an inventory of words whose meaning is known to the given language user; productive vocabulary is an inventory of words that the given user can not only comprehend, but also appropriately use, and the two types of vocabulary are not of the same size – receptive vocabulary size is always larger than the productive vocabulary. If, however, the gap between receptive and productive vocabulary size is too big, the given speaker has something that we call 'receptive-expressive gap'. With the depth and breadth of knowledge thus being elucidated, let us explore what means of vocabulary testing there are.

2.4   Vocabulary: Means of measuring

This section is a brief overview of available approaches to vocabulary testing with critical evaluation of some of the most commonly used tests. As previously mentioned above by Milton and Treffers-Daller (2013), "[t]here is no standard testing method for calculating vocabulary size and the absence of this goes a long way to explain the enormous variation in the vocabulary size estimates and rates of progress among English speaking monolinguals which are reported" (2013: 153). The consensus is to adhere to the principle of word families, as previously stated – one unit means one word-family, where

the selection of source for the words should be made with immense care as even that could influence the word count (ibid.).

2.4.1 Types of diagnostics

There are two main types of vocabulary tests: one type has the purpose of determining the number of words(lexical families) a language user knows, while the other consists of *vocabulary size* tests with the aim to determine the students' *depth of knowledge* of a given word. The main difference is that the former test type only tests *what* the test-subject knows while the latter is tries to determine *if* and *to what extent* the test-subject knows a word. In other words, the former focuses on *receptive* vocabulary, while the latter tries to determine whether the given word belongs to *passive* or *active* vocabulary.

For reference on types of vocabulary tests, Cervatiuc (2007), conveniently divides vocabulary tests into the following groups according to their purpose: *Receptive Vocabulary Breadth tests*, which focuses on what we previously defined as *receptive vocabulary size* and provides quantitative results by showing an approximate number of lexical families the given tested subject probably knows; *Productive Vocabulary Breadth tests* that "generally measure the number of words that test-takers can generate in writing" (2007: 43), focusing on the *size* of productive vocabulary; *Receptive Vocabulary Depth tests*, whose purpose is to "generally measure how well test-takers know some target words they read" (2007: 44), lastly, there are *Productive Vocabulary Depth tools*, whose purpose is to delineate to what extent a user knows a particular word.

Of all of the previously mentioned types of tests, the *vocabulary breadth test* type is particularly relevant for the purposes of this study. Vocabulary depth, on the other hand, are of very relative nature and thus extremely difficult to precisely outline. In fact, Cervatiuc (ibid.) mentions only two tools to evaluate the depth of knowledge: *Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS)* by Wesche & Paribakht, (1996), and *The Web VocabProfiler* (Cobb, 2007). Both, however, are somewhat problematic. The *VKS* tool builds upon a user's self-evaluation and is, therefore, highly subjective. The test prompts the tested subjects to demonstrate knowledge of a given word by producing a sentence, but, as Cervatiuc criticises, this still produces insufficient results, because the users "may create a semantically neutral sentence that does not accurately indicate how deeply they know the

word"(2007: 45). The *Vocab Profiler*, though praised by Cervatiuc, is still not as useful to determine one's depth of knowledge, as this tool merely provides a percentile of how lexically rich one's productive vocabulary is in terms of the given 1,000 word level.

On the other hand, some versions of vocabulary breadth tests offer more reliable results. A critical evaluation of the most common and generally accessible tools for measuring vocabulary size(s) is offered in the following section.

2.4.2   A critical evaluation of available vocabulary tests and analysing tools

The tests addressed hereafter are a selection of tests enlisted on a webpage dedicated to online versions of many available vocabulary tests, lextutor.ca, and from this study's author's research. The following is a study and a critical evaluation of those generally accessible and widely accepted as the standard for vocabulary tests as well as web-based vocabulary size tests.

2.4.2.1 Paul Meara EFL vocabulary tests

Among the more respectful and valid tests is one by Paul Meara (1992). As the tests' name suggests, they are aimed primarily at EFL learners. A benefit of this test is that it "provides a quick method of profiling the vocabularies of learners" (1992: 5). One issue, however, is that it is only focused on vocabulary levels up to 5,000-word tiers, rendering this test primarily useful for students at the B2 level. Another problem lies within the method of scoring the test: the examinee is to simply enter a 'yes' with words that they claim to know the meaning of and a 'no' with those they believe to not understand. Although the test includes a number of nonce words, it allows for fewer instances to verify the authenticity of the students' answers, nor is there any possibility of telling which words the student actually understands.

2.4.2.2 Swansea Vocabulary Levels Test (XLEX)

XLEX is another test designed by Paul Meara. It is an automatic-scoring test that examines vocabulary up to 5000 words. A significant advantage of XLEX is that it tests a combination of vocabulary and reading skills. Results from this test were cited in Milton's papers, but are unfortunately no longer available for the public viewing. Besides that, a major disadvantage, judging by Milton's presented results, is that XLEX, like that of

Meara's EFL vocabulary test, does not exceed the level of 5,000 words (Milton & Meara, 1995).

2.4.2.3 Lextale

Lextale is a test designed for EFL students. One of its advantages is that it is available online and with free access and downloadable versions. To open the test, additional software, Praat, is required (http://lextale.com/validity.html). In order to obtain results, the examinee must enter their email address. More importantly, however, this test is built upon the yes/no/nonce-word basis, and the scoring output is only presented in percentages. Methods for interpreting the results are, unfortunately, not explained. Although the website boasts its applicability to scientific research, the type of diagnostic data it provides is narrow and insufficient. With this, the test is potentially undesirable for a thorough analysis of one's vocabulary size.

2.4.2.4 A Real Me English Vocabulary Test

This test is accessible through the internet at https://www.arealme.com/vocabulary-size-test/en/. The test contains 50 questions with questions where the examinee is assigned to select synonyms and antonyms. While the test allows for a quick analysis and provides fast results, its use is strictly for entertainment purposes as opposed to research, for it does not supply the used method nor provide any statistics of the results. Additionally, it does not allow for tracking the subjects' answers. Another concern is the multiple-choice section – this type of test allows users to gain points upon guessing the correct answer as it does not allow the option 'I do not know', much like the online version of Nation's VLT tests. This, therefore, creates a distorted image of the results. An additional disadvantage to consider is that because this test is online, there is no guarantee that cheating does not take place unless the examiner observes the examinee throughout the entire process. As the test does not provide any further diagnostic data apart from the resulting vocabulary span, it is not useful for scientific research and teachers alike.

Interestingly, the test allows for testing vocabulary size in other languages, including Czech, but the Czech language version poorly rendered. The questions are mostly a direct translation of most of the questions for the English version of the test, often with mistakes.

2.4.2.5 Ghent University Vocabulary Size Test

Accessible for free through http://vocabulary.ugent.be/, this test applies the same method as Paul Meara's Vocabulary Tests – examinees enter either yes or no if they know the word, limitations of which have been previously addressed. Furthermore, the test does not provide any diagnostic data apart from its results, similar to that of the previously mentioned 'Real Me' test, and are thus at best only of orientational character.

2.4.2.6 Randomised lexical selection tests

There are two vocabulary size tests accessible via http://testyourvocab.com/ and http://writingtools.xjtlu.edu.cn:8080/cvst/checklisttest.html#TESTSTART. These tests apply the same method: the examinees select words that they are familiar with. The limitations of RLS tests are their high rate of "falsely correct" answers. In addition to its inapplicability to scientific research, such tests are only useful for the purposes of entertainment.

2.4.2.7 Laufer & Nation Productive vocabulary test (1999)

Laufer & Nation Productive vocabulary test is accessible online for free via the website http://lextutor.ca. The modus operandi with this test is a simple open clause with initial letters entered to prompt the exact correct answer. It is a battery of tests divided into several sub-tests according to the individual lexical level – 2,000, 3,000, 5,000, University Vocabulary and 10k level. There are three versions of the test: A, B, C, and they are equivalent to each other, except for version C, which does not contain the university words list. The test renders useful diagnostic data with percentages of depth of knowledge of the given word list tier. This also enables the examiners to see the examinee's answers, which allows for further diagnostic data (i.e., the students may, for example, enter the right word, but with wrong spelling). This test is one of the most commonly used vocabulary size measuring tools; potentially for two reasons: its accessibility and credibility. The credibility is guaranteed by the test's use in research and by being cited by other major names.

2.4.2.8 Paul Nation's Vocabulary Levels Test (VLT)

As Kremmel & Schmitt (2018) describe it, the VLT "has been called the nearest thing to a standardised vocabulary test currently available" (2018:1), and the diagnostic data it provides is word knowledge required for reading (ibid.). The VLT is available online

through links directly accessible at Paul Nation's official website where he also offers a range of tools as well as some of his publications. The test has several bilingual mutations. Sadly, Czech-English combination is not available. The vocabulary tests offer versions for testing 14,000- and 20,000-words vocabulary size. All tests are available free of charge for academic purposes at Paul Nation's official website: https://www.wgtn.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/paul-nation, and the tests also have two online versions accessible through a link from both Nation's website and direct link – Nation's VST (vocabulary size test) - https://my.vocabularysize.com/session/evstxx. One of the advantages of the online VST is the option 'I do not know' among answers. The option allows for neater results and less false-correct answers. On the other hand, the online version of the VST is only 14,000 words size.

Among the many advantages of this test are its accessibility and practicality – the test can be easily completed anywhere and allows for a relatively quick and easy evaluation of results. There is an online version of the test available for free at my.vocabularysize.com. Moreover, this test allows for a quick analysis of diagnostic data. Every ten questions represent the given group of 1,000 words, which estimates how well the subject knows the given tier. To explain, If a person scores 8 out of 10 within the given 1,000 words-tier, then that person knows 80% of the words within the given 1,000 words, which translates into approximately 800 words.

On the other hand, the test does have its caveats, which are the multiple-choice and the lengthiness. With the test being multiple choice, there is always a high chance of guessing the right answer without actually knowing it; this was, however, solved by the option 'I do not know' in answers which are available in the online version. The same can be done with the paper version by merely instructing the test subjects to enter the 'I do not know' answer. The other problem to address is that the entire vocabulary size is based upon a point system, where every point represents 100 words of receptive vocabulary size in the 14,000 words version and 200 words in the 20,000 words version. With this in mind, there are always ten words taken from various areas of interests to ensure a particular form of 'fairness' in that matter, but that represents only a 10:1,000 ratio of success. Nevertheless, the test's practicality and the diagnostic data it provides make the VLT likely the best option for both professional researchers and teachers alike.

2.4.2.9 Lexile Framework

According to the definition offered by the Lexile framework official website;

> [l]exile measures provide a scientific approach for matching students with ability-appropriate text and audio resources. Lexile measures help differentiate instruction and monitor growth in reading and listening, putting students on the path to success in school, college and careers. (Lexile.com)

The nature of these tests is, however, challenging to grasp, for as the official website further describes:

> Students receive a Lexile reader measure from a reading test or program. There isn't a special "Lexile" test. Instead, we partner with state departments of education and test publishers to create assessments, or link to existing assessments that can report students' reading scores as Lexile measures. (lexile.com)

The test's presentation is somewhat unconvincing; however, the website provides a wide range of tools related to teaching reading to students. This is especially significant when trying to interest students in reading, where one of the greatest challenges is knowing what to assign the students to read. For these purposes, this website offers links and materials with proper recommendations for the varying levels, which is useful for teachers. Another useful tool offered by this website is the "Lexile analyser". Both tools are available for free in order to determine the reader's level. To conclude, being more focused on reading than on vocabulary, the *Lexile Framework* is not sufficient for vocabulary testing.

Summary: vocabulary testing

Both vocabulary breadth and depth can be tested. However, while vocabulary breadth can be reliably tested, vocabulary depth of knowledge tests are generally unreliable for their vagueness. For the purposes of this study, the vocabulary breadth tests are more relevant. While there are a multiple vocabulary breadth tests, only a small number are reliable and applicable for our study, which are Paul Nation's VLT and Laufer & Nation's Productive Vocabulary Tests. Nation's VLT provides the approximate number of the student's vocabulary size while Laufer & Nation's Productive Vocabulary Test presents an estimate of how large a person's productive vocabulary is within the given vocabulary list tier. In regard to vocabulary testing, this can be discussed within the context of the Czech school system and the vocabulary demands.

2.5 Vocabulary demands in the Czech curriculum

The highest required level in the Czech secondary education, as defined by law, is B1 (cermat.cz), which translates into the receptive vocabulary size of approximately 3,000–5,000 (Webb & Nation, 2017). When the highest point accessible to students is set towards B2 , this means that even a diligent or bilingual student is not provided with sufficient challenges or learning opportunities to prompt expansion of vocabulary size. Some schools have responded appropriately and started to provide higher-level or more demanding courses. Gymnázium Na Zatlance, a Czech grammar school, for example, offers courses which apply Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) (zatlanka.cz). There are, moreover, several international schools where English is a Medium of Instruction (EMI).

The presence of schools offering CLIL and EMI signifies a rising number of students who are likely to become advanced (i.e. bordering with C1 in the minimum by the time they get to their final year of studies) before they enter the third year of studies. However, the highest level a student can achieve during their secondary education, as required by law, is B2. To achieve a higher-level certification, they must apply for exams at accredited institutions or for internationally accepted tests, such as Cambridge ESOL or TOEFL, which represents a significant caveat in the Czech school system: if students could take higher-degree exams, not only would the bar be set higher for the students, but advanced students would also be given a better chance to be more applied within their classes. On the other hand, some schools do respond to the needs of their higher achievers by raising the demands through offering specialised final exams which are guaranteed to be C1 level.

3 Learner types

With the central issues regarding vocabulary addressed, this thesis proceeds to determine the learner types a teacher can encounter within the class, such as bilinguals, foreign-exchange students and advanced learners.

3.1 Bilinguals: general

There are two main uses for the term 'bilingual'. The general meaning, as defined by the Oxford English Dictionary, refers to a speaker who can speak two languages (OED). The other is used primarily in psycholinguistic research to denote a speaker who has a

multinational background where each parent speaks a different language or a person's nationality and mother tongue differ from the country where they reside.

This thesis operates with and understands the term 'bilingual' as a language user whose linguistic background provides them with sufficient exposure to two or more languages, which results in the acquisition of both (or all) of the respective languages. This can also be defined as a language user whose first language is different from that of the country the given individual lives in and grew up in and where they interact with other individuals in the given language (as is commonly illustrated by English as a second language).

3.1.1 Age of onset and bilingualism:

Psycholinguistics further divide bilingualism into subtypes according to the 'age of onset,' i.e. the age when the child's language acquisition began:

- *Early simultaneous* (0-3 years)
- *Early sequential* (4-7 years)
- *Late sequential* (8-13 years)
- *Late second-language learners* – learners who do not *acquire* but learn a language, a speaker whose English is a foreign, not a first or second language.

(Klein et al. 2014)

The last from the list is what we can understand as 'advanced learners' in the context of this thesis.

3.1.2 Bilinguals and dominant language:

Scientific research on bilingualism shows that there is always a likelihood that one of the two languages used can become the 'dominant language' (e.g. Dornic, 1980, Gathercole & Thomask, 2009, Genesse et al. 1995, Sorace et al., 2009 etc.). Studies also show that a bilingual might speak a language in which they are either more proficient or create incorrect grammatical structures based on another language structure. The interference between the two languages derives mostly out of the environment of the given speaker. In example, if a child born in the Czech Republic has only one native English-speaking parent and lives amongst a community of predominantly Czech speakers, their dominant language is more likely to become Czech rather than English. This, furthermore, infers that the given language user's English, though possibly fluent, may be somewhat limited, most

likely in their lexicon – in comparison to their Czech lexicon – due to exposure (Bialystock, et al., 2010).

Consequently, Dornic (1980), discusses the disbalance between the two (or more) languages of the given user and states that the "non-balanced bilingual (in whom one language system is dominant) represents the most typical group of bilinguals" (1980, 369), and that "for a vast number of people using their nondominant languages for decoding (comprehension) and encoding (production), the information processing capacity is considerably reduced." (1980, 369).

3.1.3 Bilinguals and exposure

It is of particular relevance to discuss exposure to language and its effects on a language user's vocabulary size. A study by Thordardottir (2011) examined Montreal bilingual speakers of French and English and found that her subjects scored comparably to that of monolinguals in receptive vocabulary. This, of course, is the case if the exposure to both languages was equally sufficient, but the subjects' expressive vocabulary requires significantly more exposure for the subjects to provide results comparable with their monolingual counterparts.

Bringing Thordardottir's study's results into the context of Czech-English bilinguals, it could be expected that the vocabulary, especially of a bilingual speaker, may still be limited to only a rudimentary usage that reflects the given bilingual user's everyday reality. However, without being sufficiently prompted to expand their vocabulary, they will not have the same breadth of vocabulary as their English monolingual counterparts. This has been confirmed by a Czech study of French-Czech bilinguals (Siváková, 2012).

3.1.4 Bilinguals and vocabulary size

Consequently, the results of a study of Bialystock et al. (2002) show her bilingual subjects (children aged 3-10) scoring significantly lower in a receptive vocabulary test in comparison to their monolingual counterparts. Consequently, De Houwer et al.'s (2014) 13 month-old subjects scored better in understanding words. However, "at 20 months, monolinguals knew more [target language] words than bilinguals (combining comprehension and production)." (2014: 1190).

3.2   Foreign exchange students

Long-term stays can achieve greater exposure in the target language's environment. As pointed out by Milton & Meara (1995) foreign exchanges do, in fact, improve their foreign language expertise up to ten times faster than their non-foreign-exchange counterparts, with their vocabulary learning rate spanning up to 2,500 words per year (ibid.). Considering exposure, spending six months in the country studying in the target language is not only sufficient exposure to the language, but also prompts better results in terms of speaking and writing than those of bilinguals stationed in the Czech Republic.

3.3   Advanced students

With relation to bilingualism from the psycholinguistics perspective, advanced students in the understanding of this study's context belong to the group of late-sequential language users; they are Czech native speakers, but very diligent students of the target language with a high degree of proficiency in English – usually starting with C1. In terms of exposure, these students have the highest probability of the smallest portion of non-simulated exposure. On the other hand, by having to study the language with a higher degree of participation in studying vocabulary, there is a chance that their receptive vocabulary may be more abundant than that of bilinguals.

3.4   Learner types: Summary

This thesis is going to operate with three principal types of subjects: bilinguals, foreign-exchange experience students and advanced learners. Bilinguals who were chosen for the study are early simultaneous bilinguals, that is, the acquisition of both languages began in the age of 0-3 years. Research cited above postulates that bilinguals have dominant language, which in the case of our subjects is likely to be Czech, for they study at a school with the language of instruction being Czech. It can also be expected that bilinguals have a potentially smaller receptive vocabulary size than monolinguals, which speaks in favour of the previously stated assumption that our study subjects' vocabulary is inadequate.

3.5   Hypothesis

This study aims to explore the lexical knowledge of those English learners that have been identified by their teachers as exceeding the standard level of proficiency at Czech

secondary schools and specifically identify if their vocabulary is lacking in any areas. Secondly, we aim to shed light on the students' own self-perception as regards their knowledge of English, and their beliefs and needs regarding English tuition and compile a set of profiles of advanced learners for future use by English language teachers. The hypothesis is that our subjects' receptive vocabulary size will correspond with the results from previous studies and research as mentioned above, which is that our subjects' vocabulary size is insufficient.

RESEARCH: METHOD DESIGN

4 Method and data

This purpose of this chapter is to present the nature of and the method used for gathering the data.

4.1 Test design

To answer the research question and verify the hypothesis, tests that can reliably determine the size of a speaker's *receptive* vocabulary are going to be needed. We also want to know the subjects' capability in terms of productive vocabulary in order to draw conclusions on their vocabulary skills. For this, we will need to apply a test that can provide diagnostic data on that matter as well.

The tests selected for this will be Paul Nation's VLT vocabulary size test, the 20,000-words version, and Laufer & Nation's Productive VLT test. A study by Mondria & Wiersma (2004) showed that contrary to the popular belief that words are better retained if they are learned both receptively and productively (aimed towards expressive vocabulary – speaker's active usage of the given word and not just understanding of the term), "learning words both receptively and productively leads to a similar level of receptive retention as learning words just receptively" (2004 - 79). This presents us with the idea that vocabulary assessments should test both receptive and productive vocabulary, as done by Mondria & Wiersma (ibid) or Webb (2008). Moreover, doing both tests together will provide us with a double-checking device – if our subjects' ratios will exhibit higher scores in the productive tests than in the receptive vocabulary tests, even if both tests work with different words, it will be an anomaly.

4.1.1 Diagnostic data

The reasoning for our design was partially motivated by the nature of the diagnostic data rendered by the tests: while Nation's VLT focuses strictly on receptive vocabulary with a larger sample – 20,000 words, the Laufer & Nation test only provides us with data within the range of 1-10,000 words. The author furthermore piloted both tests prior to the survey to verify their applicability on the study's subjects. Other criteria leading to the choice of these two tests were the following: portability and recordability – both test

results are easy to track down – ; minimisation of risk of cheating – the tests allow the examiner to have complete surveillance over the examinees; vocabulary size – which tiers of lexical frequency profile the given test encompasses; applicability or relevance – how relevant to the study the given test is - and quality – both tests were designed by renowned experts and were applied to significant research (the productive test was used in, e.g. Laufer & Nation, 1995). The other reason for this design was to partially replicate methods previously applied by other researchers (previously mentioned in section 2 – Vocabulary testing), namely Paul Meara (2010) and Webb (2008). The replication of the mentioned experiments is only partial in that both Meara and Webb tested L2 learners, but only for a lower-range vocabulary sizes, in both cases applying only tests containing vocabulary up to 5,000-words level.

The Nation VLT test questions can be further segmented into sub-groups by 2000 words, where every set of ten questions represents 2000 words from the given two levels of vocabulary knowledge according to Zipf's law. The first ten questions are, therefore, related to the first 2000 words, while questions 90-100 refer to 19-20k. Every point scored by the students counts as 10% to the given set of 2000 words. To illustrate, if the student correctly answered. questions 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, his score of 7 points translate to a 70% score within the given segment of 2000 words[3]. This means that the given student has a 70% depth of knowledge of words in the segment of 3-4k words. With that, it is then possible to compare the percentages in the respective tiers of 1000 word levels from VLT with the online Laufer & Nation test, enabling us to verify the accuracy of the tests.

4.2   Subjects:

Our tested subjects were secondary-school students aged 15-19. All of our subjects' levels of English were perceived as far above the required standards by their teachers or were of bilingual origins or have spent at least one term in an anglophone country. All students are taken from a random selection of students who responded to our appeal. They were also recommended for the study by their teachers, so some students may be classmates. The teachers' names are, for the sake of anonymisation, undisclosed. All but one of the

---

[3] The online version of Nation's VLT (so far only 14k version available), https://www.lextutor.ca/tests/vst/ segments the test into fourteen sets of 10 questions to provide exact percentage of depth of knowledge within the given tier of 1000 words.

subjects were selected from one school. One bilingual student aged 19 studies at a different school and was recommended to us by one of the subjects. Both schools use Czech as the primary language of instruction, and there is no CLIL[4] involved in their method of instruction. The subjects were divided into the following three groups (types):

- **Bilinguals**

By 'bilinguals' we understood students whose parents, one or both, are native speakers of English.

- **Students who had previously studied abroad**

To this category belong students who are native speakers of Czech but have lived and studied in an anglophone country for at least the length of one term.

- **Advanced learners**

Students in this group are Czech native speakers whose English level is above the B2 level. These students usually achieve their prowess through dedicated studying outside of the compulsory school attendance, generally by attending extracurricular classes in language schools, with a private tutor, or by merely gaining knowledge during simulated anglophone environment – watching films, reading books and communicating with their anglophone peers.

4.3 Research design

The research was designed similarly to that of previously cited studies and with a series of adjustments to achieve this study's goals. The data collection process was divided into two stages: the test stage (stage 1) and the questionnaire stage (stage 2). In the test stage, the examiner gave the student both tests, the VLT first and the Laufer & Nation productive test second, ensuring that the student's answers were authentic (i.e. that they were not cheating). After addressing all issues related to vocabulary testing pointed out by Gyllstad et al. (2015)(i.e guessing and applying test-taking strategies, guessing the correct answers based on the alignment of the answersthat lead towards false-correct answers), students were instructed to enter a question mark next to words they did not know to avoid falsely

---

[4] Content & Language Integrated Learning – rather than teaching grammar, CLIL focuses on teaching sciences in the target language. This has one advantage – students are exposed to a wide span of terminology.

correct answers. Students were continually being observed by the examiner, and this was further reinforced by ensuring that the test was always taken on a one-to-one basis.

After that followed the questionnaire stage, where the examiner went through a set of prepared questions (see Appendix) with the student and recorded his comments and observations. The questionnaires were divided into two sections: the first section contained a set of questions that were designed for the respective type of student (advanced learner, bilingual or foreign exchange). The second section contained a battery of set questions that were aimed for all of the students regardless of the type. The examiner interviewed the student and made records of his observations simultaneously. The examiner went through all of the questions with the student organically, that is, if the student, for example, happened to have answered several of the questions already in one answer, the examiner skipped through and proceeded to those unanswered. This form of recording answers was chosen to ensure the prompting of the students to answer the questions sufficiently. The design was motivated as well by the desire to prevent social desirability bias. If the student refused to be recorded on audio, the examiner only recorded the answers manually without a transcript. If the students agreed to be recorded, the examiner entered answers to the questionnaire based on the transcript of the audio recording. Full student profiles are included in the appendix.

Each student was assigned an anonymising pseudonym – subject + number. The numbers were assigned randomly. All forms of audio recordings were, after having been recorded in the form of a transcript, discarded. All participants were informed about the process of recording their answers, the purpose of the study and how their answers and test scores will be used. Any form of incrimination on the subject's part was prevented and if necessary, erased from all of the records. With students under 18 years of age, the researcher first requested their parents' written and signed approval. Because these were made in the form of a written document and contained incriminating information, they were not included in the Appendix. Examiner also requested the participants' permission to enter their sex and age. If the participant refused to enter that information, it was not included in their profile. If the students did not agree to be recorded, participants were presented with the examiner's notes and observation for further editing on the

participant's part. All answers thus recorded were recorded with full permission from the participant's part (or their respective legal guardians).

The outcome of this research is a set of individual files containing the examiner's recorded observations (student's answers) with the respective student's tests results that provide the basis for profiles of the individual learner types as well as potential suggestions for how to effectively work with the given types of students.

Due to the tests' build-up, it was not possible to determine in which topic areas the students are lacking. Doing so would require an entirely different type of study than the one we provide here. The questionnaires, however, did contain questions that allowed for students to self-evaluate their vocabulary, such as where they thought they were lacking or which topics they would be more interested in.

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

5 Study and results

The following section is dedicated to the presentation and analysis of gathered data.

5.1 Tests results: overall

The total number of subjects was 12, 3 of whom were males. Two students, a male and female, are bilinguals, and three students studied in an anglophone country, a male and a female student were in the USA, one female student went to Ireland.

Overall, compared to results from studies carried out by Cobb & Horst (1999), Meara (2010) and Webb (2008), our subjects' results were compatible in that they followed similar downward curve in their scores. Our subjects furthermore exhibited a significant lack in their productive vocabulary of 3-5,000-word levels like those found by Cobb & Horst's subjects. With this in mind, the results partially confirm our hypothesis that in terms of productive vocabulary, where our subjects are, indeed, lacking. However, in terms of receptive vocabulary, they exhibited vocabulary sizes (all but one student) beyond our expectations – their receptive vocabulary size being over 10,000-word families.

Only four students scored between 13,000 and 15,000, while others, with the exception of one student who scored 6100 words, were between 10-12,000 words. Overall, it can be said that our subjects' results from Nation's VLT test corresponded with their results from Laufer & Nation's productive test's results in that individual subject's scores in the two tests almost mirrored each other at individual levels of difficulty. All of the subjects' performances grew poorer as the level of 1k words rose, with occasional exceptions in scores in the Laufer & Nation's productive test, where they mostly scored better in Academic vocabulary in comparison to their results in the 5-10k level. Their knowledge of the scientific terminology explains why they scored better in some areas of less common words, for example in the academic vocabulary, and can be attributed to the demands of their school and of Czech curriculum in general – there is a great emphasis put on having a broad scope of scientific knowledge with particular demands on accuracy and terminology.

Rather than through VLT where there was only one student with a score below 10k words of vocabulary size, which means that each student's (with the exception of the one student) vocabulary size already exceeds the highest possible level for standard secondary education (B2), our subjects' lacking became evident through their results from the productive test. This posits that whilst they may have a broad span of vocabulary that they are able to understand with a likely higher degree of ease, they may struggle to meet the same degree of elaboration when expressing themselves. This invites for a discussion over how to achieve a higher degree of student's productive vocabulary. A partial aid could be found in findings from the students' perspective, which is what we attempted to do with the questionnaire stage, a summary of which is provided in the following section.

5.2 Results: statistical data

The tables below display the total results of all completed tests as well as the types of learners. Table 1 demonstrates the results from the VLT. The "Vocab. size" column is the subject's total estimated receptive vocabulary size, whilst the individual columns showing 1-2k, 2-3k and higher represent the success rates in percentages within each area. Each 10% represents one point out of total 10.

Table 1: Results from VLT

No	Gen	Age	Type	VLT										Vocab. Size:	Variant:
				1-2k	3-4k	5-6k	7-8k	9-10k	11-12k	13-14k	15-16k	17-18k	19-20k		
1	M	18	FE	100%	90%	70%	50%	60%	30%	70%	30%	30%	10%	11 600	B
2	F	18	FE	90%	90%	90%	80%	70%	70%	70%	60%	70%	50%	14 000	A
3	F	17	Bil.	100%	100%	90%	80%	90%	50%	70%	30%	60%	40%	14 400	B
4	F	17	AL	80%	100%	100%	70%	80%	30%	50%	20%	40%	50%	12 600	A
5	F	17	AL	100%	90%	80%	70%	90%	50%	60%	60%	60%	50%	14 200	B
6	F	15	AL	90%	90%	100%	60%	80%	50%	30%	20%	10%	50%	11 600	A
7	F	17	Bil.	100%	90%	70%	80%	80%	40%	40%	60%	50%	40%	12 800	B
8	M	19	AL	100%	90%	70%	50%	70%	50%	0%	40%	20%	30%	10 400	B
9	F	16	AL	80%	80%	60%	70%	80%	50%	50%	30%	20%	20%	10 400	A
10	F	18	AL	90%	90%	90%	80%	90%	80%	40%	30%	20%	60%	13 600	A
11	M	18	AL	100%	90%	80%	80%	100%	50%	60%	60%	80%	70%	15 400	B
12	F	19	FE	80%	80%	40%	40%	30%	30%	10%	0%	0%	20%	6 100	A

The first column is a number of the subject. Column "Gen" stands for the person's gender/sex – M=male, F=female. Column "age" is self-explanatory. Column "Type" – "FE" stands for "foreign exchange", "Bil." stands for "bilingual", "AL" stands for "advanced learner".

The VLT test results show that all but one test subjects have receptive vocabulary size that exceeds 10,000 words, four subjects have a receptive vocabulary that spans over 14,000. This entails that these subjects' vocabulary size enables them to comprehend 90% of any text (see section 2.2.1). The subjects with vocabulary size spanning over 14,000 have the receptive vocabulary size of a native speaker and should be able to understand most written documents, including academic texts. Only three students scored this high – subjects 2, 3 and 11. Overall, based on their vocabulary size, subjects with receptive vocabulary size over 10,000 are approximately at the C1 level. The sole exception in terms of the score was subject 12 whose vocabulary size is significantly smaller than others, and with 6,100 words, she is more probably B2 level.

Individual segments of frequency levels furthermore show a falling tendency in scores (illustrated in graphs in the Appendix). Almost all of our subjects scored between 70 and 100% up to the 10k level, but in the 9-10k level and higher, the scores mostly indicate a significant drop. Only one bilingual student (subject 3) and one advanced learner's (subject 11) scores were less dynamic, and their curves were slightly flatter, but still

showing a falling tendency. The lower the score, the lower the potential number of words known within the given frequency level word list. It is only logical that students have lower scores within less frequent words. What illustrates a potential deficiency more significantly, however, are scores below 70% within the first 5,000 words (columns 1-3 in the table). Students who score below this percentage within this area should be recommended to revise their B1 vocabulary.

To summarise, the VLT test revealed that our subjects (with the exception of subject 12) have a wide-spanning receptive vocabulary that enables them to understand 90% of any non-academic text on average. In this respect, our hypothesis was not confirmed. On the other hand, lower scores within the initial parts of the test indicate that some students may be struggling with more basic vocabulary, even if their vocabulary size may exceed 10,000 words.

On the other hand, productive vocabulary test revealed our subjects' true weaknesses. Table 2 demonstrates success rates calculated by the software from the online test, where 77% represents the borderline score. Anything below that value, as defined by the test's designers, represents inadequacy.

Table 2[5]

No	Gen	Age	Type	Laufer & Nation productive test				
				2k	2-3k	3-5k	AVL	5-10k
1	M	18	FE	94%	38%	44%	50%	-
2	F	18	FE	88%	77%	66%	66%	44%
3	F	17	Bil.	100%	77%	94%	77%	66%
4	F	17	AL	94%	72%	66%	72%	44%
5	F	17	AL	94%	94%	72%	77%	44%
6	F	15	AL	100%	88%	72%	77%	55%
7	F	17	AL	77%	72%	50%	77%	44%
8	M	19	Bil.	94%	44%	50%	38%	27%
9	F	16	AL	83%	66%	61%	44%	33%
10	F	18	AL	83%	72%	66%	72%	50%
11	M	18	AL	83%	83%	55%	83%	55%
12	F	19	FE	77%	44%	44%	66%	16%

The first column is the number of the subject. Column "Gen" stands for the person's gender/sex – M=male, F=female. Column "age" is self-explanatory. Column "Type" – "FE" stands for "foreign exchange", "Bil." stands for "bilingual", "AL" stands for "advanced learner". The column titled "AVL" shows results from academic vocabulary word list section of the productive test. The AVL represents a separate category in the test.

The table reveals that most subjects found themselves struggling already with 2,000 words-level productive vocabulary. The scores follow a similar trend (please see the Appendix for graphic illustration) as with the VLT – the higher the level, the lower the score, but with a more significant drop. Interestingly, a substantial number of students scored relatively high in the academic vocabulary test. On the other hand, the 5-10,000 word-level vocabulary was proven to be too challenging for the subjects.

In comparison to VLT scores, productive vocabulary proves to be the weakness of our subjects, which confirms our hypothesis that our subjects would exhibit deficiency in productive vocabulary.

Table 3 shows arithmetical averages of all results from the respective columns to compare success rates within the respective areas in both tests. These averages represent only the corresponding levels due to the individual test's vocabulary size testing range (Laufer & Nation test contains only up to 10,000 words size, where VLT's range goes up to the 20,000 tier). A graphic representation of this table is provided in the Appendix.

---

[5] Subject 1 asked to leave earlier and was thus not able to complete the 5-10k vocabulary test.

Table 3

	>2k level	>4k level	3-5k level	5-10k level
VLT	93%	90%	84%	74%
L & N	89%	69%	62%	43%

Individual columns demonstrate the gap between the respective scores. These are better illustrated by graph 13 (in the Appendix). What the difference between these curves furthermore illustrates is the phenomenon of 'receptive-productive gap'.

5.3   Interpretation of results

Although our subjects' results indeed reflect the downward curve, it is with occasional spikes. This is likely due to the tests' build-up: all lexical levels contain 1000 words that are, however, not organised by topic, but based on their statistical occurrence in the British National Corpus. With this, words that are predominantly internationally used or scientific terms that are, again, globally recognized belonged to the levels above 10k. In this respect, those who participated during their science classes had a higher chance of scoring some words within the higher levels. What proved to be much more challenging for our subjects were, however, context-specific terms, such as "rollick", "gobbet", "magnanimity" (13-14k level), whilst terms like "spatiotemporal", "zygote" or "cyberpunk" (20k level) were mostly answered correctly. The 13-14k level proved to be the most problematic for most of our subjects, and it is for the previously mentioned reason. This shows, however, that our subjects would definitely benefit from the knowledge of these words, for they are statistically more common than their scientific counterparts, with which most of our subjects did not encounter an issue.

There were two cases of students who scored slightly better in the productive test at the corresponding level than in the receptive vocabulary size test. This, however, does not mean that our experiment is invalid. A possible explanation is that the two students happened to know the given words within the productive test but were 'unlucky' enough to be asked precisely those words that they were unfamiliar with within the VLT test.

5.4   Case study:

Based on the questionnaire (full version with the full set of questions is available in the Appendix), it was possible to determine which areas of language represent a field of interest to the students. This does not mean, however, that what their suggestions are

necessarily the right way of achieving a higher level of *depth of knowledge*. Instead, they should be understood as a form of guidance when seeking a topic which students may find more engaging.

5.4.1 Individual profiles:

The following section is an overview of the salient information on our subjects. This was gathered from the structured questionnaires (available in full form in the Appendix). The resulting summaries are not structured the same way as the questionnaires, but they mostly follow the order of the questions. Each profile contains the subject's results from both tests, a brief overview of key facts from the observation protocol and additional evaluative commentary.

Subject 1: Male, 18 years, last year of studies, foreign exchange
Test results:
VLT:

1-2k	3-4k	5-6k	7-8k	9-10k	11-12k	13-14k	15-16k	17-18k	19-20k	Vocab. Size:	Variant:
100%	90%	70%	50%	60%	30%	70%	30%	30%	10%	**11 600**	**B**

Laufer & Nation productive test:

2k	2-3k	3-5k	AVL	5-10k
94%	38%	44%	50%	-

The subject had to leave earlier so the 5-10k level was skipped on the condition that he would see the examiner later, which he, however, failed to do even after repeated reminders.

Observations[6]:

The first subject belongs to the group of 'foreign exchange' subjects. This student spent one term in the USA at a triple-A high school, where he had seven classes per day, three classes of which were compulsory and others elective. Out of the compulsory courses, he chose to specialise in sports, social studies and joined English courses, which, as he stated, "at this point, was mostly literary studies". He has the ambition of studying at a university

---

[6] For each questionnaire results including scans of the student's test results, please see the respective subject's file in the appendix

in a foreign country, preferably an anglophone country, and believes that the crucial element in a language is comprehension and lexis.

He has an FCE and CAE certificate (grades not specified by the subject) and has a relatively high number of anglophone acquaintances. He feels to be sufficiently challenged by the course load and is generally satisfied with the way English classes are taught at his school. This may coincide with the fact that he feels he should work on his vocabulary, namely on improving his knowledge of less common expressions, phrases and idioms. He only wishes he could get more opportunities to communicate with native speakers. He also claims that the classes are more focussed on individual skills rather than all skills combined (grammar, vocabulary, reading, listening).

Commentary:

This student appears to be very down-to-earth in his demands on his teacher. As for his test results, receptive vocabulary size is beyond the 10,000 words level, which, given his age, is satisfactory, as it exceeds the CPE level. What shows to be this student's weakness, however, are results from the productive test, where a significant lack of knowledge showed notably in the 2-3k level, in which the student scored mere 38%.

<u>Subject 2</u>: Female, 18 years, final year of studies, foreign exchange
Test Results:
VLT:

1-2k	3-4k	5-6k	7-8k	9-10k	11-12k	13-14k	15-16k	17-18k	19-20k	Vocab. Size:	Variant:
90%	90%	90%	80%	70%	70%	70%	60%	70%	50%	**14 000**	A

Laufer & Nation productive test:

2k	2-3k	3-5k	AVL	5-10k
88%	77%	66%	66%	44%

Observations:

This student studied and lived in Ireland for five months, where she stayed with a host family. Her school was a standard secondary school in Ireland. She stays in touch with her Irish acquaintances. She passed her CAE with grade A.

She plans on applying for a university in the UK. She believes that active communication is a crucial part of language knowledge and that the best way to expand one's vocabulary size is through reading and watching films. She does not feel that she lacks in any area of language except for specialised scientific or academic terminology.

That is probably why English classes provided at her school did not live up her expectations – she feels that she did not benefit much from them. She furthermore expressed her belief that the school system fails to provide an appropriate method for beginners and advanced students at the same time.

The student furthermore stated that she would welcome more extensive reading exercises with questions or some form of scaffolding instead of having to deal with textbook exercises. Her teacher does not give this student any extra assignments. Instead, the student is allowed to read anything she chooses during the classes. The only value she thus sees in going to the classes rests in the fact that she is allowed to use the time as a study break (tasks she is usually assigned are mostly too easy, and the student is quickly done). She also admitted that she finds it hard to respect her teacher because she, according to the student, has a problematic pronunciation.

Commentary:

Two things are striking about this student: on the one hand, it is her almost native-speaker level of receptive vocabulary size, with over 14,000 words, but on the other hand, it is also the harsh criticism of her classes. Yet her high score in the receptive vocabulary test reveals that she is very advanced and thus truly needs to be sufficiently challenged in order for her to see any value in the classes she attends. The large receptive vocabulary size could be attributed to her passion for reading.

However, her results in productive test clearly showed her weak spots. She, like most other of our subjects, scored markedly low in the 5-10k level, and her 2k level score was borderline. This means that while she may be able to read various genres of written documents, she might not be able to express herself with quite as rich vocabulary.

Subject 3: Female, 17 years, third year of studies, bilingual
Test results:
VLT:

1-2k	3-4k	5-6k	7-8k	9-10k	11-12k	13-14k	15-16k	17-18k	19-20k	Vocab. Size:	Variant:
100%	100%	90%	80%	90%	50%	70%	30%	60%	40%	**14 400**	B

Laufer & Nation productive test

2k	2-3k	3-5k	AVL	5-10k
100%	77%	94%	77%	66%

Observations:

Subject 3 is a bilingual female student aged 17 (Czech mother, British father) who immigrated to the Czech Republic with her mother at age eight, until which point she had lived and also studied in the United Kingdom. Her parents are now divorced, but she communicates with her father on a daily basis. Apart from her father, however, she does not stay in touch with other English native speakers.

Although she spent her formative years in the UK, her dominant language, she feels, is Czech, because she believes to be more fluent. She would like to study in an anglophone country, but even despite viewing her English as something she can use on a daily basis without much difficulty, she feels unsure that her skills so far will provide her with the required skills for her university studies.

When asked about English classes at her school, she responded that she finds it rather unfortunate that her teacher puts excessive emphasis on vocabulary whilst putting not enough emphasis on teaching pronunciation, particularly prosody, which she, as a native speaker of English, feels to be the Achilles' heel of most Czech learners. The student furthermore stated that she had been persistently subjected to a form of neglect – being bilingual; she would often be told to simply do something on her own as she already knows the class's target language. Her current teacher did try to get this student involved, however, by assigning her extra classwork, but owing to this student's self-confessed tendency to zone out of the assigned individual task and focus more on what the rest of the class is doing, she is no longer being assigned extra work.

When asked to self-evaluate her English skills, the student stated that her English level is roughly C1, but that her vocabulary size is not rich enough for CPE. Her writing skills are, she believes, below standards. When asked whether the teacher had tried to address that problem, the student responded that the classes mostly consist of debating.

When asked what she would like to be changed about her classes, the student stated that she would welcome to be more engaged through more challenging learning activities, by putting more emphasis on literature and culture rather than on learning language and grammar per se, because the current teacher's methodology does not provide her with the expected expansion of skills. For all that, the student admitted her appreciation for having learned meta-language.

Commentary:

This student has the second-best of all scores in the VLT and the highest score in the productive test. Her productive test scores could be attributed to her daily contact with her native-speaker father, through which she gets enough opportunity to practise her productive vocabulary. What is fascinating about this student, however, is her humbleness and her determination to expand her vocabulary and writing skills as well as her self-reflection. It is especially important to note as bilinguals are often believed to be challenging to deal with and, as the student herself has admitted, thus usually get neglected, where in fact, this student is a living proof of the very contrary – she is generally satisfied with her English classes.

Subject 4: Female, 17, third year of studies, advanced learner
Test results:
VLT:

1-2k	3-4k	5-6k	7-8k	9-10k	11-12k	13-14k	15-16k	17-18k	19-20k	Vocab. Size:	Variant:
80%	100%	100%	70%	80%	30%	50%	20%	40%	50%	**12 600**	A

Laufer & Nation productive test

2k	2-3k	3-5k	AVL	5-10k
94%	72%	66%	72%	44%

Observations:

This student has gained her English skills by attending anglophone kindergarten, later by enrolling to a bilingual programme at an elementary school in Prague, and by attending extra-curricular language courses. At age 14, subject 4 got her CAE (grade not specified by the student). Although she is Czech (through parents) and grew up in Prague, she communicates with her older sister only in English (it is more comfortable for her). She has several anglophone friends/penfriends. She regularly visits the USA for two weeks every year.

In her self-evaluation, the subject stated that she perceives her pronunciation as satisfactory. As for her weaknesses, she admitted that she "could definitely work on her formal writing and grammar" (authentic quote).

When asked to evaluate her English classes at her current school, the student presented a thorough analysis of her classes: the root of the problem, according to her, lies in the fact that the Czech school system builds largely upon translation method and metalanguage; many teachers, moreover, are often prone to making many grammatical and pronunciation errors which the students then tend to repeat, and lastly, grammar is usually presented ineffectively – the students are taught what they already know. When asked to impart some of the upsides of her classes, the student responded that she enjoys classes where she can engage with other students through debates.

The student being so critical in her evaluation, the researcher asked her to provide some solutions to see what her expectations were, to which she responded with the following recommendations: she feels that many of the problems could be solved by applying CLIL method through which she could learn more scientific terminology, for example. The view likely draws from her assertion that vocabulary is the critical element of language-learning. Another thing that this student would personally prefer would be getting more chance to express her personal views in the target language. As a follow-up question, the researcher asked whether the student believes that she would benefit from being assigned essays and reading exercises with more challenging content with which the student agreed.

Commentary:

This student was perceivably more critical about her English classes at school. The disillusion was likely triggered by her frustration with a lack of classroom engagement caused by being insufficiently challenged – the exercises they usually do in class are, as the student stated, evidently too easy for her. Her frustration signals, however, her demand for more engagement. It represents another proof that even proficient students still expect to be taught more.

The results from the receptive vocabulary prove that her vocabulary size does indeed span beyond the requirements for C1. However, like all of our other subjects, her productive vocabulary proved to be her weakness, scoring under the borderline already in the 2-5k level. The slightly higher score in the AVL part of the productive test reflects the previously stated paradox – academic vocabulary consists of mostly internationally known terminology, hence the higher score. Judging by this student's performance, this student could benefit from deepening of her knowledge of vocabulary from between 5 and 10k levels, with particular emphasis on spelling, as her poor score was caused partially by her problems with spelling.

Subject 5: Female, 17 years, third year of studies, advanced learner
Test results:
VLT:

1-2k	3-4k	5-6k	7-8k	9-10k	11-12k	13-14k	15-16k	17-18k	19-20k	Vocab. Size:	Variant:
100%	90%	80%	70%	90%	50%	60%	60%	60%	50%	**14 200**	B

Laufer & Nation productive test

2k	2-3k	3-5k	AVL	5-10k
94%	94%	72%	77%	44%

Observations:

This student has been attending English classes since her second year at elementary school, first at school, later with an experienced private tutor whom she meets once a week as an extra class outside the school to the date. She has a CPE certificate, grade B.

This student's attitude towards her English classes at school was substantially negative, which could be attributed to her recent achievement of the CPE certificate out of which she draws the assertion that there is nothing more that she could be taught. It is for the same reason that she also sees no value in further attending the classes and possibly the reason for her lack of motivation and her confessed lack of participation. When asked to specify why she has such a negative view of her classes, the subject explained that she does not like the topics that they had been dealing with in school so far and that the teacher should put more emphasis on culture and history of anglophone countries, for example. The student attributes the teacher's choice of topics to the teacher's reported strive to fit in with the group, possibly to compensate for a generation gap; which the student perceived as gratuitous.

When asked whether there was something that could improve her experience, she responded that she would certainly be interested in doing more stimulating exercises, such as extensive reading of challenging texts. The researcher also asked whether the student believes that she would benefit from being assigned more difficult writing exercises, such as extended essays, with which the student agreed.

Commentary:

Although this student initially appeared to be generally disinterested in her classes at school, it was later revealed through further discussion that the student's lack of enthusiasm was likely caused by being insufficiently challenged by assigned tasks; not so much the fact that this student had already attained CPE. The student's proficiency level did reflect in the VLT test in which she scored 14,000 words. On the other hand, results from the productive test show that there is room for improvement.

Subject 6: female, 15 years, first year of studies, advanced learner
Test results:
VLT:

1-2k	3-4k	5-6k	7-8k	9-10k	11-12k	13-14k	15-16k	17-18k	19-20k	Vocab. Size:	Variant:
90%	90%	100%	60%	80%	50%	30%	20%	10%	50%	**11 600**	**A**

Laufer & Nation:

2k	2-3k	3-5k	AVL	5-10k
100%	88%	72%	77%	55%

Observations:

Subject 6 started learning English at age eight. Outside school, she works on her English through self-teaching, watching films and tv shows in English, playing videogames and is an active participant in international chatrooms. Subject 6 is enthusiastic about studying languages in general – also studies French (at school), Welsh (self-taught) and is generally interested in linguistics, a field of study she aims to pursue further at university.

Unlike previously presented subjects, this student praised English classes at her school – students are appropriately distributed into groups, the load of classwork is distributed evenly and sometimes extended to ensure that students are engaged. The student admitted feeling that she was not advancing as fast as she expected but quickly dismissed this statement by adding that she is nonetheless satisfied overall.

When asked to self-evaluate herself, the student stated that she feels that she has a good grip of speaking skills but admitted that she struggles with writing, particularly with

spelling. She furthermore believes that the essential element of language faculty is grammar and syntax and that the best way to expand one's vocabulary size is by reading books. When asked to elaborate on her vocabulary skills, the student stated that her weak spot in vocabulary is scientific and academic terminology.

Commentary:

This student is obviously highly motivated and, for her age and year of school studies, significantly ahead of her peers in English. Despite being the youngest learner in the entire group of our subjects, she achieved an outstanding score in the receptive vocabulary test and in the productive test she placed among the best scores.

Subject 7: female, 17 years, third year of studies, advanced learner
Test results:
VLT:

1-2k	3-4k	5-6k	7-8k	9-10k	11-12k	13-14k	15-16k	17-18k	19-20k	Vocab. Size:	Variant:
100%	90%	70%	80%	80%	40%	40%	60%	50%	40%	**12 800**	B

Laufer & Nation productive test

2k	2-3k	3-5k	AVL	5-10k
77%	72%	50%	77%	44%

Observations:

This student's first language is Russian, but she started learning English, in which she believes to be more proficient than in Russian, at age three, at an English kindergarten in her country of origin. Subject 7 started studying Czech at age 6 when she immigrated into the Czech Republic with her family. Outside school, she practised her English mainly by through attending children's choir between ages 6 and 14 (the choir was predominantly formed of anglophone speakers and was led by an American). Apart from English, subject 7 also studies German and Spanish.

This student was overall dissatisfied with English classes at her school. The core of the problem probably lies in the fact that class' syllabus was not challenging enough for the students due to the materials and contents used being far under the level of the students (the student's personal view). Another problem this student complained about was the

lack of room for the development of productive skills – the classes are focussed too much on exam preparation. The exercises that they are usually assigned are furthermore far to easy for the student. When asked whether she believes that extensive reading of, e.g. scientific literature, could help improve the quality of classes, the student strongly agreed.

When asked to self-evaluate her English, the student reported that she often found herself struggling with vocabulary, particularly with spelling. Paradoxically, this student believes that vocabulary is the key to successful communication.

Commentary

This student is well aware of her weaker spots, yet she is also able to discern certain inefficiencies in her teacher, who, despite being a native speaker, possibly failed to provide a sufficient number of learning opportunities for the students, and it shows, if not in their judgment of their class, then in their scores. On the other hand, practising more general topics as opposed to specific ones appears to be not so much out of place, as, like most of her peers, this student also exhibits lack of productive skills in vocabulary and that already from 2k level.

Subject 8: male, age 19, final year of study, bilingual
Test results:
VLT:

1-2k	3-4k	5-6k	7-8k	9-10k	11-12k	13-14k	15-16k	17-18k	19-20k	Vocab. Size:	Variant:
100%	90%	70%	50%	70%	50%	0%	40%	20%	30%	**10 400**	B

Laufer & Nation productive test

2k	2-3k	3-5k	AVL	5-10k
94%	44%	50%	38%	27%

Observations:

This student is somewhat unique, partially because of his background, but also because he is the only student who studies at a different school – technical school specialised in air traffic control. Subject 8 was born in Moscow but was at his one year of age his family moved to London where they stayed until his four years of age when they moved to Prague.

At age seven, he had to attend speech expert classes, studied at Waldorf school but was later moved to a more standard Czech elementary school for the school's failure at providing sufficient learning opportunities. Since then, he has been working on his Czech with which he has always struggled whilst always excelling in English classes – always had been above average until secondary school, at 7th grade of elementary school he attended a language school classes for a month (FCE preparation courses), at 6th grade the student admits having struggled with English - not enough exposure - friends and family were too busy, and exposure was - by his own words - minimal.

has relatives living in anglophone countries, 50-50 English-Czech friends with whom he communicates on a daily basis (social networks or meetings), whose Czech is at a very basic level.

Overall, he does not see much value in attending English classes as his teacher shows lack of interest in him and tends to simply pretend that he is, by his own words, an "invisible man", which, ironically, is not as accurate – the student struggles with spelling despite showing a great level of eloquence[7]. His teacher's negligence, moreover, demonstrated perfectly in his scores – his vocabulary, which he believes to be essential for language faculty, rendered 10,400 words, and his productive test results were the second-worst score in the 5-10k level. His lower score in the productive test can be attributed, however, to his spelling errors.

On the other hand, the student furthermore admitted struggling with English grammar, which to him is paradoxical, as he considers English to be his dominant language. Yet the biggest issue he sees with his English classes at his school is in the fact that they are too grammar-centred and to an absurd degree and also in the way the Czech school system portrays and teaches grammar and that, in his own words, "too much pressure and focus is put on the textbook. The thing is, it's too indoctrinated and unnatural." (authentic quote, transcribed)

---

[7] the observation discussion was the longest in duration, as he was generally very talkative and obviously native-speaker fluent

When prompted by the examiner to express what he would like to be changed about his classes, the student stated that he would welcome some form of vocabulary expansion - even if through tests and exercises, and some intellectually and vocabulary-wise challenging texts, whether classic literature (including Shakespeare) or some scientific articles or academic writing exercises such as essay writing of at least 1500 words, for example.

Commentary:

This student's case is particularly interesting for two main reasons: firstly, for the discrepancy between his family's educational background and his scores in our tests; secondly, for the correlation between the way he was taught and his results – his teachers' neglect shows perfectly in his scores. For it does not seem that this student would not be able to meet the demands of his school or even more challenging tests, as his receptive vocabulary size still enables him to read academic texts; but that should be attributed to his passion for reading. This student represents an example of the effect of what happens when a bilingual student turns into an 'invisible man': failure at providing sufficiently challenging learning material leads towards low-achieving.

Subject 9: Female, 16 years, first year of studies, advanced learner
Test results:
VLT:

1-2k	3-4k	5-6k	7-8k	9-10k	11-12k	13-14k	15-16k	17-18k	19-20k	Vocab. Size:	Variant:
80%	80%	60%	70%	80%	50%	50%	30%	20%	20%	**10 400**	A

Laufer & Nation productive test

2k	2-3k	3-5k	AVL	5-10k
83%	66%	61%	44%	33%

Observations:

This student started learning English in the kindergarten, then continued at elementary school, with extra-curricular private tutoring. She has two American native speaker tutors and three friends from the USA, one of whom is a language exchange penfriend (Czech-English).

This student is generally satisfied with English classes at her school – she feels sufficiently challenged, and overall sees the value in her classes. There is nothing she would like to be improved.

Commentary:

This student is the only student who was fully satisfied with the way English is taught at her school. Her test results more or less reflect her level and age and, like with all the rest of our subjects, showed significant deficiency in productive vocabulary.

Subject 10: Female, 18 years, third year of studies, advanced learner
Test results:
VLT:

1-2k	3-4k	5-6k	7-8k	9-10k	11-12k	13-14k	15-16k	17-18k	19-20k	Vocab. Size:	Variant:
90%	90%	90%	80%	90%	80%	40%	30%	20%	60%	**13 600**	A

Laufer & Nation productive test

2k	2-3k	3-5k	AVL	5-10k
83%	72%	66%	72%	50%

Observations:

This student started learning English roughly at age 11 through school education. Apart from school, she expands her vocabulary by watching tv shows, reading books in the target language, listening to music and also used to attend drama classes in English in grade 3.

Her drive for studying English is motivated by "the way it sounds" and also the fact that English is a Lingua Franca. Although she does not have any anglophone relatives, she frequently attends concerts, which she perceives as an excellent opportunity to practise speaking.

She is generally dissatisfied with her current teacher, a native speaker. Much like with our other subjects, the problem this student perceives with the classes mostly lies in the fact that the exercises or activities they are assigned are insufficiently challenging and only recycle grammar structures which the students are already familiar with (or so they

believe). Another problem that the student mentioned was a lack of structure from the teacher's part – the teacher reportedly just converses with the student.

When asked whether she is aware of any potential improvements for her experience with her English classes, the student responded that she would like to be more engaged through challenging tasks such as reading English literary canon and vocabulary-building exercises. The student furthermore stated that she had been more satisfied with her previous teacher, a Czech speaker, with whose methods the student was satisfied more.

Commentary:

This student's views of her English classes and particularly her current teacher correspond with those of our other subjects. This student was also more satisfied with her previous teacher, a Czech person.

Subject 11: Male, 18, third year, advanced learner
Test results:
VLT:

1-2k	3-4k	5-6k	7-8k	9-10k	11-12k	13-14k	15-16k	17-18k	19-20k	Vocab. Size:	Variant:
100%	90%	80%	80%	100%	50%	60%	60%	80%	70%	**15 400**	B

Laufer & Nation productive test

2k	2-3k	3-5k	AVL	5-10k
83%	83%	55%	83%	55%

Observations:

This student's family background is somewhat complicated – his mother is a Czech-native-speaker teacher of English, and his father is a native speaker of Portuguese. However, the language of communication at home is English and Czech, other than home, having no strictly anglophone peers, the student does not have many other opportunities to practice his productive English. He could, therefore, technically be considered as partially bilingual, but English used in the household is limited to basic general interaction, and neither of his parents is an English native speaker. Hence the student was categorised strictly as an advanced learner student, not a bilingual.

Subject 11 started taking classes as a very young child, age 5, through auditing his mother's classes. He has never studied actively on his own, just by "attending" classes. On the one hand, this student seems to find enjoyment in his current English classes: "it is the only lesson where you can talk about anything, and it is quite fun"; but on the other hand, the student stated that he does not think that the English classes "are [there] to help anyone with English in general" and that he never expect to learn much new from those classes. When asked whether this could somehow be improved, he expressed his request for more systematicity of the class structure. When asked if there was something he would like to do more in the classes, the student stated that he would like to expand his metalanguage.

Commentary:

This student's views seem rather pragmatic and discerning. After all, he plans on studying maths at a prestigious Czech institution. He scored the highest points in both of our tests. Interestingly. Interestingly, this student's suggestion for improvement was "more structure", which confirms what other subjects indirectly touched upon – lack of structure of classes.

Subject 12: Female, 19 years, final year of studies, foreign exchange
Test results:
VLT:

1-2k	3-4k	5-6k	7-8k	9-10k	11-12k	13-14k	15-16k	17-18k	19-20k	Vocab. Size:	Variant:
80%	80%	40%	40%	30%	30%	10%	0%	0%	20%	**6 100**	A

Laufer & Nation productive test

2k	2-3k	3-5k	AVL	5-10k
77%	44%	44%	66%	16%

Observations:

This student has spent one year in Florida, studying at Fort Walton Beach High School, about a year ago prior to our interview with her. She is a high achiever in the Czech junior basketball league, which takes up most of her free time. She is a holder of the FCE Grade B certificate and is considering taking CAE exams.

Apart from her father's cousin, who lives in the United States, she keeps in touch with other exchange students whom she met during her stay. Outside school, she contributes to her English skills rather passively, through watching tv shows and listening to music, to which she attributes her fluency and also considers it to be the best way to expand one's vocabulary, alongside with reading books.

She is aware that "for the fact that [she has] been to the USA for a year, [her] English could be better, particularly in grammar." (authentic quote, transcribed) After completing her secondary education, she would like to travel or study in England. She also believes that vocabulary is the most important element of language faculty, which, however, did not project well into her skills, as she scored the lowest of all of our subjects, even despite having stayed the longest of all our foreign-exchange students in an anglophone country.

On the other hand, this student was generally satisfied with her teacher, although her praise was for the fact that the English classes are good mostly "not because of English [language] but more for the topics that the class discusses, like new vocabulary, not really grammar." (authentic quote, transcribed)

Commentary:

This student was much more lenient in her teaching reviews than other subjects. Possibly due to the fact that her vocabulary size is remarkably small, spanning merely up to B2 level with relatively low scores in the productive test – below borderline score in all levels, which is quite striking if we consider that she had spent an entire year in an anglophone country and regularly stays in touch with anglophone and international peers with whom she regularly communicates in English. This student is another living proof that excellent grammar and fluency may be somewhat misleading in measuring proficiency, and that there is still a great deal of material that even students who have returned from a long-term stay in an anglophone country have yet to learn.

5.4.2 Conclusive remarks: Tests

As the test results show, the students do, indeed have a wide-spanning receptive vocabulary – all but one of the students had receptive vocabulary over 10,000, which would correspond with first-year university students in the UK, as previously illustrated by Milton & Treffers-Daller (2013). This means that their receptive vocabulary size is between CPE and native-speaker level (see sections 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2). What was also proven, however, is that this applies only to their receptive vocabulary: their productive vocabulary leaves a great deal to be desired, which confirms our hypothesis that the subjects' vocabulary indeed is inadequate.

To summarise with respect to *lexical thresholds* (discussed in section 2.2.1), our subjects may possess all that it takes to be able to read or listen to a great variety of written or spoken texts on a relatively wide span of topics while understanding 90 % of the given texts without any difficulty, which a big portion of the students commented about in the case study. Judging by their results in productive vocabulary, however, they are less likely to be able to provide equally complicated texts in speech or writing.

5.5 Conclusive remarks: overall

It is rather tricky with data of this nature to provide many generalisations - students varied in age, study background and focus of their studies as well as in by which teachers they were taught. It could be said, however, that all our subjects showed relatively similar results at the same lexical levels. However, the purpose of this study was to set a profile of a typical bilingual, advanced or foreign-exchange-experienced student, and to find out what expectations these students have of their classes, to test their vocabulary size and to provide a set of recommendations for teachers, which was successfully achieved. As a by-product of the study, we could furthermore identify some of the students' personal beliefs about proficiency in the language as well as from which components of English language studies they may potentially benefit.

Firstly, all of the students exhibited a high degree of autonomy – most of them are highly motivated to study on their own. Secondly, the majority of our subjects expressed a high degree of interest in reading scientific literature and other challenging literature. Thirdly, native-speaker teachers do not automatically guarantee students' satisfaction. The core

of the issue in this concrete case, based on our subjects' reports, lies in the teacher's failure to assess her students' level correctly, as a result of which students were presented with materials that were not challenging enough for them. On the other hand, the problem may also be caused by the receptive-productive gap – the students generally understand vocabulary from a wide array of topics but fail to express themselves at an equally high level, which inevitably results in the impression of being at a significantly lower level than they are in reality.

Fourthly, reports from our subjects revealed that the methods that the teachers usually use are generally language-oriented, rather than content-oriented. The results posit that it would probably be more fruitful to focus more on the content of what the words represent and not so much on the vocabulary as such since mere process-learning of words only leads to their temporary memorisation, but not their retention. Such knowledge of that word is not deep enough and thus very likely to swift back into the passive vocabulary – i.e. the student understands the word but is not able to use it actively when prompted.

Finally, while it is definitely advisable to ensure that the teacher's vocabulary size keeps up with the student's, mostly the highest level of receptive vocabulary size a student can have did not exceed the number of 15,000 word families. Teachers do not need to be far exceeding the standards in order to keep up with their advanced students. Contrarily, the key is to focus on productive vocabulary.

To summarise, although advanced students or bilinguals may appear to have a native-like level of English which usually manifests through their pronunciation and fluency, asking them more specific questions on more specific (yet still quite common) vocabulary will likely startle them and reveal their gaps in knowledge. Evidence and arguments mentioned above thus lead to the conclusion that there is no doubt an area in which lies a vast opportunity to learn and expand, and that is productive vocabulary.

6   Profiles

Below is a set of profiles of learner types based on findings from the previously presented survey. Individual learner types contain delineation of indicators as well as

recommendations for approaches. Please note that since only two bilingual students and three foreign-exchange students participated in this survey, the generalisations in the following respective sections are to be taken strictly as orientational. Subsequent implications were drawn upon overlapping findings from the questionnaires and results from the tests.

6.1 Learner types

Here are broadened descriptions of typical traits that could be expected to be exhibited by the respective learner type. The set is followed by a definition of traits that are shared by all three types.

6.1.1 Bilingual student

Since one student had very advanced vocabulary size – over 14k words, whilst the other had a vocabulary size rounding between 10-11k, it cannot be said whether bilinguals' vocabulary size is generally expectable to be either large or small. It can, however, be said, judging by results from Laufer & Nation's productive test, that productive vocabulary could be challenging even for bilinguals with native speaker vocabulary size.

A bilingual student could, therefore, be expected to have native-like pronunciation, potentially with a wide-spanning receptive vocabulary size, but not so rich a productive vocabulary which might show when asked to speak about less generally known topics that may contain more specific terms such as specialised kitchenware or other. In terms of study needs and expectations of the students, it is recommended to investigate the student's background prior to assuming a method. One thing to consider is the frequency of contact with the target language as well as the family background. The female of the two students, for example, stated that she keeps in touch with her British father, but whilst she studies in the Czech Republic, her father resides in his country of origin. On the other hand, the male of the two students' father is resided in the capital city and is in close contact with his son, yet the female student's results were overall much higher than the male student's results. It is important to note, however, that the female student attributes her vocabulary enrichment to her teacher as well as to her being an ardent reader, whilst the male student attributes his vocabulary's enrichment to reading, but also to videogaming.

The third factor at play here is the age of onset: the female student moved to the Czech Republic at age eight and stayed in the United Kingdom until that age, whilst the family of the male student, who started his elementary education in the Czech Republic, moved to the Czech Republic already when the subject was four years of age.

Evidence from our data posits that there is always a room for improvement that is, in fact, perceived even by the students. There is no need, therefore, to feel that the student would automatically prefer not to engage in classroom activities. Rather, it is in the *type* of task they are doing. It seems counterproductive to try to force the students to perform basic grammar exercises, but as subject 8 confessed, more complex grammar structures might present a major challenge even to a very fluent bilingual so engaging the student in grammar for B1+ levels is recommended.

It is furthermore recommended to perform diagnostics of vocabulary knowledge with the help of VLT test and the productive vocabulary test to see how well the students are doing in the given segment of lexical levels as this may help to better determine which area of language to focus on. If the student's vocabulary size is between 10-12k and not higher, it is advisable to see how in-depth their knowledge of individual segments is if they score below 88% in individual segments – as all of our subjects did without a single exception – it is recommended to assign the student exercises that ensure productive vocabulary enrichment within that given area. For that purpose, CPE Use of English open clause exercises should suffice.

6.1.2 Students with a foreign-exchange experience

Foreign-exchange students represent a group that is difficult to tackle in terms of skills. Students of this type could be expected to have improved receptive skills (Milton & Meara, 1995). As results from our test revealed, however, the vocabulary size of this type of advanced students is highly individual.

The recommended method to apply would, therefore, be the same as with bilingual students, with the only exception that these students will often have a good grasp of

advanced grammar as they are usually required to provide a certificate of acquisition of the required language skills level, the minimum required level is usually B2.

Our findings potentially invite for a more in-depth investigation into further factors at play with foreign exchanges and their effects on vocabulary learning, for as it turns out, our results show somewhat heterogeneous data that may not disprove Milton & Meara's claims, but it definitely does not support them.

6.1.3   Advanced learner

Finally, advanced learners, who were the most populated group in our research, proved that general perception of proficiency is vastly overrated. While a student can have C1 grammar, it does not mean that their vocabulary is at the same degree and vice versa. Most of our subjects had achieved a high level of proficiency already before entering secondary education, whether through engaging in extracurricular English courses or through having attended very demanding language-specialised elementary schools. It could thus be expected that advanced learners usually have an excellent grammar.

What is the underlying factor, however, has proven to be not necessarily the vocabulary size, but rather the expressive vocabulary: a highly-proficient student with C2-level vocabulary size may still struggle to use even B2 tier words fluently. The students are therefore likely to understand a wide span of vocabulary from a wide array of topics and can achieve a high level of accuracy in grammar tests, but they may often struggle with fluency. The recommended method is, therefore, the same as with foreign exchange students.

6.2   Overlapping features

In general, it might be a challenging task to accommodate to demands of a high achieving student, especially when the students are usually convinced that there is very little to be achieved at their level of proficiency. Such false belief is often based upon the ease with which they communicate with their peers, rather than on measurable data such as vocabulary size. As this research successfully illustrated, there is often a great deal to be

desired in order to achieve a native-speaker level in terms of vocabulary size, particularly productive vocabulary size.

The results furthermore revealed that it is less probable that students will have vocabulary size spanning over 13,000 words. The native-speaker level in question furthermore mostly expresses only through surface-level proficiency in vocabulary, which, however, is likely to reveal its deficiency whenever the student needs to use more specific vocabulary.

On the other hand, students are usually aware of their deficit vocabulary, just in slightly different areas – they believe that they should learn more scientific terminology, where in fact, they may sometimes even need to revise the very general basics. The students' proficiency is, therefore, to be certainly praised, but it should by no means become an excuse for their lack of engagement in-class activities. Instead, they should be further engaged in order to further expand their knowledge; only through more specific sets of tasks that provide enough challenge as well as opportunity to learn more vocabulary.

7 Suggestions for teachers

7.1 General comments

As previously stated, it advisable to test your students with the VLT and Laufer & Nation tests to determine their vocabulary breadth and depth. Apart from establishing a certain authority in the class over potentially overconfident students, it will also enable teachers to see what type of exercises or classwork to do with the students. Another recommendation is to let the students work individually and autonomously as they should be experienced enough to be fully autonomous – no controlled practice is therefore needed. Ideally, classroom materials should be sufficiently challenging texts fortified with scaffolding and essays or seminar papers, which would enable them to put all of their already acquired knowledge into practice. More in-depth recommendations are presented below.

7.2 Focus on expressive vocabulary

As previously stated, one of the teacher's main concerns should be the students' productive vocabulary. While conversations may indeed be helpful in that matter, it may as well be counterproductive without the necessary input and recycling of some of the acquired vocabulary. Lexical levels above the 5k contain words that are related to more specific contexts, but still common enough to be needed for more in-depth communication on various topics.

7.2.1 Debates

A portion of our subjects praised conversational classes as they offer room for their engagement in the class activity and yet potentially learn something new about global problems. With the debates, however, there is a considerable risk of them becoming repetitive and later stop providing enough input as well as of the student's loss of interest in the topics. The key is, therefore, to ensure the topics are not cyclical.

7.2.1.1 Proficiency in speaking ≠ proficiency in writing

During the testing with Laufer & Nation tests, some students did not score several points due to misspelling of words, which indicates that although the students may be prolific in fluency, pronunciation and possibly even in vocabulary, which reflects in their enthusiasm for debates and conversations, they are prone to making spelling errors.

Indeed, many of the students' input comes out of watching films and communicating with their anglophone peers, which usually contains semi-formal language at its best and especially if we take into account spelling conventions of chatrooms, this is not sufficient for the correct spelling[8]. One student even admits that she may be lacking in the area of formal language. Given that these students are supposedly advanced, therefore C1 CEFR level, and appropriateness and registers are usually taught already at B1, this represents another potential niche waiting to be filled.

7.2.2 Learner autonomy

On the other hand, the other keyword judging by answers from most of our subjects is *learner autonomy*. Although the students do appreciate debates and conversation-based activities, they would not mind being challenged with difficult, dense texts through reading of which they would be prompted to expand their vocabulary and factual knowledge. Apart from those students who feel that they are sufficiently challenged in their classes, the main problem some of the students had was the fact that they were tired of having to do the same type of grammar activities or exercises which usually contain structures they mostly already know. This is partially caused by the Czech school system's rigid fixation on the use of textbooks. Such teaching style may be efficient in getting lower levels to higher levels with good grades, but sadly, it appears to omit further development of more advanced students.

What the students need and are challenging materials that will enable them to apply their honed skills. The key is autonomy, for students at this level no longer require such a high degree of controlled practice. Instead, they need enough space to express themselves, for which debates may be useful, but possibly inefficient – in a class of 15 people, there is only minimal space for individual monologues. An excellent substitute for that are essays. Although it is a written exercise, for successful completion of such task, the student is required to apply most of their language skills except for speaking.

---

[8] Spelling affects marks in Czech schools marking system; we do acknowledge arguments against correcting spelling as provided by *English as a Lingua Franca* school, but it must be taken into account that these are ambitious students at a highly advanced level and not teaching them elementary spelling conventions would be a missed opportunity.

Writing essays will furthermore help these students improve their academic writing and will overall help improve their expressive vocabulary while enabling them to learn how to structure their arguments and convey their thoughts which in turn leads to better academic writing. To further ensure the deepening of the students' knowledge in vocabulary between 3 and 10k word families, it may help to assign them shorter essays. To further practice higher-frequency words, it is recommended to focus on a particular topic and recycle some of the vocabulary (Thornburry, 2002).

The potential conclusion to draw here therefore is, while it is important to have students engage in debating activities, autonomous studying of assigned materials incorporated into the teaching could provide fruitful results. This form of exercise should not, however, replace other activities, but sooner enrich the overall class load as one of the other potential benefits could be lesser frontal teaching and more learner input with the productive outcome on the student's part.

7.2.3 Extensive reading

While Macalister & Nation (2013) suggest applying extensive reading exercises, Woodinsky & Nation (1988) recommend using graded readers. Both could be useful tools if combined appropriately: with students this advanced, it would be advisable to use more complex reading, including authentic texts appropriate for extensive reading. However, since the students have shown a significant deficiency in vocabulary, it would be more appropriate to start with graded readers.

7.2.4 Solution – CLIL?

From the questionnaires, it became apparent that students generally expect more CLIL-oriented teaching style. On the one hand, this may largely be a product of a stern learner belief based on lack of experience, but on the other hand, it could also be an appeal for a different method that stemmed from frustration with repetitive and tedious tasks.

By applying CLIL methods may not necessarily mean to change the entire syllabus or introducing densely scientific topics from life sciences. Majority of our subjects showed enthusiasm for culture and facts about the world, a substantial portion of our subjects furthermore confessed their interest in Shakespearean literature, and all subjects even

agreed that they would be interested in reading scientific literature to expand their vocabulary knowledge.

Therefore, the recommendation is to apply a form of CLIL that involves fact-learning about culture and literature of anglophone countries, for example, with students at learner-levels which enable more learner-independent approach. A perfect tool to incorporate would be essay writing as it enables the student to produce a coherent textual output where the students can apply a wide range of vocabulary.

7.2.5 Native speaker teacher

The teacher whom the students described in our survey was, apparently, not to their standards. What the students mostly criticised was the teacher's general failure to assess the students' level due to which the teacher reportedly presented students with unchallenging materials.

While this teacher may be a unique case, it still reflects the false belief that native speakers are inherently more suitable for higher-level students than non-native speakers. In reality, this belief was disproven by our subjects' responses. In fact, what students at this level expect is learning *through* the language, not *about* the language, or just the language itself; which requires knowledge of various resources, not so much the target language.

On the other hand, a significant portion of our respondents complained about their non-native-speaker teachers' frequent pronunciation and grammar errors. This is something that the native speakers should be there for – to monitor and ensure proper pronunciation and correct grammar or lexical errors appropriately. Therefore, an ideal method should incorporate the use of both the native and non-native speaker teachers.

8   Conclusion

The primary purpose of this thesis was to investigate vocabulary knowledge of bilinguals and advanced learners in the Czech curriculum as well as to verify the hypothesis that our subjects' vocabulary is inadequate and therefore needs to be attended to more adequately through Paul Nation's VLT test and a Laufer & Nation productive test. Results from the VLT test revealed that our study subjects might have a large receptive vocabulary size that could enable them to understand 90% of the majority of texts. There was only one exception to the rule – one subject whose vocabulary size was, based on their test results, at B2 level.

On the other hand, results from Laufer & Nation Productive Vocabulary Test revealed that our subjects' productive vocabulary size is relatively insufficient. With most cases, it could be said that although they may understand a wide span of vocabulary, our subjects struggle with productive vocabulary already from the 4,000-words tier.

The second goal of this thesis was to provide a set of profiles of bilinguals and advanced learners and subsequently to provide a battery of recommendations for their teachers. Although it was impossible to draw many generalisations with this small number of subjects, it could be expected that all of the three categories of students, as was shown in the test results, struggle with vocabulary, whether to a greater or to a smaller degree, which subsequently postulates that there indeed is something that even advanced students, foreign exchange students and bilinguals can be helped with; it is vocabulary, particularly productive vocabulary.

The case studies revealed that the majority of our subjects did not find much value in further attending the classes. Additional questions from the researcher revealed, however, that majority of the subjects are still open to continue attending classes but would prefer a different method. The conclusion is that the students are mostly advanced enough to be allowed a higher degree of autonomy. Majority of our subjects furthermore agreed that they would gladly write seminar papers or read challenging literature.

Based on the students' reviews from the case study, the key recommendations are to enable the students to work individually, provide them with sufficiently challenging texts that would enable them to expand their vocabulary, and let them produce more extended essays to give them enough opportunity to improve their productive vocabulary.

In light of the previously mentioned findings and subsequent conclusions, the recommended future research is to investigate the efficiency of the previously recommended methods as well as to test more subjects to provide further data so that there is eventually more possibility to draw some generalisations.

Caveats of the research method

The tests are relatively unfair in that they select random words from the given lexical level profile, and the student gets points for that only. If the student, for example, were very unlucky and did not know only the words from the given questions, but otherwise knew all of the rest, we would not be able to tell.

While it was possible to quantitatively identify which tiers of vocabulary the students lack in, it was not possible to determine which areas of vocabulary topic-wise the students may be lacking in. Such a study would, however, require an entirely different method, potentially more longitudinal type of research, with a different set of tests. The underlying issue with the lexical profiling is that the tiers gather the vocabulary solely according to their frequency of occurrence, which means that each grouping of 1,000 words is compiled of entirely unrelated topics, perhaps except for the first three tiers. Concerning ELT, profiling makes it challenging to apply when trying to redress a lack of knowledge in individual tiers. If a student has only 44% productive vocabulary in tier 5-10k words, for example, how is the teacher to know which topics to teach the student more? True, there are graded readers, for example, that allow for expansion of receptive vocabulary, but prompting appropriate usage of the given words is a different challenge, that invites for further exploration.

Another problem was the vocabulary tests' scoring method. Only one subject's results differed drastically to those that proved to be roughly similar, proving the tests' accuracy, to a certain degree; but what if the student (subject 12) with results so poor was simply so unlucky to have been asked precisely those words which she did not happen to be familiar with? The only possible way to verify would be to have the student resit the test with the second variants of the tests and compare results with the other pair of tests. On the other hand, the student scored poorly both in VLT as in the productive test, showing a great deal of lacking in all tiers except for borderline score at 2k level.

Bibliografie

Bates, E. and Goodman, J.C. (2013) "On the emergence of grammar from the lexicon." *The emergence of language*. Psychology Press, 2013. 47-98.

Bialystok, Ellen, et al. (2010) "Receptive vocabulary differences in monolingual and bilingual children." Bilingualism: Language and Cognition 13.4: 525-531.

Burger, A., and I. Chong. (2011) "Receptive vocabulary." *Encyclopedia of child behavior and development*: 1231-1231.

Cervatiuc, A. (2007) "Assessing second language vocabulary knowledge." *International Forum of Teaching and Studies*. Vol. 3. No. 3. American Scholars Press, Inc.

Cobb, T. "Computing the vocabulary demands of L2 reading." *Language Learning & Technology* 11.3 (2007): 38-63.

Cobb, T., & Horst, M. (1990). Vocabulary sizes of some City University students. *Nation*, 242.

De Houwer, A., Bornstein, M.H. and Putnick, D.L., (2014). "A bilingual–monolingual comparison of young children's vocabulary size: Evidence from comprehension and production." *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 35(6), pp.1189-1211.

Dornic, S., 1980. Language dominance, spare capacity and perceived effort in bilinguals. Ergonomics, 23(4), pp.369-377.

Gathercole, V.C.M. and Thomas, E.M., (2009). "Bilingual first-language development: Dominant language takeover, threatened minority language take-up". *Bilingualism: language and cognition*, 12(2), pp.213-237.

Genesee, F., Nicoladis, E. and Paradis, J., (1995). "Language differentiation in early bilingual development". *Journal of child language*, 22(3), pp.611-631.

Gibson, T. A., Oller, D. K., Jarmulowicz, L., & Ethington, C. A. (2012). "The receptive-expressive gap in the vocabulary of young second-language learners: Robustness and possible mechanisms." *Bilingualism* (Cambridge, England), 15(1), 102–116.

Goulden, R., Nation, P. and Read, J., (1990). How large can a receptive vocabulary be?. *Applied linguistics*, 11(4), pp.341-363.

Greidanus, T., Bogaards, P., van der Linden, E., Nienhuis, L., & de Wolf, T. (2004). The construction and validation of a deep word knowledge test for advanced learners of French. *Vocabulary in a second language: Selection, acquisition, and testing*, 191-208.

Gyllstad, H., Vilkaitė, L. and Schmitt, N., (2015). "Assessing vocabulary size through multiple-choice formats: Issues with guessing and sampling rates." *ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 166(2), pp.278-306.

Klein, Denise, et al. "Age of language learning shapes brain structure: a cortical thickness study of bilingual and monolingual individuals." Brain and language 131 (2014): 20-24.

Kremmel, B., & Schmitt, N. (2018). Vocabulary levels test. *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*, 1-7.

Laufer, B., and Geke C. Ravenhorst-Kalovski. (2010) "Lexical Threshold Revisited: Lexical Text Coverage, Learners' Vocabulary Size and Reading Comprehension." *Reading in a foreign language 22.1*: 15-30.

Laufer, Batia, and Paul Nation. (1999) "A vocabulary-size test of controlled productive ability." *Language testing 16.1*: 33-51.

Laufer, Batia, and Paul Nation. (1995) "Vocabulary size and use: Lexical richness in L2 written production." *Applied linguistics 16.3*: 307-322.

Lextutor.ca/tests/

Luk, G., & BIALYSTOK, E. (2012). Receptive vocabulary differences in monolingual and bilingual adults. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*.

Macalister, J. and Nation, I.S.P., 2013. Case studies in language curriculum design: Concepts and approaches in action around the world. Taylor & Francis.

Meara, P. M. (1992). *EFL vocabulary tests*. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse.

Milton, J. and Donzelli, G. (2013) "The lexicon," in Herschensohn, J. and Young-Scholten, M. (eds) *The Cambridge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Milton, J. and Thomaï A. (2009) "Vocabulary size and the common European framework of reference for languages." *Vocabulary studies in first and second language acquisition*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. 194-211.

Milton, J., and Treffers-Daller, J. (2013) "Vocabulary size revisited: the link between vocabulary size and academic achievement." *Applied Linguistics Review* 4.1: 151-172.

Milton, J., and Meara P. (1995) "How periods abroad affect vocabulary growth in a foreign language." *ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 107.1: 17-34.

Mondria, J.A. and Wiersma, B., (2004). Receptive, productive, and receptive+ productive L2 vocabulary learning: What difference does it make. Vocabulary in a second language: Selection, acquisition, and testing, 15(1), pp.79-100.

Nagy, William E., and Richard C. Anderson. (1984) "How many words are there in printed school English?." *Reading research quarterly*: 304-330.

Nation, I. (2006). "How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening?". *Canadian modern language review*, *63*(1), 59-82.

Nation, P. and Coady, J., (1988). "Vocabulary and reading". *Vocabulary and language teaching*, 97, p.110.

Nation, P. and Waring, R., (1997). "Vocabulary size, text coverage and word lists". *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy*, 14, pp.6-19.

Read, J. (2004) "vocabulary knowledge be defined?." Vocabulary in a second language: Selection, acquisition, and testing 10 (2004): 209.

Read, J., (2004). Plumbing the depths: How should the construct of vocabulary knowledge be defined?. Vocabulary in a second language: Selection, acquisition, and testing, 10, p.209.

Schmitt, N. (2010) *Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual*. Springer.

Schmitt, N. (1998) "Tracking the incremental acquisition of second language vocabulary: A longitudinal study." *Language learning* 48.2: 281-317.

Schütz, R., (2007). "Stephen Krashen's theory of second language acquisition". *English made in Brazil*, 2(2), p.2007.

Siváková, L., 2012. Bilingvismus se zvláštním zaměřením na výuku češtiny pro bilingvní děti s francouzštinou jako druhým mateřským jazykem (diplomová práce).

Sorace, A., Serratrice, L., Filiaci, F. and Baldo, M., (2009). "Discourse conditions on subject pronoun realization: Testing the linguistic intuitions of older bilingual children." *Lingua*, 119(3), pp.460-477.

Stenner, A. J. (1996). Measuring Reading Comprehension with the Lexile Framework.

Thordardottir, E. (2011) "The relationship between bilingual exposure and vocabulary development." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 15.4 (2011): 426-445.

Webb, S., 2008. Receptive and productive vocabulary sizes of L2 learners. Studies in Second language acquisition, 30(1), pp.79-95.

Webb, S. (2008) "Receptive and productive vocabulary sizes of L2 learners." *Studies in Second language acquisition* 30.1: 79-95.

https://www.wgtn.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/paul-nation

https://public.oed.com/how-to-use-the-oed/key-to-frequency/

https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/

https://www.coe.int/en/web/portfolio/the-common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching-assessment-cefr-

http://webapp.cal.org/FLAD/FLADDetails.aspx?id=178

Webb, S., & Nation, P. (2017). *How vocabulary is learned*. Oxford University Press.

Wesche, M., & Paribakht, T. S. (1996). Assessing second language vocabulary knowledge: Depth versus breadth. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *53*(1), 13-40.

Wodinsky, M., & Nation, P. (1988). Learning from graded readers.

Resumé (česky)

Hlavním cílem této práce bylo ověřit hypotézu, že pokročilí a nadaní studenti či bilingválové hodinách angličtiny mají navzdory své vysoké pokročilosti nedostatky ve slovní zásobě. Druhým cílem práce bylo sestavit typický profil takových žáků, a na základě zjištění získaných během šetření poskytnout několik doporučení pro učitele tohoto typu žáků.

Teoretická část práce je rozdělena do dvou hlavních oddílů. První z těchto dvou oddílů se věnuje fenoménu slovní zásoby. Druhý z těchto oddílů se zabývá typologií pokročilých žáků a bilingvizmem. Z citovaných zdrojů vyplývá, že slovní zásobu je potřeba vnímat ze dvou dimenzí: šíře a hloubka. Šíří slovní zásoby se rozumí rozsah slovní zásoby – kolik slov člověk může znát. Hloubka slovní zásoby pak určuje, do jaké míry mluvčí může slovo znát – zda pouze slovu rozumí, nebo zda je schopen dotyčný člověk jak slovu porozumět, tak jej správně vyslovit, napsat a používat ve vhodném kontextu. Pro tuto práci nejrelevantnější je přístup „receptivní/produktivní" slovní zásoba. Receptivní slovní zásoba je slovní zásoba slov, který mluvčí zná – má o nich povědomí, a porozumí jim. Produktivní slovní zásoba je zásoba slov, která mluvčí dovede aktivně používat. Slovní zásoba produktivní je zpravidla vždy menší než receptivní. Je-li však rozdíl mezi oběma slovními zásobami příliš velký, jak bylo zjištěno u bilingvních dětí, jedná se o jev zvaný „receptive-productive gap". V oblasti slovní zásoby jazyka je dále pro kontext práce důležité brát na vědomí rozdělení slovní zásoby do tzv. úrovní slovní zásoby (angl. „vocabulary levels"), což je rozdělení slovní zásoby do několika úrovní dle 1000 slov na základě statistického rozdělení podle frekvence výskytu – tzv. Zipfova zákona, kde první dvě skupiny slov jsou slova nejčastěji užívaná. Do prvních pěti tisíců slov pak patří slovní zásoba nutná pro porozumění většiny běžnějších mluvených a psaných textů. Z výzkumů např. Gouldena, Reada a Nationa, nebo Schmitta vyplývá, že slovní zásoba vysokoškolsky vzdělaného rodilého mluvčího se pohybuje mezi 14 000 a 20 000 slov, avšak z výzkumu Miltona a Treffers-Dallerové vyplývá, že většina rodilých mluvčích má v prvním ročníku na univerzitě slovní zásobu o 10 000 slovech, což je pro porozumění akademických textů nedostačující. Během studia se však tito studenti dostávají zpravidla na úroveň nejméně 15 000 slov. Tato zjištění jsou důležitá pro pochopení výsledků výzkumu: pokud jeden ze studentů například dosáhne úrovně kolem 14 000 slov receptivní slovní zásoby, znamená to, že bude schopen porozumět i akademickému textu. Po vysvětlení klíčových pojmů

z oblasti bádání práce představuje metody testování slovní zásoby, které lze rozdělit do dvou kategorií – testy zkoumající šíři slovní zásoby, a testy zkoumající hloubku znalosti slovní zásoby. V případě hloubky znalosti jsou však testy velmi orientační a pro jejich kvalitativní zaměření problematické, neboť jejich výstupy jsou těžko ověřitelné. Naproti tomu testy zkoumající rozsah slovní zásoby umožňují kvantitativní výstup a jsou lépe ověřitelné. Testy rozsahu slovní zásoby se dělí do dvou skupin: testy diagnostiky receptivní slovní zásoby, a testy diagnostiky slovní zásoby produktivní. Z dostupných jazykových testů se jako nejlepší pro účely výzkumu na základě praktičnosti a přesnosti diagnostických dat ukázaly být testy Paul Nation VLT – test rozsahu receptivní slovní zásoby, a Laufer & Nation Productive Vocabulary Test – test rozsahu produktivní slovní zásoby.

Ve druhém oddílu teoretické části práce vymezuje rozdělení typologie bilingvizmu na základní čtyři typy podle věku, kdy započne osvojování druhého jazyka. Bilingválové, kteří se zúčastnili výzkumu pro tuto práci patří do prvního z těchto typů – „raně simultánní", tzn. mluvčí, u kterého začalo probíhat osvojování jazyka souběžně v období 0-3 let věku. U bilingválů lze též pozorovat fenomén dominantního jazyka, tj. jazyka, který daný mluvčí používá primárně. Práce dále poukazuje na výzkum Ellen Bialystockové, jehož výsledky potvrdily, že bilingvní děti mají během formativního věku menší rozsah receptivní slovní zásoby, než jejich monolingvní protějšky. Tato zjištění byla jedním z hlavních podkladů pro výše zmíněnou hypotézu této práce. V závěru oddílu práce čtenáře seznámí se třemi typologiemi výrazně pokročilých studentů: Bilingvál, student se zkušeností s pobytem v zahraničí (dále „student typu foreign exchange") a velmi pokročilý student. Pojmem bilingvál se v rozsahu této práce rozumí mluvčí, u kterému docházelo k souběžnému osvojování dvou jazyků již od útlého věku. Za studenty typu „foreign Exchange" se považují vysoce pokročilí čeští studenti, kteří strávili minimálně půl roku v zemi cílového jazyka. Pokročilým studentem se pak v této práci rozumí student, který dosáhl alespoň úrovně C1.

V metodické části práce je vysvětleno, proč byly pro sběr kvantitativních dat použity dva testy: Paul Nation VLT (Vocabulary Levels Test, dále jen „VLT test") a Laufer & Nation Productive Vocabulary Test (dále „produktivní test"). Hlavním důvodem pro zvolení obou testů byl jejich rozsah – zatímco VLT test testuje rozsah až do 20 000 slov, produktivní

test zkoumá slovní zásobu jen do úrovně 10 000 slov. Dalším důvodem pro zvolení těchto dvou testů byl jejich výstup – VLT test podává přibližný údaj o tom, jak velký rozsah receptivní slovní zásoby má dotyčný jedinec, zatímco produktivní test udává procentuální údaj o tom, jak dobře daný jedinec ovládá produktivní slovní zásobu z dané úrovně 1000 slov. Produktivní test má dále stanovenou hraniční hodnotu 77%, která stanovuje, že jedinec, který nedosáhne této úrovně, má nedostačující znalost dané oblasti slovní zásoby. Jako druhý cíl práce bylo dále zjistit, jak sami studenti vnímají svojí vlastní angličtinu, zda jsou spokojení s tím, jak probíhá výuka angličtiny na jejich škole a na co konkrétně by se chtěli případně zaměřit více. Pro sběr dat této povahy byly sestaveny specifické dotazníky, které sloužily jako podklad pro strukturované rozhovory, které výzkumník provedl při osobních setkáních. Vzniklé záznamy pak byly zařazeny do jednotlivých profilů všech dvanácti subjektů.

V praktické části práce je představeno zjištění, že 11 z 12 zkoumaných subjektů mělo podle testu VLT slovní zásobu přesahující 10 000 slov, z toho tři studenti měli výslednou hodnotu přesahující 14 000, což poukazuje na fakt, že v tomto směru hypotéza, že bilingvní a pokročilí studenti mají neadekvátní slovní zásobu, nebyla potvrzena. Nicméně z výsledků produktivního testu vyšlo najevo, že studenti mají velké nedostatky v produktivní slovní zásobě – ani jeden ze studentů nepřesáhl hranici 70% v úrovni 5-10 000 slov, čímž se hypotéza této práce potvrzuje. Na základě výsledků testů lze tedy předpokládat, že zkoumané subjekty mají pro jejich úroveň dostačující rozsah slovní zásoby, ovšem s tím, že mají pravděpodobně nedostačující slovní zásobu produktivní.

Stran testů bylo též provedeno dotazníkové šetření, jehož detailní záznamy byly zasazeny do jednotlivých profilů studentů a jsou k dispozici společně s jejich výsledky v příloze k práci. Data pořízená šetřením se nepřímo shodují v několika bodech, ačkoliv nebylo možné dosáhnout generalizací, jelikož vzorek studentů byl příliš heterogenní – studenti byli různého věku, různé jazykové úrovně a v příliš malém vzorku. Klíčová zjištění, na základě kterých byla vytvořena doporučení pro vyučující, jež jsou shrnuta v sedmé kapitole této práce, byla následující:

- Zkoumané subjekty projevují vysokou úroveň samostatnosti – jejich úroveň jim umožňuje pracovat více autonomně než nižší úrovně a lze jim zadávat odpovídající formu samostatné práce, například zpracovávat komplikovanější literaturu.

- Studenti jsou vesměs připraveni a odhodláni prohlubovat své znalosti jazyka. Toto odhodlání je však podmíněno vnější motivací, jelikož se studenti zároveň domnívají, že jsou na již tak vysoké úrovni v jazyce, že je již není co více naučit.

- Větší část subjektů měla výhrady k metodice jejich vyučujících. Hlavním problémem pro studenty bylo opakování toho, co již dle jejich názoru moc dobře znají – gramatika.

- Na základě dílčích dotazů studenti většinou mírně přehodnotili své původní výpovědi a často připouštěli, že jednou z jejich slabin je slovní zásoba, kterou zároveň většina studentů považuje za nejdůležitější součást znalosti jazyka.

- Jako jednu z možných alternativ k současné metodice by podle většiny ze subjektů bylo zaměřit se více na reálie, například rozebírat Shakespearovská díla.

- Studenti byli nakloněni možnosti mít zadanou samostatnou písemnou práci většího rozsahu, a dále zadáním typu čtení složitějších textů, například akademické literatury.

Na základě výsledků testů a šetření byly sestavené tři profily pokročilého a bilingvního studenta, která jsou blíže popsána v šesté kapitole práce. Všechny tři typy studentů, tj. pokročilý student, student se zkušeností ze zahraničního pobytu a bilingvální student mají tyto společné rysy:

- Studenti mohou být přesvědčeni, že je již není co více naučit

- Je méně pravděpodobné, že tito studenti budou mít receptivní slovní zásobu, která by převyšovala hranici 13 000 slov.

- U všech výše zmíněných typů studentů lze očekávat, že dovedou porozumět většině běžných textů, avšak zároveň lze očekávat, že mají mezery v produktivní slovní zásobě.

Na základě výsledků šetření byla sestavena baterie doporučení pro vyučující pokročilých, „foreign Exchange" či bilingvních studentů, která jsou blíže popsána v sedmé kapitole této práce:

- Provést u studentů diagnostiku pomocí testů VLT a Laufer & Nation Productive Vocabulary Test

- Zaměřit se na prohlubování produktivní slovní zásoby studentů.

- Zadávat studentům složitější texty ke zpracování, které povedou k rozšíření jejich slovní zásoby

Zadávat studentům seminární práce většího rozsahu, aby bylo zajištěno dostatek prostoru pro aplikování jejich produktivní slovní zásoby.