

**Filozofická fakulta
Univerzity Karlovy v Praze**

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky

DIPLOMOVÁ PRÁCE

Role mateřského jazyka ve výuce angličtiny

The role of the mother tongue in EFL classes

Martina Ménová

Srpen 2015

Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Tomáš Gráf

Děkuji vedoucímu své bakalářské práce, PhDr. Tomáši Gráfovi, za jeho cenné rady a čas, který mé práci věnoval. Mé poděkování patří i studentům, kteří se zúčastnili dotazníkového průzkumu.

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně, že jsem řádně citovala všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze dne 10.8.2015

Abstract

This thesis focuses on the use of the mother tongue in foreign language teaching and learning. Recently there has been a notable shift towards promoting the use of the mother tongue. The theoretical part of the thesis maps the attitudes to the mother tongue in current literature as well as the suggested ways of its use in the classroom. The practical part attempts to analyse the students' attitudes towards the incorporation of Czech into English learning and teaching and their experience with its use from their secondary schools. To obtain the data, an online questionnaire was employed. The respondents are first- and second-year students of English and American studies who are expected to be able to analyse both the advantages and disadvantages of using Czech. The practical part focuses on the efficiency of Czech in comparison with English, ways of presenting grammar and vocabulary, the relation between the mother tongue use and the proficiency of students, and learning strategies of the respondents. Based on the analysis, suggestions regarding the mother tongue use are presented in the conclusion.

Key words

ELT, mother tongue, learner beliefs, teacher beliefs, cognates, teaching reading, translation, teaching beginners, learner strategies

Abstrakt

Tématem práce je využití mateřského jazyka ve výuce cizích jazyků. V posledních dvou dekáдах se v odborné literatuře objevuje nastupující trend, který mění dosavadní spíše negativní vnímání role mateřštiny a hledá pro ni možná praktická využití ve výuce. Teoretická část práce mapuje přístupy k mateřskému jazyku v současné literatuře. Praktická část práce si klade za cíl analyzovat názory a postoje studentů k využití mateřštiny a jejich zkušenosti s rolí češtiny při výuce angličtiny na střední škole. K analýze byl použit online dotazník. Skupinu respondentů tvoří studenti nižších ročníků oboru anglistika-amerikanistika, u kterých se předpokládá zájem o studium cizích jazyků a také schopnost zhodnotit výhody i úskalí češtiny ve výuce angličtiny. Praktická část práce se zaměřuje na efektivitu češtiny ve srovnání s angličtinou, způsoby prezentace gramatiky a slovní zásoby využívané středoškolskými učiteli, vztah mezi pokročilostí studentů a užitečností mateřštiny a studijní strategie využívající češtinu. Na základě poznatků získaných z analýzy dat jsou v závěru popsána doporučení pro využití češtiny při výuce angličtiny.

Klíčová slova

ELT, mateřský jazyk, přesvědčení studentů, přesvědčení učitele, kognáty, výuka čtení, překlad, výuka začátečníků, studijní strategie

List of tables

Table 1: Overview of the most frequent types and frequency of responses to a question regarding the pros and cons of the use of the MT in FLT	41
Table 2: Overview of the most frequently mentioned topics in response to a question regarding examples of situations in which Czech is more efficient than English.	45
Table 3: Overview of the answers to questions related to secondary school experience and the use of translation as a teaching strategy.....	47
Table 4: Overview of the answers to the questions related to presenting new vocabulary.	47
Table 5: Overview of the answers to questions related to the importance of the MT knowledge in learning and teaching.	49
Table 6: Overview of the answers to questions related to the role of the MT when teaching lower-level versus higher-level students.....	51
Table 7: Overview of the answers to questions related to the usefulness of the MT from the point of view of the student.	51
Table 8: Overview of the most frequent types and frequency of responses to a question regarding the likelihood of using Czech during lessons.	52
Table 9: Overview of the answers to questions related to the learning strategies in studying vocabulary.....	54
Table 10: Overview of the strategies the respondents employ to record new vocabulary.	54
Table 11: Overview of the answers to questions related to the teaching experience of the respondents and their use of the MT in their own teaching.....	56

List of abbreviations

EFL	English as a foreign language
FLT	foreign language teaching
CLL	Community Language Learning
CLT	Communicative Language Teaching
L1	first language
L2	second language
MT	mother tongue

Contents

1	Introduction.....	8
2	Theoretical background	10
2.1	Methods – historical overview	10
2.2	Current situation.....	12
2.2.1	Manuals for teachers – between strictly academic and “popular” sources.....	13
2.3	Learner beliefs.....	13
2.4	Teacher beliefs	14
2.4.1	Teacher decision making process	14
2.5	MT from students’ and teachers’ perspectives.....	16
2.5.1	Students’ perspective	16
2.5.2	Teachers’ perspective	17
2.6	Reasons for including the MT	18
2.6.1	Students’ trust.....	18
2.6.2	Understanding.....	18
2.7	L2 learning vs. L1 acquisition.....	20
2.7.1	MT as previous knowledge.....	20
2.7.2	Differences between L1 and L2 learning	21
2.8	MT and vocabulary	22
2.8.1	Cognates	23
2.9	MT and grammar.....	24
2.10	Arguments against the MT use	25
2.11	Beginners and MT.....	27
2.12	Translation as a classroom exercise	28
2.12.1	The sandwich technique	30
2.13	Bilingual reading.....	30
2.13.1	Reducing cognitive load with the help of translation	32
2.14	Dealing with too much MT	32
2.15	Summary of the theoretical part.....	33
3	Material and method	35
3.1	Research questions	35
3.2	Research instrument	35
3.3	Piloting	36
3.4	Description of the questionnaire	37

3.5	Participants	39
4	Data analysis	40
4.1	General description of the data	40
4.2	Analysis of the introductory open-ended questions	40
4.2.1	Advantages and disadvantages of using the MT in L2 learning.....	40
4.2.2	Teaching situations in which Czech is more efficient than English.....	44
4.3	Attitudes to and experience from the secondary schools	47
4.4	Learning languages and the usefulness of the MT	49
4.5	Learning strategies	54
4.6	The respondents' teaching experience in relation to the MT	55
4.7	The use of the MT at secondary schools	57
5	Discussion of findings	58
5.1	Limitations of the study	60
6	Conclusions.....	62
6.1	Future directions and suggestions for further research	64
	Résumé.....	65
	Appendix: the questionnaire	70
	Bibliography	77

1 Introduction

In the last two decades, the topic of employing the students' mother tongue (henceforth MT) in the classroom has become widely discussed. In fact, mother tongue as a learning and teaching tool, together with other topics such as the problem of how to view mistakes, implicit and explicit learning, stress on a particular language skill and others, is one of the themes in ELT which keep returning into the spotlight. The last centuries saw numerous teaching methods, many of them contradicting the previous one. The use of the mother tongue has thus been like a pendulum, swinging back and forth between a total ban and its active use in teaching. Regarding the twentieth century, the MT has often been admitted as a last resort only, a kind of fire extinguisher in case of emergency (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009).

It seems that the current teaching trend is in favour of the mother tongue. Butzkamm and Caldwell (ibid.) classify the MT as an ally in language learning. A number of articles and books (as well as blog entries by teachers-bloggers outside the academic sphere) have been published on this topic. Many authors begin to criticize the outdated view that the use of the mother tongue does not have its place in the classroom; they rather look for arguments in its favour and for ways of using it systematically.

The discussion about the incorporation of the MT goes hand in hand with the recent interest in non-native speakers as teachers. These are usually the ones who share the MT with their students and thus the MT is available in their classrooms. In these cases, the mother tongue is now often treated as a regular classroom resource¹. Most arguments in favour of the MT use are based on the view that the MT serves as previous knowledge in scaffolding. Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) claim that our first language lays the foundation for all other languages we might want to learn. Conversely, there are still numerous (especially private) schools which impose rather strict methodology guidelines on their teachers regarding the complete ban of the mother tongue in the classroom.

While it certainly remains true that the L2 input should be maximised, the MT is becoming more than an evasive strategy for incompetent teachers. There seems to be a growing amount of literature which aims to find out whether and how the L1 can facilitate L2 learning. Copland and Neokleous (2011) observe that in academic circles, the nexus of

¹ In fact, Deller and Rinvulucru (2002) published a collection of activities which make use of the MT. Numerous activities suggested in their cookbook do not even presuppose active knowledge of that particular language on the side of the teacher.

interest has shifted from a judicious use of the L1 to support the learning and teaching of the L2 to an interest in how L1 can be used to maximize learning in L2. In other words, the L1 is becoming not only tolerated in teaching, but even ways of using it purposefully are being sought.

Elliot (1991, quoted in Kumaravadivelu, 2001) claimed that the fundamental aim of action research is to improve practice rather than to produce knowledge. Accordingly, the aim of the theoretical part of this thesis is to evaluate the current state of L1 use in literature, to examine whether L1 has a facilitating effect on L2 learning and evaluate to what extent the MT taboo is justifiable. It will also suggest ways in which language teaching could benefit from the use of the MT, especially in the area of grammar, vocabulary and reading. The present thesis is concerned with the use of the MT by teachers as well as students, therefore it presents both students' and teachers' beliefs as important factors. The theoretical part is based on both academic articles and non-academic, rather popular teaching manuals which are more comprehensive and based on everyday classroom practice. Special chapters are devoted to bilingual reading and also translation as a type of until recently controversial exercise which makes active use of the MT. Although the current trend seems to favour the MT use, some negative aspects are also considered.

The practical part employs a questionnaire as the main tool for gaining data and deals with the students' attitudes and learning experience regarding the use of their MT. Students were also asked about their learning strategies and beliefs concerning the MT. Those who already have some teaching experience provided their reflections of their own teaching. The practical part is thus based on both learner and teacher beliefs rather than measuring effectivity and focussing on particular techniques. Based on the findings from the respondents, the practical part also offers suggestions on how to improve current classroom practice to fit students' need better.

The theoretical part of this thesis works with MT (L1) and L2 labels and not specifically Czech and English. This labelling was opted for since most sources work with a particular MT and L2, but the implications seem to be generally applicable to all non-MT language learning. The terminology is not homogenous in literature. Some authors work with the MT label while others prefer L1. Both labels are used in this work, mostly because of quotations. They are used interchangeably to refer to the main language spoken by a person from childhood.

2 Theoretical background

2.1 Methods – historical overview

While in the past foreign languages were studied in most cases only by those who really needed them, now it is a massive enterprise, which also means that L2 students are a heterogeneous group. Especially the twentieth century abounds with monolingual methods, so a look into the 19th and 20th century methods is necessary to understand where the MT taboo stems from.

Teaching a foreign language with the help of the mother tongue is not an entirely modern strategy. The L1 was used in numerous methods which aim at creating active links between L1 and L2, such as the New Concurrent Method, Community Language Learning and Dodson's bilingual method (Cook 2001).

The first half of the 20th century was strongly influenced by a behaviourist theory which saw the L1 as an interference in L2 learning. With the arrival of error analysis, the L1 was seen as causing specific errors (Brooks-Lewis 2009). The degree to which the MT is employed in various methods varies. While for some it serves as a useful scaffolding tool, other methods demote it to a crutch (ibid.).

The Grammar Translation Method was born in the 18th century and remained influential in the 19th century. The method was devised especially for school children and was based on studying grammatical structures with focus on the written form of language. Grammar and translation were known to both teachers and students from classical languages (Howatt 1984). Each lesson had one or two grammar rules to teach, a vocabulary list and some sentences for translation (ibid.). The method was strongly criticized by the Reform Movement for lacking spoken interaction and working with example sentences rather than texts.

The Reform Movement did not approve of translation as a type of exercise and overall, unlike the Grammar Translation Method, favoured oral methods. However, teachers were often non-native speakers and had their students' MT at their disposal. Although the teachers were expected to speak the L2 in the classroom, they could use the MT for glossing new words and explaining new grammar points (Howatt 1984). The Reform Movement teachers adopted the monolingual principle, but not to the extreme.

The so-called natural methods presuppose L2 learning is not a systematic process of exercises and explanations. It is rather viewed as an intuitive process for which learners have an innate capacity (ibid.). Basic conversations which are held do not require MT use. This

approach was adopted by the Direct Method, which, in various guises, was the dominant methodology of the 20th century (Deller and Rinvoluceri 2002). The Direct Method, made famous especially by Berlitz and his schools for immigrants, tries to copy the L1 acquisition, i.e. it excludes the MT altogether, offers no support of other languages and no explicit instruction. The Direct Method was in fact a necessity in classes in which students spoke different mother tongues. Teachers are native speakers of the target language; translations and any MT use are thus impossible.

Unlike the Direct Method, which focused on vocabulary, the Audio-Lingual Method, blooming especially during and after the World War II, put a lot of emphasis on grammatical structures, but in the light of communicative needs. The MT was excluded from learning and students memorised L2 utterances and drilled dialogues in the L2.

Several bilingual methods, although not mainstream, were introduced in the 20th century. For example, Jakobson's New Concurrent Method is based on the teacher switching from one language to another at certain moments, such as when the concepts are important or when students are distracted or need to be reprimanded (Cook 2001). Dodson introduced his bilingual method as a counterpart of the audiovisual method. A sentence is repeated several times in L2 and also translated into the MT to help students to grasp the meaning. The drill stays, but is complemented by a direct focus on meaning. Another popular method, Community Language Learning, requires a bilingual teacher who acts as a translator for the learners. The aim is to have a normal, natural conversation. The learner tells the teacher what they want to say and the teacher offers a translation (Scrivener 2005). This procedure serves as a central activity, but the follow-up activities are conventional (Cook 2001). Deller and Rinvoluceri (2002) identify the CLL as the impulse which prompted him to revise his until-then negative approach to L1 in teaching. The Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), the dominant methodology of the last decades of the 20th century, also stresses communication and focus on spoken interaction. Judicious use of native language is accepted where feasible. Translation may be used where students need or benefit from it (Richards and Rogers 2001). MT is thus not encouraged, but not prohibited either.

Currently, the so-called post-method period emphasizes the need to go beyond the limitations of the concept of method with a call to find an alternative way of designing effective teaching strategies (Kumaravadivelu 2001). Kumaravadivelu speaks about the so-called pedagogy of particularity, which means that teaching must be sensitive to a particular group in a particular context. This is antithetical to the notion that there can be one set of pedagogic aims and objectives realizable through one set of pedagogic principles and

procedures (ibid.). In other words, post-method language teaching respects individual differences rather than forces a particular method on all students. This goes hand in hand with teacher autonomy: teacher autonomy is so central that it can be seen as defining the heart of post-method pedagogy (ibid.). The respect for local situation together with the emphasis on teachers' experience rather than strictly following a particular method might be seen as providing space for the mother tongue in situations which the teacher evaluates as suitable.

2.2 Current situation

The tradition of monolingual language teaching stems mainly from two tendencies. First, it is the effort to maximize the input of the target language. Second, learning and teaching were often modelled on L1 acquisition. While the first point seems still valid and invincible in literature, the second one has already been overcome: Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) state that L1 acquisition can never be hoped to be duplicated in the classroom.

The discussion about the L1 use was opened in the 1990s. As Tian and Macaro (2012) point out, the general claim was that it facilitated classroom interaction, not acquisition. Only later did researchers start to study if and how the L1 can participate in the latter.

In current literature, the MT is no longer a taboo. It offers numerous articles on the practical use of the MT and experiments done in classrooms. Many of these articles are apologetic in tone, which shows that the MT is to a degree still not seen as a valid language in the classroom (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009). The MT seems to be moving on the scale from being banned altogether, continuing to be ignored to the present stage in which active use for it is being sought. The focus of the debate now tends to be not if, but how, when and how much the L1 should be encouraged (Sampson 2011). On the other hand, there are also articles on how to maximize the target language in the classroom, such as *Keeping It in the Target Language* by Moeller and Roberts (2013) which recommends strategies for maximum L2 use. However, they do not mention the L1 critically.

Teaching in both available languages applies only to teaching situations in which the teacher and the students share the same language as their mother tongue. Teachers who are able to draw on two languages as resources have an advantage over teachers who can only speak the L2 (Copland, Neokleous 2011). However, in their manual *Using the Mother Tongue*, Deller and Rinvoluceri (2002) even include bilingual activities which do not require the teacher to speak the same MT as their students.

2.2.1 Manuals for teachers – between strictly academic and “popular” sources

Teacher manuals and guides such as *Learning Teaching* (Scrivener 2005) and *How to Teach English* (Harmer 2007) also include at least a short section on L1 use. The stances expressed in such manuals are important as they have a wider outreach than academic articles. They are more likely to influence “ordinary” teachers who do not have access to academic publications.

Regarding the ban of the MT, Scrivener says that this supposed prohibition was an over-strong reaction to some traditional teaching styles in which teachers used only L1 to discuss and explain language, and learners hardly got to hear or use any English (Scrivener 2005). Neither Scrivener nor Harmer rejects the MT in teaching, but both warn that its use must be judicious: using the students’ L1 in class might be both sensible and beneficial if used with caution (Harmer 2007).

The beneficial nature of L1 seems to prevail. Harmer claims that if the teacher and the students share the same L1, it would be foolish to deny its existence and potential value. In fact, using the students’ L1 may help them to see the connections and differences between the L1 and L2 (ibid.).

2.3 Learner beliefs

It is now widely agreed that learner beliefs affect language learning and thus studying them is instrumental in language learning research. Learner beliefs, especially those related to the MT use and learning strategies which incorporate the MT, represent one of the central parts of the practical part of the thesis. Since measuring effectivity in language teaching and learning is problematic, learner beliefs may serve as the basis of examining the learning and teaching process.

Learner beliefs were introduced in the mid-1980s as an important learner characteristic. Dörnyei (2005) also sees learner beliefs as a learner variable, saying that the beliefs language learners hold considerably affect the way they go about mastering the L2. Dörnyei further quotes previous research and the division of beliefs into three main categories: (a) perception of the difficulty of language learning; (b) the effectiveness of approaches to or strategies for language learning; (c) the source of linguistic knowledge (which includes reliance on L1) (quoted in Dörnyei 2005). Oxford and Lee (2008) see the learner beliefs as a fundamental characteristic of a learner: beliefs are the basis of how

learners approach their learning, the strategies they employ, their motivation, their attitudes and their success in language learning.

Learner beliefs play an essential role in education. Liao (2006) warns that some preconceived beliefs are likely to restrict the learners' range of strategy use. For this reason, teachers should contribute to forming their learners' beliefs. For learners it might be beneficial to talk to the teacher about their own learning strategies, discuss their advantages and disadvantages and also find out why the teacher employs a particular strategy. Such an approach also contributes to greater learner autonomy, which is another key concept of the current post-method era.

2.4 Teacher beliefs

Teacher beliefs are a crucial factor influencing how the teacher works with the students. They shape the teacher's practice. For the purposes of this thesis, the relevant beliefs are those the teachers have towards the incorporation of the MT.

Although the post-method paradigm aims at developing autonomous learners, it can be argued that the learner's autonomy starts with the autonomy of the teacher. Kumaravadivelu (2001) says that if context-sensitive pedagogic knowledge has to emerge from teachers and their practice of everyday teaching, then they ought to be assisted in becoming autonomous individuals. He further speaks about *personal theories* as the theories that teachers develop by interpreting and applying professional theories in practical situations while they are on the job. In other words, personal theories are formed during active teaching by trying various methods and experimenting with teaching. It appears that such experience is even more formative than teacher training. This idea is also expressed by Macaro (2001) who says there is a considerable body of literature suggesting that the beliefs the teachers hold are likely to influence their decision making more than knowledge acquired during their studies. The strongest influences on teachers' beliefs are their own teaching experience, training and also the experience of having been students themselves.

2.4.1 Teacher decision making process

Copland and Neokleous (2011) say that teachers' decision making is often complex, based on either what they perceive as their students' affective needs or on their cognitive processes. The former are associated with creating a stress-free learning environment. It is

reported (ibid.) that teachers respond to their students' contributions regardless of which language they use. In other words, the message and social contact may be more important than teaching the particular language.

In terms of the affective aspects of language learning, Copland and Neokleous (2011) report that in their study teachers used the L1 in explanations to reduce the amount of stress on the part of their students, to save time and provide a more successful classroom experience. The L1 explanations were avoided by only a minority of teachers as they were not felt to be beneficial shortcuts.

The authors also report that in terms of the cognitive needs, most teachers participating in their study switch to L1 if they believe that linguistic difficulties are preventing students from understanding. This happens contrary to their beliefs that L2 input should be maximized. This strategy shows that complete understanding is essential to teachers and the L2 is worth a temporary sacrifice. Monolingual teaching is thus not a universally guiding principle.

The researchers further mention a significant imbalance between what teachers state as their beliefs and what they actually do in their classrooms. This discrepancy is attributed to the feelings of guilt when using the MT. These teachers perceive L1 more as a hindrance to learning rather than a supporting tool, stating that their aim is to avoid L1 wherever possible. Despite these strong beliefs, all of them frequently used L1 in their classrooms. One of the reasons for the discrepancies between what teachers believe and what they do could lie in the strong tradition of avoiding L1 in teaching. This is also supported by Macaro's observation (2001) that student teachers in his study had students interpret for their classmates so that the teacher would not have to resort to MT.

In relation to the use of MT, Macaro (2001) mentions three theoretical positions:

1. The virtual position: The classroom is like the target country, L1 should therefore be excluded. L1 does not have any pedagogical value.
2. The maximal position: There is no pedagogical value in L1 use. However, perfect teaching and learning conditions do not exist and therefore teachers have to resort to L1.
3. The optimal position: There is some pedagogical value in L1 use. Some aspects of learning may not be enhanced by the use of L1. There should be a constant exploration of pedagogical principles regarding whether and in what ways L1 use is justified.

The literature seems to suggest that the virtual position is unattainable and the maximal position leads to feelings of guilt and inadequacy among teachers (ibid.). The virtual position is overcome as it attempts to create unrealistic learning environment and the maximal position

sees MT only as an unwelcome complication. Nowadays it seems that the mother tongue is not being rejected any longer and more and more attention is now devoted to what positives it can bring to the classroom, which corresponds with the optimal position.

2.5 MT from students' and teachers' perspectives

The functions to which the L1 is put are most helpful in determining why it is needed. Studies show that the L1 is used as a shortcut, for contrasting L1 and L2 forms, providing metalinguistic cues, translating, giving L1 explanations of previously used L2 utterances, providing instructions, classroom management and others (Tian and Macaro 2012). Since research suggests that these functions are neither limited nor highly principled (*ibid.*), it will be difficult to identify all reasons for incorporating the MT into learning and teaching. Many aspects must be taken into account, such as the language being studied, the particular language items, the level of students, their beliefs and learning preferences etc.

2.5.1 Students' perspective

Students in monolingual classes often feel that there is no urgency behind L2 use because there is always another language to fall back on to satisfy immediate communicative needs (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009). Monolingual environment sparks the feeling that the studied language cannot really be lived (*ibid.*), i.e. it cannot be used in everyday life. This deficiency, however, can be at least partly compensated for by incorporating as authentic activities as possible. For example, classroom management should be conducted in the target language according to most authors, in order to put the language into natural, authentic use.

Harmer (2007) says that when students use their L1 in discussions, role-plays etc., they often do so because they want to communicate in the best way they can and so, almost without thinking, they revert to their own language. This is especially problematic if the language level is too low to allow comfortable conversation.

Lower-level students in particular translate into their L1 whether teachers want them to or not. It is a natural process of learning a foreign language (Harmer 2007). Besides, using a foreign language throughout the lesson is demanding especially for less advanced students. The easiest way to lower the amount of strain is to switch into a more comfortable situation, i.e. use the MT (McLoughin 2015). In his study, Sampson (2011) distinguished six different functions of MT use on the part of the students. He lists equivalence, metalanguage,

floor-holding², reiteration, socializing and L2 avoidance. He also notes that number and function of switches into MT are comparable for pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate level students.

Scrivener (2005) lists several common reasons why students use their MT during the class, for example:

- Because it is easier to speak my own language.
- Because the teacher always corrects me if I speak English.
- Because I do not want to get it wrong in front of the others.
- Because the teacher is only pretending not to understand my own language.

All these problems, however, might be solved by making an effort to establish a pleasant atmosphere in the classroom and discussing the problems regarding the use of the two languages with the class. To promote a pleasant L2 learning environment, it is generally held that the target language should be used throughout the lesson. Yet Copland and Neokleous (2011) report observing a lesson in which the “Greek sandwich”³ situation occurred commonly, i.e. the teacher asked a question in the L2, but the students reacted in their MT. The teacher responded back in the L2. This shows that there seems to be no universal solution to the students’ overuse of the L1 and individual solutions must be sought.

2.5.2 Teachers’ perspective

The main reasons why teachers make excessive use of the MT are a careless attitude towards teaching, lack of language knowledge and fear of not being understood by their learners. Other situations in which teachers use L1 are teaching grammar explicitly, providing complex instructions, controlling students’ behaviour, building personal relationships and checking for comprehension (Moeller and Roberts 2013). In all cases, too much reliance on the MT results in the students’ ignorance of the target language as they can be sure that a translation will be provided. Such behaviour of the teacher removes challenge from the classroom (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009). Butzkamm goes as far as claiming that teachers *misteach* languages, especially those who do not have a sufficient command of the target language and those on whom an official no-MT policy is imposed.

² Floor-holding refers to situations in which the speaker desires to communicate without hesitation and chooses to include a MT expression rather than stop speaking.

³ The lesson observed was a lesson of English as the target language in a Greek context. The teacher and her students shared the same MT. The sandwich technique is further explored in section 2.12.1.

In case of a monolingual class in which the students and the teacher share one MT, it might feel unnatural or even artificial to pretend that the teacher does not speak the MT and to enforce only L2-based communication. Acknowledging the existence of MT ensures a more natural environment instead of a pretend monolingual situation (Cook 2001).

2.6 Reasons for including the MT

2.6.1 Students' trust

Learners often tend to strive for perfection and often require an exact translation into their MT for fear they might not understand the concept properly. Risk-taking is integral to language learning, but many students, especially adults, are unwilling to run the risk of making a mistake.

To avoid such risk-taking, a word or grammar point they are not sure about does not appear in their language. Translation seems to be the most straightforward tool to help students to trust the L2 expression fully and use it actively: precision of meaning is important; rough comprehension is simply not good enough (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009). Moreover, true understanding is deeply satisfying (ibid.). Even L2-only coursebooks such as the *English File* series are now published with a localised bilingual dictionary. Students often demonstrate the need to understand by double-checking with their classmates in their L1 whether they understood correctly.

Similarly, if students struggle with understanding, they often find it easier to ask their fellow students for a translation of a word or instructions they did not understand rather than ask the teacher to repeat their words or rephrase. This shows that students tend to (over)rely on their MT. Alternatively it could be viewed as their learning strategy since a translation or a peer explanation saves them time and mental effort (Mcloughlin 2015).

2.6.2 Understanding

Understanding is much more demanding in a foreign language than in the mother tongue. In the latter case, there is usually no particular need to concentrate on form; all attention can be directed to meaning. Ringbom says that comprehension can be regarded as a kind of problem-solving: the listener/reader tries to solve the problem "what did the speaker/writer mean by what he said/wrote?" (Ringbom 1987). Learners thus have to make an

extra effort to decipher the form of the message before comprehension takes place. Scrivener (2005) further points out that

if the explanation is done in the language being learned, then there is an immediate problem; learners have – by definition – limited understanding of this new language, and therefore any lengthy or difficult explanation in the “target language” will be likely to be more difficult for them than the thing being explained (p.19).

The amount of concentration needed is thus double: it is necessary to understand the language items as well as the message. It follows that if students fail to understand the form fully and correctly, the message cannot get across.

Problems with understanding (individual words or the message as such) result in greater reliance on context and the learner depends on accurate bottom-up analysis (Ringbom 1987). However, if there are many items and relations that are not recognized and understood, this might lead to incomplete understanding or even misunderstandings. Teachers should take this into account when teaching and make sure that their students have enough opportunity to understand the message. It could be achieved either by simplifying explanations or using the MT as a crutch.

Successful language learning requires prior exposure to understandable language, which Krashen coined as *comprehensible input*. What is not comprehended cannot be processed and learnt. In a MT we do not hear what people say, we hear what they mean (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009). In case of L2, the understanding is not so straightforward. If the meaning is only guessed from the context, the input is more likely to remain only input. However, if the structure is transparent for the learners, most attention is devoted to the message and the input is more likely turned into intake, i.e. it is easier to internalize (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009). Other strategies the teacher may use to render the input comprehensible include visualisation, gestures and non-verbal clues (Moeller and Roberts 2013).

Butzkamm (2009) also views comprehension as the key concept. He introduces the term *dual focus*, which refers to comprehension on two levels: formal structure and content. In foreign language learning, dual comprehension is necessary (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009). This duality can be illustrated by two different translations of an L2 utterance: a literal, word-for-word translation which helps student notice the structure of the L2 and also a free translation in “good” L1.

Throughout the history, teaching methods kept changing, but the focus on dual comprehension can be seen a number of times. Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) distinguish

several types of methods which include translation, and facilitate the understanding of both the structure and its meaning. For example, for an utterance in the L2, two translations can be available: a literal and a free one. This method was used for example by Theodore Robertson in the 19th century. Teachers use this technique until today to explicate less obvious structures (cf. 2.12). Providing both translations makes sure that the students see through structure and can immediately compare it to a “proper” version. Alternatively, a text can be translated only once and include a mix of free and literal translation which take into account the learners’ level. There can be a line-by-line translation, used e.g. by William Caxton in his *Dialogues in French and English* in the 15th century. For a text that students know well, only a literal translation could be provided. Their knowledge of a “good” translation is taken for granted. This could be done for example with biblical texts. These teaching strategies which employ translation are used until today, e.g. in popular bilingual books which have the same text on opposite pages.

2.7 L2 learning vs. L1 acquisition

The MT taboo derives much of its force and appeal from the desire to imitate the first language acquisition (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009), i.e. a language learnt without reference to any other. The underlying idea is that what worked for everyone once will work again in case of other languages. This chapter explores the similarities and differences between learning the first language and the second one.

2.7.1 MT as previous knowledge

It has always been good education practice to build on a learner’s existing skills and competencies (Butzkamm 2007). Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) even claim that monolingual learning is an intrinsic impossibility as the incoming information must be matched up against prior knowledge. It can be argued that the MT functions precisely as previous knowledge. Cook (2001) agrees, saying that keeping languages visibly separate in language teaching is contradicted by the invisible processes in the students’ minds. By definition a second language user is not a monolingual and never will be (Cook 1997).

2.7.2 Differences between L1 and L2 learning

The analogy between L1 and L2 acquisition is doubtful for several reasons. First, it is the fact that these two languages are compartmentalised, i.e. stored separately. Second, the amount of exposure to the L2 can hardly match that of the L1. Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) identify further areas which children⁴ master before the L2 learning process starts: (1) they understand the concepts in the world; (2) they can communicate and negotiate the meaning; (3) they can speak and control their voice production; (4) they have an understanding of grammar, e.g. understand time concepts; (5) they can read and write. All these factors serve as a strong basis for distinguishing L1 and L2 learning as different.

The fact that the amount of time of exposure to the target language is essential for successful learning is widely agreed on. However, total immersion, i.e. a completely L2-environment, is hardly possible to create outside the country where the target language is spoken. While a child growing up is surrounded by adults speaking the language, in the case of L2 learning the teacher is usually the only competent L2 speaker in the classroom. Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) report a study according to which a preschool child hears 5,000-7,000 utterances per day. It is obvious that a standard lesson situation cannot provide more than a fraction of utterances in L2.

At a conservative estimate of 10 hours a day, a five-year old had had 18,250 hours of meaning-focused interaction but could only speak like a five-year-old (Deller and Rinvoluceri 2002). In standard language learning situations, such an amount of exposure is hardly possible. Besides, after five years of the same exposure, L2 learner is likely to achieve a much higher level than that of a five-year-old. This suggests that the mental processes employed by a young child and an older L2 learner must be dramatically different.

Literate adult learners approach language learning with a very different set of potential strategies from those available to pre-linguistic infants (Wells 1998, quoted in Brooks-Lewis 2009). L2 learners have more mature minds, greater social development, a larger short-term memory capacity and some experience of using a language already (Cook 2001). Unlike young children, L2 learners have an ability to consciously plan and organise their own learning. The goals of learning MT and L2 are also different. While every child naturally masters the MT, the L2 acquisition is often unsuccessful in terms of achieving native-like proficiency.

⁴ This thesis explores L2 learning in formal environment which typically starts at school age.

Some similarities in the learning process can be found. Natural sequences have been detected both in L1 and L2 acquisition (Macaro 2001). Just as parents use simple child-directed speech, teachers and course books grade their language too. However, although the progression from sounds to single words to short phrases and so on is technically possible to copy in L2 learning, the psychological development of a baby cannot be. Besides, such a procedure would be demotivating for learners (*ibid.*).

For all reasons mentioned above, L1 and L2 learning should be viewed as two different processes, yet linked by the fact that L2 learning draws on L1 knowledge. L2 learners have at their disposal a lot of already existing knowledge and abilities, such as memory, the ability to process information, and, importantly, the knowledge of at least one language system against which the new one can be compared.

2.8 MT and vocabulary

Whether individual vocabulary items should be translated into MT or not is double-edged. On the one hand, establishing clear equivalence is helpful for the students. Using MT replaces guessing, which can be both time-consuming and inaccurate (Deller and Rinvoluceri 2002). On the other hand, the two seeming counterparts may have slightly different meanings, differ in connotation, frequency etc. Besides, not everything is directly and easily translatable into other languages.

In order to make a decision whether to translate vocabulary or not, first it is necessary to establish how L2 word is linked to concept. Concepts are presumably stored in non-language specific neural network, but since concepts are experienced through the L1, they are strongly linked to it. The essential question of L2 learning is whether the L2 word is accessed via the concept or via the L1 equivalent (Tian and Macaro 2012). It is believed that lower-level L2 students are more reliant on L1 equivalents to access L2 lexemes than higher proficiency students (*ibid.*).

Copland and Neokleous (2011) report that one of the teachers who participated in their study saw a strong connection between motivation and translating vocabulary. The teacher claims that her students are not interested in knowing the word unless they can link it with its MT counterpart. This could be ascribed to their uncertainty and reluctance to use a particular word if its meaning is not clarified (see also chapter 2.6.1). Translating can thus be seen as contributing to interest and motivation.

To keep students engaged, the teacher can ask them for alternative translations. They might come up with phrases they are more comfortable with and which are more natural to them. Students' own translations are apt to deforeignise the language by creating a confident interface with the native language (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009). Stronger mental connections are believed to increase retention.

On the other hand, not providing the translation (at least not immediately) provides students with more time to contemplate and employ cognitive processes that turn input into intake (Copland and Neokleous 2011). The retention is thus more permanent.

In terms of time efficiency, Tian and Macaro (2012) report that in their study, the meaning of vast majority of lexical items took longer to put across compared to translating them into the MT. Liao's research results (2006) showed the superiority of using translation in learning vocabulary in terms of quantity of words learnt. Although Tian and Macaro (2012) say that teacher codeswitching⁵ may be superior to the teacher providing only L2 information, they report only limited advantage for codeswitching as opposed to L2 exclusive use in vocabulary learning. At the same time, they do not find any negative effects of codeswitching in the classroom.

2.8.1 Cognates

Using cognates in language teaching is not a new idea. In 1680, Jacob Villiers published *Vocabularium Analogicum, or the Englishman speaking French, and the Frenchman speaking English, plainly shewing the nearness or affinity betwixt the English, French and Latin* in which he exploited relations between languages (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009). Apart from cognates, there are other factors which facilitate understanding unknown words, such as the length of the word, the transparency of the word structure and the degree of agreement of reference in the two languages. On a more general level, pointing out similarities is more helpful than focussing on differences between the MT and the L2 (Brooks-Lewis 2009).

Ringbom states that an L2 word is easily matched with a phonologically and semantically similar L1 word. Psychological research has also found that L2 words with close translational equivalents in L1 are more easily learnt than words for which the immediate equivalent is not so readily available (Ringbom 1987). If an L2 word is both phonetically and

⁵ Codeswitching here refers to the alternation of two languages within a single utterance. The authors distinguish L1 use from codeswitching. While the former term is employed for any L1 use with no rules, conventions or limitations, the latter is principled (Tian and Macaro 2012).

semantically similar to the L1 word, these factors work as a magnet which keeps the word in the learner's mental lexicon (ibid.). Using a cognate requires less mental effort as only a modification of the word existing in L1 is necessary. Learners can thus draw on their L1 knowledge. This is especially useful for beginners and lower-level students who can be shown a number of "international" words which they already know in the L2.⁶

If too much emphasis is placed on stressing the similarities between vocabulary items of the two languages, students might be inclined to use their MT words in the L2 without much change. For example, many Czech students feel that the verbs *organizovat* and *inspirovat* have a similar form in English. To make the Czech words sound English, they employ the verbal *-ate* suffix to create **organizate*⁷ and **inspirate*. Cognates thus help with the forming of the word, but attention must be also paid to its form.

It must be pointed out that learners have their own individual strategies and learning preferences and some might not benefit from the attention to cognates as much as others. Individual differences should be respected as even learners with the same L1 differ greatly in how naturally and easily they can make the relevant associations (ibid.).

2.9 MT and grammar

In terms of teaching grammar and explicating structures, Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) suggest two helpful strategies which make use of the MT: idiomatic translations and structural mirroring.

First, an idiomatic translation retains the meaning but, if necessary, changes the language structure to be logical in the particular language. For example, a definition when to use *if* might be difficult to grasp: if a question word is absent in an indirect question, *if / whether* is used instead. An idiomatic translation might get the message across more easily than a "linguistic" definition: He wanted to know **if** / Il voulait savoir **si** / Chtěl vědět, **jestli**.

Second, mirroring is based on a literal translation and adaptation with a view to making the foreign structure salient and transparent to learners for didactical purposes (ibid.) *Les petits chats* would be translated as *malés kočky* to illustrate the presence of an ending with

⁶ In case of Czech and English, such elementary words are for example *hotel, bar, business, address, phone, tourist* etc. Students also can spell as they know how to pronounce letter is many abbreviations (FBI, VIP, PC, HBO, OK and many others). If they are shown how much they already know, the new language might not seem so foreign and difficult to them.

⁷ The student was content with his own creation, saying that the word sounds similar enough for listeners to decipher what he meant.

the adjective. Similarly, English *I am hungry* translated as *jsem hladový* instead of *mám hlad* might help the students to realize that the structure is different.

These two strategies are hoped to “deforeignise the foreign” (ibid.). The authors claim that they make the foreign language less remote and more easily accessible. Deller and Rinvoluceri (2002) share this view and say that English grammar can be better understood by looking into the MT grammar mirror.

Apart from various translating strategies when teaching grammar, it is necessary to take into account the fact that learners need to cope with the language used as well as the message (cf. chapter 2.6.2). Cook (2001) reports that most studies of cognitive processing suggest that even advanced L2 users are less efficient at absorbing information from the L2 than from the L1. Hence, especially if the message is important, the language in which it is presented should be adjusted accordingly, be it simplified L2 or using the MT.

2.10 Arguments against the MT use

Most authors dealing with the MT in L2 teaching apparently feel the need to defend their ideas against the former tenet that the MT should be excluded. This is probably the reason why in literature we can find numerous examples and theories about its advantages, but comparatively little on the disadvantages. The negative aspects are often only carefully touched upon in the articles while most attention is devoted the benefits of the L2 use.

The proponents of L2 exclusivity argue that learners do not need to understand everything that is said to them by teacher and that switching to the first language undermines the learning process (Macaro 2001). Teaching only through the L2 makes the language real and develops learners’ in-built language system. Moreover, the use of L1 in the classroom is viewed as reducing the amount of time the learners can be exposed to the target language and time to use it actively.

Standard classroom interactions hardly provide enough exposure to all language functions the students may need in their lives. If the teacher uses the L2 instead of the MT for social interaction and rapport-building, students are exposed to a wider range of natural samples of the L2 (Cook 2001). In a way, using the MT for social contact steals time from the L2, although it is suggested elsewhere that the MT use in these situations (praise, reprimands, small talk etc.) is beneficial.

In classrooms where all students and the teacher share the same mother tongue, it is definitely tempting to use it. The L2 may even be perceived as artificial. Thus it might be

difficult for teachers to decide in which cases it is appropriate and well-founded and in which it is only a means of escaping difficulties. For both sides, it is comfortable to have a universally effective means to resort to. Especially in case of mixed-level groups, the necessity to use the L1 is problematic as for some students it might be helpful and beneficial but redundant for others.

Students who can count on the presence of their L1 in the classroom may view it as a crutch which is always readily available. Their motivation to rephrase what they cannot yet say in the L2 and make do without the unknown or forgotten item is thus lower than in the situation in which the L1 is unavailable. Even though this learning situation is more comfortable for the learners, they may lack the strategies necessary to overcome difficulties without the teacher's help. If a translation is automatically offered by the teacher most of the time, students learn to rely on it and may disregard the L2 version. Besides, the presence of the MT in the classroom reduces motivation to learn the L2 as the students know that the MT is always available in case of problems. This is especially valid in case the students use the L2 only in the classroom and do not have any other opportunity to use the language elsewhere.

Motivation is mentioned in literature also from the opposite point of view. Sampson (2011) reports a study according to which encouraging L2 positively affects motivation. Although learners might feel anxiety in L2-only environment, they find the communication in L2 rewarding.

Copland and Neokleous (2011) studied teachers' beliefs in connection to their real classroom behaviour. They report that although most teachers in their study made active use of the L1, none of them believed that direct comparison between the two languages was beneficial. While some teachers claimed that comparison did not help at all, others considered it a risky strategy as there are not so many direct links between the two languages in question (Greek as MT, English as L2). These beliefs contradict the bilingual strategies supported in the literature. Nevertheless, this discrepancy might be at least partly attributed to the number of differences between the two languages. While for example Butzkamm (2007, 2009) mostly bases his research on teaching English to Germans, i.e. works with two Germanic languages, teachers participating in Copland and Neokleous' study work within the framework of two much more distantly related languages between which similarities are presumably less common.

In Macaro's study (2001) of student teachers, all observed teachers used at least some MT in their lessons, especially to ensure comprehension, but in the interviews, none of them mentioned a possible value in L1 use as a tool that contributes directly to L2 learning.

However, these teachers' beliefs that direct comparison does not contribute to successful learning also contradicts the assumption that building on an existing language is an inevitable stage in language learning.

2.11 Beginners and MT

Some articles and books dealing with the use of the MT in L2 learning offer practical ideas and guidance on the incorporation of the MT in the classroom. Most of them, however, deal almost exclusively with beginners and lower-level students. On the one hand, the exclusion of higher-level students is logical since their range of language is much wider and requires less MT support. On the other hand, even these students may benefit from the use of the MT in some situations. Harmer suggests that teachers discuss the issue of both available languages with their students and negotiate rules (Harmer 2007). Discussing this issue with students is also suggested by Sampson (2011) in whose study several students saw no other function of MT use than lexical equivalence.

Being a beginner in a language classroom can make students feel vulnerable, overwhelmed, frustrated and humiliated (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009). Brooks-Lewis (2009) reports her own experience of enrolling in a beginners' Spanish class, saying "I felt I had walked into the second act of a three act play" because the whole class was conducted in Spanish. It follows that in such a stressful environment learning does not take place easily. On the other hand, total non-understanding promotes trying to understand the language on a non-linguistic level. The learner must be much more perceptive and rely on noticing body language, tone of voice and other non-language communicative acts (ibid.).

Starting a course completely in the L2 means that the learner and his needs are ignored and that there is no *beginning* (ibid.). Brooks-Lewis reports starting her courses exactly where the learners were, i.e. starting from the MT and only later moving into the L2. Based on the same assumption, Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) suggest that the very first lessons could be mostly conducted in the MT and gradually switch to the maximum use of the L2. The use of the language that the students already know helps to reduce anxiety and creates a more pleasant learning environment (Brooks-Lewis 2009).

For beginners, it is useful to make a poster with a repertoire of basic phrases (such as *put the chairs up, close the windows*) and stick it on the wall (Scrivener 2005). Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) suggest the same, i.e. creating a "classroom glossary" which enables students to express and understand basic instructions and phrases. This strategy is intended to facilitate

communication and usual classroom interactions so that students can use the target language in real communication. However, especially if the instructions are complicated, the teacher may ask one student to repeat the instructions in their L1. This strategy will clearly show to the teacher whether the student being asked understood correctly. Besides, the other students in the class will make sure that they know what is expected from them. Another benefit of using MT in procedural stages of the lesson such as task setting is time efficiency and thus more time for the activity itself. The MT is easily justifiable as a short-cut for giving instructions and explanations where the cost of the L2 is too great (Cook 2001). Macaro (2001) adds that the MT is justifiable if it is a means to a better pedagogical end (ibid.). Apart from efficiency and time saving, it provides a backup in case the L2 knowledge is insufficient.

The target language should be used as much as possible for everyday classroom interactions, such as taking the register, dealing with late arrivals, praising and correcting, announcing and explaining tests, games and setting homework (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009). The first reason for this is that these situations provide opportunities for real, authentic communication. Secondly, the language used in these situations tends to be quite repetitive so that once students learn a basic repertoire of phrases, they have a chance to participate in real communication.

2.12 Translation as a classroom exercise

In the era of communicative language teaching, translation was almost a forbidden technique. The CLT, which focused on communication as the main aim of language teaching as well as the process through which the language is learnt, disregarded the MT. Although now this situation is changing, it still remains true that translation could hardly be the only and central technique used in a language classroom. The most common arguments against translation are for example the reduced exposure to the L2, possible over-reliance on it and students growing used to being offered a translation in case the teacher uses it too much. Besides, all languages are idiomatic to some degree and some language items are untranslatable. Synonymy is also a challenging point in translation. To get all the connotations correct, it might be better to offer examples rather than translation in case the language does not have a fully equivalent expression.

Although a growing number of researchers have considered the positive potential of using translation in language teaching, very little attention has been given specifically to

student perspective, their beliefs about translation and its use as a learning strategy (Liao 2006). Presumably, lower level correlates with greater need and approval of MT. Liao's research revealed that high-level students who major in foreign languages tend to believe translation would generate negative results in their learning. He also warns that because students have often been encouraged by their teachers to think in the target language, some students may have come to believe that it is detrimental for them to depend on their native language while learning and using the target language. This shows that learners' beliefs are strongly shaped by their learning experience and their teachers.

Translation is a skill often needed in real life, be it translating documents, translating our own thoughts or interpreting and mediating for someone else who does not speak the given language. As an example of such mediation, Scrivener (2005) suggests for example an activity named *Diplomatic affairs*. In this activity, two ambassadors speak only English and two interpreters speak both languages. The goal is for the two ambassadors to have a conversation together via whispering their utterances to their translators. The aim of such activities is not only language practice, but also having students realize how the language works, practising promptness and ability to react.

On the other hand, translating a written text requires extremely detailed attention to the text, including reading between the lines, so a translation exercise also has students explore the text in detail. Such detailed approach provides a deep insight into how languages work, what is translatable etc. Besides, rendering a text into another language also requires creativity. Translating also requires flexibility and practises the ability to rephrase as closely as possible in case we do not know the right expression. Finally, translation is an activity useful in everyday life; Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) even suggest that it is the fifth skill. In real life outside the classroom, many likely L2 goals include mediation between two languages rather than staying entirely in the L2 (Cook 2001).

When translating, students usually have enough time for reflection and choosing the best way to formulate the outcome text. While many speaking and generally communicative activities focus on fluency, translation is predominantly concerned with maximum accuracy. Although a common reproach is the absence of communicativeness, it can be easily integrated too, for example by having students discuss their various translations or negotiating during the process of translating. Comparing two different translations may work too. Scrivener (2005) suggests that having read a text in the L2, learners may be asked to summarize in their L1. This can reveal how much the learner understood or misunderstood.

2.12.1 The sandwich technique

Translation does not necessarily have to be only used as an activity for students, but can also work as a teaching strategy. Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) introduce the so-called *sandwich technique* (based on Dodson's bilingual technique) as a means of introducing new language items. A statement in L2 is immediately followed by its translation into L1 and, importantly, repeated again in L2. The translation is thus sandwiched between the utterances in the target language, the structure being L2 → L1 → L2. This technique makes the input comprehensible, even though unknown words and structures are included.

The first statement in L2 ensures exposure to the language and gives students a chance to analyse the unknown language. By restating this in the L1 the teacher makes sure that the students understand. This part might be carried out very discretely in the tone of an aside, as a kind of whispered interpreting (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009) so that the flow of L2 is not disturbed. The final repetition of the L2 provides another exposure and thus contributes to successful retention.

Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) claim that the sandwich technique should be the central technique of any foreign language teaching. To get students used to the technique, the L1 expression should be made taboo once it has been given. However, even so, students can easily get used to being offered a translation and thus give up even attempting to understand the new item. It can therefore be argued that a wider repertoire of ways of determining the meaning should be used too.

In Copland and Neokleous' study (2011), one of the teachers acknowledged that a procedure like the sandwich technique (although not named) was useful. In reality, however, rather than repeating the same information in the other language, there was a strong tendency for code-switching within one utterance in mid-sentences. This example illustrates that the sandwich technique is even unknowingly considered useful, but its execution might be more difficult than it seems. To use it well, teachers should get used to repeating the L2 after translating anything into MT.

2.13 Bilingual reading

Bilingual texts have been available for a long time. Traditionally, one page is in the target language and the opposite page contains its translation. Since the translation is so immediately available, chances are readers will be tempted to read mainly their MT version and not pay enough attention to the L2. Only very self-disciplined students can make

maximum use of such texts, possibly by reading a paragraph of the L2 text first, then the translation, and finally referring back to the L2 (which in fact corresponds to the sandwich technique). To be more pedagogical, such readers could progressively reduce the amount of translation (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009). An L1 text with gaps teaches the readers to depend less on the translation and use it only as a support tool rather than over-relying on it.

Rinvoluceri and Deller (2002) suggest a technique of halving whole stories. The teacher reads out a story in halves. The first is read out in the MT and the second in the L2. In groups, students then share what they remember of the second half, e.g. key words and phrases. Then the story is read again, but the two languages are swapped. Students are again asked to take notes of the L2 and finally reconstruct the story from their notes. The use of both languages ensures that students understand the story well, but the final task of reconstruction makes them listen carefully to the L2 version too.

Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) further mentions so-called sandwich stories, suitable especially for younger learners. The teacher reads a story in their MT, but with simple words exchanged for their L2 counterparts. The story for Czech learners could look like this: *Bylo nebylo, byl jednou jeden king. The king měl tři daughters.* The L2 words are woven into the MT text so that all new expressions are tied to those that the learners already know. The story could be told more times, each time with more L2 expressions so that the scope of the language increases.

Advanced students tend to read fast and concentrate only on the content rather than on the language. Thus reading does not contribute much to their active language skills (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009). To encourage dual focus, so-called re-translation, a technique used already by Roger Ascham, the teacher of Elisabeth I, may be employed (ibid.). Students are given a translated text and translate it back into the original (target) language. Students do not have to be told in advance that the text is a translation. Alternatively, the text for re-translation could be presented in a mixed version, e.g. containing only some phrases or sentences to be translated. Finally the students' translation should be compared with the original and differences discussed in detail, e.g. which words and constructions were translated differently and why.

When (re)translating, both the medium and the message must be taken into consideration and deeper attention is paid to details of the text. Students are thus encouraged to notice the differences and realize in which aspects the two languages work differently and which aspects are the same.

Re-translation in a smaller scope is a suitable warm-up activity. For example, the teacher prepares sheets of paper according to the number of students in the class and writes a sentence on each sheet. Students are then given the sheet and asked to translate. They fold the paper so that only their translation is visible and pass the paper to their neighbour, who translates the sentence again, this time back into the first language. The resulting translations are compared with the original. This activity might be used for example as a revision of vocabulary or structures covered in the last lesson or, in case of carefully selected examples, also to demonstrate to the students how important accuracy is and how easily mistranslations occur⁸.

There are a number of activities which involve translation. For example, students might enjoy creating subtitles for a film or even dubbing it themselves. Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) suggest hunting for mistranslations as a source of both fun and learning.

2.13.1 Reducing cognitive load with the help of translation

If the topic to be discussed in class is too difficult, Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) advise giving students a text dealing with the same topic but in their MT for home preparation. This preparatory input helps develop ideas as a precursor to expressing them in L2. In this way students are able to tackle more difficult texts, which means that the content can be more engaging and the process more rewarding (Deller and Rinvoluceri 2002).

Similar L2 preparation could be used for many other activities. For example, in case of films and videos, learners could first watch in their MT to understand the content, before proceeding to the L2 version. Such a procedure makes more space for concentration on the language since the content is already familiar to the students and the cognitive load is thus lower. Besides, the natural process of preparing for the less familiar (ibid.) allows students to focus on the content before they have to think about the form. Deller and Rinvoluceri (ibid.) also suggest using MT input in order to help students to produce a more meaningful outcome.

2.14 Dealing with too much MT

To deal with situations in which students use too much of their MT, the teacher may simply ignore what students say in their MT (Harmer 2007). The same ignorance of utterances in the MT is suggested by Scrivener (2005). He also implies that students tend to

⁸ For example, *I have a few friends* as opposed to *I have few friends*.

employ their MT over the target language when they are for some reason afraid of speaking the L2. In such situations the teachers are advised to maintain a positive and generally encouraging working atmosphere to make students feel less intimidated. Shy students who get discouraged easily might find it easier to talk within a smaller group or in pairs rather than in front of the whole class. Teachers should respond positively to every effort made by the students to use the L2 and also spend a lot of time on practising fluency without too much correction (ibid.). The L2 will thus become a more natural way of expression rather than only something that is being studied.

To discourage unnecessary use of MT and also to diagnose students' gaps, an *MT scribe* activity could be employed in the lesson (Deller and Rinvoluceri 2002). One of the students (possibly the one who is most prone to using the MT) is asked not to participate in an activity and instead note down anything that is said in the MT. A subsequent analysis of the MT contributions might reveal that students are in fact able to replace many MT utterances with L2. Those that the students cannot translate serve to the teacher as information about what needs to be studied. Furthermore, even the fact that the MT is being recorded might serve as a reminder that discourages students from its use.

Students often feel the need to use a word they do not know in the L2. Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) advise that students should be free to ask how to say things in the FL, or should simply insert the MT expression, rather than stop talking. The degree to which this should be done is questionable. Having the students express themselves is surely crucial, but they should also be taught to bypass such difficulties using other strategies. Apart from paraphrase, definition and description, Sampson (2011) also suggests teaching phrases such as "Hang on a moment" or "What's the word I'm looking for" as L2 fillers.

On the other hand, Sampson's study reports several students who prefer no L1 used by their teachers. L2-only classroom poses more challenges and is perceived as more motivating. Presumably, these views are held by learners who are motivated to learn the L2 and possibly had a negative experience with the teacher using too much L1.

2.15 Summary of the theoretical part

The theoretical part of the thesis shows that the classroom in which only the L2 is used is already overcome. In the literature on FLT the role of the MT is widely discussed and its use generally supported. The mass of literature on this topic suggests that nowadays the campaign in its favour is becoming as strong as the campaign against it was in the past.

Formal education is not a suitable environment for total immersion, mainly because of time limitations. Especially for lower-level students, fully monolingual environment is not necessarily an effective one. Students, by definition, do not have a perfect repertoire of the L2, but they all have knowledge of their MT. One of the situations in which they reach for the MT is when the lack of language prevents them from expressing themselves. However, it must be noted that learners have their individual learning styles and beliefs and therefore it would be a mistake to overgeneralize that the MT should be used in the same ways with all learners. Just as there is not yet a universal method which would be beneficial to everyone, it should not be concluded that the MT is a universally beneficial teaching aid. It depends on the individual teachers how comfortable they are using a particular approach and how well they employ it for their students' benefit. It remains in their responsibility to do their best to find an approach which is most suitable for their learners. To achieve this, the teacher should discuss with their students the use of the MT in the classroom and learning strategies in general. If the students know why the teacher uses the MT at certain times or why they are discouraged from using it at others, it might be easier for both parties to adhere to clearly set rules about the MT and L2 use. This shows that both teacher and learner beliefs play an essential role in education.

3 Material and method

3.1 Research questions

The practical part of this thesis attempts to answer the question of how students perceive the current situation in language learning and teaching as it is described in the theoretical part. It is expected that the respondents participating in the research, having achieved a high level of proficiency in English, will not perceive the MT as a positive contribution to their own learning, but they will be more open to the advantages of the MT use in case of lower-level students. In the literature there is a notable shift towards promoting the active use of the mother tongue in the language classrooms. This overall attitude will be compared with the opinions, perceptions and experience of the participating students. To obtain data for the analysis, a questionnaire will be used as the tool.

The main aim of the research part is to determine whether Czech students see their mother tongue as a beneficial, useful tool or rather as an obstacle in language learning. If Czech is seen as a complication by the students, it will be necessary to consider the causes and possible remedies and, primarily, ways of avoiding situations in which the mother tongue is perceived negatively. If Czech is seen as positively contributing to language learning, it will be described how in particular it can facilitate L2 learning, how much Czech is appropriate and in what situations.

The questionnaire combines both quantitative and qualitative approaches. It is hoped that especially the replies to the open-ended questionnaire items will reveal specific examples of how students account for their opinions and what aspects they mention as important for them.

3.2 Research instrument

To obtain real classroom data, either observations or recordings are necessary, but it is probable that recorded or observed teachers would behave at least slightly differently in order to conform to the school rules or any other pressures they might feel. This problem is also mentioned in literature, for example in the study by Copland and Neokleous (2010), who conclude that when teachers were asked about how they made decisions about the language in which to conduct teaching, they generally denied using the MT, but used it in their classes anyway. The authors illustrate this on several examples from interviews and classroom observations and conclude that the stated beliefs are significantly different from their

classroom practice. The conclusion of the above mentioned study was that teachers often underreport or differently report their use of L1 in the classroom, contradicting beliefs by their actions (Copland, Neokleous 2010). For this reason, face-to-face interviews as well as classroom observations were ruled out.

The data for the research part were obtained through an online questionnaire. The questionnaire was chosen as the best tool for several reasons. First, it allows for a higher number of participants than one-to-one interviews. Second, unlike observations, the data obtained through a questionnaire are based on the views of many different participants, not only the observer. Although the respondents themselves are likely to be biased, the number of participants is thought to compensate for it. Third, the questionnaire can be given to a geographically heterogeneous group of participants, not only e.g. Prague-based ones, as would be the case if observations were done. Next, the questionnaire can be a flexible tool as it is up to the participants to fill it in when they wish and without any time limit. Besides, it is possible to obtain data based on the point of view of the respondent-student as well as respondent-teacher.

The questionnaire format has its disadvantages too. First, there is the risk of low response rate which was also the case of this study. Second, the questions cannot be explained or further specified by the researcher. This risk can be lowered by conducting a pilot study, but it is still possible that in some cases respondents would appreciate having an opportunity to have the questions clarified or placed within some context. Third, when compiling the questionnaire, the researcher has to decide subjectively what is important enough to be included. Some essential aspects might be missed altogether while others might be overemphasised. As for the respondents, it cannot be controlled how deeply they think about the questions and if they answer based on their own beliefs or rather based on what they think is expected from them. Besides, when filling in the questionnaire, the respondent might think of one particular situation and not the whole subject in general.

3.3 Piloting

The first draft of the questionnaire was consulted with the thesis supervisor. Next, the questionnaire was piloted in a smaller scope which yielded valuable feedback. In this stage, it was filled in and commented on by three current and former students of English and American studies who also have experience with teaching English at language schools. They suggested changing the order of questions, reformulating several items and also reducing the

length. All their comments and recommendations were taken into consideration when preparing the final version of the questionnaire.

The final version of the questionnaire was shortened compared to the piloted version. The main reason for the omission of several questions was mostly the limitations of the online software. Some more complex questions which were prepared would have to be divided into many separate items and the questionnaire would be too lengthy. Since the length is arguably the factor which discourages many respondents from participating, some questions were left out.

It was also decided that each section of the questionnaire would be concluded with an optional open-ended question to provide space for any comments or ideas related to the items in the particular section. This was found more practical and graphically better than allowing space for comments for each individual question.

3.4 Description of the questionnaire

The questionnaire was composed out of questions which mostly arose during the preparation of the theoretical part of this thesis. It maps the current situation at Czech secondary schools, the experience and attitudes of students to using Czech as well as the participants' own teaching preferences in case they already have some teaching experience.

The questionnaire was compiled in Czech. Since the mother tongue is the main topic of the research, it was believed that using Czech in the questionnaire is preferable since it is the mother tongue for the students. For the purposes of the analysis, the responses were translated by the researcher when necessary.

Both closed and open-ended items were used. The goal of the research was not only to find out whether students agree or disagree with the incorporation of the MT, but also what they have to say about it. For this, open-ended questions were employed since they allow more themes to emerge in the data.

The close-ended questions had the students choose between *yes / no* or predefined answers appropriate to each question. When using a scale to measure frequency, it was decided to use a four-point Likert scale which offered *never – hardly ever – sometimes – often* as options. The absence of the middle, neutral answer makes the respondents think more about their answers and hopefully yields more concrete data.

The questionnaire was created and carried out using online software www.vyplnto.cz which also provides some tools for the subsequent data analysis. The software allows marking

questions as required or optional, defining many types of answers, defining a scale separately for each question and many other advanced features, which proved highly practical when creating the questionnaire.

The final version of the questionnaire contained 35 question items which were divided into 7 categories. The first section started with three introductory questions which would help characterize the participants. They inquired about self-evaluation of the participants' level of English, whether they had any experience of being teachers themselves, and, most importantly, where they studied secondary school. The type of secondary school is not considered. Both Czech and Slovak schools were included in the research. Since the two countries share a common history and the mentality is also very similar, the teaching styles are comparable. Besides, Czech and Slovak languages are structurally very similar, so it is assumed that both could serve comparable purposes and illustrate similar points. In one case, a student reported having studied abroad. For this reason, this respondent was left out, making the final number of analysed questionnaires 37.

The other two questions in the first section included two open-ended items. Item 4 asked the participants to summarize some advantages and disadvantages of the MT use in language classroom. This item was included in the introductory section with the aim of having the respondents discuss their own opinions before being potentially influenced by the specific questions which followed. In other words, this question gave the participants the space and time to start thinking in detail about the mother tongue use. With the same motivation, question 5 asked for specific examples of situations in which the MT use might be beneficial.

The second section (items 6-11) was concerned with the students' experience from their secondary schools, asking about the habits of both students and teachers. Since the first five questions are multiple-choice ones, the participants were given an opportunity to add any comments or specify their answers in Question 11. Items 12-22 asked about learning languages in general, the attitudes to the use of MT in relation with various areas of learning and the situations in which students are likely to use Czech. The fourth section (Questions 23-27) was related to the participants' learning strategies when studying and recording vocabulary. The following two sections were marked as optional as not all the students might have experience with the situations in question. Items 28-31 were concerned with the teaching practises of native speakers and their treatment of their students' mother tongue; in items 31-33 the students who have experience of being teachers themselves described their use of the MT when teaching. Finally, question 34 asked for general evaluation of the participants'

secondary school teachers and question 35 provided space for any comments and ideas related to the topic of the MT use in foreign language learning and teaching.

3.5 Participants

In total 37⁹ first- and second-year students of BA stage of English and American studies programme participated in the research. These participants provide a valuable in-between point of view from the perspective of both learners and teachers, i.e. they report on the behaviour of their teachers as well as their own teaching practice where applicable.

These students have already been at least a year away from their high schools, which means they are likely to have a top view of the school situations. Unlike students of other programmes, they are more interested in learning English and hopefully are able to provide more detailed insight into language learning, including an evaluation of their teachers' practices. Since many of these students already have some experience from active teaching and tutoring, the questionnaire contains question items which enquire about their own teaching styles. Such questions would be impossible to ask if a different group of respondents was participating. These participants are hopefully not as biased as for example students of translation, who are expected to work with their MT on a larger scale, would be. Lastly, students participating in the present study were educated in the modern, post-socialist era in which their teachers already had access to current trends, journals, training and modern textbooks.

In many ways, these students can be defined as privileged. They are advanced students who are successful in their language learning. Besides, Czech and English are both Indo-European languages, similar in many aspects (Forman 2014).

Most literature deals with the MT use in relation with beginners and low-level classes. The participants of this research represent a totally opposite group in terms of language level. In fact, their high level of English might be a source of bias as they are already able to study the language without any help of the MT. They presumably have above-average language learning aptitude. However, in the role of the teacher, they probably work with a range of language levels much lower than theirs. Therefore, as teachers, they might employ different methods than the ones used in their own studying.

⁹ This number already excludes the participant who attended secondary school abroad.

4 Data analysis

4.1 General description of the data

All the data were collected in a written form and were fully anonymous. The questionnaire was available online between May 27 and June 20, 2015. Out of 156 approached respondents, 132 clicked on the provided link and 38 filled the questionnaire in, which represents a 24.4% return rate. All of them did so within the first week of this period. They spent on average 25 minutes completing the questionnaire. Because of the length of the questionnaire and the number of open-ended questions which provided enough data, the total number of 37 respondents was considered sufficient for the data analysis.

The respondents form a homogenous group who share several characteristics. They all attended Czech or Slovak secondary schools, and now study the same study programme, which means they also share the interest to study English. It may be assumed that they invested more time and energy into learning English than their schoolmates at secondary schools. All respondents described their level of English as C1 or C2 (73 and 27% respectively).

In some questions the students were asked about learning foreign languages in general while in others the focus was specifically on Czech as the MT and English as the L2. However, in the open-ended questions the respondents often gave general answers to questions asking specifically about learning English. These answers were translated and used in the analysis as the students wrote them which sometimes results in inconsistencies in the descriptions. The responses were translated as they were provided by the students, i.e. including colloquial language, imprecise formulations and hedging.

4.2 Analysis of the introductory open-ended questions

4.2.1 Advantages and disadvantages of using the MT in L2 learning

The introductory open-ended question (Question 4) asked about the reasons for and against the incorporation of the mother tongue into foreign language teaching. The participants were asked to consider the point of view of both teachers and students. This question was intended to provide the participants with a chance to express any ideas and positive and negative aspects regarding the MT use in L2 learning before they started filling in the questionnaire. The question did not suggest any specific areas to focus on in order not

to influence the answers. However, it seems that most respondents share rather similar ideas as to how the MT can and should be used in the classroom.

Since this question was obligatory, it was answered by all 37 participants. For the purposes of the analysis, each student was assigned a number and is referred to as S1-38 (S9 being excluded). For easier analysis, all data were coded according to topics, key words and ideas expressed by each participant¹⁰. The most commonly mentioned points which emerged from the analysis were the mother tongue facilitating comprehension during the lessons, both positives and negatives regarding translation into the MT and the possibility to compare the MT with the L2. The respondents also pointed out that the amount of the MT use depends on the level of proficiency of students and that students might overly rely on the MT. The main ideas and the numbers of mentions are summarized in Table 1 below.

Topic mentioned	Mentions
MT use facilitating comprehension	23
Usefulness of translating into the MT	16
Usefulness of comparing the MT with the L2	15
The link between using the L1 and the level of proficiency	13
Impeding acquisition	9
Using the MT possibly leading to learning the L2 incorrectly and misunderstanding the differences between the languages	8
Danger of the misuse of Czech and overreliance on it	8
Better effectivity and time-saving	7
Using the MT during the lessons being easier for student / teacher	4
Being used to relying on the MT possibly later causing problems in real communication outside the classroom	3

Table 1: Overview of the most frequent types and frequency of responses to a question regarding the pros and cons of the use of the MT in FLT

The fact that the use of the L1 might facilitate comprehension is the most commonly mentioned topic in the data. In total, 62% of respondents mentioned in their answers that the MT is helpful in that it makes understanding easier for the students. Frequently, respondents mentioned the helpfulness of the MT in particular when grammar is explained (e.g. S1, S13 S25) and new vocabulary presented (S33, S38). Comprehension was often linked to the level of students (S7, S16, S18); for example, S7 mentions that the MT makes communication

¹⁰ Since the data were coded only by the researcher, it is possible that some misinterpretations might occur. To avoid or at least lower this risk, at least two researchers would have to code the data independently.

easier in case students do not have sufficient command of the language. The general view is that the lower the level of the students is, the more the MT is necessary.

Regarding translating, several issues emerged from the data. It seems that for the respondents translating is a topic which is immediately linked to the MT use. This can be illustrated for example by the answer of S27 who did not mention any other aspect of MT use apart from translation. Most other students, however, mentioned more topics than one only.

The importance of knowing both the use of the particular word and its correct translation is mentioned in several answers (S1, S23, S27). For example, S1 stresses that *new words should be learned together with their Czech counterparts, not only in the L2. [The absence of a translation] leads to uncertainty*. On the other hand, S11 warns that translation often reduces the meaning of the original word, saying that *many words cannot be translated directly. They are inherently tied to a certain situation and have their connotations which are lost in the translation. I am not saying translations shouldn't be provided at all, but careful attention should be paid to these aspects*. Other respondents (S14, S19) share a similar view and warn that in certain cases the translation is not always precise. S14 says that *because of too much reliance on the mother tongue in teaching, important connotations of a word or expression may elude the student if that word is commonly presented as an equivalent of a word in the mother tongue*. However, this student is overall very positive about using translation in learning and teaching and considers translation the key learning strategy: *in my opinion translation is one of the best ways to learn a foreign language* (S14). S19 also warns that connotations do not always correspond in the two languages, especially in case of culturally loaded words.

Another aspect of translations mentioned in the responses is its effect on memory. S23 wrote that *it is easier to remember a translation than a lengthy definition in the foreign language*. In general, most students perceive translation as a useful tool but some warn against imperfect one-to-one correspondences.

The positive aspects of comparing the two languages were mentioned by fifteen respondents and not considered negative by any respondents. While some of them mention that this is especially useful for pointing out similarities (e.g. S17), most answers consider comparing beneficial mainly because it helps to understand the differences between the languages, not just the similarities. For example, S3 states that *comparing the two languages helps to understand that the languages work in a different way*. S22 shares this view too:

In my opinion, examples from the mother tongue should be used ONLY when stressing and realizing the important, yet at first sight minute differences [...], so, paradoxically, a means of “distancing” from the mother tongue (S22).

In fact, for S22 comparing is the sole benefit of the mother tongue in language learning as no other aspects are mentioned in this answer. On the contrary, another student (S15) perceives the first language as the basis for learning the second one; this respondent values especially the *possibility to “build” a language based on the first one* (quotation marks original), which implies that the role of the mother tongue is essential.

About a third of the responses mention the importance of the level of proficiency of the students when deciding which language to use for teaching. The almost universal view is that the mother tongue is necessary and helpful for lower-level students (S18, S19, S33). S15 shares this view too but also adds that the mother tongue may as well *speed up the lessons especially in case of very advanced students (C1-C2) who want to study English as a field* (S15). Even S28 who believes that *learning [L2] should not be based on the MT* excludes less advanced students from this and adds that this does not apply in case of low-level students.

The topic of anxiety is closely connected to the attained level. Three respondents (S11, S33, S35) believe that instruction in English only may increase the level of stress experienced by lower-level learners. For example, S33 says that it is *unnecessarily stressful if students do not understand most of what is being said by the teacher*. The same view is expressed by another student:

If you speak only the foreign language to a class of not really advanced students, it may demoralize them considerably. If they are not at a level at which they understand most of the lesson, they will end up being traumatized by it (S11).

For the respondents, there seem to be a strong connection between low-level students and anxiety. The prevalent view is that the mother tongue use in the class is advisable mostly for lower-level students but the benefits of using the mother tongue when working with very advanced students are also mentioned. Conducting the lesson solely in the L2 seems to be the ideal situation but concessions are readily made for those students who are not *advanced enough to manage the whole lesson in English* (S16).

Nine students expressed an opinion that the inclusion of the MT leads to slower acquisition of the L2. However, all nine answers which mentioned this topic included both positives and negatives of using the MT in FLT, which means that none of these respondents considered the MT only a hindrance in learning. Students are afraid that not creating an English-only environment leads to the perception that Czech is a natural language (S13, S35) in the L2 classroom, and thus to its overuse. This, in turn, leads to slower and more problematic acquisition, as expressed by S34: *If students do not get used to the foreign language, it will take them longer to learn to communicate in English if only the MT is used as the language of instruction.* Although the respondents do not search for a remedy in their answers, it follows that it is the absence of rules of using the MT in the classroom which leads the students to overusing it.

Overly relying on Czech and its subsequent misuse is closely connected to misunderstanding the differences between the two languages. Respondents S26 and S29 note that the use of Czech in English learning and teaching also leads to problems especially when a student attempts to apply a Czech structure to an incompatible English sentence. As S26 puts it, *for students it is sometimes difficult to understand that the grammatical structure of the foreign language is different from that of the MT.* Instruction at least partially in the MT leads to certainty that the student will be understood and helped by the teacher if necessary (S1, S8). According to S6, there might be some *sliding into the more natural language* which does not have to be a result of laziness or ignorance, but rather a natural process of finding the most immediate way to express oneself.

Too much reliance on Czech may also result in problems in real communication with other L2 speakers outside the classroom. S7 mentions that *if students are not used to using the target language in natural communication except during tasks, it might lead to increased shyness in the target language.* Another problem, commented on by S10, is that students who are used to being helped by the teacher if they insert a Czech expression may have problems when communicating with a foreigner who, unlike their teacher, does not understand their MT.

4.2.2 Teaching situations in which Czech is more efficient than English

The last question of the introductory part of the questionnaire was also open-ended. Participants were asked to supply particular examples of situations in which Czech is more efficient than English. Out of 37 answers, only two students wrote they could not imagine any

such situations, but the remaining 35 students found at least one example. Table 2 below summarizes the most frequently mentioned topics.

Topic mentioned	Mentions
Teaching grammar	18
Teaching vocabulary and idioms	13
Teaching beginners and low-level students	10
Making explicit connections between English and Czech vocabulary	5
Comparing the structures in both languages	3
Teaching translating	3

Table 2: Overview of the most frequently mentioned topics in response to a question regarding examples of situations in which Czech is more efficient than English.

When answering this question, 49% of students mentioned grammar as an area in which Czech can be more efficient than the target language. Most students answered the question with a general mention of *grammar* rather than a specific topic or a teaching situation, which were supplied only by four students (S5, S21, S31, S37). All of them specified that the area in which Czech can be better than English is tenses. While three of the answers did not go into detail, one answer specified that Czech should be used to *explain tenses, especially the perfect ones which Czech does not have and students find it difficult to grasp the principle* (S37).

Other students consider Czech more efficient than English when teaching grammar to beginners (S10, S14, S18). S14 says that *even talented students may have problems to understand grammar of the foreign language at the beginning, especially if the explanation is done in the language which they are only just studying*.

These results show that the students are willing to sacrifice maximum exposure to the target language in favour of clear and understandable grammar explanations. For example, S32 wrote a personal note on this topic: *I generally preferred when new grammar was first explained in Czech in full*. Besides, the number of answers which state that grammar should be explained in Czech also implies that there is a preference to study and teach grammar in the traditional way through overt presentation.

As regards teaching and learning vocabulary, 35% of students mentioned they welcome the translation into the MT and 14% argue for creating an active link between the equivalents in the MT and the L2. For example, S23 writes about strengthening the link between the English words and their meaning if the Czech counterpart is readily available: *if I*

learn the word in my mother tongue, I perceive its meaning better, while if I learn a definition which for example describes a character trait, I feel it with a much weaker and a less concrete meaning. S12 appreciates knowing the Czech equivalent as it helps to create a stronger memory link: *I personally remember new words and phrases better if I have a clear, distinct Czech counterpart instead of a lengthy definition in the foreign language.* Other students (S27, S38) note that providing a translation is much more economical than a lengthy definition. Three students (S3, S8, S28) consider knowing a Czech version of idioms essential.

The students point out that knowing a word in the target language does not necessarily mean that the user can link it with its counterpart in the mother tongue. Such gaps in knowledge originate when the meaning of a word is understood from the context or an L2 explanation. S11 then describes a situation which may follow: *Someone wants you to translate a sentence which you understand perfectly well but you have no idea what words to use in the translation. It is useful to learn in connection with Czech unless it is overdone.* From the responses it is evident that some students already have experience with translating as two more answers (S15, S21) mention the necessity of providing a Czech equivalent when teaching translating.

The data show the students are aware that learners on lower levels of proficiency may benefit from using different techniques than the more advanced ones. 27% of responses contained mentions of the necessity of incorporating Czech into lessons for beginners, low-level students and children. The benefits of having a teacher who knows both the MT and the L2 are summarized by S22: *unlike a native speaker of the foreign language, [this teacher] can recognize not only when the student makes a mistake, but also why.*

The first two open-ended questions clearly show that respondents are not only passive receivers of teaching, but individuals with their own opinions and beliefs who, in some cases, already put these into their own practise. Without any ideas being offered to them, the students managed to come up with numerous aspects, both positive and negative, of using the MT in teaching and learning. They are clearly able to analyse classroom reality. Besides, the teachers should be prepared for the fact that students have their own beliefs and experiences which strongly influence their approach to learning as well as teaching.

4.3 Attitudes to and experience from the secondary schools

The second section of the questionnaire deals with the students' experience from secondary schools, especially regarding translation and teaching vocabulary. Tables 3 and 4 below summarize the results.

	never	hardly ever	sometimes	often
6. Did your teacher speak with you about learning (e.g. provided advice on how to learn, was interested in your opinions on his / her methods and whether you are happy with them)?	43%	27%	22%	8%
7. Did students ask about the Czech translation of unknown words?	0%	16%	38%	46%
9. Did students tend to ask other students for translations of new words and instructions?	0%	24%	46%	30%
10. Did your teacher use translation as a type of exercise?	19%	32%	14%	35%

Table 3: Overview of the answers to questions related to secondary school experience and the use of translation as a teaching strategy.

	8. How did your teacher present new vocabulary?
He / she rather translated into Czech	49%
He / she rather explained in English	11%
He / she did both	32%
Different answer	8%
total	100%

Table 4: Overview of the answers to the questions related to presenting new vocabulary.

In Question 6 students were asked whether and how often their secondary school teacher discussed learning with them, for example providing advice on learning strategies and discussing his or her own teaching methods with the students. The respondents were asked to tick their answer on a scale which offered *never* – *hardly ever* – *sometimes* – *often* as possible answers.

43% of students marked *never* as their answer, 27% ticked *hardly ever*. 22% marked *sometimes*, leaving only 8% for *often*. The results show that 70% of teachers are generally

unwilling to let students participate in shaping the teaching and uninterested in their opinions on teaching and learning. It might be argued that teachers should be able to observe the class carefully so that they could adjust their teaching strategies, but it is questionable whether this is enough. In response to Question 11 which provided the students space to specify their answers or express any further ideas relating to the previous questions, S21 wrote that *teachers should make effort to find out about the quality of their performance* which is apparently a quality that is missed.

49% of teachers translated new words into Czech as a way of presenting vocabulary while 14% used only English. 32% of teachers used both strategies, but in the comments S22 says that an *explanation in English was considered rather an extra effort than a natural thing*. In the remaining two cases, the teachers let their students deal with new vocabulary as they wished, thus not teaching it at all, which was criticized in the comments by S11. The comments also reveal that the students consider explaining vocabulary in English useful; for example S11 sees it as *a really good activity for teaching the language*.

The results suggest that knowing the Czech equivalents is important for students. In Question 7 (*Did students ask about the Czech translation of unknown word?*), the respondents answered *often* in 46% of cases and *sometimes* 38%. 16% of students marked *hardly ever* and no-one chose *never*. It seems there is no link between teaching vocabulary only in English and students asking for a Czech translation as out of 17 cases in which students ticked *often*, only one student (representing 6% of the subgroup) reported that the teacher used mostly English for vocabulary presentation. In fact, even in cases when teachers used Czech translations for teaching vocabulary, 53% of respondents report that their fellow students tended to ask for a Czech translation.

These results suggest that students who are used to instruction only in English are generally satisfied with the explanation they receive. It would, however, be useful to have further details about this group of students, for example if they translate the words later on their own or look up an example etc. On the other hand, 46% of those who asked for a Czech translation did so although their teacher commonly used Czech in vocabulary teaching, which suggests that students who are used to being given a translation require it.

30% of students say that their fellow students often asked other students for a translation or explanation if they did not understand the teacher. 46% of respondents say it happened *sometimes* and 24% say it was *hardly ever*. The option *never* was not ticked by any respondents. Except for two students, those who ticked *hardly ever* or *sometimes* also reported in the previous questions that their teachers translated new vocabulary into Czech or

used both Czech and English, which implies that these students did not have the need to ask for clarifications. Only two respondents whose fellow students *hardly ever* or *sometimes* asked the others for clarification report that their teachers used mostly English. The answer *often* is evenly distributed among all teaching styles. From the answers it is evident that understanding is essential for students and also that if they do not understand the teacher, they do not hesitate to ask the other students as an alternative strategy. This is also described by S11 who commented that *everyone looked up unknown words on their own – often asking their neighbours*.

The data show that translation is a valid teaching technique at Czech secondary schools. 34% of the students report that their teachers often used translating in their lessons, while 19% of teachers never did so. Considering the fact that 51% of teachers were reported to use translation in their lessons either *never* or *hardly ever* (19% and 32% respectively), it can be assumed that their attitude towards this activity is rather negative. This finding also suggests that many teachers are still strongly influenced by the former trend of education exclusively in the L2. Since the data are gathered via the students, it cannot be judged what factors the remaining teachers who used translation as a type of exercise took into consideration when using this particular activity.

4.4 Learning languages and the usefulness of the MT

The third section of the questionnaire examines how important it is for the teachers to know the MT of their students and the usefulness of Czech in particular in relation to how advanced students are. Table 5 below summarizes the results of Questions 12-16 in which students were asked about the use of the MT from the point of view of both the teacher and the student. If they wished to do so, the participants could specify their answers in Question 22.

	yes	no
12. Should the teacher know his / her students' MT?	68%	32%
13. Should the teacher use the MT of his / her students during the lessons?	49%	51%
14. Should the students use their MT during the lessons?	41%	59%
15. Is it necessary to understand everything that is being said in the L2 during the lessons?	24%	76%
16. Should a lesson for beginners be conducted entirely in English?	14%	86%

Table 5: Overview of the answers to questions related to the importance of the MT knowledge in learning and teaching.

The introductory five questions in this section map how important it is to know and use the MT. The numbers indicate that on the part of the teacher the knowledge of the MT is welcome but its use is not supported too strongly. Regardless of the level, 68% of the students claim that the teachers should know their students' MT and 49% of students agree that the teacher should use the MT during the lessons. Even fewer participants (41%) agree that students should use their MT when learning. For example, S18 agrees with it, but only when the MT *helps to understand the topic better*. In the comments, 4 students mentioned the link between the level and the MT use. While 3 of them expressed the more expected view that the lower the level, the more the MT can be used, one respondent disagreed. S14, on the contrary, believes that *in the early stages of learning a new language, students should learn from a native speaker, ideally someone who does not speak their MT so that they are not tempted to overuse the MT*. On the other hand, S14 prefers the absence of the MT on the part of the teacher, but agrees with the MT use by students, saying that *the use of the MT should not be banned. For example, students can check with each other that they understand a new word*.

Only 24% of the students believe that it is necessary for the student to understand everything during the lessons. S18 says that *students should be encouraged to ask if they do not understand, ideally in the foreign language*. It thus seems that full understanding is easily sacrificed in the learning process (76% of the respondents claim it is not necessary to understand everything). Unfortunately the respondents did not elaborate on this topic in their comments. Out of the 9 participants who are in favour of full understanding, 8 were used to being provided with either a Czech translation of new words or both a translation and an English explanation at their secondary schools. Eight of them also agree that a lesson for beginners should not be conducted exclusively in English. All 9 respondents believe that Czech is useful when explaining grammar to lower-level students but only 6 believe so in case of teaching vocabulary. We can thus conclude that these students who are in favour of complete understanding were used to having a translation at hand but they would not readily copy this model in their own teaching. However, they agree that the MT has its place in teaching beginners.

In the second part of this section of the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to choose whether they agree or disagree with the given statement about the usefulness of using Czech. The answers were ticked separately for lower-level students (up to B1) and higher-level students (B1 and higher). Tables 6 and 7 below show the breakdown according to level. The general trend manifested in the figures is the tendency to use more MT for

lower-level students but considerably less once the students reach a higher level of proficiency.

17+18. It is useful when the teacher uses Czech when	lower-level students (up to B1)		higher-level students (B1 and higher)	
	I agree	I disagree	I agree	I disagree
explaining grammar	95%	5%	32%	68%
presenting new vocabulary	54%	46%	14%	86%
explaining the differences between Czech and English (contrastive approach)	89%	11%	59%	41%

Table 6: Overview of the answers to questions related to the role of the MT when teaching lower-level versus higher-level students.

19+20. Students find it useful if	lower-level students (up to B1)		higher level students (B1 and higher)	
	I agree	I disagree	I agree	I disagree
they can use Czech during pairwork and groupwork	30%	70%	8%	92%
the teacher translates the word so that they understand fully	89%	11%	46%	54%
are provided with an explanation of a word in English as well as a Czech translation	92%	8%	46%	54%

Table 7: Overview of the answers to questions related to the usefulness of the MT from the point of view of the student.

The view that Czech is a valuable resource for teaching grammar to lower-level students is supported by 95% of respondents but only by 32% in case of higher-level students. Thus Czech seems to be considered an obvious tool to teach lower-level grammar, possibly because it is considered too complex to be explained in English. Vocabulary, on the other hand, seems easier to present even in the L2 as 46% of respondents disagree with using Czech here. Only 14% of respondents agree with the usefulness of Czech when teaching vocabulary to higher-level students.

Czech is apparently a useful tool for drawing comparisons between the two languages. This holds true regardless of the level, although the percentage of respondents who agree with the statement decreases from 89% (lower-level students) to 59% (higher-level students). Being able to contrast the studied languages seems important at all levels.

Using Czech during activities in pairs or groups is not welcome on any level, although it appears more acceptable for the respondents in case of lower-level students. 89% of the

respondents agree that it is useful for students if an unknown word is translated into their MT, but even more (92%) respondents support the idea of providing both an explanation in English and a Czech translation. In her answer to Question 27, S11 says that being an advanced student, she prefers working in English only. However, *in a language in which I am a beginner I rely on a translation because there is no other choice*. This personal statement tallies with the above-mentioned results.

In case of higher-level students, the respondents are almost equally divided between agreeing and disagreeing with the usefulness of translating words (46 and 54% respectively). In the comments, S19 writes that *the MT definitely helps. The lower the level, the more necessary its use, but even at C1/C2 level I am sometimes unsure unless I translate literally*. This comment illustrates the usefulness of a translation to facilitate understanding at all levels. However, S7 says that *a translation should be restricted only to cases in which the word has its Czech equivalent* and illustrates this with the example of mistranslating *buchta* as *cake*. For this person, the disadvantages of translating outweigh the positives.

Question 21 asked the respondents to define in what situations students are most likely to use Czech. While only several responses contained just one example of such a situation, most students came up with a more detailed list of possible situations. Table 8 presents the most frequently mentioned topics.

21. Students tend to use Czech	Mentions
when they work in pairs or groups	12
when they do not have a sufficient level of English	9
when they check whether they understand correctly	8
when they do not understand the explanation in English	8
when they are afraid of making a mistake	5

Table 8: Overview of the most frequent types and frequency of responses to a question regarding the likelihood of using Czech during lessons.

Using Czech during pairwork and groupwork is mentioned by 12 respondents. The responses suggest that for students Czech is much more natural than English when interacting with their peers (S7, S11, S21). S7 writes that during group activities the MT *is automatically used as it is more natural in communication while English is perceived only as an artificial barrier*. S11 adds that students may *feel awkward, especially at secondary schools where nobody wants to appear to be a dutiful student*. S21 ascribes this problem to *laziness to*

communicate in the foreign language with someone with whom I normally communicate differently. S35 describes the experience from secondary school:

Unless the student is really motivated and constantly under the teacher's supervision, he / she is swayed by less advanced students who use Czech. Everyone would probably feel unnatural if asked to speak English to the others and at the same time hear their Czech reactions.

On the other hand, S15 also mentions that using Czech in pairwork may be beneficial as it accelerates the activity. However, other respondents seem to have a negative attitude towards using Czech during class activities. Students' beliefs and attitudes seem to be the key problem in such situations; students who understand the benefits of practising the L2 in pairs or groups with the absence of the teacher are less likely to resort to Czech. Such situations also illustrate the importance of learner beliefs as one of the key factors which have impact on how successful the learning is.

According to the respondents, students tend to resort to Czech in situations when they do not have sufficient knowledge of English to express what they need to say. Lack of vocabulary is especially stressed as a factor strongly contributing to the need for Czech (S5, S10, S24). Such situations can be easily solved by using the MT which the teacher understands. For example, S10 describes the tendency to use Czech if a student cannot remember or does not know a word rather than describe the unknown word in English.

Students are also likely to use Czech when they want to ensure that they understand correctly. They use it both with their peers and the teacher. The typical scenario is described by S4: *when the teacher explains a word in English, the student says it in Czech to make sure that he / she understands well.* Making sure about correct understanding of instructions is another topic mentioned by the respondents (S1, S38). 8 respondents believe that students are likely resort to Czech when they do not understand what is being said in the classroom.

Another topic which emerged from the responses is anxiety; 5 respondents believe that Czech is used instead of English when students are unsure and too afraid of making a mistake. From the responses it seems that students do not like taking risks and when uncertain, they choose Czech as a means of avoiding possible mistakes. S12 lists situations in which students may prefer to use Czech: *when they are uncertain in their speech, afraid that other students are listening, embarrassed to speak.* In other words, if the atmosphere in the classroom is not positive and supportive, some students may feel uncomfortable, which in turn has a negative impact on their learning.

The willingness to take risks was also examined in Question 26 in which the respondents were asked to state how they tend to react when they are not completely sure about the meaning of a particular word. 54% of respondents say that they do not use such a word while the remaining 46% are ready to take the risk and use it.

The fact that in certain situations English may be more efficient than Czech appears in responses by S8, S12, S19. For example, S19 believes that a student is likely to use Czech if they deal with *something too complex and important and he / she does not want to waste time and effort to express it in English*. S8 adds that Czech is more probable to be used if a student *knows that he / she will be understood in Czech and it is faster*. The respondents realize that students thus have at their disposal a tool which ensures comprehension and which they can also use to ask about anything although their level of proficiency might not allow this in the L2 and thus save time.

4.5 Learning strategies

Questions 23-27 of the questionnaire examine ways of learning vocabulary and learning strategies connected to it. In particular, the questions were related to the use of bilingual dictionaries, the effect of Czech translation on memory, ways of recording new vocabulary and the willingness to take risks. Tables 9 and 10 show the results.

	yes	no
23. Translating a word into Czech helps me to remember the word.	49%	51%
24. I use bilingual dictionaries.	70%	30%

Table 9: Overview of the answers to questions related to the learning strategies in studying vocabulary.

25. When I record new vocabulary, I write down	
an English explanation	30%
a translation	24%
an English explanation and a translation	14%
an example sentence	11%
an English explanation and an example sentence	8%
I don't write down new vocabulary	5%
it depends on the given expression	8%

Table 10: Overview of the strategies the respondents employ to record new vocabulary.

49% of respondents believe that knowing the Czech translation is helpful in remembering new vocabulary whereas 51% claim the opposite. 70% of the respondents use bilingual dictionaries. 94% of those who claim that knowing a translation facilitates remembering the word use bilingual dictionaries. On the other hand, 50% of those who claim that a translation does not help them to retain the word use bilingual dictionaries too.

The respondents use various ways of recording new vocabulary¹¹. Most often (30%) they note down the explanation in English. Translating the new word or expression into Czech is the second most common strategy. Recording a translation or a translation alongside with an English explanation accounts for 34% of cases. 11% of respondents rely on understanding the word from context as they note down only a sentence containing the new expression. In total, 33% of respondents regularly record new words in more than one way, e.g. combining English explanation with a translation (14%). For example, S28 writes down a synonym, an example sentence and a translation. Some students choose a way of recording the meaning based on the complexity of the given expression, such as S23 who uses *an English explanation and in case I do not feel the meaning from the definition, I also write down the translation*. In the comments, S19 draws attention to an interesting point: *the longer I study English the more I lose the ability to translate, because the lessons are only in English and I learn most new word from context, but by translation*.

The respondents seem to work with a wide variety of strategies. Since the respondents are successful language learner capable of self-reflection, the variety of their learning strategies shows that there is not one in particular which would be considered perfect by all. The implication for successful teaching might be letting the students choose a strategy they prefer to use and consider effective instead of forcing them into a particular one.

4.6 The respondents' teaching experience in relation to the MT

The questions regarding the respondents' experience in the role of the teacher were optional as not all of them have the relevant experience. 23 respondents provided their answers. Below, Table 11 shows the answers to these questions.

¹¹ It must be pointed out that the strategies described here are described by C1/C2 level students. It is probable that less advanced students have different preferences.

	never	hardly ever	sometimes	often
31. Do you translate new words into Czech for your student?	0%	13%	35%	52%
32. Do you explain grammar in Czech?	0%	0%	35%	65%

Table 11: Overview of the answers to questions related to the teaching experience of the respondents and their use of the MT in their own teaching.

From the figures it is evident that the respondents considerably rely on Czech in their own teaching. 52% of them say that they often translate new words into Czech for their students. The option *never* was not ticked by anyone and *hardly ever* was ticked only by 13% of respondents. When teaching grammar, the respondents rely on Czech even more. 65% of them often explain grammar in Czech; the remaining 35% do so sometimes.

In the comments to these two questions, the respondents mentioned the low level of English of their students as the main reason for their use of Czech. Although conducting the lessons mostly in English is the aim (this is suggested by S6, S37), their students' low level of proficiency prevents it. The respondents also say that teaching beginners without Czech would be impossible (S13, S28, S37). Besides, S34 also writes that if she uses only English, her student gets frustrated and demotivated.

To deal with these problems, the respondents who chose to include some comments say they help themselves by using Czech. Two of them describe their practises in more detail. S37 describes the experience of tutoring children who *have only been studying English for two years and are lost. I cannot speak English all the time*. However, this respondent does not resign: *I gradually increase [the amount of communication in] English so that they would get used to it*. Another respondent, S34, uses a different strategy: *I always try to say the sentence in English and then in Czech*.

In general, several points can be made based on the data above. Firstly, it is evident that the participants of the study think carefully about their students' needs and adjust their teaching accordingly. Secondly, it is important for them that their students understand well what is said during the lesson. However, this may be influenced by the fact that the participants mention their experience with tutoring and not standard lessons at schools. Thirdly, although using English throughout the lesson is considered ideal, they are not afraid to make concessions and use Czech too in cases in which they believe it is more effective.

4.7 The use of the MT at secondary schools

At the end of the questionnaire the respondents were given space to write more details about their secondary school teacher and their own reflections. In particular, they were asked whether this teacher was a role model for them in any way and also what they (would) do differently in their own teaching practice. The respondents used this space for comments on various topics and their experience from the secondary school, including topics which are not entirely relevant to this thesis. The analysis below deals with the responses on the mother tongue use, pronunciation issues and also what positive aspects the students value about their teachers most.

In the comments, the respondents mention various attitudes of their teachers towards Czech. Some criticize their teachers for overusing Czech during their lessons. For example, S18 says that *unfortunately, my secondary school teacher spent most of the lesson talking in Czech*. Based on similarly negative experience, S17 attempts to do the opposite in the lessons: *vast majority of my secondary school lessons was conducted in Czech – in my lessons I try to use as little Czech as possible*. The students seem to protest against excessive use of Czech instead of the target language. Although the comments are too short, it seems that the teachers who are criticised use Czech unsystematically, simply as the main means of communication. It is noteworthy that students who have negative experience in turn try to avoid copying the same problems by opting for the opposite extreme, i.e. not using Czech at all.

On the other hand, several other students (S19, S20, S27) write about their positive experience with the MT use at secondary school. For example, S19 appreciates that the teacher used English throughout the lessons but also says she was very satisfied with learning vocabulary by translation. S27 is also happy with the use of translation in the lessons. This shows that the MT can be incorporated well and judiciously even in lessons which are conducted mostly in the target language.

Among other often-mentioned topics, the respondents commonly write about problems with pronunciation. They are generally very critical of their teachers' pronunciation (S3, S13, S36) as well as the absence of corrections (S5, S4). The absence of teaching pronunciation is noted as negative by the respondents (S4, S7, S10). Since issues with phonetics are mentioned in 24% of responses, it is evident that it is an acute topic.

In the comments it is also possible to find what the students appreciate about their secondary school teachers. In general, these comments can be divided into two categories. Firstly, the students appreciate their teachers' solid knowledge of English (S13, S38).

Unfortunately, these mentions also show that it is not standard situation that all secondary school teachers have good knowledge of English. Secondly, the students also welcome the positive attitude and enthusiasm of the teacher. The respondents mention a very open and friendly attitude (S38), resourcefulness and patience (S32), being systematic (S4) as desirable qualities.

5 Discussion of findings

The data obtained from the questionnaire proved that the students can provide the teachers with valuable feedback of their practice. In the first two open-ended questions the respondents expressed their own opinions on the advantages and disadvantages of the MT use. The respondents came up with a wide range of topics regarding both its positives and negatives. It is worth pointing out that the three most commonly mentioned topics are the advantages: the MT facilitating comprehension, the usefulness of translating and the benefits of comparing the two languages. The respondents also mentioned the disadvantages of the MT use, especially too much reliance on it once the students reach a higher level of proficiency.

The most common suggestion as to in which area the MT can be useful is explaining grammar, mentioned by 49% of respondents. Although they do not elaborate on their answers, it can be assumed they realize that an explanation in the L2 requires that the learner first concentrate on the language being used. Without this stage it is impossible to grasp the message. The learners are thus asked to perform two demanding operations at once. The respondents suggest that when students reach B1/B2 level, grammar should be explained in the L2. Generally, the respondents work with the fact that the MT is more beneficial for lower-level students and its use should diminish with the attainment of a higher level of proficiency. Contrastive approach is also considered beneficial by the respondents who suggest that comparing the structures in the MT and the L2 leads to better acquisition.

The data reveal that 70% of secondary school teachers do not discuss learning, learning strategies and the classroom practises with their students (43% ticked *never*, 27% chose *hardly ever*). This clearly shows that the teachers are not interested in the individual preferences of their students and do not take learner beliefs into account when planning their teaching.

The most common way of presenting new vocabulary, translating it into Czech, accounts for 49% of cases; explaining it only in English is much less frequent (11%). The

comments reveal that while some respondents prefer to work only in the L2, many prefer to be given the translation. Since the preferences are diverse and also depend on the complexity of the expression being taught, it would seem ideal to let the students choose the way they prefer to learn. In this light it is good to see that 32% of teachers do not avoid one or the other way and use both.

It is reported by 46% of respondents that their fellow students often asked for a Czech translation of an unknown word. It can be assumed that the reason why these students asked for a Czech counterpart rather than an English explanation is that knowing the Czech version brings a sense of completeness and full knowledge. The importance of translating words is also documented in other questions. For example, 70% of the respondents use bilingual dictionaries and 49% claim that knowing a Czech translation helps them to remember the new word. These results should be taken into account by teachers when presenting new vocabulary. It cannot be denied that providing a definition and an example sentence in the target language are beneficial and also practise the language, yet the Czech translation is still important for many students.

There is a difference between the number of students who believe that the teachers should know their students' MT (68%) and those who believe that the teachers should use it actively in their lessons (49%). Although the questionnaire did not ask specifically why the teachers should know the MT, it can be assumed that it can serve as a backup in case of problems and also for error analysis. The importance of the MT in learning other languages is also demonstrated in the fact that 41% of respondents say that it is acceptable if students use their MT during the lessons. This figure shows that students are aware of the fact that learners enter the classroom with a tool which can be actively used to facilitate learning. 86% of respondents claim that beginners' lessons should not be conducted entirely in English. In the comments to this as well as to other questions, they also draw attention to the fact that exclusive use of English may be too challenging and demotivating for learners. Such comments also illustrate that the respondents think about the topic of the MT use from various perspectives, considering learners on different levels and trying to find the best solutions for each situation. In other words, they are not tied by a single approach which they would consider universally valid and effective for all learners. S22 writes that to find the best way to teach a language, *it is necessary to be a student first and have both positive and negative experience.*

According to the respondents, students tend to use Czech during pairwork activities when they are not observed by the teacher. Besides, they often mention that Czech is used as

a compensation for lacking English knowledge and also as a means of ensuring that they understand correctly. Anxiety is mentioned as one of the reasons why students use Czech in the lessons rather than English.

The comparison of the usefulness of the MT use when working with lower- and higher-level students shows that except for teaching vocabulary, the MT use is strongly supported in case of less advanced students. In case of higher-level students, the usefulness of the MT is considered lower, but it is still welcome in some areas; for example, 59% of respondents find it useful for comparing the two languages. The numbers of students agreeing and disagreeing with the usefulness of providing Czech translations of new words (46% and 54% respectively) are almost equal. This again demonstrates that among the respondents there is not an agreement on the best strategies for dealing with new vocabulary. This is also evident in the ways in which the respondents themselves record new words.

The MT plays an important role in studying other languages. It is considered more useful when dealing with grammar than with vocabulary. In the latter, opinions are diverse. The hypothesis that the usefulness of the MT for lower-level students is higher than for more advanced ones was confirmed. However, the respondents themselves make use of the MT in their own learning and appreciate the MT too. At the same time they are well aware of the dangers of its misuse. In the final comments, S18 summarizes: *Czech has its role in learning, but as students become stronger in the foreign language, it is necessary to reduce it. The MT can be very helpful, but at the same time it can distract the attention towards an easier variety.*

5.1 Limitations of the study

The research part works with opinions and experience of only very advanced students (all evaluate themselves on C1 / C2 level of proficiency), who are likely to have an above-average linguistic aptitude and motivation to study English. As students of philology, they are also expected to provide a more analytical and mature view on language learning than students who major in other disciplines. Although the group of respondents is narrow and limited in this way, it is necessary to consider the fact that they probably are a very good example of what is called in literature good language learners (Griffiths 2008). Their experience with approaches and techniques they consider effective may serve as an inspiration to other students. It is exactly their experience with successful L2 learning that makes them suitable respondents and assessors of the current situation and therefore the

results of the study may hopefully translate to other language learners at Czech secondary schools.

The study was conducted based on a sample of 37 respondents. The sample is small in terms of the number of responses, but wide in other aspects. Most importantly, the respondents do not represent members of one school class but come from different parts of the country and different secondary schools. Thanks to this, it was possible to show that the practises at Czech secondary schools are not homogeneous.

All the respondents are first- and second-year students of English and American Studies. To obtain a larger sample, it would be necessary to include also third-year students. However, these students may have already been exposed to a subject focussing on methodology. Secondly, they have been away from their secondary schools for three years and they might analyse their experience differently after this time.

6 Conclusions

The theoretical part of this thesis provided an overview of the most commonly discussed aspects of the MT use in the language classroom. It is shown that throughout the history of English teaching the approaches to the MT varied depending on the particular “fashionable” approach. The current trend seems to be to move away from monolingual classrooms to active use of the MT in language teaching. This shift reflects the students’ needs and also the fact that the MT is now viewed as previous knowledge on which further learning should be based. Current methodology requires learning to be as learner-centred as possible and the inclusion of the MT implicitly includes the learners (Brooks-Lewis 2009). The assumption that the MT should be also seen as the mother of the second (and third and fourth) language (Deller and Rinvoluceri 2002) is becoming widely accepted.

Prodromou (in Deller and Rinvoluceri 2002) suggests several metaphors which illustrate the potential for using the MT as well as warn against the danger of abusing it: (1) it is a *drug* which might have a therapeutic potential but may become addictive and harmful; (2) it is a *reservoir* from which we draw; (3) it is a *wall* on which we write but which can become an obstacle; (4) it is a *crutch* which helps in the lessons but also recognizes a weakness; (5) it is a *lubricant* which keeps the lesson moving and saves time.

Especially for beginners and lower-level students, the MT seems to be an obvious tool they can use to build their knowledge of the L2. From literature it is not evident in what situations the MT use is justifiable and how they differ from those situations in which the MT makes learning less efficient. Judicious use of L1 thus remains a problematic term – what is judicious? For example, it is obvious that while giving instructions to higher level students in their MT is superfluous and unnecessarily steals time away from the L2, doing the same with an elementary class may be much more effective and significantly time-efficient. Such cases seem easy to decide. But in the real classroom, decision making must be fast and it often reacts to the immediate needs, which may result in inefficient MT use in seemingly unnecessary situations. It is only up to the teachers to decide which language will be more beneficial for their particular students in the particular situation. This is also in accordance with the so-called postmethod pedagogy which places a lot of significance on learner as well as teacher autonomy.

Although academic literature on the topic of the MT use flourishes, it is disputable whether its findings have any effect on ordinary teachers. It is necessary that the methodologists reflect the changes, innovations and updates in methodology they develop for

teachers' use. Although the theoretical aspects of the field are developing dynamically, the impact of new trends on practice is limited. To overcome this problem, several steps are necessary. First, research data should be made readily available to teachers who could draw on them. Second, teachers should have enough freedom to experiment with various techniques and methods in their classrooms, as it is one thing to hear and another thing to discover (Copland and Neokleous 2011). Teachers, in fact, need to be prepared for innovations and be open to them. At the same time, teacher trainers should actively speak about the MT with their students who are future teachers. But, most importantly, keeping an open mind and not being afraid to employ various approaches seem to be the key attribute all teachers should possess.

The majority of the students who participated in the research, despite being advanced and proficient speakers of English who do not need to rely on the MT in their own learning, still perceive the role of the MT in the classroom positive and valuable. Even a more important finding is that students are able to evaluate the classroom reality as well as their own process of learning in a very mature way. On a more general level, it shows that teaching practice could be evaluated by the students. It is difficult to measure empirically the effectiveness of teaching, but learners' beliefs and evaluations seem to be a useful tool to study the teaching and learning process through the eyes of those who are the receivers.

The students are able to comment on the advantages of the MT use as well as its pitfalls. The theoretical part of this thesis maps the shift towards the MT incorporation and the practical part shows that students, with some limitations, welcome it. The respondents' arguments are not only impressions, but well-reflected experience. The beliefs of this group of students are even more telling as many of them are future teachers and 61% of the respondents already have the experience of being teachers themselves.

To make teaching learner-centred, learner beliefs must be worked with. One way of incorporating students' beliefs into education can be that the teacher discusses learning and teaching with the students and takes an active interest in what the students believe and expect when they enter the classroom. At the start of a course, teachers should clarify the role of the MT for the students so that they understand why the teacher uses it. Nevertheless, its use should not be haphazard. The course should start with stating clearly the rules for the MT use for both the teacher and the students.

Reasons in favour of the MT are numerous. Brooks-Lewis (2009) lists the most important ones: being able to understand and participate in the class, making learning easier and, dissolving the sense of rupture in knowledge, promoting confidence and a sense of

achievement. Despite so many positive aspects, the degree to which the MT is used should depend on the teacher's careful analysis of the particular learning situation and adjusted accordingly.

6.1 Future directions and suggestions for further research

Firstly, future research should examine specific areas in which the bilingual approach is useful as well as those in which the MT complicates the matter. This will have to be done separately for individual languages and contexts in order to respect the sociocultural environment (Macaro 2001). Macaro further specifies that establishing principles for codeswitching in the classroom must be preceded by understanding its functions and consequences (*ibid.*).

Secondly, it is essential to gather as much experience from practising teachers as possible. It would be useful to encourage bilingual teachers who use their students' MT in teaching to share their experience, but also to listen to those who are in opposition, and learn from the arguments of both sides. In other words, more examples from practice are necessary. This could help to break the taboo still deeply ingrained in many teachers.

Thirdly, academia should actively support the incorporation of MT discussion in the education of future teachers. The role of the MT in language learning and teaching should be presented to new teachers and student-teachers. In accordance with the post-method approach, new teachers should not be taught dogmatic truth about teaching, but rather not to be afraid to adapt their teaching to meet their students' needs.

Résumé

Předkládaná diplomová práce se zabývá využitím mateřského jazyka při výuce cizích jazyků, což je v současné době velmi diskutované téma. V průběhu 20. století se na poli výuky anglického jazyka objevilo mnoho specifických metod, ale role mateřštiny (L1) v nich byla povětšinou minimální. V posledních dvou desetiletích nacházíme v literatuře mnoho článků a studií právě na toto téma s cílem stanovit, v jakých případech může mateřština usnadnit proces učení se cizímu jazyku (L2).

Zastánci výuky probíhající jen v cílovém jazyce argumentují především nutností maximalizovat kontakt s vyučovaným jazykem. Mateřština je tak vnímána spíše jako jazyk, jehož používání by ubíralo čas určený ke studiu cizího jazyka. I když maximální kontakt s vyučovaným jazykem je nezbytný, v poslední době se začínají v literatuře objevovat studie, které se věnují výhodám využití mateřštiny, a to v situacích, kdy je mateřský jazyk efektivnějším prostředkem výuky. Druhým argumentem v neprospěch mateřštiny je připodobňování procesu učení se cizímu jazyku akvizici mateřštiny. Ačkoliv oba procesy sdílí mnohé, rozdíly převažují. Nejsilnějším argumentem proti této analogii je především fakt, že zatímco mateřský jazyk je naučen bez znalosti jakéhokoliv jiného jazyka, každý jazyk učený po akvizici mateřštiny je už vystaven na jejích základech. Mateřština tedy nevyhnutelně funguje jako základ, na kterém se staví znalost dalších jazyků. I když se mateřštinu její mluvčí úspěšně naučí i bez zprostředkovatelského jazyka, není možné aplikovat stejný postup i na učení dalších jazyků, především z důvodu omezeného času, po který je student vystaven cizímu jazyku. Vyspělejší student cizího jazyka tedy studuje jazyk za zcela jiných podmínek a s rozvinutějšími mentálními schopnostmi.

Studie ukazují, že učitelé mateřštinu v hodinách nejčastěji využívají jako rychlejší způsob komunikace, pro porovnání struktur v L2 a L1, dávání instrukcí, řešení organizačních záležitostí, překlad z L2 a další. Důvody, proč na mateřský jazyk spoléhají studenti, jsou mnohé. U studentů na nižší úrovni je to především nedostatečná znalost L2 k vyjádření se. Nejjednodušším způsobem, jak si tuto situaci ulehčit, je právě použít mateřštinu. Dalším důvodem pro zapojení L1 je strach z chyb; v takovém případě by se učitel měl pokusit vytvořit pro studium prostředí, ve kterém se studenti nebojí riskovat a jejich snaha komunikovat v cílovém jazyce je oceněna, i když chybují.

Třetím důvodem, proč studenti spoléhají na svou mateřštinu, je snaha maximálně porozumět. Studenti, nejedná-li se o malé děti, chtějí rozumět všemu, co učitel říká. Pokud tomu tak není, přichází demotivace. Studenti mívají také tendenci ujišťovat se u spolužáků,

jestli danému slovíčku či gramatice, vysvětlené v cílovém jazyce, porozuměli správně. Mnozí autoři tento postup nepovažují za špatný – student přichází do výuky cizího jazyka se znalostí své mateřštiny a je tedy logické, že v případě problémů se spoléhá právě na ni. Navíc porozumění nutně předchází zvnitřnění dané látky. Zejména pro začátečníky a studenty na nižší úrovni, kteří nemají L2 zautomatizovaný, je velmi složité porozumět jazykové stránce sdělení a současně pochopit sdělení samotné, tedy nejen CO učitel říká, ale také JAK. V literatuře se setkáváme s termínem *dvojitá pochopení*.

Při rozhodování o způsobu výuky musí učitel vzít v úvahu mnoho faktorů. Jeho cílem je naučení dané látky a maximální využití cizího jazyka. Měl by ale také vzít v úvahu schopnosti svých studentů a zhodnotit, jestli studenti mají dostatečné znalosti L2, aby porozuměli výuce vedené v cílovém jazyce. Zejména při výuce začátečníků se v literatuře doporučuje nevyhýbat se mateřskému jazyku, ale postupně zapojovat co nejvíce L2. Jedním ze způsobů, jak zapojit oba jazyky, ale současně zdůrazňovat L2, je tzv. sendvičová technika. Učitel za promluvu v L2 zařadí překlad do L1, čímž zajistí, že studenti rozumí jeho sdělení. Poté ale znovu zopakuje tutéž promluvu v L2, aby si studenti danou strukturu v cílovém jazyce upevnili.

Mateřský jazyk má svou roli při výuce slovní zásoby, kde překlad do L1 může významně zkrátit a zjednodušit prezentaci nové slovní zásoby. Pro studenty je obzvlášť přínosné, pokud je učitel upozorní na podobu slov v L1 a L2 (kognáty). I když má překlad slovní zásoby své výhody, nemělo by se na něj spoléhat ve všech situacích; je na učiteli, aby zvážil, ve kterých případech si vystačí s L2 a ve kterých překlad výrazně ulehčí studentům pochopení. Vedle toho je nutné studenty upozorňovat na možné rozdíly v konotacích. Při výuce gramatiky může být mateřština použita pro idiomatický překlad dané gramatické struktury a tzv. *structural mirroring*, tedy doslovný překlad, který osvětlí strukturu v cizím jazyce.

Překlad jako typ cvičení je často považován za kontroverzní aktivitu. Při překládání však studenti musí s textem pracovat velmi detailně a všimnout si, jak cizí jazyk funguje v porovnání s mateřským, což může být velmi přínosné. Přesnost překladu je možné zkontrolovat např. zpětným překladem (*retranslation*).

Na výše popsanou teoretickou část práce navazuje průzkum názorů studentů. Cílem práce je zjistit, jak se k problematice využití češtiny při výuce angličtiny na střední škole staví sami studenti. Praktická část diplomové práce se tedy zaměřuje na přesvědčení studentů (*learner beliefs*) ohledně role mateřštiny. Výzkum se zaměřil na několik oblastí, zejména strategie v učení, možnosti využití mateřštiny v souvislosti s jazykovou úrovní studentů,

zkušenosti ze střední školy a možnosti výuky slovní zásoby. Část práce se zabývá také názory studentů v roli učitele.

Pro sběr dat byl sestaven dotazník, který byl nejprve pilotován v menším rozsahu. Finální sběr dat proběhl na přelomu května a června 2015. Dotazník byl sestaven tak, aby poskytl kvantitativní i kvalitativní data pro následnou analýzu. Skupinu respondentů tvoří studenti prvního a druhého ročníku oboru anglistika-amerikanistika na FF UK. Jedná se o poměrně úzkou skupinu studentů, u kterých můžeme předpokládat zájem o studium jazyků a široké zkušenosti se studiem. Dále můžeme říci, že tito studenti jsou tzv. dobrými studenty (*good language learners*), kteří se úspěšně dostali na vysokou úroveň (všichni respondenti hodnotí svou angličtinu na úrovni C1 nebo C2) a jejich zkušenosti se studiem jazyků tak mohou být přínosné i pro ostatní studenty. Dotazník vyplnilo celkem 38 respondentů, z toho 37 odpovědí bylo použito pro analýzu.

Zejména z odpovědí na otevřené otázky lze vyčíst, že studenti jsou schopni uvědomit si výhody i nevýhody používání L1 a své postoje dokáží podepřít vhodnými argumenty. Studenti oceňují mateřštinu především jako nástroj, který usnadňuje porozumění. Mezi další výhody řadí možnost překladu, porovnání obou jazyků a časovou úsporu při výuce. Zároveň upozorňují, že přílišné používání mateřštiny vede k pomalejší akvizici, nadměrnému spoléhání na ni a následně k problémům v reálné komunikaci.

Podle účastníků průzkumu mají studenti tendenci použít češtinu nejčastěji během práce ve dvojici a při skupinových aktivitách. Dá se usuzovat, že v těchto situacích čeština zazní z důvodu pohodlnosti studentů, pro které je čeština přirozenější. Čeština je také zapojena v případě, že studentova úroveň angličtiny nestačí k vyjádření. Vedle toho mají žáci také tendenci si česky ověřovat, jestli pochopili vysvětlení či instrukce správně.

Studenti připisují češtině významnou pozitivní roli zejména při výuce gramatiky, kde může být i efektivnější než angličtina, obzvláště při výuce začátečníků. Druhou často zmiňovanou oblastí je výuka slovní zásoby a především idiomů, u kterých studenti považují znalost českého ekvivalentu za klíčovou. 49 % respondentů uvádí, že je pro ně jednodušší zapamatovat si nové slovíčko, pokud si ho aktivně propojí s českým ekvivalentem. Třetí nejčastěji zmiňovaná oblast je výuka začátečníků a studentů na nižší úrovni, kde mnozí považují aktivní využití češtiny nejen za přínosné, ale také nutné. Jen 14 % studentů zastává názor, že hodina pro začátečníky by měla být vedena kompletně v angličtině.

Sami studenti mají s rozdílné představy o tom, jak se nejlépe učit slovní zásobu. Z jejich zkušeností ze středních škol je zřejmé, že slovní zásoba je nejčastěji prezentována překladem do češtiny, případně současně i vysvětlením v angličtině. Vysvětlování nových

výrazů jen v angličtině není příliš časté. Lze tedy doporučit, aby učitel kombinoval oba tyto přístupy a studenti si tak mohli vybrat, co jim více vyhovuje. Středoškolští studenti výrazně spoléhají na překlad výrazu do češtiny a je běžné, že se studenti explicitně ptají na překlad slovíčka do češtiny. Protože studenti nejsou jednotní v tom, jaké postupy učení slovní zásoby preferují, ideální se zdá být situace, kdy učitel použije češtinu i angličtinu a student sám si vybere, který přístup upřednostňuje. Důležitost překladu se projevuje i ve způsobu, jakým si studenti zaznamenávají novou slovní zásobu: 70 % studentů používá překladové slovníky. Účastníci průzkumu často upozorňují na problematiku rozdílných konotací v obou jazycích a možných nepřesných překladů

Překlad jako typ cvičení se na středních školách využívá, ale ne plošně. 51 % studentů uvádí, že jejich učitel využíval překlad *nikdy* nebo *málokdy*, zatímco 49 % uvádí *často* nebo *občas*. Takto rozdílné výsledky ukazují, že postoje učitelů k překladu jsou velmi rozdílné.

Obecně platí, že větší podíl češtiny ve vyučování je přijatelnější u začátečníků a s rostoucí úrovní se tato tolerance snižuje. Při výuce gramatiky pokročilejších studentů je čeština přijatelnější než při výuce slovní zásoby, při které studenti považují za vhodnější použití angličtiny. Bez ohledu na úroveň je ale čeština vnímána pozitivně v případě, že ji učitel použije pro porovnání rozdílů mezi L1 a L2.

Účastníci průzkumu, kteří již sami angličtinu učí, při svých hodinách výrazně spoléhají na češtinu. Jako důvody častého zapojení češtiny uvádí především nízkou úroveň studentů a také motivaci svých žáků, které odrazuje, pokud učiteli nerozumí.

V poslední části dotazníku studenti popisovali své středoškolské učitele. Mnozí oceňují, že jejich učitel používal při výuce převážně angličtinu; naopak nadměrné, nesystematické využití češtiny je kritizováno a učitel je vnímán jako nekompetentní. Jiní studenti naopak oceňují, že výuka neprobíhala jen v cílovém jazyce a studenti se věnovali například překladu. Z odpovědí dále vyčteme, že na středních školách není zvykem, aby učitel se svými studenty mluvil o učení jako takovém, procesu učení a jeho vlastních postupech. Učitelé se nezajímají o názory studentů, ani s nimi nijak nepracují.

Z analýzy je patrné, že čeština má své místo především při výuce studentů na nižší úrovni, ale ocení ji i studenti pokročilejší. Mateřština by ale měla být zapojena jen v odůvodnitelných případech, kdy výuku ulehčuje a pomáhá studentům. Cílem výuky je maximální zapojení cílového jazyka ze strany studentů i učitelů. Učitel by měl studentům objasnit, v čem a jak je uvážlivé použití mateřštiny při výuce přínosem.

Appendix: the questionnaire

Since the questionnaire was carried out online, it is presented here in the way the respondents accessed it.

povinná otázka

Vaše úroveň angličtiny (na základě sebehodnocení, certifikátů apod.):

B1 (Intermediate)

B2 (upper-Intermediate)

C1 (advanced)

C2 (proficient)

povinná otázka

Máte nějaké zkušenosti s výukou angličtiny z pozice učitele (např. doučování)?

povinná otázka

Absolvoval(a) jste alespoň polovinu střední školy v ČR (SR)?

povinná otázka

Jaké jsou podle vás důvody pro a proti využití mateřštiny ve výuce cizího jazyka (z hlediska žáka i učitele)?

povinná otázka

Napadá vás nějaký konkrétní příklad situace, ve které je čeština při výuce efektivnější než angličtina?

Vaše střední škola (pokud jste měli více učitelů, vyberte prosím toho, který vás učil nejdéle)

povinná otázka

Mluvil s vámi váš učitel o učení? (např. poradil, jak se učit, zajímal ho váš názor na jeho metody a přístupy, ptal se vás, jestli vám jeho postupy vyhovují)?

- často
- občas
- málokdy
- nikdy

povinná otázka

Ptali se studenti na český překlad neznámých slov?

- často
- občas
- málokdy
- nikdy

povinná otázka

Jak váš učitel prezentoval novou slovní zásobu?

- spíše překládal do češtiny
- spíše vysvětloval v angličtině
- dělal oboje
- Vlastní odpověď:

povinná otázka

Měli studenti tendenci ujišťovat se u spolužáků o překladu nových slovíček nebo pochopení instrukcí?

- často
- občas
- málokdy
- nikdy

pořádná otázka

Využíval váš učitel překlad jako typ cvičení nebo testu?

- často
- občas
- málokdy
- nikdy

nepořádná otázka

Pokud chcete upřesnit své odpovědi k otázkám 4-10, piště prosím zde.

Učení jazyků

pořádná otázka

Měl by učitel umět rodný jazyk svých studentů?

pořádná otázka

Měl by učitel používat při výuce mateřský jazyk studentů?

pořádná otázka

Mohou studenti používat svůj mateřský jazyk při výuce?

pořádná otázka

Je nezbytné vždy rozumět všemu, co zazní ve výuce v cizím jazyce?

povinná otázka

Měla by hodina pro začátečníky a nižší úrovně být vedena kompletně v angličtině?

ANO

NE

povinná otázka

Při výuce studentů na nižších úrovních (do B1) je užitečné, když učitel používá češtinu při:

	souhlasím	nesouhlasím
vysvětlování gramatiky:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
prezentaci nové slovní zásoby:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
vysvětlování rozdílů mezi češtinou a angličtinou (contrastive approach):	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

povinná otázka

Při výuce studentů na vyšších úrovních (B1 a výš) je užitečné, když učitel používá češtinu při:

	souhlasím	nesouhlasím
vysvětlování gramatiky:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
prezentaci nové slovní zásoby:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
vysvětlování rozdílů mezi češtinou a angličtinou (contrastive approach):	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

povinná otázka

Studentům na nižší úrovni (do B1) pomáhá, když:

	souhlasím	nesouhlasím
mohou použít češtinu při práci ve dvojicích / skupinkách:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
jim učitel přeloží slovo, aby mu opravdu rozuměli:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
dostanou kromě vysvětlení slovíčka v angličtině také překlad:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

povinná otázka

Studentům na vyšší úrovni (B1 a výš) pomáhá, když:

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| mohou používat češtinu při práci ve dvojicích / skupinkách: | souhlasím <input type="radio"/> | nesouhlasím <input type="radio"/> |
| Jin učitel přeloží slovo, aby mu opravdu rozuměli: | souhlasím <input type="radio"/> | nesouhlasím <input type="radio"/> |
| dostanou kromě vysvětlení slovíčka v angličtině také překlad: | souhlasím <input type="radio"/> | nesouhlasím <input type="radio"/> |

povinná otázka

V jakých situacích podle vás student nejspíše použije češtinu?

nepovinná otázka

Pokud chcete upřesnit své odpovědi k předchozím otázkám, pište prosím zde.

Vaše strategie v učení

povinná otázka

Překlad slovíčka do češtiny mi pomáhá si ho lépe pamatovat.

ANO NE

povinná otázka

Používám překladové slovníky.

ANO NE

povinná otázka

Když si zapisuji nová slovíčka, píšu si:

- překlad
- anglické vysvětlení
- příkladovou větu
- vlastní odpověď:

povinná otázka

Pokud si nejsem úplně jistý(á) významem a použitím slova:

- raději ho nepoužiji
- "risknu to" a použiji ho

nepovinná otázka

Pokud chcete upřesnit své odpovědi k předchozím otázkám, pište prosím zde.

Výuka s rodilým mluvčím

nepovinná otázka

Využíval rodilý mluvčí někdy silnější studenty k překladu pro "nechápaní" kolegy?

nepovinná otázka

Využíval rodilý mluvčí někdy češtinu (např. ptal se na překlad nebo porovnání s češtinou)?

nepovinná otázka

Pokud chcete upřesnit své odpovědi k předchozím otázkám, pište prosím zde.

Pokud vy sami učíte angličtinu

nepovinná otázka

Překládáte studentům slovíčka do češtiny?

- často
 občas
 málokdy
 nikdy

nepovinná otázka

Vysvětľujete gramatiku v češtině?

- často
 občas
 málokdy
 nikdy

nepovinná otázka

Pokud chcete upřesnit své odpovědi k předchozím otázkám, pište prosím zde

obligatorní otázka

Byl pro vás váš středoškolský učitel v něčem vzorem? Je naopak něco, čemu se na rozdíl od tohoto učitele snažíte při svých hodinách vyhýbat?

nepovinná otázka

Choete se k tématu využití češtiny při výuce angličtiny vyjádřit ještě k něčemu dalšímu (ať už z pohledu studenta nebo učitele)?

Odeslat dotazník

Bibliography

- Brooks-Lewis, Kimberly A., 2009. Adult Learners' Perceptions of the Incorporation of their L1 in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning. *Applied Linguistics* 30/2: 216-235.
- Butzkamm, Wolfgang, 2007. Native Language Skills as a Foundation for Foreign Language Learning. In *Transcending boundaries. Essays in honour of Gisela Hermann-Brennecke*, ed. Wolf Kindermann. Berlin: Lit Verlag: 71-85.
- Butzkamm, Wolfgang and John A. W. Caldwell, 2009. *The Bilingual Reform: A Paradigm Shift in Foreign Language Teaching*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
- Cook, Vivian, 1997. Monolingual Bias in Second Language Acquisition Research. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 34: 35-50.
- Cook, Vivian, 2001. Using the First Language in the Classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57/3: 402-423.
- Copland, Fiona and Georgios Neokleous, 2011. L1 to teach L2: complexities and contradictions. *ELT Journal* 65/3: 270-280.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán, 2005. Learner Beliefs. *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 214-217.
- Deller, Sheelagh and Mario Rinvolutri, 2002. *Using the Mother Tongue: Making the most of the learner's language*. Peaslake: Delta Publishing.
- Griffiths, Carol (ed.), 2008. *Lessons from Good Language Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Accessed at <https://goo.gl/NXd4cI>.
- Harmer, Jeremy, 2007. *How to Teach English*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Howatt, A. P. R., 1984. *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kumaravadivelu, B., 2001. Toward a Postmethod Pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly* 35/4: 537-560.
- Liao, Posen, 2006. EFL Learners' Beliefs about and Strategy Use of Translation in English Learning. *Regional Language Centre Journal* 37/2: 191-215.
- Macaro, Ernesto, 2001. Analysing Student Teachers' Codeswitching in Foreign Language Classrooms: Theories and Decision Making. *The Modern Language Journal* 85, iv: 531-548.
- McLoughlin, Aoife, 2015. L1 in the L2 Classroom – For or Against? A blog post. Accessed at <http://elt-connect.com/l1-in-the-l2-classroom/> May 2015.
- Moeller, Aleidine J. and Amy Roberts, 2013. Keeping It in the Target Language. *MultiTasks, MultiSkills, MultiConnections: Selected Papers from the 2013 Central States Conference on*

the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ed. Stephanie Dhonau. Eau Claire, Wisconsin: Crown Prints, 2013: 21-38.

Oxford, Rebecca L. and K. R. Lee, 2008. The Learners' landscape and journey: a summary. *Lessons from Good Language Learners*. Cambridge University Press: 306-317.

Richards, Jack C. and Theodore S. Rogers, 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Ringbom, Håkan, 1987. *The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning*. *Multilingual Matters* (series) 34. Clevedon, Philadelphia.

Sampson, Andrew, 2011. Learner code-switching versus English only. *ELT Journal* 66/3: 293-303.

Scrivener, Jim, 2005. *Learning Teaching*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Tian, Lili and Ernesto Macaro, 2012. Comparing the Effect of Teacher Codeswitching with English-only Explanations on the Vocabulary Acquisition of Chinese University Students: A Lexical Focus-on-Form Study. *Language Teaching Research* 16/3: 367-391.

Tools

Demčák, Marek. *Vyplnto* (online questionnaire application). Available at <https://www.vyplnto.cz/>.