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1. Introduction

As a director of a small language school where Communicative Approach is used as the main methodology approach, I have had many opportunities to observe how students react to lessons and progress throughout their studies. I must admit that I have considered the communicative approach as the best and the most effective method of all. Unfortunately, progress and results of students do not prove me right. According to my own experience students seem able to use what they have learnt in the lesson and maybe in several following ones but as soon as they move to a different topic or grammatical area, they seem to forget to use what they have previously studied. As soon as the teacher reminds them of that, they start overusing certain structures and the outcome does not sound natural. As a result of this experience I started to search for other methods and means of providing them with learning environment, in which it would be necessary for them to use the language effectively and naturally and to be able to acquire long-term knowledge.

When I came across task-based learning, I felt that it is the right method to follow. While using this method, adults still feel that they are pushed and that they are learning. Even though the lesson is not as strictly organized as with presentation-practice-production lesson structure, I believe that the result of the task makes them feel that they have actually achieved some knowledge without realizing that they have been using the language to attain the result of their task. Also, they are made to report to class, which I find extremely useful, because they do not only practice informally while doing the task, but also formally when they report. They feel important and they concentrate on the task with greater motivation.

While I was doing research for this thesis, I discovered an article by David Evans, where he criticizes that even though other more modern methods of lesson preparation
apart from presentation-practice-production exist and are proved successful, teachers still hold on to it very tightly. This brings me to the theme of my bachelor thesis, where I would like to research what factors influence the teachers’ choice of method for their students.
2. Approaches and methods in English language teaching

The history of English language teaching in the last one hundred years has been characterized by a search for more useful and effective ways of teaching English as a foreign language (EFL), which lay in practicing or ‘experimenting’ with various methods and approaches that have evolved. Richards and Rogers described the development as follows:

…the Direct Method was enthusiastically embraced in the early part of the twentieth century as an improvement over Grammar Translation. In the 1950s the Audiolingual Method was thought to provide a way forward, incorporating the latest insights form the sciences of linguistics and psychology. As the Audiolingual Method began to fade in the 1970s, particularly in the United States, a variety of guru-led methods emerged to fill the vacuum created by the discrediting of Audiolingualism, such as the Silent Way, Total Physical Response, and Suggestopedia. While these have declined substantially by the 1990s, new ‘breakthroughs’ continue to be announced from time to time, such as Task-Based Instruction, Neurolinguistic Programming, and Multiple Intelligences, and these attract varying levels of support. (244)

Communicative Language Teaching is considered to be the mainstream and the basis for language teaching methodology even though it is understood to be little more than just a set of very general principles that can be used and interpreted in many different ways (Richards and Rogers 244; Lindsay and Knight 20).

Anthony stated that an approach is a ‘set of correlative assumptions’; approach to language teaching and learning represents an outline conception of the way in which
these should proceed, a seedbed from which a method springs, but is not yet a strategy specifying details of classroom practice (qtd. in Johnson and Johnson). None of the approaches leads to a specific set of prescriptions and techniques to be used in teaching a language. They are characterized by a variety of interpretations as to how the principles can be applied. They can be revised and updated over time as new practices emerge (Richards and Rogers 245). Examples of approaches are Communicative Language Teaching, Lexical Approaches, Task-Based Language Teaching, etc.

A method, on the other hand, refers to a specific instructional design or system based on a particular theory of language and of language learning. All the procedures, including specifications of content, roles of teachers and learners and teaching procedures and techniques, are described in detail. It is fixed in time and there is little scope for individual interpretation (Richards and Rogers 245). Examples of methods are Audiolingualism, The Silent Way or Total Physical Response.

Methods tend to fall out of favor as they become unfashionable or discredited, but they have several advantages over approaches. Because of their clear definition, they are much easier to use, whereas approaches, which are not as clearly defined, can be a source of frustration and irritation for especially beginner teachers (Richards and Rogers 245).
3. A brief description of approaches and methods used in EFL

3.1. Grammar-translation method

The Grammar-Translation Method (further on referred to as the GMT) is considered to be one of the oldest methods and approaches in English language teaching. “It dominated European and foreign language teaching from the 1840s to the 1940s, and in modified form it continues to be widely used in some parts of the world today” (Richards and Rogers 6). Stern claimed that the GMT became popular in the late eighteen century and highlighted that there is evidence that it was the regular combination of grammar rules with the translation into the target language. Stern said that its focus is on “accuracy and not fluency” (453); on learning of rules of grammar and their application in translations from mother tongue into the target language and vice versa. In this way students learn more about the language than the language itself (Lindsay and Knight 16). Richards and Rogers claimed that “it is a method for which there is no theory. There is no literature that offers a rationale or justification for it or that attempts to relate it to issues in linguistics, psychology, or educational theory” (7). The skills practiced were only reading and writing. It is general knowledge that it is necessary to practice all four skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) in order to have students who take active part in the process of communication.

3.2. Direct method

The Direct Method (further on referred to as the DM) is also known as Reform Method / Natural Method / Phonetic Method / Anti-Grammatical Method (Direct Method). The development of the DM is associated with L. Sauveur, who argued that “a foreign language could be taught without translation or the use of the learner’s native language if meaning was conveyed directly through demonstration and action”
(Richards and Rogers 12). Enthusiastic supporters of DM introduced it in France and Germany at the turn of the century and it became widely known in the United States through its use by Sauveur and Maximilian Berlitz in successful commercial language schools (Richards and Rogers 12). According to Stern the DM is characterized by the use of the target language as a means of instruction and communication in the language classroom, and by the avoidance of the use of the first language and of translation as a technique (456). Lindsay and Knight mentioned that “DM was an important step forward - the use of the target language as the language of instruction underpins a lot of teaching today” (17). Its aims are only speaking, reading, understanding and having good pronunciation. The learners are encouraged to speak, but not forced. Writing is postponed as much as possible.

3.3. Audio-lingual method

According to Richard and Theodore’s Framework this method was developed by professors at Michigan and Pennsylvania University and it became known as Oral, Aural-Oral or Structural Approach (English Teaching Methodology). In the 1950s and 1960s, it was believed that learning a language was similar to learning new habits (Lindsay and Knight 18). Nunan said that “it was, in fact, the first approach which could be said to have developed a ‘technology’ of teaching and based on ‘scientific’ principles” (2000: 229). Stern described Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) as follows “the dominant emphasis is placed on listening and speaking. While reading and writing are not neglected, they are given priority in the teaching sequence precede reading and writing. Audiolingualism tries to develop target language skills without reference to mother tongue” (464). Harmer mentioned that this method was based on stimulus-response-reinforcement model (32), which basically means drilling. Mistakes were
immediately criticized and correct utterances were immediately praised. Its objectives are accurate native-like pronunciation and grammar, an ability to respond quickly and accurately in any speech situations and knowledge of sufficient vocabulary to use the grammar patterns (Orwig).

3.4. Total Physical Response

The Total Physical Response method (further on referred to as TPR) is based on James J. Asher’s idea that the more active learning is, the more effective it becomes (Nunan 2000: 134). According to Krashen’s theory of first language acquisition, children are first exposed to the language and through listening and following simple instructions; they slowly acquire the language (8). TPR lessons are based on teachers’ instructions and students’ physical response (Harmer 36). Asher saw successful adult second language learning as a parallel process to child first language acquisition. He felt that adults should recapitulate the processes by which children acquire their native language (Richards and Rodgers 73). Harmer reminded us that TPR allows a pre-speaking phase where students are not forced to speak until they feel confident to do so (36). From my own experience this method is very useful for kinesthetic students, especially children and beginner learners. Its limitation is that mostly imperative form is used and only limited language structures can be introduced.

3.5. Communicative approach

There are a lot of origins of Communicative approach (further on referred to as CA). It could be said that it is the product of educators and linguists who had not been satisfied with the ALM and the GMT (Morea). Lindsay and Knight said that these methods put little, if any, emphasis on the ability to communicate or interact (20).
Communicative language teaching was also influenced by developments in the way the language was described - taking into account the communicative function of language.

If we want to characterize the pedagogy of the last fifteen to twenty years in one word it would definitely be “communicative”. Widdowson said that it is of course the CA which is in current fashion in methodology (102-103). He continued his description of the CA as following:

…it concentrates on getting learners to do things with language, to express concepts and to carry out communicative acts of various kinds. The content of a language course is now defined not in terms of forms, words and sentence patterns, but in terms of concepts, or notions, which such forms are used to express, and the communicative functions which they are used to perform. (159)

Richards and Rogers reminded us that:

The work of the Council of Europe; the writings of Wilkins, Widdowson, Candlin, Christopher Brumfit, Keith Johnson, and other British applied linguists on the theoretical basis for a communicative or functional approach to language teaching; the rapid application of these ideas by textbook writers; and the equally rapid acceptance of these new principles by British language teaching specialists, curriculum development centers, and even governments gave prominence nationally and internationally to what came to be referred to as the Communicative Approach, or simply Communicative Language Teaching. (154)

Such wide acceptance of CA and it varied way of interpretation and application can be attributed to the fact that practitioners from different educational traditions can
identify with it and therefore interpret it in different ways (Richards and Rogers 158).

Richards and Rogers also mentioned that “for some, Communicative Language Teaching means little more than an integration of grammatical and functional teaching” (158).

Littlewood stated, “One of the most characteristic features of communicative language teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language” (1). According to Lindsay and Knight some of the other features of CA are that oral and written activities may be used from the start; one role of the teacher is that of a ‘facilitator’ who helps learners to communicate in English and motivates them to work with the language; learners often interact with each other through pair and group work and the four skills are developed simultaneously (20).

Howatt distinguished between a ‘strong’ and a ‘weak’ version of Communicative language teaching:

There is, in a sense, a ‘strong’ version of the communicative approach and a ‘weak’ version. The weak version which has become more or less standard practice in the last ten years stresses the importance of providing learners with the opportunities to use their English for communicative purposes and, characteristically, attempts to integrate such activities into a wider program of language teaching… The ‘strong’ version of communicative teaching, on the other hand, advances the claim that language is acquired through communication, so that it is not merely a question of activating an existing but inert knowledge of the language, but of stimulating the development of the language system itself. If the former could be described as ‘learning to use’ English, the latter entails ‘using English to learn it’. (279)
Whichever description of CA is more accurate; its aim is students’ communicative competence, which is “a subconscious knowledge of language use, and of language as discourse” (Harmer 14). Harmer also claimed that communicative competence does not include only language competence, but also knowledge of how language is used appropriately and how it is organized as a discourse (14). Rivers described it as “developing a smooth transition between ‘skill-getting’ and ‘skill-using’ (qtd. in Revell 5).

Lindsay and Knight said that the “CA is very widely used all over the world. It has shifted the focus in language teaching from learning about the language to learning to communicate in the language. However, there are problems associated with it. … The most serious criticism of CA is that it is not as effective as it claims to be” (23).

3.6. Task-based learning

Task-based language teaching (further on referred to as TBL) was developed by Dave and Jane Willis and “it is based on the use of tasks as the core unit of planning and instruction in language teaching” (Richards and Rogers 223). Willis and other proponents present it as a logical development of Communicative language teaching as it draws of some of its principles.
- activities that involve real communication are essential for language learning
- activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote learning
- language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process (Richards and Rogers 223)
In the 1970s the British applied linguist Allwright conducted an experiment which challenged traditional notions of language teaching (Harmer 34). He theorized that:

…if the ‘language teacher’s’ management activities are directed exclusively at involving the learners in solving communication problems in the target language, then language learning will take care of itself… (qtd. in Harmer 34).

In TBL learning is promoted by giving students tasks to complete while using the target language (Lindsay and Knight 23). “Tasks are believed to foster processes of negotiation, modification, rephrasing, and experimentation that are at the heart of second language learning” (Richards and Rogers 228). This statement brings us to a question what a task is. Nunan offered this definition:

…the communicative task [is] a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form. The task should also have a sense of completeness, being able to stand alone as a communicative act in its own right. (1989: 10)

For Prabhu, a task is “an activity which requires learners to arrive at an outcome from given information through some process of thought, and which allows teachers to control and regulate that process” (qtd. in What are tasks?). As task is the key element of TBL, task types are important, because they should reflect types of situations in which language might be used by the students and also types of activities in which
students practice certain functions of language. According to Hanušová the typology of
the TBL can be the following:
1. ordering
2. sorting/classifying
3. listing
4. comparing/matching
5. problem solving
6. creative tasks/projects
7. sharing personal experience/anecdote telling

In TBL it is the sequence of tasks that is the key to success and according to Willis it includes:

Pre-task: Introduction to topic and task

Teacher (T) helps Students (Ss) to understand the theme and objectives of the task. Ss may do a pretask, for example, topic-based odd-word-out games. T may highlight useful words and phrases, but would not pre-teach new structures. Ss can hear a recording of a parallel task being done (so long as this does not give away the solution to the problem). If the task is based on a text, Ss read part of it.

The task cycle: Task - the task is done by Ss (in pairs or groups) and gives Ss a chance to use whatever language they already have to express themselves and say whatever they want to say. This may be in response to reading a text or hearing a recording. T walks round and monitors, encouraging in a supportive way everyone's attempts at communication in the target language. T helps Ss to formulate what they want to say, but will not intervene to correct errors of form. The emphasis is on spontaneous, exploratory talk and confidence building, within
the privacy of the small group. Success in achieving the goals of the task helps Ss’ motivation.

Planning - Planning prepares for the next stage when Ss are asked to report briefly to the whole class how they did the task and what the outcome was. Ss draft and rehearse what they want to say or write. T goes round to advise students on language, suggestion phrases and helping Ss to polish and correct their language. If the reports are in writing, T can encourage peer editing and use of dictionaries. The emphasis is on clarity, organization, and accuracy, as appropriate for a public presentation.

Report - T asks some pairs to report briefly to the whole class so everyone can compare findings, or begin a survey. Sometimes only one or two groups report in full; others comment and add extra points. T chairs, comments on the content of their reports, rephrases perhaps, but fives no overt public correction.

Posttask listening - Ss listen to a recording of fluent speakers doing the same task, and compare the ways in which they did the task themselves.

The language focus: Analysis - T sets some language-focused tasks, based on the texts students have read or on the transcripts of the recordings they have heard. For example, find all the verbs in the simple past form. Say which refer to past time and which do not. T starts Ss off, and then Ss continue, often in pairs. T goes round to help; Ss can ask questions. In plenary, T then reviews the analysis, possibly writing relevant language up on the board in list form; Ss may take notes.

Practice - T conducts practice activities as needed, using examples from the text to transcript. Practice activities may include choral repetition, memory challenge games, matching, etc. (1996: 56-57)
Willis said “it takes time for language to develop. The first treatment of a new form or forms will not lead to mastery. It may aid development in that the learner will be more likely to notice the new form in future once it has been highlighted. But the form will not become a part of the learners’ spontaneous repertoire until they have had time to assimilate it” (2007: 18). In TBL learners have many opportunities to practice and recycle the vocabulary or structures that they have just been 'taught'.
4. Methods and approaches for planning lessons

4.1. The PPP approach

The "Three Ps" approach to language teaching is the most common modern methodology employed by professional schools around the world. It is a strong feature of the renowned CELTA certification and other TEFL qualifications offered especially in the United Kingdom (Ludescher). Even though David Evans mentioned that current thinking in Second Language Acquisition suggests that ‘PPP’ approach is totally unjustifiable as a means of teaching. However it not only persists but seems to flourish (Evans).

Presentation, Practice, Production works through the progression of three sequential stages.

Presentation: The teacher presents new words or structures, gives examples, writes them on the board, etc.

Practice: Students practice using words or structures in a controlled way, e.g. making sentences form prompts, asking and answering questions, giving sentences based on a picture. Practice can be oral or written.

Production: Students use language they have learnt to express themselves more freely, e.g. to talk or write about their own lives and interests, to express opinions, or imagine themselves in different situations. Like practice, production can be oral or written. (Doff 97)

This method offers “to the novice teacher the reassurance of a detailed set of sequential steps to follow in the classroom” (Richards and Rodgers 246). Many CLT classrooms used a PPP model of teaching, but the original model has been developed and modified since it was first introduced and no longer represents CLT as the only
teaching model (Lindsay and Knight 20-22). Evans agreed that “PPP has evolved over the years, cherry picking the more attractive elements of other approaches, and incorporating them into its basic format” (Evans).

4.2. The TTT approach

The Test-Teach-Test approach is useful when the teacher is not sure whether the learners are familiar with a particular item of language (Lindsay and Knight 22). The structure is a PPP approach the other way round and it basically reflects the one of TBL, where students have to perform a task (see chapter 3.6.). For example, the class is asked to work in pairs and arrange an appointment with a doctor according to their diaries. The teacher monitors students' work and only when the activity is finished either gives a feedback or asks students to report about their results.

4.3. The EEE approach

The Exploration, Explanation, Expression approach mainly used in teaching grammar is a slightly modified form of PPP. In Exploration stage students are given sentences illustrating a certain grammar rule and are asked to find the pattern, and with the help of the teacher to formulate the rule. This stage uses so called 'inductive learning' (Sysoyev). The other two stages are the same as Presentation and Production stages in PPP approach.
5. Teaching adult learners

“Education is no longer viewed as preparation for productive adulthood; it is increasingly being seen as a lifelong necessity for personal and social well-being. Adult education’s role in lifelong learning is becoming more prominent as the social context changes” (Merriam and Cunningham 1). Darkenwald and Merriam defined adult education as “a process whereby persons whose major social roles are characteristic of adult status undertake systematic and sustained learning activities for the purpose of bringing about changes in knowledge, attitudes, values or skills” (9).

Adult education is a specific kind of education because it “assumes the equality of teachers and learners and the interchangeability of teaching and learning roles. Facilitators usually are described in terms that imply; they will assist rather than direct learners” (Merriam and Cunningham 201). The teachers should serve as “resource persons and helpers” (Merriam and Cunningham 201). Knowles said that “facilitators are sometimes described as andragogues, who treat adult learners in ways very different from the ways they would treat children. This concept has had an enormous and far-reaching influence on the field of adult education practice. Central idea of this practice is adults’ capacity for self-direction” (Knowles, 1975; Brookfield, 1985; Long and Associates, 1988 qtd. in Merriam and Cunningham 201-202). Taylor, Marienau and Fiddler claimed that “there has been an expanding need for more experiential, more applied, and more self-reflective approaches to teaching and learning” (xii).

5.1. Adults as learners

“Adults can be paradoxical learners” said Taylor, Marienau and Fiddler (3). When teacher enters a classroom he/she may meet many different types of people with a “rich store of life experience” (Taylor, Marienau and Fiddler 3). Adults want to learn things
that seem relevant and applicable to their current lives (4). As Merriam and Cunningham mentioned learning episodes that the learners recalled as being of the greatest personal significance were those where the learners had to confront and overcome some kind of challenge (206). They also pointed out that:

[Students] did not recall vividly or proudly those times when developing skills, acquiring knowledge, or realizing insights came easily and quickly. Instead, they spoke proudly of how they had come to resolve contradictions, to appreciate ambiguities, or to develop problematic skills, overcoming their fears and poor self-images as learners in the process. (206)

All these comments logically lead to a conclusion that content and task-based learning based on their previous knowledge and experience is effective and natural for adult learners. Nevertheless, as Brookfield observes, using adults’ experience as a basis for their learning requires careful facilitation as some individuals may not be able to generalize their experience and others may not see the significance of experiences that are not their own (qtd. in Taylor, Marienau and Fiddler 7).
6. Conclusion

When we take all the information from previous chapters into consideration, there is no perfect and only method suitable for every student. Students are individuals and as individuals they prefer various approaches and methods. When teachers take students’ interests and experiences into account, students do not concentrate on the method the teacher uses as long as it has an effect on his/her level of English.
7. Research

7.1. Introduction

As I have already mentioned in this thesis I am a director of a small language school where I am in charge of methodology and teachers’ training. Consequently, when I was considering the topic of my thesis, my first choice was methodology. Since I have always been pushing my teachers towards the use of modern methods and approaches and I have always been in quite close contact with teachers from various language schools, I have realized that the real success of an English lesson is not only in a method or an approach that the teachers use, but also greatly depends on the structure of the lesson. I realize that there are many factors influencing “success” of a lesson, but I have decided to concentrate on the lesson structure in correspondence with methodology.

The main aim of my research was to find out which methods for structuring lessons are the most common and which factors influence teachers’ choice of the structure. I thought that the most effective way to find this out would be a questionnaire.

In the first 6 questions, teachers were asked personal questions about their age, years of practice, whether they teach at a state or a private language school etc. Second part of the questionnaire included two Likert scales where the teachers were asked to highlight a number corresponding to frequency with which they use methods described in chapters 2.1. to 2.5. and methods for structuring lessons described in chapter 3. I have changed the name of TTT approach into TBL in the second scale, as it means the same thing and teachers are more familiar with the term Task-Based Learning. The questionnaire included a short description of all the methods at the end. The following four questions were directed at teachers’ preferences concerning only PPP and TBL approaches.
As the structure of a lesson is greatly influenced by the main teaching material the
teachers use, the next two questions were devoted to main and additional teaching
materials that the teachers use most often. This information should either prove or deny
teachers’ answers connected to methods. The last three questions were directed at
continuous education of teachers in order to find out whether this factor influences their
choice of methods and approaches while planning their lessons. For the whole version
of the questionnaire, the description of methods used in the questionnaire and an
introductory letter for the representatives of the schools see Appendices 1, 2 and 3.

In total, the questionnaire had been sent to 86 language schools including 43 state
language schools (these are all the state language schools in the Czech Republic) and a
corresponding number of private language schools. There were two factors influencing
my choice of private language schools, first they had to be from the same area as the
state language schools and second, the minimum number of English teachers had to be
four. As I was sending the questionnaires to the schools and not to the individual
teachers, the total number of questionnaires may only be estimated. With a minimum
number of teachers in each school being four the total number of teachers that should
have received my questionnaire may be estimated at 344. Eighty-seven of the
questionnaires were returned, of which 84 were suitable for evaluation.

In the following section, the results of the research are presented.
8. Findings

8.1. Participants

The total number of participating teachers was 84, of which 57 were Czech and 27 were native speakers. All of the native speakers were from private language schools.

Eighty percent of all participants stated that they have a pedagogical university degree, 66% of which have master’s degree and 34% bachelor’s degree. Only 10% of all the participants said that they have some other education. The most commonly mentioned were DELTA and CELTA. Here I would just like to mention that both of these programs use PPP approach as their standard for lesson planning. The 10% remaining have no pedagogical education, which I personally find rather a high number, considering how difficult, demanding and responsible job it is.

Number of lessons that a teacher teaches a week does in my opinion have an influence on quality of those lessons. Sixteen to twenty-five lessons a week seem adequate or at least manageable with enough time left for further study, planning and self-reflection. Forty-seven per cent of participants stated that they teach in the range of 16 to 25 lessons a week, but 47% of participants said that they teach more than 25 lessons a week. This factor has to have influence on how much time teachers are willing to devote to preparation for their lessons. Only 6% of the participants answered that they teach less than 16 lessons a week.

Very interesting information was shown when looking at the age of participants. 58% of them are between 31 and 45 years of age, 32% are younger, but only 10% of all the participants are older than 46. Relating to years of teaching practice, the range of teachers in individual groups was fairly equal. 36% of teachers have less than 3 years of practice, 32% of them have 4 to 10 years of practice and 32% have more than 11 years of teaching practice.
8.2. Methods

In the second part of the questionnaire participants were highlighting numbers from 1 to 5 according to how often they use certain method. Number 1 means that the teacher uses the method most often and number 5 means that s/he never uses the method. When I added up all the points for individual methods I came to a list ranking the methods from the most to the least used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of methods from the most common to the least common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communicative approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Direct method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Grammar translation method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Audio-lingual method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total Physical Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most widely used method is Communicative approach, which is an expected result as I mentioned in chapter 3.5. One surprising piece of information is the difference between the frequency of Communicative approach and Direct method, which was considerable. CA is used about three times more often than DM, whereas the difference in preference between the other methods is very slight. Still, DM seems to be used quite often taking into account that it is has evolved even before ALM (see chapter 2). Even more surprising information is the position of GTM, which is one of the oldest methods as I pointed out in chapter 3.1.

Very similar result was reached when I compared the frequency of used methods for lesson planning. Presentation-practice-production was by far the most common approach, whereas EEE was second and TBL was legging far behind these two methods.
8.3. Comparison of PPP and TBL

8.3.1. Advantages of PPP

Four main ideas repeated in the answers of teachers in this section. I will describe them from the most common to the least common ones.

The first advantage mentioned was that PPP lessons provide clear and simple structure of the lesson. As a second positive point teachers said that such a lesson is easy to prepare because the materials used for the lesson are ordered from the simplest to the most difficult and types of activities are arranged from the most controlled to the least controlled. The third benefit was availability of materials, which will be discussed further in chapter 9.5. The fact that the teacher sees the progress of students in the lesson clearly and easily was written as the last common point. Several teachers also wrote that this approach is relatively easy for beginner students and that communication is effective.

8.3.2. Disadvantages of PPP

Most teachers mentioned two main disadvantages of this approach. The most common answer was that students tend to be passive quite a large part of the lesson, which means that lessons are predisposed to be teacher-centered. This piece of information contradicts the fact that adult learners have a good ability of self-direction (see chapter 5.). Some of the participants stated that this fact makes this approach unsuitable for more advanced students, as they do not get so much chance to communicate freely and independently. The second point matches one of the points mentioned in advantages of PPP; it is predictability of the lesson structure, which, in this case, the participants criticized as being rigid. Some of the teachers, about 5%, have
also mentioned that this approach does not seem to be as effective as it claims to be, which is exactly the same as Lindsay and Knight said (see chapter 3.5.).

8.3.3. Advantages of TBL

Answers about the TBL method have to be taken with a certain level of restrain as most teachers use TBL only scarcely and therefore do not have necessary experience to judge or comment on its effectiveness.

Nevertheless, about 20% of participants stated that while implementing this approach, students are more active and participate more in the progress of the lesson. The other most commonly mentioned point was stress on fluency of communication. Some of the other comments include greater students’ motivation, more orientation to students’ needs and change of the learning routine, which corresponds greatly with adult learner’s needs mentioned in chapter 5.1.

8.3.4. Disadvantages of TBL

Four main disadvantages of TBL structure were mentioned as answers to this question. Difficult and time-consuming preparation was stated as the most usual problem of this method. The same number of teachers said that TBL is quite complicated in monolingual classes, because the students have tendency to use their native language. About a tenth of teachers believe that this lesson structure is unsuitable for some types of students.

8.4. Comparison of factors

In this chapter of my thesis I am comparing eight factors which might have influence on teachers’ choice of methods and methods for lesson structure. These are:
1. state or private language school
2. native or non-native speaker
3. years of teaching practice
4. number of lessons taught a week
5. age
6. type of pedagogical education
7. internet use
8. attendance to seminars

For evaluation of these factors I used the following method. As each of the methods received a mark ranging from 1 to 5 according to frequency of use (1 means ‘often’, 5 means ‘never’), I added all the marks given to each method and made an average. The lower the mark that the method received, the more often it was used. The reason why I used the method of average mark for each method is that the difference can be clearly seen even though the order of methods from 1 to 5 and from 1 to 3 does not really dramatically change.

8.4.1. State vs. private language schools (for details see appendix no. 4)

Even though CA is in both types of language schools as the primary method, teachers of private language schools use it considerably more often. The latter use TPR as a much more common method compared to the state language school teachers. Also the score of GTM is much lower in state schools, which means that it is used more often.

Concerning the approaches to lesson structures, the difference is more noticeable. TBL is used significantly more often in private schools. On the other hand state school teachers use TBL extremely rarely; the score of which is 4,3.
8.4.2. Native vs. non-native speakers (for details see appendix no. 5)

These two groups of participants use CA with nearly the same frequency, but when we observe the order of all the other methods used quite a disparity exists there. Non-native speakers use DM fairly often, whereas native speakers placed this method in the last place. On the other hand, TPR is applied fairly often by native speakers, but the other group uses it very rarely. GTM is employed quite regularly by non-native speakers with a score of 3.6. Surprisingly native speakers placed GTM as their third or fourth most common method, but with a higher score of 4.3. All in all, native speakers use a slightly smaller range of methods compared to non-native speakers. The latter put greater emphasis on grammar, though.

Looking at the range of use of TBL by native speakers, it seems to be used fairly regularly whereas TBL is much less widespread among non-native speakers. The use of PPP is slightly lower by native speakers than non-native ones.

8.4.3. Number of English lessons taught a week (for details see appendix no. 6)

Teachers who teach less than 15 lessons a week use CA and GTM as their two main methods and DM and ALM also quite often, whereas the other two groups of participants, who teach more often, use CA as their major approach and just a very low ratio of any of the other methods. Teachers who teach the most lessons a week use GMT slightly more often than teachers from the middle group. The latter group uses TPR noticeably more than the participants with 26 lessons and more a week.

PPP is the most frequent approach with the group that teaches the most number of lessons a week; the other two groups combine PPP with EEE quite habitually. TBL is used the most often by the group with the least number of lessons a week.
8.4.4. *Years of teaching practice (for details see appendix no. 7)*

This factor does not seem to have such a visible influence on the range of methods used by the teachers as we have perceived in previous factors. Teachers with 4 to 10 years of teaching practice use CA slightly less and TPR slightly more than teachers with up to 3 years of experience or teachers with more than 11 years of practice. They also use DM the least often. GTM is applied the most by the least experienced group, a little less often by the group with 4 to 10 years of experience and rarely used by the most experienced group.

When we focus on methods for structuring lessons the only difference that we can distinguish is that teachers with the most teaching practice seem to combine PPP and EEE more frequently. Otherwise, the rate of TBL is approximately the same.

8.4.5. *Age (for details see appendix no. 8)*

Several striking results appeared when I compared the situation from the age point of view. GTM is being employed with a surprising frequency by all the teachers up to the age of 45, whereas teachers older than that stated that they do not use GTM at all.

Nevertheless, when we compare teachers’ use of TBL, the older generation does not use TBL at all, while the other two groups of participants use it significantly more often with a score of 3.5. PPP is employed the most by the oldest teachers, and very frequently by the youngest group. Teachers aged 31 to 45 use it the least regularly.

8.4.6. *Type of pedagogical education (for details see appendix no. 9)*

The type of pedagogical education seems to have far greater influence than any other factor. CA still remains in the first place, but DM is also quite common method used here. Quite an unexpected result for me is the position of GTM. Teachers with M.A. use
it relatively frequently and then the score of GTM gradually drops down to score 5 with teachers with no pedagogical education. On the other hand, TPR experiences progressive increase of position from M.A. to teachers with no pedagogical training.

The situation of TBL appears to be more stable here, where its score is ranging from 2,2 to 2,6 concerning teachers with prior training; while the group of teachers with no prior education applies TBL as well as EEE methods very scarcely.

8.4.7. Use of internet (for details see appendix no. 10)

Forty-three per cent of respondents stated that they use the internet for searching for additional materials and ideas for teaching weekly. Twenty-seven per cent use it monthly, 15% daily and the same percentage uses internet several times a year.

All of the participants regardless of the frequency of their use of the internet employ CA as the most common method. Daily users of internet use CA as their sole approach of teaching as scores for the other methods are 4 and higher. DM is quite frequently used by teachers who use internet a few times a year and weekly users. GTM received quite a low score from groups that use internet monthly or weekly. TPR got a very high score from most of the respondents.

PPP keeps its exclusive position with all the groups whereas the use of TBL grows gradually as we look at its score from scarce to daily users of internet. Daily users of internet use it noticeably more often then occasional internet users.

8.4.8. Attendance to seminars (for details see appendix no. 11)

Eighty-five per cent of teachers regularly attend seminars and only 15% do not. Those participants who go to seminars or other educational events attend them several
times a year – 94%; only 6% of them go weekly. None of the respondents attend seminars on monthly basis.

A great majority of all the participants go to seminars organized by Cambridge University Press. Second most common provider of methodological seminars mentioned by the participants was Oxford University Press. British Council is in third place closely followed by Express Publishing.

Those teachers who attend seminars weekly use CA as their major approach, all the other methods are being employed really scarcely. Annual participants on seminars and those who never go to them seem to combine all of the methods a little more equally. Still, the difference between the use of CA and any other method is great.

On the other hand, those teachers who attend seminars on weekly basis use TBL significantly more often than any other respondents. TBL has a score of 1,4 which has not appeared in any other comparison.

8.5. Textbooks and additional materials

Among textbooks that teachers use as their main teaching material are six textbooks mentioned the most often. I will list them from the most frequently used one to the least.

1. New English File
2. Cutting Edge
3. Expert (FCE and CAE)
4. Inside Out
5. Maturita Solutions
6. Face to Face
Other teaching materials stated are *Clockwise, New Headway, In Company, Instant PET, Objective PET* and *Straightforward*.

The most common additional material is *Grammar in Use* series. Other materials are resource packs of *Reward, Cutting Edge, New Headway* and *New English File, Vocabulary in Use, Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing Extra* and *Way with Words*. 
9. Discussion of findings

9.1. Participants

Fairly surprising information to me came to my view straight at the beginning, when I realized that 32% of all the participants were native speakers, I find this number quite high and I was very pleased with this fact, because native speakers are an important asset to learning languages as they motivate the students, but also a great source of language for colleague teachers. I was even more surprised when I found out that all of the native speakers were from private language schools. This fact might have several possible reasons. Firstly, it might suggest that native speakers prefer working hours in private schools or they might find students there more motivated and therefore working with them might be more rewarding, native speaker’s salary might be higher or it might even mean that private language schools have greater tendency to employ people without proper working permits or appropriate level of pedagogical education.

9.2. Methods

As the most widely used approach to teaching adults is CA and the most common approach to lesson planning is PPP; it seems nearly impossible not to see the connection between these two approaches even though Lindsay and Knight claim that PPP no longer represents CA as the only teaching model (see chapter 4.1.). Also the relative frequency of usage of GTM supports the PPP system more than any other, as it offers the opportunity for the teachers to use Czech and to order their activities from more controlled to less controlled ones. This would hardly be possible while using the TBL system of lesson planning as there is no space for those ‘fill-in’ or ‘translate’ activities.
9.3. Comparison of PPP and TBL

This part of my research brought up several interesting points, teachers had to write their answers and not only underline certain options and I find this sort of information the most valuable.

It seems that most of the positives of PPP approach mentioned by the teachers are only for the teachers and not for the students. I understand that a teaching job is not an easy one and that it is very time consuming, but I still believe that students should be in the center of our attention. We, as teachers, should consider benefits of certain methods from the students’ point of view. It is also understood that many students prefer clear and easy-to-follow lessons, but the question whether this is really effective still remains.

When we look at advantages of TBL, most of the responses had students in the center of attention, e.g. fluency, activity, motivation. In my opinion, lesson is for the students and therefore it should be planned with the students’ best interests in mind whether it is more difficult for the teacher to prepare or not. One of the disadvantages of TBL caught my attention as I have experienced the same problem. It is the students’ tendency to use their mother tongue in monolingual classes. Students have to be monitored quite closely in order to make them really use the target language. This dilemma seems to be even more evident with lower levels of students whose range of vocabulary and grammatical structures is quite limited.

9.4. Comparison of factors

9.4.1. State vs. private language schools

In my opinion, the results indicate that teachers at private language schools try much harder to engage their students and to experiment with various methods much more enthusiastically than teachers from state language schools. One of the reasons of this
might be the fact that private schools rely on the students with their income and students’ satisfaction has direct influence on their success and consequently existence of their language school.

9.4.2. Native vs. non-native speakers

This factor definitely has influence on the teacher’s choice of methods. Native speakers seem to use narrower range of methods, which might imply that they are not as qualified as non-native speakers and teach more according to their own experience with learning languages. On the other hand non-native speakers might have higher level of education, but they have greater tendency to teach in a more traditional way.

9.4.3. Number of English lessons taught a week

The results seem to indicate that teachers with the least number of lessons a week have a greater tendency to use a wider range of methods and approaches and also change their lesson planning system more often than the other two groups. There might be many factors influencing this, but I assume that they have more time to ‘play’ with lesson preparation. On the other hand, this might not be the only reason as they might teach other subjects the remaining number of lessons a week.

9.4.4. Years of teaching practice

This factor does not have obvious influence on methods for lesson structure but there seems to be one feature worth discussing. Teachers with less than 3 years of teaching practice use a slightly wider range of methods than teachers with more years of experience; this fact suggests that they have a greater tendency to experiment with various methods in order to try what suits them and what suits the students the most. On
the other hand, when we look at the group with 11 and more years of experience their
range is basically CA and occasionally DM, but otherwise all the other methods have a
score higher than 4, this implies that they have already decided on their favorite
methods and they do not experiment as much.

9.4.5. Age

Considering the youngest group of participants they seem to use most of the methods
slightly more often than the remaining two groups. The middle group little bit less and
the oldest participants use basically only two methods. This phenomenon indicates, as
with the previous factor, that younger teachers experiment more with methods as well
as with approaches to lesson structure.

9.4.6. Type of pedagogical education

There are several features that can be commented in this chapter. Firstly, teachers
with M.A. degree use greater range of methods most often; with the other groups the
range is getting lower as the level of pedagogical education is getting lower. Quite a
striking difference is perceived with the use of TBL; it seems that unqualified teachers
do not use it at all. Either they do not know of its existence, or they find it too hard to be
effectively used in the lesson. The TBL lesson is hard to manage and it might be too
complicated and risky area for teachers with no qualification.

9.4.7. Use of internet

We can clearly see that the more often internet is used as a source of additional
materials, the more often TBL is applied in the lessons. The reason for this might be the
fact that TBL is a relatively new method and most materials for it are available on the internet, whereas very few TBL books are easily obtainable.

9.4.8. Attendance to seminars

Very similar result has emerged when comparing groups of teachers according to their attendance at seminars. TBL is used the most often by attendees of seminars on weekly basis. I have to point out here that majority of those respondents who attend seminars weekly go to seminars organized by the British Council.

9.5. Textbooks and additional materials

All of the textbooks used as the main teaching material correspond greatly with the fact that CA as well as PPP is the most commonly applied approach to teaching as all of the textbooks mentioned follow the PPP structure.

The additional materials do not match the idea of CA as being the mostly used approach. The most common additional material is Grammar in Use by Raymond Murphy, which fits more into GTM than any other method.
10. Conclusion

When I summarize the findings there are four main areas that seem to show some corresponding and interesting facts.

Firstly, the difference between private and state language school teachers seems to be very similar to the situation between native and non-native speakers. Private language schools and native speakers employ more methods concentrating on communication and activity with much greater usage of Task-based learning than state language schools and non-native speakers.

Secondly, number of lesson taught a week, years of teaching practice and age seem to have very little influence on the range of methods and approaches of English teaching. The only striking fact appeared with teachers older than 46 who do not seem to use TBL at all.

The third point that has a great influence on teacher’s choice of methods is education, continuous self-reflection and search for new methods and ideas. Three areas have been looked at; academic education, use of internet as a source of materials and attendance to educational seminars. The result is that teachers with higher level of education, greater interest in searching for additional materials and more training in general have a much greater tendency to use wider range of methods like CA, DM and TPR and a much more frequent use of Task-based learning.

The last area that I would like to comment on is the reasons that teachers have for using PPP more often than TBL. Two areas of answers proved that there is a great shortage of materials for TBL compared with PPP. Most textbooks and additional materials in print or on the internet are PPP-based. Most teachers realize the advantages of TBL for students but say that they are limited by time and availability of materials.
The question of availability of materials seems to me more like an excuse by the teachers. I agree that there are very few books organized according to TBL format. But there are plenty of materials available that can be just slightly edited or reorganized and it seems to me that teachers just want to have everything ready without putting any extra effort into preparation.

My suggestion would be to organize more seminars that would be more concerned with new methods and materials development than promotion of books by certain publishing houses. This would solve the situation with availability of materials as well as with knowledge of new methods and approaches by language school teachers.
Resumé

The main concerns of this thesis are methods in foreign language teaching and frequency of their use at language schools in the Czech Republic. It principally concentrates on two methods for structuring lessons; PPP and TBL. The theoretical part describes methods in foreign language teaching, most common methods for structuring lessons and core ideas in adult learning, whereas the practical part consists of analysis of a questionnaire which focuses on frequently used methods and possible teacher’s reasons for their choice of such methods. This thesis suggests that language school teachers know about advantages of TBL for students but prefer to use PPP because such lessons are easier and less time-consuming to prepare than TBL.

Hlavním tématem bakalářské práce jsou metody používané při výuce cizích jazyků a frekvence jejich použití na jazykových školách v České Republice. Soustředí se zejména na dvě metody týkající se struktury vyučovací hodiny; PPP a TBL. V teoretické části jsou popsány metody používané při výuce cizích jazyků, nejčastěji používané metody pro strukturování vyučovacích hodin a základní informace o výuce dospělých. Praktická část se skládá z analýzy dotazníku, který se zaměřuje zejména na frekventované metody a možné důvody učitelů k jejich výběru. Závěrem této práce je fakt, že učitelé jazykových škol ví o výhodách TBL pro studenty, ale preferují použití PPP, protože takové lekce jsou pro ně méně časově náročné a snazší na přípravu než TBL.
Appendix 1 - Questionnaire

Could you please either underline one of the options or answer the question?

1. Do you teach in a state language school or a private language school?
2. Are you a native or a non-native speaker?
3. How many English lessons (45 min) a week do you teach?
   - 1-15
   - 16-25
   - over 25
4. Years of teaching practice:
   - up to 3
   - 4 – 10
   - 11+
5. Age:
   - 20 – 30
   - 31 – 45
   - 46 +
6. Which type of pedagogical education do you have? M.A. B.A. Other
   - None
7. What methods do you use?
   A short description of methods can be found at the end of this questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of method:</th>
<th>Use often……………never use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communicative Approach</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grammar Translation Method</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Audio-Lingual Method</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Direct Method</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total Physical Response</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. What methods for structuring your lessons do you use?
   A short description of methods can be found at the end of this questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of method:</th>
<th>Use often……………never use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Presentation, Practice, Production (PPP)</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Task-Based Learning (TBL)</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Exploration, Explanation, Expression (EEE)</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. What do you like about PPP the most? Please, write down 2 things.

10. What do you dislike about PPP the most? Please, write down 2 things.

11. What do you like about TBL the most? Please, write down 2 things.

12. What do you dislike about TBL the most? Please, write down 2 things.

13. What textbook or series do you use as your main material? Please, write down title(s).

14. What supplementary material do you use most often? Please, write down title.

15. How often do you use Internet to search for new ideas for lessons?
   A few times a year    monthly    weekly    daily

16. Do you go to the seminars or other educational events focused on ESL?
   No       Yes       Please write down the name of a provider (e.g. Masaryk University, CUP, Express Publishing)

17. How often do you attend these seminars? Please, underline.
   A few times a year    monthly    weekly
Appendix 2 – Description of methods

Communicative Approach

The method focuses on language as a medium of communication, goal is communicative competence - ability to use the language correctly and appropriately to the situation, communicate completely, but not as a native speaker. The teacher facilitates the communication between all participants but acts as an independent participant. Emphasis is on practice of oral and listening skills in pair work and group work as a way of developing communicative skills. Grammar is taught but less systematically. Materials- relate to pupils' own lives and must be authentic, real and fresh.

Grammar Translation Method

Learning rules of grammar and their application in translations from one language into the other. Vocabulary learned through translation of isolated words. Classes taught in mother tongue.

Audio-Lingual Method

Based on drills and dialogues. Its objectives are accurate pronunciation and grammar, ability to respond quickly and accurately. Emphasis on building blocks of language and learning the rules for combining them. Vocabulary learned only in context. No mother tongue. The work is based on listening and responding to the teacher.

Direct Method

Includes lots of oral interaction, spontaneous use of language, no translation between the first and second language, and little or no analysis of grammar rules. No place for mother tongue in classes. Emphasis on spoken word and great stress is put on correct pronunciation. Vocabulary taught through demonstrations, objects and pictures, and abstract vocabulary is taught through association of ideas.
Total Physical Response

Mother tongue is rarely used; students are allowed to use it when necessary. Acting, performing and listening are very important. Only concrete vocabulary connected with actions is taught. No grammar is taught, just commands and imperatives are used, and then drill.

PPP - Presentation, Practice, Production

Presentation – new language is presented perhaps as a grammatical pattern or within some familiar situation. During this phase, the teacher is often very active and dominates the class.
Practice – the new language item is identified, repeated and manipulated by the students.
Production – the students attempt to use the new language in different contexts provided by the teacher.

TBL - Task-Based Learning

Based on three stages: - pre-task phase - introduction of topic/task/new words by teacher -task-cycle- students do the task, students prepare a report to class, report presentation - language focus - analysis of new features and practice. The aim is to explore, listen and speak.
Based on self-teaching. Grammar explained afterwards. Teacher is advisor and initiator, students are explorers and investigators.

EEE - Exploration, Explanation, Expression

Exploration - students are given sentences illustrating a certain grammar rule and are asked as a group to find the pattern and, with the help of the teacher, to formulate the rule.
Explanation - the teacher or the students summarize what was discovered in Exploration stage, they focus on the form.
Expression - students start practicing the production of meaningful utterances with each other in communication and interactive tasks.
Appendix 3 - Introductory letter

Dear teachers,

I am a 3rd year student of the Faculty of Education of Masaryk University Brno and I am writing my bachelor thesis on factors influencing teacher’s choice of methods used for teaching adults at language schools.

I would like to ask you to fill in this questionnaire and send it back to me before the 20th March 2009 on my email address lenka.vystavelova@seznam.cz.

There are two versions in the attachment, one in Czech and one in English for the native speakers.

Thank you very much.

Lenka Vystavělová
### Appendix 4 - State vs. private language schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State language school</th>
<th>1. communicative approach</th>
<th>2. direct method</th>
<th>3. grammar translation method</th>
<th>4. audiolingual method</th>
<th>5. total physical response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private language school</td>
<td>1. communicative approach</td>
<td>2. direct method</td>
<td>3. total physical response</td>
<td>4. grammar translation method</td>
<td>5. audiolingual method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.-4.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.-4.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State language school</th>
<th>PPP</th>
<th>EEE</th>
<th>TBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private language school</td>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>TBL</td>
<td>EEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>4,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5 - Native vs. non-native speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native speakers</th>
<th>Non-native speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. communicative approach</td>
<td>1. communicative approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. total physical response</td>
<td>2. direct method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.-4. audiolingual method</td>
<td>3. grammar translation method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.-4. grammar translation method</td>
<td>4. audiolingual method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. direct method</td>
<td>5. total physical response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. PPP                           | 1. PPP                               |
| 2. TBL                           | 2. EEE                               |
| 3. EEE                           | 3. TBL                               |
Appendix 6 - Number of English lessons taught a week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 -15</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.-2.</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.-2.</td>
<td>GTM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.-3.</td>
<td>ALM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.-4.</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.-3.</td>
<td>DM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.-4.</td>
<td>ALM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>TPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>GTM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16 -25</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>PPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>EEE</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>EEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>TBL</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>TBL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>26 and more</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>GTM</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>ALM</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 7 - Years of teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 3</th>
<th>4 - 10</th>
<th>11 and more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CA</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>1. CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DM</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>2. ALM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GTM</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>3. GTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ALM</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>3. TPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TPR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5. DM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. PPP      | 1,3    | 1. PPP      | 1,5 |
| 2. EEE      | 3,2    | 2. EEE      | 2,8 |
| 3. TBL      | 3,5    | 3. TBL      | 3,5 |

| 1. PPP      | 1,3    | 1. PPP      | 1,5 |
| 2. EEE      | 3,2    | 2. EEE      | 2,8 |
| 3. TBL      | 3,5    | 3. TBL      | 3,5 |
### Appendix 8 - Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 30</th>
<th>31 - 45</th>
<th>46 and more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CA</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DM</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GTM</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ALM</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>3,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TPR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>3,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. PPP</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EEE</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TBL</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 9 - Type of pedagogical education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>B.A.</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.-3.</td>
<td>GTM</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.-3.</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>ALM</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>B.A.</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>TBL</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>EEE</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 10 - Use of internet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A few times a year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>CA 1,3</td>
<td>CA 1,6</td>
<td>CA 1,2</td>
<td>CA 1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>DM 2</td>
<td>GTM 3,4</td>
<td>DM 3,1</td>
<td>TPR 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>ALM 3,6</td>
<td>TPR 3,6</td>
<td>GTM 3,6</td>
<td>DM 4,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.-5.</td>
<td>GTM 4,3</td>
<td>ALM 4</td>
<td>ALM 3,7</td>
<td>ALM 4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.-5.</td>
<td>TPR 4,3</td>
<td>DM 4</td>
<td>TPR 4,1</td>
<td>GTM 4,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      | PPP 1,3            | PPP 2,6 | PPP 1,5| PPP 1 |
| 1.                   | PPP 1,3            | PPP 2,6 | PPP 1,5| PPP 1 |
| 2.                   | EEE 1,6            | EEE 2,6 | EEE 3,4| EEE 3 |
| 3.                   | TBL 4,6            | TBL 3,6 | TBL 3,5| TBL 3 |
### Appendix 11 - Attendance to seminars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several times a year</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CA</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>1. CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2. DM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GTM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3. ALM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TPR</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>4. GTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ALM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5. TPR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. EEE | 2,3 | 1. PPP | 1,4 | 1. PPP | 1,2 |
| 2. PPP | 2,6 | 2. EEE | 2,7 | 2. TBL  | 1,4 |
| 3. TBL | 3,3 | 3. TBL | 3,6 | 3. TBL  | 3,2 |
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