EduLingua

Alkalmazott nyelvészeti folyóirat

Journal of Applied Linguistics

Impresszum

EduLingua

Alkalmazott nyelvészeti folyóirat

Journal of Applied Linguistics

EduLingua

Tartalomjegyzék
Contents

TANULMÁNYOK
STUDIES

Observations from the language classroom: The importance of the group

Francis J. Prescott

Károli Gáspár University, Hungary

The concept of group dynamics, coined by psychologist Kurt Lewin in the 1940s to describe behaviour in social groups, was first applied to the foreign language classroom in 1997 by Dörnyei and Maldarez as a way of exploring how group processes affect learning outcomes. This paper reports on a small-scale longitudinal case study of four university study skills classes for novice students and examines how the four teachers' differing approaches to group dynamics affected the students' experiences in those classes. The aim was to find what the differences were between the groups and to see what effect they had on the students' learning. The research was done over an entire academic year using semi-sructured qualitative interviews with both students and teachers, and the data (transcribed interviews) was analysed using the constant comparative method developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). While the findings do not provide direct evidence that more cohesive groups promote better learning outcomes, they do indicate that students' enjoyment and engagement is enhanced in more cohesive classes, and that their attitude to their own learning is more positive. Furthermore, creating good classroom dynamics promotes skills which are also highly rated for 21st century learning.

Key words: group dynamics, learning outcomes, qualitative interviews, constant comparative method, 21st century learning

1. Introduction

As a scientific idea, the concept of group dynamics has been around for many years – it originated in the 1940s in the work of social psychologist Kurt Lewin, who found that the way a group was configured strongly influenced the behaviour of its individual members (Hergenhahn & Henley, 2009, p. 459), and it was subsequently applied in many areas of sociology and psychology (Dörnyei & Malderez, 1999). However, it took a great deal longer for the concept to be adopted by educationalists. In the world of the language teaching classroom, it was the importance attached to the communicative approach and cooperative learning that gave the impetus to examine the group dynamics of the language classroom in the 1990s (Dörnyei & Malderez, 1997; Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003). Now in the 21st century there is a renewed emphasis on the need for learners to develop good communication and collaboration skills (P21 Partnership for 21st Century Learning, n.d.; Trilling & Fadel, 2009) and it may be time to take a fresh look at how fostering good group dynamics in and out of the language classroom can promote better learning.

This short paper looks at the way group dynamics may have affected learning in four first-year university classes held by teachers who had distinctly different

approaches to group building. The idea for the paper grew out of my experience of observing the four teachers in their classes while doing my PhD research. Despite differing degrees of teaching experience, all four teachers had developed distinctive classroom practices, as well as a view of their own role as a teacher, which they were able to articulate clearly. Both in their words and in their actions there were marked differences between the ways they approached the culture of the classroom, and because I was also interviewing several of their students, I was able to get a two-way picture of what was going on in the classroom. This provided me with a fascinating insight into the group dynamics of each classroom, and I thought it would be worth exploring the topic in greater depth. However, the focus of my PhD (Prescott-Pickup, 2012) was on how the students adapted to academic writing requirements, so I could devote very little space to the culture of the different classrooms and the effect it had on the students.

The main aim of this paper is to examine what the differences in group dynamics were between the four classes and what the reasons were for them, and to look at the effect the classroom culture had on the students' learning in each case. Although the focus is on classroom learning, in the case of one teacher in particular, it will be seen that group dynamics involved creating a group structure which involved both in-class dynamics and out of class dynamics through the use of online communication. In this way the study is also connected to a more up-to-date view of how classroom dynamics can work in the digital age.

2. Group dynamics in the language classroom

It was Breen (1985) who first highlighted the neglect of the social nature of classroom language learning, and it was with Prabhu (1992) that a clearer understanding of the language classroom as a site of complex social interaction was first brought to notice. He drew attention to the fact that a classroom lesson, besides being an element in a planned curriculum and a way of implementing a particular method, is a social event and "an arena of social interaction" (p. 229) in which the teacher plays a crucial role. Prabhu claimed that in order to reconcile the potential conflict between these disparate aspects, it is necessary for the teacher to take into consideration the social dimensions of classroom life as well as the pedagogic ones. The teacher's role is essential to the establishment of routines that promote classroom stability and security, but for productive learning to take place, Prabhu called on teachers to become their own theorists rather than just implementers of the methods provided for them by specialists. This view of the teacher as theorist can be seen as part of the long discussion of the role of teachers and theorists in L2 education, a discussion which is still ongoing (e.g., Block, 2000; Labaree, 2003; Vanderlinde & van Braak, 2010), but it is Prabhu's view of the way the teacher's personality affects the classroom dynamics which is of most interest here: "the teacher's own personality is a major factor in the interplay of forces, and conflict resolution will necessarily have to vary from one teacher to another" (p.

231). This points to the need for research to focus not just on finding the most effective teaching method for teachers to use, but also on understanding the complex interactions that actually take place in the language classroom. It is from this realisation of the foreign language classroom as a site of social interaction between learners and teacher that interest in group dynamics grew.

In their seminal 1997 article, Dörnyei and Maldarez argue that by an understanding of the principles of group dynamics, foreign language teachers can gain a much greater understanding of the characteristics and processes of their own groups and that this is worth doing because such characteristics and processes have a direct effect on the success or failure of learning outcomes. They also offer a number of practical suggestions (pp. 76–79) on how to exploit the principles of group dynamics for more effective L2 learning based on both the theory and their own teaching experience. Amongst these suggestions, they recommend using cooperative rather than individualistic or competitive learning tasks, including problem solving tasks, group projects and the writing of group reports, an approach that has a great deal of overlap with the currently popular 21st century learning skills approach (Trilling & Fadel, 2009). Dörnyei and Murphey (2003) also emphasize the importance of teachers devoting time to building cohesive groups in order to reduce the stress of teaching and to avoid teacher burnout as well as to promote more effective learning: "Learning about group dynamics and organising well-functioning groups will go a long way toward facilitating smooth classroom management and enhancing student performance" (p. 11). This need to pay attention to the cohesive functioning of the classroom group has been further emphasized and explored in the work of Rose Senior, which takes a social constructivist view of teaching and learning (2001; 2002; 2006). In her more recent work, Senior relates the kind of socially connected classrooms that effective teachers foster with the way effective online educators build online communities for distance learning, thus making the connection between successful learning in face-to-face classrooms and the skills needed for learning and cooperating in the 21st century digital world (Senior, 2010).

The aim of the present paper is to explore the differences in the use of group building techniques by four university teachers in their classes and to show how these differences affected the classroom experience of both the students and their teacher. It also attempts to discover more about how group building can contribute to effective learning. The research involved a qualitative approach, so the next section will describe in greater detail how the study was conducted.

3. Research methods

The present paper relies on data from a much larger research study which was carried out for my PhD. This section will only deal in detail with those aspects of the larger study which are relevant to the data discussed in this paper, namely, the observations

and interviews involving the four Academic Skills (AS) teachers and their first-year students. That data was gathered as part of a longitudinal ethnographic study of how first year-students adapt to the writing requirements of university.

3.1 Research setting and participants

The research setting was the English Department of a large university in Budapest, and within this the weekly 90-minute AS classes which all new students studying English had to take over their first and second semesters. The main aim of these courses was to help the students adapt to the requirements of written academic discourse. The research was done by gaining access to four of these AS classes with the agreement of their teachers. In the first lesson of each class, the students were asked to fill in a short questionnaire asking about their English learning experience and with the questionnaire there was a letter of consent asking the students whether they were interested in participating in the research study. In all, 20 students, 4 to 6 students from each class, agreed to participate.

3.2 Data collection

The main method of data collection was long semi-structured qualitative interviews (McCracken, 1988; Prescott, 2011) which were conducted at intervals of roughly three months over the students' first three semesters studying English. A simple interview schedule was developed for each round (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994), but the interviews gradually became longer and more free-flowing as the trust between interviewer and interviewee grew. The interviews were principally about the students' learning experience at the university, with particular attention paid to their writing assignments. Naturally, the writing that they did in the AS classes was also discussed, and in the course of these discussions their feelings about their learning experience in the AS course emerged.

In the first semester permission was also obtained to sit in as a participant observer on the four AS classes. Every single class was observed and I gradually became more of a participant and less of an observer. I took notes during and after each class using a simple observation protocol (based on Creswell, 1994) which focused on teacher-student interaction and teacher talk. Being accepted into each class in the role of both an observer and a participant was important because it gave me the opportunity to learn much more about the culture of each class from the perspective of the participants (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2002).

I was also interested in the perspective of the four teachers, and whenever possible I discussed each lesson with the teacher immediately after the class was over. However, this depended on how much time I and the teacher had available. In some cases it proved possible to meet the teacher later in the week to discuss the class. Such short

informal conversational interviews (Patton, 2002) focused on points of interest arising from the class, but could also be used to explore the teacher's views of his or her students' progress and general feelings about how the course was developing. No pre-planned interview protocol was used for these discussions and, in order to keep them relaxed and informal, they were not recorded. I wrote down brief notes during the discussions and added to them afterwards.

Three of the teachers[1] also agreed to do much longer recorded interviews after the end of the students' second semester. These interviews were well over an hour long and covered all aspects of their teaching of the course. A validated and piloted structured interview protocol was used, following McCracken's guidelines for ethnographic interviews (1988).

3.3 Data analysis

All the interviews were transcribed and sent to the interviewee for member checking. The constant comparative method of data analysis first described by Glaser and Strauss (1967) in their ground-breaking work on making qualitative research more rigorous was used as the basic approach. A clear and succinct description of the basic method is given by Saldana (2009). It involves breaking down the data into simple data chunks, each of which represents a concept in the data. These coded concepts are then used to build up more complex categories and the relations between the categories are described, until a clear picture of the phenomenon under investigation is achieved.

4. Results and discussion

Before looking at each teacher individually, it is important to point out that multiple factors are at play in any classroom that can affect the group feeling, and it is certain that the teacher cannot control all of them. Moreover, as with any piece of social scientific research in everyday contexts, the reality under investigation cannot be neatly controlled by the researcher either. Nevertheless, such research is worth doing as it can give an in-depth insight into particular contexts which can then be compared with other similar contexts (a notion termed *transferability* by Guba (1981)), and even in a short study such as this, it is possible to distinguish some salient differences between these teachers which clearly had an effect on the way the students saw the course.

One further point that is worth mentioning is that for any teacher who wants to create positive group dynamics in their class, the job is made more difficult by the fact that the class is only held once a week and the students in each AS class mostly do not meet each other in their other classes. Moreover, as noted by an expert AS teacher (interviewed in the initial stages of the research) who had been involved with the AS

---

[1] Teacher A was on maternity leave at that time and later went to work in another country.

course from its inception, there was a problem with the students having a negative perception of the course: "I don't know if this is a weakness of the course or a weakness of us teachers – I can still feel that students are not so terribly happy about this course" (Interview with an expert AS teacher, pp. 10-11). As will be seen, this unhappiness with the course actually tended to vary from student to student, but it was certainly palpable in some students, especially the more able ones who tended to be dissatisfied with doing more basic activities.

4.1 Teacher A

Teacher A was the least experienced teacher of the four. She was in her second year as a university teacher and most of her experience of AS came from her time as a student at the same university rather than from teaching it. She tended to use the same approach throughout the semester: the students sat in a circle with her (this seating arrangement never varied) and they would work from handouts that she gave them. The students did tasks in pairs or small groups and then she would conduct whole-class feedback by going through the questions and asking additional ones.

The problem with this approach is that it did not result in much interaction between students and teacher or between students and other students. Several times in my observation notes, I was aware of long pauses and lack of responsiveness on the students' part when the teacher asked questions. The students too were aware of this problem with the stilted nature of the interaction in the classroom. One student, Brigi[2], put it in the following way: "I would make it more interactive. So more speaking and debating ... because it was a little bit boring. Because the teacher said what she wanted to say and we read the papers, but we couldn't share our ideas" (Brigi, Interview 3, p. 2). Another student, Erika, also grew tired of the repetitive nature of the classes: "So sometimes I feel a bit bored or, so it's, well, it's always the same and always the same structure and always the same form" (Erika, Interview 2, p. 1).

It was clear that the teacher herself frequently found it very difficult to elicit answers, having to use probes repeatedly. In conversation after her classes, she was aware of this problem but talked about it in terms of students as either being contributors or being quiet. She also said that she preferred students to volunteer but if nobody volunteered then she picked someone (Teacher A, Post-class discussion, Week 4). Teacher A's classes were always teacher led with her doing most of the talking. This was very likely exacerbated by the difficulty of getting significant contributions from more than a handful of students. By Week 4 she knew who the main contributors were, naming three in the post-class discussion. One of these contributors, Viki, actually became progressively less keen to interact in class, and her reason gives an insight into what might have been holding back other students, as well:

---

[2] Since the students and their experiences were the main focus of the research, each one was given a pseudonym.

Sometimes I'm trying to interact but sometimes I feel that I shouldn't because maybe I cannot say the thing our teacher is thinking about, and I will be /?/ the others and saying things that are misleading. So sometimes I just don't want to answer because of this. (Viki, Interview 2, pp. 1-2)

She was particularly conscious of the mixed ability of the group: "So we are very different on this course. I mean there are those who don't speak fluently and there are some who have written many many essays, and know what [an] argumentative essay is" (Viki, Interview 2, p. 2). As a result, she had taken the decision that she would rather be a listener than a talker. A much weaker student[3], Csenge, felt a similar inhibition about speaking in front of the group:

I think sometimes we are not sure about the question, or about the task, and that's why nobody want to talk about it or just raise a hand and say something. And because nobody want to talk, you know, there is a complete silence, anybody want to break it. So – or nobody want to break it I mean. (Csenge, Interview 2, p.10)

This inhibition felt by weaker and stronger students is a clear sign that Teacher A was unable to create a group dynamic that encouraged collaboration in her classroom in spite of her efforts to do so. At the time she also seemed unable to take any effective steps to overcome this inhibition or to even clearly identify the nature of the problem – the situation had not changed by the end of the first semester. However, with more experience it is to be hoped that she would be able to use more variety in her teaching methods and find more successful techniques for fostering classroom interaction.

It should also be pointed out that, despite the lack of interaction during the classes, the students still felt that they learnt a lot during Teacher A's course. For instance, Brigi, looking back on the first AS course at the beginning of her second semester, said that she felt the course had been useful because she learnt how to build up a paragraph and then an essay, and it helped with other writing assignments that she had to do (Brigi, Interview 3, p. 2).

4.2 Teacher B

Teacher B had considerable teaching experience and had been involved with the AS course since its beginning, first as a student and then as a teacher. However, he too experienced problems with creating good group dynamics in his AS classes, and he was quite open about this: "I know that I have group dynamics problems, partly again because it's one course per week" (Interview with Teacher B, p. 12). He felt that in

---

[3] Csenge knew that she had basic problems with her grammar right from the beginning of the study when she filled in the initial questionnaire. In answer to question 8, which asked if there was anything in particular that she needed help with in her writing in English, she mentioned "use of tenses" and "more accurate work" (Csenge, Student Questionnaire).

classes where he met the students twice a week (he had one such class at the time, a Language Practice class) he was able to do a better job of creating good group cohesion:

> I had time to find out about people and then we had interesting discussions about each other and then, at the end, I could feel that we are a sort of family ... So this kind of group dynamics is not given in the AS classes, partly because I'm sort of frugal (laughs) I don't want to spend time [on it]. (Interview with Teacher B, p. 12)

The point about not wanting to spend time on building good group dynamics was indicative of a conscious decision on Teacher B's part to spend his limited class time on teaching the subject matter. It also indicated that he saw group dynamics as being a peripheral concern to the main business of his classes, an optional extra. He clearly realised that good group dynamics was a desirable quality for a class to have, but he did not see building a cohesive group as an important part of the learning experience of his students, other than for purposes of getting students to give each other feedback: "I know I should do more in terms of group dynamics, and group dynamics is important because it actually rewards you when you have feedback, when you have peer revision for example" (Interview with Teacher B, p. 12). Not surprisingly, he used "very little peer feedback" (p. 12). He also said he thought his students were used to being in classes in which they did not know each other's names, and, therefore, "they don't even seek the kind of interaction or they don't want to get to know one another so very well, *I think*" (p. 12).

From the students' point of view, Teacher B's classes were described as being useful but not very interesting. All five of the students interviewed from this class spoke either of the teacher's expertise in the subject or of the need to learn writing skills, and Vilmos, Zsuzsa, Natalie, and Gergely mentioned choosing Teacher B's group because it had been recommended to them by older students. However, three of the students said they sometimes found the course boring. Both views are reflected in Fiona's observation:

> Well it's OK. I find it lots of times boring. I don't know. Well I think Teacher B does it well. I mean he knows what he's doing and he's really into whatever but I don't think it's a very interesting class. So I know it's probably good for writing skills or whatever but... (laughs). (Fiona, Interview 1, p. 2)

Zsuzsa said she liked the lessons and thought the teacher was good but she also felt that sometimes they were uninteresting:

> I mean the lesson sometimes is very boring. Well not boring just, we are just sitting there, and listening to the teacher and nothing happens, he just talks. And, and, it's not the kind of topic which we're interested in. (Zsuzsa, Interview 3, p. 2)

Vilmos also had mixed feelings: he found the classes necessary but "a bit boring" (Vilmos, Interview 1, p. 4). Another student, Gergely, while not saying that he found the classes boring was not very enthusiastic about them. He found the course "quite useful" (Gergely, Interview 2, p. 1) and said the group was "okay" in the same interview. He was much less forthcoming in his interviews than most of the other students and tended towards the minimal in his responses, but in a later interview it seemed clear that he sometimes found the classes not to be very enjoyable, as well: "Yeah I would say sometimes it was good. Sometimes not (Laughs)." (Gergely, Interview 3, p. 2).

This mixed response corresponded very closely with what the teacher himself said about the need to spend the limited time available on teaching the subject material rather than building good group dynamics. All the students seemed to recognise the usefulness of the course content, although for the most able students the perceived pace of the course was part of the problem. Vilmos and Fiona were both significantly ahead of the other students in terms of their general proficiency in English. Vilmos had learnt English mostly outside high school from the South African wife of one of his father's friends and from doing voluntary work for a charitable organisation for four years, translating the annual budget from English into Hungarian and spending two months in the organisations international office in the south of England. Fiona came from a highly academically oriented family (her parents and her sister had all attended university), who all spoke English and she had spent two periods living in the USA during which she attended the 1st and 6th grades at school.

Both these students had a high level of spoken English but did experience some problems with their writing. Vilmos did not like having to do obligatory writing tasks. However, when his internship with the charitable organisation had ended unexpectedly early in December, he had started university in the spring semester of the previous year, rather than waste valuable time, and had found himself having to write four seminar papers without having had any preparation. The fact that he was able to do this and managed to get a pass grade in three out of the four subjects that he wrote the papers for was an indication of both his proficiency in English and his resourcefulness as a student. He appreciated the AS course because he knew it was providing him with the help that he had lacked in his first much more difficult semester, but still he found the course very slow:

> It's absolutely necessary because I know the, my desperation from last semester when I had to write four seminar papers and then I didn't have any idea how to write an essay or anything which is academic in style. And so, yeah, I find it completely necessary but I'm not interested in it at all. So it's a bit like ambivalent, or contradictory. And, yeah, I find the classes a bit boring. (Vilmos, Interview 1, p. 4)

One factor beyond Teacher B's control which may have negatively affected the dynamics in the class was the room. Out of the four classes I observed, Teacher B's was in the smallest room and this meant that it would have been very difficult to change the

seating arrangement, which was a U-shape with the teacher's desk at the top in front of the blackboard. This arrangement allowed the teacher to walk around in the middle of the U-shape to talk to individual students, but made it quite difficult for the students to move around on the outside of the U, with the result that when pair or group activities were done, students tended to work with others close to them if they could, thus limiting the amount of interaction during the classes. There were occasions when the teacher made an effort to get mixed groups, as in the second week when he assigned each student a number from one to four and they had to work with the other students with that number. However, this was the exception rather than the rule, probably because it took time for the students to arrange themselves in their new groups, a fact quickly noticed by the teacher: "Okay, now this takes ages!" (Teacher B, Classroom Observation 2, p. 3).

One result of this relatively static seating arrangement is that the students did not seem to know all the other students' names (there were 12 of them altogether). This was something that several of the students commented on half way through the course: "I find that sometimes I find it quite difficult to communicate with the others, especially because I usually sit, actually almost everybody sits in the same place" (Vilmos, Interview2, p. 1). Fiona felt she only knew the student who was in another of her courses: "We don't talk much, I mean, with each other. I don't really know any of them. Well there's just one guy who I'm in with two other seminars and that's it" (Fiona, Interview 2, p. 2). Natalie also mentioned that she only knew those students who she shared another seminar with.

Teacher B's content-focused approach demonstrated that a competent and experienced teacher may choose to more or less ignore group dynamics and still be able to teach the content of the course effectively. Nevertheless, it was clear from his students' interviews and from my own observation of his classes that at times there was a distinct lack of energy, and when the students were required to work together they did so without enthusiasm. It was also clear that, although the students may have appreciated the usefulness of the content, they sometimes did not enjoy the classes.

4.3 Teacher C

Teacher C had taught English as a foreign language for several years in private schools and for the British Council. He was a very experienced teacher but his style of teaching was influenced by his years of TEFL[4]. His lessons were tightly planned with a variety of tasks which involved group, pair and individual work. Sometimes he would make an activity more interesting and interactive by doing it in an unusual way. One example of this was the peer evaluation activity he did in the second class with the short essays the

---

[4] In fact, Teacher C identified his teaching style as "a beneficial amalgam of the academic approach plus the EFL approach" (Interview with Teacher C, p. 9) as he had begun his teaching career in the university sector.

students had written in the first class. The teacher stuck the essays all around the classroom and gave each student a post-it note. After brainstorming what makes a good essay as a whole class, everybody had to read someone else's essay and write some feedback on the post-it, sticking it on the essay when they had finished, and then going on to another essay. At the end the teacher asked them to add to the ideas already on the board about the characteristics of a good essay using the feedback they had written and read (Teacher C, Classroom Observation 2, pp. 2-4). This was an unconventional way of handling peer evaluation in an AS class but the students clearly found it an enjoyable and interesting activity. It also proved to be an effective way of raising some key ideas about what an academic essay should be like.

One of the students, Emily, had attended a private language school in England and she very quickly recognised the TEFL style: "When I first came in, I felt like I'm back in that school … where I studied. It was like, this Academic Skills class is like being in a, or attending a, like a high quality language group" (Emily, Interview 1, p. 4). Emily was clearly very impressed by Teacher C, particularly his use of humour, something which was often noticeable in the classroom observations, too, for instance, in the way Teacher C introduced the very first class: "This will be a short class, not short short but shortish" (Teacher C, Classroom observation 1, p. 1). As a prospective teacher herself she regarded him as a good role model:

> I'm hanging on all the words [Teacher C] is saying. Finding it very funny actually – he keeps making jokes. And I would like to actually – I thought of making notes of how he's teaching because I think it's just brilliant and he's a very good teacher. (Emily, Interview 2, p. 2)

The way Teacher C used his TEFL experience to create interesting classes with frequent variations of pace and style was appreciated by the other students, too. Krisztina also really enjoyed the course: "Oh I like it very much. I think Teacher C teaches very well. I like the lessons cos they are quite enjoyable and everyone gets included into the lesson so that's good" (Krisztina, Interview 2, p. 2). She particularly liked the emphasis on giving peer feedback on each other's writing: "I liked the way he teaches us. I think it's really good that we can see each other's works, and we can talk about how we should be better. I think it's very effective" (Krisztina, Interview 3, p. 2). She also felt that the course had helped her with the seminar papers she had to write in her other courses and that she had made progress with her writing.

Both Richard and Steven had done very little writing at school. Richard said he had "had a bad teacher. Mainly the past two years. So I really learnt at home in English" (Richard, Interview 1, p. 1). Steven also felt that his English classes were not very good: "we didn't really study English very well … And we didn't really have to write essays, nothing like that" (Steven, Interview 1, p. 1). Consequently, both of them experienced difficulty with their English studies and with writing in particular, but again they both enjoyed Teacher C's course and felt that it helped them. Richard felt that Teacher C was

"a bit severe with things like homework" (Richard, Interview 1, p. 2), but he acknowledged that it was his problem because he had not done the homework and he liked the teacher's approach which he described as "fun" (p. 2). Steven was worried about not being good enough to succeed in his studies. This feeling was particularly exacerbated by the awareness of other students who were much better at English than he was: "and they speak English pretty good. And I'm not so good. And I have this fear that I, maybe I won't be good enough" (Steven, Interview 1, p. 2). Because of this he appreciated the amount of practice that he did in Teacher C's classes and particularly the feedback he received on his writing:

> … we had to write this essay for about 500 words, or something like that. And then we got it back and there were a lot of signs – p and v f and everything, what we should practice. And that's a great thing I think, especially for me because I have to know what my weaknesses are. And so I can see. And practice them. (Steven, Interview 1, p. 3)

Looking back on his first semester, Steven was aware of the difference in the way the course was conducted and its effectiveness: "And since I never had earlier such lessons, I don't have anything else to compare with, but I suppose it was quite effective, and I learnt how to write, so I really appreciate that course. So positive feelings" (Steven, Interview 3, p. 2).

In addition to the careful planning of the classes, Teacher C was conscious of the need to create good interactions between his students in the classroom. This was partly because of his view of the course as being more than just about teaching the students academic skills: "I do think that the 104 [AS] course should be more of an introduction to university life and what it means to be a student" (Interview with Teacher C, p. 2). He was very aware of the difficulty many students had in making the transition from school to university, and he thought the AS course was the right place to give them some assistance:

> So I think the first semester should be, you know, sitting down with the students, talking about what courses they teach, [sic] what combinations they have, how they're going to organise their life, their academic life, their personal life, maybe their working life because that's an issue which I think is becoming more and more significant here. Lots of students are studying at other places, lots of them are doing double majors, lots of them are working at the same time. (Interview with Teacher C, p. 3)

He felt that students often were unaware of the formal requirements of their new role: "that if they're at university they're expected to fulfil a certain role with a certain function, and as a teacher I'm there to perhaps guide them and help them if possible" (Interview with Teacher C, p. 3). However, he found it very difficult to do this

alongside teaching the necessary content that he had to cover: "I try to discuss these issues, specifically in the first half of the semester, … but again it's always, there's always the course content hanging over all our shoulders, or over all our heads" (Interview with Teacher C, p. 3).

This view closely echoes the feelings of Teacher B; however, Teacher C put much more emphasis on good group dynamics: "I think group dynamics is an important area. … I do try to create a cohesive group. I do try and bring everybody in" (Interview with Teacher C, p. 9), and he felt that the techniques he had picked up during his years in private language teaching helped him "change the whole dynamic of the group, positively. And make my life probably easier and be more entertaining and useful and productive for the students" (p. 8). This certainly seemed to be borne out by the responses of his students. Thus, Teacher C was both similar to Teacher B, in his concern for teaching the required academic content of the course, and in contrast to him, in his concern for creating a good classroom experience for his students and believing it worthwhile to do so. And both of the teachers' approaches and worries were evidence of the conundrum of having to make difficult decisions about how to use limited classroom time in the most effective way.

4.4 Teacher D

For Teacher D, creating a strongly cohesive group and building student confidence was central to his approach to the course, and consequently he did more to develop good group dynamics than any of the other teachers. He wanted to help his students develop the skills they needed to write academic essays but he also wanted to foster the students' ability to think for themselves: "I like to encourage a thinking-for-themselves attitude. I don't like spoon-feeding them, you know. I don't like – my views of education are to do with discovery, self, you know, with finding out" (Interview with Teacher D, p. 4). He saw the ability to work effectively with others and take risks as a necessary part of discovery learning: "And then to do with group, working in a group or to develop a safety in the group, that they can share ideas and work together" (Interview with Teacher D, p. 4), an approach which closely resembles the emphasis put on cooperative learning in the 21st century learning skills model.

It was clear from the views of his students that he was very successful in his aim of building a group where the students felt secure and able to work together. All of the students who took part in the research expressed very positive feelings about the course. Jane, a highly academic student whose mother and father had also gone to the same university, felt that the AS course was "one of my best in all the courses at the university" (Jane, Interview 2, p. 1). For her the group was "the best English group I have" (Jane, Interview 2, p. 1) in stark contrast to her Linguistics group, which she described as a "catastrophe" (ibid) in comparison. Alice also came from an academic background. She particularly enjoyed the interaction in the group: "I like this because

it's very interactive, and I don't feel like at the other courses, that I'm sitting there, looking at the teacher and trying to pay attention" (Alice, Interview 1, p. 3), and in the same interview she said she didn't want the course to finish. Tibor was equally positive: "I think it's great" (Tibor, Interview 1, p. 3). He felt that "this group is not concentrating really on the boring part of this academic skills. I think another teacher could do it in a very boring way but he's not boring" (ibid). This statement is interesting because while it reveals a negative view of the subject matter, a phenomenon already mentioned as being a problem with the image many students had of the course, at the same time it shows that the course could be taught in an interesting way.

Monica had a class just before AS that she did not like and she found Teacher D's class made her feel better:

> I enjoy it very much. It is very friendly. It is very good because before that course I have Linguistics which isn't so enjoyable and after that lesson I always feel: 'Oh, I'm not suitable. I don't want to /?/. And it ends at 10 o'clock and Academic Skills starts at 10 so just right after that lesson comes this lesson. And then it makes me stronger that I enjoy it. That lesson. So it is very /?/ me. And I think that's the only course where I know the people around me. So it's good. (Monica, Interview 1, p. 3)

The positive effect that Teacher D's course had on Monica is clear from this quotation and since she had chosen this particular AS course only because it fitted her timetable, she felt very lucky that she had got such a good teacher. By contrast, Julie deliberately chose Teacher D's course because she had been told at the Freshers' Camp that he was a good teacher. She was doing a double major and in the first semester she too had problems with some of her other courses, particularly with the reading she had to do, but similarly to Monica, she felt that the AS course helped her:

> So I always look forward to that one hour and a half because it's not so strict but it's very helpful I think. And not just – so I like it that it's not just about one topic but it's mostly about how to help us to improve. And I think it's very useful and no-one else takes care of this. (Julie, Interview 1, p. 4)

She also very much appreciated being in a group where she felt secure: "It's like coming into a small family or I don't know what. It's a great place and I'd like to stay there next semester too, because it's very, very good" (Julie, Interview 2, p. 2).

Teacher D was able to achieve this remarkable degree of group cohesiveness through a number of techniques which he used, but most of all through his own interaction with his students. He spent a lot of time on developing a cohesive group both through the way he organised his classes and by getting students to work together and to feel that they were part of a group that was more than the sum of its parts. One of the ways he achieved this was to always take notice of students who were absent or late and get other students to notice as well: "Are we all here, right? Can anyone think who's

missing?" (Classroom Observation Notes, Week 2, Teacher D, p. 1), and in the informal interview after the fifth class he said that he discussed people being absent to develop group respect and to remind the students that he wanted them to be in the classes (Classroom Observation Notes, Week 5, Teacher D, p. 9). He also encouraged his students to contact him by email between classes with questions or when they were working on writing tasks and wanted more help. He saw this as a way of giving them individual attention and also helping to develop their language ("they can write without fear of making mistakes – they're not being marked" (Classroom Observation Notes, Week 13, p. 11) as well as developing a better relationship with his students.

For Teacher D the group itself was the key to successful learning. He felt that building good relationships within the group had a direct effect on the quality of learning in the class:

> I think if people don't know anybody in the class I don't see how you can have a decent discussion. Cos there's no trust between anybody, you know, people are worried about saying things or they don't feel like saying things. So, you know, to actually create an atmosphere where they're happy to go there, they don't feel stressed out, they don't feel worried about making a fool of themselves or speaking out. I think that's really important. (Interview with Teacher D, p. 16)

Everything that happened in each of his classes was deliberately designed to create a positive feeling in his students and to encourage them to support each other and to cooperate:

> I think it's from the beginning when they walk in, you know, the way that you behave towards them, the way you create an atmosphere in the class with either a bit of a song or something that's going on in the world that you bring in, something that's different, and you create a – there's always something unexpected that happens, you know, that people look forward to coming. And then you encourage them to help each other with the work that they do. You talk about 'Could you get together and work on this together?' and see, you know, sometimes that's possible, sometimes there are people who are big individualists and they don't do that. But most of them do, if you encourage that. (Interview with Teacher D, p. 17)

His ability to build a fully cohesive group and make his classes something that the students positively looked forward to showed that, in spite of the course being just once a week and students being used to other classes where it was usual that they did not know each other, it was possible to have very good group dynamics. Moreover, the learning experiences of his students were indicators that this also had a significant positive effect on students' learning. For example, peer feedback activities were very successful in his groups and several students commented on how effective they felt the writing activities had been in helping them understand what was required at this level:

> I guess the first, so basically what's about essays we learned in the first seminar, the first semester, with Mark, and those things of course still helped me because that's when we got the foundation of essay writing and I think that's gonna help me for years and years because we, he taught us this. (Julie, Interview 5, p. 6)

The other students said very similar things about how the course helped them with their writing; for instance, Monica said: "I feel that I could achieve improvements in writing /?/ and the whole lesson will help us I think" (Interview 2, p. 4), and Tibor, who had problems with organisation and writing to the required length also felt that "my essays improved" and that his last piece was better organised (Interview 2, p. 5). Even Jane, who had participated successfully in a national academic competition in which she had to write a long essay, felt that she benefited from the course. While she did not find the writing tasks difficult, she appreciated the teacher's interactive approach to discussing them:

> Well I think it is very good and not very difficult. But I really like that Mark tries to discuss the problems and does not usually discussing like the teacher tells us how to write, but we have to correct mistakes. (Jane, Interview 2, p. 5)

Teacher D was the teacher who put the most emphasis on creating good group dynamics and it was very clear from the reactions of his students that he was successful. Because of this he was able to win the students trust and get them to try different approaches which created valuable learning opportunities and outcomes. His class shows how good group dynamics can be a powerful support for learning, something that the literature on 21st century learning skills also seems to suggest in its call for students who can cooperate in complex learning tasks.

5. Conclusion

If the enjoyment and engagement of the students are important to successful learning in the language classroom, then teachers cannot afford to ignore the need for building cohesive groups, groups that encourage and motivate students because they enjoy being a part of them and which, therefore, enhance their learning experience. Clearly it is not possible to generalise from a sample of just four classes, but what is clear from these in-depth case studies is the effect each teacher's approach to group dynamics had on the students' experience of and attitude to the course. The research also shows how important it is to get the students' perspective on what goes on in the classroom. In this study, the differences in the students' experiences show clearly the effect of not paying attention to group dynamics or not knowing how to foster cohesion within a group. In all of these classes the students reported that what they learned was useful to them, but there was a clear divide in terms of motivation and engagement between those classes where the teacher created a strong group feeling and those where he or she did not.

Cohesiveness is particularly relevant to language classes where cooperation and trust are desirable for more effective learning to take place, such as when doing communicative activities and when asking students to do peer evaluation in writing classes. Moreover, in the 21st century the need for cooperation, communication and flexibility are at a premium, and so creating good classroom dynamics is more than just an incidental extra – it should be a key part of the learning experience of all students at every level of education. Teachers should be paying much more attention to how to create cohesiveness in order to better facilitate cooperation and communication, especially in language classes, and nowadays it is a lot easier to develop close learning relationships both within and outside the class using the affordances of digital technology. Modern teachers can no longer afford to view group dynamics as something optional – it has to be an integral part of the learning process, all the more so when communication skills are at the centre of the learning aim and when education has to prepare students to be successful in the digital world of online connectivity.

References

Block, D. (2000). Revisiting the gap between SLA researchers and language teachers. *Links & Letters 7*, 129–143.

Breen, M. (1985). The social context for language learning – A neglected situation? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*(2), 135–158.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design – qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

DeWalt, K. M., & DeWalt, B. R. (2002). *Participant observation: A guide for fieldworkers.* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Dörnyei, Z, & Malderez, A. (1997). Group dynamics and foreign language teaching. *System, 25,* 65–81.

Dörnyei, Z., & Malderez, A. (1999). The role of group dynamics in foreign language learning and teaching. In J. Arnold (Ed.), *Affect in language learning* (pp. 155–169). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Murphey, T. (2003). *Group dynamics in the classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal, 29*(2), 75–91.

Hergenhahn, B.R., & Henley, T.B. (2009). *An introduction to the history of psychology.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Labaree, D. F. (2003). The peculiar problems of preparing educational researchers. *Educational Researcher,32*(4), 13–22.

Maykut, P., & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophic and practical guide.* London, England: The Falmer Press.

McCracken, G. (1988). *The Long Interview.* Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

P21 Partnership for 21st Century Learning (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.p21.org/index.php

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Prabhu, N. S. (1992). The dynamics of the language lesson. *TESOL Quarterly, 26*(2), 225-241.

Prescott, F. J. (2011). Validating a long interview schedule. WoPalP (Working Papers in Language Pedagogy) 1, 17–37. Retrieved from http://langped.elte.hu/WoPaLParticles/W5Prescott.pdf

Prescott-Pickup, F. J. (2012). *Adapting to the requirements of written academic discourse on entering university* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Eötvös Lóránd University, Budapest, Hungary.

Saldana, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Senior, R. M. (2001). Creating safe learning environments: Developing and maintaining class cohesion. *Intercultural Education, 12* (3), 247–259. DOI: 0.1080/14675980120087462

Senior, R. M. (2002). A class-centred approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal, 56*(4), 397–403.

Senior, R. M. (2006). *The experience of language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Senior, R. M. (2010). Connectivity: A framework for understanding effective language teaching in face-to-face and online learning communities**.** *RELC Journal*, *41*(2), 137–147.

Trilling, B., & Fadel, C. (2009) 21st century skills: Learning for life in our times. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Vanderlinde, R., & van Braak, J. (2010). The gap between educational research and practice: Views of teachers, school leaders, intermediaries and researchers. *British Educational Research Journal, 36*(2), 299–316.

Foreign language requirements in Hungarian job advertisements

Bajzát Tünde

University of Miskolc, Hungary

As a result of globalisation, European integration, technological innovations, historical and political changes, and also student and workforce mobility, foreign language needs and requirements have changed in Hungary. The aim of this paper is to present foreign language knowledge requirements at Hungarian workplaces in order to provide a picture of the language skills in demand on the labour market. The study analyzes 400 Hungarian online job advertisements to identify foreign language and other competence requirements expected from Hungarian graduates. The findings show the significance of speaking English as a foreign language, followed by German. The analyses of the advertisements have revealed that the employers require foreign language competences mainly from engineers, however, for economists, doctors and lawyers it is not a great necessity. Besides foreign language requirements, the investigation has proved the necessity of good communication skills.

Keywords: foreign language requirements, foreign language usage, job advertisements, Hungary, needs analysis

1. Introduction

In 1989 the former Hungarian People's Republic came to an end, the Republic of Hungary was established, and the first democratic election was held in 1990. Since then the Hungarian governments' top foreign policy goal has been to achieve integration into Western economic and security organizations. At the same time, a gradual transition towards open markets and economic liberalization has started. Therefore, in 1995 Hungary became a member of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), in 1996 a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO), in 1999 Hungary joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and on 1st May 2004 the European Union (EU). The Schengen Agreement was signed in 2003 and implemented in 2007, which made passport-free travel possible in the member states. As a consequence, student and workforce mobility rapidly increased among Hungarians. According to Eurostat data, the number of Hungarians living abroad has been continually increasing since the mid-2000, the main countries of destination including Germany, the United Kingdom and Austria. In 2013 nearly 280,000 Hungarian citizens were living in the countries of the European Economic Area (EEA), which is an approximately three times bigger number than it was in 2001. According to the United Nations (UN) data, 528,000 Hungarians were living abroad all over the world in 2013, which is 5.3 percent of the total population (Gödri, 2014).

According to the Database of UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS), the number of Hungarian students participating in academic programs abroad increased in the last

decade by 15%, that is, the number of students grew from 6,880 to 7,921 between 2000 and 2010. Hungarian students attended foreign institutions in 43 different countries on five different continents. The top destinations include Germany, Austria, the USA, France and the United Kingdom (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2014). However, foreign language proficiency is not only necessary for those who wish to study or work abroad, but companies operating in Hungary also require such a competence from their employees.

The first part of the paper presents the background of the study, namely, it describes the theoretical framework and it also discusses the results of several research studies carried out by Hungarian scholars between 2004 and 2011, including five data analyses of the job requirements of Hungarian job advertisements and the foreign language competence requirements of the companies operating in Hungary. The second part shows the outcomes of a recent analysis of 400 job advertisements. Finally, the paper gives suggestions on how teaching should take account of these needs.

2. Background

In language teaching needs analysis is defined as "… the process of determining the needs for which a learner or group of learners requires a language and arranging the needs according to priorities… [it] makes use of both subjective and objective information …" (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 389). The aims of a needs analysis are to gather information on the situations in which a language is used, the purposes for which the language is demanded, the type of communication that is used, and the required level of language proficiency (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 389).

Several approaches to needs analysis have been developed over the years, and the most influential models include target-situation analysis, present-situation analysis, learning-centred approach, strategy analysis, means analysis and language audits (Jordan, 1997, pp. 23-28). First of all, target-situation analysis focuses on the students' needs at the end of a language course and target-level performance. The core of Munby's model (1978) is the Communication Needs Processor (CNP) in which account is taken of the variables that affect communication needs by organising them as parameters. The results from the processing of the eight parameters indicate the learners' language needs, then, based on the outcomes, a syllabus is designed (Munby, 1978, pp. 32-40). While the model provides several details, it has proved to be inflexible, complex and time-consuming. Despite these shortcomings, it has influenced later approaches (Jordan, 1997, pp. 23-24). Secondly, present-situation analysis was developed by Richterich and Chancerel in 1977 with the aim of finding out the learners' state of development at the beginning of the language course, by means of surveys, questionnaires and interviews. As opposed to Munby's model, in this approach the learners are at the centre of attention, and their needs are examined by the learners themselves, the teaching establishment and by the institution by using more than one

data collection method (Richterich & Chancerel, 1977, pp. 5-8). Thirdly, the learning-centred approach was developed by Hutchinson and Waters in 1987. They made a distinction between learner-centred and learning-centred approaches. The learner-centred approach means that learning is determined by the learner, whereas in the learning-centred approach the process of learning is negotiated between the individuals and the society (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, pp. 72-74).

Hutchinson and Water compared target and learning needs. Target needs describe the learners' needs in the target situation, whereas learning needs are about the learners' actions in order to learn. Target needs are divided into necessities, lacks, and wants. Necessities describe the knowledge the learners need to be able to function effectively in the target situation. Lacks are defined as the gaps between what the learner knows and the necessities. Wants are described as the learners' opinion of their own needs (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, pp. 54-56). Learning needs refer to the following areas: why the learners are taking the course, how the learners learn, what resources are available, who the learners are, when and where the course will take place (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, pp. 62-63). The methods of data collection include questionnaires, interviews, observation, data collection (e.g. gathering texts), and informal consultations with sponsors or learners (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, p. 58).

The fourth approach is strategy analysis. Allwright (1982) was a pioneer of strategy analysis. His starting point was to examine the students' perceptions of their own needs, and he made a distinction between needs, wants, and lacks. Allwright's aim was to help students to identify skill areas and their preferred strategies of achieving these skills. Problems have occurred when students utilise learning strategies or styles that are considered inefficient or inappropriate by teachers. Therefore, the development of learner autonomy and learner training became more important (Allwright, 1982, pp. 24-31). The fifth approach is means analysis, which was developed by Holliday and Cooke in 1983. This approach attempts to adapt language courses to local situations. It involves a study of the local situation in order to see how a language course might be implemented. This approach starts from a positive premise of what might be achieved with certain factors, and pays attention to what is culturally appropriate and discourages any models that are inappropriate in the given situation (Holliday and Cooke cited in Jordan, 1997, pp. 27-28). Finally, a language audit is a special type of needs analysis, because it is carried out within a particular company or organization and focuses on the specific features of that organization. It identifies the strengths and weaknesses of a certain organization in terms of its foreign language communication. The findings of the language audit provide the basis of a report which outlines what actions the company needs to undertake in order to increase its employees' language competence. However, there are three disadvantages of language audits. First of all, research into the company may be restricted or the final report may be considered confidential, because the company does not want to disclose any sensitive consumer or customer data. Secondly, the collected data cannot be generalised because they apply only to one organization.

Finally, it is difficult to access data on all levels of the organization (Huhta et al., 2013, pp. 22-23).

2. 1 Foreign language requirements in Hungarian job advertisements

Several studies have been carried out by Hungarian scholars in Hungary to discover the foreign language requirements of Hungarian companies. In their investigations two directions can be discovered, one of them aims at finding out the needs by analysing job advertisements and the other at discovering the foreign language usage at Hungarian workplaces.

Five studies carried out by Sturcz (2004), Híves (2006), Hajdú (2007) and Bajzát (2010; 2011) have analysed the requirements in job ads. Sturcz (2004) analysed the requirements of 181 companies in 2004. The analysed companies were large or medium-sized firms including multinational and Hungarian companies from all areas of employment. The companies were looking for applicants with a degree in the fields of arts, health care, pharmacology, law, economics, engineering and management. The data show that most of the employers (88%) require knowledge of English as the first foreign language, followed by German (7%), French (2%), Italian (1.5%), Russian (1%) and Spanish (0.5%). His findings also indicate that a third of the companies (36%) expect their future employees to have a competence in a second foreign language as well. For forty-three percent of the companies the knowledge of German is required, followed by English, French, Italian, Russian and Spanish. Besides the needs of speaking foreign languages, the study highlights the importance of possessing good communication skills as 41 out of the 181 companies (23%) expressed this need (Sturcz, 2004, pp. 31-32).

Híves (2006) analysed 954 job advertisements in 2006. The outcome of his research shows that more than half of the employers (57.2%) require knowledge of English as a foreign language, followed by German (18%) and other languages (5.5%), such as French Italian and Russian. The data also reveal that one third of the advertisements (33.5%) do not contain any language requirements. After analysing the data further, Híves points out that companies operating in the fields of IT, technology, commerce and tourism, finance and education are looking for applicants who have foreign language competences; however, in the fields of law, health care and social services such competences are not required. In addition to foreign language requirements, the advertisements mention the need for good communication skills (34%), problem-solving skills (10.9%), organizational skills (8.8%) and team-working skills (8.6%) (Híves, 2006, pp. 81-82).

Hajdú (2007) carried out her research among 112 employers in 2007 in the North Great Plain in Hungary. Her findings show that companies are looking for workers who are competent in three foreign languages at the same time. English as a first foreign language is required by most employers (83.4%), followed by German (8.4%), Russian

(3.2%), Italian (2.6%), Romanian (1.9%) and French (0.6%). The data show that the second expected foreign language is German for more than half of the companies (57.3%), followed by English (21.8%), Russian (6.4%), Romanian (5.5%), Dutch (3.6%), Italian (3.6%), French (0.9%) and Spanish (0.9%). Hajdú highlights that German is required as the third foreign language by a third of the employers (31%), followed by Romanian (22.4%), Russian (22.4%), French (8.6%), Spanish (8.6%), English (3.4%), Italian (1.7%) and Polish (1.7%) (Hajdú, 2007, pp. 145-146).

Bajzát (2010) conducted her data analysis between November 2008 and March 2009 and analysed 1000 Hungarian job advertisements targeting engineers to be employed in Hungary. Most of the advertisements (840 ads) appeared online on Hungarian job search websites (http://profession.hu, http://jobline.hu, http://szuperallas.hu, http://www.topjob.hu, http://www.workania.hu, www.jobpilot.hu) and 160 appeared in the job hunting brochures of Miskolc University between 2005 and 2009. Only those advertisements were included in the analysed data that required the knowledge of at least one foreign language. The results show that more than half of the advertisements (56.8%) are looking for engineers with the competence of speaking English, followed by "English or German" (17.2%), "English and German" (16.5%), "German" (6.3%), "English or French" (2.1%), "English or Russian" (0.3%), "English or Italian" (0.3%), "English and French" (0.3%) and "English and Russian" (0.2%). It can be seen that English is mentioned as a foreign language requirement in most of the advertisements (93.4%), and only a few of the ads (17%) expect applicants to have the competence in two foreign languages. Besides the foreign language requirements, more than half of the advertisements (60.5%) contained other skills and competence requirements, the most frequently mentioned were good communication skills (55%), problem-solving skills (38%), team-working skills (30%) and organizational skills (8%) (Bajzát, 2010, pp. 92-96).

Bajzát (2011) carried out a second data analysis between March and April 2010 and analysed 400 Hungarian job advertisements aiming at graduates to be employed in Hungary. All the 400 advertisements appeared online on Hungarian job search websites (http://profession.hu, http://jobline.hu, http://szuperallas.hu, http://www.topjob.hu, http://www.workania.hu, www.jobpilot.hu). The companies were looking for applicants with a medical (100 ads), a law (100 ads), an economics (100 ads) and an engineering (100 ads) degree. The study shows that most of the advertisements (81%) expect applicants to have competence in one foreign language, whereas only 11 advertisements (3%) require knowledge of two foreign languages, while 65 out of the 400 ads contain no language requirements. Most of the advertisements (94%) describe the need for general language knowledge, and only few of them (6%) require the knowledge of a foreign language for special purposes. The data reveal that most of the advertisements mention "English only" (79%) as a foreign language competence requirement, followed by "German only" (16%), "English and German" (2%), "French only" (1%), "Italian only" (1%), "English and French" (0.5%) and "English and Spanish" (0.5%). It can be

seen that if two languages are mentioned as requirements, English is always present as one of the foreign languages; therefore, English is mentioned in 82 percent of all advertisements. If the foreign language competence expectations of the different fields are compared, it can be noticed that this requirement is the highest in the fields of engineering (97 ads) and economics (96 ads), followed by medicine (72 ads) and law (59 ads). Speaking two foreign languages is required for people holding a degree in economics (4 ads), engineering (4 ads) and law (3 ads); nevertheless, it is not expected from employees with a medical degree. In addition to foreign language requirements, most of the advertisements (74%) contained other competence and skills requirements. The most frequently mentioned skills and competences are the following: excellent communication skills (70%), self-determination (37%), problem-solving skills (30.5%), exactitude (24%), organizational skills (20%) and team-working skills (17%) (Bajzát, 2011, pp. 297-302).

2. 2 Foreign language usage at Hungarian workplaces

Four studies have aimed at exploring the foreign language usage of employees at Hungarian workplaces. András (1999) carried out his research at Dunaferr, near the capital of Hungary. Konczos-Szombathelyi (2008) conducted her research among Hungarian managers working in Győr, in the western part of Hungary, near the Hungarian-Austrian border. Bajzát (2010) pursued her research among 92 mechanical engineers working at six multinational companies in north-east Hungary. Finally, Ablonczyné Tompos and Kecskés (2014) did their research at 250 companies in the north-western part of the Transdanubian region among 250 employees.

The results of the four studies demonstrate that English and German are the main foreign languages of communication. András (András, 1999, p. 115) found that more than half of the Hungarian workers (61%) communicate with their foreign colleagues in German and nearly half of them in English (39%). However, the findings of the three other research studies suggest the dominance of English as the language of communication. Konczos-Szombathelyi's results show that the Hungarian managers communicate with their foreign colleagues in English in more than half of the cases (54%) and in German in nearly half of the cases (46%) (Konczos-Szombathelyi, 2008, pp. 89-90). Abloncyné and her colleagues found that the workers use the following foreign languages during their interactions at work: English (in 58% of the cases), German (33%), Russian (2%), Slovakian (2%), French (1%), Italian (1%) and other foreign languages (3%) (Ablonczyné et al. 2014, pp. 12-13). Furthermore, Bajzát's findings reveal that the language of communication is mainly English (94%), but some of the workers (6%) communicate in German. Because the language of communication is a third language – neither the mother tongue of the Hungarian employees, nor the mother tongue of the foreign colleagues – the Hungarian engineers have communication

problems that arise from the lack of active vocabulary, the lack of grammatical knowledge, comprehension, the speed of speech, the differences in pronunciation and accents (Bajzát, 2010, pp. 113-115). The variation in foreign language use can be explained by regional differences, and the differences in company ownerships and business partners. Another reason for the differences can be the increasing usage of English language as a lingua franca.

3. The present study

3. 1 Methods

The study uses a quantitative data collection method in order to gain insights into the most recent foreign language requirements of Hungarian workplaces. The data collection was conducted between February and April 2016. Since online job adverts are removed after a short period of time, data was collected fortnightly within the sampling period. The purposive sampling approach was employed for collecting the advertisements. Two sampling criteria were chosen, namely the ads were selected by place (i.e. to be employed in Hungary) and type (i.e. graduates). The corpus contains 400 Hungarian job advertisements targeting graduates to be employed in Hungary. The ads appeared online on five Hungarian websites recruiting workers (http://profession.hu, http://jobline.hu, http://www.topjob.hu, http://www.workania.hu, www.monster.hu). The advertisements were published for applicants with a medical (100 ads), a law (100 ads), an economics (100 ads) and an engineering (100 ads) degree. The gathered data appeared only online and not in print. After data collection content analysis was carried out. The key elements (foreign language requirements, competence in a general foreign language, knowledge of a foreign language for specific purposes, other skills and competence requirements) were collected manually by reading the ads. For the purpose of analysis, the data were arranged according to the different foreign languages and other skills and competence requirements. Finally, the comparison of the requirements between the different fields of employment was carried out.

3. 2 Results and discussion

The data reveal that a little more than two thirds of the advertisements (66.5%) require the knowledge of one foreign language, whereas only five advertisements (1.25%) expect applicants to have the competence in two foreign languages, while a third of the ads (32.25%) contain no language requirements. Most of the ads (93%) describe the need for general language knowledge, and only few of them (7%) require the knowledge of a foreign language for specific purposes. Competence in a foreign language for specific purposes is necessary for people with law, medical, economics and engineering degree. The results demonstrate that most of the advertisements mention

"English only" (80%) as a foreign language competence requirement, followed by "English or German" (13%), "German only" (5%), "English and Russian" (1.2%) and "English and German" (0.8%). It can be seen that English is present as the foreign language requirement in 95% of all advertisements. Comparing the foreign language competence expectations of the different fields, it can be seen that this requirement is the highest in the fields of engineering (97 ads), which is followed by economics (74 ads), law (59 ads) and medicine (37 ads). However, speaking two foreign languages is required for applicants with a medical (2 ads), a law (2 ads) and a technical degree (1 ad) and none for people holding an economics degree. Besides foreign language requirements, most of the advertisements (70%) contain other competence and skills requirements. The most frequently mentioned skills and competences are excellent communication skills (61%), self-determination (46%), accuracy in work (41%), problem-solving skills (32%), team-working skills (31%), being able to handle an increased workload, (18%) and reliability (16%).

A comparison of the five previously described needs analyses and the results of the present study reveals that speaking English as the first foreign language is the most significant requirement in Hungarian job advertisements. The knowledge of a second foreign language does not prove to be as important as having a competence in English, and speaking German as the first foreign language is a necessity only for some of the employers. Furthermore, competence in other languages as a second or third foreign language, for example, French, Italian, Romanian, Russian and Spanish, is mentioned even in fewer advertisements. General foreign language competence is a requirement in most cases, and the knowledge of foreign languages for specific purposes appears only in some of the advertisements. The data also prove that foreign language skills are not equally necessary for everybody with a higher education degree since only companies operating in the fields of IT, engineering and economics are looking for applicants who have foreign language competences. However, in the fields of law, medicine, health care and social services such competences are not required to such an extent or in some cases they are not even necessary at all.

Comparing the results of the data analyses with the outcome of the four studies carried out at Hungarian companies (András, 1999; Konczos-Szombathelyi, 2008; Bajzát, 2010; Ablonczyné, Tompos & Kecskés; 2014) it can be seen that for most companies, English is the primary foreign language of communication, followed by German. The differences among the companies can be explained by regional differences because if a company is near the Austrian-Hungarian border or if it is a subsidiary of a German-owned and directed company, German plays a more important role than English. In one of the research studies (Ablonczyné et al. 2014, pp. 12-13) besides English and German, other foreign languages were mentioned as the language of communication; however, the need for speaking Russian, Slovakian, French, Italian or other foreign languages proved to be much lower than the knowledge of English and

German. This result also resembles the outcome of the analyses of the advertisements of the present study.

If the findings of the present analysis are compared with the previously discussed ones it can be seen how the requirements have changed with time. One of the differences is that there are fewer foreign languages mentioned among the needs of the employers, that is, earlier several other languages, such as Dutch, French, Italian, Romanian and Spanish appeared besides English and German. At the same time, English plays an even more major role in the 2016 analysis than in the data analyses carried out earlier by Sturcz (2004), Híves (2006), Hajdú (2007) and Bajzát (2010; 2011). Another difference is that the need for the knowledge of foreign languages for specific purposes has slightly increased; however, it is still not an essential requirement for people with higher education. A further difference is that the need for foreign language skills in the different fields of employment has changed as well. In other words, the latest results show that for engineers the knowledge of a foreign language is still considered to be of crucial importance; however, for economists and doctors this requirement has considerably decreased. Apart from that, for employees with a legal degree it is still not a necessity. Also, speaking two foreign languages is not a requirement for economists any more. In the case of engineers and lawyers, however, this need has decreased, while for doctors this requirement has become more important. A comparison also demonstrates that in addition to having foreign language proficiency, employees are required to possess excellent or good communication skills, problem-solving skills, organizational skills and team-working skills. The data from 2016 show that besides these requirements the ideal worker is reliable, has strong self-determination, preciseness and is able to manage a heavy workload.

4. Conclusion

The purpose of the current study was to determine the foreign language requirements in Hungarian job advertisements. The research has identified the significance of speaking English as a foreign language, followed by German. The findings of the reviewed empirical studies have also revealed that most of the employers require the knowledge of one foreign language and only some of them are looking for employees with a good proficiency in an additional second or third foreign language. The analyses of the advertisements have shown that the employers require foreign language competences mainly from engineers, however, for economists, doctors and lawyers it is not a great necessity. This research has several practical applications. Firstly, students should be encouraged and given the opportunity to study and further develop their proficiency in English as a foreign language. Secondly, language awareness of other foreign languages and multilingualism should be promoted. Thirdly, more attention should be paid to developing engineering students' foreign language skills at Hungarian institutions.

Besides foreign language requirements, the investigation has proved the necessity of communication skills. In the case of companies, communication in a foreign language is part of the employees' daily routine. As Bajzát's study (2010), carried out with engineers, shows, the lack of good communication skills in a foreign language might cause serious problems, especially if the employees' knowledge of active vocabulary and grammar is not sufficient, or if they are not familiar with different pronunciations and accents. In the advertisements an increasing attention is paid to having excellent or good communication skills as a primary requirement, followed by problem-solving, organizational and team-working skills. Consequently, education should aim at developing such skills as well, and raising students' attention to the development of these additional skills and competences. Moreover, the findings could be used for course design and development, language policy and planning; moreover, future employees might also benefit from them.

References

Ablonczyné, M. L., Tompos, A., & Kecskés, P. (2014). Munkahelyi nyelvhasználat az északnyugat-dunántúli régió vállalatainál. *Alkalmazott Nyelvészeti Közlemények, 9*(1), 9-17.

Allwright, R. (1982). Perceiving and pursuing learners' needs. In M. Geddes & G. Sturtridge (Eds.), *Individualisation.* Oxford: Modern English Publications Ltd. pp. 24-31.

András, I. (1999). *Termelés, kultúra, nyelv. Külföldi tulajdonosi érdekeltségű vállalatok nyelvi-kommunikációs sajátosságai a Dunaferr Csoportnál.* Dunaújváros: Dunatáj Kiadó Kft.

Bajzát, T. (2010). *A mérnökök kommunikatív és interkulturális kompetenciája: elvárások és felkészítés.* PhD dissertation. Pécs: Pécsi Tudományegyetem. doi: http://pea.lib.pte.hu/handle/pea/15311.

Bajzát, T. (2011). Az interkulturális kompetencia elméletének és fejlesztésének legújabb eredményei, az idegennyelv-tudás és az interkulturális kompetencia vállalati elvárásai. In Á. Borgulya & Cs. Deák (Eds.), *Vállalati kommunikáció a 21. század elején* (pp. 295-304). Miskolc: Z-Press.

Gödri, I. (2014). *Emigration from Hungary: An increasing tendency*. Available: http://www.demografia.hu/en/downloads/Research_Highlights/RH-17-Godri.pdf. Access: 10th May 2017.

Hajdú, Z. (2007). Foreign language requirements of employers in the North Great Plain Region of Hungary. In M. Silye (Ed.), *Porta Lingua – 2007. Szaknyelvoktatásunk – határokon átívelő híd* (pp. 143-150). Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem.

Híves, T. (2006). Munkaadói elvárások megjelenése az álláshirdetésekben. In Z. Györgyi (Ed.), *Diplomával a munkaerőpiacon* (pp. 73-87). Budapest: Felsőoktatási Kutatóintézet.

Holliday, A., & Cooke, T. (1983). An ecological approach to ESP. In A. Waters (Ed.), *Issues in ESP. Lancaster practical papers in English language education 5.* (pp. 123-143). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Huhta, M., Vogt, K., Johnson, E., Tulkki, H., & Hall, D. (Eds.) (2013). *Needs analysis for language course design: A holistic approach to ESP.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning–centred approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jobline. Hungarian website for job seekers. Available: http://jobline.hu. Access: 1st February – 30th April 2016

Jordan, R. (1997). *English for academic purposes.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Konczos–Szombathelyi, M. (2008). *Kommunikáló kultúrák. A tőketelepítés nyelvi és kulturális infrastruktúrája, avagy a kultúraközi kommunikáció néhány aspektusa*. Budapest: L'Harmattan.

Monster. Hungarian website for job seekers. Available: www.monster.hu. Access: 1st February – 30th April 2016

Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative syllabus design.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Profession. Hungarian website for job seekers. Available: http://profession.hu. Access: 1st February – 30th April 2016

Richards, J., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching & Applied linguistics.* Fourth edition, Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Richterich, R., & Chancerel, J. L. (1977). *Identifying the Needs of Adults Learning a Foreign Language.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Sturcz, Z. (2004). A munkavállaló nyelvi környezete. In I. Bakonyi & J. Nádai (Eds.), *A többnyelvű Európa*. Győr: Széchenyi István Egyetem Idegen Nyelvi és Kommunikációs Tanszék. pp. 29-41.

Topjob. Hungarian website for job seekers. Available: http://www.topjob.hu. Access: 1st February – 30th April 2016

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. Available: http://www.uis.unesco.org/education/Pages/international-student-flow-viz.aspx. Access: 25th January 2017.

Workania. Hungarian website for job seekers. Available: http://www.workania.hu. Access: 1st February – 30th April 2016

The appearance of cross-linguistic influence in the speech of a multilingual child[1]

Javier Furus

University of Szeged, Hungary

This paper explores the language usage of a multilingual child, Clau, who speaks English and Hungarian and has receptive skills in Spanish. Several utterances of cross-linguistic influence (CLI) can be found in his speech that need further exploration. The source of Clau's mixed utterances is analysed by looking into parental strategies used by his parents, applying a speech production model on his speech and looking for the source language of the CLI in his speech. Parental strategies are examined because they facilitate code-switching (CS) in the child's speech as his parents mostly rely on the move on strategy which enforces the child's multilingual self and encourages CS. Clau's speech is analyzed through a speech production model proposed by Green (1986) and the analysis proves that his dominant language is English and that it is a language that is always in an active state in his mind. Furthermore, the utterances produced by Clau are also analyzed by looking for different levels of transfer, like item, system and overall transfer, and through the application of the theory of iconicity. These transfers prove that the dominant language of Clau is English, as in his Hungarian speech he mostly uses that language as his source of word and structural borrowings.

Key words: multilingualism, cross-linguistic influence, code-switching, parental strategies, multilingual speech production model

1. Introduction

Multilingual families with small children speaking three or more languages are becoming more and more common nowadays. The reason for that in many cases is that families with small children move from one country to another in search for better job opportunities and with the means of settling in the new country. Such families may include small children who are still in the middle of the acquisition of their native language. In these families children are sometimes brought up spoken to in one language by one, and in another language by the other parent and in a third language by their community. The way these multilinguals acquire and use their languages gives rise to many questions unanswered by bilingual theories and provide ground for research.

Determining, for example, which is the dominant language in a multilingual's mind is a slightly more complex issue than in the case of a bilingual person. The question might arise whether the language the child is spoken to at home is the dominant language or the one they are most exposed to is. If it is the one the child is

---

[1] This is an improved version of my BA thesis entitled *Code-switching and cross-linguistic influence in a multilingual child: "Csináltunk egy presentation"*, April 2017.

spoken to at home, then the question is how one could determine which of the two is the dominant one. In either case one must look for causes, and this is more complex in the case of a multilingual person than in the case of a bilingual.

There is a great number of research done on multilingualism that discuss third or additional language acquisition and all the fields connected to it. These studies list the main concepts connected to multilingualism and also to the limitations of the field. One of the limitations of the field of multilingualism is that there is, because of the relative novelty of the field, no consensus over basic terms and that there is a great reliance on previous research done on bilingualism and second language acquisition. Because of this, many researchers have to rely on models built for bilinguals and apply them on multilinguals, with very little to no change.

Most researchers in the field of multilingualism apply bilingual speech production models by stretching them to multilinguals. Scholars must rely on this method because, technically, there are no multilingual speech production models. While this method of analysing multilingual speech works in the majority of the cases, a multilingual speech production model could also account for what happens in the multilingual person's mind when the language they only have receptive skills in is used around them, and they have to rely on their receptive skills.

In this paper I analyse the speech of a multilingual child named Clau, who speaks Hungarian and English and has receptive skills in Spanish. To do this, this paper, along with multilingual and trilingual theories, also relies on bilingual theories and models extended for multilinguals, because of the aforementioned mentioned limitations.

First, I define the main terms connected to the field of multilingualism with first defining multilingualism itself, then the terms third or additional language acquisition, cross-linguistic influence, multilingual approaches and transfer. Second, I define the speech production model proposed by Green (1986) with the help of De Bot's (1992) work. Third, I analyse Clau's speech applying these terms and models.

The purpose of this paper is to find out how the parental strategies applied by Clau's parents influence his code-switching, how his languages interfere with each other and to identify which, out of Clau's three languages, is the dominant one.

2. Literature review

2. 1 Multilingualism

While most researchers define multilingualism as the ability of a person to use at least three languages (De Angelis, 2007, p. 8), in fact, there are no universal definitions for either bilingualism or multilingualism, as both terms can refer to people who speak two or more than two languages (Kemp, 2009, p. 15; De Angelis 2007, p. 8). For example, Myers-Scotton (2006) defines bilingualism as "the ability to use two or more languages" (Myers-Scotton 2006, p. 44) which is a definition, as Kemp (2009) and De

Angelis (2007) also point out, that makes no difference between multilinguals and bilinguals. This lack of distinction suggests that there is no difference between a person who speaks two languages and a person who speaks three or more. However, this assumption is not correct in every situation, as there is proof that multilingual speakers, in contrast to bilingual ones, are also influenced by their L2 and L1, while bilingual speakers are only influenced by their L1 (Cenoz et al., 2001, p. 22). Kemp (2009) in her article addresses this issue by listing the most common definitions of each term with the advantages and disadvantages of each one. She also highlights that it might be problematic to use the term bilingual to refer to speakers of two or more languages. (Kemp 2009, p. 15) Her article does not offer one universal definition for each term; instead, she lists several descriptions researchers have used in the past. She explains that the diversity among the definitions is the result of the novelty of the field of research of multilingualism and that researchers come from various backgrounds and societies with different form of understanding multilingualism (Kemp, 2009, pp. 11, 13).

In this study I use the term *multilingual* based on the definition of De Angelis (2007) mentioned above to refer to Clau, the subject of my research. Although he speaks only two languages, which would define him as a bilingual, I believe that his receptive skills in Spanish make him a multilingual, as he has no problem in understanding Spanish sentences. Kemp (2009, p. 19) also suggests that subjects with only receptive skills in one language can be considered multilinguals as their knowledge can also be counted as a language in their multilingual system.

2. 2 Second language acquisition

While my research is concerned with third or additional language acquisition, it is vital to define second language acquisition (SLA) as well as to get a clearer picture of the topic of the research.

Myers-Scotton (2006) defines SLA as the acquisition of a second language after childhood, regardless of the mode of acquisition, be it through education or informal learning (Myers-Scotton, 2006, p. 324). This definition is vital for this research, as De Angelis (2007) and Barnes (2006) highlight that many researchers use SLA as a term to refer to both bilingual and multilingual acquisition, which is a nonspecific understanding of SLA that is overgeneralising for the purpose of this research, which is why this paper relies on Myers-Scotton's (2006) definition.

Myers-Scotton (2006) also provides much valuable information on the language acquisition of bilingual speakers which, although not directly connected to this present research, gives the researchers an insight into the way a multicompetent mind works. Myers-Scotton (2006) in her book differentiates between adult and child language acquisition. She highlights that children can attain a native-like knowledge of a language and points out that it is a much harder task for adults to achieve the same result. Although she does not define a clear age limit for the group of child bilinguals,

she highlights that by the age of 9 the ability of acquiring a second or additional language greatly decreases. However, there is no consensus over this, as she points out too, the Critical Age Hypothesis puts the age limit at the age of 13, while some other researchers also argue that there might be no age limit at all (Myers-Scotton, 2006, pp. 36-37).

2. 3 Third or additional language acquisition

The basic framework of the current research is third or additional language acquisition. De Angelis (2007) provides an extensive overview of the basic terms and concepts connected to trilingualism and multilingualism. Her work points out why the term third language acquisition (TLA) is not appropriate to use and why third or additional language acquisition is a more appropriate term in this research. De Angelis (2007) believes that the term of TLA "places major emphasis on the third language at the exclusion of all the other languages also in the mind" (De Angelis, 2007, p. 11), which excludes the possible interference between the other two languages. Third or additional language acquisition removes the emphasis from the third language and takes into consideration the other existing languages too (De Angelis, 2007, p. 11).

De Angelis (2007) has not only provided the definitions of TLA used in this paper, but her work proved to be the most vital literature for the current research altogether. She collects and explains all the fundamental concepts connected to multilingualism in a well-organised and understandable fashion. Her work also elaborates on cross-linguistic influence and transfer with several examples and eloquent explanations, making these terms clearer and easier to understand. Apart from definitions, De Angelis (2007) also gives suggestions for future research on topics that need further exploration, such as multilingual speech production models.

Barnes (2006) goes into further detail about trilingual acquisition and different types of trilingualism. She lists several models of multilingualism from different researchers, out of which Hoffmann's (2001) seems to be the most applicable. Hoffmann (2001) separates multilinguals into three different groups according to speech mode: monolinguals who use their three languages separately; bilinguals who use the combination of two languages and the third separately; and trilinguals who use all their three languages at the same time (Hoffmann, 2001, p. 16; Barnes, 2006, p. 30). Hoffmann (2001, p. 16), however, believes that the third group is very unlikely to exist in practice.

Barnes (2006) focuses mainly on how children acquire three languages at the same time. She also defines the fundamental concepts of multilingualism although some of her definitions lack detail and are mostly shaped for the characteristics of her research. Other notions that are used were not defined at all. Apart from this, Barnes provides a starting point for researchers interested in early trilingualism and the different approaches that can be used to facilitate the trilingual development of children,

like the one parent, one language approach, which led me to the works of Chevalier (2011, 2012).

2. 4 English, Hungarian and Spanish – Clau's languages

Clau speaks two languages, English and Hungarian, and has perceptive skills in Spanish. It is important to highlight the differences between these languages and discuss them here. Both English and Spanish are Indo-European languages while Hungarian is a Uralic language. That means that while English and Spanish are somewhat similar, Hungarian is very different from them. English and Spanish are both inflected languages although Spanish is more so. An inflecting language adds grammatical contrast like person, tense and number to a word through affixes without changing the class of the word (Crystal, 2008, p. 243) for example change in 'He *changes* his clothes every now and then". An agglutinating language, such as Hungarian, adds each grammatical contrast through a "linear sequence of morphemes" (Crystal, 2008, p. 17) for example, *zsebekben* 'in pockets' where the noun *zseb* 'pocket' receives the plural suffix *-k* and the inessive suffix *-ben* (Rounds, 2001, p. 84).

Another difference is that while English and Spanish are analytic languages Hungarian is synthetic. In an analytic language the word order is usually SVO (Rounds, 2001, p. 253) and is much stricter, as changing the word order can greatly alter the meaning of a sentence (Crystal, 2008, p. 24) while in a syntactic language the word order is much less strict. Rounds (2001, p. 253) uses the example sentence 'The dog chased the postman' and its alteration 'The postman chased the dog'. In these examples we can clearly see that with just by changing the order of the words *postman* and *dog* the subject and, therefore, the entire meaning of the sentence changed (Rounds, 2001, p. 253). If the first sentence is translated into Hungarian, *A kutya üldözte a postást,* and then its word order is changed into *A postást üldözte a kutya* 'The dog chased **the postman**' (bold shows emphasis) the meaning of the sentence does not change, only the focus does. That is why, although the SVO word order is used regularly, Hungarian word order is usually referred to as a 'topic-comment structure' which is a structure where common knowledge is at the beginning of the sentence and additional comments are after it (Rounds, 2001, p. 254).

2. 5 Cross-linguistic influence, iconicity and code-switching

Cross-linguistic influence (CLI) is a umbrella term for all the interference there can be between the L1, L2 and L3, like "transfer, interference, avoidance, borrowing and L2 related-aspects of language loss" (Sharwood Smith & Kellerman, 1986, cited in De Angelis, 2007, p. 19). Although Barnes (2006) also talks about CLI, De Angelis (2007) covers it in greater detail dedicating a whole chapter to it, while Barnes takes a much

simpler approach explaining the concept in brief and then applying it throughout her work.

Cenoz et al. (2001) examine CLI strictly in trilingual acquisition. They highlight that while in the case of bilingual speakers it is the L1 and L2 that influence each other, it is all three languages that are in connection with each other in a trilingual person, which means that it is not only the L1-L2 but also the L1-L3 and L2-L3 that come into a two-way relationship (Cenoz et al., 2001, p. 2). This also supports the observation mentioned before that it is, indeed, not advised to use the term bilingual to refer to speakers of more than two languages.

Kazzazi (2011) approaches the topic of CLI from a more practical standpoint, explaining the utterances recorded by the author. Kazzazi's (2011) article is about two trilingual children who speak German, English and Farsi. Her research has a great number of examples of CLI from children in their relatively early stages of third language acquisition. Along CLI, however, she also includes the term of iconicity into her research. Kazzazi (2011) defines iconicity as the opposite of arbitrariness, as "content motivates the expression" (Kazzazi, 2011, p. 65), which means that when children want to express something they do it in a way so that what they say resembles what they actually mean. As an example she uses the utterance of her trilingual daughter "Ich brauche mix-cough!" (Kazzazi, 2011, p. 70), "I need cough-mixture", where the child, Anusheh, uses a post-modifier structure, common in Farsi, instead of a pre-modifier one, common in English and German as in "cough-mixture". The explanation of this, according to Kazzazi (2011, p. 71), could be that for Anunsheh the Farsi post-modifying structure might be more iconic because it proposes an order, which Kazzazi (2011) describes as "determined before determining element" (Kazzazi, 2011, p. 71), which is more logical, thus more iconic, for the child. Elaborating further, Kazzazi (2011, p. 71) also explains that the child is more motivated to use this structure, because it lets her first name the object she wishes to describe and describe it after it was mentioned.

2. 6 Parental strategies

The issue of parental strategies or parental discourse strategies is important when examining the speech production of multilinguals. Barnes (2006) also touches upon the topic of parental discourse strategies in connection with code-switching and cross-linguistic influence. She believes that what matters when looking at a child's mixed utterances apart from "the amount and quality of the input" (Barnes, 2006, p. 19) that he or she receives is what parents do when they are communicating with their multilingual child (Barnes, 2006, p. 19).

Several researchers examine the effects of parental strategies on multilingual children. Chevalier (2012), for example, is interested in the development of two trilingual children who are brought up applying the one parent, one language strategy by

their parents, which is a strategy where each parent speaks in their native language to the children (Chevalier, 2012, p. 439). She is also interested in finding out what the motivating factors are for trilingual children to speak a specific language. Her finding is that despite the fact that both children are bought up applying the same strategy they do not develop the same way, that is, one of them is more motivated than the other to speak the language of one of their parents (Chevalier, 2012, p. 452). She makes the same observation in her later work, too. She suggests that the reason for the different development of the two children lies in the strategies that the parents apply when their children mix codes (Lanza, 2004, cited in Chevalier, 2012, p. 439).

Chevalier (2011) explains Lanza's (2004) parental strategies towards child language mixing in great detail. Lanza (2004) lists five strategies that parents use: *minimal grasp*, *expressed guess, adult repetition*, *move on strategy*, and *code-switching*. In the *minimal grasp* and *expressed guess* strategies the parents make it clear for the children that their utterance is not in the language they were expecting, thus they ask the children to clarify themselves by simply asking a WH-question or telling them that they do not understand what is said to them (Chevalier, 2011, p. 21). The difference between the two strategies is that in the case of the first, it is entirely up to the child to realize what is wrong with the utterance they have produced to their parents, while in the latter, in the *expressed guess* strategy, the parent repeats the child's utterance as a question in the target language (Chevalier, 2011, p. 22). *Adult repetition* is, in fact, the same as the *expressed guess* strategy with the only difference being that the parent simply repeats the utterance rather than repeating it as a question (Chevalier, 2011, p. 23). In the last two strategies called *move on strategy* and *code-switching* the children are not required to fix their utterances. In the first case the parent simply ignores the language mixing and moves on with the conversation in the target language (Chevalier, 2011, p. 24). In the second case, the parent does not simply ignore the mixings of the child but does not ask for correction either. Instead, they choose to go on in the target language and code-switch and repeat the child's utterance the way they said it (Chevalier, 2011, p. 24).

Chevalier (2011, 2012) in both of her works examines two Swiss trilingual children, Elliot and Lina. They are both exposed to the same three languages: French, Swiss German and English. The difference between the two children is that Lina is passive while Elliot is an active trilingual (2011, p. 236). Chevalier (2011) examines the children from the perspective of their parents' consistency in following the *one parent, one language strategy*, regarding the "amount of input" they received, the "variety of contact" with their languages, promotion of languages with the least input in conversations and the status of the languages of the children (Chevalier, 2011, pp. 237-238). She suggests that Elliot is more motivated to speak the languages other than the community's because his parents are consistent in the usage of the non-community language, provide equal input of each language, avoid using the community language at home, endorse the language the child is the exposed to the slightest and provide a diverse contact with the languages of the parents (2011, p. 239). Lina, on the other hand

is less motivated because her father is not persistent while using his native language, French, and relies a lot on the community language and the mother tongue of Lina's mother, Swiss German, meaning she has an uneven input of languages (2011, p. 239). She, therefore, receives more input from the community language and her parents promote the language she is least exposed to a lesser extent than Elliot's parents, making Lina less proficient in it.

2. 7 Transfer

Although mainly focusing on SLA, Ringbom (2007) does not specifically differentiate L2 transfer from L3/4/5 transfer, which makes his research on the topic of transfer a valuable asset, even for those who are analysing the language usage of multilinguals. He categorises transfers into three levels of transfer: item, system and overall level.

Item level refers to the practice of a learner looking for what Ringbom calls "one-to-one relationships" of words in their source language and in their target language (Ringbom, 2007, p. 55). In the beginning this process of equating words happens on the level of form and not on meaning. This helps the learner at first to acquire basic vocabulary with the help of positive transfer, when words with similar forms have the same meaning. However, it often leads to negative transfer as well, as students often rely on words with similar forms but different meanings, words which are referred to by De Angelis (2007, p. 24) as "false friends".

The second level, system transfer, refers to the case when the learner does realise that there is a similarity in meaning in the case of two words in the source and target language, but does not realise the difference in the form. In Ringbom (2007, p. 55) this kind of negative transfer is exemplified with a Finnish example. The Finnish word *kieli* means both "tongue" and "language", which may cause negative transfer in the case of a Finnish learner of English and produce something like "he bit himself in the language" (Ringbom, 2007, p. 55).

Overall transfer, the last level of transfer, is a collective level that refers to the learner's observation of similarities between the languages they know in the form and meaning of each element, and in the similarities between their systems (Ringbom, 2007, p. 57). According to Ringbom (2007, p. 57) this explains why learning a language similar to the L1 of the learner is much faster than learning one that differs greatly.

2. 8 Summary

All of the literature read on multilingualism for this research helped to understand the topic better with the help of definitions and suggestions for multilingual speech production models. As it has been mentioned before, the work of De Angelis (2007) is the fundamental literature of this thesis. Her definitions of multilingualism, third or additional language acquisition and cross-linguistic influence, are the ones used

throughout my work. The parental strategies listed by Lanza (2004) and explained by Chevalier (2011) are used to examine their effects on Clau's speech and Ringbom's (2007) three levels of transfer is used to analyse Clau's utterances. The rest of the literatures serve as a base for fundamental terms and easier understanding of the issues discussed in the paper.

3. Research questions

The following sections are concerned with looking for the answers for three questions. First, how, if at all, do the parental strategies applied by Clau's parents facilitate his code-switching, second, how his languages affect each other in his speech, and third, which is the dominant language in his multilingual mind.

4. Methodology

The subject of the current paper is Clau, who was 13 years old at the time when the research was conducted. He is a multilingual child who speaks English and Hungarian and has receptive skills in Spanish. He is one of the three children of a Spanish-Hungarian bilingual family which moved to England when he was 7 years old. Up until that point he was spoken to in Hungarian by his mother and in Spanish by his father, applying the *one parent, one language strategy*, as it has been described by Chevalier (2012), and he went to a monolingual Hungarian kindergarten. Clau only spoke Hungarian both at the kindergarten and at home with his parents and siblings, and understood Spanish perfectly although he never spoke it and only his father spoke in it with him. He had just begun school when his father was offered a job in England, which he accepted, meaning that Clau could not finish his first year in a Hungarian primary school. In England he went to the local school where he was prepared for the English education system and the English language as he lacked former English knowledge. By now, he speaks fluent English; however, despite still using Hungarian at home with his parents, his knowledge of it has deteriorated. His language usage with his siblings has also changed, as they use a mixture of Hungarian and English to communicate nowadays. His mother still communicates with him in Hungarian and his father in Spanish and he always responds to both of them in Hungarian.

This research is based on two half-hour long voice recordings between the participant and the researcher and two five minute long conversations conducted by the mother and the father according to the instructions of the researcher. The conversations were semi-structured, focusing on asking questions about Clau's daily life, about novelties he encounters each day in school or after school. Each interview was conducted in Spanish by the researcher and the father, and in Hungarian by the mother, to see how each language affects the language use of the child. The study lacks a

recording where Clau was spoken to in English. In order to have data in English he was required to answer in English in the recording with his father.

The voice recordings were later transcribed and analysed by looking for cross-linguistic influence and code-switching. Only the utterances themselves were analysed, the way they were uttered, hesitation or stuttering was not considered during the analysis.

Chevalier (2012) and Kazzazi (2011) used a very similar approach in their research. Chevalier (2012) recorded the way multilingual parents and their children communicate and later analysed the strategies used by the parents and connected them to the utterance of the children. Kazzazi (2011) recorded the utterances of her own children but instead of looking at parental strategies she only analysed what the children uttered looking for cross-linguistic influence. This paper combines the methods proposed by the two researchers and observes Clau's utterances from both perspectives.

5. Results and discussion

5. 1 Parental strategies facilitate code-switching

The reason why Clau has only perceptual Spanish skills can be traced back to parental strategies elaborated by Lanza (2004) and later by Chevalier (2011). Although this paper is limited in the time it covers of Clau's language development, at the age of 13 some parental strategies can still be seen being applied by his parents, which can still be seen relevant in his language usage.

Clau's situation is similar to Lina's in Chevalier's (2011) study. As mentioned before, he lived in Hungary until his 7th birthday and he was spoken to in Spanish by his father and Hungarian by his mother. His parents communicate in Hungarian with each other. The parents' consistence in their *one parent, one language strategy* is steady, unlike Lina's father's approach, because they never switch to either Hungarian or Spanish respectively when communicating with him. However, his only source of Spanish was his father and his paternal grandparents, leaving him exposed to mostly Hungarian and to an unequal input of languages. Although the parents strictly followed the *one parent, one language strategy* they mostly used the move on strategy with Clau when he produced mixed utterances. This means that even when he was spoken to in Spanish he was not required; therefore, he was not motivated to answer in Spanish, which explains why his Spanish is only perceptive. The parents followed the same strategies after moving to England, where Clau received a more balanced input of Hungarian, reducing the source to his mother, siblings and maternal relatives. However, upon moving to England Clau had to learn the community language, English, relatively fast with good proficiency in order to be able to perform in school. This means that the status of English in Clau's mind rose, making it the dominant language for him.

Clau feels more comfortable speaking in mixed utterances because he knows that his parents can understand code-switching, just as Grosjean (1998, p. 136) highlighted that multilinguals are more willing to code-switch when communicating with people with the same multilingual background. This code-switching or cross-linguistic influence is also facilitated by the parents' frequent application of the move on strategy proposed by Lanza (2004) and explained by Chevalier (2011). In Example 1 the move on strategy can be seen in the case of Clau. In this example Clau's mother asks him about his day at school and Clau responds with a code-switch in his sentence. His mother, instead of correcting him and disturbing the flow of the conversation, decides to go on with the conversation in her own code. Clau's code-switching is marked with italics and the move on strategy is marked in bold.

A. Move on strategy
(1)   MOT: Es ö, valamilyen modellről is beszéltél vagy mi, mit készítettetek a suliban?"And um you spoke about a model or something like that, what have you made at school?"
CLA: Csináltunk egy *presentation* "We made a presentation"
MOT: **Igen** "Yes"

According to Chevalier (2011, p. 23) the *move on strategy* reinforces the child's bilingual identity and communicates to the child that it is acceptable to speak in mixed utterances. This might explain why Clau could learn English fast and with considerable ease because he did not have to fear repercussions (Chevalier, 2011, p. 24) which means he could have fluent conversations in English without needing to rely on his yet limited English vocabulary.

In some cases his parents use an additional strategy called *minimal grasp* as can be seen in Example 2 to enforce the one parent, one language strategy which includes the adult requesting for clarification after code-switching to signal the need to use another code (Chevalier, 2011, p. 21).

B. Minimal grasp strategy
(2)   CLA: Kellett… vagy is, igen *powerpoint slash presentation* és kellett um,választani "We had to… I mean, yes, powerpoint slash presentation and we had to choose"
MOT: Ezt **el tudnád mondani magyarul**, hogy micsoda? "Could you say what that is in Hungarian?"
CLA: Um… *írópapír*? "Um… writing paper?"
MOT: Nem, valami <u>bemutató</u> vagy ilyesmi. "No, a presentation or something like that"

In Example 2 Clau did not know the answer to the *minimal grasp* (*el tudnád mondani magyarul),* so the mother had to switch to adult repetition, which required her to repeat the utterance in the expected code. Clau's code-switching is marked in italics, his incorrect translation in bold italics, his mother's request for clarification in bold and the adult repetition is marked with an underline.

5. 2 Language interference

The reason why Clau produces these utterances in Hungarian can be traced back to two further reasons. It can be because of the iconicity of the English language for Clau. Another possibility is that Clau is, in fact, a kind of trilingual who, according to Hoffmann (2001), uses his language as a bilingual, meaning that he uses only two of his languages at the same time.

Clau could be considered a bilingual as in Hoffmann's (2001) term and that English is his language A, Hungarian is his language B and Spanish is his language C. This would explain why Clau's speech is only affected by English and not by Spanish. That means that his languages are intertwined as A+B and that explains the transfer from English to Hungarian. Hoffmann's model also accounts for the transfer from English, as she explains that with the emergence of a dominant language the number of possible combinations in the multilingual mind decreases considerably (Hoffmann 2001, p. 16). However, the theory in Hoffmann (2001) does not explain what happens to language C if it does not affect the others in any way. It does not account for the fact that while Clau's speech is not affected by Spanish he does interpret it and has no problem responding to questions and requests addressed to him.

Iconicity explains why Clau uses English structures in Hungarian sentences. With English being Clau's dominant language it is much closer for him to real life experiences than Hungarian structures. Just as for Anusheh to use post-modifying structures in Kazzazi (2011), it is also more natural for Clau to include the personal pronouns most of the time or to borrow English structures. However, iconicity is not concerned either with what happens with the least dominant third language. For that, this paper relies on Green's (1986) speech production model.

During this research I expected Clau's language to be affected by the language he is spoken to. As has been mentioned before, Clau has only receptive skills in Spanish and when he is spoken to in this language he answers in Hungarian. I did not expect him to switch to Spanish when I spoke to him in Spanish because I was aware that he could not speak but only understand it; however, I was expecting a degree of influence from Spanish to Hungarian. My theory was backed up by previous research highlighted in Hoffmann (2001, p. 6), who mentions the example of Elwert, who chooses his languages according to where he is or who he is speaking with, as well as in De Angelis (2007, p. 81), who proposes and explains the speech production model developed by Grosjean (1998). Grosjean's (1998) speech production model or Language Mode Hypothesis, as it is referred to by De Angelis (2007, p. 79), differentiates between monolingual and bilingual speech modes (Grosjean, 1998, p. 136) which are, according to him, activated on different occasions, for example, depending on who the bilingual speaker is speaking with, where they are, or what the context they are communicating in is. In both cases the language choice is facilitated by the environment and by the other participant of the conversation. Grosjean (1998, p. 136) believes that the language

modes are two endpoints on a continuum and that speakers are often on different sides of it depending on who they are speaking with. That means that if they speak with a multilingual of the same language background they are more likely to code-switch (Grosjean, 1998, p. 136) and produce mixed utterances. Since Clau is aware of the fact that his family is similarly multilingual as him, he is more willing to code-switch in his speech. He is aware that they understand mixed utterances without a problem. A case similar to Elwert's can be seen in Hoffmann (2001), with the difference that Clau does not choose to speak in Spanish when he is spoken to in it, but in Hungarian. However, neither Hoffmann's nor Grosjean's (1998) theory addresses the issue of what happens in the multilingual mind with the language that does not affect the speech production directly, which is Spanish in Clau's case.

To address the issue of Spanish in Clau's multilingual system this research turns to the above mentioned speech production model proposed by Green (1986). Green claims that each language in the mind can be triggered to various degrees (Green, 1986, p. 216). He suggests that each language is in either one of the three states distinguished by him: selected, active and dormant (Green, 1986, p. 215). The selected language is the one used to communicate and the one that navigates speech production, the active language is the one that helps processing the input and the last, the dormant language is the language that is rarely used by the speaker, a language which does not affect the speech production and the ongoing processing, a kind of passive knowledge (Green 1986, p. 215). According to De Bot and Schreuder, "one language is always dormant" (De Bot & Schreuder, 1993, p. 198). Explaining Green's (1986) model, De Bot (1992, p. 13) suggests that the selected language is the main source of words and the secondary one is the active language and although rarely, the third source can be the dormant language. De Bot (1992, p. 13) also proposes the idea of "parallel production" in which he suggests that the multilingual person forms the same sentences in the selected language parallel with the active language. During sentence formation lexical items are selected and surface structures are formulated too, which means that parallel production explains the appearance of code-switching and cross-linguistic influence in the speech of multilinguals (De Bot, 1992, p. 13).

The following section is concerned with the effects of each language, except English, on Clau's speech production. Unfortunately, no voice recording was available where Clau is spoken to in English by the time of the writing of this paper, which means that English had to be excluded from the list of languages observed from that perspective. There is one voice recording where Clau speaks English, which is used to examine his usage of English.

5. 3 The effect of Hungarian

In Example 3 the effect of Hungarian can be seen on Clau's speech. His mother speaks with him in Hungarian and Clau responds in Hungarian with code-switching. Clau's code-switching is marked in italics.

C. Clau spoken to in Hungarian by his mother

(3)   MOT: … a bemutatót azon (iPad) készítetted? "… did you make your presentation on that (on the iPad)?"
CLA: Aha, mert a *keynotesen* va- um tudsz csinál-, azt (prezentáció) mint a, um, mint a *pagesen* "Yes. because in keynotes there is - um you can make that (presentation) like, um, like in pages"
MOT: Aha.
CLA: És tudod mit? Még nem használtam, de van um a *numbersen*, azon tudsz csinálni *spreadsheet*. "And you know what? I haven't used it yet, but there is um, in numbers, in that you can make spreadsheet"

Separating the languages in Clau's multilingual system according to Green's (1986) terms can be challenging. The most straightforward categorization would be to say that Clau's selected language is, depending on discourse, either English or Hungarian, as these are the languages he speaks. His active language is always the one he is not currently speaking out of the two as, according to Green (1986, p. 215), the active language is the one that helps the multilingual in communicating. Clau's dormant language is likely to be Spanish, as he does not speak it and it has no effect on his production. This division is applicable for instances when Clau speaks with a Hungarian or an English speaker, as in the Hungarian example for this in Example 3. He has no problem understanding and responding to his mother's utterances. The high number of cross-linguistic influence we can see in his Hungarian speech is explained by De Bot's (1992, p. 13) parallel processing theory, which means that Clau creates his sentences in his selected language, Hungarian, parallel with his active one, English. When he cannot find a word or an expression in his selected language, Hungarian, he falls back to his active language, English, and borrows the appropriate word from that language.

5. 4 The effect of Spanish

When Clau speaks with his Spanish-speaking relatives, the previously proposed division has to be slightly refined. In examples 4 and 5 Clau is spoken to in Spanish by the researcher, to which he responds in Hungarian.

D. Clau asked about a magnifying device used to read books in Spanish

(4)   RES: Con eso leyes los libros, verdad? "You read books with that, right?"
CLA: Öö, még nem olvasok ott (iskolában), csak használtunk egy pár könyvet hogy gyakoroljunk vele, a Prodigyvel. "Umm, I don't read there (at school) yet, we just used it to read some books with it to practice, with the Prodigy"

(5)   RES: Sólo poco tenías que estar ahí? "You had to be there only a little?"

> CLA: Hát nem, nem kellett, de ma volt ez *a disaster day*, hát csináltuk, *activity*. Csináltunk egy házat, nem igazit, egy házat ilyen szívószálakból meg ilyesmik és akkor megnéztük, hogy, hogy kinek fog teljesen leborulni vagy szétmenni. "Um, no, we didn't have to, but we had today this Disaster Day, um we did, um, an activity. We made a house, not a real one, a house out of straws and things like that and then we checked that, that whose will fall apart or get destroyed entirely"

When Clau is spoken to in Spanish, his Spanish cannot be categorized as a dormant language as Green (1986) specifies that a dormant language has no effect on ongoing processing (Green, 1986, p. 215), which means that perception does not take place with the dormant language either. Evidence for this can be seen in Examples 4 and 5. That means that in this context Clau's active language is Spanish as Clau has perceptive skills in it and has no issues understanding it when he is spoken to in it. His selected language is Hungarian because he speaks with his Spanish relatives in that language. The dormant language in this scenario should, therefore, be English as it seemingly has no effect on production and perception. However, as it can be seen in Examples 4 and 5, even when Clau is spoken to in Spanish, his knowledge of English remains active as he heavily relies on it during his Hungarian speech production. That means that in Spanish context Clau has one selected (Hungarian) and two active languages (Spanish and English) and he has no dormant language.

5. 5 Usage of English

As mentioned above, no recording was available where Clau is spoken to in English by the time of the writing of this paper, which means that his English usage in an English context was not analysed. However, in order not to entirely exclude the analysis of Clau's English usage, a recording where Clau speaks in English and his father gives him instructions in Spanish has been analysed instead.

E. Clau speaking English
(6) FAT: Por qué te gusta ahí? (escuela) "Why do you like it there? (at school)"
 CLA: Because it's a good school and I have made some friends there. There is one called Jacob who goes go-karting.
(7) FAT: Es un clase especial en la escuela? "Is it a special class at school?"
 CLA: **Hát… umm, vagyis, umm**… yeah, it's for people with special needs. "Well… umm, I mean, umm…"

In Example 6 it can be seen how Clau navigates his English knowledge. In this scenario his selected language is English, his active language is Spanish. Interestingly, as can be seen in example 7, Hungarian is active too in his mind which is likely because he is used to responding to Spanish in Hungarian. Although De Bot and Schreuder (1993) suggest that there is at least one dormant language, in this case Clau has no dormant language. Clau speaks fluent English and even though he has been spoken to in Spanish,

to which he usually responds in Hungarian, he finds it less challenging than expected to respond in English. This shows that two of his languages are always active and English is clearly the dominant one.

Concerning the three languages he has daily contact with, English is the one that affects Clau's language usage the most. He does not only borrow words, but also grammatical and syntactic structures from English and applies them in his Hungarian sentences. This concerns word order and whole expressions borrowed from the English language. The following examples are sentences which Clau most probably constructed from English.

5. 6 Structural borrowings

With the use of De Bot's (1992) parallel production theory it can be proven that Clau's dominant language is English and that he forms most of his utterances in English and Hungarian at the same time. The following list of structural borrowings, conforming to De Bot's (1992) theory, show that each sentence was constructed from English structures and are mostly direct translations of those sentences.

F. Structural borrowings
(8)   CLA: kellett **kitalálnunk** egy új csokit "we had to **make up** a new chocolate"
(9)   CLA**:** Ha egy könyvet **aláteszel** akkor tudja **elolvasni** neked. "If you put a book under it, it can read it for you"
(10) CLA: játszottunk focit "we played football"
(11) CLA: van **mint** 5 vagy 6 (tanóra) "there are, **like**, 5 or 6 (classes)"
(12) CLA: A többiek **is** nem annyira tudták. "The others didn't really know it either"

In Example 8 and 9 Clau's Hungarian sentence was almost a direct translation from English to Hungarian. In Hungarian, the auxiliary verb *kellett* separates the verb *kitalálni* 'to make up' into the verbal prefix *ki-* and the verb *-találni*, so the structure in Hungary Hungarian looks like this: *ki kellett találnunk egy új csokit*. This is not the case in English where the auxiliary *have to* does not split *make up* into *make* and *up* and so the form remains intact. That is the reason why Clau did not split up *kitalálni* and left it intact just as he would have in English. In Example 9 he does the same, Clau did not split the word *elolvasni* 'to read' into prefix *el-* and verb *-olvasni*. In Hungary Hungarian the structure usually used is to put the prefix *el-* before *tudja* '(it) can' and the stem *-olvasni* 'to read' as in *el tudja olvasni* 'can read it'.

Clau used the same tactic of using English as the base of his Hungarian sentence in Example 10. In Hungary Hungarian, the expression 'to play something', for example, 'to play football' or 'to play basketball' is usually conveyed through a verb, for example *kosárlabdázni*, which translates to 'to play basketball', which means, that instead of the expression *játszottunk focit,* in Hungary Hungarian the verb *fociztunk* is the expression that should be used. This is the characteristic of synthetic languages which use synthetic

forms, common to agglutinating languages such as Hungarian, which use prefixes and suffixes to highlight grammatical differences and relations. Analytic languages, such as English and Spanish, however, use very little affixes, and grammatical relations are communicated through word order instead. In synthetic languages, and, therefore, in Hungarian, word order is less important, which means that using analytic forms is less motivated. In Hungarian both *játszunk focit* and *focit játszunk* mean 'we play football'; therefore, the synthetic form 'focizunk', which means the same, is usually used. Clau systematically uses this analytic structure from English. He, in another case, said *játszottunk Unot* 'we played Uno' instead of saying *Unoztunk*.

In Example 11 we can see a system transfer. Clau inserts the word *mint* 'like' between *van* 'be' and 5, which is grammatically correct in English but not in Hungarian. The word *mint* does, in fact, mean 'like', however, only when *like* is used as a preposition for comparison, for example in 'he is like a brother to me'. If it is used as a conjunction, then *like* translates to *vagy/körülbelül* in English 'more or less'. This corresponds to Ringbom's (2007) *kieli* 'tongue' example and shows that Clau uses English as the base of his speech production, because it is English where *like* functions both as a preposition and as a conjugation as in the translated sentence above. Clau did not realise that there is a meaning difference between the two forms of the Hungarian translations of the word *like*.

In Example 12 the word *is* 'too/as well' is the source of the interference. Clau correctly identified that English 'either' here stands for something similar to 'too' or 'as well'; however, it is used in the negative sense, for example in "I don't like it either". He also correctly identified that this has to be negated in Hungarian too; however, lacking the word for it he instead directly negated *is* 'too' with *nem* 'not'. The word used in Hungary Hungarian to refer to this is *sem*.

5. 7 Overall transfer

As it can be seen in the examples above, translating *like* into Hungarian can be a challenging task because of the vast amount of meanings the word can convey. It is not surprising, therefore, that it causes transfer and interference in Clau's speech. In the examples below, we can see a third meaning of the word *like* where it translates to either *like to do something* or *like doing something*.

> **G. Overall transfer induced by system transfer of *like***
> (13) CLA: nekem jobban **tetszik** az iPaden **olvasni.** "I like to read on the iPad better."
> (14) CLA: nem **tetszik** neki **tanulni** "he doesn't like to study"
> (15) CLA: (Az iskola) Ahova most megyek az a Forest, ahova az **előbb** mentem az a… "(The school) Where I go now is Forest, where I went before is…"

In the Examples 13 and 14 above an overall transfer induced by the system transfer of *like* can be seen, marked in bold. Here, it is not only the meaning of the word *like* that

leads to transfer, but also the grammatical structure that follows it. In English *like to* is followed by an infinitive as in 'I like to read' However, the Hungarian *tetszik* 'to like' used by Clau in both examples is not followed in Hungary Hungarian by an infinitive, which in Hungarian is formed as verb + infinitive suffix *-ni,* as Clau used it, but by a noun, such as *tanulás,* 'act of studying', which translates into gerund in English. This means that *tetszik neki a tanulás* translates to 'he likes studying'. Another way to make Clau's utterance correct and keep the infinitive in Hungary Hungarian is to replace word *tetszik* with the first person singular form of the transitive verb *szeret* as *szeretek* 'I like to' in Example 13 and with its third person singular form *szeret* 'he likes to' in Example 14 because the verb *szeret* is followed by an infinitive in Hungary Hungarian. If the verb *szeret* is used then the personal pronouns *nekem* 'to me' and *neki* 'to him/her' have to be removed because they are only required by *tetszik*. This transfer happened because Clau did correctly identify that *like* in Hungarian has two very similar meanings, *tetszik* and *szeretni,* but he did not identify the difference between their forms, and that the two verbs require different complements. It is not possible to say which form Clau might have wanted to use, since traces of both forms can be seen in Examples 13 and 14.

In Example 15 Clau correctly identified that *előbb* translates into 'before' in English. However, while before in English can refer to something that has happened in the past in any timespan, Hungarian has two versions of it: *előbb* which refers to something that has happened not a long time ago and *korábban* which refers to something that has happened longer time ago.

5. 8 Insertion of personal pronouns

Clau does not always apply whole structures from English into Hungarian. He also inserts the personal pronouns in his Hungarian sentences even when they are not necessary. In Hungarian the personal pronoun appears only when "the pronoun is emphasized, contrasted, or referred to specifically" (Rounds 2001, p. 123), otherwise they are omitted. In English omitting the personal pronouns is very rare and only happens in imperative sentences where there is no subject as in "Look!" (Nelson 2001, p. 19) or in informal speech as in "Wish I could do something". Clau applies the English rule of using pronouns in his following Hungarian sentences.

H. Insertion of personal pronouns
(16) CLA: jött egy barátom az **ő** testvérével "a friend of mine came with his brother"
(17) CLA: ő az **én** legjobb barátom "he is my best friend"
(18) CLA**: Ti** most a **universtyben** jártok? "Are you going to University now?"

In Example 16 Clau uses the personal pronoun *ő* 'he/she' to refer to his friend. As mentioned above, the usage of this personal pronoun is not necessary as both the third person singular verb *jött* and the noun *testvérével* with the third person possessive suffix *-e* contains both the number and the person. Similarly, in Example 17 *én* 'I' can also be

omitted because the noun *barátom* already contains the first person possessive suffix *-om*. It is important to note though that *ő* 'he' cannot be omitted as it functions as the subject of the sentence. The same appears in example 18, where the verb *jártok* already contains the second person plural in *-tok*, yet Clau still inserted the second person plural *Ti* 'you' to the beginning of the sentence. In addition he also codeswitched and used an incorrect suffix. University is *egyetem* in Hungarian and the suffix *-be* should have been used instead.

5. 9 Summary

This section has been concerned with answering the research questions proposed in section 3. First, it has been established that parental strategies facilitate code-switching because the move on strategy applied by Clau's parents does not alter the flow of the conversation even when mixed utterances are present. Second, it has been shown how Clau's languages influence one another and that English is the most prominent one. Third, it has been proven with examples that Clau's dominant language is English, as he mostly relies on that language when forming his sentences.

5. Conclusion

This paper examined the language usage of a multilingual child named Clau. He lives in England and he speaks English and Hungarian and has receptive skills in Spanish. It has examined the language usage of the child, how and why his languages affect each other. The paper has listed three reasons why cross-linguistic influence appears in Clau's speech.

First, the parental strategies described by Lanza (2004) and applied by Clau's parents facilitate his code-switching. Because his parents mostly apply the move on strategy with him to keep up the flow of the conversation, he feels more comfortable to speak in mixed utterances. Second, Clau's language usage was examined applying Hoffmann's (2001) theory of multilingualism and Grojsean's (1998) speech production model, both of which provided useful information, but did not explain the issue of what happens with Spanish when Clau is spoken to in it. For this, Green's (1986) speech production model was used and it has been shown that Clau's languages can be divided into selected, active and dormant categories according to context. Spanish is in either the active or the dormant state in his mind, explaining why he is able to understand but not speak Spanish. Hungarian and English are always in either the active or the selected state in Clau's mind, often causing cross-linguistic influence in his Hungarian speech, which is explained by De Bot's (1992) parallel processing theory. Third, it was proven that English is Clau's dominant language. It has been established that English is always active in his mind and that this fact is the cause of cross-linguistic influence in his speech. Applying Ringbom's (2007) theory it has been shown that apart from code-

switching there are also structural borrowings and negative transfer from English to Hungarian in his speech.

This paper has been concerned only with Clau's current language usage and its causes. It could be the base of further research to look at the language development of a multilingual child similar to Clau's from the very early age until late childhood. This would provide further insight into the development of multilingual children in general.

References

Barnes, J. D. (2006). *Early trilingualism: A focus on questions.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B., & Jessner U., (Eds.) (2001). *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Chevalier, S. (2011). *Trilingual language acquisition: Contextual factors influencing active trilingualism in early childhood.* Zurich: University of Zurich, Habilitation dissertation.

Chevalier, S. (2012). Active trilingualism in early childhood: The motivating role of caregivers in interaction. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 9*(4), 437-454.

Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

De Bot, K. & Schreuder, R. (1993). Word production and the bilingual lexicon. In: B. Weltens and R. Schreuder, (Eds.) *The bilingual lexicon* (pp.191-214). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

De Bot, K. (1992). A bilingual production model: Levelt's speech production model adapted. *Applied Linguistics, 13*(1), 1-24.

Green, D. W. (1986). Control, activation, and resource: A framework and a model for the control of speech in bilinguals. *Brain and Language, 27*(2), 210-230.

Grosjean, F. (1998). Studying bilinguals: Methodological and conceptual issues. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 1*(2), 131-149.

Hoffmann, C. (2001). Towards a description of trilingual competence. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 5*(1), 1-17.

Kazzazi, K. (2011). Ich brauche mix-cough: Cross-linguistic influence involving German, English and Farsi. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 8*(1), 63-79.

Kemp, C. (2009). Defining multilingualism. In: L. Aronin & B. Hufeisen, (Eds.) *The exploration of multilingualism*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 11-26.

Lanza, E. (2004). *Language mixing in infant bilingualism: A sociolinguistic perspective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple voices.* Malden: Blackwell.

Nelson, G. (2001). *English: An essential grammar.* London: Routledge.

Ringbom, H. (2007). *Cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Rounds, C. (2001). *Hungarian: An essential grammar.* London: Routledge.

Sharwood Smith, M., & Kellerman E. (Eds.) (1986). *Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Encouraging high school students to become autonomous EFL learners: Exploring the possibilities of Duolingo

Lilla Bende

Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Hungary

Online applications have been reported to support independent language learning, but there seems to exist little evidence concerning the application of gamification and Duolingo. Gamification is the framework for Duolingo due to certain gamified elements in it. One of my main aims was to test the effectiveness of these elements in practice to see whether they are capable of supporting EFL learner autonomy. To examine the research problem, I carried out an experiment with a group of high school students by implementing a pre-task student questionnaire, experimental teaching and post-task interviews. Results suggest that the students need the EFL teacher's training and support in order to gradually become more independent. An analysis of the data implies that Duolingo's gamified elements did not engage the students effectively. At this point, it seems that more research is needed on the influence of gamification, including Duolingo, on learner autonomy.

Key words: learner autonomy, gamification, Duolingo, online applications, EFL learners

1. Introduction

Since lifelong learning plays a significant role in our lives, it is vital to deal with learner autonomy because it may enable students to acquire certain skills that help them supplement or continue their studies. Although there is a vast amount of research on learner autonomy (Benson (2013); Bergen (1989 cited in Legenhausen, 2009); Dafei (2007); Holec (1979, cited in Legehausen, 2009); Yagcioglu, 2015), there are a limited number of studies examining the potential benefits of online technology for learner autonomy (e.g. Figura & Jarvis, 2007). Also, students are surrounded with different online applications that teachers may use. Thus, the main objective of my study was to examine how an application using elements of gamification, namely Duolingo, might contribute to an increase in the level of learner autonomy.

My literature review includes the definitions of learner autonomy and a collection of the characteristic features of an autonomous EFL learner. Besides, I also sought for ways of encouraging students to become more autonomous; therefore, I studied the concept of gamification and listed its elements. In the empirical research, I examined high school students' level of leaner autonomy and whether using Duolingo can be part of gamification. Finally, I intended to check to what extent Duolingo can promote learner autonomy and how.

2. Learner autonomy

Reviewing the literature has provided an insight into learner autonomy and the characteristics of autonomous learners as well as ways of promoting learner autonomy. Learner autonomy is a complex issue; therefore, there is no relevant universal theory accepted in language pedagogy (Benson, 2013; Legenhausen, 2009). Nevertheless, when describing learner autonomy, there are several concepts that provide important principles, which I have included in the table below.

Table 1. Concepts of learner autonomy based on my literature review

Focus	References	Importance
Learner autonomy is a **capability**	Holec (1979, cited in Legehausen, 2009)	This has provided a basis for other definitions.
Learner autonomy is a **willingness**	Bergen (1989, cited in Legenhausen, 2009)	It opposes concepts regarding capability as the main factor in autonomy.
Learner autonomy is not only self-directed learning	Dafei (2007), Benson (2013)	Autonomous learners also show certain attitudes to learning and hold beliefs about the process.
Self-directed learning involves **skills** and **capability**, students' **decisions** and **control**	Benson and Voller (1997, cited in Thanasoulas, 2000)	These five basic components enable students to take responsibility and consciously direct to some extent the learning process.
Role of **control** in learner autonomy	Benson (2013)	The more control the student has, the more likely they can take action to achieve success in learning.
Confidence and **willingness**	Wenden (1994, cited in Figura & Jarvis, 2007)	Awareness of strategies or knowledge might not necessarily follow activity, which is required to establish learner autonomy.
Active participation in learning	Little (2015), Thanasoulas (2000)-constructivism	Students should know what to do to become more autonomous, but they need to take steps to reach this goal.
Successfully taking part in **social learning**	Bhattacharya and Chauhan (2010), Benson (2013), Legenhausen (2009)	Learner autonomy should enable students to cooperate with others successfully.

When dealing with learner autonomy, the name of Henry Holec is worth mentioning. He is often cited by professionals (e.g.: Bajrami, 2015; Legenhausen, 2009), because he developed the basic definition of learner autonomy. According to him, autonomous

learners are responsible for their own decisions relating to learning issues (Holec (1979) cited by Legenhausen (2009)). This definition involves the capability of clarifying the aims and the contents of language learning, monitoring the procedure and the progression, consciously selecting learning techniques and strategies and, of course, evaluating the whole language learning process (Legenhausen, 2009).

On the other hand, there is a debate whether learner autonomy is a matter of behaviour or capability (Legenhausen, 2009; Little, 2015). As opposed to Holec (1979 cited in Legehausen 2009), who supports the latter, there is Bergen's definition of learner autonomy (also cited in Legenhausen, 2009). This regards autonomy as a willingness to take charge of one's own learning, which "entails that learners have developed and can sustain positive motivational attitudes towards the learning task" (Legenhausen, 2010, p. 380).

Other aspects can be considered as well. Dafei (2007) argues that terms such as 'self- instruction', 'self-access', 'self-study', 'self-education', 'out-of-class learning' or 'distance learning' are not equivalent with autonomous learning and he makes a distinction emphasizing that autonomous learning involves abilities and attitudes, while the others refer to different ways and degrees of learning by oneself. Benson (2013) also differentiates autonomy from self-directed learning, because the former can be described as an attribute of learners, whereas the latter is supposed to be only a mode of learning. He claims that autonomous learning also involves "decisions about content, methods and evaluation" (Benson, 2013, p. 37).

According to Benson and Voller (1997) cited in Thanasoulas (2000), learner autonomy can be interpreted in at least five ways, namely the situations in which learners learn totally by themselves, the learnable skills, which can be used during learning, an innate capacity, the learners' control over learning and, finally, the students' right "to determine the direction of their own learning" (Thanasoulas, 2000, What is autonomy?).

The basic traits of autonomous learners have been characterized by many professionals (e.g., Benson, 2013; Legenhausen, 2009; Little, 2015; Yagcioglu, 2015). Wenden's definition of autonomous learner cited in Figura and Jarvis (2007) is the following: those students, who are willing and confident enough to apply certain strategies and knowledge in order to become responsible for their own learning.

Little (2015) argues that "there is a consensus that the practice of learner autonomy requires insight, a positive attitude, a capacity for reflection, and a readiness to be proactive in self-management and in interaction with others" (Little, 2015, Definitions). This can be connected to the concept of Bhattacharya and Chauhan (2010), according to which learner autonomy includes reflective and critical thinking, responsible and independent selecting of own learning strategies. Besides independence (the skill of working alone), interdependence becomes more and more important so that learners can efficiently cooperate with others. The social aspect of

learning as a part of learner autonomy is mentioned by other educationalists as well (e.g., Benson, 2013; Legenhausen, 2009).

Thanasoulas (2000) states that autonomous learners play an active part in learning, use their creativity and take opportunities. Consequently, they do not only react to the input coming from the teacher, but they initiate interaction, which results in learning. This concept is closely related to the ideas of constructivism, a pedagogical ideology (Thanasoulas, 2000), because this suggests that students become constructors of their knowledge. In the concept of constructivism, knowledge is restructured and reorganised based on new experience, the focus is on building up knowledge, in other words on learning rather than on teaching. Hence, every student has her own experience and world knowledge that influence how they manage a task and how they use the target language. Due to this, constructivism supports self-directed learning, as the basis of autonomous learning (Thanasoulas, 2000).

Based on the literature that I reviewed, I developed my own understanding of the term 'learner autonomy': a willingness to take responsibility for one's own learning and control the learning process which includes conscious learning management and evaluation, as well as reflection aimed at progression in learning (cf. Benson, 2013; Bergen 1989 cited in Legenhausen, 2009; Bhattacharya & Chauhan, 2010; Little, 2015; Thanasoulas, 2000).

Besides, the role of the EFL teacher cannot be neglected as far as training students to become increasingly autonomous is concerned. Thus, teachers should act as facilitators and counsellors, as Bajrami (2015) suggests, because they should manage activities and provide help when needed. Furthermore, teachers can supply students with a rich toolkit and support students by providing personalized feedback and involving them in decision-making. In this way, students can become ever more autonomous, thus potentially benefitting both teachers and students. For example, some research suggests that a higher level of autonomy contributes to improved language proficiency (Dafei, 2007; Legenhausen, 2009).

3. Duolingo as part of gamification

Online applications have been reported to support independent language learning, but little evidence seems to exist on the use of gamification and Duolingo. Duolingo is a free online language website providing translation tasks to learn vocabulary and grammar (in the form of learning and practising given topics), as well as tasks to practise pronunciation and listening. Although it mainly employs the grammar-translation method, there are playful functions included. That is why I introduce the definition of gamification, which is "the use of game design elements and game mechanics in non-game context" (Deterding et al., 2011, p. 9) by "incorporating game elements into a non-gaming software application" (Domínguez et al., 2013, p. 381). Consequently, gamification provides the framework for Duolingo due to certain

gamified elements involving time pressure, pointification (earning points for completing tasks), badges (visual display of progress), leaderboards and progress bars.

Kiryakova et al. (2014) have found that by enhancing motivation and engagement, gamification positively influences students' beliefs and attitudes towards learning; therefore they suggest that gamification supports an effective learning process. Munday (2016) points out that since it provides instant feedback, Duolingo might be suitable for promoting self-directed learning. According to Magnuson (2014), using Duolingo in the classroom can promote independence and self-paced learning as well. In addition to this, this website also increased students' interest and contributed to the teacher's monitoring work to follow students' progress.

4. Empirical research

In the study, one of my main goals was to test the effectiveness of Duolingo's gamified elements in practice in order to see whether they are capable of supporting EFL learner's engagement in their own learning as well as learner autonomy. The research questions concerning the empirical research were the following:

(1) To what extent are the participating high school students autonomous?
(2) Can Duolingo be part of gamification?
(3) To what extent can Duolingo promote learner autonomy?
(4) How can Duolingo promote learner autonomy?

In addition, I have developed the following corresponding hypotheses: (1) Duolingo can be part of gamification in learning English, and (2) Duolingo can contribute to an increase in the level of learner autonomy within the context of EFL.

The empirical research has been carried out in the form of a case study in order to gain in-depth data on the relationship between learner autonomy and gamification. I conducted my research in a Hungarian grammar school, in Budapest. My participants were 14-15 year-old students in their 9th grade specializing in drama. The school focuses on learning English as a foreign language. This is the first foreign language that is compulsory to learn in the school, as a consequence, classes are usually divided based on the learners' level of proficiency in the foreign language. The group that I examined involved EFL learners, partly A1 and partly A2 students. The group consisted of 16 students from which eleven students' first foreign language was English, because they learnt it in the primary school as well. On the other hand, the five other students from this group learnt German in the primary school, but in the high school they had to learn English as a compulsory foreign language. Due to this, they did not have a chance to learn German, just English as a foreign language.

To examine the research problem, I implemented a pre-task student questionnaire, experimental teaching and post-task interviews with the EFL teacher and the participating students. I employed triangulation, because this helped me explore and

analyse the multifaceted topic of learner autonomy and gamification. Dörnyei (2007) argues that it is beneficial to use both qualitative and quantitative research methods as they strengthen each other and mitigate the deficiencies. Also, this combination allows researchers to confirm the validity of the outcomes of their research.

In the focus of the questionnaire, there was mainly learner autonomy (see Appendix 1). The students had to answer my questions using a Likert Scale, finish sentences by choosing one or more of the endings provided, and they also had to give reasons why e-learning might be beneficial.

During the experimental teaching, which I implemented myself, I relied on the Duolingo website, and the lessons had two foci: one was to deal with technical issues such as joining an online group, and the other one was to engage students in the use of Duolingo. The experimental teaching lasted for two weeks, including four lessons dedicated to an introduction, a presentation and a discussion of how to use Duolingo. There were some technical problems to solve as well. The students had to complete tasks outside the school that I had assigned them via the Educator's page of Duolingo. Although the website allowed me to assign all of the topics, due to technical problems, I was able to set certain goals, but not much more, e.g. to earn 50 XP (experience points). To set homework and follow students' progress, I also used this website. There are five different functions on this website. The first one is to follow students' progress. The students who joined the group can be listed by their names. In this case, every student has a name card with their XPs and three numbers representing how many assignments the students completed in time and after the deadline and how many they missed. Besides, educators can obtain information about students' activities: on how many days they were active, how many lessons they have learnt, how far in the course the students have progressed and how many points they have earned. Thirdly, progress in the course can be listed according to students and units, with visual representation for educators to check whether certain topics are covered by the students or not. Thus, this webpage also enabled me to follow students' progress and see which students completed the tasks on time/after the deadline and which ones did not do anything at all. At the weekend and in the autumn break, the number of active students increased, but in the meantime, just a few of them completed the exercises I had set for them.

The pre-designed exercises available on the website focused on vocabulary and grammar topics suitable for their own level of English. Students were given homework with deadlines and as a Duolingo Educator I could have my own webpage. After the experiment, I set tasks to them and my webpage still shows how students accomplish all the tasks. In addition to setting tasks, my Educator site provides information about the progress in their English studies on Duolingo, in others words, on which days the students completed tasks and how many points they collected. During this phase of my research, I also asked the participants' EFL teacher to fill in an observation sheet to give reflective thoughts about the lessons. Furthermore, I also relied on informal discussions between the teacher and me, and my own reflections provided useful data as well.

After the experimental teaching, I conducted semi-structured interviews with the EFL teacher who observed the whole experiment and a group of students to let them reflect on the whole process. The EFL teacher is the group's form teacher at the same time, however, she had little knowledge about the students as she had been teaching them for couple of months only at that time.

5. Results and discussion

The results of the questionnaire suggest that the students were autonomous to some extent before the experiment because they showed limited awareness of their English language knowledge. Moreover, they seemed to lack control and responsibility with regard to their learning process, with most of them preferring teacher-directed learning. The students' progress on Duolingo and the findings from the interviews support the idea that these students were overburdened and lacked time to do the tasks on time. Since students attend drama specialisation, they have extra drama lessons in the afternoon which take most of their free time. They also lack certain skills such as selecting proper learner strategies that might help them become more autonomous, as they had only attended high school for three months when I started my experiment with them. As far as these circumstances are concerned, there had not been so many opportunities for the students to manage their own language learning. They would need their EFL teacher's training and support in order to gradually become more independent.

Analysis of the data suggests that Duolingo's gamified elements did not engage the students effectively. The interviewed students, as users of the website, pointed out several problematic elements: failing to complete the tasks precisely, they had become frustrated about earning points and checking their current performance and progress. The students could follow their progression on their own with the help of the performance graph built-in Duolingo. Although it should have shown how well the student can remember the words and grammar structures from that particular lesson, it was strongly affected by the time passing by. The algorithm that calculated this value could not precisely reflect on the real performance; therefore, it could not show the real knowledge of the students - that was reported by the students as well - thus it was also demotivating for them. Moreover, Duolingo offers very few badges, the tasks including translation are without context and there are no possibilities for the teacher to intervene in the tasks to adjust them to the needs of the learners. However, the students did not take all the opportunities made available to them by Duolingo; they just completed the tasks that I had set for them, which might also be due to the low level of autonomy. The students reported that they stopped completing the tasks after the experimental teaching.

On the other hand, there was a considerable contrast between the views of the EFL teacher and those of the students interviewed on the use of Duolingo in the EFL classroom. The EFL teacher was ready to employ Duolingo as a source for homework

for each of her beginner/elementary groups. However, the students interviewed, who were almost complete beginners, refused to use Duolingo to learn English on their own. One reason for this might be that although the website was new for the students, it did not provide further enjoyable features, only the same tasks all the time. There were several gamified elements that did not motivate the students either extrinsically or intrinsically. For example, the badge system offers only a few rewards (double or nothing, timed practice and bonus skill), which provide nothing more than practice. Failing to complete the tasks precisely, the students had become frustrated.

Although the teacher reinforced my instructions, it was not compulsory for the students to do the exercises; thus, they may not have taken the whole learning process as seriously as their school studies. Moreover, the students insisted on refreshing their knowledge by practising several units provided by the website, and thus they did not make any progress. Although repetition helps them to remember the grammar structures and words better, the students did not recognise that making progress might be more beneficial than repeating the same tasks in each case.

In summary, I would like to return to my research questions:

(1) To what extent are the participating high school students autonomous?

What I can deduce from my results is that students showed some signs of autonomy. I worked with 9th graders who had just entered high school; therefore, it might not be surprising that they need to develop further to become more conscious language learners. It may be natural that the teacher would like to direct students at the beginning. However, it can be beneficial to allow students to make some of their own decisions or invite students to choose from alternatives in order to support learner autonomy. In this way, students might later become independent language learners who can self-manage and self-monitor their own work.

(2) Can Duolingo be part of gamification?

It seems that this website does not engage learners in the long term. There may be a need for modifications in order to adjust the website to the needs of learners. There are some game elements, such as a few badges, a performance graph, leaderboards, restarting the task and immediate feedback, but they are not enough to stimulate competition and increase motivation in the long run. Students easily became demotivated when the lessons were no longer concerned with using Duolingo. To avoid this, there may be a greater need to link Duolingo lessons with classroom activities, such as creating competition among students, who can receive points monthly/weekly and be rewarded accordingly.

(3) To what extent can Duolingo promote learner autonomy?

It seems possible to use Duolingo as a supplementary tool besides lessons, yet careful preparations may be essential to maintain student motivation. For instance, every completed set of tasks may be worth an extra point in the teacher's grading system. Duolingo is not sufficiently motivating to encourage students to learn on their own; therefore, teachers should consider if it is possible to integrate Duolingo into the course. Eventually, more research would be needed to answer this question.

(4) How can Duolingo promote learner autonomy?

There are certain elements (setting goals, units with explanation and tests, and following one's own progress) which enable students to learn on their own. Nonetheless, careful pedagogical preparation and planning would be needed and maybe longer experimentation on the lessons in order to help students deal with the problems ahead.

6. Conclusion and directions for further research

The aim of this research project was to investigate the relationship between gamification in the form of Duolingo and the enhancement of learner autonomy in secondary school. In this study, a pre-experiment learner questionnaire and experimental teaching, including classroom observation and follow-up interviews with the learners and their EFL teacher, were applied.

One of my hypotheses can be accepted, namely that Duolingo can be part of gamification in learning English, because the game elements are an integrated part of Duolingo and learning takes place when the different tasks are completed as well. However, these elements and the game environment might not be well-designed enough to be entirely enjoyable for users and to hold students' attention constantly. The reward system should be reconsidered in order to be able to engage students more.

My second hypothesis, however, can only be partly accepted. Although Duolingo can contribute to the increase in the level of learner autonomy within the context of EFL, in this case, the students tended not to use the website on their own, thus they did not make use of the functions of Duolingo that could have helped them to become more autonomous. Duolingo has elements which might enable students to develop their autonomy, but students did not seize the chances to manage their own learning. However, students might be affected by other factors apart from using Duolingo, which can also decrease or increase their level of autonomy. Therefore, it is difficult to assume a direct link between using Duolingo and promoting learner autonomy. Consequently, it would be beneficial to alter the reward system of the website to the needs of learners.

At this point, it seems that more research is needed on the influence of gamification, including Duolingo, on learner autonomy. Connecting Duolingo topics directly to the lessons with the help of the teacher might be a good idea, as well as

asking her to actively participate in experimental teaching. Another approach may be to integrate Duolingo into the lessons and gradually allow students to use it on their own at home. Teacher control would thus slowly shift towards student control. These pedagogical preparations might help students to make use of Duolingo's gamified elements, which can promote learner autonomy as well.

References

Bajrami, L. (2015). Teacher's new role in language learning and in promoting learner autonomy. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *199*, 423–427.

Bhattacharya, A., & Chauhan, K. (2010). Augmenting learner autonomy through blogging. *ELT Journal*, *64*(1), 376–384.

Benson, P. (2013). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. London: Pearson Education Limited.

Dafei, D. (2007). An exploration of the relationship between learner autonomy and English proficiency. *Asian EFL Journal. Professional Teaching Articles,* 2–23.

Deterding, S., Dixon, D., Khaled, R., & Nacke, L. (2011). From game design elements to gamefulness: defining "gamification". In: Paper presented at the *Proceedings of the 15th International Academic MindTrek Conference.* Envisioning Future Media Environments. Retrieved 20 December 2016 from: http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=2181037.2181040

Domínguez, A., Saenz-de-Navarrete, J., de-Marcos, L, Fernández-Sanz , L, Pagés, C., & Martínez-Herráiz, J. (2013). Gamifying learning experiences: Practical implications and outcomes. *Computers & Education, 63*, 380–392.

Dörnyei, Z. (2002). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration and processing.* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Figura, K., & Jarvis, H. (2007). Computer-Based Materials: A Study of Learner Autonomy and Strategies. System: *An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics, 35*(4), 448–468.

Kiryakova, G., Angelova, N., & Yordanova, L. (2014). Gamification in education. In.: *Proceedings of 9th International Balkan Education and Science Conference*. Retrieved 02 January 2017 from: http://dspace.uni-sz.bg/bitstream/123456789/12/1/293-Kiryakova.pdf

Legenhausen, L. (2009). Autonomous language learning. In K. Knapp, B. & Seidholfer (Eds.), *Handbook of foreign language communication and learning* (pp. 373–400). Berlin: Mouton DeGruyter.

Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System, 23*(2), 175–182.

Little, D. (2015). *Learner Autonomy and Second/Foreign Language Learning*. LLAS Centre for Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies, University of Southampton, Southampton. Retrieved 20 December 2016 from: https://www.llas.ac.uk/resources/gpg/1409#ref2

Magnuson, P. (2014). *Teaching with Duolingo*. Retrieved 21 December 2016 from: https://www.las.ch/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/teachingwithduolingo.pdf

Munday, P. (2016). The case for using Duolingo as part of the language classroom experience. *RIED. Revista iberoamericana de educación a distancia*, *16*(1), 83–101.

Thanasoulas, D. (2000). What is learner autonomy and how can it be fostered? *The Internet TESL Journal, 11*(6). Retrieved 20 December 2016 from: http://iteslj.org/Articles/Thanasoulas-Autonomy.html

Yagcioglu, O. (2015). New approaches on learner autonomy in language learning. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 199*, 428–435.

Appendix 1 – Student questionnaire

I. Read the statements and decide how often they are true for you. According to this, circle one number besides each statement.
1 never   2 monthly
3 weekly   4 daily

1. I preview before the class.1 2 3 4
2. I make self-exam before test-writing.1 2 3 4
3. I believe I can finish my task in time.1 2 3 4
4. I plan how I learn English.1 2 3 4
5. I reward myself such as buying chocolate etc.when I make progress.1 2 3 4
6. I make good use of my free time in English study.1 2 3 4
7. I attend out-class activities to practise and learn the language, e.g.: private lessons, courses.1 2 3 4
8. During the class, I try to catch chances to take part in activities such as pair/group discussion, etc.1 2 3 4
9. I know my strengths and weaknesses in my English study.1 2 3 4
10. I know what kind of tasks are hard and what kind of tasks are easy for me.1 2 3 4
11. I think I have the ability to learn English well.1 2 3 4
12. I believe I am confident English learner.1 2 3 4
13. I also learn English on the computer/internet.1 2 3 4

II. Please, finish the statements with those endings which are mostly true. Circle the letter(s) before the appropriate statements. More than one letter can be marked.

14. When the teacher asks questions for us to answer, I would mostly like to…
A. wait for others' answers.
B. think and ready to answer.
C. look up the answer on the web/ in a book.
D. discuss the answer with others.

15. When I meet a word I don't know, I mainly…
A. let it go.
B. ask others about the meaning.
C. guess the meaning based on the context.
D. look it up in the dictionary.

16. When I make mistakes in study, I'd usually like …
A. the teacher to correct.
B. the classmates to correct.
C. to correct with the help of the book.
D. to correct based on a key.

17. I usually use materials selected…
A. only by the teacher.
B. mostly by the teacher.
C. by myself together with the teacher.
D. by myself.

18. I think my success or failure in English study is mainly due to…
A. luck or fate.
B. the strategy I use.
C. the teachers.
D. myself.

19. As for my English studies, it is true that…
A. I use applications on my smartphone/tablet/ PC which I can learning English with.
B. I play computer/online games in English.
C. I browse English web pages.
D. I search for English teaching websites.

III. In your opinion, is it useful to learn English with the help of your PC/ tablet/ smartphone? Underline one answer, please.
YES NO DON'T KNOW

Give your reasons and opinion about this question briefly, in 2-3 sentences:

SZEMLE
REVIEWS AND REPORTS

Book review

James Dean Brown: Mixed Methods Research for TESOL. (2014). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Erzsébet Balogh

University of Szeged, Hungary

Brown (2014) is a volume of a series of textbooks (Edinburgh Textbooks in TESOL) providing guidance for students, teachers and instructors in major areas within Teaching English as a Second Language. The book aims to familiarize the reader with the theoretical and practical concepts of quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods research (MMR) by investigating how and to what extent these methods can be employed in research related to English language teaching.

Each main section of the book, *Getting Research Started*, *Analyzing Research Data*, and *Presenting Research Studies*, is divided into three subsections whose structure is unified. That is, in each subsection, the author first briefly introduces the key points that are later described and elaborated on in detail. Several tasks, i.e. questions that make the reader think about what they have read or assignments to be completed with the data at hand, are included throughout the individual subsections to help to understand the theoretical explanation or background information presented by the author. Also, these tasks provide the reader with the opportunity to process and deepen the acquired knowledge in different ways. Furthermore, with the exception of the very first one, each subsection consists of a *Guided Reading* part, in which the author offers a detailed presentation, quasi in the form of an annotated bibliography, of two research articles that are related to the given topic. Each subsection also includes a *Conclusion* part in which the author summarizes the main points of the subsection in a table where each main point is supplemented with associated questions that the reader needs to ask when dealing with the issue in question. Finally, each subsection ends with the author's recommendation for further reading.

The first section, entitled *Getting Research Started*, consists of three subsections which are the following: a) *Introduction to Research*, b) *Starting Research Projects*, and c) *Gathering, Compiling, and Coding Data*. The main focus of the first subsection is the types of research methodology that exist today in TESOL research. Beside the quantitative−qualitative dichotomy, MMR that is best applied when one wants to investigate issues from multiple viewpoints is introduced. This subsection helps the reader to understand what methodology ought to be used with different types of research. The aim of the second subsection is to describe the process of how to start a

research project. The first important task is to design an outline of the project, then to choose the suitable methodology for it, and to formulate good research questions. This subsection guides the reader through handling these issues before starting to do research. The question of triangulation appears in this subsection, too, whereby the author presents the misconceptions, as well as the criticism connected to this concept. The third subsection, as its title suggests, deals with data gathering, data compiling, and data coding. The author separates quantitative, qualitative, and MMR data, describing the potential advantages and disadvantages of each type of data. The subsection also explains what variables and constructs are and how to operationalize them by measuring them with scores.

The second section, *Analyzing Research Data*, is a practical chapter leading the reader through the process of data analysis concerning quantitative data (first subsection, entitled *Analyzing Quantitative Data*), qualitative data (second subsection, entitled *Analyzing Qualitative Data*) as well as MMR data (third subsection, entitled *Analyzing MMR Data*). Concerning quantitative data, the author explains how to calculate and interpret descriptive and correlational statistics in Excel using spreadsheets with real data. As far as qualitative data are concerned, six types of matrixes as tools for qualitative data analysis are presented. Also, the steps one needs to follow when analyzing qualitative data are outlined and described in detail. As for MMR data, the most important point the subsection makes is drawing attention to the fact that MMR does not simply combine quantitative and qualitative data and analyze them accordingly, but it offers strategic techniques or guidelines that guarantee that data collected with mixed methods provides more extensive and far-reaching results than either quantitative, or qualitative research, or the two combined.

In the third section, *Presenting Research Studies*, the author collects a great deal of useful information about what to do when one has finished data collection and analysis. In the first subsection, *Presenting Research Results*, how to present the results of a study in tables and figures is described step by step. After the thorough description, the reader is also advised what to do and what not to do when they want to organize data presentation. In the second subsection, *Writing Research Reports*, the various types of papers, for example, research reports, articles, theses, and dissertations, are outlined from which the reader can choose the most suitable to publish their results. In addition, the author reports on his own experience and strategies that have helped him to overcome difficulties in writing or even writer's block. The third subsection, *Disseminating Research*, talks about the importance of doing and then publishing research. Beside the three subsections, this section contains the Conclusion part which is the closing and summarizing chapter of the whole book. Several important issues are mentioned here by the author, including a section on how the field of TESOL research has expanded in the past years, the different topics one could investigate in the field, research ethics one needs to consider when conducting research, the difficulties that

arise from the different (native vs. non-native) research cultures, the issue of plagiarism as well as the future of TESOL research and its methodology.

The textbook is suitable for students, teachers and instructors whose aim is to gain a general picture of how to conduct research in the field of TESOL, starting from formulating their research questions, through choosing the most appropriate data collection and data analysis methods, to the writing up and disseminating their results. The book fulfills this purpose by presenting the issues logically and perspicuously, with a structure and a language that are both easy to follow. It introduces the topic starting from the foundations; therefore, reading the book requires no previous knowledge or expertise in the field. An additional asset of the book is that whenever a new term is introduced, the author immediately provides not only a definition of the term, but also references for further reading. However, despite the author's attempt to provide a thorough description of research methodological issues as well as ample examples and tasks that enable the reader to see the application possibilities of the methodologies, the level of the book remains rather elementary. For example, even though several excellent and more sophisticated statistical programs exist, such as SPSS or Statistica, some versions of which are even available free of charge, the author explains the calculation of t-tests with actual mathematical equations on paper, or, in another case, shows some statistical data analysis only with the help of Excel tables. Moreover, as a lot of tasks are inserted between the main bodies of the texts and usually marked with the same headings as the actual heading of the different parts, the whole reading process is often interrupted and the reader tends to become rather distracted by these intermissions. Finally, as the textbook has originally been designed for coursework, it is not really suitable for self-study.

I recommend this volume for those who would like to gain an insight into valuable current research methodological practices within the field of TESOL. I believe students in a course on research methodology or in-practice teachers who would like to conduct research in the classroom can all benefit from reading it as the book leads the reader through the difficulties of investigations from the beginning to the very end. Also, I recommend the textbook for those who are interested in learning more about mixed methods research and who would like to understand why and how MMR is (or should be) different from or more than the multiple research methods studies which are generally employed in TESOL. Therefore, the textbook provides invaluable assistance in understanding MMR and its practical application in TESOL research.

Szerzőink/Authors

Tünde Bajzát is an associate professor at the Language Teaching Centre of Miskolc University, Hungary. She holds a PhD in Applied Linguistics from the University of Pécs, Hungary. She has taken part in several national and international conferences in Hungary and abroad in Belgium, China, Finland, Italy, Lithuania, Malaysia, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, South Africa, South Korea and the USA. She has published several articles and book reviews in international journals, conference booklets and online in Hungary and worldwide. Her research interest includes language use at the workplace, intercultural communication, developing intercultural competence and foreign language teaching, learning and acquisition.

Erzsébet Balogh is a teaching assistant at the Department of English Language Teacher Education and Applied Linguistics (ELTEAL) of the University of Szeged. She completed her PhD in English Applied Linguistics in 2014. Her research focuses on sociolinguistics and language attitudes, more specifically, she is interested in investigating non-English speakers' attitudes towards English accent varieties.

Lilla Bende is a final year MA in TEFL student at Pázmány Péter Catholic University. She successfully participated in the 2017 OTDK (the national scholarly paper competition) with her research project on the relationship between autonomous learning and Duolingo, for which she received a special award.

Javier Furus was born in 1994 in Orosháza, Hungary. He graduated from the University of Szeged (Institute of English and American Studies) and he is currently a graduate student of the Masters in International Relations program at the same university. He wrote his BA thesis on multilingualism, analysing the speech of a multilingual child named Clau, aiming to find a system behind the speech production of multilingual speakers. His fields of interest are multilingualism, international relations and diplomacy.

Francis J. Prescott studied English at the University of St Andrews in Scotland, graduating with an MA degree in 1988. In 1993 he received a PGCE in English from the University of Heriot Watt. He has been teaching English ever since, first of all in secondary schools in Edinburgh, and then as a lector at Eötvös Loránd University and currently as a senior lecturer in the English Department at Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church, Budapest. He completed his PhD in Language Pedagogy in June 2014, focusing on the experience of first-year students learning to write at university. From 2011 to 2017 he was on the organising committee of IATEFL-Hungary and he has also represented IATEFL-Hungary in the Cooperation and Innovation in Teachers'

Associations (CITA) Erasmus+ Project (2014-2016). He is interested in learner autonomy, group dynamics, using drama in the language classroom and teaching writing skills.