

Gábor Szabó & Marianne Nikolov

**“More playful tasks”:
An analysis of secondary-school students’ responses to a
questionnaire on their needs**

Abstract

This paper analyzes the answers collected with the help of an online questionnaire to explore the needs of students learning English and German at seven secondary schools. A top-down project (EFOP-3.2.14-17) aimed to enhance students’ proficiency in English and German by inviting experts at Hungarian universities training pre-service teachers of English and German to design innovative and motivating courses for schools teaching disadvantaged students. The underlying assumption was that young pre-service teachers close in age to the target population would be able to boost and maintain students’ language learning motivation by applying non-traditional tasks in free extra classes. To tap into students’ needs at the participating schools, a questionnaire was designed and filled in by a total of 114 learners of English (55) and German (59). The first part of the paper places the project in context by describing the language teaching situation in Hungary and the main ideas underlying the project. The second part presents the findings about the respondents’ language learning background, their attitudes and motivation. It analyzes students’ responses to open questions: what types of tasks they like, dislike and would appreciate in a new course. Finally, limitations and the way forward are outlined.

Keywords: students’ language learning background, motivation, goals, liked and disliked classroom activities in English and German

1 Introduction

The aim of this paper is to offer insights into the results of a survey conducted with 114 students learning English and German at seven secondary schools in the Southern part of Hungary. The first part outlines the background to the study by drawing on the language pedagogy literature. It also describes the rationale of a longitudinal project initiated by language policy decision-makers to improve disadvantaged secondary-school students’ proficiency in foreign languages. The second part details the research questions the study aims to answer, presents the participants, the data collection instrument and the procedure. It analyzes and discusses the answers obtained in the survey by using mixed methods. The last part outlines the main lessons learnt, the limitations and how the survey could lead to more valid and reliable answers.

2 The language teaching and learning situation in Hungary

The efficiency of teaching and learning of foreign languages (FL) has been a recurring theme of discussions in Hungary since the change of regime at the end of the 1980s. Although over the last three decades Hungarians have had many opportunities to improve their proficiency in FLs, the ratio of citizens speaking a FL is still modest. Two recent Eurobarometer surveys (2006, 2012) indicate growth in the numbers: in 2006, 29% of Hungarians stated that they were able to have a conversation in a FL, whereas in 2012, 35% said so. The increase is significant; however, it was still the lowest indicator in the EU. Compared to the minimum nine years students spend learning a FL, it is highly problematic that two out of three Hungarians claim that they speak no other language than their mother tongue. This result, however, has to be taken with a pinch of salt. All survey data are based on self-reports and they may reflect Hungarian respondents' low self-esteem as FL users rather than a valid picture of what they can do in a FL.

Recent papers have synthesized research on what the reasons may be (Medgyes & Nikolov 2014, Nikolov 2007, 2011). This short summary is based on the findings. Hungarians' attitudes and motivation to learn and use foreign languages in general have been positive over the past years. English has been perceived as the most important world language offering opportunities to access popular culture, science, mobility, new jobs; therefore, a must have skill. German has been the regional FL making it possible to find jobs in the European Union, but less attractive than English. Language policy and language choice have played controversial roles. One FL is mandatory for all students from grade 4 (age 9); students at grammar schools are expected to learn two FLs from age 15. Although curricula and policy documents state that students are free to choose which FL they learn, schools have struggled to offer enough English classes. Therefore, many students have been demotivated by being placed in German classes.

Schools may decide to launch earlier programs (from age 6), intensive courses (weekly FL classes range between 2 and 6) and dual-language programs teaching curricular subjects in the target language. Parents who want to make sure that their offspring can speak good English plus another FL at the end of their public education choose schools with better quality intensive programs. As a result, in many villages German is the only language taught, and English is more typically available to all students in towns and cities.

Schools stream students according to their abilities and achievements; more able learners are placed in the more intensive FL classes and their disadvantaged peers tend to learn in fewer weekly classes. The educational system, unfortunately, fails to compensate for the differences students bring to schools. Socio-economic status is the strongest predictor of success in schools.

As a result of these trends, achievements in English have been consistently higher at all levels of public education than in German. In addition to this, few students learn a second FL and they tend to learn either English or German, or another European language. Although some students graduate from secondary schools with advanced-level (C1) proficiency in one or two FLs, the majority of Hungarian students fails to achieve communicative competence at B2 level.

A number of projects initiated by decision-makers have aimed at improving the FL learning situation. One of them, for example, the year of intensive language learning, inserted a full academic year devoted to teaching one or two FLs in year nine in 12 to 18 classes a week.

The program is still functional, although it has not come up to expectations (Nikolov, Ottó & Öveges 2009).

Large-scale national projects have examined how English and German are taught in schools, how learners' individual differences and contextual factors impact students' proficiency over time. Findings show large significant differences in the level students achieve with learners of English systematically outperforming their peers learning German. The reasons are related to streaming practices and learners' motivation rather than the way the two languages are taught. Although language policy documents recommend communicative language teaching techniques, and good practice is documented in studies, surveys involving representative samples have found that teachers of both English and German frequently apply techniques of the grammar-translation method in a frontal lock-step fashion rather than meaning-focused communicative tasks in pairs or small groups. Students prefer interactive speaking tasks, role plays, real-life-like and playful activities; but these are the least frequent (Nikolov 2007, 2011).

Research on teachers indicates that they complain about demotivated students and argue for more classes and streaming; however, more time devoted to language teaching does not automatically improve students' attitudes, motivation and proficiency and many students, for example at vocational schools, are left behind over the years (Nikolov, Ottó & Öveges 2008). Research on language teachers' beliefs has revealed that many teachers assume that boring drills and focus on rules is a prerequisite of meaning-focused tasks or content teaching which cannot be applied below a certain level (Nikolov et al. 2008).

This is the overall context in which the present study is embedded. A recent language policy initiative serves as the framework of the project designed and coordinated at the University of Pécs. A top-down project, EFOP-3.2.14-17,¹ aimed to enhance disadvantaged students' motivation and proficiency in English and in German so that they could pass their school-leaving examinations at the intermediate (B1) and advanced (B2) levels. Experts at Hungarian universities training pre-service teachers of English and German were invited to apply for funding. They were expected to design short, innovative and motivating courses in English and German and to collaborate with schools teaching disadvantaged learners. The underlying assumption was that innovation would come from language pedagogy experts who would design courses at beginner, intermediate and advanced levels using "experiential learning principles" (Kohonen, Jaatinen, Kaikkonen & Lehtovaara 2001). The term, which is rarely used in the literature on language teaching methodology, refers to principled communicative and task-based language teaching integrating intrinsically motivating activities with a focus on language in use.

The motivating courses for disadvantaged language learners are to be taught by pre-service teachers who are closer in age to the target groups than their FL teachers. The underlying assumption in project documents is that novice teachers would be able to successfully boost and maintain students' language learning motivation by applying non-traditional tasks in extra classes. During the teaching of the course, pre-service teachers are mentored by the students' FL teacher in addition to getting on-going support in university seminars. At the time of writing this text it is not known how many would-be teachers volunteer to participate in the implementation of the project and how they can cope with the challenges. Overall, over 2,000 secondary-school students of English and German are expected to participate in the project in three years.

¹ See call at <https://www.palyazat.gov.hu/efop-3214-17-nyelvtanulssal-a-boldogulsrt-1>

As a first step of implementing the project, students at seven schools volunteering to participate in the program were asked to allow us to gain insights into who they were, what their needs and preferences were so that the findings could serve as a baseline for designing new courses. This paper gives an account of the first cohort's results.

3 The study

This part of the paper presents the research methodology of the empirical study involving 114 students. It discusses the findings of the first phase of data collection at the beginning of the three-year project.

3.1 Research questions

The survey aimed to find answers to the following research questions:

- 1) What is the participants' language learning background like prior to applying to the free program?
- 2) How do students assess their English or German skills?
- 3) What motives characterize them?
- 4) How often do they use English and German and for what purposes?
- 5) What are their beliefs like about their aptitude and language learning?
- 6) What tasks do they like in their English and German classes?
- 7) What tasks do they dislike?
- 8) What would they like to do in the extra English and German sessions?
- 9) How many respondents would like to participate in the free English and German program?

3.2 Participants

A total of 114 students were involved in the present study. They were the very first cohort in the longitudinal project expecting to develop over 2,000 students' proficiency in English and German. Table 1 presents basic information on the participants.

Number of participating schools	7
Number of participants	114
Males	54
Females	60
Year 9 students	31
Year 10 students	49
Year 11 students	9
Year 12 students	25
Grammar school (gimnázium) students	40
Comprehensive school (szakgimnázium) students	50
Vocational school (szakközépiskola) students	24

Table 1. Basic information on participants

As can be seen, participants are roughly evenly distributed in terms of gender. Concerning what year they attend, year 10 students dominate this sample, and year 11 students appear to be underrepresented. It is worth noting the fact that altogether 80 participants, the bulk of the population, attend the first two years of secondary school. The significance of this, potentially, is that these students are likely to spend at least two more years at school, so their preferences concerning future language education may signal a higher degree of interest in the topic. Concerning school types, it may be of significance to point out that vocational school students form barely more than 20% of the population, although the program was meant for disadvantaged language learners and students at vocational schools tend to be more disadvantaged than their peers at other types of institutions. Since it is not clear how schools invited participants and how many of them filling in the questionnaire could be identified as disadvantaged, this point is not considered further.

3.3 The online questionnaire for learners of English and German

The questionnaire had two versions: one for learners of English and one for students learning German. All items were the same, but references to the foreign language were English or German, respectively. The questionnaire was in Hungarian to avoid misunderstandings and inducing anxiety.

The first section asked for background data: name of school, respondents' gender, year of study (between 9 and 13), and what type of school curriculum they followed. Their language learning background was explored by questions on which languages they learnt in how many weekly lessons at the time of filling in the answers, and how many years they had studied foreign languages. They were asked if the level of the English or German class they were in was too easy, just right or too difficult for them. Three items inquired into the level of proficiency in the family (father, mother, siblings); one item asked about out of school language learning. The last question on the background invited students to state their goals they set for the end of their secondary school studies.

In the second section, 41 items elicited data on statements on a 1 to 4 Likert scale. Respondents were first asked about their self-assessment by stating, for example, how well they were able to comprehend texts, speech, and movies in English or German. The next 13 items focused on students' motivation: the reasons why they learnt English or German: for example, "I study English/German, because it is useful outside of school"; "it is hard to manage without it"; "I'll be able to use it as an adult". The next ten statements asked students how frequently they did certain activities in English or German: e.g., search the internet, watch movies without subtitles; play computer games. The last eight items included statements about students' aptitude and beliefs: for example, "I learn English/German with ease"; "I enjoy guessing meanings of words"; "it is up to me how well I'll learn English/German". The whole questionnaire (the version for English in Hungarian) is included in the Appendix.

The third section asked for information on what the students found enjoyable and what they disliked in their English or German classes; they were to write three answers to these two questions. Then, they were invited to give five ideas on what they would like to do in the sessions offered by university students.

Finally, students were asked to indicate if they were willing to participate in a free 12-week long course of sessions once a week or a one-week long intensive summer course (both a total of 24 hours).

3.4 Procedure

Data collection started by the university project manager sending a link to the online questionnaire to the seven schools in March 2018. Schools invited their students to fill it in in two weeks if they meant to participate in the program. The rubrics framed the questionnaire as part of a three-year project for students at the target schools. Respondents were asked to answer the questions to allow materials designers to find out about their background, what they found useful and enjoyable in their foreign language classes and in their free time in order to improve their proficiency and to prepare for their school-leaving exams. The original idea was to invite all respondents to give their names; however, the project management decided not to do so, assuming that students would be reluctant to fill in the questionnaire or give honest answers. Although it is not possible to link data in the survey with students' later feedback on the program, their responses were expected to offer useful information for materials designers to understand students' needs and preferences.

The closed items were analyzed with the help of SPSS version 25; means and standard deviations were calculated for Likert scale items. Students' responses to eleven open items were analyzed qualitatively. First, both researchers looked at all answers independently to identify emerging patterns. Then, they agreed on nine larger categories for coding the dataset. During the coding process further categories were identified; thus, the liked and disliked classroom activities were finally grouped into 14 categories. The same number of categories emerged in the answers to the question on what tasks they would welcome in the extra sessions. Two categories were different in the last dataset: comments on classroom management and on teachers were substituted by innovative tasks and no suggestion at all. Some of the categories in all three datasets were further divided into subcategories.

3.4 Results and discussion

The findings are presented in the sequence of the research questions and the emerging issues are discussed after analyzing the larger themes. As a starting point, the sample size (114) was small, especially in comparison with the targeted 2,000+ participants (about 5%). Due to the small convenience sample none of the findings can be generalized, as they characterize the respondents but not others at their schools or at other schools. A further difficulty was posed by the issue of the validity of responses. As it turned out during the analysis, some of the respondents clearly did not take the questionnaire seriously and thus invalidated their own responses. Besides the obvious cases, however, it remains unclear what proportion of the responses may similarly be invalid. Although the sample is not representative of the larger student population, tentative conclusions are drawn, and comparisons are made between the participating groups of students learning English and German at the seven schools.

3.4.1 What is the participants' language learning background like prior to applying to the free program?

Students were asked to fill in data on their language learning histories at and outside school, and to indicate their goals for the end of their secondary-school studies. Tables 2-7 comprise data for English learners, and Tables 8-13 for German learners. The numbers in Tables 2 and 8 indicate how many weekly classes students participated in and which languages they learnt. The most typical frequency in both groups is 3-4 hours a week; more German learners study

in more intensive courses; the number students in low exposure groups is the same (8), and very few students learn a third language (a total of 5).

	1-2 hours a week	3-4 hours a week	5-6 hours a week
English	8	45	2
German		9	2
Spanish		2	
Italian		1	

Table 2. Foreign languages learnt in the English group

	Less than 1 year	1-2 years	3-4 years	5-6 years	7-8 years	Over 8 years
English	1	6	10	15	12	11
German	1	1		1	2	7
Spanish	2					
Italian				1		

Table 3. Time spent learning foreign languages in the English group

Just the right level	33
Too low	17
Too high	5

Table 4. Current level of learning English

	English			German			Other			none
	begin- ner	inter- mediate	advanced	begin- ner	inter- mediate	advanced	begin- ner	inter- mediate	advanced	
Mother	12	10		6	8	3	10	5	3	17
Father	10	6	4	11	3	1	15	3	5	21
Sibling(s)	15	11	14	6	9	5	1	2	3	11

Table 5. Family members' foreign language proficiency in the English group

	English	German	Other
Languages learnt outside school	21	2	34

Table 6. Languages learnt outside school in the English group

Advanced level school-leaving exam	11
Intermediate level school-leaving exam	27
Good grade in English	9
Ability to use English in one's profession	16

Table 7. Purpose of studying English by the end of secondary school

Gábor Szabó & Marianne Nikolov:
“More playful tasks”: An analysis of secondary-school students’ responses to a questionnaire on their needs
Argumentum 15 (2019), 344-378
Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó

	1-2 hours a week	3-4 hours a week	5-6 hours a week
English	1	20	3
German	7	37	14
Italian		2	

Table 8. Foreign languages learnt in the German group

As for how many years participants have learnt foreign languages, Tables 3 and 9 show how unevenly the numbers are distributed. The numbers of English learners are similarly distributed in the 3-4 to over 8 years categories, whereas the majority (38 respondents) have learnt German over 8 years. Also, 24 students in the German group have learnt English and Italian, including 6 students with over 8 years of history of English studies, whereas only 12 students in the English group have learnt a third language.

Both groups indicated how well tuned they thought the classes were to their current needs:

	Less than 1 year	1-2 years	3-4 years	5-6 years	7-8 years	Over 8 years
English	4	2	7	5		6
German		5	5	3	7	38
Italian	2					

Table 9. Time spent learning foreign languages in the German group

Just the right level	50
Too low	7
Too high	2

Table 10. Current level of learning German

	English			German			Other			none
	begin- ner	inter- mediate	advanced	begin- ner	inter- mediate	advanced	begin- ner	Inter- mediate	advanced	
Mother	8	7	1	12	6	4	15	7	1	20
Father	9	6	2	13	8	4	13	4	2	21
Sibling(s)	9	12	7	15	22	5	2	1	1	8

Table 11. Family members’ foreign language proficiency in the German group

	English	German	Other
Languages learnt outside school	5	15	42

Table 12. Languages learnt outside school in the German group

Advanced level school-leaving exam	11
Intermediate level school-leaving exam	32
Good grade in German	12
Ability to use German in one's profession	17

Table 13. Purpose of studying German by the end of secondary school

Tables 4 and 10 indicate that the vast majority (50) in the German group marked just the right level, and only 7 found the level too low and 2 too challenging. The distributions in the English group show a less favorable picture: 33 students feel their courses are tuned to their level, 17 indicate that the level is below their current proficiency and 5 find the classes too demanding.

Participants were invited to mark what languages their parents and sibling(s) could use (English, German and other languages) and at what proficiency level. Their responses are shown in Tables 5 and 11. The numbers on parents tend to be somewhat lower than those on siblings, indicating that the younger generation's data are better than those of their parents. In both groups of learners in all languages beginner and intermediate levels are more typical for parents and siblings than the advanced level, and quite a few family members are unable to use any foreign language.

Tables 6 and 12 comprise numbers of students learning English and German in extracurricular classes. The numbers are definitely high in both groups, which may indicate two things. On the one hand, students may feel that they need to update themselves to keep up with what is going on at school. Some of these respondents could be the ones who found their English or German classes beyond their current level. On the other hand, it may also indicate these students are highly motivated to improve their proficiency not only in the language(s) they learn at school but also in other languages. Interestingly, in the English group, 21 students attend extra English classes, two learn German and 34 study another language. In the German group, five students learn English, 15 German and 42 study a different language. The surprisingly high numbers in the third language category may show the need to go beyond English and German, but the desired language is not available at the schools we surveyed.

Tables 7 and 13 show what goals respondents set for themselves by the end of their secondary-school studies. The numbers and trends are similar in the two groups: the majority intends to pass the intermediate level school-leaving exam (English 27; German 32); eleven students aim for the advanced level examination in both groups. The numbers of students setting the ability to use English or German in their professions are 16 and 17, respectively, whereas a good grade is desired by nine and twelve students. These numbers indicate that 22 students out of the sample aim for B2 level proficiency, whereas 59 find B1 level realistic.

3.4.2 How do students assess their English or German abilities?

Tables 14 and 15 show data on how well learners of English and German think they can use their foreign language.

How well can you do these in English?					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	StDev
I understand well the texts I read	55	1.00	4.00	2.81	.86
I can express myself fluently in speech	55	1.00	4.00	2.27	.89
I understand spoken English excellently	55	1.00	4.00	2.36	.88
I can compose written texts well	55	1.00	4.00	2.63	.94
My speech is nearly free of errors	55	1.00	4.00	1.96	.85
I understand movies in English	55	1.00	4.00	2.50	1.01
I understand the words in English language music	55	1.00	4.00	2.78	.95
I can chat on the internet	55	1.00	4.00	2.67	1.01
I can handle internet-based games well	55	1.00	4.00	3.09	.98
I am good at what really interests me	55	1.00	4.00	3.38	.78
Valid N (listwise)	55				

Table 14. English learners' self-assessment data

They were asked to indicate their answers by marking to what extent the statements were not true at all or fully true for them on a 1 to 4 scale. Table 14 presents findings for English, whereas Table 15 for German.

English learners' means on the self-assessment items range from 1.96 to 3.38; the lowest mean was calculated for their correct use of oral English and the highest for their general self-assessment: how good they are at what is of real interest to them. The latter item has the lowest standard deviation in the group's dataset. Their means were higher for extracurricular authentic uses of English (movies, games, lyrics, chat) than for oral fluency and listening comprehension skills. The highest mean was found for reading comprehension among the school-based FL skills. Standard deviations indicating larger differences within the group are found for how well they understand movies and are able to chat on the internet. The means indicate the highest level of confidence about reading and writing skills, and lowest about speaking among the four skills.

How well can you do these in German?					
	N	Min	Max	M	StDev
I understand well the texts I read	59	1.00	4.00	3.00	.61
I can express myself fluently in speech	59	1.00	4.00	2.42	.79
I understand spoken German excellently	59	1.00	4.00	2.50	.75
I can compose written texts well	59	1.00	4.00	2.62	.69
My speech is nearly free of errors	59	1.00	4.00	2.10	.75
I understand movies in German	59	1.00	4.00	2.27	.82
I understand the words in German language music	59	1.00	4.00	2.27	.82
I can chat on the internet	59	1.00	4.00	2.44	.91
I can handle internet based German language games well	59	1.00	4.00	2.57	.91
I am good at what really interests me	59	1.00	4.00	3.30	.70
Valid N (listwise)	59				

Table 15. German learners' self-assessment data

Table 15 comprises results of the group learning German. The highest mean was calculated for students' general self-assessment with the lowest standard deviation in the table. The lowest mean relates to errorless speaking ability, whereas the highest mean concerns reading

comprehension in German. The means for classroom-related language skills and for authentic uses of German are similar: they range between 2.10 and 2.62. Standard deviations are lower for classroom skills than for extracurricular activities.

Comparing the two groups shows some differences between the datasets. Learners of English claim to be better at real life uses than their peers learning German. Both groups have the lowest self-assessment of their oral skills and their means indicate that they tend to estimate their fluency higher than their accuracy. These results indicate that students' speaking skills are definitely in need of improvement.

3.4.3 What motives characterize learners of English and German?

The next section of the questionnaire explored language learning motivation. Students were asked to finish the statement "I learn English/German because..." by choosing a number indicating to what extent the statements are true for them. Tables 16 and 17 comprise English and German learners' data.

In Table 16 means for utilitarian reasons are over 3 for English. This finding indicates that most students are perfectly aware that English will be usefulness for them in the future. The mean is somewhat lower for how useful English is in further studies, and even lower for work abroad. The intrinsic motive of the way English sounds and the wish to meet native speakers (indicating integrative orientation) are less attractive for the group. Parental advice seems to play a more important role than peers' recommendations. Standard deviations are quite high ranging between .90 and 1.22.

Table 17 comprises data on German learners' motivation. Respondents tend to be motivated by instrumental reasons: German will be useful in their adult life and parental support indicates the same view. The lowest mean was found for peers' recommendations to learn German. This result shows the lower prestige of German compared to English. The means on the other items are all over 2, but less than 3. In contrast with the data characterizing English learners' motivation, means tend to be lower for students learning German. The contrast is salient in the amount of interesting things found on the internet and how useful the languages are during travel.

I learn English because...					
	N	Min	Max	M	StDev
I have always wanted to learn English	55	1.00	4.00	2.83	1.08
I would like to meet native speakers of English	55	1.00	4.00	2.83	1.10
I very much like the way it sounds	55	1.00	4.00	2.72	1.04
It is also useful outside school	55	1.00	4.00	3.40	.99
I will make good use of it as an adult	55	1.00	4.00	3.20	1.11
It is hard to manage without it	55	1.00	4.00	3.01	1.09
My parents advised me and support me to learn it	55	1.00	4.00	3.20	1.00
My friends advised me to learn it	55	1.00	4.00	2.29	1.22
Many interesting things are in English on the internet	55	1.00	4.00	3.10	.95
I would not be able to pursue further studies without it	55	1.00	4.00	2.92	1.13
It is indispensable for traveling	55	1.00	4.00	3.25	.90
Everybody needs to know English today	55	1.00	4.00	3.05	.95
I wish to work abroad in future	55	1.00	4.00	2.40	1.09
Valid N (listwise)	55				

Table 16. English learners' reasons for learning the language

I learn German because...					
	N	Min	Max	M	StDev
I have always wanted to learn German	59	1.00	4.00	2.47	.95
I would like to meet native speakers of German	59	1.00	4.00	2.57	1.07
I very much like the way it sounds	59	1.00	4.00	2.44	.93
It is also useful outside school	59	1.00	4.00	3.03	.98
I will make good use of it as an adult	59	1.00	4.00	3.06	.86
It is hard to manage without it	59	1.00	4.00	2.47	.91
My parents advised me and support me to learn it	59	1.00	4.00	3.27	.84
My friends advised me to learn it	59	1.00	4.00	1.77	.92
Many interesting things are in German on the internet	59	1.00	4.00	2.05	.81
I would not be able to pursue further studies without it	59	1.00	4.00	2.66	1.10
It is indispensable for traveling	59	1.00	4.00	2.67	.87
Everybody needs to know German today	59	1.00	4.00	2.37	.84
I wish to work abroad in future	59	1.00	4.00	2.44	1.08
Valid N (listwise)	59				

Table 17. German learners' reasons for learning the language

In sum, both groups of learners are quite motivated to learn English and German and their reasons tend to be utilitarian. Respondents have long-term goals and agree that knowing English and German will be advantageous over time. Parental support is strong to motivate them to study the language. Learners of English find real-life authentic uses of the language more motivating and necessary than their peers learning German.

3.4.4 How often do they use English and German and for what purposes?

Extramural activities requiring some use of English and German were further explored by asking students to answer the question "How often do you do this in English/German?" They marked frequencies for each activity by choosing a number from four options between never and often. These items were meant to tap into motivated behavior outside the classroom.

Table 18 shows the means and standard deviations for English. The most frequent activity was listening to music; the lowest standard deviation indicates that most respondents often do so. Watching video clips was also quite frequent. The means for searching the internet to read or to find lyrics were also quite high. Respondents reported similar frequencies for watching movies without or with subtitles; however, they do so somewhat more often with Hungarian subtitles. Role play games are the least popular with the lowest mean; whereas playing computer games is quite frequent with the highest standard deviation.

How often do you...in English?					
	N	Min	Max	M	StDev
I search and read things on the internet	55	1.00	4.00	2.54	1.05
I watch movies and series without subtitles	55	1.00	4.00	2.21	1.11
I watch movies and series with English subtitles	55	1.00	4.00	2.27	1.06
I watch movies and series with Hungarian subtitles	55	1.00	4.00	2.36	1.07
I listen to music	55	1.00	4.00	3.69	.66
I watch video clips	55	1.00	4.00	3.03	1.12
I play computer games	55	1.00	4.00	2.49	1.27
I take part in RPGs	55	1.00	4.00	1.56	.87
I search the internet for lyrics	55	1.00	4.00	2.78	1.11
I converse in English	55	1.00	4.00	2.23	1.03
Valid N (listwise)	55				

Table 18. Frequency of extracurricular use of English

Table 19 indicates frequencies of the same activities for German learners. All means are lower than those for learners of English indicating that authentic uses of German tend to be less frequent, although the trends are similar. For example, the highest mean was calculated for listening to music, and the second highest is searching for lyrics, the two are obviously related to one another.

How often do you ... in German?					
	N	Min	Max	M	StDev
I search and read things on the internet	59	1.00	4.00	2.06	.96
I watch movies and series without subtitles	59	1.00	4.00	1.86	.99
I watch movies and series with German subtitles	59	1.00	4.00	1.69	.85
I watch movies and series with Hungarian subtitles	59	1.00	4.00	1.91	1.00
I listen to music	59	1.00	4.00	2.49	1.08
I watch video clips	59	1.00	4.00	2.05	1.04
I play computer games	59	1.00	4.00	1.79	1.07
I take part in RPGs	59	1.00	4.00	1.40	.81
I search the internet for lyrics	59	1.00	4.00	2.27	1.03
I converse in German	59	1.00	4.00	2.20	.90
Valid N (listwise)	59				

Table 19. Frequency of extracurricular use of English

These differences between data for learners of English and German are in line with results of the previous section of the questionnaire. Students use German in extracurricular activities less frequently than learners of English use their target language. This means that less frequent use gives them fewer opportunities to pick up the language authentic contexts besides learning it in the classroom.

3.4.5 What are their beliefs about their aptitude and language learning like?

The next section of the questionnaire included items starting with “generally” and they intended to elicit data on what respondents thought about their own abilities and to what extent

their success depended on their own effort. Result for English learners are shown in Table 20 and for German learners in Table 21.

Generally...					
	N	Min	Max	M	StDev
I learn English easily	55	1.00	4.00	2.70	.97
The more I use English the better I get at it	55	1.00	4.00	3.14	.84
I have no language aptitude I am a hopeless case	55	1.00	4.00	1.69	.87
Grammar is beyond me I will never understand it	55	1.00	4.00	1.83	.97
I love translating	55	1.00	4.00	2.25	1.04
I have a good memory	55	1.00	4.00	2.90	.88
I like to guess the meaning of words	55	1.00	4.00	2.58	1.10
It only depends on me how well I learn English	55	1.00	4.00	3.14	1.00
Valid N (listwise)	55				

Table 20. English learners' beliefs

In both tables the two highest means relate to how much importance students attribute to their own efforts. The means are over 3.1 on the item indicating that the more students use the FL the better they become, and it depends on them how well they learn the FL. On the one hand, they tend to agree that regular practice makes them smarter and on the other hand, they feel in charge of their own learning. These two results show quite a high level of learner autonomy and a growth mindset characterizing both groups of learners.

Both groups have a favorable opinion about their memory and disagree with the statement that they lack general language learning aptitude. They are quite optimistic about learning grammar and learners of both languages think that they learn relatively easily. These results indicate that students learning English and German are quite confident about their abilities and feel in charge of their learning.

Generally...					
	N	Min	Max	M	StDev
I learn German easily	59	1.00	4.00	2.86	.79
The more I use German the better I get at it	59	1.00	4.00	3.27	.86
I have no language aptitude I am a hopeless case	59	1.00	4.00	1.64	.88
Grammar is beyond me I will never understand it	59	1.00	4.00	1.89	.88
I love translating	59	1.00	4.00	2.08	.79
I have a good memory	59	1.00	4.00	2.91	.77
I like to guess the meaning of words	59	1.00	4.00	2.62	.94
It only depends on me how well I learn German	59	1.00	4.00	3.20	.86
Valid N (listwise)	59				

Table 21. German learners' beliefs

3.4.6 What tasks do they like in their English and German classes?

To further explore students' language learning motivation, they were asked to list three class-room activities they liked in their English and German classes. Each student could list three items; therefore, 55 learners of English could list 165 (3 times 55) and 59 learners of German

could write 177 (3 times 59) tasks. In this section, first we analyze their preferred English classroom tasks and then move on to the German tasks.

As was explained in the section on Procedure, all data were first reviewed by both researchers; then, the main categories were established before all answers were coded. In the second round, subcategories were established where different patterns emerged within the category. For example, in the main category of listening comprehension task no further category emerged for the English tasks, although students used synonyms (hallásértés, beszédértés, listening). However, within the reading comprehension task category mentioned by 20 respondents, 16 students used general terms (olvasás, szövegértés) and four used more specific terms: reading aloud (2), text on science (1), and interesting text (1). Therefore, in the four tables (22-25) subcategories include answers which further specified the idea within the larger category, but not all the answers did so. Thus, the numbers in the two columns under N do not add up.

The categories in the tables are listed in the order the emerging categories were established: first, the four skills and translation, then the other categories, finally, *others* includes the ones not fitting any of the categories.

3.4.6.1 English tasks students liked

Table 22 comprises the main categories and the numbers of students' answers to what tasks they liked best in their English classes. The most frequently mentioned tasks included reading comprehension and speaking tasks (20 times, respectively). Most students responded in general terms (speaking), but a few gave specific reading and speaking tasks (e.g., dialogue and roleplay). Fifteen students mentioned translation and 13 found listening comprehension tasks motivating. Tasks using specific authentic materials were mentioned eleven times (music 6, movies 5). Writing came up ten times (letter writing 7, copying 1), playful classroom activities got eight votes (2 of them were word chains, practicing vocabulary in a game-like manner). Four students mentioned assessment tasks (2 liked mock exams; 2 enjoyed vocabulary tests) and tasks boosting vocabulary got four votes. Work format using group (2) and pair (1) work was preferred by three students, and two others liked the classroom atmosphere. Two references were made to teachers, although they were somewhat out of step with the question. All students gave three answers, but (see 47 others) some of them made no sense or were written with the tongue in the cheek (e.g., alszok [I'm asleep; igen [yes] 35) or said they liked nothing (12).

Category	N	Subcategory	N
Listening comprehension task	13		
Reading comprehension task	20	Reading aloud	2
		Text on science	1
		Interesting text	1
Speaking task	20	Dialogue	4
		Roleplay	1
Writing task	10	Letter	7
		Copying	1
Translation task	15		
Test task	4	Mock proficiency exam	2
		Vocabulary test	2
Grammar exercise	6		
Playful task	8	Word chain	2

Gábor Szabó & Marianne Nikolov:
"More playful tasks": An analysis of secondary-school students' responses to a questionnaire on their needs
Argumentum 15 (2019), 344-378
Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó

Task based on authentic material	11	Music	6
		Movie	5
Vocabulary task	4		
Group or pair work	3	Group	1
		Pair	2
Reference to classroom management	2	Laughter	1
		Good atmosphere	1
Comment on teacher	2		
Others	47	None	12
		Nonsense response	35

Table 22. English learners' answers to the question what tasks they liked

3.4.6.2 German tasks students liked

The most frequently mentioned activities in the German classes (Table 23) included speaking (25) and playful tasks (24). Eleven popular speaking tasks were further specified (dialogue 3, roleplay 1, storytelling 2, arguing (érvelés) 1, and preparing oral presentations 4). Kahoot, a game-based website was mentioned by four and the internet by one student in connection with playful activities. Translation was liked 22 times, whereas listening and reading comprehension tasks 10 and 19 times, respectively. Writing was popular with five students: three liked writing letters, two compositions. Taking tests was a preferred activity for twelve respondents: two found exam tests, two vocabulary tests and two "felelés", a traditional oral form of regurgitating what has been learnt, motivating. Tasks using authentic sources were listed by twelve learners: movies (8), music (2), topics of German culture and jokes by one each. Six students liked grammar exercises and five listed vocabulary tasks. Work format was mentioned nine times (groupwork 8; pair work 1). One student particularly appreciated peers as good company, and three liked their teacher (one of them elaborated on the pleasure of listening to her great German pronunciation). In the other (53) category three types of items were grouped: nine respondents could not mention any task they liked, eight listed no task but other positive things (e.g., learn new things; learn German); whereas 36 answers were inappropriate or not valid (e.g., doing nothing, sleep).

Category	N	Subcategory	N
Listening comprehension task	10		
Reading comprehension task	19		
Speaking task	25	Dialogue	3
		Roleplay	1
		Story telling	2
		Give argument	1
		Prepare presentation	4
Writing task	5	Letter	3
		Composition	2
Translation task	22	Sentences	1
Test task	12	Proficiency exam task	2
		Vocabulary test	2
		"Felelés"	2
Grammar exercise	6		
Playful task	24	Kahoot	4
		Internet	1
Task based on authentic material	12	Music	2

Gábor Szabó & Marianne Nikolov:
“More playful tasks”: An analysis of secondary-school students’ responses to a questionnaire on their needs
Argumentum 15 (2019), 344-378
Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó

		Movie	8
		Cultural topic	1
		Joke	1
Vocabulary task	5		
Group or pair work	9	Group	8
		Pair	1
Reference to classroom management	1	Good company	1
Comment on teacher	3	Pleasure to listen to	1
Others	53	None	9
		Not specific task	8
		Nonsense response	36

Table 23. German learners’ answers to the question what tasks they liked

3.4.7 What tasks do they dislike in their English and German classes?

The very same categories were used for the activities students did not enjoy doing. Tables 24 and 25 indicate how many times the categories were mentioned. First, we present the answers of English learners, then the unpopular tasks listed by their peers learning German.

3.4.7.1 English tasks students did not like

The most often (24 times) mentioned unpopular classroom activities were tests for English learners (Table 24). Ten respondents specified “felelés”, three students mentioned vocabulary tests. Grammar exercises were listed 18 times, specified only once as tenses. Ten students mentioned listening and nine reading comprehension tasks. Writing tasks were unpopular with eight, speaking tasks with seven, vocabulary tasks with four, and translation with two respondents. Activities with authentic materials were disliked by two students, pair work by three, and word chain, a game, by 1. Classroom management issues were mentioned by six learners: two complained about their peers, two about shouting, and two about boring classes. Teachers were mentioned three times in reference to what students disliked in their English classes. Fifteen students explicitly stated there was nothing they did not like, twelve did not like learning in general, and 41 answers were not valid.

Category	N	Subcategory	N
Listening comprehension task	10		
Reading comprehension task	9		
Speaking task	7	In front of others	1
Writing task	8	Letter	2
		Composition	3
Translation task	2		
Test task	24	“Felelés”	10
		Vocabulary test	3
Grammar exercise	18	Tenses	2
Playful task	1	Word chain	1
Task based on authentic material	2	Music	1
		Movie	1
Vocabulary task	4	Definitions	1
		Dictionary use	1
		Where to put stress	1
Group or pair work	3	Pair	3

Gábor Szabó & Marianne Nikolov:
“More playful tasks”: An analysis of secondary-school students’ responses to a questionnaire on their needs
Argumentum 15 (2019), 344-378
Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó

Reference to classroom management	6	Classmates	2
		Shouting	2
		Boring class	2
Comment on teacher	3	Does not speak English	1
Others	68	Nothing disliked	15
		Learning	12
		Nonsense response	41

Table 24. English learners’ answers to the question what they did not like

3.4.7.2 German tasks students did not like

The least popular category included all kinds of tests mentioned 53 times (Table 25). Among the tests learners of German disliked, “felelés” got 16 votes, followed by vocabulary and grammar tests (5 each) and oral proficiency exam tasks (3). Grammar exercises were unpopular with 20 respondents, whereas 14 learners disliked writing tasks. Speaking tasks were not appreciated by 13 students, including giving arguments by 5. Interestingly, this type of task was not mentioned in the group of English learners. Listening comprehension tasks and translation were both mentioned eleven times. The way classes were managed was disliked by seven students: two complained about discipline problems and another two about shouting. Five students listed vocabulary tasks, and four did not like using authentic cultural materials (3 movies, 1 music). Six respondents stated that there was nothing they disliked, five complained about no specific tasks, and 20 answers were not valid.

To sum up the findings on what students liked and disliked, the numbers indicate similar trends for English and German and students offered a wide range of classroom activities. The results mostly overlap with what previous large-scale studies have revealed about frequencies and language learners’ preferences (for summaries see Nikolov 2007, 2011). Also, the responses indicate that students are aware of what they do in FL classes and can use the meta-language to describe classroom activities in response to open items.

The most frequently mentioned popular classroom activities included speaking, reading comprehension, playful tasks and translation. Activities using authentic cultural resources were less often listed, either because they are not as often used as tasks related to skill development, or because the actual tasks built on authentic materials are not motivating.

Category	N	Subcategory	N
Listening comprehension task	11		
Reading comprehension task	6		
Speaking task	13	Dialogue	1
		Roleplay	2
		Give argument	5
		Not enough	1
Writing task	14	Letter	3
		Composition	2
		Dictation	1
Translation task	11	German movie	1
Test task	53	Proficiency exam oral task	3
		Vocabulary test	5
		“Felelés”	16
		Grammar	5
Grammar exercise	20		
Playful task	0		

Gábor Szabó & Marianne Nikolov:
"More playful tasks": An analysis of secondary-school students' responses to a questionnaire on their needs
Argumentum 15 (2019), 344-378
Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó

Task based on authentic material	4	Music	1
		Movie	3
Vocabulary task	5	Define words	1
Group or pair work	2	Group	2
Reference to classroom management	7	Discipline	2
		Shouting	2
Comment on teacher	0		
Others	31	Nothing disliked	6
		Not specific task	5
		Nonsense response	20

Table 25. German learners' answers to the question what they did not like

These results are similar to the outcomes of previous studies involving nationally representative samples and examining how frequent and how popular certain classroom activities are in English and German classes in public education. Students are motivated by varied meaning-focused tasks, including interactive speaking tasks (e.g., roleplay, dialogues), playful activities and tasks using authentic materials (e.g., videos). In other words, language learners prefer communicative tasks. Translation as a popular task type was not found in previous surveys; however, it was one of the most frequent activities typical of the grammar-translation method, together with drill-like grammar exercises and reading aloud. These were the least popular with students. Therefore, the present study has found that in contrast with previous findings participants find translation as a means of meaning making motivating.

The most often mentioned unpopular activities in both languages include tests and grammar exercises, similarly to previous research. Learners of English and German unanimously dislike different forms of assessment, including "felelés". This traditional oral performance test is a unique phenomenon in Hungarian classroom discourse. Two decades ago Duff (1995) analyzed it in her classroom ethnography of dual-language programs. She used the term "felelés" (recitation) in Hungarian to indicate its embeddedness in the sociocultural and educational context and documented how this stress-inducing oral assessment was slowly replaced by short student presentations and other, more open-ended discussion activities in the classrooms she observed. Data in the present study document that "felelés" has survived in the English and German classes participants attend. Although it is a sort of speaking task and students like those, this stressful oral regurgitating practice is not in line with the principles of communicative language teaching. Further research is needed to figure out why teachers apply such tasks and how they use them for assessment.

Another finding concerns the wide range and overlaps in motivating and demotivating tasks. What some students consider enjoyable, others reject. In other words, the pedagogical challenge teachers face every day concerns students' personal preferences and individual differences. Some tasks may function as inherently appealing to most students in a group (e.g., playful tasks, watching movies), whereas other activities are highly appreciated by only a few students with a special interest in a topic, focus on form, a mode of learning (e.g., pair work), or they may be goal oriented and find test practice rewarding. The very same activities may be dreaded by some members of a group, depending on how successful they are at performing them or how useful they consider that task at their stage of development or how anxious they tend to be. The teacher's job is a balancing act to offer happy compromises in every class.

After discussing what respondents claimed to like and dislike in their English and German classes, in the next section we examine students' proposed wish lists. Most probably what they recommend is based on what they have experienced and enjoyed in their classes.

3.4.8 What would students like to do in the extra English and German sessions?

The ideas students proposed in response to the question what they would enjoy doing in extra English or German classes could be categorized partly into the same and partly into different headings in comparison with the open items on liked and disliked tasks. Tables 26 and 27 comprise the findings. Learners of English had room to suggest 275 and learners of German 295 activities, as each student had five options to fill in.

3.4.8.1 English activities students would like to do

As data in Table 26 show, students' recommendations include playful activities (44), speaking tasks (38) and tasks using authentic resources (35). The latter category was less prominent in the top ranking preferred tasks, whereas the other two were ranked high. Learners of English voted for music 21, and for movies 14 times. This category overlaps with what they would like to translate (20 votes): 16 respondents suggested lyrics and two specified movies. If these two are added up, using authentic materials is the top winner category (55). As for speaking tasks, eight students would like to talk with native speakers. In all categories students gave more specific answers than in response to what they liked or disliked. For example, 14 learners would like to do more reading tasks: three of them added interesting texts and four others voted for reading whole books. From among the twelve students suggesting writing tasks, two would like to write stories and five intend to write compositions. Tasks boosting vocabulary were voted for by 13 students; four emphasize enriching vocabulary, three want to learn slang, and two wish they could learn vocabulary for specific purposes. A new category emerged for suggested activities labelled as innovative tasks. Out of 18 suggestions, 14 would like to learn about English culture; this also is an overlapping category with authentic materials (thus votes are up to 69). A guided tour in English, cooking traditional English food, discussing politics and retelling memorized stories were each suggested by one respondent. Three students would appreciate exam preparation, another three would like more grammar practice, two recommend pair work, and six learners would like to improve their listening skills. There were no answers on teachers of classroom atmosphere. Seven students (35 votes) had no suggestions at all and 32 responses were not valid.

Category	N	Subcategory	N
Listening comprehension task	6		
Reading comprehension task	14	Interesting text	3
		Reading books	4
Speaking task	38	Talk with native speaker	8
		Roleplay	2
Writing task	12	Story	2
		Composition	5
Translation task	20	Lyrics	16
		Movie	2
Test task	3	Exam prep task	3
Grammar exercise	3		
Playful task	44	Kahoot	4
		Online game	2

Task based on authentic material	35	Music	21
		Movie	14
Vocabulary task	13	Special vocabulary	2
		Enrich vocabulary	4
		Learn slang	3
Group or pair work	2	Groupwork	2
Innovative tasks	18	Learn about English culture	14
		Guided tour in English	1
		Cook traditional English food	1
		Discuss politics	1
		Memorize and retell story	1
No suggestion	35	7 students	
Others	32	Nonsense response	

Table 26. English learners' answers to the question what tasks they wanted

3.4.8.2 German activities students would like to do

Sixty learners of German suggested speaking tasks (Table 27), including 14 who would like to talk with native speakers, eleven recommending dialogs and yet another group of 11 students would simply like to speak more. Playful activities were proposed 48 times: seven students want more vocabulary games, four would like to use Kahoot, and two voted for Stadt rally.

In line with the recommendations of English learners, 46 students of German would like to use authentic materials: 24 voted for music and 22 for movies. In addition to these ideas 22 learners would like to translate lyrics, and two would enjoy translating interesting texts. Specific activities under innovative tasks also include cultural materials: five students would like to do projects, four would like to make short movies and two suggest visiting a German radio station. Further tasks were recommended by one student each, e.g., cooking German dishes or learning German proverbs. Thus, the activities related to authentic sources are over 70. Reading comprehension tasks were suggested by 15, listening tasks by eight learners. Writing was mentioned 18 times including letters (3), compositions (2), essays (1) and crossword puzzles (3). Four students want more tests, four voted for grammar practice, six suggest vocabulary tasks and three would like to work in groups. Nobody made a reference to teachers or how classes should be managed. Only one student wrote no suggestion at all and 35 responses were not valid.

In summary, the activities learners of English and German proposed are overwhelmingly meaning-focused communicative tasks integrating interaction, oral production and authentic cultural resources. The most important differences between what students claimed to like and what they suggested for the extra classes are that they were more specific and creative in their recommendations. They offered more elaborate wording of tasks and some came up with really new ideas. For example, making a short movie, visiting a radio station, and cooking.

Overall, most ideas they recommended show their awareness of real-life uses of English and German and they would like to benefit from extensive exposure to movies, music, interactions with native speakers or peers in communicative tasks. These findings indicate that they find intrinsically motivating materials both attractive and useful for developing their proficiency.

Category	N	Subcategory	N
Listening comprehension task	8		
Reading comprehension task	15	Interesting text	7
Speaking task	60	Dialogue	11
		With native speaker	14
		Speak more	11
Writing task	18	Letter	3
		Composition	2
		Essay	1
		Crossword puzzle	3
Translation task	24	Lyrics	22
		Interesting text	2
Test task	4	Proficiency exam preparation	2
Grammar exercise	4		
Playful task	48	Stadt rally	2
		Kahoot	4
		Vocabulary games	7
Task based on authentic material	46	Music	24
		Movie	22
Vocabulary task	6	Enrich vocab	3
Group or pair work	3	Group	3
Innovative tasks	19	Project	5
		Make short movie	4
		Tasks with movements	2
		Cook German recipes	1
		Visit German radio station	2
		Write poems	1
		Study German regions	1
		Learn about German economy	1
		Study German proverbs	1
		Travel to Germany	1
No suggestion	5	1 student	
Others	35	Nonsense response	35

Table 27. German learners' answers to the question what tasks they wanted

At a time when the internet and mobile technologies make information easily available online, it is surprising how few references were found in the dataset. Kahoot, an online platform, and unspecified online games were mentioned a few times, but overall, students do not seem to realize that mobile apps and websites offer many learning opportunities for autonomous and classroom learning, as none were mentioned. Maybe students use such resources in their free time, but do not see them as desirable classroom tasks. There was not a single reference to classroom uses of information technology (e.g., interactive white board, online tasks); this may indicate that language teachers do not use them in the participants' language classes.

Finally, an important validity issue must be pointed out in connection with all the open items eliciting answers on what students liked, disliked, and recommended. The relatively high number of nonsense answers indicate that response validity is problematic due to some respondents' contributions. Whether they had no ideas to share or they took advantage of anonymity is unclear. Most of the answers found not valid were given by students whose self-assessment data indicated low self-esteem and modest or no long-term goals. As the next section explains, not all students filling in the questionnaire wanted to be part of the project.

3.4.9 How many respondents would like to participate in the free sessions?

The results are somewhat controversial: the 114 students who were assumed to be enthusiastic about participating in extra free English and German classes either (1) once a week for twelve weeks or (2) for two hours daily for a week in their holidays were far from being unanimously ready to volunteer. Out of the 55 learners of English and 59 students of German, 18 and 14, respectively, said no to both options. As for the two options, 22 learners of English, and 17 students of German did not want to participate in the weekly sessions, and the numbers for the intensive one-week option were 21 and 22, respectively. These numbers indicate that some students preferred one type of program over the other.

Most of the respondents whose answers to the open items were not valid did not want to participate at all. However, some students suggesting reasonable tasks also rejected both options. One of them specified the reason: "I'm taking my English intermediate-level proficiency exam now, so I don't need to attend more classes, so I would not like to do anything". The others' reasons are not known, but most probably, the fact that they filled in the questionnaire anonymously allowed them to state their honest wish. Most of the students who did not feel like putting extra work into developing their English or German proficiency were the ones who estimated their abilities low, had less favorable self-assessment than the ones who felt more optimistic and enthusiastic. These findings will need to be revisited once the program is over and feedback has been collected from all participants.

4 Conclusion and limitations of the study

The aim of the survey was to map who the students learning English and German are at the seven institutions involved in the project, what their language learning background and goals are like. Their answers to the open questions were meant to reveal their needs, what they find motivating and demotivating in their classes, and what activities they would welcome in the extracurricular programs.

The datasets revealed that the groups of English and German learners represent mixed abilities and a wide range of motives. They comprise highly motivated learners with a solid learning history, high self-esteem, and clear long-term goals. Some of them learn multiple foreign languages at school and in extracurricular classes. Others are highly frustrated disadvantaged students with poor self-assessment, low expectations and hardly any motivation to put effort into language learning. The invalid answers reflecting nonsense ideas prove that they are in fact a valid mirror of how disappointed and disadvantaged some students are.

Overall, the students' answers indicate that they are aware of what types of classroom activities they like and dislike, and they proposed a wide range of varied and meaningful tasks for the new program. The suggested activities are overwhelmingly communicative, interactive, with an emphasis on speaking and using real-life materials for gaining new knowledge and skills. The challenges course designers face are as follows: meeting a wide range of needs by offering varied and tasks based on authentic materials and age-appropriate playful activities at A2, B1 and B2 levels. How the truly disadvantaged students can be involved in the free courses remains to be seen.

The limitations of the study are numerous. The number of participants was small, especially in comparison to the target population. Therefore, it is not sure that other students at the same or similar schools would find the same task types motivating, as the findings cannot be generalized. A relatively high number of responses were not valid. As has been mentioned

earlier, this is a potentially serious drawback. On the one hand, respondents giving invalid answers to some of the questions may or may not have given valid ones to others. On the other hand, the fact that there are numerous obviously invalid responses may imply that some of the responses that do appear to be valid may still not be so, as some students may not have given provocative answers, but did not take the questions seriously, anyway. The uncertainty stemming from all these problems points to the necessity of further studies, which the subsequent stages of the project will likely make possible.

The outcome may in fact prove that many respondents are indeed disadvantaged, although no direct question elicited data on this variable. If respondents do not state what they would like to do to close the achievement gap and they do not want to participate in the free program, the project may fail to achieve its stated aim.

An additional weakness concerns data collected with only one instrument. Classroom observations and language teachers' views would have allowed for triangulation of the data-set. All in all, the results are hopefully helpful for the first step of the project.

References

- Duff, P. (1995): An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly* 29.3, 505–537.
- Eurobarometer (2006): *Europeans and their languages*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Eurobarometer (2012): *Europeans and their languages*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Kohonen, V., Jaatinen, R., Kaikkonen, P. & Lehtovaara, J. (2001): *Experiential Learning in Foreign Language Education*. London: Routledge.
- Medgyes, P. & Nikolov, M. (2014): Foreign language learning and teaching in Hungary: A review of empirical research literature from 2006 to 2012. *Language Teaching* 47.4, 504–537.
- Nikolov, M. (2011): Az idegen nyelvek tanulása és a nyelvtudás [Learning and proficiency in modern foreign languages]. *Magyar Tudomány* 2011.9, 1048–1057.
<http://www.matud.iif.hu/2011/09/04.htm>; <http://www.matud.iif.hu/2011/09/Tartalom.htm>
- Nikolov, M., Ottó, I. & Öveges, E. (2008): *Az idegennyelv-tanulás és tanítás helyzete és fejlesztésének lehetőségei a szakképző intézményekben* [Research report on the teaching and learning of foreign languages at vocational schools]. Budapest: Oktatásért Alapítvány.
http://www.oktatasert.hu/files/idegennyelvi_kutatas_jelentes.pdf
- Nikolov M., Ottó, I. & Öveges, E. (2009): *A nyelvi előkészítő évfolyam értékelése 2004/2005 – 2008/2009* [An evaluation of the year of intensive language learning project between the 2004/2005 and 2008/2009 academic years]. Budapest: Oktatási és Kulturális Minisztérium.
http://www.nefmi.gov.hu/letolt/vilagnyelv/vny_nyek2009_jelentes_100510.pdf

Gábor Szabó and Marianne Nikolov
 Department of English Applied Linguistics
 Institute of English Studies
 University of Pécs
 H-7624 Pécs
 Ifjúság u. 6.
 szabo.gabor2@pte.hu
 nikolov.marianne@pte.hu

Appendix

Kérdőív középiskolás nyelvtanulók számára a nyelvi képzés beindulása előtti szükségletekről (angol)

Kedves Nyelvtanuló!

A Pécsi Tudományegyetem egy hároméves projekt keretében középiskolások angol nyelvi szintjének fejlesztéséhez nyújt segítséget. Az alábbi kérdőív segítségével a véleményedet kérjük arról, hogy szerinted milyen segítségre van szükség ahhoz, hogy minél jobban megtanulj angolul, és sikeresen érettségizz angolból.

Kérjük, neved említése nélkül, őszintén válaszolj a kérdésekre. Először néhány háttéradatot kérünk. Utána a felsorolt állításokra adj 1-től 4-es skálán választ arra, hogy magadra vonatkoztatva mennyire fogadod el, vagy utasítod el az állítást. A kérdőív végén ötleteidet kérjük.

Köszönjük, hogy válaszaiddal munkánkat segíted. Válaszaidat kizárólag arra használjuk, hogy minél jobban az igényeidhez tudjuk szabni az angol foglalkozásokat. Válaszaidat lekódolva, elzárva kezeljük, azokat kizárólag a kutatás céljaira használjuk, másnak át nem adjuk (https://pte.hu/sites/pte.hu/files/files/Adminisztracio/Szabalyzatok_utasitasok/Hat_Es_Egyeb_Szadatvedelmiszabalyzat20111215.pdf).

PTE „Nyelvtanulással a boldogulásért” kutatócsoport

A kitöltés után a SUBMIT (elküldve) gombra kattintva továbbíthatod a válaszaidat.

* Required

1. Háttéradatok

1. 1.1. Iskolád neve (írd ide): *

2. 1.2. Nemed (kattintással válaszd ki): *

Mark only one oval.

☐ fiú

☐ lány

3. 1.3. Hányadik évfolyamra jársz? (kattintással válaszd ki) *

Mark only one oval.

☐ 9

☐ 10

☐ 11

☐ 12

☐ 13

4. 1.4. Milyen osztályba jársz? (kattintással válassz egyet) *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Szakgimnáziumi normál
- ☐ Szakgimnáziumi nyelvi előkészítő
- ☐ Szakgimnáziumi két tanítási nyelvű
- ☐ Szakgimnáziumi általános nyelv
- ☐ Szakgimnáziumi szaknyelv
- ☐ Szakközépiskolai
- ☐ Gimnáziumi normál
- ☐ Gimnáziumi nyelvi előkészítő
- ☐ Gimnáziumi két tanítási nyelvű

5. 1.5. Milyen idegen nyelveket tanulsz most, és heti hány órában? (többet is megjelölhetsz)

Check all that apply.

	heti 1-2 órában	heti 3-4 órában	heti 5-6 órában	több mint heti 6 órában
angolt	☐	☐	☐	☐
németet	☐	☐	☐	☐
franciát	☐	☐	☐	☐
spanyolt	☐	☐	☐	☐
olaszt	☐	☐	☐	☐
egyéb nyelvet	☐	☐	☐	☐

6. 1.6. Hány éve tanulsz ezeket az idegen nyelveket? (Csak azt jelöld meg, amelyiket tanulsz)

Check all that apply.

	kevesebb mint 1 éve	1-2 éve	3-4 éve	5-6 éve	7-8 éve	több mint 8 éve
angol	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
német	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
francia	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
spanyol	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
olasz	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
egyéb nyelvet	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7. 1.7. Milyen szinten tanulsz most az angol nyelvet, szerinted? (kattintással válaszd ki) *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ túl alacsony
- ☐ éppen megfelelő
- ☐ túl magas

8. 1.8. Milyen nyelven tud édesanyád? Milyen szinten, szerinted? (többet is megjelölhetsz)

Mark only one oval per row.

	alapszint	középszint	felsőszint
angol	☐	☐	☐
német	☐	☐	☐
egyéb	☐	☐	☐
nem beszél idegen nyelvet	☐	☐	☐

9. 1.9. Milyen nyelven tud édesapád? Milyen szinten, szerinted? (többet is megjelölhetsz)

Mark only one oval per row.

	alapszint	középszint	felsőszint
angol	☐	☐	☐
német	☐	☐	☐
egyéb	☐	☐	☐
nem beszél idegen nyelvet	☐	☐	☐

10. 1.10. Milyen nyelven tudnak a testvéreid? Milyen szinten, szerinted? (többet is megjelölhetsz)

Mark only one oval per row.

	alapszint	középszint	felsőszint
angol	☐	☐	☐
német	☐	☐	☐
egyéb	☐	☐	☐
nem beszélnek idegen nyelvet	☐	☐	☐

11. 1.11. Az iskolán kívül tanulsz-e idegen nyelvet magántanárnál vagy nyelviskolában? (többet is megjelölhetsz) *

Check all that apply.

- ☐ angol
☐ német
☐ egyéb

12. 1.12. Mi a célod angolból a középiskola végére? *

(többet is megjelölhetsz)

Check all that apply.

- ☐ Emelt szintű érettségi
☐ Középszintű érettségi
☐ Jó osztályzat angolból
☐ Tudjak angolul a szakmában boldogulni

2. Mennyire tudsz jól angolul szerinted?

Ebben a részben 10 állítás szerepel. Egy szám kiválasztásával jelöld, hogy szerinted mennyire igazak rád az állítások:

1: egyáltalán nem igaz 2: részben igaz 3: többnyire igaz 4: teljesen igaz

13. 2.1. Jól értem az olvasott szövegeket. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

14. 2.2. Szóban folyékonyan ki tudom magam fejezni. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

15. 2.3. Remekül értem az angol nyelvű beszédet. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

16. 2.4. Írásban jól tudok fogalmazni. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

17. 2.5. Szinte hibátlanul beszélek. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

18. 2.6. Megértem az angol nyelvű filmeket. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

19. 2.7. Az angol nyelvű zenék szövegét jól megértem. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

20. 2.8. El tudok csevegni az interneten. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

21. 2.9. Jól boldogulok internetes játékokban. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

22. 2.10. Ami igazán érdekel, az jól megy. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

3. Azért tanulok angolul, mert:

Ebben a részben 13 állítás szerepel. Egy szám kiválasztásával jelöld, hogy szerinted mennyire igazak rád az állítások:

1: egyáltalán nem igaz 2: részben igaz 3: többnyire igaz 4: teljesen igaz

23. 3.1. mindig is angolul szerettem volna tanulni. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

24. 3.2. szeretnék olyan emberekkel megismerkedni, akiknek angol az anyanyelvük. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

25. 3.3. nagyon tetszik a hangzása. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

26. 3.4. **hasznos az iskolán kívül is.** *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

27. 3.5. **felőttként jól tudom majd használni.** *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

28. 3.6. **nehéz boldogulni nélküle.** *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

29. 3.7. **szüleim tanácsolták, támogatják.** *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

30. 3.8. **barátaim tanácsolták.** *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

31. 3.9. **sok érdekes dolog angolul van az interneten.** *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

32. 3.10. **enélkül nem tudnék továbbtanulni.** *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

33. 3.11. utazáshoz nélkülözhetetlen. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

34. 3.12. ma már mindenkinek tudnia kell. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

35. 3.13. külföldön szeretnék majd dolgozni. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

4. Milyen gyakran csinálod ezeket a tevékenységeket angolul?

Ebben a részben 10 állítás szerepel. Egy szám kiválasztásával jelöld, hogy milyen gyakran csinálod ezeket a tevékenységeket angolul.

1: soha 2: néha 3: gyakran 4: rendszeresen

36. 4.1. Interneten keresgélek, olvasgatok. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
soha	☐	☐	☐	☐	rendszeresen

37. 4.2. Filmet, sorozatot nézek felirat nélkül. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
soha	☐	☐	☐	☐	rendszeresen

38. 4.3. Filmet, sorozatot nézek angol felirattal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
soha	☐	☐	☐	☐	rendszeresen

39. 4.4. Filmet, sorozatot nézek magyar felirattal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
soha	☐	☐	☐	☐	rendszeresen

40. 4.5. Zenét hallgatok. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
soha	☐	☐	☐	☐	rendszeresen

41. 4.6. Klippet nézek. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
soha	☐	☐	☐	☐	rendszeresen

42. 4.7. Számítógépes játékot játszok. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
soha	☐	☐	☐	☐	rendszeresen

43. 4.8. Szerepjátékban veszek részt. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
soha	☐	☐	☐	☐	rendszeresen

44. 4.9. Megkeresem számok szövegét az interneten. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
soha	☐	☐	☐	☐	rendszeresen

45. 4.10. Angolul beszélgetek. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
soha	☐	☐	☐	☐	rendszeresen

5. Általában:

Ebben a részben 8 állítás szerepel. Egy szám kiválasztásával jelöld, hogy szerinted mennyire igazak rád az állítások:

1: egyáltalán nem igaz 2: részben igaz 3: többnyire igaz 4: teljesen igaz

46. 5.1. Könnyedén tanulok angolul. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

47. 5.2. Minél többet használom, annál jobb leszek angolból. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

48. 5.3. Nincs jó nyelvérzékem, reménytelen eset vagyok. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

49. 5.4. Magas nekem a nyelvtan, sosem fogom megérteni. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

50. 5.5. Imádok fordítani. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

51. 5.6. Jó a memóriám. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

52. 5.7. Szeretem kitalálni a szavak jelentését. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

53. 5.8. Csak rajtam múlik, hogy mennyire tanulok meg angolul. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
egyáltalán nem igaz	☐	☐	☐	☐	teljesen igaz

6. Az angolórákon:

Az alábbi kérdésekre válaszolj saját szavaiddal röviden vagy néhány mondatban.

6.1. Sorolj fel 3 angolórai tevékenységet, amit LEGJOBBAN kedvelsz (írd ide):

54. 1. *

55. 2. *

56. 3. *

6.2 Sorolj fel 3 angolórai tevékenységet, amit NEM kedvelsz (írd ide):

57. 1. *

58. 2. *

59. 3. *

6.3. Sorolj fel 5 olyan dolgot, amit SZÍVESEN csinálnál külön

angol foglalkozásokon (írd ide):

60. 1. *

61. 2. *

62. 3. *

63. 4. *

64. 5. *

65. 6.4. Szívesen vennél-e részt az iskolában ingyenes 12 hetes különórai foglalkozásokon angolból heti egy alkalommal a PTE szervezésében? (kattintással válaszd ki) *

Mark only one oval.

☐ igen

☐ nem

66. 6.5. Szívesen vennél-e részt egyhetes ingyenes nyári angol nyelvi képzésben a PTE szervezésében? (kattintással válaszd ki) *

Mark only one oval.

☐ igen

☐ nem

Válaszaidat köszönjük!
