ENGLISH TEACHING IN FINNISH UPPER SECONDARY SCHOOLS:
Students' and teachers' perceptions

Master's thesis
Kaisa Korhonen

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Kaisa Korhonen	
Työn nimi – Title English teaching in Finnish upper secondary schools: Students' and teachers' perceptions	
Oppiaine – Subject Englannin kieli	Työn laji – Level Pro gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Maaliskuu 2014	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 85 sivua + 2 liitettä

Tiivistelmä – Abstract

Englannin opetus on käynyt läpi monia muutoksia ajan kuluessa. Globalisoituvan yhteiskunnan myötä englannin käyttö on yleistynyt ja kieltä opitaan myös muualla kuin koulumaailmassa. Tämä asettaa haasteita englannin opetukselle ja opettajien onkin mietittävä, miten opetusta voisi kehittää nykyajan vaatimuksia ja tarpeita vastaavaksi. Tässä kehittämistyössä on tärkeää ottaa myös oppilaat ja heidän mielipiteensä huomioon.

Tämän tutkimuksen tarkoituksena on selvittää millaista englannin opetus nykyään on suomalaisissa lukioissa. Erityisesti tutkimus pyrkii saamaan selville, käytetäänkö tunneilla enemmän perinteisiä vai innovatiivisia opetusmenetelmiä. Perinteisillä opetusmenetelmillä tarkoitetaan tutkimuksessa opettajakeskeisiä, kirjalliseen tuottamiseen ja kielioppiin keskittyviä tapoja kun taas innovatiivisilla opetusmenetelmillä tarkoitetaan oppilaskeskeisiä, kielen kaikkiin neljään eri osa-alueeseen tasapuolisesti keskittyviä tapoja opettaa. Tutkimuksen tarkoituksena on myös selvittää oppilaiden ja opettajien mielipiteitä erilaisista perinteisistä ja innovatiivisista opetusmenetelmistä. Lisäksi tutkimus pyrkii saamaan selville millaiset tavat opettaa ovat oppilaiden ja opettajien mielestä kaikkein tehokkaimpia. Tarkoituksena on myös verrata oppilaiden ja opettajien vastauksia kaikkiin edeltäviin kolmeen kysymykseen ja etsiä eroja ja yhtäläisyyksiä heidän vastauksistaan.

Tutkimukseen osallistui 96 lukiolaista ja 84 lukion englannin kielen opettajaa. Tutkimuksen aineisto kerättiin kyselylomakkeella maalis-huhtikuussa 2013. Kyselylomake sisälsi Likert asteikkoon pohjautuvia kysymyksiä, jotka analysoitiin määrällisesti. Lisäksi kyselyssä oli yksi avoin kysymys, joka analysoitiin laadullisesti.

Tulokset osoittavat, että innovatiivisia opetusmenetelmiä käytetään suomalaisissa lukioissa englannin tunneilla enemmän kuin perinteisiä. Tunneilla keskustellaan paljon englanniksi ja keskitytään enemmän viestin ymmärtämiseen kuin virheiden korjaamiseen. Ryhmässä tai pareittain työskentely on yleistä ja opettajat käyttävät enemmän englantia kuin suomea ja rohkaisevat myös oppilaita puhumaan englanniksi. Tästä huolimatta tunneilla käytetään myös paljon perinteisiä tapoja opettaa, sillä kirjallisilla kokeilla on edelleen suurin merkitys arvioinnissa. Tulosten mukaan oppilaat ja opettajat kokevat erilaiset innovatiiviset oppilaskeskeiset opetusmenetelmät mielekkäämmiksi kuin perinteiset tavat opettaa. Hyödyllisimpinä englannin oppimisessa pidettiin erilaisia keskusteluharjoituksia ja yhteistoiminnallisuutta. Lisäksi vaihtelevuus ja monipuolisuus koettiin tärkeänä. Oppilaiden mielestä perinteisiä tapoja opettaa käytettiin tunneilla enemmän kuin opettajien mielestä. Lisäksi oppilailla oli opettajia positiivisempi asenne perinteisiä opetusmenetelmiä kohtaan. Oppilaiden ja opettajien mielipiteet tehokkaimmista tavoista oppia englantia olivat melko yhteneväisiä, mutta opettajat arvostivat kuitenkin oppilaita enemmän vaihtelua perinteisten ja innovatiivisten opetusmenetelmien välillä.

Säilytyspaikka – Depository Kielten laitos

Muita tietoja – Additional information

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

Language teaching is going through changes all the time. New theories about language learning, the changing needs of the students and the demands of the outside world have directed language teaching methodology throughout history (Davies 1996: 1). The last century alone has seen the development of language teaching from grammar-translation to audiolingualism and from humanistic approaches to communicative language teaching. However, today language teaching methods are not seen similarly as they were before. According to Kumaravadivelu (1994, cited in Liu 2004: 138) we are living in "the post-methods era", in which the idea of eclecticism has gained more popularity. In other words, language teaching is nowadays seen as a combination of different methods and language teachers prefer to tailor their teaching according to the context and the specific needs of their students.

The need for changes in language teaching is especially relevant in today's global society where the role of English has become more important. Finnish students use English in their everyday lives a great deal more than they earlier used to. One of the biggest reasons for this is the Internet, which offers several possibilities to interact with people all over the world in English (Leppänen, Nikula and Kääntä 2008: 13). Many students have contacts with native English speakers and are more familiar than earlier with different English speaking cultures through travelling and exchange programs. Today the classroom is definitely not the only place where students learn English. Because of this, teachers really need to think about their ways of teaching and the role of English lessons: is teaching effective and does it encourage and motivate students to actually use English outside the classroom? Or is it more important to focus on form and grammar because nowadays students get to use English so much outside the classroom? Indeed, teachers need to think whether the skills taught in school correspond with students' real needs or not.

The purpose of the present study is to find out what kinds of ways of teaching are used today in English lessons in Finnish upper secondary schools. Specifically, the purpose is to find out whether there is a clear preference either for traditional teacher-centered teaching, which focuses more on the structural aspects of language training or innovative student-centered teaching, which focuses equally on all the language skill areas and emphasizes student autonomy in the language learning process. Moreover, the

purpose is to find out students' and teachers' opinions on different ways of teaching English and to ask for the participants' opinions about the most effective ways of teaching. In addition, students' and teachers' answers will be compared in order to find out how their views and opinions differ from one another and how these converge.

Indeed, there is a need to study how English is taught in upper secondary schools in order to find out what kinds of skills are actually emphasized today. Moreover, this study will give valuable information for teachers by asking students' opinions on different ways of teaching and what kind of teaching they consider as the most useful and effective. Furthermore, it is important to compare students' and teachers' answers because conflicts between their perceptions and opinions on language teaching can cause problems in learning and in classroom interaction. Finally, the present study is relevant because similar studies have not been conducted earlier in Finland.

The present study is quantitative in nature as the data was collected with a questionnaire that consisted of Likert scale questions. However, one open-ended question included in the study survey offers a possibility for a qualitative analysis as well. The data has been collected in two different ways: the student participants filled a questionnaire in paper form and the teacher participants filled a similar questionnaire on the Internet. The answers for the Likert scale statements were analyzed statistically and content analysis was used in analyzing the answers for the open-ended question.

I will begin by discussing the theoretical framework of the study. First, I will take a closer look on the history of language teaching by discussing general characteristics in the development of language teaching and giving a historical overview of the most popular language teaching methods (Chapter 2). Second, I will move on to language teaching today and discuss traditional and innovative teaching, some factors affecting language teaching and current trends in the language teaching world. In addition, I will take a closer look at the Finnish National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools 2003 and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Chapter 3). What is more, I will introduce previous Finnish and foreign studies on the popularity and use of different language teaching methods and on students' and teachers' perceptions on language teaching (Chapter 4). In chapter 5, I will discuss the methodological framework of the present study and the results will be presented and

analyzed in chapter 6. I will discuss the main results, limitations of the study and future research in chapter 7 and finally, chapter 8 will conclude the study.

2 HISTORY OF LANGUAGE TEACHING

I will begin this chapter by introducing general characteristics in language teaching all the way from the Classical period to the 20th century. Furthermore, I will discuss the reasons behind the changes in the ways languages are taught. After that, I will provide a historical overview of the most popular language teaching methods and trends in the linguistic world: I will present the development of language teaching in the 20th century and discuss the Grammar Translation Method, the Direct Method and the Audio-Lingual Method. Furthermore, the "Designer" methods of the 1970s, the Silent Way and Total Physical Response, will be introduced. Finally, I will discuss the shift from structure-centered approaches to communicative approaches in the 1980s and introduce communicative language teaching.

2.1 General characteristics in the development of language teaching

The 20th century has seen the development and experiment of a number of different language teaching methods – some of them have spread widely and are still used in many places and contexts while some of them have quickly lost their popularity. Probably the most common way to view the history of language teaching is to do it chronologically. However, according to Tornberg (2005: 26) the development of language teaching can also be observed thematically through changes in certain principles and trends. For example, the two opposite ideas about language teaching, formalism (i.e. focus on form) and activism (i.e. focus on meaning) have regularly taken turns in being the leading principles in language teaching methodology. Active oral production in Latin was valued from the Classical period to the Middle Ages whereas the Renaissance witnessed the rise of formalism. However, the ideas of Comenius made oral language skills dominant during the 17th century and again after that the idea of formal instruction became dominant in language teaching.

As Richards and Rodgers (1995: 1) write, it is important to acknowledge that the issues relevant in today's language teaching discussion are not normally new. For example, Tornberg (2005: 26) argues that drilling, which was introduced as an important

technique in language learning after the 1950s, was actually widely used already during the 16th and 17th centuries. Indeed, the same topics emerge from time to time depending on what kinds of skills and learner proficiency are valued. Moreover, Tornberg (2005: 26) continues that language teaching can never be considered as objective because there is always a strong connection between language teaching and the society and its culture. For example, the shift from the formalist Grammar Translation Method to audiolingualism, which emphasized oral production, was originally caused by the sudden need to teach new languages fast to American soldiers all over the world after the Second World War (Johnson 2008: 163). In other words, the society has an influence on the ways languages are taught at least on some level.

As already mentioned, the changes in the theories and principles about language learning have affected the development and invention of new language teaching methods. Linguists and language teachers are constantly trying to find the most effective ways of teaching languages and common to all the new methods or approaches is normally the belief that they are better and more effective than the previous ones. However, nowadays the idea of using only one specific language teaching method has become quite old-fashioned and the idea of an eclectic method combining several different methods has gained more popularity (Trim 1992: 10-11). Nevertheless, it is important to know about different language teaching methods and about the history and development of language teaching in order to understand the present day. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001, cited in Liu 2004: 138), the study of past and present teaching methods is important because:

> 1) it provides teachers with a view of how language teaching has evolved as a field; 2) teachers can adapt methods and approaches as sources of well used practice rather than prescriptions to suit their own teaching contexts and needs; and 3) they can provide teachers (especially novice teachers) with basic teaching skills with which they can expand their own teaching repertoire.

2.2 A historical overview of the most popular language teaching methods

Next I will briefly introduce some of the best known changes and innovations in language teaching from the second half of the 19th century to the end of the 20th century mainly in a chronological order. However, it must be remembered that different methods often overlap with each other. Therefore, presenting the history of language teaching strictly chronologically is impossible.

As Larsen-Freeman (2008: 11) presents, one of the oldest methods used in language teaching is the Grammar Translation Method, which has also been called the Classical Method, since it was used in teaching Latin and Greek. Even though translation and grammar exercises had been already used for many centuries, the idea of a specific Grammar Translation Method did not begin to develop until the end of the 18th century (Tornberg 2005: 27). During that time language learning was considered beneficial mainly because of the mental exercise and it was generally believed that students would not actually need to use the language. Therefore the main purpose of the Grammar Translation Method was to teach students to read, translate and appreciate literary classics. As Richards and Rodgers (1995: 4) point out, the method was widely used from the 1840s to the 1940s, but it has never disappeared totally and it is still popular in modified forms in several schools all over the world.

Richards and Rodgers (1995: 3-4) explain that in addition to learning to read literature in a foreign language the main purpose of Grammar Translation Method was to develop students' intellectuality and mental discipline. Moreover, as Larsen-Freeman (2008: 11) states, one of the goals in teaching students a foreign language was to familiarize them more with the grammar of their native language and to help them use their mother tongue more accurately. According to Richards and Rodgers (1995: 3-4), language learning began with a detailed analysis of grammar rules which were taught deductively, that is, the rules were taught first after which they were applied to translation tasks. Earlier approaches to language teaching concentrated on translating longer texts whereas Grammar Translation Method focused on single sentences. Indeed, this was a special feature of the new method – translating longer texts was considered too challenging for secondary school students. Vocabulary taught in classes was based on the texts translated and students were to memorize them in the form of lists of isolated words. Moreover, errors were not allowed and being accurate was the only way to pass formal written examinations. In addition, speaking and listening were not valued and the language of instruction was always the students' mother tongue.

Richards and Rodgers (1995: 5-6) point out, that as the world slowly started to globalize and opportunities for communication among people all over the world increased, a new demand for oral proficiency in foreign languages arose. Language specialists saw that the language education given in schools failed to teach students to actually use the language. Therefore, new ideas and methods began to develop. Attempts to change

language teaching starting from the late 19th century became known as the Reform Movement. Even though the opinions of linguists about the best ways to teach foreign languages differed to some extent, there were some general principles they agreed on. First of all, and as Richards and Rodgers (1995: 8) list, spoken language was considered the most important in language teaching. In addition, it was generally agreed that like children learn their mother tongue, also foreign language students should hear the language first before seeing the written form. Clearly differing from the Grammar Translation Method, it was considered that vocabulary would be best learned from sentences and from meaningful contexts, not from isolated lists of words. Furthermore, translation into and out of the target language was now thought to be unnecessary even though students' native language could still be used to check comprehension. Finally, linguists agreed on the effectiveness of inductive grammar teaching, that is, students' were to first become familiar with the context and only after that the rules were taught.

Because the Grammar Translation method did not succeed in teaching students to actually use foreign languages, the Direct Method became popular and widely used at the turn of the century (Larsen-Freeman 2008: 22). According to Richards and Rodgers (1995: 9) the name of the method came from the idea that students learn best when foreign language is used directly and spontaneously with the help of visual aids. Indeed, the Direct Method was based on the principle that the target language should be the only language used in the classroom and only the vocabulary used in everyday life was considered important. The new method underlined the importance of correct pronunciation and grammar and both speech and listening comprehension were considered important. Moreover, grammar was taught inductively and new issues were always introduced orally. When compared to the Grammar Translation Method, Larsen-Freeman (2008: 29) states that the Direct Method was much more communicative and there was more interaction from teacher to students and from students to teacher. In addition, it was now acceptable and recommended for students to communicate with each other during the lessons.

Even though the Direct Method was very popular and it seemed that it really was effective in teaching a foreign language, Brown (1994: 56) points out that the method proved to be difficult to use in schools where the classroom sizes were bigger than in private schools, the time and budget was limited and teachers were not that educated. Because of this, it eventually did not succeed in public education in Europe or in the

United States. In addition, Brown argues that the personality and skills of the teacher might have affected more to the popularity and success of the method than the actual principles behind the method.

Brown (1994: 56) states that because the Direct Method lacked a thorough methodological foundation, its popularity declined in the 1930s and teachers began to use the Grammar Translation Method again. Nevertheless, the emphasis on written skills did not last long and oral-based approaches started to gain popularity again. As Johnson (2008: 163) points out, the Second World War caused a sudden need for American soldiers to learn new languages: they were sent all around the globe and they needed proficiency in the languages of their allies and enemies. The U.S. military gave the funding for language courses focusing on oral skills and after the new "Army Method" had proved to be somewhat successful, language educators all over the world became interested in the new methodology, which in the 1950s became known as the Audio-Lingual Method (Brown 1994: 57).

In similar manner as the Direct Method, the Audio-Lingual Method regarded communication as the primary skill in language learning. Nevertheless, as Larsen-Freeman (2008: 45-47) explains, supporters of the Audio-Lingual Method believed that the best way to learn communication was through dialogs, drills and repetition, not through communicative situations. In other words, the purpose was to overlearn the target language in order to be able to use it fluently. In addition, the importance of pronunciation was emphasized with the help of tapes and language labs and errors were considered harmful.

According to Brown (1994: 45-59), the golden age of the Audio-Lingual Method was the 1960s. The idea of a continuous intense contact with the target language attracted language educators and made them believe that it was a fast and effective way to learn a new language. However, Richards and Rodgers (1995: 59) point out that people began to gradually notice that even though the new method was effective in teaching students to memorize words, sentences and dialogues, it did not succeed in teaching students to actually communicate in real life. Eventually, changes in linguistic theory in the sixties resulted in the decline of audiolingualism. For example, instead of accepting the idea of language learning as a set of habit formation, the linguist Noam Chomsky underlined the importance of "deep structure" in language learning. Whereas the supporters of the

Audio-Lingual Method believed in the importance of imitated behavior in language learning, Chomsky argued that people must have knowledge of underlying abstract rules whereby they are able to form and understand utterances they have not heard before. Moreover, he continued that in order to master a new language and to understand its complicated rules people have to use their own ability to reason and to think (Larsen-Freeman 2008: 53).

According to Brown (1994: 58), language learning research increased significantly in the 1970s. As Larsen-Freeman (2008: 53) writes, perceptions about how people learn languages changed drastically. Human cognition was emphasized and instead of seeing learners as passive recipients, they were seen as active participants in the language learning process. Indeed, it was now believed that learners have to make errors in order to test their hypothesis and in order to discover the rules and structure of the language. This change in the linguistic theory and the growing interest to how people learn languages resulted in several "innovative" methods, which were also later called the "Designer" methods of the 1970s, such as Community Language Learning, Suggestopedia, The Silent Way, Total Physical Response and The Natural Approach (Brown 1994: 58-66).

According to Johnson (2008: 180), the Silent Way and Total Physical Response were the two best known of these methods. As Larsen-Freeman (2008: 64) points out, the Silent Way highlighted learners' independence from the teacher and in order to achieve this, the teacher was to be silent for most of the time. Moreover, instead of correcting mistakes verbally, different aids were used to make meanings clear (Johnson 2008: 180). Larsen-Freeman (2008: 113) explains that the Total Physical Response, instead, underlined the importance of enjoying the learning process. The purpose was to reduce the stress students experience while learning and a clear connection was made between physical actions and learning. Moreover, the supporters of this method believed that foreign language learning should be similar to the way children learn their native language, which is why students learned to first understand the language and only after that to produce it (Larsen-Freeman 2008: 113). According to Johnson (2008: 179), common to all of these humanistic approaches of the 1970s was the emphasis of the individual learner and the importance of active participation and self-discovery in the language learning process. Moreover, these new methods highlighted the significance of the learners' feelings and cognitive growth. According to Rodgers (2001), the period

from the 1950s to the 1980s can be referred to as "The Age of Methods". Indeed, these three decades were characterized by a number of quite detailed methods for language teaching.

As Larsen-Freeman (2008: 121) points out, towards the end of the 1970s linguists began to, again, question the new methods. Students might have learned linguistic structures but when it came to actual communication outside the classroom, the skills were not that good. Indeed, it soon became apparent that mastering a language includes considerably more than just linguistic competence. Language educators realized that the knowledge of how to communicate in different social situations was as important as the knowledge of the language itself: the significance of communicative competence was finally acknowledged. These ideas caused a major shift in the field from a linguistic structure-centered approach to communicative approaches in the early 1980s (Widdowson 1990, cited in Larsen-Freeman 2008: 121).

Richards and Rodgers (1995: 66) argue that instead of seeing communicative language teaching as a single method, it should be seen as an approach because there is no single model behind the teaching. Depending on the learners, their goals and the surroundings, the content of communicative language teaching varies a lot and compared to earlier methods, it offers a greater possibility for individual interpretation (Richards and Rodgers 1995: 83). Nevertheless, according to Larsen-Freeman (2008: 121-135), everything that is done in communicative language teaching has a communicative intent. Moreover, the role of the teacher is to be an adviser, not an authority and the students are seen as communicators. Interaction during lessons happens in the target language and authentic materials are strongly recommended in order to make the exercises purposeful. In addition, even though communicative language learning stresses the importance of communication, all the four language skills – speaking, writing, listening and reading – are considered necessary.

As Brown (1994: 77) points out, communicative language teaching has maintained its dominance since the 1980s. Probably the biggest reason for its wide popularity is the fact that nowadays people need to communicate in foreign languages and learning grammar and linguistic structures is not enough. Moreover, instead of restricting the teacher and the students to a narrow, specific kind of teaching, communicative language teaching offers numerous possibilities to learn new languages and gives language

educators the freedom to decide what suits their purposes best, as long as the teaching has a communicative intent. Even though communicative language teaching has been the biggest trend in language teaching already for three decades, Richards and Rodgers (1995: 83) point out that this approach as well has its opponents. First of all, there is no guarantee that communicative language teaching is suitable for all levels. Second, the opponents raise the question of how teachers using communicative language teaching can evaluate their students. Moreover, because communicative language teaching requires a lot from the teacher, critique has fallen on how suitable this approach is for non-native teachers. Finally, the usefulness of the approach has been questioned in situations where students have to continue to take grammar-based tests.

As mentioned earlier, language teaching methods are not seen similarly today as they were before. Language teachers have to decide what kind of teaching suits their purposes best and even though communicativeness seems to be the trend nowadays, the idea of eclecticism, the freedom to tailor teaching to the specific needs of the class regardless of latest trends, has gained more popularity among language educators.

3 LANGUAGE TEACHING TODAY

As discussed above, nowadays teachers often prefer to choose and blend different ways of teaching depending on students' needs. Therefore, both traditional and innovative ways of language teaching are used. In this chapter I will discuss what the terms traditional and innovative language teaching mean. First, I will take a closer look on the definitions of traditional teaching and after that I will move on to present what kinds of things are usually connected with innovative teaching.

In order to understand the field of language education better, it is relevant to acknowledge what directs language teaching today. Therefore, I will also discuss key factors affecting foreign language teaching and take a closer look at two documents directing language education in Finland: the Finnish National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools 2003 and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Finally, I will present the current trends in language teaching today and different approaches connected to the dominant method, i.e. communicative language teaching.

3.1 Traditional and innovative teaching

Traditional methods are characterized by teacher-centeredness. According to Novak and Gowin (1984, cited in Norrena 2011: 25), Bernaus and Gardner (2008: 390) and Choudhury (2011: 35-36), it is assumed that teachers are the ones who make students learn by giving them all the information they need. Indeed, the teacher is seen as the organizer and controller of all classroom activities. Furthermore, Novak and Gowin (1984, cited in Norrena 2011: 25) emphasize the importance of teacher's charisma in lessons.

According to Chism (2006: 3), traditional teaching happens only in classrooms and at fixed times. The lessons follow the same routine and learning is an individual activity which demands privacy. What is more, lessons are based on course books (Nowak and Gowin 1984, cited in Norrena 2011: 25). Bernaus and Gardner (2008: 390) argue that the focus in the lessons is on learning the elements and structure of the language. Moreover, Choudhury (2011: 35) continues, repetitive practice, mechanical drills and memorization of grammar rules are emphasized in traditional teaching. As Larsen-Freeman (2008: 18) points out, the language of instruction during lessons is most of the time students' native language. Moreover, Bernaus and Gardner (2008: 390) mention tests as a way to evaluate students' achievement in traditional teaching. Furthermore, they hypothesize that in traditional teaching it is not common for teachers to develop their teaching by asking feedback from students.

According to Choudhury (2011: 37), the idea of innovative teaching and learner-centeredness is the result of several innovative perspectives on language teaching that have emerged during the recent decades. Choudhury mentions the humanistic approaches of the 1970s which emphasized the emotions of the learner and after that the rise of communicative language teaching as crucial factors in the development of innovative teaching. Both Choudhury (2011: 37) and Bernaus and Gardner (2008: 390) see innovative teaching as student-centered: the focus is on the learner, who is in charge of his or her own learning. Bernaus and Gardner continue that all the exercises done in lessons encourage students to interact with each other and with the teacher in the second language. Moreover, they argue that in innovative teaching, all the four language skill areas are considered equal and that the importance of student feedback is emphasized. As Choudhury (2011: 37) points out, students are active users of a language and the

teacher's role is to be an adviser and a motivator. Furthermore, he continues, the teacher has an important role in creating the best possible classroom environment and atmosphere for learning.

According to Shear et al. (2009: 1), innovative teaching is characterized by three factors. First of all, and as stated also by Choudhury (2011: 37) and Bernaus and Gardner (2008: 390), innovative teaching is student-centered and activates students. Secondly, teaching is not limited to classrooms. Instead, in addition to normal classroom teaching, it is advisable to offer students learning opportunities outside the normal school environment. Thirdly, integrating information technology to teaching is important: computers and the Internet offer numerous possibilities and excellent tools for creating a student-centered learning environment. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that information technology is a means and not an end in itself: teachers need to familiarize themselves with the functions and possibilities of computers before integrating information technology to their teaching.

To sum up, these two sets of practices differ from each other significantly. Traditional methods are characterized by teacher-centeredness and the focus during lessons is on form, structure and accurate production. Moreover, teacher is considered as the protagonist in the classroom. Innovative strategies, on the other hand, are characterized by student-centeredness, which means that the autonomy of the language learner is emphasized. In addition, the focus of the lessons is on holistic understanding and fluent communication. These two sets of practices also differ from each other in the way in which they evaluate students' progress in language learning. It is often hypothesized that traditional teaching favors written exams as the main tool of evaluation, whereas teachers using innovative strategies also test students' oral proficiency and consider all the four language skills equal. Furthermore, innovative teaching emphasizes the importance of student feedback in developing lessons and it is hypothesized that teachers preferring innovative teaching often ask their students to evaluate their teaching performance.

3.2 Factors affecting language teaching today

As discussed earlier, language teaching has been through several changes during the history. But what is the situation today? Even though communicativeness is widely

valued, other ways of teaching are still not forgotten. As Larsen-Freeman (2008: 177) points out, all the language teaching methods used in the 20th century are still being practiced to different extents in different situations. According to Hinkel (2006: 111), the popularity of methods depends a lot on the context: it is definitely more challenging to, for example teach language with communicative methods in a lecture hall with seventy students than with a group of ten students in a small classroom. In other words, the group size and the physical setting can affect a great deal on the way languages are taught. Moreover and most importantly, learners' needs and goals direct teaching. When planning a course, language educators need to take into account how well the students should and need to learn the language: while others have to learn a new language in order to use it in academic written contexts, others might only need it in practical oral situations. In addition, other resources such as time, money and the skills of the teacher and the effort he or she is ready to make for the lessons are relevant factors in determining the way language is taught. Finally, Larsen-Freeman (2008: 184) points out, that it is often outside the control of teachers to decide the way language is taught. The curriculum and the exams often force teachers to teach a foreign language in a specific way, even though they would want to try something else.

Hinkel (2006: 110) argues that there are four factors that have affected crucially the way languages are taught today. First of all, the decline in the use of specific methods has led to a situation where teachers have a larger responsibility in planning the courses. Even though, as Trim (1992: 9-10) points out, there is a general acceptance of communicative competence as the central goal in language learning and learners are nowadays seen as active participants rather than as passive recipients of teaching, teachers have the freedom to choose the ways of teaching which best suit their purposes. Trim continues by pointing out that the most significant current trend in language teaching today is methodological pluralism, meaning that all the positive features of different methods should be absorbed. Larsen-Freeman (2008: 183) agrees with Trim's idea and introduces the concept of *principled eclecticism*, where teachers create their own methods by taking features of other methods in a principled manner.

Another factor affecting language teaching today, according to Hinkel (2006: 111), is the growing emphasis on both bottom-up and top-down skills. Even though continuous exposure to a foreign language and communicative interaction develop students' communicative competence, studies have shown that without traditional, form-focused

instruction learners' syntactic and lexical accuracy will not develop. In other words, both ways of teaching have to be applied in teaching in order to develop students' four language skills equally.

Third, Hinkel (2006: 112) argues that new knowledge about English affects language pedagogy. English language is studied all the time and there are large corporas of spoken and written English from different countries, registers and genres. These findings of real-life language use can, according to Hinkel, direct English language teaching and improve learning. Nevertheless, the effects of corpus findings to English language teaching have also been questioned because the findings are often very much connected to a specific native culture and therefore useless for learners who have no opportunities to interact with native speakers and have no access to that culture.

Fourth, according to Hinkel (2006: 113), integrated and multiple skills taught in context affect language teaching today. Indeed, nowadays the focus of teaching is often on meaningful communication and the goal is to develop learners' communicative competence. Therefore, the popularity of teaching through a foreign language has increased considerably. Content and language integrated learning has gained popularity and different variations to it have developed, such as multilingual education, immersion, enriched language programmes and language showers (Mehisto, Marsh and Frigols 2008: 12). As Oxford (2001) says, the most prominent advantage of content and language integrated learning is that it acquaints learners with authentic language. Moreover, students realize that the foreign language they are learning is a useful tool in interaction, not only a school subject or a key to pass an exam. Nevertheless, as Hinkel (2006: 113-114) points out, the effectiveness of content and language integrated learning has also been questioned in situations where learning is limited to only few hours of classroom instruction and input. Furthermore, the effectiveness suffers in situations where it is challenging for the teacher to master both the language and the subject matter or where the students concentrate only on learning the subject matter and do not have motivation to learn the language of instruction.

The focus on communication and the image of the learner as an agent rather than as a passive recipient of teaching in language education can be seen from the Finnish school curricula. Indeed, the importance of learners' own activity, autonomy and communication are emphasized already in basic education. According to the Finnish

National Core Curriculum for Basic Education (2004: 17) "the function of the working approaches is to develop social, learning, thinking, working and problem-solving skills, and to foster active participation". Furthermore, teachers are advised to choose working approaches, which in addition to other things "support learning that occurs through interaction among the pupils", "promotes social flexibility, an ability to function in constructive cooperation, and the assumption of responsibility for others" and "develop capabilities for taking responsibility for one's own learning, for evaluating that learning, and for seeking feedback for purposes of reflecting on one's own actions".

According to the curriculum the focus in language teaching before third grade is clearly on oral communication and comprehension. During grades 3-6 the focus continues to be mostly on oral situations even though the role of written communication grows as well. Finally, in grades 7-9 the importance of written skills further increases even though it is also important to develop students' language skills in more demanding social situations. Indeed, the language skill areas that are emphasized affect the way language is taught: if oral skills have the biggest role, it could be assumed that more innovative teaching is favored. Furthermore, if written skills are dominant, teachers might choose more features from traditional teaching. Nevertheless, Vitikka (2009, cited in Norrena 2011: 29) argues that instead of giving advice on how to teach, the curriculum for basic education focuses only on describing the contents of different subjects. Therefore, it does not support teachers in the teaching-learning process enough.

Kangasvieri et al. (2011: 52) point out, that even though the curriculum for basic education emphasizes communicativeness in language teaching, the study results show that knowledge about language is still more important than the actual ability to use language. Furthermore, according to Pitkänen-Huhta (2003: 12), language teaching still revolves too much around textbooks, which is considered as one of the problems in language teaching today. In addition, Luukka et al. (2008: 64) state that the content of textbooks is still very traditional and therefore restricts language teaching.

Because this study focuses on English teaching in Finnish upper secondary schools, I will next take a more closer and detailed look at the Finnish National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools 2003 and discuss whether it directs teaching towards innovative or traditional ways of teaching.

3.3 The Finnish National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools 2003

The Finnish National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools tells a lot about the current trends and skills valued in foreign language learning in Finland today. The curriculum is planned by the Finnish National Board of Education and it defines the objectives and core contents of each subject taught in upper secondary schools. Moreover, according to the Finnish National Board of Education, the government decides on the amount of time used for instruction in different subjects. The curriculum used today is already ten years old, but a new curriculum is being reformed and will be implemented in the schools in 2016.

As already mentioned, Trim (1992: 10) argues that the students are seen more as agents than as passive recipients of teaching in the classroom. Indeed, even though his ideas are already twenty years old, the curriculum proves that they are still valid. According to the curriculum, students should "be familiar with their own strengths and development needs as communicators and language learners" and "know how to develop their language skills through strategies that are appropriate to their development needs, study assignments and communication tasks" (National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools 2003: 102). Moreover, according to the curriculum it is important that language instruction provided in upper secondary schools supports students with independent study of languages "by helping them to understand that achievement of communication skills requires perseverance and diversified practice in communication" (National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools 2003: 102). Indeed, students' role as active participants in their own language learning process is emphasized.

Moreover, according to the curriculum, "students must be provided with opportunities to listen, read, speak and write for different purposes on every course, even though the priorities emphasized vary from course to course" (National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools 2003: 103). In other words, the document states that it is important to practice all the four language areas. When looking at the course descriptions on compulsory courses in language A (the syllabus started in grades 1-6 of basic education), there are two courses in which the emphasis is clearly on oral communication and one course in which the emphasis is on written expression. Other

courses place equal emphasis on both oral and written communication or there is not any mention about the skills emphasized.

The curriculum highlights the importance of cultural issues and multiculturalism as well. Indeed, according to the curriculum the purpose is to develop students' intercultural communication skills and help students to "develop their awareness, understanding and appreciation of the culture within the area or community where the language is spoken" (National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools 2003: 102). In addition, the curriculum states that foreign language teaching is seen not only as a practical and theoretical, but also as a cultural subject.

Moreover, the curriculum includes language proficiency levels based on the evaluation scale of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR 2001: 24-29). The levels describe foreign language proficiency at six levels: A1 and A2, B1 and B2, C1 and C2. In the National Core Curriculum, these levels are further divided into smaller levels in order to make assessment easier. These proficiency levels set concrete goals for foreign language teachers and learners by showing which levels students should achieve, depending on the syllabus. For example, students who have started studying English in grades 1-6 of basic education (the "A language") should achieve level B2.1 in all the four language skill areas by the end of upper secondary school.

As can be seen, the curriculum only outlines the general goals and aims of language learning in upper secondary schools and therefore offers language teachers the freedom to plan and tailor their teaching according to their own interests and preferences, as long as the themes and goals are covered. In other words, rather than telling how to teach languages, the curriculum focuses on the goals and outcome. In fact, the only thing referring to the actual teaching is the recommendation to use authentic material (National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools 2001: 103), which is a common feature in communicative approaches. However, because the curriculum emphasizes students' active role in their own language learning process, the equality of all the four language skill areas and multiculturalism, it could be argued that it directs teachers to use more innovative ways of teaching.

3.4 The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, abbreviated as CEFR, is an extensive guideline document about language learning, teaching and assessment. It was put together by the Council of Europe in 2001 after twenty years of research in order to improve co-operation among educational institutions in Europe. In its own words, the document provides "a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks etc. across Europe" (CEFR 2001: 1). Indeed, the main aim of the document is to offer clear definitions of language teaching and learning objectives and in that way make it easier to evaluate language proficiency in an internationally comparable manner (Council of Europe 2012).

As many other European countries, also Finland has used the CEFR as the main source in planning language curricula. As already mentioned, the Finnish National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools 2003 uses the language proficiency scales based on the six level evaluation scale of the CEFR. Moreover, the ideas of communicative competence and the importance of versatile language proficiency, which the CEFR promotes, can also be seen in the curriculum. Indeed, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages and especially the document's description of language proficiency has become very influential in Europe among language educators in language teaching, testing and assessment.

The common reference levels are represented in several different ways for different purposes. Language skills can be summarized in single holistic paragraphs as well as in more detailed overviews of different language skill areas, such as accuracy or fluency in spoken performance. For example, below are descriptions of the general language skills an A1 basic user and a B2 independent user should have:

> A1. Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.
>
> B2. Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various points. (CEFR 2001: 24.)

As can be seen, neither the National Core Curriculum nor the CEFR provides direct advice on how to teach languages. Nevertheless, it sets goals and provides detailed descriptions of different skill levels which should be achieved in different developmental stages. In other words, teaching and learning objectives are clearly defined in the document. In addition to the language proficiency scales, the CEFR also provides a detailed analysis of the situations and domains of communication and the knowledge and skills communicative situations require (Council of Europe 2012).

3.5 Current trends in language teaching

As already mentioned, communicative language teaching is dominant in the linguistic world today. Nevertheless, the approach is very broad and offers teachers the possibility to teach in numerous different ways and with individual interpretations. According to Larsen-Freeman (2008: 137), the postmethod era has seen the development of several different approaches connected to communicative language teaching, such as content-based, task-based and participatory approaches. Howatt (1984: 279, cited in Larsen-Freeman 2008: 137) argues that the difference between these three approaches and communicative language teaching is the fact that when in communicative language teaching students "learn to use English", these three approaches offer students the possibility to "use English to learn it". In other words, the focus is more on the process instead of the content.

As mentioned above, content-based instruction means teaching some other content with the foreign language. In this approach, the focus is on the subject matter and learning the language is more unconscious. As Brown (2007: 56) points out, content-based instruction demands more from teachers because they have to be experts in two subjects, the foreign language and the actual content taught.

Larsen-Freeman (2008: 144) says that task-based instruction reminds content-based instruction because the purpose of both approaches is to provide a natural context for using language. Nevertheless, the focus in task-based teaching is only on the foreign language instead of two subjects. The purpose is to teach students a foreign language by giving them interactive and communicative tasks which they have to solve together. In this way, the attention is drawn from the language to the task and learning the language becomes unconscious.

According to Brown (2007: 50), there are conflicting opinions on whether task-based teaching differs from communicative language teaching or not. However, Larsen-Freeman (2008: 146) argues that there is a significant difference. Even though similar tasks can be used in communicative language teaching as well, the focus is, according to Larsen-Freeman, always on a particular language function or form, whereas in task-based teaching the teacher uses a variety of different linguistic forms. Moreover, the focus in task-based instruction is more on completing the task, not on the language used during the process.

The third way of teaching focusing more on the process instead of the content is participatory approach. Larsen-Freeman (2008: 150) points out that because the focus of this approach is on meaningful content, it resembles content-based language teaching. Nevertheless, instead of another subject matter, the content is built on topics that are somehow related to the personal lives of the students. Moreover, students are encouraged to take action and do something about the problems they have discussed during the lessons. For example, if students discuss about the high prices of public transport, the teacher might give them a task to write a real letter to transport services requesting to lower the prices. In this way the lessons become more meaningful and authentic. As Larsen-Freeman (2008: 154) argues, in this approach as well the language follows from the content instead of thinking about it in advance.

Whether these three approaches differ from communicative language teaching or not, Brown (2007: 50) argues, depends on how communicative language teaching is seen. If communicative language teaching is seen as an umbrella term for all the ways of teaching a foreign language with a communicative intent, these approaches can be considered simply as different versions of communicative language teaching. However, if communicative language teaching is seen as a more narrow approach with specific goals and ways of teaching, these three concepts can be considered as their own approaches to language teaching. All in all, several different ways to teach foreign languages communicatively have developed during the last decades and as Brown (2007: 18) points out, foreign language teaching with a communicative intent has established a firm position in the linguistic world.

4 PREVIOUS STUDIES ON THE POPULARITY AND USE OF DIFFERENT LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODS

After discussing the previous history of language teaching methods and essential views on language teaching today, I will move on to presenting previous studies made on the popularity and use of different language teaching methods. Even though a study like the present study has not been made, language teaching methods and students' and teachers' opinions on language teaching have been studied from slightly different perspectives. These studies have concentrated on the use and popularity of different language teaching methods and on the perceptions of students and teachers on different ways of teaching English or other foreign languages. I will begin with foreign studies: a research covering several countries all over the world will be discussed first and after that I will present studies limited to only a few countries. Finally, I will present studies conducted in Finland.

4.1 Foreign studies

Liu (2004) studied the use of different language teaching methods by teachers in the postmethod era. The purpose of the study was to find out and understand how familiar language teachers all over the world are with different language teaching methods and what kind of teaching and methods they prefer. Altogether 448 language teachers from different countries took part in the study. The teaching contexts, institutional settings, educational levels, years of teaching and class sizes they usually taught varied a great deal, which made the participant group very diverse.

The results showed that the respondents were most familiar with communicative language teaching and an eclectic method, meaning the combination of several different language teaching methods (Liu 2004). Moreover, according to the results, communicative language teaching and an eclectic method were the most common methods used in all proficiency levels. Nevertheless, the findings showed that teachers' use of specific methods clearly decreased with learners at advanced proficiency levels, which validates Brown's (1997: 10) earlier assumption that methods are more indistinguishable from each other at advanced levels than at lower levels. Finally, the study showed that from all the methods, teachers preferred communicative language teaching and an eclectic method the most. Even though Grammar Translation was

among the least favorite methods, it was still used in many contexts especially in larger classes and with learners at low proficiency levels. As already mentioned, Larsen-Freeman (2008: 184) argues, that teachers are not always able to control the way they teach. Liu's study confirms this argument: according to the results, not all English teachers can do what they prefer because of a number of factors, such as the class size and the examination system. Indeed, if the class has fifty students it might be impossible for the teacher to for example evaluate students' oral proficiency or if there are compulsory exams which only measure written skills, oral communication might easily be left out from the lessons.

Bernaus and Gardner (2008) conducted a similar study in Spain. However, finding out what kinds of language teaching strategies teachers used was only a part of the study. The purpose was also to compare teacher and student perceptions of strategy use and find out the effects of those strategies on students' achievement and motivation. Altogether 31 English teachers and 694 students took part in the study. The student participants were 15 years old and in their last year of compulsory secondary education.

The participants were asked to rate the frequency of 26 different language teaching strategies used in their lessons. Bernaus and Gardner (2008) divided these strategies into traditional and innovative ways of teaching, even though they were not identified as such in the questionnaire. Statements referring to traditional strategies, such as "*I ask students to memorize lists of vocabulary*" or "*I allow my students to speak Catalan or Spanish in class*", referred to teacher-centered teaching which, as already discussed, focuses on the structural aspects of language whereas statements referring to innovative teaching, such as "*My students play games in class*" or "*I surprise my students with new activities in order to maintain their interest*", emphasized student-centeredness and focused on communication. Moreover, innovative teaching emphasized the role of the student in the language learning process.

According to the results, even though the use of different language teaching strategies differed a lot depending on the teacher, they still used more traditional than innovative ways of teaching. In addition, students' perceptions of strategy use affected their motivation and achievement: traditional strategies affected negatively whereas innovative strategies affected positively. Interestingly, even though traditional strategies were mostly recognized by both students and teachers, many students did not recognize

the innovative strategies teachers claimed to use. With these results a conclusion was drawn, that in order for the teaching strategies to be effective they must be perceived as such by the students. In order to make this possible, teachers should for example collect feedback from students.

The study by Bernaus and Gardner is supported by an earlier study by Ibarrarran, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2007, cited in Bernaus and Gardner 2008: 388). The results showed that students clearly prefer communicative activities, active participation and authentic materials instead of only following the course books. Nevertheless, according to the study, students also hoped explicit correction of grammar errors. Furthermore, a study by Schulz (2001) supports the finding that students and teachers can perceive things differently. The focus of his study was on student and teacher perceptions concerning the value of the use of grammar instruction and corrective feedback in foreign language learning in Colombia and USA. The results showed that even though the two teacher groups and the two student groups highly agreed with each other on the majority of questions, there was a significant disagreement between the teachers and the students about the role of formal grammar instruction and error correction: students valued formal study of grammar and error correction in foreign language learning clearly more than teachers.

Brown (2006) has also studied the perceptions of students and teachers on effective language teaching and compared their views. The participants were from the university of Arizona. Furthermore, he compared the students' and the teachers' perceptions of how often specific teaching behaviors were performed in the classroom. Overall, Brown states, that the teachers' opinions of effective language teaching resembled the "ideal" communicative classroom where students engage in meaningful, real-world tasks, work in groups or pairs, use computers and authentic materials and get to know the target culture. Interestingly, students' ideas about effective language teaching were more traditional. Supporting the results of the study by Schulz (2001), Brown found that the students valued direct error correction of oral mistakes clearly more than the teachers. Moreover, the students thought that traditional grammar practice is more useful than communicative practice in foreign language learning, whereas the teachers preferred communicative language teaching strategies over grammar. Furthermore, the teachers wanted their students to speak the foreign language from the first lesson, whereas the students were more hesitant with speaking.

Even though the biggest differences between the two groups were found in their opinions about effective language teaching, some differences also occurred in their perceptions of what was actually happening in the classroom. For example, the teachers agreed more than the students that they had tasks with real-life purpose, that they used authentic materials and that they encouraged students to speak the foreign language in class. Moreover, the students agreed more than the teachers that the mistakes they did while speaking were corrected directly. In other words, the teachers' perceptions of their language lessons reminded more of an "ideal" communicative classroom and innovativeness in teaching than the perceptions of the students.

Even though students' opinions about effective language teaching are, at least according to the study by Brown (2006), more traditional than their teachers' opinions, Bartram (2006) argues that students do prefer innovative language teaching. He studied the opinions of students aged 15 to 16 on language teaching in England, Netherlands and Germany. Interestingly, students were unanimous in all countries about what is good and bad language teaching. According to the results, versatility in lessons and exercises providing practical language skills were valued the most. Furthermore, the participants agreed on the positive effects of good atmosphere and teacher-student relationship. Students experienced the lessons boring if they always follow the same routine, there is too much focus on textbooks or if there is too much focus on one particular language skill area, such as reading. Furthermore, students hoped that the role of information technology would be bigger in foreign language lessons.

4.2 Finnish studies

Interestingly, the scope of studies made on foreign language teaching in Finland is quite narrow. Moreover, the studies made concentrate more on oral skills teaching whereas the focus of the present study is on language teaching in general. Nevertheless, the studies I found have got some interesting results in relation to my study. Huuskonen and Kähkönen (2006) studied the perceptions of altogether 80 teachers on practicing, testing and assessing oral skills in Finnish upper secondary schools. The results showed that teachers generally value oral skills and the majority also used English in their lessons as much as possible. The most common methods for practicing oral skills during lessons were pair and group discussions and dialogs. The results also showed that less time was

spent on practicing oral skills during the third year because of the Matriculation Examination.

Even though the respondents considered teaching oral skills in upper secondary school important, oral proficiency was not assessed by most of the teachers as part of the course grade. The biggest reasons for this were lack of time, large group sizes and the matriculation examination, which only tests literary skills. Interestingly, teachers also reported that students often lack motivation or are too restless or shy to practice oral skills. Indeed, the National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools (2003) states that students should achieve the proficiency level B2.1 in all the four language skill areas. However, as Huuskonen and Kähkönen point out, determining students' proficiency level in speaking is impossible if oral skills are not assessed by teachers in upper secondary schools. All in all, the study showed that teachers generally have a positive attitude towards teaching oral skills in Finnish upper secondary schools. On the other hand, they were skeptical about assessing speaking and many teachers considered written skills more important because of the matriculation examination. Even though these results do not tell anything directly about the language teaching strategies used in upper secondary schools, it can be assumed that if teachers prefer written skills over oral skills, more traditional ways of teaching are favored.

Yli-Renko and Salo-Lee (1991) examined if students are satisfied with foreign language teaching in upper secondary schools and if they are not, what kinds of changes should be made. Even though the results showed that students are generally satisfied with the teaching, the majority agreed that oral skills should be practiced more. Biggest reasons for ignoring oral skills in lessons were similar to the reasons Huuskonen and Kähkönen (2006) gave: large group sizes, emphasis on grammar teaching and the matriculation exam which makes the lessons more teacher-led by forcing teachers to focus on teaching literary skills. Because of the matriculation examination students did not want to reduce traditional language teaching because it was experienced as a clear and safe way of working. According to the results the majority of the students considered speaking and using the language in real life as the most important goals in foreign language learning. Because of this, a conclusion was drawn that more emphasis should be placed on practicing oral skills. (Yli-Renko and Salo-Lee 1991: 25-69.) However, this study is already over twenty years old and more up-to-date information is needed.

5 THE METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE PRESENT STUDY

In this chapter I will introduce the present study in detail. First, the aims of the study and the research questions will be presented and discussed in the light of earlier research. Second, the research method will be introduced and the advantages and disadvantages of the method will be discussed. Third, the data gathering process will be discussed, the questionnaire will be presented and the participants will be introduced. Finally, the methods used in analyzing the data will be explained.

5.1 The aims and research questions

The research questions of the present study are the following:

1. What kind of teaching takes place in English lessons in Finnish upper secondary schools? Is there a clear preference either for traditional methods (teacher-centeredness) or innovative strategies (student-centeredness)?

2. What are students' and teachers' opinions on traditional and innovative language teaching?

3. What are the most effective ways of teaching English according to students and teachers?

4. Are there differences between students' and teachers' perceptions and opinions on English language teaching?

The purpose of the first research question is to find out how English is taught in Finnish upper secondary schools. To be more precise, the aim is to examine whether there is a clear preference either for traditional or innovative ways of teaching in English lessons. The idea to use this kind of categorization came from the study by Bernaus and Gardner (2008) who, as already mentioned above, among other things studied how much teachers use traditional and innovative teaching in their English lessons.

The purpose of the second research question is to find out students' and teachers' opinions on specific traditional and innovative ways of teaching English. Furthermore,

the third research question aims to find out what the most effective ways of teaching English according to students and teachers are. Studies have shown that there is a clear link between student satisfaction and effective teaching (Theall and Franklin 2001, cited in Sajjad 2010: 2). In other words, if students are satisfied with their lessons, they learn effectively. Therefore, it is important to know students' opinions on English teaching. Furthermore, Gault (2003) argues that the opinions of students and teachers regarding good language teaching practices often differ significantly from each other and that this conflict can lead to student dissatisfaction and at the worst to lack of motivation, which is why it is important to know teachers' opinions about different ways of teaching English as well. Indeed, knowing the opinions of both students and teachers is very important in developing English teaching in upper secondary schools.

Finally, the purpose of the fourth research question is to compare students' and teachers' answers in all of the three earlier questions and to discuss reasons for the possible differences. Bernaus and Gardner (2008) found that students did not recognize the innovative strategies their teachers claimed to use during English lessons. Therefore, a conclusion was drawn that students and teachers can perceive things differently in the classroom. Furthermore, as already mentioned, students' and teachers' opinions on different ways of language teaching can differ from each other and it can cause problems in learning, which is why a comparison between students' and teachers' answers is relevant. In addition to Gault (2003), the results of the studies by Brown (2006) and Schulz (2001) support this view.

These questions seem to be quite scantly studied in Finland. However, when looking at the results of the study made by Yli-Renko and Salo-Lee (1991), it can be hypothesized that students are generally satisfied with the teaching but hope that more emphasis would be placed on teaching oral skills. In addition, according to the study by Huuskonen and Kähkönen (2006) it can be assumed that even though teachers generally have a positive attitude towards teaching speaking skills, written skills dominate English teaching in upper secondary schools because matriculation examination focuses only on testing literary skills. Moreover, it can be assumed that if written skills are preferred over oral skills, more traditional teacher-centered teaching is favored.

5.2 The research method

Finding a suitable method for the study was a challenging task. However, after a thorough reasoning and comparison of the pros and cons of different methods, I decided to use a multiple choice questionnaire in order to get a general overview of the issue. The questionnaire has altogether 42 Likert scale statements and an open-ended question. In other words, the study is quantitative but the open-ended question offers a possibility for a qualitative analysis. Several other methods could have also been used, such as interviewing students and teachers or observing lessons. Nevertheless, because the purpose was to get a general overview of the issue and to get straightforward descriptive information, these qualitative methods would not have been suitable for this study.

As with all research methods, there are both advantages and disadvantages in using questionnaires to gather data. According to Hirsjärvi, Remes and Sajavaara (2009: 195), using a questionnaire is one of the fastest ways of gathering data from a large number of participants. In addition, it is easy to include several questions in a questionnaire, although the number of questions and the length of the questionnaire should be carefully considered. As Munn and Drever (1991: 10) point out, another advantage of using a questionnaire is that it guarantees anonymity for the respondents. This is especially important for the teacher-participants in my study because in order to get realistic results they need to answer truthfully the questions about how they teach English and not how they perhaps would want to teach or are expected to teach. Moreover, a questionnaire is a good tool in producing straightforward descriptive information, which is important in order to be able to answer the research questions of the present study. In addition, Munn and Drever (1991: 10) continue, that even though it is impossible to control the way in which the respondents interpret the questions in a questionnaire, the questions are at least presented similarly and in the same order for everyone. Finally, according to Hirsjärvi et al. (2009: 195) the answers of a questionnaire are easy and fast to process and analyze by using statistical computer software.

As already mentioned, there are also disadvantages in using a questionnaire as a tool in collecting data. Hirsjärvi et al. (2009: 195) point out, that designing a good questionnaire is a time-consuming and demanding task and that data collected with a questionnaire is often considered superficial. Moreover, it is impossible to know how seriously the respondents have taken the questionnaire: answers might have been

written in a hurry without thorough thinking which naturally influences the quality of the answers. It can also be challenging to come up with good and extensive answer alternatives and it is impossible to control misunderstandings: even though the questions seem clear for the researcher, the participants might interpret them differently. In addition, it is difficult to know how familiar the participants actually are with the topic and how interested they are in answering questions related to it. In the present study the teacher participants definitely are familiar with the topic and assumingly also interested in answering the questions but it is impossible to know how much the student participants have thought about English teaching and the most effective ways of learning prior to their participation in the study, even though they have a lot of experience about English lessons as students. Besides, as Hirsjärvi et al. (2009: 195) argue, it is easy for the participants to leave questions unanswered and therefore the loss of answers can in some situations grow high.

As Dörnyei (2007: 35) points out, one of the disadvantages of quantitative research is that it does not do justice for individual responses and that it tends to focus only on averages of the whole heterogeneous group of participants. Therefore, quantitative research has been criticized as overly simplistic. Moreover, as Hirsjärvi et al. (2003: 201) criticize the restrictedness of the Likert scale questions because of the ready-made answer alternatives, an open-ended question was included in the questionnaire. Indeed, by adding an open-ended question in the questionnaire made it possible for the participants to express their opinions freely without any restrictions, which according to Dörnyei (2007: 107) makes the data more versatile than fully quantitative data.

According to Dörnyei (2007: 107), responses for open-ended questions can also provide unexpected data and lead us to identify completely new issues, which was also one of the reasons to add the open-ended question to the questionnaire. Even though the Likert scale questions already asked the opinions of the participants on several different ways of teaching English, offering the participants the possibility to answer freely with an open-ended question was necessary because it was impossible to include the whole range of possible teaching techniques in the Likert scale questions. Moreover, the purpose of the Likert scale questions was only to ask the participants to rate different ways of teaching on a scale from 1 to 5 according to their effectiveness, not to find out what are the most effective ways of teaching English according to the participants.

Only one open-ended question was included in the questionnaire because this study is mainly quantitative and the purpose was to collect data from a large group of participants in order to get a general overview of the issue. Furthermore, as Hirsjärvi et al. (2009: 195) argue, there is always a risk that the respondents answer superficially to the open-ended question because there is no interviewer asking to elaborate on the answer. Moreover, it is easier and faster for the participants to answer multiple choice questions than open-ended questions.

5.3 Data collection and the questionnaire

The data was collected during February and March 2013. I compiled two Likert scale questionnaires, one for students and one for teachers. Each questionnaire had 42 statements, five response alternatives and one open-ended question where the respondents were able to freely write about their opinions. The questionnaires had the same content but the questions in the teachers' questionnaire were formed slightly differently (see Appendices 1 and 2). The questions were in Finnish in order to minimize the possibility of misunderstandings. In addition, I believe it was easier at least for the students to answer the open-ended question in their mother tongue because using English might have affected the length and quality of their answers.

In order to be able to design a good questionnaire, a pilot study is necessary (Hirsjärvi et al. 2009: 204). After conducting a pilot study on eleven people and consulting my supervisor, I modified the instructions of the questionnaire in order to make it as clear and informative as possible. Moreover, I left some of the statements out and added new statements. The original Likert scale questionnaire had only four answer alternatives but after the pilot study I added the fifth response alternative "Cannot say". Indeed, it is recommended to always include an answer alternative which does not force respondents to choose from ready-made opinions (Robson 1994, Borg & Gall 1989, Fodd 1995, cited in Hirsjärvi et al. 2009: 203). In addition, I decided to add a background question about the respondents' gender in case it would give any interesting results. However, because for some reason, approximately one third of the student participants left the background question unanswered, the background variable was left out from the analysis.

The original plan was to conduct the questionnaire for student participants during their English lessons. However, because the teachers reacted quite negatively to the idea that filling the questionnaire would take time from their English lessons, I decided to give the questionnaires to teachers who then gave it to their students as homework. I gave altogether 100 questionnaire sheets to teachers and received 96 filled questionnaires. The fact that the students answered the questionnaire at home instead of in a supervised classroom might have naturally influenced the results. First of all, there is no guarantee that they have thought about the questions thoroughly. However, this same problem also exists in the classroom. Secondly, even though the respondents are instructed to answer the questions on the basis of their own experiences, other people might still have influenced their answers. On the other hand, the fact that the student participants were able to answer the questionnaire at home and take all the time they needed might have also had a positive effect.

The fastest and easiest way to conduct the teachers' questionnaire was via Internet. The questionnaire was entered in Webropol, an online survey and analysis software. Contacting upper secondary school English teachers from all over Finland was rather challenging and time-consuming because the only way to find out their e-mail addresses was simply to randomly search for upper secondary schools' webpages and look for teachers' contact information. I collected altogether 312 e-mail addresses and sent a letter with a link to the questionnaire for all the teachers. After two weeks and one reminder e-mail I had received altogether 84 responses.

The questionnaire was divided into three different sections. The first two sections consisted of Likert scale questions with 21 statements in both sections. The purpose of the statements in the first section was to find out how English is taught in Finnish upper secondary schools. To be more precise, the purpose was to examine whether there is a clear preference either for traditional or innovative teaching in English lessons. When answering the questions, the participants were asked to think about their latest "normal" English course, excluding all optional courses for example specializing in oral skills, culture or grammar.

The statements were divided into two categories: 10 statements referred to traditional and 10 to innovative ways of teaching. In addition, one statement relating to the atmosphere in the lessons was included in order to find out if the participants were

generally satisfied with their English lessons. The idea to divide teaching into these two categories came from the study by Bernaus and Gardner (2008). For example, statement 1 *"Written exams had the biggest value in evaluation"* and statement 9 *"All the errors students made while they were talking were always corrected"* were categorized as referring to traditional teaching because traditional methods focus on form, structure and accurate production. Furthermore, statement 8 *"We discussed a lot in English in pairs or in small groups during lessons"* and statement 11 *"It was more important to use and understand English than correct errors"* are examples of statements referring to innovative teaching because in the present study innovative methods are characterized by student-centeredness and underline holistic understanding and fluent communication.

The aim of the second section was to find out the opinions of the participants on the different ways of teaching asked in the first section. For example, if a statement in the first section was *"Written exams had the biggest value in evaluation"*, the corresponding statement in the second section was *"It is good, that written exams have the biggest value in evaluation"*. In both sections, the students and the teachers were to decide if they agreed or disagreed with the statements by ticking the appropriate response alternative:

1.   I strongly agree
2.   I agree to some extent
3.   I disagree to some extent
4.   I strongly disagree
5.   Cannot say

The third section of the questionnaire consisted of the open-ended question. The aim of the question was to give the participants the possibility to tell freely about their opinions on the most effective ways of teaching English. The open-ended question in the questionnaire was "*Tell shortly, what kind of teaching and exercises are in your opinion most effective in learning English? What kind of teaching would you wish to have in English lessons? (You can for example give concrete examples of different types of exercises.)*"

5.4 The participants

As already mentioned, there are two groups of participants in this study. The first group of participants are Finnish upper secondary school students aged 16-18 in their first or second year. They come from two upper secondary schools in Central Finland. The second group of participants are Finnish upper secondary school English teachers from all over the country. 96 student participants and 84 teacher participants filled in the questionnaire, which makes the total of 180 participants.

There are several reasons for choosing particularly first and second year students from upper secondary schools as participants in the study. First of all, upper secondary school students have already been studying languages for several years and therefore it can be assumed that they have formed more opinions on language teaching and developed a more critical thinking towards it than, for example, secondary school students. Moreover, the reason for not choosing students from higher education levels, for example university students, is that upper secondary school is, for most of the students, the final school level in which English is taught as a general subject with several compulsory courses. The majority of the students have to survive in later life with the English language knowledge they have gained in upper secondary school, which is why English teaching especially in upper secondary schools has a significant role and is worth examining. Finally, I chose first and second year upper secondary school students as participants because third year students needed to concentrate on their matriculation exams.

The contact information of the teacher participants was searched from the websites of upper secondary schools all over Finland in order to get geographical variation. Even though it could have been interesting to ask for example how long they have been in their profession, the only background information asked was gender, because the purpose of the present study was to only find out participants' perceptions and opinions on language teaching regardless of background information.

5.5 Methods of analysis

Because the questionnaire included Likert scale questions and an open-ended question, the data was analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The first two parts of the questionnaire with the Likert scale questions were analyzed quantitatively. The respondents' answers were converted into numbers and tabulated, after which the results were entered into the SPSS program, which provided all the statistical information. First of all, frequencies, mean values and percentages were calculated. Secondly, in order to be able to find out if the two participant groups' answers were statistically different from each other, the Pearson Chi-Square test was calculated for each statement. If the p value was less than 0,05, there was a statistically significant difference between the students' and the teachers' answers (Dörnyei 2011: 229) and the difference between the two groups was more significant the lower the value was (Ranta et al. 1991: 142). Furthermore, if the maximum of 20% of the expected counts were less than five and all the expected counts were one or greater, the Pearson Chi-Square test was valid (Ranta et al. 1991: 142). All the invalid values have been marked in the tables by asterisk.

The answers for the open-ended question were analyzed qualitatively with the help of content analysis. According to Tuomi and Sarajärvi (2009: 92), there are four main steps in the process. First, the researcher decides what is interesting in the data. Second, all the important information has to be separated from the irrelevant data. Third, the information will be grouped according to themes or categories and finally, a summary of the findings will be written.

In the present study, all the answers were first carefully read through and all the different ways and techniques of English learning and teaching the respondents mentioned were written down. The data was organized by labelling the answers into different categories and counting how many times all the different ways of teaching were mentioned in each category. The students' answers were labelled into 21 different categories (see chapter 6.2.1), whereas teachers' answers formed 28 categories (see chapter 6.2.2). Finally, the answers were presented in tables.

6   FINDINGS

In this chapter I will introduce and discuss the results of the study. As already mentioned, the questionnaire consisted of three parts: there were 21 Likert scale statements in both of the first two parts and an open-ended question in the third and last part of the questionnaire. Chapter 6.1 presents the results for both groups of Likert scale questions, while chapter 6.2 discusses those of the open-ended question.

6.1 The Likert scale questions

The results for the Likert scale questions are presented with percentages and the highest figures in all the tables are bolded. The original questionnaire had five response alternatives for each statement. However, in order to make it easier to analyze the results, the tables in this analysis show only three response alternatives: agree, disagree and neutral. Therefore, agree includes two response alternatives: clearly agree and somewhat agree. Likewise, disagree includes two response alternatives: clearly disagree and somewhat disagree. Because there are altogether over hundred statements, I will not go through all of them in detail in the analysis. Instead, I will concentrate on discussing mainly the statements to which a notable majority of the participants has answered similarly, either agreed or disagreed. However, the results for all the statements can be seen from the tables. Furthermore, the Pearson Chi-Square values in the tables reveal whether students' and teachers' answers are statistically different from each other or not. Because of this, the values are always the same in students' and teachers' tables with the same set of statements.

6.1.1   How is English taught in upper secondary schools?

I will begin by presenting the results for the first part of the questionnaire. The purpose of the first 21 statements was to find out how English is taught in Finnish upper secondary schools and the focus was on finding out whether there is a clear preference either for traditional or innovative teaching. There were ten statements referring to traditional ways of teaching, ten statements referring to more innovative ways of teaching and one statement relating to the general atmosphere in the lessons (see Appendix 1). The results for the statements referring to traditional ways of teaching are introduced first, followed by the results for the more innovative statements. With each

set of statements, I will begin with student participants' answers and then move on to teachers' answers. Finally, their answers will be compared.

6.1.1.1 Statements relating to traditional ways of teaching

Table 1. Student participants' answers to statements relating to traditional ways of teaching

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Cannot say	Pearson Chi-Square
1.Written exams had the biggest value in evaluation	**96,8%**	1,1%	2,1%	0,037*
5. Written tests were regular during the course (for example vocabulary tests)	**86,4%**	12,7%	1,1%	0,818*
9. The errors students made while speaking were always corrected	28,4%	**61,1%**	10,5%	0,000
10. Students used more Finnish than English during lessons	**62,1%**	31,6%	6,3%	0,000
12. The teacher used more Finnish than English during lessons	12,6%	**82,1%**	5,3%	0,391*
13. Students worked more alone than together during lessons	24,2%	**65,3%**	10,5%	0,000
14. We focused more on grammar and vocabulary than on oral skills and communication during lessons	**47,3%**	41%	11,6%	0,000
16. We did a lot of translation exercises (sentences or short texts)	**85,3%**	12,6%	2,1%	0,000
18. We often read textbook chapters or other texts aloud in English with a partner	**69,5%**	25,3%	5,3%	0,110
19. We often used to work with the same order and exceptions to routine were rare	**51,5%**	37,9%	10,5%	0,000

*value is invalid

Table 1 shows that students agreed most with the first statement. Indeed, according to 96,8% of the students written exams had the biggest value in evaluation in their English lessons. Moreover, 86,4% agreed that there were regular written tests during the course and a group almost the same size**,** 85,3% agreed that there were a lot of translation exercises. The students disagreed the most (82,1%) with statement number twelve *"The teacher used more Finnish than English during lessons"*. As can be seen from the table, there were altogether seven statements (1, 5, 10, 14, 16, 18, 19) with which the majority of the students agreed with.

Table 2. Teacher participants' answers to statements relating to traditional ways of teaching

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Cannot say	Pearson Chi-Square
1.Written exams had the biggest value in evaluation	**90,4%**	9,6%	0,0%	0,037*
5. Written tests were regular during the course (for example vocabulary tests)	**83,3%**	16,7%	0,0%	0,818*
9. The errors students made while speaking were always corrected	8,3%	**89,3%**	2,4%	0,000
10. Students used more Finnish than English during lessons	23,9%	**70,3%**	6,0%	0,000
12. The teacher used more Finnish than English during lessons	7,2%	**90,4%**	2,4%	0,391*
13. Students worked more alone than together during lessons	4,8%	**94%**	1,2%	0,000
14. We focused more on grammar and vocabulary than on oral skills and communication during lessons	17,9%	**77,4%**	4,8%	0,000
16. We did a lot of translation exercises (sentences or short texts)	31,3%	**67,5%**	1,2%	0,000
18. We often read textbook chapters or other texts aloud in English with a partner	**67,5%**	32,5%	0,0%	0,110
19. We often used to work with the same order and exceptions to routine were rare	32,1%	**66,7%**	1,2%	0,000

*value is invalid

Table 2 shows the teacher participants' answers to the same statements. Like the students, the teachers also clearly agreed with statements number one (90,4%) and five (83,3%). Furthermore, over two thirds of the teachers, 67,5% agreed that different kinds of texts are often read aloud in English with a partner during lessons. These were the only statements with which the majority agreed. According to 94% of the teachers students did not work more alone than together during lesson. Indeed, the teachers disagreed the most with this statement (13). In addition, 90,4% disagreed that the teacher used more Finnish than English during lessons. Almost the same amount of teachers, 89,3%, also disagreed that students' speech errors were always corrected. All in all, there were seven statements (9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19) with which the majority of the teachers disagreed.

The results show that the students and the teachers were quite unanimous with statements one and five: both participant groups agreed that written tests had the biggest

value in evaluation and that written tests were regular during the course. Furthermore, according to the majority of both groups the teacher used more English than Finnish during the lessons and different kinds of texts were often read aloud in English with a partner. In addition, even though there were statistically very significant differences (Pearson Chi-Square value 0,000) in students' and teachers' answers in statements nine "*The errors students' made while speaking were always corrected*" and thirteen "*Students worked more alone than together during lessons*", still the majority of both participant groups disagreed with these statements.

As already mentioned, the majority of the students agreed with seven statements whereas the majority of the teachers agreed with only three statements. The Pearson Chi-Square value 0,000 shows that there are very significant statistical differences in as many as six statements (9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19) between the students' and the teachers' answers. Indeed, the students agreed more that 1) their errors in speech were always corrected, 2) they used more Finnish than English during lessons, 3) they worked more alone than together during lessons, 4) they focused more on written exercises than on oral skills and communication, 5) they did a lot of translation exercises, and 6) they often used to work with the same order with no exceptions to routine. Interestingly, the participants' answers to statement nine about direct error correction are similar to the results of the study by Brown (2006), according to which the students agreed more than the teachers that the mistakes they did while speaking were corrected directly. The students and the teachers had the biggest disagreement with statement 16: there were a lot of translation exercises according to 85,3% of the students, whereas only 31,3% of the teachers agreed with them.

Finally, in order to find out how much traditional ways of teaching are used in Finnish upper secondary schools according to the whole group, table 3 shows the combined answers of both students and teachers.

Table 3. Students' and teachers' answers to statements relating to traditional ways of teaching

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Cannot say
1.Written exams had the biggest value in evaluation	**93,8%**	5,1%	1,1%
5. Written tests were regular during the course (for example vocabulary tests)	**84,9%**	14,5%	0,6%
9. The errors students made while speaking were always corrected	19%	**74,3%**	6,7%
10. Students used more Finnish than English during lessons	44,1%	**49,7%**	6,1%
12. The teacher used more Finnish than English during lessons	10,1%	**86%**	3,9%
13. Students worked more alone than together during lessons	15,1%	**78,8%**	6,1%
14. We focused more on grammar and vocabulary than on oral skills and communication during lessons	33,5%	**58,1%**	8,4%
16. We did a lot of translation exercises (sentences or short texts)	**60,1%**	38,2%	1,7%
18. We often read textbook chapters or other texts aloud in English with a partner	**68,5%**	28,7%	2,8%
19. We often used to work with the same order and exceptions to routine were rare	42,5%	**51,4%**	6,1%

As can be seen from table 3, when the students' and the teachers' answers are combined, the majority agrees that written exams had the biggest value in evaluation and that written tests were regular during the course. In addition, a lot of translation exercises were done and different kinds of texts were read aloud during lessons. Indeed, the majority of the participants agreed with four of the statements referring to traditional ways of teaching.

Now that I have presented and discussed the results for the statements relating to traditional ways of teaching, I will introduce and discuss the results for the statements referring to innovative ways of teaching.

6.1.1.2 Statements relating to innovative ways of teaching

Table 4. Student participants' answers to statements relating to innovative ways of teaching.

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Cannot say	Pearson Chi-Square
2. There was at least one oral exam during the course	27,4%	**63,2%**	9,5%	0,082
3. The teacher evaluated our speech all the time and active participation clearly affected our course grade	**53,6%**	33,7%	12,6%	0,025
4. We did a self-evaluation/self-evaluations of our own learning	20%	**69,5%**	10,5%	0,001
6. Teacher often asked students to give feedback about his/her teaching	12,6%	**80%**	7,4%	0,002
7. Students talked more than the teacher during lessons	20%	**70,5%**	9,5%	0,000
8. We discussed a lot in English in pairs or in groups during lessons	**89,5%**	10,6%	0,0%	0,016*
11. It was more important to speak English and understand it than correct mistakes during lessons	**71,3%**	20,3%	8,5%	0,000
15. We focused equally on writing, reading, listening and speaking during lessons	**63,1%**	26,3%	10,5%	0,284
17. In addition to the schoolbooks, we often used also other material during lessons (for example the Internet, music, books, newspapers, movies etc.)	41,1%	**54,8%**	4,2%	0,005
20. Teacher encouraged us to use English during lessons as well as in our free time	**61,1%**	28,5%	10,5%	0,000

*value is invalid

Table 4 shows that there were five statements, 3, 8, 11, 15 and 20 with which the majority of the student participants agreed. According to 89,5% of the students there is a lot of discussion in English in pairs or in groups during lessons (statement 8). Interestingly, even though the majority of the students agreed on this statement, 70,5% of the students still thought that the teacher talked more than the students during lessons (statement 7). Furthermore, 71,3% agreed that it was more important to speak English and understand it than correct mistakes during lessons. Indeed, because as much as 61,1% of the students also disagreed with statement nine "*The errors students made while speaking were always corrected*", a conclusion can be drawn that in the students' opinion more emphasis is placed on encouraging students to speak instead of on correcting students' English. Moreover, the students disagreed the most (80%) with statement six "*Teacher often asked students to give feedback about his/her teaching*",

which suggests that teachers are relatively traditional when it comes to developing their teaching, at least according to the students.

Table 5. Teacher participants' answers to statements relating to innovative ways of teaching.

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Cannot say	Pearson Chi-Square
2. There was at least one oral exam during the course	20,2%	**77,4%**	2,4%	0,082
3. The teacher evaluated our speech all the time and active participation clearly affected our course grade	**72,6%**	25%	2,4%	0,025
4. We did a self-evaluation/self-evaluations of our own learning	41,7%	**57,2%**	1,2%	0,001
6. Teacher often asked students to give feedback about his/her teaching	38,1%	**56%**	6,0%	0,002
7. Students talked more than the teacher during lessons	**69%**	27,4%	3,6%	0,000
8. We discussed a lot in English in pairs or in groups during lessons	**91,6%**	8,4%	0,0%	0,016*
11. It was more important to speak English and understand it than correct mistakes during lessons	**92,9%**	2,4%	4,8%	0,000
15. We focused equally on writing, reading, listening and speaking during lessons	**72,6%**	25%	2,4%	0,284
17. In addition to the schoolbooks, we often used also other material during lessons (for example the Internet, music, books, newspapers, movies etc.)	**67,8%**	32,1%	0,0%	0,005
20. Teacher encouraged us to use English during lessons as well as in our free time	**94,1%**	3,6%	2,4%	0,000

*value is invalid

Table 5 shows the teacher participants' answers to the same statements relating to innovative ways of teaching. As can be seen, there were seven statements with which the majority of the teachers agreed. According to 94,1% of the teachers students were encouraged to use English during lessons as well as in their free time. Indeed, the teachers agreed the most with this statement. Furthermore, almost a similar group of teachers agreed that it was more important to speak English and understand it than correct mistakes during lessons (92,9%) and that there was a lot of discussion in English during lessons (91,6%). As the results show, the majority disagreed with only three statements. The biggest disagreement was with statement two: oral exams were not held during the course according to 77,4% of the respondents. On the other hand, 72,6% of the teachers agreed that they evaluated students' speech all the time and active

participation affected course grade. Because of this, it could be argued that even though oral exams are not much used, innovative methods are still used in evaluation in English lessons in the form of constant evaluation of participation. Furthermore, 57,2% of the teachers replied that self-evaluations were not done during the course and a group almost the same size, 56% of the teachers had not often asked students to give feedback about their teaching.

The results show that the students and the teachers were most unanimous with statement eight: 89,5% of the students and 91,6% of the teachers agreed that there was a lot of discussion in English during lessons. In addition, both groups answered similarly to statements two and fifteen. Therefore, a conclusion can be drawn that oral exams were not held during the course and that the focus during lessons was equally on all the four language skill areas: writing, reading, listening and speaking.

Even though the majority of the students and the teachers answered similarly (either agreed or disagreed) to eight statements (2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 15, 20), the Pearson Chi-Square values (< 0,05) reveal that their answers were statistically different with seven statements (3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 17, 20). Furthermore, there was a very significant statistical difference between the groups' answers in statements 7, 11 and 20 (Pearson Chi-Square value 0,000). The teachers agreed more than the students that 1) the students talked more than the teacher during lessons, 2) it was more important to speak English and understand it than correct mistakes during lessons, and 3) they encouraged students to use English during lessons as well as in their free time. In other words, in the teachers' opinion, students were given the possibility to talk enough during lessons whereas the students thought the opposite. Moreover, compared to students, teachers seemed to believe more in the freedom to speak English during lessons without having to be afraid of making mistakes. Finally, the teachers also believed that students were encouraged enough in their use of English whereas the students did not recognize the support equally. Again, there were similarities in the participants' answers to the results of the study by Brown (2006), now with statements 17 and 20. Indeed, as the present study revealed, also according to Brown's study the teacher participants agreed more than the students that they used authentic materials and that they encouraged students to speak the foreign language in class.

As with student participants, a clear correlation was also found with teachers' answers to statements eleven and nine. Indeed, only 8,3% of the teachers agreed that the errors students made while speaking were always corrected and as already mentioned, 92,9% agreed that it is more important to speak English and understand it than correct mistakes during lessons. Even though there were significant statistical differences between the students' and the teachers' answers to these statements, a conclusion can be drawn from both participant groups' answers that there is a clear emphasis on encouraging students to speak instead of an emphasis on correcting students' English during lessons.

Indeed, the majority of the students agreed with five of the innovative statements whereas the majority of the teachers agreed with seven. Furthermore, there were clear statistical differences between the groups' answers in seven statements. According to the results, the teachers agreed more with the statements referring to innovative ways of teaching. This finding supports the studies by Brown (2006) and Bernaus and Gardner (2008). According to the results of the study by Brown (2006), the teachers' perceptions of what was happening in the classroom included more communicativeness and innovativeness than the students' perceptions. Moreover, Bernaus and Gardner (2008) found out that students did not recognize the innovative strategies their teachers claimed to use. According to them, the traditional strategies were mostly recognized by both students and teachers. However, in the present study there were even more differences between the students' and the teachers' answers in the statements relating to traditional ways of teaching than with the statements relating to innovative ways of teaching.

When looking at the results in both traditional and innovative sets of statements, it can be clearly seen that the student participants have chosen the response alternative "Cannot say" a lot more than the teachers. This was not a surprising result because the teachers most likely know and remember better what kinds of exercises were done and how during the lessons. Furthermore, it can be assumed that the teacher participants are more likely to be interested in answering a questionnaire like this which can also be a reason for their relatively small amount of "Cannot say" -responses.

Finally, in order to find out how much innovative strategies are used in Finnish upper secondary schools according to the whole group, table 6 shows the combined answers of both participant groups.

Table 6. Students' and teachers' answers to statements relating to innovative ways of teaching

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Cannot say
2. There was at least one oral exam during the course	24%	**69,8%**	6,1%
3. The teacher evaluated our speech all the time and active participation clearly affected our course grade	**62,6%**	29,6%	7,8%
4. We did a self-evaluation/self-evaluations of our own learning	30,2%	**63,7%**	6,1%
6. Teacher often asked students to give feedback about his/her teaching	24,6%	**68,7%**	6,7%
7. Students talked more than the teacher during lessons	43%	**50,3%**	6,7%
8. We discussed a lot in English in pairs or in groups during lessons	**90,5%**	9,5%	0%
11. It was more important to speak English and understand it than correct mistakes during lessons	**81,5%**	11,8%	6,7%
15. We focused equally on writing, reading, listening and speaking during lessons	**67,6%**	25,7%	6,7%
17. In addition to the schoolbooks, we often used also other material during lessons (for example the Internet, music, books, newspapers, movies etc.)	**53,6%**	44,1%	2,2%
20. Teacher encouraged us to use English during lessons as well as in our free time	**76,5%**	16,8%	6,7%

Table 6 reveals that there was a lot of discussion in English during lessons and that it was more important to speak English and understand it than correct mistakes. Furthermore, the teachers encouraged the students to use English during lessons as well as outside school and there was equal focus on all the four language skill areas. Finally, the majority agreed that the teachers evaluated the students' speech all the time and active participation affected course grade and in addition to schoolbooks, also other material was often used during lessons. Indeed, the majority of participants agreed with six statements relating to innovative ways of teaching.

6.1.1.3 Statement 21

As already mentioned, in addition to the traditional and innovative statements, the first part of the questionnaire had one statement relating to the general atmosphere in the lessons. The statement for students was: *Learning English in the lessons was fun and interesting*, while the statement for teachers was: *Teaching English in the lessons was fun and interesting*. Below are the answers of both students and teachers to the statement.

Table 7. Statement 21: *Learning/teaching English in the lessons was fun and interesting*

	Agree	Disagree	Cannot say	Pearson Chi-Square
Students	49,5%	42,1%	8,4%	0,000*
Teachers	95,2%	4,8%	0,0%	0,000*

*value is invalid

As can be seen, an overwhelming majority of the teachers, 95,2%, agreed with the statement whereas only half of the students agreed with it. Furthermore, again this statement was more challenging for the students than for the teachers because 8,4% of the students could not state their opinion whereas all the teachers had an opinion. According to these results, students and teachers experience their English lessons quite differently. Probably one of the reasons for this is that teachers quite naturally are interested in the topic they teach and are there voluntarily whereas students have to study English in upper secondary schools despite their own interests.

6.1.1.4 Summary of the first part of the questionnaire

A few conclusions can be made from the first part of the questionnaire. First of all, when looking at the statements relating to traditional ways of teaching, according to both participant groups written exams had the biggest value in evaluation and written tests, such as vocabulary tests, were regular during the course. Furthermore, both groups agreed that the teacher used more English than Finnish during lessons and that different kinds of texts were often read aloud in English with a partner. Interestingly, the Pearson Chi-Square value 0,000 reveals that there were statistically very significant differences in as many as six statements between the groups' answers. Indeed, the majority of the students agreed with seven statements whereas the majority of the teachers agreed with only three statements. Therefore, a conclusion can be drawn that traditional ways of teaching are used more according to students than according to teachers.

When looking at the statements relating to innovative ways of teaching, both participant groups agree that there was a lot of discussion in English in pairs or in groups during lessons and that oral exams were not common during the course. Furthermore, both groups agreed that the focus during lessons was equally on writing, reading, listening and speaking. In addition, the students' and the teachers' answers revealed that the emphasis during lessons is more on encouraging students to speak than on correcting

mistakes. The answers of the two participant groups were statistically different in seven statements referring to innovative ways of teaching (Pearson Chi-Square value < 0,05). Nevertheless, whereas the Pearson Chi-Square value was statistically very significant 0,000 in six statements referring to traditional ways of teaching, only the statements 7, 11 and 20 received the same value from the innovative statements. Indeed, the majority of the students agreed with five statements and the majority of the teachers agreed with seven statements. Therefore, a conclusion can be drawn that even though the teachers agreed more than the students with the statements referring to innovative ways of teaching, the difference between the students' and the teachers' answers was not as remarkable as with the statements referring to traditional ways of teaching. In other words, the participant groups were more unanimous with the statements referring to innovative ways of teaching.

In addition, the results of the combined answers of both the students and the teachers (tables 3 and 6) reveal that the majority agreed with four statements referring to traditional ways of teaching and with six statements referring to innovative ways of teaching. Indeed, from these two sets of statements, the innovative ways of teaching are used more in Finnish upper secondary schools. Liu (2004) found that teachers all over the world use communicative language teaching and an eclectic method the most in all proficiency levels. Because communicative language teaching can be categorized as innovative, this study seems to at least partly support the finding of Liu's study.

Finally, the two participant groups' answers differed significantly in statement 21. Almost all of the teachers, 95,2%, considered their English lessons fun and interesting whereas only half of the students agreed with the statement.

Now that I have presented the results for the first part of the questionnaire, I will move on to the second part and discuss the opinions of the participants about different ways of teaching English.

6.1.2   Opinions about different ways of teaching English

In this chapter, I will continue with the second part of the questionnaire. The purpose of the second set of statements was to find out the opinions of the students and the teachers to different ways of teaching. The statements were similar to the statements in the first

part of the questionnaire: there were ten statements referring to traditional ways of teaching, ten referring to innovative ways of teaching and one referring to the general atmosphere in the lessons. Again, the results for the statements relating to traditional ways of teaching are introduced first. I will begin by presenting the students' answers. After that, I will introduce the results of the teacher participants and finally, I will compare the answers of both participant groups.

6.1.2.1 Statements relating to opinions about traditional ways of teaching

Table 8. Student participants' answers to statements relating to opinions about traditional ways of teaching.

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Cannot say	Pearson Chi-Square
1. It is good that written exams have the biggest value in evaluation	**63,2%**	35,8%	1,1%	0,045*
5. It is good that there are written tests regularly during the course (for example vocabulary tests)	**88,1%**	11,9%	0,0%	0,543*
9. It is important that the errors students make while speaking are always corrected	**54,8%**	35,8%	9,5%	0,000
10. It is good that students use more Finnish than English during lessons	21,1%	**70,6%**	8,4%	0,000
12. It is important that teacher uses more Finnish than English during lessons	18,9%	**72,6%**	8,4%	0,000*
13. It is good that students work more alone than together during lessons	27,3%	**65,3%**	7,4%	0,000
14. It is important that we focus more on grammar and vocabulary than on oral skills and communication during lessons	23,4%	**68,1%**	8,5%	0,002*
16. Translation exercises (sentences or short texts) are useful in learning a language	**90,3%**	9,7%	0,0%	0,006*
18. Reading textbook chapters or other texts aloud in English with a partner is useful in learning a language	**82%**	17%	1,1%	0,075*
19. It is good to work with the same order so that exceptions to routine are rare during lessons	20,2%	**68,1%**	11,7%	0,293

*value is invalid

Table 8 shows that the students agreed most with statement 16. Indeed, according to 90,3% of the students translation exercises are useful in learning a language. Moreover, almost a similar group of students, 88,1%, agreed that it is good that there are written tests regularly during the course (statement 5). Furthermore, according to 82% of the

respondents it is useful to read textbook chapters or other texts aloud in English with a partner (statement 18). The students disagreed the most (72,6%) with statement number twelve "*It is important that teacher uses more Finnish than English during lessons*" and almost a similar group, 70,6% thought that it is not good that students use more Finnish than English during lessons. As can be seen from the table, the majority of the students agreed with half of the statements (1, 5, 9, 16, 18). According to the results, even though the students consider some of the traditional ways of teaching these statements represent ineffective, such as using Finnish during lessons, they also see several traditional ways of teaching useful in learning English. This finding supports the study by Yli-Renko and Salo-Lee (1991), who found out that even though students in upper secondary schools wanted more practice in oral skills, they did not want to reduce traditional teaching because it was considered as a clear and safe way of working in preparation for the matriculation examination.

Table 9. Teacher participants' answers to statements relating to opinions about traditional ways of teaching

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Pearson Chi-Square
1. It is good that written exams have the biggest value in evaluation	**72,6%**	23,8%	3,6%	0,045*
5. It is good that there are written tests regularly during the course (for example vocabulary tests)	**80,9%**	19,1%	0,0%	0,543*
9. It is important that the errors students make while speaking are always corrected	8,6%	**90,1%**	1,2%	0,000
10. It is good that students use more Finnish than English during lessons	15,9%	**80,5%**	3,7%	0,000
12. It is important that teacher uses more Finnish than English during lessons	9,6%	**88%**	2,4%	0,000*
13. It is good that students work more alone than together during lessons	7,2%	**91,6%**	1,2%	0,000
14. It is important that we focus more on grammar and vocabulary than on oral skills and communication during lessons	6,2%	**92,6%**	1,2%	0,002*
16. Translation exercises (sentences or short texts) are useful in learning a language	**69,6%**	29,3%	1,2%	0,006*
18. Reading textbook chapters or other texts aloud in English with a partner is useful in learning a language	**90,5%**	8,4%	1,2%	0,075*
19. It is good to work with the same order so that exceptions to routine are rare during lessons	8,7%	**81,3%**	10%	0,293

*value is invalid

Table 9 shows the teacher participants' answers to the same statements. Like the students, the majority of the teachers also agreed with statements number five and eighteen. In addition, 72,6% of the teachers agreed that it is good that written exams have the biggest value in evaluation (statement 1). A reason for this is most likely the fact that it is easier for teachers to evaluate written exams.

The majority of the teachers clearly disagreed with six statements: 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 and 19. Furthermore, there were three statements with which over 90% of the teachers disagreed with. Indeed, an overwhelming majority of the teachers thought that 1) the errors students make while speaking should not be always corrected, 2) students should work more together than alone during lessons, and 3) there should not be more focus on grammar and vocabulary than on oral communication during lessons. As can be seen from the table, the majority of the teachers agreed with four of these statements referring to opinions about traditional ways of teaching (1, 5, 16, 18). In other words, like the students, also the teachers consider traditional methods effective to some extent. However, the percentages show that they were more negative towards the usefulness of these traditional ways of teaching than the students.

Furthermore, even though a clear majority, 81,3% of the teacher participants disagreed with statement number nineteen *"It is good to work with the same order so that exceptions to routine are rare during lessons"*, 10 % did not have an opinion about the statement, which is interesting because the amount of "Cannot say" answers is clearly lower in all the other statements. In other words, this statement seemed to be more challenging for the teachers than the other statements.

When comparing the answers it is clear that the students and the teachers both agreed with statements 5 and 18. In other words, they both consider regular written tests and reading different kinds of texts aloud with a partner in English useful in learning the language. Furthermore, the majority of both groups thought that it is good that written exams have the biggest value in evaluation. In addition, even though the students (90,3%) agreed clearly more with statement 16, *"Translation exercises (sentences or short texts) are useful in learning a language"* the majority of the teachers (69,6%) agreed with the statement as well. Statement number 9 *"It is important that the errors students make while speaking are always corrected"* divided the opinions of the two participant groups clearly the most. Indeed, 54,8% of the students agreed with the

statement whereas only 8,6% of the teachers agreed with it. The difference between the two groups was statistically very significant because the Pearson Chi-Square value for the statement was 0,000. Indeed, this finding supports the earlier studies by Schulz (2001) and Brown (2006), who found that students valued error correction in foreign language learning clearly more than teachers. However, even though the majority of the students would want their errors in speech to be corrected, only 28,4% of the students and 8,3% of the teachers agreed in the first part of the questionnaire that the errors actually are corrected.

In addition, even though the majority of the students and the teachers disagreed with statements 10, 12, 13 and 14, there were rather big differences between the answers of the two groups. Indeed, the teachers agreed more than the students that 1) students should work more together than alone during lessons, 2) students should use more English than Finnish during lessons, 3) teachers should use more English than Finnish during lessons, and 4) focus during lessons should not be more on grammar and vocabulary than on oral communication. Once again, this last finding supports the results of the study by Brown (2006), who found out that language teachers value information exchange over grammar more than students.

As already mentioned, the majority of the students agreed with five statements whereas the majority of the teachers agreed with four statements relating to opinions about traditional ways of teaching. Furthermore, compared to the students, a clearly bigger group of teachers disagreed with the statements. Because of this, a conclusion can be drawn that the teachers' opinions about these traditional ways of teaching were more negative than the students'.

Finally, in order to find out the opinions of the whole group about traditional ways of teaching, table 10 shows the combined answers of both the students and the teachers.

Table 10. Students' and teachers' answers to statements relating to opinions about traditional ways of teaching

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Cannot say
1. It is good that written exams have the biggest value in evaluation	**67,6%**	30,2%	2,2%
5. It is good that there are written tests regularly during the course (for example vocabulary tests)	**84,7%**	15,3%	0%
9. It is important that the errors students make while speaking are always corrected	33,5%	**60,8%**	5,7%
10. It is good that students use more Finnish than English during lessons	18,6%	**75,1%**	6,2%
12. It is important that teacher uses more Finnish than English during lessons	14,6%	**79,8%**	5,6%
13. It is good that students work more alone than together during lessons	17,9%	**77,7%**	4,5%
14. It is important that we focus more on grammar and vocabulary than on oral skills and communication during lessons	15,4%	**79,4%**	5,1%
16. Translation exercises (sentences or short texts) are useful in learning a language	**80,6%**	18,9%	0,6%
18. Reading textbook chapters or other texts aloud in English with a partner is useful in learning a language	**86%**	12,9%	1,1%
19. It is good to work with the same order so that exceptions to routine are rare during lessons	14,9%	**74,1%**	10,9%

As can be seen from table 10, when the students' and the teachers' answers are combined together, the majority agrees on the usefulness of reading different kinds of texts aloud in English with a partner, regular written tests and translation exercises. In addition, the majority believes that it is good that written exams have the biggest value in evaluation. Indeed, the majority agrees with four of the statements relating to opinions about traditional ways of teaching.

Now that I have presented and discussed the results for the statements relating to opinions about traditional ways of teaching, I will move on to introduce the results to statements relating to opinions about innovative ways of teaching. As before, I will

begin by presenting the student participants' answers and after that I will move on to the answers of the teachers. Finally, a comparison between the results will be made.

6.1.2.2 Statements relating to opinions about innovative ways of teaching

Table 11. Student participants' answers to statements relating to opinions about innovative ways of teaching.

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Cannot say	Pearson Chi-Square
2. It is good that there is at least one oral exam during the course	46,3%	**47,4%**	6,3%	0,017
3. It is important that the teacher evaluates our speech all the time and active participation clearly affects our course grade	**64,2%**	34,8%	1,1%	0,001*
4. It is useful to do self-evaluations of our own learning	37,3%	**52,2%**	10,6%	0,000
6. It is important that teacher often asks students to give feedback about his/her teaching	**60%**	33,7%	6,3%	0,209
7. It is good that students talk more than the teacher during lessons	**44,7%**	39,4%	16%	0,000
8. It is useful to discuss a lot in English in pairs or in groups during lessons	**82,1%**	17,9%	0,0%	0,000*
11. It is more important to speak English and understand it than correct mistakes during lessons	**74,7%**	17,9%	7,4%	0,000*
15. It is good to focus equally on writing, reading, listening and speaking during lessons	**93,6%**	4,3%	2,1%	0,153*
17. In addition to schoolbooks, it is important to often use also other material during lessons (for example the Internet, music, books, newspapers, movies etc.)	**81,9%**	17%	1,1%	0,059*
20. It is important that teacher encourages us to use English during lessons as well as in our free time	**86,2%**	10,7%	3,2%	0,000*

*value is invalid

Table 11 shows that the students agreed most with statement 15. According to 93,6% of the students it is good to focus equally on writing, reading, listening and speaking during lessons. Furthermore, a clear majority of the students, 86,2%, also agreed that it is important that the teacher encourages students to use English (statement 20). In addition, according to 82,1% it is useful to discuss a lot in English during lessons and a group of almost the same size, 81,9%, agreed on the usefulness of other material in addition to schoolbooks. Interestingly, even though 64,2% agreed that it is important

that the teacher evaluates students' speech all the time and that active participation affects course grade (statement 3), a similar group, 63,2% agreed that it is good that written exams have the biggest value in evaluation (statement 1). In other words, even though the students prefer that the emphasis in evaluation is on written skills, they still want speech and active participation to clearly affect the course grade.

As can be seen from the table, there were only two statements with which a small majority disagreed with. Indeed, 52,2% disagreed with statement 4 *"It is useful to do self-evaluations of our own learning"* and even a smaller amount of participants, 47,7% disagreed with statement 2 *"It is good that there is at least one oral exam during the course"*. In addition, statement seven clearly divided the students' opinions. According to 44,7% of the students it is good that they talk more than the teacher during the lessons. Nevertheless, almost a similar group, 39,4% thought that the teacher should talk more during the lessons. Moreover, 16% did not have an opinion about the statement at all.

Table 12. Teacher participants' answers to statements relating to opinions about innovative ways of teaching.

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Cannot say	Pearson Chi-Square
2. It is good that there is at least one oral exam during the course	**54,8%**	35,8%	9,5%	0,017
3. It is important that the teacher evaluates our speech all the time and active participation clearly affects our course grade	**86,6%**	12,2%	1,2%	0,001*
4. It is useful to do self-evaluations of our own learning	**94,1%**	4,8%	1,2%	0,000
6. It is important that teacher often asks students to give feedback about his/her teaching	**75,9%**	18,1%	6%	0,209
7. It is good that students talk more than the teacher during lessons	**95,3%**	3,6%	1,2%	0,000
8. It is useful to discuss a lot in English in pairs or in groups during lessons	**97,6%**	1,2%	0,0%	0,000*
11. It is more important to speak English and understand it than correct mistakes during lessons	**96,4%**	3,6%	0,0%	0,000*
15. It is good to focus equally on writing, reading, listening and speaking during lessons	**88,1%**	10,7%	1,2%	0,153*
17. In addition to schoolbooks, it is important to often use also other material during lessons (for example the Internet, music, books, newspapers, movies etc.)	**90,4%**	7,2%	2,4%	0,059*
20. It is important that teacher encourages us to use English during lessons as well as in our free time	**98,8%**	1,2%	0,0%	0,000*

*value is invalid

Table 12 shows the teacher participants' answers to the same statements. As can be clearly seen, they had a very positive attitude to all of the statements. Indeed, the majority of the teachers agreed with all of the statements. Moreover, there were six statements (4, 7, 8, 11, 17, 20) with which an overwhelming majority, over 90%, agreed. However, statement number 2 *"It is good that there is at least one oral exam during the course"* divided opinions clearly more than others. At least one oral exam during the course was considered useful by 54,8% of the teachers. Interestingly, the percentage was clearly bigger than with the similar statement in the first part of the questionnaire. Indeed, even though only 20,2% agreed that there was at least one oral exam during their last English course, over half of the respondents still believed that oral exams are useful.

Interestingly, even though 86,6% agreed that it is important that students' speech is evaluated all the time and that active participation affects the course grade (statement 3), also the majority of the teachers, 72,6% agreed that it is good that written exams have the biggest value in evaluation (statement 1). Indeed, the pattern was similar with the students' answers to the same statements: even though the majority of the teachers prefer that the emphasis in evaluation is on written skills, also the majority wants speech and active participation to clearly affect the course grade.

The students and the teachers agreed the most with this category of statements. As already mentioned, the majority of the students agreed with eight of the statements and the majority of the teachers agreed with all of the statements. Nevertheless, there were two statements clearly dividing the opinions of these two participant groups. First of all, 94,1% of the teachers agreed with statement four *"It is useful to do self-evaluations of our own learning"* whereas only 37,3% of the students agreed with it. Because the statement got the Pearson Chi-Square value 0,000, there was statistically a very significant difference between the two participant groups' answers. Indeed, the students clearly do not see the usefulness of self-evaluation in learning English in the same way the teachers do. One reason for this might be that the students do not have much experience about self-assessment because only 20% of the students agreed that self-evaluations were done during the course in the first part of the questionnaire. According to Cory-Wright (2014), it can be challenging for students to understand the usefulness of self-assessment if they lack experience in doing it. Furthermore, she argues, students might feel uncomfortable in doing something the teacher normally does. Moreover, 95,3% of the teachers agreed with statement 7 *"It is good that students talk more than the teacher during lessons"* whereas only 44,7% of the students agreed with it. There was statistically a very significant difference between the groups' answers with this statement as well because the Pearson Chi-Square value was 0,000. As already mentioned, this statement seemed to be rather confusing for the student participants because as much as 16% of the students did not have an opinion about it. Indeed, while the teachers almost unanimously agreed that students should talk more than the teacher during lessons, the students clearly did not see its usefulness to the same extent the teachers did. The similar statement in the first part of the questionnaire revealed that according to 70,5% of the students the teacher actually talked more than the students during lessons. Perhaps one of the reasons why the majority of the students believe that

it is better that the teacher talks more than the students is that they are, at least according to their answers, used to that traditional pattern and therefore still believe in it.

When looking at the results in both traditional and innovative sets of statements, it can again be seen that the student participants have chosen the response alternative "Cannot say" more than the teachers. However, the number of students choosing the neutral response alternative in all of the statements relating to opinions about teaching was lower than in the first part of the questionnaire, which indicates that it was easier for the students to express their opinions about language teaching than tell how English was actually taught. When looking at the teacher participants' "Cannot say" answers, there was not any significant difference between the first and the second part of the questionnaire.

Finally, in order to find out the opinions of the whole group about innovative ways of teaching, table 13 shows the combined answers of both the students and the teachers.

Table 13. Students' and teachers' answers to statements relating to opinions about innovative ways of teaching:

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Cannot say
2. It is good that there is at least one oral exam during the course	**50,3%**	41,9%	7,8%
3. It is important that the teacher evaluates our speech all the time and active participation clearly affects our course grade	**74,6%**	24,3%	1,1%
4. It is useful to do self-evaluations of our own learning	**64%**	29,8%	6,2%
6. It is important that teacher often asks students to give feedback about his/her teaching	**67,4%**	26,4%	6,2%
7. It is good that students talk more than the teacher during lessons	**68,5%**	22,5%	9%
8. It is useful to discuss a lot in English in pairs or in groups during lessons	**89,4%**	10,1%	0,6%
11. It is more important to speak English and understand it than correct mistakes during lessons	**84,8%**	11,2%	3,9%
15. It is good to focus equally on writing, reading, listening and speaking during lessons	**91%**	7,3%	1,7%
17. In addition to schoolbooks, it is important to often use also other material during lessons (for example the Internet, music, books, newspapers, movies etc.)	**85,9%**	12,4%	1,7%
20. It is important that teacher encourages us to use English during lessons as well as in our free time	**92,1%**	6,2%	1,7%

As can be seen from table 13, when the students' and the teachers' answers are combined together, the majority agreed with all the statements relating to opinions about innovative ways of teaching. Indeed, they agreed the most that encouragement from the teacher in using English is important but almost the same amount of participants also agreed that it is good to focus equally on all the four language skill areas and that it is useful to discuss a lot in English during lessons. Statement two *"It is good that there is at least one oral exam during the course"* divided opinions the most because only half, 50,3%, of the participants agreed with it.

6.1.2.3 Statement 21

Like the first part of the questionnaire, also the second part had an extra statement in addition to the traditional and innovative statements. The purpose of the statement was to find out whether the participants believe that learning English at schools has to be fun and interesting. Below are the answers of both students and teachers to the statement.

Table 14. Statement 21: *Learning English at school has to be fun and interesting.*

	Agree	Disagree	Cannot say	Pearson Chi-Square
Students	92,6%	3,2%	4,3%	0,563*
Teachers	96,3%	2,4%	1,2%	0,563*

*value is invalid

As can be seen, the students and the teachers are quite unanimous with their answers. A clear majority of both participant groups think that learning English at school should be fun and interesting.

6.1.2.4 Summary of the second part of the questionnaire

A few conclusions can be made from the second part of the questionnaire. First of all, when looking at the statements relating to opinions about traditional ways of teaching, it can be seen that the majority of both participant groups agreed on the usefulness of regular written tests and reading different kinds of texts aloud in English with a partner. In addition, they both agreed on the usefulness of translation exercises and that it is good that written exams have the biggest value in evaluation. Furthermore, while 54,8% of the students thought that it is important that the errors students make while speaking are always corrected, only 8,6% of the teachers agreed with it. Indeed, this statement

caused the biggest disagreement between the two participant groups in the set of statements relating to opinions about traditional ways of teaching. All in all, the majority of the students agreed with five of the statements whereas the majority of the teachers agreed with four statements. Furthermore, the percentages reveal that the teachers' opinions about the traditional ways of teaching in general were more negative than the students'.

The students and the teachers had generally a positive attitude towards all of the statements referring to innovative ways of teaching because the majority of the students agreed with eight statements and the majority of the teachers agreed with all of the statements. Nevertheless, the percentages reveal that the students disagreed more than the teachers with this set of statements.

In addition, the results of the combined answers of both the students and the teachers (tables 9 and 12) reveal that the majority agreed with four statements relating to opinions about traditional ways of teaching and with ten statements relating to opinions about innovative ways of teaching. Because of this, it could be argued that the majority of the participants believe clearly more in the usefulness of innovative ways of teaching than to traditional ways of teaching in learning English. This finding seems to support the earlier studies by Liu (2004) and Bartram (2006). According to Liu, communicative language teaching is, together with an eclectic method, the most popular language teaching method among teachers. Furthermore, Bartram's study revealed that students consider innovative ways of teaching the most effective in language teaching.

Finally, when looking at the statement 21, the majority of both the students and the teachers believe that learning English should be fun and interesting. This is not a surprising result. Nevertheless, whereas almost all of the teachers also actually enjoyed teaching English at upper secondary schools, only half of the students considered learning English fun and interesting. In other words, the students are not as satisfied with the lessons as the teachers are.

6.2 The open-ended question

In the third part of the questionnaire the participants were asked to write their opinions on what kind of teaching they considered as most beneficial in learning English and what kind of teaching they wished to have in English lessons (see Appendix 1 and 2). I will begin by introducing and discussing the student participants' answers.

6.2.1   Students' answers to the open-ended question

The length and quality of the answers varied substantially: some of the participants had answered with only a few words whereas others had written longer responses with detailed examples. Surprisingly many students, altogether 34, left the open-ended question unanswered. One reason for this might be that it was the last part of the questionnaire and students might have been already tired in answering the questions. Therefore, perhaps it would have been better to place the open-ended question to the beginning of the questionnaire. On the other hand, they might simply not have had any ideas or opinions about the topic. Nevertheless, 61 student participants answered the question and now I will present their answers.

The content of the answers varied to some extent**,** even though there were some clear common preferences about what they think are the most effective ways of teaching. Many of the responses included similar types of suggestions and as a result all the different "ways of teaching" found in them were divided into 21 different categories. Furthermore, these categories were divided into innovative and traditional teaching. In addition, there were answers which could not be labelled into traditional or innovative ways of teaching and these responses formed a third group, "Other ways of teaching". The answers are presented in table 15 and the numbers in the table tell how many times different ways of teaching were mentioned in the participants' answers. The answers are listed according to their popularity, starting from the most common answer.

Table 15. Students' suggestions for effective ways of teaching English

Innovative ways of teaching	
oral exercises and natural conversation	26
pair and/or group work	24
watching movies and/or TV series	8
versatility and variation in exercises	7
listening to English music	6
practical language skills	5
good and relaxed atmosphere	5
listening exercises	2
playing games	1
Traditional ways of teaching	
translation exercises	7
vocabulary exams	4
written grammar exercises	3
vocabulary exercises	3
essay writing	2
reading texts in English	2
writing summaries	1
Others	
less theory	3
schoolbook exercises	2
clear examples	2
genuinely interesting texts	1
everyone has their own ways of learning	1

There were altogether four participants who mentioned only traditional ways of teaching, such as grammar and translation exercises, in their answers. In comparison, thirty-one participants suggested only tasks and exercise types which can be labeled as innovative ways of teaching, such as discussion exercises, pair and group work, practical English teaching and watching movies. Moreover, seventeen answers contained both traditional and innovative ways of teaching and the rest nine answers something more general.

According to the answers, the student participants consider different kinds of communicative exercises the most effective in learning English in English lessons. Indeed, oral exercises and/or natural conversation were mentioned in 26 responses which made it clearly the most popular answer. Examples 1 and 2 demonstrate these kinds of opinions.

> **Example 1.**
>
> "…Pitäisi keskittyä enemmän puheen tuottamiseen ja ymmärtämiseen. Suomessa enkun tunneilla keskitytään liikaa korjaamaan pieniä virheitä. Sanoja on myös hyvä harjoitella. Eli lyhyesti: vähemmän kielioppia, enemmän puheen tuottamis- ja ymmärtämisharjoituksia."

"…We should focus more on speech production and understanding. We focus too much on correcting small errors in English lessons in Finland. It is also good to practice vocabulary. In short: less grammar, more practice in producing and understanding speech."

Example 2.

"Jutellaan normaalisti esim. tunnin alussa kuulumisista englanniksi, saa kielen "päälle" ja puhuminen tuntuu lopputunnin ajan luontevammalta."

"Talking normally in English for example in the beginning of a lesson, in that way the language gets "turned on" and it feels more natural to speak during the rest of the lesson."

The second most popular answer with 24 mentions was pair and/or group work. There were two different ways pair or group work was mentioned. The first group, seventeen students, did not specify what kinds of exercises should be done in pairs or groups whereas the second group, seven students, connected pair and group work only with communication and oral tasks. These two ways of studying English, communicative exercises and pair and group work were clearly the most popular in student participants' answers, because the third most popular answer, watching movies and/or TV series, got only eight mentions. These three most common answers can be categorized as innovative ways of teaching.

In addition, other answers which could be labeled to more innovative ways of teaching were versatility and variation in exercises (7) and listening to English music (6). Furthermore, five students underlined the importance of good and relaxed atmosphere in the lessons. Relating to the atmosphere in the lessons, there were four students who wrote how important it is that teachers do not force anyone to speak if they do not want to (example 3).

Example 3.

"Jos opettaja "hiillostaa" oppilaita, suurin osa oppimisajasta menee pelkoon että milloin mua aletaan tenttaamaan."

"If the teacher "grills" students, most of the learning time gets wasted because of the fear that the teacher will soon ask me something."

Finally, five participants hoped to have teaching which would provide practical language skills which help in different kinds of real life situations, two students mentioned listening exercises and one playing games as the most effective ways of learning English.

Despite the popularity of oral tasks, several participants still preferred traditional ways of teaching and written exercises. Furthermore, seventeen students mentioned traditional ways of teaching, such as translation exercises and written grammar exercises in conjunction with communicative exercises**.** Translation exercises were the most popular: it was mentioned by seven students. Furthermore, other traditional suggestions were vocabulary exams (4), written grammar exercises (3), vocabulary exercises (3), essay writing (2), reading different kinds of texts in English (2) and writing summaries (1). Example 4 demonstrates preference for only traditional ways of teaching:

> **Example 4.**
>
> "Kielioppia ja sanastotehtäviä. Suulliset esitykset eivät mielestäni ole niin tärkeitä, kuin teoria."
>
> "Grammar and vocabulary exercises. Oral performances are not in my opinion as important as theory."

In addition to these innovative and traditional ways of teaching, there were some answers which were difficult to clearly label into any specific category. Three suggested that there should be less theory, two participants wrote that it is always good if the teacher uses clear examples and other two were happy with their lessons as they were. Furthermore, schoolbook exercises as an effective way of learning were mentioned by two participants. Finally, one student answered that everyone has their own ways of learning and one student underlined the importance of genuinely interesting texts in effective English teaching.

Indeed, according to the responses, the student participants clearly prefer innovative ways of teaching. Communicative exercises and pair and group work were considered as most beneficial in learning English. This finding supports the earlier study by Ibarrarran, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2007, cited in Bernaus and Gardner 2008: 388), who found that students clearly prefer communicative activities, active participation and authentic materials instead of only following the course books. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, seventeen participants suggested both traditional and innovative ways of teaching and versatility and variation in lessons was mentioned in seven responses. Like Bartram (2006) found that students consider versatility in lessons as one of the most valued aspects in language learning, it could be argued according to the present study as well that student participants value versatility and equality between the different language skills and that some kind of a balance between innovative and traditional ways of teaching would be advisable.

6.2.2 Teachers' answers to the open-ended question

There were 84 teacher participants of which 70 answered the open-ended question. The length and quality varied in the teachers' answers as well. However, the teachers' responses were generally a lot longer and more elaborate than the students', which is not surprising. Indeed, it can be assumed that English teachers are generally more interested in answering a questionnaire about teaching and learning English than students. Moreover, the questionnaire for the teachers was on the Internet and therefore writing the answers for the open-ended question was definitely easier and faster than for the students who filled a paper version.

The answers were analyzed similarly to the students' answers: after reading the responses, all the different ways of teaching were written down and finally divided into 28 categories. Furthermore, these categories were grouped into traditional and innovative ways of teaching. The answers are presented in table 16.

Table 16. Teachers' answers to the open-ended question

Innovative ways of teaching	
oral exercises and natural conversation	39
pair and group work, cooperation	29
versatility (depending on the situation and topic)	23
authentic material	17
information technology (Internet, computers, iPads, mobiles)	17
exercises in different difficulty levels	9
student-centered teaching	8
media, following current issues	7
movies, TV series	6
oral performances, presentations	6
good and relaxed atmosphere, support	5
listening exercises	4
smaller exams and constant evaluation	3
visitors, visits	2
music	2
humour	2
playing games	1
self-evaluation	1
peer feedback	1
trips and travelling	1
Traditional ways of teaching	
traditional grammar exercises, repetition	11
writing tasks	8
getting to know different text types	6
reading texts aloud	5
translation exercises	4
vocabulary exercises	4
writing summaries	1
pronunciation exercises	1

Like the students, the teachers as well had some clear common preferences about what they think are the most effective and useful ways of teaching. However, compared to the students' responses, the teachers' answers were not as simplistic and definite. Several teachers were suspicious about the whole question and wrote how difficult it is to answer because there is no single best way of teaching. As can be seen from table 16, 23 teachers mentioned versatility and variation in teaching methods and nine teachers also mentioned how teaching has to be tailored according to the skills of the students. Example 5 demonstrates these kinds of opinions:

Example 5.

"Opetuksessa täytyy ottaa huomioon eritasoiset opiskelijat. Suurin haaste onkin vastata erilaisten taitotasojen, oppimistapojen ja luonteiden tarpeisiin kielenoppimisessa. …yritän tarjota vaihtoehtoja tehtävissä…"

"The different skill levels of students need to be considered in teaching. Therefore the biggest challenge is to meet the needs of students with different skill levels, ways of learning and personalities in language learning. …I try to offer alternatives in exercises…"

Moreover, several teachers wrote how much the size of the group and students'
motivation affects the way English can and should be taught. In addition, there were
two teachers who thought that the ways of teaching and different kinds of methods
teacher should use are secondary compared to students' inner motivation: if a student
simply is not interested in learning English, the methods, no matter how inspiring or
innovative, do not help. Indeed, there seemed to be a consensus about how much the
situation, time, group, motivation and students' skills affect teaching.

There were not any teachers who would have suggested only traditional ways of
teaching as the most useful in learning English. Twenty teachers suggested only tasks
and exercise types which can be clearly labeled as innovative ways of teaching such as
oral exercises, pair and group work and student-centered teaching (example 6).

> **Example 6.**
>
> "Oppitunneilla pitäisi aktivoida oppilaat töihin tekemällä mahdollisimman paljon erilaisia
> suullisia ja muita pari- ja ryhmätöitä ja opettaja vain ohjailee hieman oppilaita ja on itse
> mahdollisimman paljon hiljaa."
>
> "Students should be activated in lessons to work by doing different kinds of oral and
> other pair and group work as much as possible and teacher only directs students a little bit
> and is quiet as much as possible."

A clear majority of the responses, the remaining fifty, included both innovative and
traditional ways of teaching or something more general:

> **Example 7.**
>
> "Erilaiset oppilaita aktivoivat työtavat (parityö, ryhmätyö, ääntämisharjoitukset, suulliset
> harjoitukset…pelit, leikit jne.) …Kielioppia on myös opetettava ja opiskeltava, siinä
> kääntäminen on edelleen hyvä ja tehokas keino."
>
> "Different ways of working which activate students (pair and group work, pronunciation
> exercises, oral exercises… playing games etc.) …Grammar must also be taught and
> studied, translation is a good and effective way to do that."

Even though teachers were generally more suspicious about answering the question,
they also mentioned several single ways of teaching that they consider generally useful
in English lessons. Like the students, also the teachers seem to value oral exercises and
natural conversation the most. There were altogether 39 teachers out of 70 who
mentioned different kinds of discussion exercises as a useful way of learning English.
Following the students' opinions, pair and/or group work and cooperation was the

second most popular answer with 29 mentions. As discussed above, versatility in teaching was mentioned in 23 responses. Moreover, there were 17 teachers who mentioned how important it is to use authentic material and another 17 who mentioned information technology as a useful and effective tool in English teaching. Examples 8 and 9 demonstrate preference for authenticity and information technology:

Example 8.

"…Kaikenlainen autenttinen materiaali, kuten elokuvat, vaihto-oppilasvierailut, netti, yms motivoivat opiskelijoita enemmän kuin mikään muu."

"…All kinds of authentic material, like movies, exchange student visitors, the Internet, etc motivate students more than anything else."

Example 9.

"…Tabletit tulevat pian opetuskäyttöön ja se tuo monet uudet mahdollisuudet tiedon hakuun ja prosessointiin."

"…Tablets will soon be used in teaching, which brings many new possibilities for searching and processing information."

Indeed, these five categories were clearly the most popular in the teacher participants' responses and can be labelled as innovative ways of teaching.

As mentioned earlier, nine teachers wrote how important it is to have exercises in different skill levels. Moreover, eight teachers mentioned student-centeredness as a starting point when planning the lessons. Following media and current issues was considered important in everyday English lessons by seven teachers and one of the students' favorites, watching movies and/or TV series was also mentioned by six teachers as an effective way in learning English. Oral performances and presentations were supported by six teachers. Furthermore, five teachers mentioned the importance of good and relaxed atmosphere in learning a language.

Other ways of teaching which could be labelled into the innovative category were listening exercises (4), smaller exams and constant evaluation (3), visitors and visits (2), music (2) and humour (2). Finally, playing games, doing self-evaluations, giving peer feedback and travelling were all mentioned once as an effective way of learning English. To sum up, teachers mentioned 20 different things or ways of teaching they believe are useful in English learning which could be labelled into the category of innovative teaching.

Even though innovative ways of teaching such as oral exercises, cooperation and emphasizing communication in general were clearly the most popular answers to the open-ended question, traditional grammar teaching was definitely still not forgotten. Moreover, pair and group work was not always connected only with communicative exercises. Instead, cooperation was considered important in learning grammar as well. Several teachers wrote how important grammatical correctness is even though communication seems to be the trend nowadays (example 10).

Example 10.

"...Tarvitaan myös vanhanaikaista läksyjen lukua (nykyoppilaille tervanjuontia!) ja sanaston opiskelua erilaisin tavoin. Kielioppia on myös opetettava ja opiskeltava, siinä kääntäminen on edelleen hyvä ja tehokas keino. ...Luetaan siis tekstejä aivan vanhanaikaisesti kysymysten, tiivistämisen, sanastokartoitusten avulla."

"...We need also old-fashioned homework (unappealing for students) and vocabulary studying in different ways. Grammar must also be taught and learned, translating is a good and effective way to do that. ...So we read texts old-fashionedly with the help of questions, summaries and vocabulary exercises."

As table 16 shows, there were 11 teachers who mentioned how important it is that grammar is studied traditionally during lessons: simple repetition in exercises was considered as the most effective way of learning grammar, structures and vocabulary in several responses. Moreover, eight teachers mentioned writing and six getting to know different text types as the most useful ways of learning English. Reading texts aloud was mentioned in five responses and four teachers mentioned translation exercises and written vocabulary exercises. Finally, writing summaries and pronunciation exercises were both mentioned once.

Indeed, according to the responses, most of the teachers want oral communication, pair and group work and variation to their lessons. Nevertheless, it is good to remember that these answers tell what the teachers believe are the most effective ways of teaching, not necessarily what they actually do in English lessons in upper secondary schools. Larsen-Freeman (2008: 184) argues that it is often outside the control of teachers to decide the way language is taught. Also the teachers' responses in this study revealed that there are several things affecting the ways teachers teach English, such as time, group, motivation and students' skills. The restrictions of time and group size were mentioned in several responses:

Example 11.

"Mielestäni kommunikatiiviset harjoitukset ovat tärkeitä ja niillä tulisi olla isompi rooli lukio-opetuksessa. Kurssien opetussuunnitelmat vain ovat NIIN täyteen ahdettuja, että aika ei meinaa millään riittää kaikkeen. Suullisen kielitaidon arviointi on myös isojen ryhmien takia hankalaa..."

"I think that communicative exercises are important and they should have a bigger role in lessons in upper secondary school. The course syllabuses just are SO full that there does not seem to be time for everything. Evaluating oral skills is also difficult because of the large group sizes..."

Example 12.

"Haluaisin teettää enemmän suullisia harjoituksia ja laajempia ryhmä- ja paritöitä sekä esitelmiä. Näiden tekemistä rajoittaa suuret ryhmäkoot sekä tiukka aikataulu."

"I would like to have more oral exercises and bigger group and pair works and presentations. Large group sizes and a strict schedule limit doing these.

Eleven teachers also mentioned matriculation examination and/or the curriculum for upper secondary schools as restricting powers in planning the lessons, forcing teachers to focus on teaching grammar and therefore reducing time from everything else.

Example 13.

"...Yo-koe ohjaa lukion englantia kielioppipainotteiseksi, eli perinteisiä opetustapoja suosivaksi eli opettajajohtoiseksi. Kielioppia ei vain opita passiivisilla tv katselulla ja musiikin kuuntelulla!"

"...The matriculation exam directs English lessons in upper secondary schools to focus on grammar, or favouring traditional ways of teaching, in other words teacher-centered teaching. Grammar is not learned by just passively watching TV and listening to music!..."

Example 14.

"...ongelmana on ajan rajallisuus ja siksi tunnit väkisinkin ovat samanlaisia. Tämä on siksi, että he oppisivat edes sen mitä OPS vaatii."

"...the problem is limited time and therefore lessons are by necessity always similar. The reason for this is that they should learn at least what the curriculum demands."

Example 15.

"...Nykyoppikirjojen ongelma on se että kaikki kurssikirjat tehdään samalla kaavalla, mikä ei motivoi oppilaita eikä opettajia. Tähän on osasyyllisenä myös OPS, joka on varsinkin pakollisten aineiden osalta melko orjuuttava."

"...The problem with schoolbooks today is that all the books are made with the same pattern, which doesn't motivate students or teachers. The curriculum is also partly guilty for this because at least with compulsory subjects it is quite enslaving."

Indeed, these issues came up in the study by Huuskonen and Kähkönen (2006) as well: teachers generally have a positive attitude towards teaching oral skills in upper secondary schools, but lack of time, large group sizes and the matriculation examination

restrict teachers' work. Furthermore, the teachers reported that less time was spent on oral skills during the last year of the school because of the matriculation examination.

To sum up, in similar manner as the student participants, the teacher participants clearly prefer innovative ways of teaching. As already mentioned, twenty teachers suggested in their responses only tasks and exercise types which can be labeled as innovative ways of teaching and the remaining fifty answers contained either both traditional and innovative ways of teaching or something more general. Because of this, a conclusion can be drawn that even though teachers value communicativeness a great deal, a balance between traditional and innovative ways of teaching is important. This finding supports the earlier study by Liu (2004), according to which communicative language teaching and combining several different language teaching methods were the most popular among language teachers.

Indeed, the students' and the teachers' answers to the open-ended question were very similar. Yet, the teachers seem to value variation between teaching that emphasizes communicativeness and student-centeredness and traditional teacher-led lessons more than students. Furthermore, whereas the students only mostly gave simple suggestions for effective ways of learning English, several teachers also explained why they think their suggestions are effective in language learning or why something does not necessarily work in lessons.

7   DISCUSSION

In this chapter I will discuss the main findings of the present study in relation to previous research. In addition, I will go through the limitations of the study and give suggestions for future research.

7.1 The main results

The purpose of the present study was to find out what kinds of ways of teaching are used in English lessons in Finnish upper secondary schools and whether there is a clear preference either for traditional or innovative ways of teaching. Furthermore, the study aimed at finding out the students' and the teachers' opinions on different ways of teaching English. Moreover, the participants' opinions about the most effective ways of

language teaching were asked. In addition, the students' and the teachers' answers were compared throughout the study and differences and similarities were identified.

The purpose of the first part of the questionnaire was to find out an answer for the first research question: what kind of teaching takes place in Finnish upper secondary schools? The results indicate that from the two sets of statements the participants agreed more with the statements referring to innovative ways of teaching. Therefore, a conclusion can be drawn that, at least to some extent, innovative ways of teaching are used more than traditional in language teaching in Finnish upper secondary schools. This result supports the study by Liu (2004), according to which communicative language teaching is, in addition to an eclectic method, favored the most by language teachers. The combined answers of both the students and the teachers revealed that students discuss a lot in English during lessons and the focus is more on information exchange than on correcting students' mistakes. Moreover, according to the majority of the participants, teachers use more English than Finnish during lessons and also encourage students to speak English. Furthermore, students work often together and instead of focusing more on written skills the emphasis is equally on all the four language skill areas.

Even though the results indicate that innovative ways of teaching are used more in English lessons, traditionality in teaching is still not forgotten. An overwhelming majority replied that written exams still have the biggest value in evaluation and written tests are regular during courses. Furthermore, according to the results oral exams were not common. Larsen-Freeman (2008: 184) argues that teachers often cannot decide the way language is taught because the curriculum, schedule and exams direct teaching. Indeed, the teachers' answers to the open-ended question revealed that even though they would want to, large group sizes and lack of time make it often impossible to have oral exams, which was also the case in the study by Huuskonen and Kähkönen (2006). In addition, several teachers wrote how difficult it can be to evaluate oral exams objectively and how nervous many students are in a situation where they know their speech is being evaluated. In other words, the situation is not natural which can be one reason why written exams are favored in English lessons. Even though oral exams are not very common, approximately half of the participants agreed on the usefulness of oral exams in language teaching. Because of this, a conclusion can be drawn that without the practical problems teachers mentioned, such as large group sizes and lack of

time, teachers would probably use oral exams more as a way to evaluate students' English skills. In addition, even though the participants emphasized the value of written exams in evaluation, the majority still reported that active participation also has an influence on evaluation and that teachers constantly evaluate students' speech during the lessons.

Furthermore, according to the participants, other traditional teaching behaviors were used as well during lessons. The results indicate that it is common to read aloud different kinds of texts in English and to do translation exercises during lessons. In addition, when asked about innovative ways of teaching, the majority of the participants replied that self-evaluations were not common and that the teacher did not ask feedback about his or her teaching.

The hypothesis set in the beginning of the study was that written skills dominate English teaching in upper secondary schools because matriculation examination focuses only on testing literary skills. As already mentioned, the combined answers of the students and the teachers indicate that innovative language teaching and communication is emphasized over traditional ways of teaching. However, because an overwhelming majority of both participant groups agreed that written exams had the biggest value in evaluation and because matriculation examination was often mentioned as a restricting factor in planning the lessons in the teachers' answers to the open-ended question, it could be argued that the hypothesis proved to be right.

The second research question aimed at finding out the opinions of the students and the teachers on the ways of teaching mentioned in the statements of the first part of the questionnaire. The purpose of the second part of the questionnaire was to provide answers to it. The results indicate that the participants had clearly more positive attitudes towards innovative ways of teaching than towards traditional teaching. This finding is confirmed also by Liu (2004), Ibarrarran, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2007, cited in Bernaus and Gardner 2008: 388), Brown (2006) and Bartram (2006). Indeed, an overwhelming majority of the participants agreed that it is important that the teacher encourages students to use English, that there is equal focus on all the four language skill areas and that there is a lot of discussion in English during lessons. Furthermore, over 80% of the respondents also agreed that it is useful to use authentic materials and to speak and understand English instead of focusing on correcting mistakes.

From the traditional ways of teaching the majority of the participants agreed that it is useful to read different kinds of texts aloud in English, have regular written tests and do translation exercises. In addition, over two thirds of the participants replied that it is useful that written exams have the biggest value in evaluation.

The third part of the questionnaire was designed to give answers for the third research question which aimed at finding out what are the most effective ways of teaching English. The most popular answers among both participant groups were oral exercises and pair and group work. Hinkel (2006: 111) points out that the context defines the methods used in language teaching. This became evident from the participants' answers: several teachers wrote how important it is to tailor teaching according to the needs and skills of the students. Furthermore, as also Liu (2004) and Bartram (2006) found out, versatility and variation in teaching was mentioned often in both the students' and the teachers' answers. Even though different kinds of innovative ways of teaching were clearly considered as the most effective in language learning, traditional ways of teaching, such as translation and grammar exercises and written tasks were still not forgotten. This result is confirmed by Yli-Renko and Salo-Lee (1991) as well.

The purpose of the fourth research question was to find out whether there are differences between the students' and the teachers' perceptions and opinions on language teaching. The comparison between the two participant groups' answers for the Likert scale statements in the first part of the questionnaire gave interesting results that support the findings by Brown (2006) and Bernaus and Gardner (2008). The results indicate that traditional ways of teaching were used more according to the students than according to the teachers and vice versa, innovative ways of teaching were used more according to the teachers than according to the students in English lessons. However, the participant groups were more unanimous with the statements referring to innovative ways of teaching than with the traditional statements.

It is interesting to speculate why these two participant groups have perceived these teaching methods as differently as the results show. It is obvious that several of the statements in the questionnaire referring to traditional ways of teaching do not represent the nowadays generally valued teaching which, as Trim (1992: 10) points out, emphasizes the importance of communicative competence and versatility. Instead, most of these statements represent teaching which is not generally popular or recommended

among language educators today. Therefore, even though it is impossible to say how honest teachers have been with their answers, there is a possibility that they have answered how they know English should be taught today and not how they actually teach it. However, it also has to be remembered that because the student participants were only from two different upper secondary schools, their answers as well represent only the English teaching cultures of two different upper secondary schools in Finland. The teacher participants, on the other hand, were from all over Finland which is why it could be argued that their answers give a more reliable result when the purpose is to find out how English is taught in upper secondary schools all over Finland.

When comparing the students' and the teachers' answers in the second part of the questionnaire, the results indicate that the teachers had more negative opinions about traditional ways of teaching and more positive attitude toward innovative ways of teaching than the students. These findings support the studies by Schulz (2001) and Brown (2006), who also found that students value traditional language teaching, such as formal grammar instruction and direct error correction more than teachers. Brown (2006: 258-259) argues that students are not simply familiar with all the different principles in second language acquisition, which is why they usually do not value communicativeness as much as teachers do. In addition, he continues, if evaluation only measures written skills, it is natural for students to believe that language teaching should focus more on grammatical accuracy than on communicativeness and information exchange. Furthermore, students' appreciation for traditional teaching is also confirmed by Yli-Renko and Salo-Lee (1991), who found out that students did not want to reduce traditional teaching because it was considered useful in preparation for the matriculation examination.

The two participant groups' answers differed more in the first part of the questionnaire. In other words, the students and the teachers were more unanimous with their opinions about the effectiveness of specific language teaching behaviors than with their perceptions about what actually happens in the classroom. As already mentioned, the Likert scale questionnaire revealed that the students value traditional ways of teaching more than the teachers. However, even though the answers for the open-ended question were relatively similar with both the students and the teachers, the results revealed that the teachers seem to value variation between innovative and traditional teaching slightly more than the students.

7.2 Limitations of the study

It has to be remembered that the study has its limitations. First of all, the study is relatively small because only 96 students and 84 teachers took part in it. In addition, because the student participants come from only two different upper secondary schools, the study only covers the ways of teaching used by a couple of English teachers. Therefore, the results cannot be generalized to cover the whole of Finland.

Moreover, questionnaire as a data collecting method sets its own limitations to the study. First of all, it is challenging to construct a good questionnaire. There is a possibility that the wording in some statements might have been unclear and has therefore caused uncertainty or misunderstandings among the respondents. The students answered the questionnaire alone at home and the teachers filled an online questionnaire. Because of this, they did not have the possibility to ask if they did not understand something, which might have affected their answers. In addition and especially with student participants, there is a possibility that they have not filled the questionnaire independently and therefore other people might have affected their answers. Furthermore, using a Likert scale questionnaire always limits the respondents' possibilities to express their opinions freely. Indeed, a couple of the teacher participants mentioned in their answers to the open-ended question that for some questions it was difficult to choose a ready-made response alternative because the ways of teaching and their effectiveness vary depending on the situation and the context. In addition, analyzing the participants' gender would have added depth to the analysis, which is why it could be considered as a limitation that the respondents' gender had to be left out.

7.3 Future research

More extensive research is needed in order to be able to generalize the results. Because of the particular nature of a Likert scale questionnaire, other methods could also be used in gathering the data, such as observing and recording the lessons or interviewing the participants personally. Further research could be made to find out how students form their ideas about effective language teaching and whether students' grades, motivation and earlier success in English affect their answers. Similarly, the possible effects of teachers' age, the length of previous work experience and education could be explored. What is more, future research could aim at finding out whether there are any local

differences both in the ways of teaching and in students' and teachers' opinions on different teaching behaviors and how potential differences might influence how and what students learn.

8 CONCLUSION

As discussed above, according to the majority of all the participants, innovative ways of teaching were used more than traditional ways of teaching in English lessons in upper secondary schools. However, the results revealed that traditionality in teaching is still not forgotten and the hypothesis set in the beginning of the study about written skills dominating English lessons proved to be right, because written exams clearly have the biggest value in evaluation. What is more, even though some traditional ways of teaching, such as translation exercises, were considered useful, the participants had clearly more positive attitudes towards the innovative ways of teaching mentioned in the questionnaire. When asked about the most effective ways of teaching, the most common answers were oral exercises, pair and group work and versatility in teaching. However, different kinds of written tasks and grammar exercises were considered important as well in several responses.

Finally, the results revealed that the students' and the teachers' perceptions and opinions about language teaching differed to some extent: the students reported about the use of traditional strategies in English lessons clearly more frequently than the teachers and even though the participants were more unanimous with their opinions about the effectiveness of specific language teaching strategies than with their perceptions about what actually happens in the classroom, the students also had more positive opinions about traditional ways of teaching than the teachers. In addition, the answers for the open-ended question revealed that the teacher participants seemed to value variation between traditional and innovative teaching slightly more than the students.

The results of the study can help upper secondary school English teachers in developing their teaching. First of all, because it is apparent that both students and teachers value innovative ways of teaching, such as communicative exercises, equality between all the language skill areas and the use of authentic materials more than traditional ways of teaching, such as working alone or focusing more on written skills instead of oral skills, teachers should strive for innovativeness when planning their lessons. However, it has

to be remembered that the restrictions of time, large group sizes and the matriculation examination, which only measures written skills, affect the ways teachers can teach. Therefore, bigger changes should be made in the curriculum and the whole examination system. What is more, even though innovativeness was valued highly, the results also revealed that traditional teaching should not be completely forgotten and therefore some kind of a balance between these two ways of teaching would be advisable.

Secondly, instead of automatically assuming that students perceive English lessons similarly and share the same thoughts and ideas about what is effective language learning, teachers should communicate more with their students about what actually happens in the classroom, what are the goals and purposes of different exercises and what they consider as effective in language learning, because conflicts between students' and teachers' perceptions and opinions can cause problems in learning. As the results revealed, asking feedback from the students was not common in English lessons. However, regular feedback might help teachers to understand better their students' thoughts about the purposes and effectiveness of different ways of teaching. In addition, even though teachers clearly do not have time to explain the rationale behind all their teaching activities, it might be useful to briefly tell why certain activities are done.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bartram, B. (2006). The L2 classroom: Pupil perspectives on pedagogy in England, Germany and the Netherlands. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching* [online] 3 (1), 90-101. http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v3n12006/bartram.pdf

Bernaus, M. and Gardner R.C. 2008. Teacher motivation strategies, student perceptions, student motivation, and English achievement. *The Modern Language Journal* [online] 92 (3), 387-401. http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=a8265ed6-c208-4642-9690-ec3f5f97b5b4%40sessionmgr115&vid=2&hid=114

Brown, A. (2006). *Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective teaching in the foreign language classroom: A comparison of ideals and ratings.* PhD Dissertation. University of Arizona, Tucson, USA.

Brown, H.D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown, H.D. (1997). English language teaching in the postmethod era: toward better diagnosis, treatment and assessment [online]. http://eteachermethods.wikispaces.com/file/view/English+Language+Teaching+in+the+Post+Method+Era.pdf. (26 November, 2013).

Brown, H.D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman.

Chism, N. (2006). Challenging traditional assumptions and rethinking learning spaces. In D. G. Oblinger (ed.), *Learning spaces* [online]. https://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/PUB7102b.pdf. (28 January, 2014).

Choudhury, A. S. (2011). Classroom roles of English language teachers: the traditional and the innovative. *Contemporary Online Language Education Journal* [online] 1, 33-40. http://www.academia.edu/1026697/Classroom_roles_of_English_language_teachers_The_Traditional_and_the_innovative

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment 2001. Council of Europe [online]. http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_en.pdf. (28 November, 2013).

Cory-Wright, K. (2014). Students' self-assessment. Cambridge English [online]. http://www.cambridge.org/us/esl/catalog/subject/project/custom/item6585366/?site_locale=en_US. (18 March, 2014).

Council of Europe 2012: Education and Languages, Language Policy. http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/cadre1_en.asp. (24 November, 2013).

Davies, C. (1996). *What is English teaching?* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2011). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Finnish National Board of Education 2014: General upper secondary education. http://www.oph.fi/english/curricula_and_qualifications/general_upper_secondary_education. (28 November, 2013).

Gault, T. R. (2004). *Adult Hispanic immigrants' assumptions regarding good teaching in ESL.* University of California, California, USA.

Hinkel, E. 2006. Current perspectives on teaching the four skills. *TESOL Quarterly* [online] 40 (1), 109-131. http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.jyu.fi/stable/40264513

Hirsjärvi, S., Remes, P. and Sajavaara, P. (2009). *Tutki ja kirjoita*. Helsinki: Tammi.

Huuskonen, M. and Kähkönen, M. (2006). *Practising, testing and assessing oral skills in Finnish upper secondary schools: teachers´ opinions*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages. http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:jyu-2006384.

Johnson, K. (2008). *An Introduction to Foreign language learning and teaching*. Harlow, England: Pearson Longman.

Kangasvieri, T., Miettinen, E., Kukkohovi, P. and Härmälä, M. (2011). Kielten tarjonta ja kielivalintojen perusteet perusopetuksessa. Opetushallitus [online]. http://www.oph.fi/download/138072_Kielten_tarjonta_ja_kielivalintojen_perusteet_perusopetuksessa.pdf. (27 January, 2014).

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2008). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leppänen, S., Nikula, T. and Kääntä, L. (Eds.) (2008). *Kolmas kotimainen. Lähikuvia englannin käytöstä Suomessa.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Liu, J. 2004. Methods in the post-methods era. Report on an international survey on language teaching methods. *International Journal of English Studies* [online] 4 (1), 137-152. http://revistas.um.es/ijes/article/view/48161/46141

Luukka, M-R., Pöyhönen, S., Huhta, A., Taalas, P., Tarnanen, M. and Keränen, A. (2008). *Maailma muuttuu – mitä tekee koulu? Äidinkielen ja vieraiden kielten tekstikäytänteet koulussa ja vapaa-ajalla.* Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopistopaino.

Munn, P. and Drever, E. (1991). *Using questionnaires in small-scale research: a teachers' guide*. Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Mehisto, P., Marsh, D. and Frigols, M. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.

National Core Curriculum for Basic Education 2004. Finnish National Board of Education [online]. http://www.oph.fi/english/curricula_and_qualifications/basic_education. (18 March, 2014).

National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools 2003. Finnish National Board of Education [online]. http://www.oph.fi/download/47678_core_curricula_upper_secondary_education.pdf. (28 November, 2013).

Norrena, J. (2011). *Innovativiiset opetuskäytänteet ja opettaminen*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Education. https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/37182/URN%3aNBN%3afi%3ajyu-201201101018.pdf?sequence=1

Oxford, R. (2001). Integrated skills in the ESL/EFL classroom. Center for applied linguistics [online]. http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/0105oxford.html. (7 November, 2013).

Pitkänen-Huhta, A. (2003). *Texts and interaction. Literacy practices in the EFL classroom*. Jyväskylä studies in Languages 55. University of Jyväskylä. https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/13471/9513914291.pdf?sequence=1

Ranta, E., Rita, H. and Kouki J. (1991). *Biometria: tilastotiedettä ekologeille*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.

Richards, J. C. and Rodgers T. S. (1995). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rodgers, T. S. (2001). Language teaching methodology. Center for Applied Linguistics [online]. http://www.cal.org/resources/Digest/rodgers.html. (28 November, 2013).

Sajjad, S. (2010). Effective teaching methods at higher education level [online]. http://class.web.nthu.edu.tw/ezfiles/669/1669/img/1381/1.Effectiveteachingmethodsathighereducationlevel.pdf. (15 February, 2014).

Schulz, R. 2001. Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal* [online] 85 (2), 244-258. http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=80687c8d-7d05-4386-ba14-824bab5a6497%40sessionmgr4001&vid=2&hid=4212

Shear, L., Means, B., Gallagher, L., House, A. and Langworthy, M. (2009). ITL research design [online]. http://www.itlresearch.com/images/stories/reports/ITL_Research_design_29_Sept_09.pdf. (28 January, 2014).

Tornberg, U. (2005). *Språkdidaktik*. Stockholm: Gleerup.

Trim, J. L. M. (1992). Language teaching in the perspective of the predictable requirements of the twenty-first century. In J.F. Matter (ed.), *Language teaching in the twenty-first century*. Amsterdam: Free University Press, 10-11 [online]. http://www.aila.info/download/publications/review/AILA09.pdf. (28 November, 2013).

Tuomi, J. and Sarajärvi, A. (2009). *Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi*. Helsinki: Tammi.

Yli-Renko, K. and Salo-Lee, L. (1991). *Vieraiden kielten puheviestintä ja sen oppiminen lukiossa*. Turku: Turun yliopiston offset paino.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. The questionnaire for students.

Hyvä lukiolainen,
teen pro gradu –tutkielmaa englannin opettamisesta suomalaisissa lukioissa. Pyrin
selvittämään, millaista englannin opetus nykyään on ja mitä mieltä oppilaat ja opettajat
ovat opetuksesta. Lisäksi tutkin, eroavatko oppilaiden ja opettajien mielipiteet
toisistaan. Keräämäni aineisto käsitellään tilastollisin menetelmin, eikä yksittäisiä
vastauksia voi erottaa.

Alla näet väittämiä liittyen **lukion englannin tunteihin**. *Mieti, millaista* **edellisen**
englannin
kurssisi *tunneilla oli (poissulkien erikoiskurssit, esim. puhekurssi) ja vastaa väittämiin*
omien kokemustesi perusteella *ympyröimällä oikea vaihtoehto. Vastaukset käsitellään*
luottamuksellisesti ja nimettöminä. Lomakkeen täyttämiseen menee noin 10 minuuttia.

Olen   tyttö / poika

Vastausvaihtoehdot ovat:

1 = täysin samaa mieltä
2 = jokseenkin samaa mieltä
3 = jokseenkin eri mieltä
4 = täysin eri mieltä
5 = en osaa sanoa

	Täysin samaa mieltä	Jokseenkin samaa mieltä	Jokseenkin eri mieltä	Täysin eri mieltä	En osaa sanoa
1.Kirjallisilla kokeilla oli suurin merkitys arvioinnissa.	1	2	3	4	5
2.Kurssin aikana pidettiin ainakin yksi suullinen koe.	1	2	3	4	5
3.Opettaja arvioi jatkuvasti puhettamme ja Aktiivinen osallistuminen vaikutti selkeästi kurssinumeroon.	1	2	3	4	5
4.Teimme itsearvioinnin/itsearviointeja omasta oppimisestamme.	1	2	3	4	5
5.Kurssilla oli säännöllisesti kirjallisia testejä (esim. sanakokeita).	1	2	3	4	5
6.Opettaja pyysi usein oppilailta palautetta antamastaan opetuksesta.	1	2	3	4	5
7.Oppilaat olivat tunneilla enemmän äänessä kuin opettaja.	1	2	3	4	5

8.Keskustelimme tunneilla paljon englanniksi pareittain tai ryhmissä.	1	2	3	4	5
9.Oppilaiden puheessa ilmenevät virheet korjattiin aina.	1	2	3	4	5
10.Oppilaat käyttivät tunneilla enemmän suomea kuin englantia.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Englanniksi puhuminen ja viestin Ymmärtäminen oli tunneilla tärkeämpää kuin virheiden korjaaminen.	1	2	3	4	5
12.Opettaja käytti tunneilla enemmän suomea kuin englantia.	1	2	3	4	5
13.Oppilaat työskentelivät tunneilla enemmän yksin kuin yhdessä.	1	2	3	4	5
14.Tunneilla keskityttiin enemmän kielioppiasioihin ja sanastoon kuin käytännön kielitaitoon.	1	2	3	4	5
15.Tunneilla keskityttiin tasapuolisesti kirjoittamiseen, lukemiseen, kuuntelemiseen ja puhumiseen.	1	2	3	4	5
16.Teimme usein käännöstehtäviä (lauseita tai tekstipätkiä).	1	2	3	4	5
17.Käytimme tunneilla oppikirjan lisäksi usein myös muuta materiaalia (esim. Internet, musiikki, kirjat, sanomalehdet, elokuvat jne.).	1	2	3	4	5
18.Luimme usein kirjan kappaleita tai muita tekstejä parin kanssa ääneen englanniksi.	1	2	3	4	5
19.Toimimme tunneilla usein saman järjestyksen mukaisesti ja poikkeuksia rutiiniin tuli harvoin.	1	2	3	4	5
20.Opettaja kannusti ja rohkaisi meitä käyttämään englantia niin tunneilla kuin vapaa-ajallakin.	1	2	3	4	5
21.Englannin oppiminen oli tunneilla hauskaa ja mielenkiintoista.	1	2	3	4	5

*Alla näet väittämiä liittyen englannin opetukseen. Mieti nyt, **mitä mieltä olet väittämistä yleisesti** ja vastaa ympyröimällä mielestäsi oikea vaihtoehto.*

	Täysin samaa mieltä	Jokseenkin samaa mieltä	Jokseenkin eri mieltä	Täysin eri mieltä	En osaa sanoa
1.On hyvä, että kirjallisilla kokeilla on suurin merkitys arvioinnissa.	1	2	3	4	5
2.On hyvä, että kurssin aikana pidetään Ainakin yksi suullinen koe.	1	2	3	4	5
3.On tärkeää, että opettaja arvioi jatkuvasti puhettamme ja aktiivinen osallistuminen vaikuttaa selkeästi kurssinumeroon.	1	2	3	4	5
4.On hyödyllistä tehdä itsearviointeja omasta oppimisesta.	1	2	3	4	5
5.On hyvä, että tunneilla pidetään säännöllisesti kirjallisia testejä (esim. sanakokeita).	1	2	3	4	5
6.On tärkeää, että opettaja pyytää usein oppilailta palautetta antamastaan opetuksesta.	1	2	3	4	5
7.On hyvä, että oppilaat ovat tunneilla enemmän äänessä kuin opettaja.	1	2	3	4	5
8.Tunneilla on hyödyllistä keskustella Paljon englanniksi pareittain tai ryhmissä.	1	2	3	4	5
9.On tärkeää, että oppilaiden puheessa Ilmenevät virheet korjataan aina.	1	2	3	4	5
10.On hyvä, että oppilaat käyttävät tunneilla enemmän suomea kuin englantia.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Englanniksi puhuminen ja viestin Ymmärtäminen on tunneilla tärkeämpää kuin virheiden korjaaminen.	1	2	3	4	5
12.On tärkeää, että opettaja käyttää tunneilla enemmän suomea kuin englantia.	1	2	3	4	5
13.On hyvä, että oppilaat saavat työskennellä tunneilla enemmän yksin kuin yhdessä.	1	2	3	4	5
14.On tärkeää, että tunneilla keskitytään enemmän kielioppiasioihin ja sanastoon kuin	1	2	3	4	5

käytännön kielitaitoon.

15. Tunneilla on hyvä keskittyä tasapuolisesti kirjoittamiseen, lukemiseen, kuuntelemiseen ja puhumiseen.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Kielen oppimisen kannalta on hyödyllistä tehdä käännöstehtäviä (lauseita tai tekstipätkiä).	1	2	3	4	5
17. On tärkeää, että tunneilla käytetään oppikirjan lisäksi usein myös muuta materiaalia (esim. Internet, musiikki, kirjat, sanomalehdet, elokuvat jne.).	1	2	3	4	5
18. On hyödyllistä lukea kirjan kappaleita tai muita tekstejä parin kanssa ääneen englanniksi.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Tunneilla on hyvä toimia saman järjestyksen mukaisesti ja niin, että poikkeuksia rutiiniin tulee harvoin.	1	2	3	4	5
20. On tärkeää, että opettaja kannustaa ja rohkaisee meitä käyttämään englantia niin tunneilla kuin vapaa-ajallakin.	1	2	3	4	5
21.Englannin oppimisen täytyy olla Koulussa hauskaa ja mielenkiintoista.	1	2	3	4	5

Kerro lyhyesti millaisten opetustapojen ja tehtävien uskot omasta mielestäsi olevan kaikkein hyödyllisimpiä englannin oppimisessa? Millaista opetusta toivoisit englannin tunneille?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

KIITOS VASTAUKSISTASI! ☺

Appendix 2. The questionnaire for teachers.

Kysely englannin opettamisesta lukiossa

Arvoisa englannin opettaja,
teen pro gradu –tutkielmaa englannin opettamisesta suomalaisissa lukioissa. Pyrin selvittämään, millaista englannin opetus nykyään on ja mitä mieltä oppilaat ja opettajat ovat opetuksesta. Lisäksi tutkin, eroavatko oppilaiden ja opettajien mielipiteet toisistaan. Keräämäni aineisto käsitellään tilastollisin menetelmin, eikä yksittäisiä vastauksia voi erottaa.

Alla näet 20 väittämää liittyen **lukion englannin tunteihin**. Mieti millaista **edellisen englannin kurssisi tunneilla** oli (poissulkien erikoiskurssit, esim. puhekurssi) ja vastaa väittämiin ympyröimällä oikea vaihtoehto. Vastaukset käsitellään luottamuksellisesti ja nimettöminä. Lomakkeen täyttämiseen menee noin 10 minuuttia.

1. Sukupuoli *

◯ Nainen

◯ Mies

2. Mieti edellisen opettamasi englannin kurssin tunteja ja valitse sopivin vastausvaihtoehto.

	täysin samaa mieltä	jokseenkin samaa mieltä	jokseenkin eri mieltä	täysin eri mieltä	en osaa sanoa
1.Kirjallisilla kokeilla oli suurin merkitys arvioinnissa.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
2.Kurssin aikana pidettiin ainakin yksi suullinen koe.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.Arvioin jatkuvasti oppilaiden puhetta ja aktiivinen osallistuminen vaikutti selkeästi kurssinumeroon.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
4. Oppilaat tekivät itsearvioinnin/itsearviointeja omasta oppimisestaan.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
5. Kurssilla oli säännöllisesti kirjallisia testejä (esim. sanakokeita).	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
6. Pyysin usein oppilailta palautetta antamastani opetuksesta.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
7. Oppilaat olivat tunneilla enemmän äänessä kuin minä.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

8. Oppilaat keskustelivat tunneilla paljon englanniksi pareittain tai ryhmissä.	○	○	○	○	○
9. Oppilaiden puheessa ilmenevät virheet korjattiin aina.	○	○	○	○	○
10. Oppilaat käyttivät tunneilla enemmän suomea kuin englantia.	○	○	○	○	○
11. Englanniksi puhuminen ja viestin ymmärtäminen oli tunneilla tärkeämpää kuin virheiden korjaaminen.	○	○	○	○	○
12. Käytin tunneilla enemmän suomea kuin englantia.	○	○	○	○	○
13. Oppilaat työskentelivät tunneilla enemmän yksin kuin yhdessä.	○	○	○	○	○
14. Tunneilla keskityttiin enemmän kielioppiasioihin ja sanastoon kuin suulliseen kielitaitoon ja kommunikointiin.	○	○	○	○	○
15. Tunneilla keskityttiin tasapuolisesti kirjoittamiseen, lukemiseen, kuuntelemiseen ja puhumiseen.	○	○	○	○	○
16. Teimme usein käännöstehtäviä (lauseita tai tekstipätkiä).	○	○	○	○	○
17. Käytimme tunneilla oppikirjan lisäksi usein myös muuta materiaalia (esim. Internet, musiikki, kirjat, sanomalehdet, elokuvat jne.).	○	○	○	○	○
18. Oppilaat lukivat usein kirjan kappaleita tai muita tekstejä parin kanssa ääneen englanniksi.	○	○	○	○	○
19. Toimimme tunneilla usein saman järjestyksen mukaisesti ja poikkeuksia rutiiniin tuli harvoin.	○	○	○	○	○
20. Kannustin ja rohkaisin oppilaita käyttämään englantia niin tunneilla kuin vapaa-ajallakin.	○	○	○	○	○
21. Kurssin opettaminen oli hauskaa ja mielenkiintoista.	○	○	○	○	○

3. Mieti, mitä mieltä olet väittämistä yleisesti ja valitse sopivin vaihtoehto.

	täysin samaa mieltä	jokseenkin samaa mieltä	jokseenkin eri mieltä	täysin eri mieltä	en osaa sanoa
1.On hyvä, että kirjallisilla kokeilla on suurin merkitys arvioinnissa.	○	○	○	○	○
2.On hyvä, että kurssin aikana pidetään ainakin yksi suullinen koe.	○	○	○	○	○
3.On tärkeää, että opettaja arvioi jatkuvasti oppilaiden puhetta ja aktiivinen osallistuminen vaikuttaa selkeästi kurssinumeroon	○	○	○	○	○
4.Oppilaiden on hyödyllistä tehdä itsearviointeja omasta oppimisestaan.	○	○	○	○	○
5.On hyvä, että tunneilla pidetään säännöllisesti kirjallisia testejä (esim. sanakokeita).	○	○	○	○	○
6.On tärkeää, että opettaja pyytää usein oppilailta palautetta antamastaan opetuksesta.	○	○	○	○	○
7.On hyvä, että oppilaat ovat tunneilla enemmän äänessä kuin minä.	○	○	○	○	○
8.Tunneilla on hyödyllistä keskustella paljon englanniksi pareittain tai ryhmissä.	○	○	○	○	○
9. On tärkeää, että oppilaiden puheessa ilmenevät virheet korjataan aina.	○	○	○	○	○
10.On hyvä, että oppilaat käyttävät tunneilla enemmän suomea kuin englantia.	○	○	○	○	○
11.Englanniksi puhuminen ja viestin ymmärtäminen on tunneilla tärkeämpää kuin virheiden korjaaminen.	○	○	○	○	○
12. On tärkeää, että opettaja käyttää tunneilla enemmän suomea kuin englantia.	○	○	○	○	○
13.On hyvä, että oppilaat saavat työskennellä tunneilla enemmän yksin kuin yhdessä.	○	○	○	○	○
14.On tärkeää, että tunneilla keskitytään enemmän kielioppiasioihin ja sanastoon kuin suulliseen kielitaitoon ja	○	○	○	○	○

kommunikointiin.

15. Tunneilla on hyvä keskittyä tasapuolisesti kirjoittamiseen, lukemiseen, kuuntelemiseen ja puhumiseen.	○	○	○	○	○
16. Kielen oppimisen kannalta on hyödyllistä tehdä käännöstehtäviä (lauseita tai tekstipätkiä).	○	○	○	○	○
17. On tärkeää, että tunneilla käytetään oppikirjan lisäksi usein myös muuta materiaalia (esim. Internet, musiikki, kirjat, sanomalehdet, elokuvat jne.).	○	○	○	○	○
18. Oppilaiden on hyödyllistä lukea kirjan kappaleita tai muita tekstejä parin kanssa ääneen englanniksi.	○	○	○	○	○
19. Tunneilla on hyvä toimia saman järjestyksen mukaisesti ja niin, että poikkeuksia rutiiniin tulee harvoin.	○	○	○	○	○
20. On tärkeää, että opettaja kannustaa ja rohkaisee oppilaita käyttämään englantia niin tunneilla kuin vapaa-ajallakin.	○	○	○	○	○
21.Englannin oppimisen täytyy olla koulussa hauskaa ja mielenkiintoista.	○	○	○	○	○

4. Kerro lyhyesti millaisten opetustapojen ja tehtävien uskot omasta mielestäsi olevan kaikkein hyödyllisimpiä englannin oppimisessa? Millaisia opetusmenetelmiä toivoisit voivasi hyödyntää oppitunneilla?