Hamline University
DigitalCommons@Hamline

School of Education Student Capstone Theses and Dissertations

School of Education

Summer 8-14-2015

The Most Effective EFL Approach for an Elementary School in Spain

Krista Emily Swanson
Hamline University, kswanson09@hamline.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_all

Part of the Education Commons

THE MOST EFFECTIVE EFL APPROACH FOR AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN

SPAIN

by

Krista E. Swanson

A capstone submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master

of Arts in English as a Second Language.

Hamline University,

Saint Paul, Minnesota

August 2015

Primary Advisor: Julia Reimer
Secondary Advisor: Julie Schmidt
Peer Reader: Grant Swanson

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

My interest in Spain began in 2007. I was taking Spanish classes at a university

there for the summer. Around the same time, I developed an interest in teaching English

while taking TESOL college classes in 2006-2008. Ever since that summer in Spain I

have wanted to work there. While in college I decided to pursue teaching as a career and

after graduation entered a teaching licensure graduate program at Hamline University in

St. Paul, MN. Now having taught for a few years, my interest in teaching has waned, but

I still want to be involved in some capacity with a school in Spain. In addition, I am a

deeply religious person, and I knew that I wanted to be involved with a parochial school.

While visiting Madrid in July of 2013, I learned of a private, parochial elementary school

in the works. I contacted its director and he confirmed that there would be some type of

EFL program at the new school. I plan on moving to Madrid within one or two years, and

in the meantime I am keeping updated on the progress of the school-to-be via emailed

newsletters. Finding the most effective EFL approach is critical to the students who will

attend the school in Madrid, the EFL teachers there, the director of the school, and

anyone involved with bilingual education. I am not on staff at this school. I am doing the

research because of my own interest in what kind of approach would most benefit the

school.

An Elementary School in Madrid

The school I am interested in will be a private, parochial elementary school in a

northern suburb of Madrid. The director of the school and others are currently laying the

groundwork and they hope to launch the school in the fall of 2016. The proposed school

is aimed at Spanish national students. The curriculum will possibly be American, but it

will meet Spanish education standards. In the school's first year, it will only have

preschool and kindergarten levels, probably one class each, with the goal of eventually

having grades K-12. It will be under the management of either an association or a

foundation. The students in the school will most likely be from the suburb in which it will

be located, or the surrounding suburbs. The students will not have a lot of opportunities

to use English outside of the school since Spanish is the language spoken in their society

and homes. That is a challenge that the school will face—how to develop fluency in all

four modes in students when there is not a lot of practice outside of the school setting.

Here is further background about this elementary school in Madrid. The director

of the school in Madrid and other people who are laying the groundwork for the school

say that there are negative stereotypes associated with the Spanish bilingual school

programs, and so they will not be using that type of program model. A teacher, who is

from Canada and who will be helping to start the school, has brought up the French-

English language programs in schools there, and suggested the school in Spain could

possibly use an adapted model of one of those programs. Thus, the founders are currently

thinking of having some type of an International English program. The school will start

with only instructing in English and then later incorporate Spanish instruction, perhaps in

the later elementary grades once those are in place. The director has also said that there are presently long waiting lists for English speaking schools in Spain, and so it seems that a market study is not needed. All that is needed is a feasibility study of what current fees are, et cetera.

Spain's government runs a program in which English speakers from the U.S. and Canada can apply to be a conversation auxiliary (language assistant) in K-12 Spanish schools ("Cultural Ambassadors," 2014). They assist the English teacher in the Spanish schools by preparing activities to teach the English language and culture. It runs from October through May 31. It is primarily aimed at enlisting university age students. The goal is for the North American to broaden the Spanish students' knowledge of English and its culture. The director of the school that I will be involved with in Madrid mentioned that he thinks he might want to try this in the new school.

<div align="center">English in Spain</div>

Spain is behind the rest of Europe in its ability to speak English, the international language (Reichelt, 2006). This is partly because Spain's former dictator, Francisco Franco, who died in 1975, did not allow other languages besides Spanish to be taught (Lasagabaster, 2000). There is a strong push right now for Spanish schools to prepare their students to be competitive in the global workplace by teaching them English from a young age. Reichelt states that only 18% of Spaniards speak, read, and write English effortlessly, as compared to 31% of non-native English speakers in the European Union. Most Spanish schools have used traditional EFL drip-feed models of distributing hours of instruction. Traditional drip-feed means that students receive three to five hours of

English instruction per week spread throughout the whole school year, and the instruction focuses on the English language. Since 1996 there have been bilingual schools and schools using Content and Language Integrated Learning in some parts of Spain (CLIL) (Muñoz Lahoz & Navés, 2007). As opposed to traditional drip-feed programs, these programs use English as a medium to teach multiple subjects.

Research Questions and Purpose

Although I am not directly involved in selecting the model of English language instruction this school will use, my personal interest in the school has made me curious about possible models of delivery. I will use this school as a backdrop for exploring my research questions, which are:

1. What does the literature say about effective EFL approaches to be implemented in a private, elementary school in Spain?

In order to fully answer that question, this capstone will address the following question as well:

2. What teaching strategies are effective for developing fluency in an EFL setting for children?

The research questions are answered through a review of literature. In this project, I review targeted articles about English teaching in schools in Spain and in similar settings and compare them to locate the umbrella findings about what makes effective English teaching programs in Spain.

In conclusion, I am studying the elementary EFL approaches that promote fluency because I want to discover the most successful type of approach in order to recommend

the most efficient and effective EFL approach for a new private, parochial school in Madrid. It will benefit the faculty, administration, and students of the school in Madrid, as well as any second language learner, other immersion schools, other language teachers and researchers, and persons interested in bilingual or immersion education. My interest in this topic stems from a high interest in Spain and in English teaching.

Chapter One presented my background and interest in the topic, the purpose of this paper, the research questions, and the expectations for what will be learned. Chapter Two defines terms and provides background on information needed to understand the studies included in the review of literature. Chapter Three covers the method to be utilized to conduct the research. Chapter Four describes the results. It shall include analysis and interpretation of the findings. Chapter Five reviews the results in light of the literature, considers the implications and any limitations, looks at possible further research needed, and reflects on the growth of this author.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Spain has used intensive and semi-intensive language instruction programs in its universities (Serrano & Muñoz, 2007), but it has not implemented them in its elementary schools except in the form of bilingual schools and CLIL schools. Exploration into the results of Quebec's intensive English programs in its elementary schools, other European CLIL programs, and the results of Spain's current bilingual and CLIL schools is needed in order to determine which type of program is most effective. Little attention has been paid, for example, to the number of hours of English instruction per week in Spanish elementary schools in regard to the most successful EFL program model.

My research questions and the purposes for my research are these: What does the literature say about effective EFL approaches to be implemented in a private, elementary school in Spain? What teaching strategies are effective for developing fluency in an EFL setting for children?

I am studying multiple elementary EFL program models (and selected EFL programs beyond elementary grades) because I want to discover the most successful type in order to recommend the most efficient and effective EFL program for a new private, parochial elementary school in Madrid.

This chapter provides background and definitions that will be useful in defining the parameters of the review of literature. In addition, it includes further background on EFL teaching in Spain, parochial and private schools in Spain, definitions of different

types of EFL programs and approaches, a definition and description of "fluency," and information about teaching strategies that promote fluency.

<p style="text-align:center">Parochial/Private Schools in Spain</p>

An aspect of education separate from language, but which applies to the school I will be involved with, is parochial and private education in Spain. In 1984 the Spanish government changed legislation on the federal subsidies for parochial schools (Sánchez de Horcajo, 1995). This law was called the Law of the Right to Education. The stated purpose was to regulate standards for student admission, hiring of teachers, and to give parents and students an influential voice in administrative decisions. The reason that Spain has so many private schools is because the public schools could not accommodate all of the students in Spain. Hence, the private system is not a luxury, but a necessity. Another purpose of the 1984 legislation was to change funding rules for religious schools. The law said that the religious classes and practice in schools receiving state money would have to be a voluntary option for students. In Spain there are partial-private schools that receive some state aid, and there are completely-private schools that receive none. Currently two-thirds of the schools in Spain are state schools, and one-third are private schools ("Datos y Cifras," 2011). The school that I will be involved with in Madrid will be a purely private school and will not receive any government funds.

In 2007, Mancebon and Muñiz did a study on private versus public high schools in Spain. What they found was that, overall, private schools attain better academic results than public schools. However, they concluded that it was not the repercussion of comparatively more adequate management, but that the private schools have students

who arrive with a more favorable upbringing for the academic journey. The suburb of Madrid where my school will be located is a middle class suburb. Thus the majority of the students will probably be from middle class families. Since the school I will be helping with in Madrid will be a private school and its students will likely have parents that are very involved in their child's education, it could be that its students will be in an advantageous position.

<div align="center">Models for English as a Foreign Language</div>

English-as-a-foreign-language teaching means that the language being taught, English, is not the official language of the country, nor is it widely spoken in society (Brown, 2007). English-as-a-foreign-language models are commonly referred to as EFL and will be in this paper. An EFL program teaches English to students who live in a location where English is for the most part an academic subject, and it is used in their culture as a way of communicating with outsiders (Díaz-Rico, 2004).

An immersion program, one possible model for EFL, is where the immersion language, in this case, English, is used to instruct subject matter for at least 50% of the day at the preschool or elementary level and 100% of the day at the secondary level (Finch, 2009). This differs from a bilingual program, which uses two languages as the medium of teaching for the purpose of developing balanced individuals who associate and feel at one with both minority and majority groups (Finch, 2009). Under the umbrella of "bilingual education" there is transitional bilingual education and dual language education. Transitional bilingual education is for students in a country where English is the main language, which is not the case in Spain. The goal is to transition students with

limited English proficiency to the academic mainstream of all-English. Dual language education programs teach subject matter using two different languages. Certain courses are taught in one language and certain courses in another. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is yet another program model, in which the goal is to develop a plurilingual path to education (Finch, 2009). Within CLIL there are three different models. These are the sheltered model, the adjunct model, and the theme-based model. In the sheltered model, the courses included are regular content courses such as math, science, and social studies that are taught by a specialist. The specialist has the ability to teach rigorous content in the target language (Finch, 2009). In the case of the school in Madrid, the target language is English. In this model there are some modifications done with the second language learners in mind. Texts are chosen for their organization and clarity, the teacher may veer lectures to align with the written text and implement linguistic adjustments so that students are able to listen comprehensibly, and the broad course requirements could be adjusted to have more focus on receptive skills and less on speaking and writing skills (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 2003).

The adjunct model was originally developed for English Learners (ELs) in the U.S. In the adjunct model, students take two linked courses. One is a language course and the other is a content course. The concept is that the courses have the same content base and can work together and mutually coordinate assignments. The students learning a second language are sheltered within the language course and integrated within the content course. An adjunct program necessitates a huge amount of cooperation to make sure the two classes' curricula works in tandem. Both courses usually have to be

modified to make sure it happens. The language course's materials are different from a regular EFL class (Brinton, et al., 2003).

Theme-based language instruction is a theme or topic-based language class designed to increase subject matter content in a language course. The topics or themes make up the structure of the curriculum. The content that the teacher teaches is the focal point for language analysis and practice. A ten-week theme-based language course could be planned based on many unrelated topics (Brinton, et al., 2003). For example, the themes could be cardiovascular disease, noise pollution, wind energy, and media news coverage. The topic would first be introduced in a reading text, the topic and vocabulary would then be used in facilitated discussions, and topic-related audio and/or video resources would be the tools for listening activities. Lastly, a written assignment involving synthesizing the different source materials would complete the topical unit. Topic-based courses could also consist of organizing the curriculum of a class around a single big topic (e.g., marketing), which would then be split up into more specific topics (e.g., "product development, advertising strategies, consumer behavior," (Brinton, et al., 2003)). This design calls for much more planning and preparation of the materials. Yet it could have extra benefits since students are constantly using the vocabulary related to the topic and concepts through the different materials, and they can achieve a high level of fluency concerning the ideas. Theme-based language classes can be used in any institution and the topics can be chosen according to students' interests (Brinton, et al., 2003).

A multilingual program promotes proficiency in three or more languages in students. In Europe, schools that have this program strive to grow the students' first language and culture, while aiming to advance an identity that is European through teaching for all students in at minimum two languages, requiring study of a third as a subject, and providing the opportunity to learn a fourth language (Finch, 2009). Most students who go through this program are multilingual when they graduate.

Abello-Contesse (2013) states that content-based instruction is used in many different forms. It appears in immersion, sheltered instruction, adjunct language instruction, theme-based instruction, and CLIL. In content-based instruction the teaching is often referred to as "meaningful" because students are learning subject matter that fits their current academic needs in their school setting rather than the more frivolous topics and stories that are found in most foreign language textbooks. The belief is that by instructing academic knowledge in the foreign language it gives students content that is applicable and pertinent for their role as a student and possibly for their future profession. When choosing what to teach, the starting point is not the language objectives, but the content objectives. The language objectives surface from the oral and written activities used in class. The language in the texts and tasks is supposed to be authentic and comprehendible. The more advanced the grade level the more academic- and content-specialized the register becomes. Content-based instruction requires students to use the second language in order to learn it. The second language is the medium used to present new content, discuss, and test it, while furthering proficiency in the second language. The

benefit is that students learn their school subjects while simultaneously learning a second language (Abello-Contesse, 2013).

It has been established that the more time given to learning a language the greater the proficiency levels achieved, as shown in research mostly by American psychologist J.B. Carroll (1967 as cited in Serrano & Muñoz, 2007). Yet not a lot of attention has been paid to how the time should be distributed. The time allocation can range from small chunks spread out over a large time allotment ('drip-feed' distribution) to large chunks fit inside of small time allotments. There are many factors that go into deciding time allocation for language teaching. It could be budget costs, urgency of high level of proficiency, schedule convenience or limitation, et cetera. Serrano and Muñoz point out that during WWI there were intensive language training programs in the U.S. that were created because of a need for acquiring high proficiency swiftly, and not from a support of the psychological benefits of massed versus distributed learning. Since then massed, intensive language teaching has become common for business and university language training. In primary schools, it is still distributed in small amounts over several years for the most part (Serrano & Muñoz, 2007).

Traditional "Drip-Feed," Intensive, Semi-Intensive, and Extensive

The term "traditional drip-feed" means that students receive three to five hours of English instruction every week for the whole school year (Serrano & Muñoz, 2007). Netten and Germain (2004) and Spada and Lightbown (1989) (both as cited in Serrano & Muñoz, 2007), noted that traditional foreign language programs that give small amounts of teaching in a non-concentrated time distribution have not proved to be especially

effective in acquiring a foreign language. Thus, many new programs have been created to remedy the situation. There are a handful of terms for them, but for simplicity they will be referred to as intensive. Benefits of intensive programs are that students can achieve higher proficiency levels in shorter amounts of time, they mirror a more naturalistic language learning, and they facilitate close connections between students and the teacher. A big prerequisite for intensive programs is that students need to have motivation and enthusiasm to work hard during the class's time allotment in order for most gains to occur. Secondly, as cited by Serrano and Muñoz (2007), research by Schulz (1979) and Scott (1996) suggests that the teachers need to be inspiring, engaging and have a whole slew of activities that they can use to captivate students.

Again Serrano and Muñoz point out that intensive language training especially for adults is commonly done in language training for businesses and universities. In comparison, the teaching of languages in the elementary grades comprises small amounts of instruction stretched over many years. The authors state that Canada is where there have been experiments executed concerning the time disbursement in second language learning, some of which were presented earlier. In addition, they said learning English in an intensive course is much more similar to how one learns a language naturally as a child. It more closely follows natural language acquisition. Nevertheless, there are little to no Spanish elementary schools implementing an intensive EFL program in place of the drip-feed EFL program, although there *are* bilingual programs and CLIL programs at the elementary level.

Intensive ESL in Quebec

One variation of the EFL model is the intensive ESL model used in Quebec. In intensive ESL programs in Montreal for grades five and six they often use a five months-on/five months-off model (Ammar & Spada, 2006). This means that the students study English all day, every day for five months of the school year and the other five months are spent on learning regular curriculum such as math, science, and et cetera. These are taught in French (Ammar & Spada, 2006). The students receive the ESL section of their schooling in a communicative instructional method that places an emphasis on meaning instead of form. The Ministry of Education of Quebec gave guidelines for ESL instruction that says teachers need to focus on fluency by conducting activities that largely target listening and speaking. That is occasionally done at the expense of the growth of reading and writing skills and, particularly, grammatical accuracy. In Quebec, immersion in English is forbidden in the Francophone schools. This is why they have developed the intensive language programs, where students receive instruction several hours a day and do not receive content instruction in English. In their English classes, the focus is on the English language and oral fluency (Serrano & Muñoz, 2007).

Spain's Bilingual School Program

According to Fernández-Cezar, Harris, and Aguirre-Perez (2009), in 1996 the Spanish Ministry of Education signed an agreement with the British Council and French government to begin bilingual programs in state schools. These programs would be either Spanish-English or Spanish-French.

Before Spain's Ministry of Education signed an agreement with the British

Council and the French government, there were already bilingual schools in Spain using

the native languages of Spain (Pérez Murillo, 2013). Forty percent of the population of

Spain lives in bilingual areas. The schools in these parts of Spain are multilingual, and

English is a third language. These regions are the Basque Country, where Basque and

Spanish are spoken; Galicia, where Gallego and Spanish are spoken; Catalonia, where

Catalan and Spanish are spoken; and Valencia, where Valenciano (equal to Catalan) and

English are spoken. The project that was launched in 1996 between the Ministry of

Education and the British Council as well as the French government is called the

Bilingual Education Project (BEP) (Pérez Murillo, 2013). The chief goal of the BEP is to

implement language development so as to gain bilingualism in Spanish and English, or in

Spanish and French. There is more emphasis on Spanish and English. Pérez Murillo

noted in 2013 that there were then 80 elementary bilingual schools and 42 bilingual high

schools, equaling 122 total bilingual schools across Spain. The author also notes, that the

learning of the two languages is enhanced when the setting confers status on both the L1

(first language) and the L2 (second language). The bilingual educational programs do not

use English outside of the educational setting. English is spoken 40% of the day in these

schools. In the elementary schools, English language and literacy is a core subject, along

with history, geography, science, and art and design. All of the students in the bilingual

schools are involved in the BEP from first grade (Pérez Murillo, 2013). The BEP schools

have developed curriculum guidelines for their preschool and elementary schools. On an

attitudinal survey given to 382 sixth and eighth graders in 2008-2009, 99 percent of them

believed that English was important for their future. The push to know English for a future job is what drives Spaniards to pursue fluency in English.

Reichelt (2006) traces the development of language programs from the 1980s on. In the 1980s, before the bilingual programs were started in the elementary schools, the Spanish schools followed the traditional drip-feed model, consisting of two to three hours per week of English instruction. During the last two years of high school, which is called "bachillerato" and is optional in Spain, there were three to five hours of English instruction per week. The teachers used the grammar-translation approach and the students' exit levels at the end of bachillerato were below the Cambridge First Certificate Level. There are five Cambridge Certificate Levels ("International Language," 2015). British English has a strong presence in Spain, and the Cambridge system of language certificates are valued. The schools use British curriculum for teaching English. In 2002, the Spanish government passed a law requiring English to be taught starting in first grade. Some preschools start instruction at age three. Since 2000-2001, the Catalonian Department of Education has supported the learning of English beginning in first grade. Students in Catalonia then receive education in three languages: Spanish, Catalan, and English. The test results are that those receiving education in three languages have achieved equal or better results than their peers in bilingual programs (Reichelt, 2006).

Content and Language Integrated Learning

CLIL stands for Content and Language Integrated Learning. CLIL is a European program model of second language teaching (Maxwell-Reid, 2011). It is similar to Content-Based Language Instruction, which is done in many ESL programs in U.S.

public schools. CLIL is defined as a dual-focused educational approach in which a second language is used for the learning and teaching of the content and language (Ruiz de Zarobe & Catalán, 2009). Both the English language and the content are comprehensible and are embedded within learning-centered tasks and activities that nudge students to use language to gain information, negotiate understanding, and construct knowledge (Ting, 2011). It first appeared in European education systems in 1994 (Ruiz de Zarobe & Catalán, 2009). It is an overarching term for features that are practiced in various bilingual educational programs. For example, CLIL programs involve studying subjects such as history or geography in a language that is not one's maternal language. In CLIL programs, language is used for an objective, so that the language becomes a tool instead of an end in itself. The two main goals of CLIL are mastering content *and* a foreign language (Ruiz de Zarobe & Catalán, 2009). It was developed from the findings of content-based approaches to second language instruction that were first used in French immersion schools in Canadian and North American bilingual teaching programs in the 1960s. It has been found in different studies by university teams in Spain that there are gains of approximately two school years for CLIL English learners versus non-CLIL English learners (Muñoz Lahoz & Navés, 2007). The data has shown that the various language aspects are likely affected to different degrees. Also, the results seem to greatly vary depending on the school and the teachers.

CLIL is replacing bilingual education today in Europe. Bilingual education has meant a program in which the language used as the vehicle of instruction is an additional language, distinct from the majority language spoken by the students and the teacher.

CLIL is being used in most of the European member states. Some countries use it in all

areas of their education system, like Luxembourg and Malta. The majority apply it to

large parts of mainstream education in their respective countries. There are a few

countries that do not use it, such as Greece and Denmark (Pérez-Vidal, 2013).

CLIL has changed from a way to expand exposure to a foreign language to being a

strategy for overhauling teaching practices. Nevertheless, CLIL is an approach that

greatly increases students' exposure to English. The aim of CLIL is for the language and

content to be comprehensive for students while implementing learning-centered activities

and tasks that cause students to use the language to gain new information, work out

understanding, and build knowledge. It gets a lot more complicated the higher the grade

level that is being taught. The language complexity increases as well as the depth and

extent of the content (Ting, 2011). In immersion schools in Canada and bilingual

programs in the U.S., it has long been noted that content-based instruction works (Ruiz

de Zarobe & Catalán, 2009). Ting compares Spain to Malaysia where a top-down

approach was taken toward bilingual education and was not successful. She says that

since Spain has not done a systematic approach, the CLIL approach has seen positive

results (Ting, 2011).

    Catalonia CLIL program. In the region of Spain called Catalonia which is in the

northeast of the country, the schools use an immersion program to teach students Catalan

and Spanish. It is expected that by the time they finished the mandatory schooling at age

16 they will be fluent in written and oral communication in Catalan and Spanish. It

begins with Catalan as the vehicle of instruction, and Spanish is introduced gradually.

Spanish is the language employed by mass media in Spain and is spoken widely in the community, and that gives students a lot of exposure to it (Muñoz Lahoz & Navés, 2007). English is the first foreign language that students take and is taught using CLIL.

English teaching begins at age eight (grade three) following a country-wide law. There are some preschools that introduce English earlier. It has become common practice in Spain to teach English using approaches similar to content-based teaching or CLIL. For example, topic-centered units are used as well as a growing practice of task-based teaching. The primary teachers combine subjects and their teaching is holistic, integrative, and interdisciplinary. The primary teachers do not use the foreign language all the time in the classroom (Muñoz Lahoz & Navés, 2007).

The mandatory secondary education is during ages 12-16. In Catalonia, English is taught twice a week as a subject, although many schools offer elective credits of three hours per week. All of the students need to take one of the courses at minimum. In the elective courses there is more flexibility for integration of the content and language. The teachers have a lot of options in designing and implementing them, and they can be multidisciplinary and blend cultural and social aspects of English speaking communities. For instance, the theme-based topics could be American music, cuisine, or sports, and the content-based courses may be Geography, Social Studies, the U.S. Customary Measurement System and the British Imperial System, Art, et cetera. In content-based courses, the final exam concentrates on the content that has been covered as well as the language (Muñoz Lahoz & Navés, 2007).

A requirement of secondary students at the end of every two years is a compulsory project called "synthesis credits." The secondary schools are divided into cycles, and at the end of each one students work collaboratively in teams to create a multidisciplinary project, which is then assessed holistically by a team of teachers. The students find information in different languages, edit and arrange the sources, and use and convey the information. While they are giving their presentation they are supposed to use the national languages and the foreign language(s) (Muñoz Lahoz & Navés, 2007).

Teacher Training

Teacher preparation in the areas of content, the target language, and teaching strategies are an important component in all the different EFL program models. If teachers are trained properly on immersion teaching strategies they are a lot more likely to be effective as teachers and the students will benefit greatly.

Content and language integrated learning. In the public schools, the primary teachers for the CLIL program are non-native language specialists. Most of the training for the teachers is in-service.

There have not been any prerequisite courses in a foreign language for teachers to teach in bilingual schools in Spain. The teachers are, however, required to identify their language skills. The study by Fernández-Cezar, et al., (2009) looks at the bilingual schools in the region of Spain called Castilla-La Mancha. In Castilla-La Mancha there are 61 elementary bilingual schools. Forty-eight of them teach the content through English, and 13 of them teach the content through French. In their study the researchers gave a survey about the bilingual program to teachers in nine of the elementary schools. The

survey found that 25% of the teachers feel that they can partially conduct a content focused class in the target language. The training that is available at present for teachers and is provided by the regional government consists of classes at the Escuela de Idiomas (School of Languages). This school is Spain's national language school, and has numerous locations throughout the country. Of the teachers surveyed, 50% were without any ability, including oral or written, in the foreign language, whether that was English or French.

For teachers who teach a non-linguistic discipline, there is no requirement of a foreign language. In the 2009-2010 Bologna Agreement, an agreement regarding higher education amongst European countries, it was decided that from then on university students studying to be a teacher would need a minimum of two years of a foreign language and a B1 level (Fernández-Cezar, et al., 2009). In Europe, the levels of proficiency in a language are A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2. A1 is the beginner level, and C2 is native-like proficiency. Some universities also have plans to introduce specific courses on teaching content through a foreign language via the CLIL program.

    Bilingual. In these schools there are regular teachers and special project teachers (Pérez Murillo, 2013). The special project teachers were enlisted by the British Council, and the majority of them are Spaniards fluent in English, but a few of them are native English speakers.

Fluency

My second research question is what teaching strategies are effective for developing fluency in an EFL setting for young children? Fluency is the chief goal for students studying a second language. Fluency is peripheral, automatic attention-processing of the parts and components of language (Brown, 2007). Peripheral means that attention is focused on the periphery, in contrast to focal, which means that attention is focused centrally. Both are a conscious form of attention. According to Norbert (2011), in young children, proficiency is defined as the ability to use their second language for some important purpose. The goal of the Spanish school in Madrid that I will be involved with is for the children to achieve proficiency in language functions relating to school achievement, literacy, and further scholastic uses of language.

To more adequately address what fluency means, communicative competence will be laid out and discussed. Communicative competence is known as the foundational system of knowledge and skill required for communication, as cited in Canale 1983. The aforementioned skill needed for communication is the knowledge of vocabulary and skill used in applying the sociolinguistic conventions for a certain language.

The theoretical outline of communicative competence presented by Canale is comprised of four fields of knowledge and skill. They are grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence. It is presumed that this argument of communicative competence interacts in currently undefined ways with different systems of knowledge and skill (e.g., world knowledge), along with an argument of human action (handling factors like volition and personality).

Moreover, it is presumed that specific competencies listed here are used in practices of language besides communication (Canale, 1983). This outline is coming from the research done by Canale and Swain (1980 as cited by Canale, 1983).

Grammatical competence is about the finesse of the language system (both verbal and nonverbal). Incorporated in grammatical competence then are rules and features of a language. These include vocabulary, syntax, word formation, pronunciation, spelling, and linguistic semantics. This competence targets specifically on the knowledge and skill necessary to comprehend and express correctly the exact meaning of oral and written communication; therefore, grammatical competence will be a significant interest for all second language programs (Canale, 1983). However, Canale states that it has not been proven if one theory of grammar can be chosen over another to represent grammatical competence; nor has it been proven exactly how a theory of grammar is directly related to pedagogy for second language teaching.

Sociolinguistic competence is covered by Canale and Swain within sociocultural rules of use and discourse rules; Canale includes it only in relation to sociocultural rules. Sociolinguistic competence therefore covers the degree to which verbal communication is spoken and comprehended aptly in various sociolinguistic contexts, based on the circumstantial elements such as status of persons present, reasons for the interaction, and the norms or strictures of the interaction. Aptness of verbal communication alludes to both aptness of meaning and aptness of form. Aptness of meaning pertains to the amount that certain oral communicative functions (e.g., imperative; whining and appealing; demeanors, including politeness and formality; and opinions) are thought to be

appropriate for a particular situation. For instance, in most cases it would be improper for a restaurant waiter to direct a patron to choose a particular item from the menu regardless of the manner in which his command was delivered (Canale, 1983). Correctness of form pertains to the degree to which a certain meaning (such as statements, demeanor, and communicative functions) are shown in a spoken or non-spoken form that is proper in a specific sociolinguistic context. For instance, a waiter attempting to politely take an order in a respectable restaurant would be using disrespectful grammatical form (or register) if he were to say, "Ok, chump, what are you and this broad gonna eat?" (Canale, p.8-9, 1983).

The idea of apt and correct forms therefore incorporates what Richards (1981 as cited in Canale, 1983) and others call "interactional competence," which covers aptness of kinesics (body motions) and proxemics (social spatial distance). It is obvious that the idea of naturalness or probability of it happening may also play a part in deciding the aptness of meaning and form; yet this idea could be of finite value due to the spontaneous and creative nature of communication. There are culture- and language-specific rules about correct and apt language use (Canale, 1983).

It is common in many second language programs to view sociolinguistic competence as not as important as grammatical competence (Canale, 1983). There are two reasons this common view is odd. Firstly it seems to say that grammatical correctness of oral communication is of more value than appropriateness of oral communication in actual communication, a view that is questioned by data from first and second language use. And second, it disregards the matter that sociolinguistic

competence is vital in interpreting oral communication for its "social meaning," such as communicative function and demeanor, when that is not apparent from the exact message of oral communication or from nonverbal clues (e.g., sociocultural framework and body language). There are of course universal elements of effective language use that do not need to be relearned to communicate effectively in a second language. But there are distinct language and culture elements as well.

Blum-Kulka and others have done helpful work on aspects of language and culture that should be taught. Blum-Kulka's work (1980 as cited in Canale, 1983) categorized three areas of rules that are factors in deciding how adequately a certain communicative function is depicted and interpreted: pragmatic rules, social-appropriateness rules, and linguistic-realization rules. Pragmatic rules are concerned with the circumstantial preconditions that need to be met in order to execute a specific communicative function (e.g., to give a command, one needs to have the right to do so). Social-appropriateness rules are about if a specific function might normally be expressed at all, and, if yes, to what degree of discreteness (e.g., inquiring of a stranger their salary amount). Linguistic-realization rules include many different elements. For example, the regularity with which a certain grammatical form is utilized to express a specific function, the amount and framework range of forms connected with each function, the general principle of forms used with functions and contexts, and the means of fine-tuning the dispositional tone of a given function. Blum-Kulka has found that the sociolinguistic appropriateness as a universal rule lowers when one moves from pragmatic rules to social-appropriateness rules to linguistic-realization rules. Blum-Kulka stated that if the

way a learner achieves communicative functions in different languages is not studied or
known, the learners' communicative goals will frequently fail to be met in the second
language, and the students and teachers will not know why (Canale, 1983). Richards and
Schmidt report that Clyne (1975 as cited in Canale, 1983) had similar findings.

According to Canale (1983) discourse competence is about proficiency in
combining grammatical forms and meanings to attain a consolidated oral or written text
in multiple genres. Genre refers to the type of text. For example, oral and written
narrative, a persuasive essay, a scientific report, a business letter, or a list of instructions.
Solidarity of a text is attained via cohesion in form and coherence in meaning. Cohesion
addresses how oral communication is connected structurally and aids interpretation of a
text. For instance, the use of cohesion tools like pronouns, synonyms, ellipsis
conjunctions, and parallel structures assists to connect singular spoken statements and to
show how a group of spoken statements, is to be comprehended (e.g., logically or
chronologically) as a text. Coherence addresses the inner workings between a text's
different meanings. The meanings could be literal meanings, communicative functions, or
attitudes (Canale, 1983).

For instance, look at the following verbal communication which Canale (1983)
took from Widdowson (p. 29, 1978):

"SPEAKER A: That's the telephone.

SPEAKER B: I'm in the bath.

SPEAKER A: OK," (Canale, p.10, 1983).

Even though there is not a blatant show of cohesion in this discourse, they do make up a coherent discourse because A's first remark acts as a request, B's answer acts as an excuse for not cooperating with A's request, and A's final statement accepts B's excuse. Charolles (1978 as cited in Canale, 1983) provides intuitive discussion of coherence. He outlines four different 'meta-rules' for obtaining and examining coherence in a text. The rules are recurrence of meaning, to indicate continuance; advancement of meaning, to mark development and order; non-contradiction, to note reliability; and applicability of meaning, to show congruity. Charolles' work shows that the job of cohesion devices is to assist the coherence meta-rules. Canale (1983) cites the valuable work done by Breedle, Fine and Fellbaum (1981) and Halliday and Hasan (1976). They look to find the specific cohesion devices that assist the various elements of coherence and hence add to the solidarity and standard of a text. It is fairly clear that discourse competence is distinct from grammatical and sociolinguistic competences. For instance, read the following verbal discourse that Canale borrowed from Widdowson (p. 25, 1975):

"SPEAKER A: What did the rain do?

SPEAKER B: The crops were destroyed by the rain," (Canale, p.11, 1983).

The answer B gives is grammatical and sociolinguistically correct in the framework, but it does not connect well with A's question. The error in this conversation appears to be in the level of discourse and in the typical organization of sentences (and texts) in English, where the topic (shared information) goes before comment (new information). According to this, it would be more normal for the conversation to be:

SPEAKER A: What did the rain do?

SPEAKER B: The rain destroyed the crops.

This rule of discourse limits the grammatical form of oral communication that can coincide with A's question, sifting out appropriate forms from inappropriate ones, disregarding their grammaticality and sociolinguistic correctness. The relation of grammatical, sociolinguistic, and discourse rules alludes to the intricacy of communicative competence and is in agreement with the idea mentioned in these three areas of competence. Yet it is not evident that all discourse rules have to be different from grammatical rules (in regard to cohesion) and sociolinguistic rules (in regard to coherence).

Canale (1983) says that strategic competence is made up of proficiency of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that could be called into use for these purposes: (a) to make up for breakdowns in communication because of finite conditions in actual communication (e.g., momentary inability to recollect an idea or grammatical structure), or because of not enough competence in one or more of the different parts of communicative competence and (b) to emphasize the success of communication (e.g., purposely using a slow and soft voice for rhetorical effect).

For instance, when a person cannot remember a certain grammatical form, one way to get around it is to paraphrase. If a student doesn't know the term *train station*, he or she could say "the place where the trains leave," or "the place that trains go." Strategies like these do not have to be restricted to just solving grammatical problems: actual communication will also demand learners manage sociolinguistic problems (e.g., how to greet stranger when unaware of their social status) and discourse problems (e.g.,

how to attain coherence in a text when unaware of cohesion devices). Canale points out other studies that look at affective factors that play a role in successive communication. For example, Lepicq (1980 as cited in Canale, 1983) found that in native-speaker judges' viewpoints, the learners with high confidence in themselves and an eagerness to communicate could atone for a lack of grammatical accuracy.

Terrel (1977 as cited in Canale, 1983) advocates strongly that strategies for communication are vital in the early stages of second language acquisition. A possible rebuttal could be that teaching these strategies in a second language class is unnecessary because they are universal and acquired when mastering one's first language. Canale and Swain (1979 as cited in Canale, 1983) argue that strategies like paraphrasing need to be taught to second language learners. It is admitted that paraphrasing or strategies similar to it may be known in their first language, but students need to be taught how to use them in the second language (e.g., what are the comparable power vocabulary seen in English, like "place," "person," and "thing"). Moreover, students should be encouraged to utilize these strategies (in place of remaining quiet when they cannot recall a specific grammatical form, et cetera), and they ought to be allowed chances to practice them (Canale, 1983).

To better understand the importance of strategies like paraphrasing, consider the teacher of the second language being a student of the first language. For instance, hypothetically there is a French teacher who only speaks French to her Anglophone students. In the students' eyes their French teacher is seen as a student of English as a second language because she knows practically zero English and attempts to

communicate effectively with her students in French. The teacher uses communication strategies to be understood, and the degree to which she is understood is the degree to which the strategies are vital for communication to occur. Canale states that there is a parallel between the speech of the teacher to her second language students and the output of the second language students. They point out that teachers are instructed in strategies to make themselves understood in the second language by their students, and it only makes sense then that students should also be trained in the same strategies.

Canale (1983) conceded at the time of the book being published that there was not a lot of verifiable evidence for differentiating between the four areas of competence laid out. Canale gos on though to list evidence from work at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) that assessed knowledge and skills in the four competency areas. Thirty-seven French speaking tasks were given to 174 students learning French as a second language. The students were in grade six and grade ten in Ontario. The results of the tasks were analyzed. Interrelationships amongst the scoring criteria, which were information, grammaticality, pronunciation, (sociolinguistic) appropriateness, and discourse, were minimal, positive, and not significant. Moreover, it was seen that students attained higher results on tasks that dealt with grammar versus the tasks that dealt with sociolinguistic features. The results are concurrent with the levels of importance associated with the competence areas. Canale notes that Bachman and Palmer (1981) found that their testing data on second languages could be accounted for in the best way via a communicative competence model that draws differences in grammatical competence (word formation and syntax), pragmatic competence (rules of vocabulary

and discourse), sociolinguistic competence (correctness, naturalness, and cultural

allusions), and a general variable (not identified but connected with Bachman and

Palmer's oral interview method). The authors state that both knowledge-oriented

activities and communicative skill-oriented activities are needed in second language

teaching. Knowledge-oriented activities being grammar exercises and skill-oriented

referring to communicative skills (Canale, 1983). They go on to compare it to driver

training. If student-drivers were only taught the rules of traffic, road signs, and operation

of a car (knowledge-oriented), but were never allowed to drive in traffic (skill oriented),

then they would not fare very well in an actual driving scenario. The same goes for

second language learners, they need knowledge-oriented activities and skill-oriented

activities.

Thus, it can be seen that communicative competence is made up of four categories

of knowledge and skill. These are grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence,

discourse competence, and strategic competence. There is not any data proving that

grammatical competence is more crucial or less crucial to effective communication than

any of the other three competence areas. A communicative approach's main goal should

be to guide the integration of four of the categories of competence for the students. That

will not likely happen if one area is given more emphasis than another (Canale, 1983). A

good second language program will seek to help its students develop fluency using the

framework of communicative competence. As I review the literature I will look for

whether the programs being assessed are trying to implement fluency in light of

communicative competence, or if they focus on one category of competence over another.

Teaching Strategies versus Program Models

A program model determines what classes students will have and in what language those classes will be taught (Moughamian, Rivera & Francis, 2009). It also specifies how often students will have their classes during the week. Teaching strategies can be used with language learners regardless of the program model being used. They are implemented in the classroom to promote effective language learning.

In this chapter I have reviewed the following topics: CLIL programs in Spanish schools; bilingual schools in Spain; semi-intensive, intensive, and extensive programs and traditional drip-feed programs; and a fluency framework of communicative competence. The definitions of the terms being used were provided. The fact that the school in Madrid I am involved with is a private and parochial school suggests that the students may be in an advantageous position for academic success. I outlined the model of communicative competence, which is a comprehensive explanation of fluency. The four areas of communicative competence should be taught in an effective second language program, and where it comes up in the literature it will be presented. The gap in the current research is that there is very little research in Spain on intensive English programs for elementary schools. The primary focus of this paper is on elementary EFL approaches because I want to discover the most successful type of approach in order to help my reader understand what is the best approach for second language, so I can recommend the most efficient and effective EFL approach for a new private, parochial

elementary school in Madrid. My research questions are these: What does the literature say about effective EFL approaches to be implemented in a private, elementary school in Spain? What teaching strategies are effective for developing fluency in an EFL setting for children? The next chapter will discuss the lens of my research and give more specifics about the school in Madrid.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

I am studying elementary EFL approaches (and selected EFL approaches beyond elementary grades) because I want to discover the most effective EFL approach for second language teaching in order to recommend the most efficient and effective EFL approach for a new private, parochial elementary school in Madrid.

Chapter Three discusses the methodology of the present study, including the framework of the research paradigm, the method, the parameters, and the data analysis procedures. The method of research I am using is a review of literature. This means that I will review a broad scope of existing studies in place of amassing data in a study conducted by me. The reason for this is that I am not in Spain and do not have a way of performing studies on English language programs and approaches in elementary schools there or in other countries outside the U.S.

Method

The framework of a review of literature is a good overall method for my research questions because there are many reputable studies in existence pertaining directly to them. A thorough and methodical review will provide the answers and information needed.

I am using a qualitative research paradigm. A qualitative research paradigm is best for my capstone because it is research that does not have a consistent use of statistical methods (Mackey & Gass, 2005). Qualitative research gives rich description.

The aim is to give detailed and thoughtful descriptions, whereas quantitative research reports data in the form of measurements, frequencies, scores, and ratings.

Qualitative research is usually process-oriented and open-ended to allow for categories to emerge (Mackey & Gass, 2005). The research frequently is inductive so that it starts with a couple specific notions and then goes through fine-tuning, at which point the focus is narrowed. The research situation is approached with the goal of observing anything that is naturally there, allowing for more questions to materialize. I conduct my research with the view that bilingual or multilingual fluency is a positive and desirable skill. Hypotheses might come out of the research instead of being stated at the beginning.

In regard to inductive data analysis, the purpose is normally for research findings to come out of the reoccurring, repeated, or important themes in the data (Mackey & Gass, 2005). There are not restraints imposed. Inductive analysis is decided by numerous evaluations and interpretations of the data in consideration of the research objectives, with the topics induced from the data (in my capstone, the literature).

My manner of data collection is a systematic review of the literature. To conduct research, I am primarily using Hamline University Bush Memorial Library's internet search engine called 'Search Summon' to locate journal articles and books. I use Bush Memorial Library's CLICnet and Interlibrary loan systems to locate books and check them out. I am also using EBSCO Host which includes ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center), LLBA (Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts), MLA (Modern Language Association), Academic Search Premier, Article First, and Teacher Reference Center search databases. Yet another search engine I have used is Google

Scholar. The search terms I first used in all places of research to find studies related to the topic of my capstone were "EFL in Spain," "English language program in Spain," "English Education in Spain," and "Private schools in Spain." The studies I found from these searches led to searching the terms "English education in Quebec," "Bilingual schools in Spain," "Immersion schools in Spain," "CLIL programs in Spain," "Drip-feed EFL," and "Early childhood fluency." The search terms expanded beyond Spain and became "effective EFL programs," "fluency in young learners," "English in Europe," and "EFL strategies for young children."

<div align="center">Parameters</div>

I carried out a wide-reaching review of literature from professional journals and books in the field of EFL in primary, secondary, and university programs based in the province of Quebec in Canada, Spain, and Europe as a whole.

<u>Types of Studies</u>

The research studies discussed in my capstone include qualitative and quantitative studies. Some of the studies are statistical and some are interpretive. All of the studies were used because they address EFL program models and approaches. The data in the studies was interpreted to answer the research questions. The data in the studies was also closely inspected to resolve if success and effectiveness of a program or approach is related to the amount of EFL instruction time in a given school year.

<u>Age of Participants</u>

I tried to find studies that were on primary school age children, but I did also read studies that involved secondary or tertiary levels implementing EFL programs. The

school in Madrid would like to be a K-12 school eventually, and alignment across the grades should be planned for from the beginning. The studies I read were conducted on large groups of students and were not intense studies on one individual student.

Dates

   I did not have a date restriction when I first began my capstone. However research on English education in Spain is all fairly recent and my sources are from the 1980s into the 21st century. Once the studies are gathered and read, they are then kept track of based on whom is being studied, the languages used, and the results. The nature of my data analysis is explanatory and interpretative. I will interpret the findings of the studies in light of the research questions. An explanation will be attempted.

Data Analysis

       This review of literature is being done with an interpretative method of analysis. I kept track of the many different studies that I read in an excel spreadsheet. The column headings in the excel spreadsheet included name and year of the study, authors of the study, age and native language of the students, EFL program model or approach, results, and reference or URL link. Once I have determined if a source is appropriate for my research and have read it, I compile it and compare it with other studies. The compilation includes who was being studied, what languages were used, what program model or approach was used, and what the results were. I looked for themes and patterns that arose from the different programs and approaches about effective programs, approaches, and teaching strategies. Specifically, I looked for what the successful ones had in common.

As previously stated, the method chosen for this capstone is a review of literature. The reason being that it is the best fit for answering the research questions. In this chapter I have described the lens of my research. To recap, the lens is private elementary schools in Spain where English would be taught as a foreign language. My main research question is:

1. What does the literature say about effective EFL approaches to be implemented in a private, elementary school in Spain?

In order to fully answer that question, this capstone will address the following question as well:

2. What teaching strategies are effective for developing fluency in an EFL setting for children?

I am studying the elementary EFL approaches in Spain because I want to discover the most successful type of approach in order to help my reader understand what is the best approach for second language teaching, and so I can recommend the most efficient and effective EFL approach for a new private, parochial elementary school in Madrid. A secondary purpose is for the reader to apply it to their own second language study or teaching, and for bilingual and immersion schools in the U.S. to utilize the findings as well. In this chapter I covered where and how I collect data, what the criteria is for inclusion and exclusion of studies, and the appraisal of the studies. The next chapter will discuss connections found in the literature review including agreements, disagreements, and discovery.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

I am studying elementary EFL approaches (and selected EFL approaches beyond elementary grades) because I want to discover the most effective EFL approach for second language teaching in order to recommend the most efficient and effective EFL approach for a new private, parochial elementary school in Madrid. My research questions are as follows:

1. What does the literature say about effective EFL approaches to be implemented in a private, elementary school in Spain?

2. What teaching strategies are effective for developing fluency in an EFL setting for children?

This chapter will lay out the literature that was reviewed. It includes a description of the information collected and the themes that arose. It also presents an interpretation of the data. In my review of the literature there were seven themes that emerged regarding effective EFL approaches: content-based instruction, contact with native speakers/study abroad, the amount of time exposed to English, strategies for young learners, strategies for older learners, teacher training, and form-focused instruction. This chapter is split into seven parts, one for each theme. The literature corresponds to each theme accordingly.

Overview

First, I will provide an overview of the sixteen different studies I reviewed. The table in the appendix lists the studies' authors, country, languages involved, students' grade levels or ages, program model or approach, and the significant findings.

I looked at a study by Egiguren (2006) mentioned by Pérez-Vidal (2013) that studied CLIL, a content-based program used to teach English to Basque students in Spain. In that study the L1 was Basque, the L2 was Spanish, and the L3 was English. The CLIL students were age eight when the study began, and they were being compared with students who had started regular EFL at age four. Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe (2008 as cited in Pérez-Vidal, 2013) also did a study comparing Basque students learning English with CLIL to students in regular EFL classes. The L1 of those students was Basque, the L2 was Spanish, and the L3 was English. It looked at preschool students all the way to students in high school. Gallardo del Puerto, Gomez Lacabex, & García Lecumberri's (2009) study mentions a study by Jiménez Catalán (2006) on CLIL in the Basque Country and a study by Villareal and García Mayo (2007) in the same region. In those studies once again the L1 was Basque, the L2 Spanish, and English was the L3. One study was on primary students and the other on secondary students of ages 14-16. I also read a study by Ruiz de Zarobe and Catalan (2009) that studied CLIL in the Basque Country region of Spain. They studied grade six CLIL students and their L1, L2, and L3 were the same as the other Basque study participants.

Llinares and Dafouz (2010) studied a CLIL program in Madrid, as well as Whittaker and Llinares (2009). For both of those studies the L1 was Spanish and the L2

was English. Llinares and Dafouz studied CLIL students in primary school. Whittaker and Llinares studied CLIL students in secondary school. Pérez-Vidal (2013) did a study on CLIL in Catalonia. She looked at grade eight CLIL students and grade ten regular EFL students. Their L1 was Catalan, the L2 was Spanish, and the L3 was English. Iatcu (2000) did a study on an intensive ESL program in Romania that used some CLIL in its program. The students were of the ages seven to 17 and received seven hours per week of English instruction, with two of those hours being content-based instruction. Their L1 was either Romanian or Hungarian, their L2 Romanian or Hungarian, and the L3 was English. Björklund and Suni (2000) conducted a study on an immersion school in Finland that taught English as a third language using CLIL. They studied grades one-six. The students' L1 was Finnish, the L2 was Swedish, the L3 was English, and the L4 was German. The program was early immersion with content-based English instruction. Björklund (2005) did a study on the same school that examined the success of the program and approach in relation to the students' language skills.

Pérez-Vidal (2013) discussed several studies on the gains of students' English competence from studying abroad. The students were from Spain. Their L1 was either Catalan or Spanish, their L2 was either Spanish or English, and their L3 was English for the Catalan speakers.

A 2007 study by Burgi (as cited in Gallardo del Puerto et al., 2009) looked at secondary schools in Switzerland that used CLIL to teach English. Their L1 was German, and the L2 was English. Lorenzo, Casal, and Moore (2010 as cited in Pérez-Vidal, 2013) performed a study on primary and secondary CLIL programs in the Andalusia region of

Spain. Those students' L1 was Spanish and their L2 was English. Serrano and Muñoz

(2007) and Spada and Lightbown (1989 as cited in Ammar and Spada, 2006) did studies

on intensive ESL programs in Quebec, Canada. They looked at grades six through 11,

and the L1 was French and the L2 was English. Ammar and Spada (2006) did a study on

teacher corrective feedback in an intensive ESL program in Quebec, Canada in grade six.

Those students' L1 was French and their L2 was English. Ytsma (2000) did a study on

immersion schools in Friesland, the Netherlands, which began teaching English as a

subject in grade six, and after a couple of years switched to using CLIL. It was taught for

20% of the week. Their L1 was either Frisian or Dutch, the L2 was Frisian or Dutch, and

the L3 was English.

      Dalton-Puffer (2009) did a study on CLIL in Austria and how the communicative

competence framework played out in it. She looked at CLIL students in grades six-seven

and grades ten-thirteen which included vocational schooling. The L1 was German, but for

a few students it was a minority language. The L2 was English for the German L1

speakers and German for the L1 minority language speakers. The L1 minority speakers'

L3 was English. Next, the themes that emerged from the studies will be presented along

with the results of the studies.

<center>Content-Based Instruction</center>

      Content-based instruction is one of the themes that surfaced from the literature.

Many of the studies that saw success in English achievement used content-based

instruction. Language teachers vary on which of two broad teaching approaches they

prefer: one focuses on language use, and the other focuses on language forms or analysis.

The differing view arises from a split on whether one learns to speak in a second language by speaking in that language (like an immersion setting), or if one learns to speak in a second language by learning the *lexicogrammar* (the vocabulary and grammatical structures) of the second language (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). Content-based teaching follows the communicative approach which adheres to the belief that one learns to speak a second language by speaking in that language. It can also be referred to as meaningful teaching. The communicative approach makes students' needs an essential component and stresses using interactive, group-oriented class activities (Szecsy, 2008). The teaching syllabus is formed on communicating meaning. It is the approach that is the basis for CLIL as well.

A Vaasa, Finland Multilingual School's Approach

In 1987, a multilingual immersion school was started in Vaasa, Finland. The school's main language of instruction was Swedish. The majority of the students were Finnish and spoke Finnish at home. The Vaasa area has a lot of Swedish speakers and that was the reason for immersion in Swedish. The students were taught English starting in first grade for one 45-minute class per week. They were taught using content-based instruction and the teachers only spoke in English. Once they reached third grade the students received two 45-minute English classes per week. They were also introduced to a fourth language, German, in fifth grade. The immersion students' English was more advanced and better developed than non-immersion students' English (Björklund, 2005). Content-based English instruction has been effective in this setting (Björklund & Suni, 2000).

Intensive EFL Program in Romania

In Romanian intensive EFL programs, the English language objectives for the younger

children, who are ages seven-ten, are speaking and understanding (Iatcu, 2000). Their

students' English does improve as they progress to higher grades, but this program is not

producing the level of English proficiency in its high school graduates that is desired. It

could mean that the two hours of content-based instruction is not sufficient. The majority

of their English instruction is traditional EFL. Reading and writing skills are taught as the

students advance grade levels. The majority of the schools looked at used Romanian as

the main language of instruction, but some used Hungarian due to high numbers of

Hungarian speaking students.

The teaching methods used to teach Romanian are what Iatcu refers to as

traditionalist. This includes a combination of structuralist, situational, audio-lingual, and

Latin grammar-based. Most of the English teachers use the audiolingual method of

teaching. There are not many who have been taught to be communicative classroom

teachers. With English teaching, the communicative approach is gaining use because

Romanian education officials believe it is more effective (Iatcu, 2000). The British

Council helped teach the communicative method after political changes in Romania in

1989. The British Council is an institute with native English teachers that provided

training for Romanian teachers as well as educational materials. Textbooks are the

primary material, and teachers supplement with pictures, books, drawings, computers,

charts, tapes, and videos. Kids at a young age in Romania tend to love English cartoons,

songs, films, and TV. This aids in their motivation to learn it. Other reasons are that it is

in vogue, and for a very few, because of a future career. Content-based instruction is used for part of the English instruction.

The number of English teachers in the three counties of Romania with Hungarian students was 277 in 1996-7. Of them, 188 had university-training and were qualified to teach English. Of the university-trained teachers, 59 taught at schools that used Hungarian as the language of instruction. The students receive seven hours of English instruction per week, with two of those hours being content-based instruction (Iatcu, 2000). It seems that two hours a week of content-based English instruction is not sufficient for developing proficiency in these students.

Basque Country CLIL Program

Pérez-Vidal (2013) mentions Egiguren's (2006) finding that in only a year and a half eight-year-old Basque students just starting CLIL English classes caught up with students who had started traditional EFL at age four. The eight-year-olds took Art in English, and that was adequate to cut out big differences between the two groups by the time they reached age ten. Egiguren concluded that perhaps the group that began learning English at age eight and caught up to the group who had started learning English earlier at age four had the advantage because of the effectiveness of the CLIL teaching they received. These results suggest it may not be the amount of exposure, but the quality of exposure that leads to foreign language success (Pérez-Vidal, 2013). CLIL teaching is content-based teaching, and this study shows it as being more effective than regular EFL.

Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe's (2008 as cited in Pérez-Vidal, 2013) research on the Basque Country region, reports that CLIL produces an increase in language-

learning, with learners' foreign language proficiency being notably greater than traditional EFL results when looking at measurements of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and content in oral and written output, done holistically. The students in the CLIL group and the students in the form instruction group (traditional EFL) had the same number of hours that they were exposed to English. What led to the difference could be the type of teaching in CLIL.

Ruiz de Zarobe and Lasagabaster (2010) looked at CLIL English classes in the Basque Country in Spain, a region in the north of Spain that speaks Spanish and Basque. The students in these classes achieved greater English competence in comparison to their non-CLIL counterparts. The CLIL students also exhibited more positive language attitudes (Ruiz de Zarobe & Lasagabaster, 2010).

A study done in the Basque Country by Jiménez Catalán (2006 as cited in Gallardo del Puerto et al., 2009) examined the learning of English in primary schools when English was the medium of instruction versus English as a subject. The results showed that content-based instruction (CLIL) was more effective. He administered a cloze test that was made to evaluate lexical, grammatical, and discourse ability, a task for reading comprehension, a test on receptive vocabulary, and a written composition to gather data about productive vocabulary that was learned (Gallardo del Puerto et al., 2009).

In comparing CLIL versus non-CLIL Basque English students, Villarreal and García Mayo (2007 as cited in Gallardo del Puerto et al., 2009) analyzed the attainment of tense and agreement inflectional morphology in spoken English from secondary school

learners. They found that the CLIL students had more favorable outcomes in regard to

using the third person singular –s verb (Gallardo del Puerto et al., 2009).

Swiss CLIL Program

In 2007 Burgi (as cited in Gallardo del Puerto et al., 2009) did a longitudinal research

project in three secondary schools in Switzerland that compared CLIL and traditional

EFL students across three academic years for basic competence and vocabulary skills in

English. The scores that both groups of students earned on placement and vocabulary

tests within three testing sessions and in the three schools revealed that the students for

whom English was used as the medium of instruction for subjects had developed a higher

level of English than students in regular EFL classes (Gallardo del Puerto et al., 2009).

Monolingual Madrid Region's CLIL Program

In comparisons done by Llinares and Dafouz (2010) between CLIL English classes in

Madrid's MEC/British Council Project (which started in 1996) with non-CLIL English

classes, the CLIL learners showed significantly better concentration and listening skills in

all subjects. They also showed more "higher order thinking skills," such as inquiring,

recapping, envisioning, and speculating. Students also produced more affective gains,

including more eagerness to work cooperatively, greater personal confidence, the

capability to confront challenges, and an understanding of cultural differences.

Llinares and Dafouz also found that, in regard to academics, the primary CLIL

students in the project started by the Comunidad de Madrid (CAM) in 2004 achieve

better results in second language competence, particularly in the receptive skills, which

are listening and reading, even though the evidence is not yet one hundred percent clear

about the non-linguistic areas. When students get to the end of the academic cycles in years two, four, and six, they complete what is known as the Trinity Exam. It is an oral exam that looks at the students' skills in listening and speaking. The exams are one-to-one tests that take about six-seven minutes. The students are tested by a native-speaking Trinity tester who comes from the UK. The scores for the test have been very good, with around 96% passing. Although only the students whom the teachers consider to be prepared can take the exam.

In the CAM Bilingual Project in Madrid, which uses CLIL, the schools are required to instruct a minimum of 30% of their syllabus in English, and at most 50% (Llinares & Dafouz, 2010). That results in eight hours per week of English. Five of those hours are traditional English classes, and three are devoted to any other subject. For example, gym, art, science, music, et cetera. The schools get to decide which subjects are taught in English depending on their staff and resources, but Math and Spanish have to be taught in Spanish according to a national law. A lot of the schools teach science in English since there are numerous materials and resources available for that subject. Also, Llinares and Dafouz mention that Barbero (2007) states that speaking from a conceptual and cognitive viewpoint, science works well for teaching a second language because of its experimental and procedural makeup.

In 1996 Romero and Llinares began a research project on bilingual schools using CLIL in Madrid (as cited in Llinares & Dafouz, 2010). They recorded and transcribed pre-primary classes of five-year-olds and followed those students into primary school. They also obtained data from different private bilingual schools that had varying levels of

English contact hours. Llinares-García did an analysis in 2006 (as cited in Llinares & Dafouz, 2010) on the five-year-old students' realization of communicative functions. She found that the students exposed to a smaller quantity of input surpassed other students in programs with bigger quantities of input and with more of a functional range of language produced when the smaller quantity students did tasks constructed to encourage their involvement in self-activated interactions. This outcome shows the importance of the quality of exposure over the quantity of exposure in regard to functional features of second language learning. For instance, show-and-tell activities, when students are told to share a personal belonging and discuss it in front of the class, appear to cultivate students' functional use of the second language more than different types of classroom tasks. Llinares-García and Romero-Trillo (2007 as cited in Llinares & Dafouz, 2010) also mention the pertinence of promoting students' use of the second language to discuss personal things. When they compared native and non-native students of the same age on their performance in the classroom, they observed that the personal function is most recurrent in the L1 and L2 situations, but the non-native students more often use the L1 when completing that function. Although when students are supported by their teacher in using the L2, their oral production tends to improve. The authors suggest that the students' L2 use should be promoted in a similar fashion as is their use of their native language, and that they should be emboldened to initiate conversational interactions.

A 2009 study by Whittaker and Llinares sought to analyze language use in the CLIL classroom. They concentrated on the students' oral and written output in the social science course which was Geography and History. They also retrieved data from students

learning the same subject in their native language, Spanish, and from native English

speakers of the same age. The data taken from CLIL students' first year of secondary

school (middle school in the U.S.) in the Madrid region was compared with data from

non-CLIL situations. As regards fluency, the CLIL students' written output was close to

the level of non-CLIL students in their final year of schooling (Whittaker & Llinares,

2009). Studies outside of this one have shown that it takes four to five years more for

students in non-CLIL classes to produce around the same number of words in the same

time-limited task. The students in this study were only just starting their secondary

schooling, and it appears that in the classes of the study the work done by students and

teachers is paving a good beginning for their journey to advanced achievement, and it is a

solid justification for the CLIL program despite its complications. In addressing whether

the students have the type of language skills required for the classes, the researchers felt

that more work was needed in certain areas. The teachers should be given linguistic

support on registers of the curriculum in order to teach using specialized elements to

garner the production of meanings needed by the curriculum. Also detailed analysis of

student output and the target written and oral texts is needed in order to reveal the types

of interventions needed.

Catalan Content and Language Integrated Learning

   Studies by Navés and Victori (2010) looking at the Catalonia region's CLIL programs

observed results similar to those that Egiguren (2006) (both studies as cited in Pérez-

Vidal, 2013) found. Egiguren's findings were that students who started learning English

in CLIL classes at age eight caught up to non-CLIL students that began studying English

at age four by the time they reached age ten. Navés and Victori found that Catalan CLIL students in eighth grade exceeded non-CLIL learners in tenth grade. They understood the success of the eighth graders to be due to the quality of the CLIL teaching, since they had had fewer hours of exposure than the tenth graders in the regular form instruction foreign language class (traditional EFL). In the non-CLIL students' classes, English was taught as the subject and was not the only language used in teaching. It can be seen that in the studies reviewed content-based instruction was a more effective form of English instruction than regular EFL teaching. The content-based instruction practiced in the form of CLIL in Finland, the Basque Country, Switzerland, the Madrid autonomous community, and in Catalonia led to higher proficiency in English than traditional EFL. Romania is where a positive result was not seen, but they only use content-based instruction of English two hours per week, and that may not be a sufficient enough time allotment.

<div align="center">Contact with Native Speakers and Time Abroad</div>

I will recommend that the school in Madrid offer a study abroad opportunity for its students. Pérez-Vidal (2013) notes that study abroad situations provide students colossal amounts of exposure to foreign language input, in multiple types of situations, all the while allowing participation in various speech events, as well as allowing them to assume different roles within an array of human relationships and in countless social domains. However, it is important to state that students vary in their capability and preparedness to prosper from the stimulating environment of outside-the-classroom communicative opportunities on hand during study abroad.

Comparisons of Study Abroad and Non-Study Abroad Students

   Pérez-Vidal (2013) cites studies by DuFon and Churchill (2006), Freed (1995), and

Milton and Meara (2009), that suggest the largest linguistic benefits attained during

studying abroad happen in oral production, especially in fluency, lexis, and grammatical

precision. She says that research she has been a part of concurs with those findings in

fluency pausing and temporal aspects, and in a shift to better accuracy and complexity

(Pérez-Vidal, Juan-Garau, Mora, & Valls-Ferrer, 2012 as cited in Pérez-Vidal, 2013). A

measurement of university students after three months abroad in an English-speaking

country compared them to a form instruction (traditional EFL) non-study abroad class

and they showed notably higher improvements on two tests. One test was open-ended

role-play involving problem-solving. The other was a partial-guided oral interview.

Students did both of the tests with their peers. Another study that analyzed the

development within written output on a timed composition with a stated topic produced

comparable results. Pérez-Vidal (2013) lists a study by Pérez-Vidal and Juan-Garau

(2009) that discovered students improved immensely in the three areas of fluency,

vocabulary complexity, and accuracy, matching previous studies like Sasaki's (2007 as

cited in Pérez-Vidal, 2013). In Sasaki's, a beneficial effect of study abroad was seen

when evaluating listening comprehension using an authentic radio interview activity.

Studies cited in Pérez-Vidal (2013) by Allen and Herron (2003) and Beattie (2008)

showed that there is a vigorous positive effect in the study abroad context because

learners improve immensely in the skills listed above. Nonetheless, there have been

studies that the form instruction traditional EFL class students improved more than the

study abroad students in certain areas. It seems to be that the skills that improved most in study abroad situations were communicative tasks that were evaluated with the role-play, interview, composition, and listening activities. On the other hand, the more discrete-point activities that looked at phonetic and grammatical skill improvements had higher scores in the form instruction traditional foreign language class group. In regard to pragmatic skills, which refers to colloquial speech and speech functions, it was found there are significant gains after studying abroad in three different studies (Pérez-Vidal, 2013).

Caveats for Study Abroad

It is agreed that students will be most likely to benefit and gain automation from a study abroad program if they have functional mastery in the foreign language. Collentine and Freed (2004 as cited in Pérez-Vidal, 2013) conclude that it is not the study abroad context by and of itself, but the sort and depth of contact with the foreign language that students establish while there that regulates the improvements that learners gain from various contexts of acquisition.

Juan-Garau and Pérez-Vidal (2007 as cited in Pérez-Vidal, 2013) found that students who lived in an apartment with native speakers of the foreign language were the ones who scored highest on the role-play activity. These students also participated in several academic activities, worked very hard to learn English, possessed a strong desire to learn, and could keep a low level of anxiety when speaking. Their findings correlated with those of Collentine and Freed (2004 as cited in Pérez-Vidal, 2013), where the study abroad students with high improvements over the regular students had taken part in

extracurricular academic activities on top of communicating with foreign language natives. They also showed awareness for their learning and emotions, they had an eagerness to learn, and they had self-awareness of their learning progress. All of these appear to coincide with high achievement in the foreign language. The biggest factor for success was living with a family in the study abroad country or in housing with native foreign language speakers—versus living with their peers who spoke the same language.

Gains from Study Abroad and CLIL

The gains that come from CLIL and the gains from study abroad programs complement each other. CLIL grows receptive skills, primarily reading, lexical, and positive attitudes toward the foreign language. Studying abroad develops students' oral competency, along with listening, writing, and pragmatic and sociolinguistic skills. It would be ideal if students could learn in both of these contexts along with some form of instructional teaching (Pérez-Vidal, 2013).

Spaniards' Need for Studying Abroad

Spain and its region Catalonia differ from the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, and other European communities, in that there are not many opportunities to practice English outside of formal schooling. The media in Catalonia does not use English. However, in written press, it is common to see borrowed English words. Catalonia and Spain follow an old tradition of dubbing movies into Castilian (Spanish) and more recently Catalan. Whereas in other European countries movies are left in English, resulting in more exposure to spoken English. Yet since the late 1990s parents have been enrolling their children in exchange programs with Ireland, Britain, Canada,

and the United States, and it is affecting the communicative English abilities of Catalan and Castilian teens positively (Muñoz, 2000). Studying abroad adds a lot to a student's English language education and allows for certain aspects to be acquired that may not otherwise be acquired. A study abroad program would be a helpful piece for future older elementary students who have had content-based English instruction.

<div align="center">Amount of English Exposure</div>

The amount of time students have contact with English in a school day is a significant factor in how proficient they become in the language. I now discuss studies that saw success with their amount of time and some that did not, perhaps because of the low amount of contact their students had with English during a school day or week. In CLIL programs and immersion programs, because English is used as the medium of instruction, the students have a lot more contact with English than non-CLIL students.

Basque Country CLIL Program

The main objective of Gallardo del Puerto et al.'s (2009) study was to look at the effect that CLIL has on pronunciation. This is an aspect of language output that has not been studied a lot within CLIL classrooms. The authors include Scovel's (2006) statement that the occurrence of a foreign accent (FA) in second language learners is tough to correct and is a wide-spread feature of foreign language students. They go on to say that pronunciation effects communicative effectiveness in different ways. One instance is intelligibility, which is often recorded to be impaired when there is a lot of L1 influencing their pronunciation. Much of the time though, the additional amount of focus required to decode and fix the speakers' L2 mistakes, is the problem that

mispronunciation causes the listener. The listener has to mentally fix the mistakes that vary from the phonological norms of native speakers. The mistakes can cause listeners to feel bothered, irked, distressed, or disinterested. The authors also discuss previous studies that show that accent, intelligibility, and annoyance are connected because a smaller FA is correlated with more intelligibility and less annoying speech.

The study participants were 28 Basque-Spanish students at a bilingual school. All 28 students had only been exposed to English at school (Gallardo del Puerto et al., 2009). The languages used in their school were Basque (the minority language in that region), Spanish (majority language of that region), and English (a foreign language in Spain). Basque was the main language of instruction, and English and Spanish were subjects that were taught three to four hours a week. The students had begun learning English when they were eight years of age. The students were ages 14 to 16 at the time of the study.

Students were split into two groups consisting of 14 students each. They were assigned a particular group depending on if they were in CLIL classes or not. Each group had ten students in their sixth year of English and four in their seventh year of English. Students in non-CLIL classes received an average of 721 hours of English instruction starting from when they were eight-years-old. They went to school in Gipuzka, a province in the Basque Country. The CLIL students for whom English was a tool to learn the content had an average of 980 hours of instruction in English starting from when they were eight-years-old. That gave 259 more hours to CLIL students over non-CLIL students. It represents the academic time devoted to CLIL. The CLIL students attended school in Bizkaia, a province in the Basque Country. On average they took two CLIL

English classes per year starting at age 11 or 12. The subjects were English literature, classical culture, religious education, science, geography, history, and drawing. The students began taking these classes at age 11 or 12.

For their task, the students were shown a series of black and white illustrations without words that told the story of a frog. The students needed to look at the illustrations and then relay the story to the interviewer in English. An audio-tape recorded the students. There were five native English speakers from Great Britain that listened to the clips to judge the students' foreign accent level. They did not have any other experience in evaluating pronunciation or a background in linguistics. It has been noted that inexperienced judges are dependable in assessing foreign accents and are less lenient than listeners that have a background in the exercise (Gallardo del Puerto et al., 2009).

The scores of the CLIL and non-CLIL students for degree of FA did not have a statistical difference. Yet for two of the judges the CLIL students outperformed the non-CLIL students. This means that the CLIL students had less of a foreign accent. There was statistical differences between CLIL and non-CLIL students in the area of foreign accent intelligibility. The CLIL students' accents were rated as more intelligible than the non-CLIL students. For the assessment of foreign accent irritation, the analysis showed that there was a big difference between CLIL and non-CLIL students' accents. The findings demonstrated that the CLIL students' accents were much less irritating than non-CLIL students' accents. In summary, the students that had undergone a larger amount of exposure to English via English as an instructional tool were judged to speak with a more intelligible foreign accent. They were also judged to speak with a less irritating accent

than the non-CLIL students. However, their degree of foreign accent was not perceived to be significantly different than the non-CLIL students. The authors suggest that is due to the fact that their teachers are non-native English speakers and so the input the students receive is influenced by the teachers' L1. The fact that the CLIL students' foreign accent degree was not noticeably different than the non-CLIL students may be due to them possessing a more advanced competence in grammar and fluency and not a milder foreign accent. Also, pronunciation is viewed as least important in basic language skills, and the textbooks used in the Basque Country have few activities that develop pronunciation. Gallardo del Puerto et al. (2009) state that when comparing the issue of early introduction to a foreign language to the amount of exposure that research by Gallardo Del Puerto (2006) and García Lecumberri & Gallardo del Puerto (2003) indicates that amount of exposure to a foreign language is more significant than age for language acquisition in formal settings. In conclusion, it has been observed that CLIL classes lead to more intelligible and less irritating spoken output. A less noticeable foreign accent could be achieved if the students had more authentic input. The CLIL students had more exposure to English than the non-CLIL students, and they had better foreign accents than the non-CLIL students in regard to FA intelligibility and FA irritation.

Catalonia CLIL Study

In another study done in 2009 by Ruiz de Zarobe and Catalán, CLIL English learners were compared with non-CLIL learners in regard to receptive vocabulary in EFL, and the results showed a significantly better performance on the cloze and receptive tests of the

CLIL students over non-CLIL students. This meant that there was a higher level of

receptive vocabulary and higher language level on the part of the CLIL students. There

was much more exposure to language in the CLIL classrooms (Ruiz de Zarobe &

Catalán, 2009). Villarreal Olaizola and García Mayo (2009 as cited in Ruiz de Zarobe &

Catalán, 2009) also looked at a group of Basque/Spanish bilinguals in CLIL English

classes and a group in non-CLIL classes. The CLIL group outperformed the non-CLIL

group in the production of affixal morphemes. Both groups produced suppletive forms

(auxiliary and copula *be*) in a parallel fashion, which makes sense assuming suppletion is

guided by Universal Grammar. Ruiz de Zarobe and Catalán (2009) cite Agustín Llach,

who says that non-CLIL (meaning traditional EFL) learners produce significantly more

lexical transfer errors than their CLIL peers, and that their biggest error is borrowing

production. Ruiz de Zarobe and Catalán (2009) also cite Ojeda (2009), who says that the

socioeconomic context may have a fundamental influence on the acquisition of students'

lexical competence. The studies cited by Ruiz de Zarobe and Catalán also showed that

students who had more exposure to English in CLIL programs outperformed the students

with less exposure in regular EFL programs.

Andalusia CLIL Program

Pérez-Vidal (2013) discusses a study done by Lorenzo et al. (2010) on the CLIL

situation in the region of Andalusia in Spain, and he discovered that the CLIL students

were surpassing the mainstream students in a ratio of 62.1% for the CLIL group to 38%

for the control group. The students' oral and written production included rhetorical

moves and discourse arrangements, like hedging and tentative language; hypothesizing;

and impersonal sentences and metaphorical grammar, which are normal for academic discourse, but not taught in regular primary or beginning secondary second language courses.

There have also been studies on CLIL in Spain that show mixed results, but it could be due to the difficulties in CLIL research methodology (Pérez-Vidal, 2013). Studies on CLIL in Europe as a whole report superior skills in students in the area of receptive skills, reading, vocabulary, attitude, and creativity. The skills that do not seem to gain from CLIL are syntax, pragmatics, and writing.

A Vaasa, Finland Multilingual School's English Exposure

As mentioned earlier, in 1987 an immersion program began in Vaasa, a region on Finland's west coast. The program followed the Canadian immersion program structure, and its target students were Finnish speaking students. They would be taught the minority language, Swedish, while learning the content. About 70% of the citizens of Vaasa spoke Finnish, and around 30% spoke Swedish. During the first year, the program began in half-day kindergarten classes. The teachers spoke only in Swedish. Following kindergarten, students were taught for 15-20% of the time in Finnish. The majority of the content was taught in Swedish and accounted for 80% of instructional time. Once students reached grades five and six, half of the time they were taught in Swedish and the other half in Finnish. The Vaasa program led to multiple schools across Finland implementing immersion programs using Swedish and other languages. The schools chose to implement early immersion at ages three-six (Björklund & Suni, 2000). This is in line with the Basque and Catalan programs, but differs with programs in Germany and

the Netherlands where they practice late immersion. A late immersion program in the Netherlands is discussed later in this chapter. Björklund and Suni (2000) argue that one reason early immersion is chosen over late immersion is that studies like one done by Harley (1986) reveal that early immersion students have a preparedness and are more open to using the language than students in late immersion programs.

The chief goal of Finnish immersion programs is multilingualism which is where they differ from Canadian programs. Before the Vaasa immersion program, students' L3 and L4 were introduced in grades five and eight and the lessons were conducted in more than one language and based on textbooks. The Vaasa program decided to have the L3 and L4 classes be conducted solely in the L3 and L4, just like the L1 and L2 languages were taught. That made the L3 and L4 languages purely immersion as well.

A study by Björklund in 2005 noted that English was being introduced in grade one when students were seven years old in the Vaasa immersion school, and German was an elective class they could take in grade five. The English and German lessons are content-based as mentioned before, but are still considered language lessons and are one to two hours each week (Björklund, 2005). The target language for the L3 and L4 is the language of instruction for the third and fourth language classes.

Teachers report that the immersion students have different attitudes toward learning English, different ways of dealing with the new approach, and a different manner in handling the target language than non-immersion students (Björklund, 2005). The immersion students' attitudes toward the target language (English) are that it is possible for them to learn it, and they call upon their knowledge about learning a

language. On the other hand, the non-immersion students tend to have quite low expectations about their ability and the instruction that they will receive.

In the classroom, the non-immersion students do not seem to understand that the teachers use non-verbal cues to communicate the meaning of the message, and these students are uncertain about guessing the meaning of a verbal message and try to avoid circumstances where it could be possible to discern the meaning. The immersion students are accustomed to their teachers acting out meanings and know they should pay attention to nonverbals in order to aid in their comprehension (Björklund, 2005). As a result, the immersion students listen closely and attempt to figure out what is said. They are open to digging in and going further, even if they do not know everything that has been said, whereas the non-immersion students feel obligated to a word-for-word translation and appear unprepared to move on unless they fully understand a message. Even if they do not abandon interest because of vocabulary struggles, they might not be able to stay on the topic or main idea of a message as effortlessly as immersion students can.

A 1996 study by Heinonen (as cited in Björklund, 2005) on the cross-linguistic influence on the lexical level in English looked at written production of 17 immersion students in grade four at three different times in the school year. The analysis showed that the influence of Swedish on English decreased from the first test given to the last test. It was also seen that the influence of Finnish on English was very minimal. This shows that learning more than two languages at once does not hinder students.

In 2001 Björklund (as cited in Björklund, 2005) looked at the written production of immersion and non-immersion students in English. There were 68 students that came

from two immersion groups and one non-immersion group. The non-immersion group had Finnish as their first language. The data was collected the last month they were in grade five. They all had the same amount of time with English since grade one, and the same teaching approach was used. However, for the non-immersion students it was the second language, and for the immersion students it was their third language (Björklund, 2005). The data collected was a biographical essay that the students had 30 minutes to write. They were told to discuss themselves and their lives. The immersion students all wrote longer essays on the whole. It thus appears that there is an ambition and preparedness to communicate in English by the immersion students that does not exist in the non-immersion students. It was observed that the immersion groups produced many times more nouns and verbs than the non-immersion students.

A 2002 study by Lainas and Nurmi (as cited in Björklund, 2005) looked at the oral production of English in the immersion and non-immersion students. Students were told to tell a story using pictures from a comic strip, and if needed they were given probing questions by the testers. A close review of macro-syntagmas (phonemes, words, and phrases) did not reveal big statistical differences between the two groups, but it did show the non-immersion students' speech as being more fragmentary. They said that it was in part due to the fact that they were obliged to ask more questions of the non-immersion students in order to get more speech out of them. The broad impression was that the immersion group could use English more freely and at a complex level not seen in the non-immersion students. They formed more clause complexes and subordinating conjunctions than the non-immersion group. Additionally, the immersion students had

more lexical density, and it suggests that they are more advanced English speakers because overall in their speech there were more grammatical components than lexical components (Björklund, 2005).

The immersion students who were taught English with CLIL had more written and oral output at a higher level in English than the non-immersion students. The students in CLIL classes had more exposure to English.

Trilingual Schools in Friesland

Ytsma (2000) reports that in 1997-8 the Fryske Academy and the Provincial Centre for Educational Advice's Frisian department started a trilingual project in Friesland, in the Netherlands. The three languages taught in the Fryske Academy are Frisian, Dutch, and English. A longitudinal study was being done to look at children's language acquisition in the L1, L2, and L3, and their sociopsychological demeanor (i.e., the students' attitudes and motivation) toward the three languages. For the 1997-8 school year, five primary schools began working in the model at grade one. They began bilingually in Frisian and Dutch. In 1998-9 there were two more schools that joined the project. The trilingual model was to be introduced into the next grades each successive school year. English was instructed as a subject and was not used as a vehicle of teaching for a couple of years, although it was used discreetly in pilot settings as the vehicular language. English would be taught through delayed immersion. The students were tested in Frisian and Dutch at the completion of the academic year to assess their progress. The participating schools were small and situated in the countryside.

The core objectives followed by the primary schools for the foreign language (English) are basic communicative skills in the spheres of understanding, speaking, and reading. In regard to Dutch and Frisian, the core objectives are full oral and written language proficiency.

The program is being run using the principle of linguistic interdependence, which suggests that language competency in one language transfers to competency in another language. The transfer is more likely to happen with deeper elements of language competency, like reading comprehension. The trilingual project relies on that and the teachers do not teach reading comprehension twice or three times, but teach it once as a foundational skill that can be used in more than one language. The Frisian project loosely adheres to the "two-way bilingual education" model. Four elements of a two-way bilingual model are these:

1. The minority language is used at minimum for 50% of instruction.
2. For each class period, only one language is employed.
3. The student body has minority and majority speakers, preferentially in balanced numbers.
4. Both types of speaker are assimilated in all lessons.

For the Frisian project, Frisian is used as the vehicle of teaching for at minimum 50% in grades one through six. The rest of the instruction is in Dutch. In grades seven and eight English is used for 20% of teaching time. That results in English as the medium of instruction for two afternoons a week. English, world studies, and the creative arts are the

courses taught in the L3. Students in grade six receive English lessons that develop vocabulary for world studies and the creative arts (Ytsma, 2000).

In 2005, for a study on experimental trilingual schools in Friesland in the Netherlands, Deelstra and Ytsma (as cited in Gorter & van der Meer, 2008) looked at the comparison of the home language, temperament and opinion associated with the languages, and vocabulary and reading abilities in Frisian, Dutch, and English in students from the schools participating in the trilingual study and the control schools. Language competency in Dutch, Frisian, and English was evaluated in the seven experimental schools and in the ten control schools. Students scored the same in Dutch for the three different tests in comprehensive reading, technical reading, and spelling. For Frisian, the students in the experimental trilingual schools achieved, on average, better than the students in the control schools on literacy skills. Competency of literacy skills in English was also assessed. They tested reading comprehension, listening comprehension, and vocabulary. The schools had only slight differences which were statistically unimportant. The goal of the trilingual schools to attain higher results in English proficiency was not met (Gorter & van der Meer, 2008).

Van der Meij (as cited in Gorter & van der Meer 2008) studied the oral production in Frisian, Dutch, and English of the students at the trilingual schools in 2008. She looked at two grades in one of the schools and compared it to one control school that was a regular bilingual school. The schools are both situated in a tiny village in the Frisian countryside where Frisian is the majority language. The schools are both small. The students were assessed on their oral competency for all three of the languages, using

different tests for each language. They were told to tell a short story with three separate

sets of six pictures. The students were tested first in their L1 (Frisian or Dutch), then in

the L2, and lastly in the L3 (English). The data gathered was written up and then

analyzed for "pauses, pause fillers, repetitions, transfer, neologisms, prompts, MLU

(Mean Length of Utterance), TTR (Type Token Ratio), and errors," (Gorter & van der

Meer, p. 99, 2008). She paid special attention to the level of fluency and vocabulary. Her

hypothesis had been that children in the experimental school would be more proficient

than children in the regular bilingual school, but the data did not confirm that. Also, there

were not any differences in the Dutch language. The students in the trilingual school were

not more proficient in English than the students in the bilingual school. Her findings

match up with the report of the literacy skills in the Fryske Academy (Gorter & van der

Meer, 2008). This study and Deelstra and Ytsma's 2005 (as cited in Gorter & van der

Meer, 2008) study possibly suggests that teaching 20% of the time in English was not

sufficient for developing English proficiency in students; they needed more exposure to

the language.

Romanian EFL Program's English Exposure

   A study on teaching English as a third language to Hungarian-Romanian bilinguals

will now be addressed. It was done in an area of Romania where a lot of Hungarian

speakers live. It will be noted if the number of hours of English instruction the students

receive is sufficient and effective or not. Until the 1970s, English classes in Romania

were for three hours per week in secondary schools (grades five-eight) (Iatcu, 2000).

Iatcu says that now schools in Romania are able to provide intensive English classes,

assuming there are qualified teachers available. The term *intensive English* in Romania means there are around seven hours of language instruction per week, two of which have English as the language of instruction. The subjects that are taught in English are ninth grade geography of the UK and USA, tenth grade history of the UK and USA, and eleventh and twelfth grade culture and civilization of the UK and USA. The present day program aims to be student-centered and to facilitate learning skills like "analysis, synthesis, comparison, problem-solving, and the application of information," (Iatcu, p.240, 2000).

Iatcu states that the research data available from primary grades shows that the Hungarian students have a slower time of learning English and tend to speak with more of a mother tongue accent than the Romanian students. Iatcu suggests that it could be because they began learning English and Romanian at the same time. Iatcu does not state what sort of test is administered, but posts the marks obtained by Hungarian and Romanian students in grades two to eight. As the Hungarian students got to the higher grades, their marks improved. Iatcu notes that Romanian is closer to English in grammar patterns and vocabulary than Hungarian. It is possible that the Hungarian students do better in higher grades because the Romanian they have learned simultaneously has helped their English learning. After ten years of studying English and being taught with the Communicative Language Teaching method, Romanian students are not the proficient speakers they should be by the time they reach university (Mureşan, 2011). Mureşan does not mention on which proficiency test results her conclusion is based. It could be that the students might achieve a higher proficiency if more of their hours of

English used English as the vehicle of instruction, or perhaps they need more hours of contact with English overall. Either way, the current number of hours of English instruction is not sufficient for developing English proficiency for the students in Romania.

Quebec Intensive Programs

A popular form of intensive ESL programs used in Montreal is the five months-on/five months-off program model (Ammar & Spada, 2006). Occasionally this is used at the cost of the progress of reading and writing skills and, particularly, grammatical accuracy (Ammar & Spada, 2006). The findings of a study done by Spada and Lightbown in 1989 (as cited in Ammar & Spada, 2006) on the success of the intensive ESL programs in Quebec showed that Francophone students in the intensive ESL programs performed better than students in traditional ESL programs on comprehension tests for listening, reading, and oral fluency. Additionally, the students' attitudes were more positive regarding English.

In Canada there are French immersion schools in English speaking communities, intensive French programs in English speaking communities, and intensive English programs in French speaking communities. In the intensive program, the English classes begin in grade six (ages 11-12) and at times in grade five. The students then receive around 350-400 hours of English teaching during that year. In the regular program, the English teaching starts in grade one and is one or two hours per week, with students receiving 35-70 hours during the year. In the secondary school students receive two and a half hours per week of English teaching in grades seven to eleven. Research studies done

on the two types of programs have revealed that the students in intensive English programs surpass the students in the same grade in regular English programs. Furthermore, intensive students outperform even their counterparts who are given the same amount of instruction and are in higher grades (Serrano & Muñoz, 2007). The tests used in this study were the Baldwin-Cartier Test de Classement (BTC), the Ministry of Education of Quebec (MEQ) listening comprehension test, and a picture card game for oral skills. In the intensive program students achieved higher in all tasks. They were also more fluent and confident.

Other Quebec models of intensive English allocate the time differently. The massed program gives students 350-400 hours of English in five months. The massed plus program is similar, but students are challenged to use English outside of class in the hallways, cafeteria, and so on. The distributed program gives students 300-350 hours of English in a school year, which is ten months. Collins et al. (1999 as cited in Serrano & Muñoz, 2007) found that the students in both massed programs surpassed those in a distributed program. They were all given a vocabulary recognition test, a Ministry of Education of Quebec (MEQ) test with emphasis on listening comprehension and reading, and a narrative task involving describing pictures orally. It may be possible that not only is the larger amount of exposure to English beneficial, but the higher amount of concentration than a traditional program too.

Austrian CLIL Study Looking at Communicative Competence

Dalton-Puffer (2009) made observations of 40 Austrian middle and high school CLIL lessons for the 2001-2003 school years with the goal of seeing how communicative

competence as defined by Canale and Swain is played out. All of the schools were public schools. There were 305 students total, consisting of grades six-seven and grades ten-thirteen at secondary schools and higher vocational schools. The lower secondary students were 11-13 years old, and the upper secondary students were of 16-19 years old. The class sizes ranged from 16 to 28, showing that some classes were a bit big for a CLIL program. The majority of the students spoke German as their L1, but there were some minority languages spoken as first languages. On top of CLIL classes, the students' schedules also included traditional EFL courses. Outside the classroom, the students' exposure to English was mostly listening to music or browsing the internet.

There were ten teachers and two teaching assistants that were native English speaking. The content subjects were geography, history and social studies, biology, physics, music, accounting, business studies and economics, tourism management, and international marketing (Dalton-Puffer, 2009).

To assess the students' grammatical competence, Dalton-Puffer did a quantitative error analysis in 2007 (as cited in Dalton-Puffer, 2009) that looked at grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. It showed that the most common error type was lexical errors, then pronunciation, followed by grammatical errors. The CLIL context of a content subject lengthens out students' lexical skills in order to create a lexical gap, and students then try to fill that gap. The frequency with which students realize their lexical gap and try to fill it contrasts with students in regular EFL classrooms. When CLIL teachers are asked what the biggest language advantage for students in CLIL is, they

mention vocabulary first. Dalton-Puffer infers that where students struggle the most is also where they learn the most.

Dalton-Puffer (2009) says that pronunciation errors can only be picked out in activities where students are doing a lot of talking, and the main activity used in the classroom in this study, whole-class discussion, does not involve much talking from any one student. It mostly elicits minimal responses out of students. Therefore, it could be that she found few pronunciation errors because of the dominant interaction activity. She also argues that this could also be the reason for the low number of grammatical errors. She says it is hard to make mistakes when only speaking a little bit in English because of its rudimentary case- and number-marking system. She points out that the mistakes would be higher in a language like French with its rich inflectional system. That causes minimal responses to include "marking for case, number, person, inflectional class, and agreement" (p.203, 2009). Unless students go beyond single phrases, their resources are not forced past familiar territory. Scripted student presentations do not stretch students' abilities either. The communicative teaching method restricts long teacher lectures, and so the input of syntactic patterning is not really vast and includes many interrogatives. Interestingly, Dalton-Puffer says that what is usually a problem for English learners, the third person –s, does not appear to be a problem in the CLIL students. She thus concludes that the higher amount of exposure to the language in CLIL allows for reinforcement that causes the correct use of the inflectional marker to be automatic.

Dalton-Puffer looked at sociolinguistic competence as it relates to directives and repairs in a classroom. Assessments of the students in the CLIL classes suggest that the

repair rate in the CLIL class is lower than in the typical EFL class. Many cite this as being an advantage of CLIL because students feel they are able to speak more freely (Dalton-Puffer, 2009). Repair can be done by oneself or another person. Repair is present to some degree in CLIL classrooms. These classrooms tend to have fixed roles, and because of that it limits the interactions that occur. Students might ask for help with their individual lexical gaps, but there is little evidence of them asking for clarification from other speakers, including the teacher.

When it comes to directives, the teachers give many directives in the CLIL classroom, but the students do not give many directives themselves (Dalton-Puffer, 2009). She describes the CLIL classroom as having the nature of a language bath because there is ample exposure but small amounts of active use. To examine redressive action in directives, Dalton-Puffer looks at a study comparing Austrian and Finnish classroom directives, and it showed that Austrian classrooms have more redressive discourse modifiers. That indicated that the L1 culture that values indirectness gave Austrian students input that mimics communication with equal but reserved adults. Dalton-Puffer says that the sociolinguistic competence experience in a CLIL classroom is not any different than regular EFL classrooms, the reason being that the students are still in a classroom environment and act accordingly. However, she states that in a more artistic class subject, such as art, crafts, or technology, which are not included in her study, there could be an alteration to the social interaction that occurs in EFL and most content-based CLIL classes.

Some experts in the field consider discourse competence to be the core competency of Canale and Swain's framework because it is "where everything else comes together" (Dalton-Puffer, p. 206, 2009) and all of the competencies are actualized. The primary skill in discourse competence is sequencing and arrangement of items into coherent texts. This is most commonly done in writing, but could also be in speaking. Dalton-Puffer says though that in the classes she observed, writing was very minimal and consisted of a bit of note-taking, so she focused on the spoken level. The work on oral discourse mostly happens in student presentations. Apart from those, students are challenged to take part in protracted ongoing interaction in the target language. That comes directly from the goal of CLIL— that students communicate in real-life ways in the target language. All students are experts at classroom discourse and so having them communicate in the target language in their familiar daily workplace is fitting. It was observed that almost never did students or teachers challenge each other's contributions to conversation in the classroom. In regard to repair, a whole-class discussion does not lead to a situation where students initiate or carry out repair. It can usually be seen that the teacher plays an active interactional role, and the students have passive responding roles.

Language teaching strategies have been developed since the 1980s, and they come down to manipulation of meaning and manipulation of form. Dalton-Puffer used that knowledge to aid in her study about students' strategic competence. Dalton-Puffer states that strategies that manipulate the meaning function on a scale of reducing the intended message to completely avoiding the subject altogether. In a classroom structure it is

completely possible for a student to avoid a topic entirely while others discuss it in

discourse. Being a student in a collective setting allows for some to remain quiet, unless a

teacher calls on specific students to speak. In terms of manipulating form, research has

focused on the lexicon; specifically, how L2 students deal with lexical gaps. There are

two big strategies that have been discussed for lexical gaps. First, holistic strategies that

replace a term for a different, more general term. For example, *bird* in place of *sparrow*.

Second, analytical strategies that function in description and circumlocution. If talking

about a sparrow, one could say "It's small and you can find it in every city park,"

(Dalton-Puffer, p. 209, 2009). Teachers are observed to use these strategies much more

often than students are. The teachers are under more pressure to communicate to the

students, and if they do not know it in English, they tend to not switch to the L1 since

they are teaching in English. The students though often switch to the L1 if they do not

know how to say something in English. Or they will indicate that they have a lexical gap,

and their teacher or peer will help them. The fact that the listeners probably anticipate

exactly what the student wanted to say before they ask for help and that they have a

common L1 makes the CLIL classroom different than real life experiences at least

regarding strategic competence. Dalton-Puffer argues that the CLIL classroom situation

does not prepare students for different situational contexts (Dalton-Puffer, 2009).

Overall, Dalton-Puffer lists some small advantages that CLIL students have over

students in regular EFL classes. The CLIL students develop bigger vocabularies, know

how to use the third person –s, and have less anxiety and hesitation about speaking the

English language in class because of the low repair rate (Dalton-Puffer, 2009). The

students in the CLIL classes have more exposure to English than students in regular EFL classes.

The students in the intensive ESL classes in Quebec also have more exposure to English than traditional EFL/distributed program students and surpass them in their level of English. A high amount of English exposure with effective instruction can lead to higher levels of English proficiency.

Strategies for Younger Students

Younger students in this section means preschool through grade two. Björklund & Suni (2000) studied a school that uses content-based instruction to teach English to students in Finland. The school officials at the Vaasa Finnish immersion school traded textbook-focused teaching for a more communicative approach with original, teacher-generated material. The L3 and L4 lessons were two 45-minute slots per week. English is the L3 (third language learned) and German is the L4 (fourth language learned). In their content-based teaching approach the English and German teachers aim to teach the same content that is dealt with in the thematic units that are taught using the first or second language of the students. The L3 and L4 teachers use the same teaching strategies as the L1 and L2 teachers, and discussing methods with each other was encouraged. The Vaasa Finnish program altered the teaching strategies due to the change in grade level introduction of L3 and L4. The students in grade one did not yet have literacy skills, and the L3 teachers (usually English) were told not to focus on reading or writing skills. Those students were learning to read and write in Swedish in grade one. Since their students know how to read and write, the teaching is text-based. For those teaching

English as an L3 in grades one through six, the same teaching strategies are followed that

are used by the L2 teachers for the immersion program. The following are teaching

guidelines that the Vaasa research team constructed:

- The target language is learned naturally because the students are to learn in

  another language, not *about* another language.

- The teachers can understand the students' first languages, but they only speak to

  the students in the target language.

- Facial expressions, gestures, et cetera, are used to communicate the meaning of

  words and expressions which is called ostensive teaching.

- The teacher's role is advisor and expert, and he or she supplies students with key

  words.

- Students are allowed to use their first languages, but are encouraged to use the

  target language.

- At the start, routines are implemented to establish a safe environment.

- Language is consistently displayed visually in the classroom.

- Through various activities and efficient communication a "student-centered"

  teaching approach is practiced.

- "Learning-centered" teaching gives several opportunities to use the language. An

  expansive vocabulary is acquired through natural communication.

- A "whole-language" teaching approach is implemented.

- The teaching strategies incorporate stories, rhymes, drama, and theater.

- Teachers use activities and culture that reach beyond the classroom.

- Authentic supplemental resources are used.

In grades one-two the L3 English lesson is only one 45-minute lesson per week. Students are put in group situations to help with understanding and production. From the start, words and phrases are repeated in the target language collectively and individually, even though students may not always grasp the meaning of the word. Teachers teach words that are essential for communication (nouns, verbs, negative and positive constructions) early on. It is also taught that there is not an equivalent word in both languages all the time. The goal is to develop active language learners, not translators.

The teaching strategies in the Finnish immersion school incorporate stories, rhymes, drama, and theater. Teachers in the Finnish school also include ones such as a method developed by Artigal, a Catalan kindergarten teacher and teacher trainer (Björklund & Suni, 2000). His method is very similar to Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS), which was developed by Blaine Ray in California in the 1990s (Ray & Seely, 2005). Artigal proposed in 1991 that the way for a child to acquire a language that they do not know is through drama. His response to challenges faced in early language teaching was to create language stories. The stories are short pieces of drama concerning students' everyday lives. The vocabulary in them is about family, house chores, friends, health and sickness, seasons, and time. Artigal says that a tale should have a simple plot and address topics related to experiences and fantasies of the students' age group. While it is being narrated the students all participate in a dramatization of it. The students and teacher all produce the actions, gestures, mimes, and

intonation that they create collectively so as to make the plot understandable. To provide variety to the new language learning, Artigal made a lot of helping material that aids in teaching content and words and phrases. Examples of the auxiliary materials are pictures, drawing activities, games, crosswords, competitions, and songs.

Furthermore, Finnish immersion programs use songs, especially for the younger students, to teach foreign languages. Fonseka (1997 as cited in Björklund & Suni, 2000) stated that songs enable teachers and students to interact in an important way, because when they sing together they connect in a totally stress-free environment. Singing also works with memory to a high degree. A large number of children are able to sing from memory. While singing, students repeat words and phrases and use the rhythms of the immersion language. This plays a vital role in locations where students do not have natural interaction with the immersion language (Björklund & Suni, 2000). Teaching strategies for younger children that aid in developing fluency in a second language are stories combined with drama, songs, rhymes, and theater.

<div align="center">Strategies for Older Students</div>

Older students in this section refers to grade three and above. In the Finnish immersion school, when students go into grade three at age nine, there is a shift in the teaching strategies because by grade three students have developed literacy skills and there are many more options for lessons involving reading and writing. Finland's National Board of Education states that by the time students complete junior comprehensive school (sixth grade) they need to be able deal with daily life issues in the L3 and L4, as well as understand basic written language and be able to write brief messages. To achieve

this, the students need to have learned the essential vocabulary necessary for age-appropriate linguistic settings. Students need to have learned basic knowledge about the country, culture, and people of the immersion language (Björklund & Suni, 2000). The teaching strategies in the junior school need to be chosen with the emphasis of communication in mind. A main focus of the program needs to be teaching a vocabulary for each respective age group, and it should expand in a methodical manner. Working with texts plays a key role in ensuring progress throughout the program.

Once students reach grades five and six and are at the ages 11 and 12, the vocabulary and structural forms used in lessons have advanced significantly. The teaching strategies are different too. The teacher has to find a balance between input and output. Björklund and Suni (2000) mention Krashen's (1985) input hypothesis about language learning requiring comprehensible input as well as Swain's (1995) research about learner output. Swain stated that learner output is essential because it strengthens fluency and accuracy. Moreover, output allows learners to control their linguistic knowledge and internalize it.

Björklund and Suni point out that the text topics need to be very interesting in addition to being functional. Themes that can be motivating and effective are "suspense, mystery, overcoming problems, fun, anticipation, and happy endings," (Björklund & Suni, p. 210, 2000). Adventure novels often contain all those themes. An adventure could be original, or it could be a "legend, science fiction, a narrative, a dialogue, and a cartoon," (Björklund & Suni, p.210, 2000). Good planning and organization of text work can aid in creating positive views of reading and increase overall reading skills.

Björklund and Suni believe that using different forms of input leads to the best results. Video and film viewing and surfing the internet could be sources of learning as well.

Exercises in writing are planned according to the immersion principles, are communicative, and have authentic meaning. They begin in grade three with students having their own booklets containing easy activities. Some tasks concentrate on comprehension. For example, "Listen and do" and "Connect a picture and the word" are each practical and motivating. There is some grammar instruction in grade four, but the main focus is on students' production of letters, stories, directions, dialogues, and news. In grades five and six similar strategies are used, except the expectations are increased, and the exercises are more difficult. More and more collaboration with other teachers is being done.

Group work or partner work is often used so that students are able to use language in meaningful social interaction with their classmates. Since the teacher's job is to make language comprehensible, he or she needs to be constantly practicing reflection on meaning. Teachers also help students to form understandable messages and grow and to enlarge their vocabulary. Björklund and Suni state that teachers need to use simplified language and speak at a slow speed, operating particular structures and vocabulary.

Teacher Strategies in Quebec

Ammar and Spada (2006) examined teacher corrective feedback in grade six intensive ESL classes in Quebec. This study narrowed in on corrective feedback in the form of recasts and prompts. A recast is when a student says something in the second language incorrectly, and the teacher immediately repeats back to them the meaning of what they

said in the correct way. If a student says, "The boy has two orange," the teacher would say, "The boy has two oranges." The goal is for students to notice the difference between what they said and what the teacher said. The step of noticing the difference is an essential part of learning (Ammar & Spada, 2006). The authors state that VanPatten (1990) proposed that students cannot focus on meaning and form at the same time. He demonstrated though that second language students can consciously attend to form if the input is easy to comprehend. Since recasts connect the correct and incorrect statements while maintaining the meaning, it is thought that recasts make processing resources available and let the student focus on the form of the statement.

Ammar and Spada note that the literature has discussed the disadvantages of recasts. They cite that Krashen (1981) and Truscott (1999) feel that recasts will negatively influence a learner's affect and hinder the flow of communication. Ammar and Spada (2006) also cite that Doughty and Varela (1998) and Long (1996) see recasts as implicit, discreet and able to model the correct form and at the same time keep the focus on meaning, thus making them an optimal corrective feedback technique.

An analysis done on recasts and noncorrective repetitions found that their forms and functions are very alike and are in use reciprocally. This makes the purpose of recasts unclear when they are overlapped with repetitions. Ammar and Spada (2006) note that Fanselow (1977) and Chaudron (1977) found that students in second language content-based classes did not react overtly to recasts as much as they did for other corrective feedback techniques. The limited show of understanding after recasts was seen as a sign that the students did not note the corrective nature of the recasts.

However, there is a lot of other literature that argues that a lack of immediate repair does not mean that students did not notice the correction, or that they will not apply it in the future. Immediate incorporation also does not necessarily show learning has occurred, it could just suggest mimicking. Ammar and Spada designed their study to address the effectiveness of recasts and other corrective feedback. The other type of corrective feedback looked at was prompts. Prompts are when a teacher pushes a student to self-correct. They conducted a pretest, immediate posttest, and a delayed posttest, and they had a control group.

This study was done in intensive English as a second language programs in Montreal. The intensive ESL programs are available in French language schools beginning in grade five or grade six. There are varying models of intensive ESL, but the most prominent is the five-month on/five-month off model.

The study was done in three classes of three primary schools in the Montreal metropolitan. The classes were intensive ESL classrooms. Sixty-four students were a part of the study. They were all in the second half of the grade six school year, which was February to June. The students were Francophone Quebecers and had little interaction with English outside of school. The researchers decided to look at the grammar feature of possessive determiners and, specifically, the third-person singular possessive determiners *his* and *her*. The teachers were provided two booklets to help them in the study. One booklet had the teaching materials for the activities, and all teachers received it. The other booklet was the corrective feedback booklet, and only the experimental-group teachers

received it. There was a recast-group teacher, a prompt-group teacher, and a control-group teacher.

The prompt group students' improved the most on both of the posttests in their awareness of possessive determiners. The difference between the prompt group's and the recast group's scores on the immediate posttest and delayed posttest were significant. The recast and prompt groups both scored higher than the control group on the immediate and delayed posttests.

In conclusion, the study found that using corrective feedback techniques combined with communication activities leads to higher achievement than conducting said activities without corrective feedback (Ammar & Spada, 2006). Prompts were more successful than recasts for the lower-proficiency students in each respective group. The prompts and recasts were equivalently effective for the high-proficiency students in each of those groups. Prompts cause students to fix their mistakes themselves and force them to learn. The findings indicate then that there is not one corrective feedback technique that can be recommended to every situation. It depends on proficiency level, the target feature, and the context.

Austrian CLIL Strategies

The classroom activities in the Austrian CLIL classes were comprised of group-work, short presentations of group-work results, longer student presentations, and observations of small-scale science experiments (Dalton-Puffer, 2009). Yet the predominant activity in almost all of the lessons was a whole-class discussion. This included the typical set up of teacher initiation, students' reactions, and teacher follow-up.

Dalton-Puffer's 2009 study on CLIL programs in secondary schools in Austria discussed two teaching strategies for lexical gaps. Again, one was holistic strategies that replace a term for a different more general term. For instance, *dog* in place of *collie*. The second, was analytical strategies that function in description and circumlocution. If talking about a collie one could say, "It's a long-haired dog that originates from Scotland."

The teachers are the primary users of these strategies, but students occasionally use them. The teachers may use them more because they are supposed to speak only in English. Whereas the students are also supposed to use solely English, but they do code switch if they experience a lexical gap. I would recommend that teachers explicitly teach these strategies to students and encourage them to use them.

Strategies for older students that promote fluency include writing exercises like "listen and do" and "connect a picture and the word;" recasts and prompts; whole-class discussions, group-work, student presentations; and holistic and analytical strategies.

<center>Teacher Training</center>

Many of the studies reviewed included information about the type of training that their teachers are required to obtain. That will be presented in this section.

<u>Content and Language Integrated Learning</u>

A teacher that is well-trained in the second language could teach "soft-CLIL," which would mean teaching the vocabulary necessary for talking about content on a basic level. But a teacher would need to have a high proficiency in the content in order to teach "hard

CLIL." In that setting the learning objective is content-driven (Ting, 2011). Teacher training in the language and the content is essential because of this.

Ting (2011) states that Escobar (2010) strongly suggests that CLIL teaching should be thought of as a new community of practice in which teachers build knowledge and different ways of being via Vygotzkian social interaction processes. CLIL teacher training should not just be about making sure that the teacher is fluent in the foreign language, but it should include equipping the teachers with strategies and linguistic resources that will empower them to deal with the exhaustion that accompanies using a foreign language. Effective CLIL teaching is not just the teachers translating their lessons into English and expecting students to learn both the content and the language. A learner-centered, communicative approach needs to be used with effective didactic materials designed specifically for CLIL teaching.

Teachers in Spain are supposed to have a B2 level of language competency in English to run their CLIL classroom and develop resources that teach the content and guide communicative competence and multidisciplinary literacy. There are some regions in Spain that let teachers have only a B1 level. A C1 level is considered ideal for secondary and tertiary levels (Ting, 2011).

The teachers of foreign languages in Catalan CLIL secondary schools complete a four-year university degree in the foreign language in which most of their classes are taught in the target language. They also earn a one-year degree in foreign language teaching methodology (Muñoz Lahoz & Navés, 2007). The Catalan teachers have a high level of proficiency in English and have language teaching methodology training.

Ytsma (2000) hypothesizes that one weakness of the Friesland program is the teachers' level of English competency. They are all Frisian-Dutch bilingual. Those who teach English in the higher grades have a decent knowledge of the language, but are not proficient enough to teach a subject using English as the medium. A course was then made for those teachers to improve their oral language skills. A few of the teachers were part of a pilot program to attempt teaching a subject in English so that the researchers could have an idea of how the program would work once its students reach the upper grades in 2003-4. It seems to be detrimental that the Frisian teachers cannot teach a subject using English as the medium. It was not stated in the study if the English course they took remedied the situation.

Iatcu (2000) notes that aspiring English teachers in Romania are required to study at a university for four years and to earn a bachelor's degree. Once they have completed three years of teaching, they then have to take a mandated exam which enables them to become a fully qualified teacher. Teachers also have the opportunity to study abroad while at university. The English proficiency levels of the Romanian English teachers are not known. It would be beneficial if the Romanian teachers were trained in language teaching *and* their subject.

Björklund & Suni (2000) explain that the L3 teachers in the Finnish immersion school had gone through training to be regular classroom teachers and could teach all subjects in grades one-six. In addition, they had specialized training in teaching English. For the secondary grades (seven-nine), the teachers had more language-specific training in one or two languages. The English teachers had qualifications to teach English and

another language as a subject. In the secondary grades, there are required times when the English teachers teach while being observed by experienced English teachers and teacher trainers. The Finnish program seems to be the most comprehensive. Its teachers are trained to teach subjects *and* the language, and they have ongoing professional development accountability.

Dalton-Puffer (2009) states that seven of the ten teachers in the Austrian CLIL study had qualifications to teach EFL and a content subject. The other three teachers were qualified only as content teachers, but had acquired a good level of competence in English from long stays in countries where English is spoken. It sounds as if the Austrian CLIL teachers had a sufficient level of English to be able to teach subjects with English as the medium.

It seems that across the board teachers are required to have a four year university degree and to have a significant level of proficiency in English in order as qualified to be an English teacher. It would be ideal if teachers were trained in language teaching as well as the content they teach in English.

<div align="center">Form-Focused Instruction</div>

A few of the studies reviewed highlighted the need for some form-focused instruction to be included in a second language program for optimal language acquisition to occur. A study by Ammar and Spada (2006) in Quebec on teacher corrective feedback was done because low levels of grammatical accuracy have been observed in second language classes that used comprehensible input and meaning-based instruction. Even though the students achieve comparatively high levels of fluency in spoken output, they

have trouble with accuracy of morphology and syntax. Ammar and Spada (2006) point out that Schmidt (1990, 2001) highlighted the need to guide students' attention to the formal aspects of language in order to assist their noticing the L2 forms and thus to learn them. Out of that has come the idea of form-focused instruction, which is proactive and reactive and can be used in communicative classrooms to bring students' attention to language form. Ammar & Spada (2006) note that a heavy number of studies support that proposal. One that was expounded on was research by Norris and Ortega (2000 as cited in Ammar & Spada, 2006), in which the conclusion was that form-focused second language instruction is useful and that explicit methods of instruction are more effective than implicit methods.

Genesee (2013) reports that research on the effectiveness of content-based second language instruction has demonstrated that students in these types of programs develop great levels of functional competency in the second language that is significantly higher than the acquisition of students in more traditional second language programs. However, there is research that shows a sole focus on meaning or the functional use of the second language in content-based programs is not ideal for progressing students' language skills. Research on the language development of students in Canada's French immersion programs has shown that students who were in immersion programs for several years frequently did not acquire skills like verb tenses, pronouns, prepositions, and sociolinguistic forms. Genesee discusses studies that have shown that students who have been in immersion programs and had much more exposure to the language do not always exceed students who had less exposure to the language on tests that measure linguistic

competence. He says that this seems to indicate that simply upping the exposure and functional use of the second language does not automatically result in greater linguistic proficiency. The students perhaps can communicate what is needed using their narrow repertoire and are not forced by teachers to expand their linguistic proficiency.

Genesee argues that language instruction that is more systematic and explicit and is connected to the communicative needs of students in these programs ought to be used in addition to a more direct focus on the linguistic forms that are challenging for students to learn. He states that research by Norris and Ortega (2000 as cited in Genesee, 2013) gave evidence that teaching that concentrates on structural properties of the foreign language in a content-based program can strengthen the students' second language proficiency.

In 2007 Pérez-Vidal (as cited in Pérez-Vidal, 2013) investigated the input strategies of teachers in four CLIL classrooms in the Catalonia region. Her aim was to look at the focus-on-form moves of the teacher in the lessons examined. The outcome was that 25% of the teachers' turns were done to garner students' responses, 21% to talk over content meaning, 17% to review students' understanding of the lesson, and less than 10% was spread among other features of the lesson, such as discussing the materials, the syllabus, or modifying the content and the language. Perhaps most significantly, she found that there was 0% code-switching, and there were not any focus-on-form moves. She states that it is intriguing that the accuracy results reported are so good if all CLIL classrooms have such little focus on form as the four Catalan ones. It could be that the

classrooms may have even more success if they were to include some form-focused instruction in their program.

Pérez-Vidal (2013) next compares the results from Immersion programs in Quebec with the CLIL programs in Spain. Pérez-Vidal (2013) cites studies by Genesee (2004) and Harley, Allen, Cummins, and Swain (1990) on immersion programs in Quebec and suggests that students come out with high fluency and communicative ability, but that it has not lead to superior levels of accuracy or refined sociolinguistic skills. In addition, Pérez-Vidal (2013) cites Lyster (1987, 2007), who revealed that there was a degree of weakness in the oral and written productive abilities of students that showed up in their grammatical and sociolinguistic proficiency. What was decided by Canadian educational professionals was that they needed to balance the approaches of experiential and analytical, or simply bring in more focus-on-form. I recommend that the Madrid school include some form-focused instruction in their curriculum.

Summary

I am studying elementary EFL approaches (and selected EFL approaches beyond elementary grades) because I want to discover the most effective EFL approach for second language teaching in order to recommend the most efficient and effective EFL approach for a new private, parochial elementary school in Madrid. My research questions are as follows:

1. What does the literature say about effective EFL approaches to be implemented in a private elementary school in Spain?

2. What teaching strategies are effective for developing fluency in an EFL setting for children?

In Chapter Four I presented the seven themes that surfaced from the literature. First, content-based instruction seemed to be the second language teaching approach that is the most effective. Second, having contact with native speakers of the target language in a study abroad experience is seen to be very beneficial to students studying a second language. Third, the amount of exposure to the second language, English, often has a big impact on the level of proficiency that is achieved. Fourth, teaching strategies that are effective for developing fluency in younger students. Fifth, teaching strategies that are effective in developing fluency in older students. Sixth, the training that teachers in English language programs have in the studies reviewed and the recommended ideal. Seventh, the need for some form focused instruction. CLIL, content-based English teaching, and immersion programs are the programs that give students a notable amount of exposure to the English language and have resulted in higher success than traditional EFL programs.

In Chapter Five I will discuss the knowledge I obtained through my review of literature, what may be the implications or restrictions from the information gathered and the themes found in relation to my research questions. I will address the relation of the capstone to Hamline School of Education's Conceptual Framework.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

I am studying elementary EFL approaches (and selected EFL approaches beyond elementary grades) because I want to discover the most effective EFL approach for second language teaching in order to recommend the most efficient and effective EFL approach for a new private, parochial elementary school in Madrid. My research questions are as follows:

1. What does the literature say about effective EFL approaches to be implemented in a private elementary school in Spain?

2. What teaching strategies are effective for developing fluency in an EFL setting for children?

This chapter will feature the learning that occurred during the capstone process, it will briefly revisit the review of literature, and it will contemplate the potential implications and limitations of the study and its findings. It will recommend forthcoming research projects, ponder the growth of this author, and look at this author's possible prospective research agenda. This chapter will also mull on the relationship of the capstone to Hamline School of Education's Conceptual Framework.

Findings from the Review of Literature and Implications

Both of the research questions were answered in the review of literature. The first question asks about the most effective EFL approach for an elementary school in Spain. The literature review indicates that a content-based program in which English is the

language of instruction appears to be the most effective. The second question about the most effective teaching strategies for developing fluency in an EFL setting for children seems to be answered in the literature by stories with drama that are similar to TPRS, rhymes, and songs. Also, writing exercises, corrective feedback like recasts and prompts, whole-class discussions, group-work, student presentations, and holistic and analytical strategies are indicated as being effective. Moreover, it was seen in the literature that not all form-focused teaching should be cut out.

Many studies were looked at that confirm the positive results of the content-based teaching that is included in the communicative approach. However, some of the literature also pointed to the need for some form-focused teaching to be included with the communicative approach in an ideal second language program. Based on the literature, I would recommend that the elementary school in Madrid use content-based instruction with their students and that their teachers receive strong training in it. I would also recommend that the teachers include some form-focused teaching within their content-based instruction for optimal results. I believe that the school would like to have at least some American teachers and it is important, if they are only content-trained for those teachers to also have some training in language teaching, preferably in the communicative approach.

I reviewed literature that commended the addition of participating in study abroad programs as part of a student's second language learning and described the possible positive effects. I believe the elementary school in Madrid should include study abroad options for their students once it has been established and has higher grades in place. A

French immersion school in Saint Paul, MN offers study abroad trips to France for its fifth graders. The fifth graders live with a French family while there. Perhaps once the elementary school in Madrid has fifth grade in place it could begin looking at a study abroad program for its fifth graders. Fifth grade presumably is when elementary students are the most mature and able to be away from their families. Since Spain is so close to the UK, this may be the most cost effective option. But studying in North America would be a viable option as well.

It was seen that in most of the CLIL programs in either bilingual or multilingual schools, the students attained higher levels of English than students in regular EFL classes. Students in CLIL programs, bilingual, multilingual, or immersion programs have much more exposure to English than their peers in traditional EFL classes. The Friesian and Romanian students did not attain sufficient levels of English. The Friesland program began teaching their students later than in the other programs and for only two hours per week. Perhaps it was the low amount of exposure and later starting point that resulted in insufficient English proficiency. The Romanian program provided English seven hours per week, with two hours using English as the language of instruction. The Romanian schools are also still developing their teaching methods to be communicative. It could be that they need to increase the amount of contact with English or increase the number of hours when English is the language of instruction. Also, if all of their teachers were trained in the communicative approach they may see different results.

The elementary school in Madrid in which I have an interest is planning to function as an international school in which English will be the language of instruction in

every class. There may eventually be Spanish or foreign language classes. When this capstone originally began, it was not known that the school would be an international school run in English. The students at the school will have abundant class exposure to English all day, beginning at age three in preschool.

Limitations

The limitations of this study are that often times the students chosen in CLIL studies are high-performing students. Thus the results could be skewed. But not in every case: some studies specifically stated that students of different levels were selected to be participants.

There is always a lot of literature to look at and given the time limitations I read what I could. Also, I am still learning about the different EFL program models and approaches and my interpretations of the data may be different in the future. My data collection and review skills grew in the process, but are still in progress.

Some of the studies stated what tests were used to measure students' English proficiency, but others did not. A limitation then is that it is not known if the way proficiency was measured could affect the results.

Future Research

I gained a broader and deeper understanding of the field of teaching English in general and a much more thorough understanding about the teaching of English in Spain and other countries while working on this capstone. My data collection and review methods improved. I feel that my abilities to read studies and to pick out what information is important and relevant to my research questions were sharpened. Future

research projects may comprise looking at whether teacher training programs in universities across Spain are changing their training to include language-teaching methodology for all content teachers, since CLIL is beginning to be implemented in all of Spain's 17 autonomous regions. If one were in Spain and able to conduct studies on students there it would be interesting to see if students living in bilingual areas of Spain and attending trilingual or multilingual programs achieve higher in English than students living in monolingual areas of Spain attending a bilingual program. It would also be worthwhile to conduct a study on the effects participating in a study abroad trip has on students studying English at an elementary school and to see if they outperform the students who do not study abroad.

<div align="center">Communication of the Results</div>

The primary way the results of this capstone will be communicated with others is by making the capstone available to the worldwide public on Hamline University Bush Memorial Library Digital Commons' website. I may seek to publish the findings of this review of literature in an ESL Journal in the future. I will also communicate the findings of my capstone with the director of the elementary school in Madrid.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

The topic of this capstone is aligned with Hamline School of Education's Conceptual framework in that it sought to discover the most effective approach that would support students' success in developing fluency in English. The review of literature was driven by my two research questions as I looked at different theories of teaching practices and second language learning and how they have built on one another

and evolved. I desired to build on and question past ways of understanding in order to

find an innovative and sound EFL approach with effective teaching strategies and which

is able to serve students of all backgrounds.

APPENDIX A

Table of Studies Included in this Review of Literature

Appendix A: Table of Studies Included in this Review of Literature

Authors, date	Country	L1, L2, L3, L4	Ages/Grades	Program Type	Key Findings
Ammar & Spada, 2006	Quebec, Canada	L1: French L2: English	Grade six	Intensive ESL five months-on/five months-off	Corrective feedback of prompts and recasts lead to higher achievement
Björklund & Suni 2000; Björklund, 2005	Finland	L1: Finnish L2: Swedish L3: English L4: German	Elementary Grades one through six	Early Immersion, content-based program	Immersion students had better attitude towards English than non-immersion students. Better understanding of nonverbals, more written output, oral output more complex and used more freely
Burgi (2007 as cited in Gallardo del Puerto et al., 2009)	Switzerland	L1: German L2: English	Secondary	CLIL	CLIL students developed a higher level of English than non-CLIL students
Dalton-Puffer, 2009	Austria	L1: German, some	Grades six-seven;	CLIL	CLIL students develop

		spoke minority languages as L1 L2: English	Grades ten-thirteen		bigger vocabularies, use the third person –s, less anxiety and hesitation about speaking English
Egiguren (2006 as cited in Pérez-Vidal, 2013)	Basque Country, Spain	L1: Basque L2: Spanish L3: English	Ages four and eight	Five hours per week of CLIL	CLIL eight-year-olds caught up to non-CLIL students that had started English at age four in one and a half years
Gallardo del Puerto, Gomez Lacabex, & García Lecumberri, 2009	Basque Country, Spain	L1: Basque L2: Spanish L3: English	Primary; secondary ages 14-16	CLIL	Primary: CLIL instruction more effective. Secondary: CLIL students' foreign accents more intelligible
Iatcu, 2010; Mureşan, 2011	Romania	L1: Romanian or Hungarian L2: Romanian (For Romanian	Ages seven-seventeen	Intensive ESL seven hours a week. Two of those hours content-based instruction	The students are not the proficient English speakers they should be by the time they reach university

		L1's, L2 is English) L3: English-For the Hungarian L1 students			
Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2008	Basque Country, Spain	L1: Basque L2: Spanish L3: English	Pre-K to 12	CLIL	CLIL students' English proficiency notably greater than non-CLIL students'
Llinares & Dafouz (2010 as cited in Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010)	Madrid Community, Spain	L1: Spanish L2: English	Primary	CLIL	CLIL students attain higher English proficiency than non-CLIL students
Lorenzo (2010 as cited in Pérez-Vidal, 2013)	Andalusia, Spain	L1: Spanish L2: English	Primary and Secondary	CLIL	CLIL students surpassed the mainstream students
Pérez-Vidal, 2013	Catalonia, Spain	L1: Catalan L2: Spanish L3: English	Grade eight and ten	CLIL	Eighth grade CLIL students exceeded tenth grade non-CLIL students

Pérez-Vidal, 2013	Catalonia, Spain	L1: Spanish or Catalan L2: English or Spanish L3: English for the Catalan speakers	Secondary	Study Abroad in English speaking country	Study abroad students achieve higher proficiency in English overall than non-study abroad students
Ruiz de Zarobe & Catalán, 2009	Basque Country, Spain	L1: Basque L2: Spanish L3: English	Grade six	CLIL	Higher level of receptive vocabulary and language in CLIL vs. non-CLIL students
Serrano & Muñoz, 2007	Quebec, Canada	L1: French L2: English	Grades six-eleven	Intensive and massed ESL	Intensive and massed program students achieve higher than regular program students
Whittaker & Llinares, 2009	Madrid Community, Spain	L1: Spanish L2: English	Secondary	CLIL	First year secondary CLIL students close to level of non-CLIL final year students
Ytsma, 2000	Friesland, the Netherlands	L1: Frisian or Dutch L2: Dutch or Frisian L3: English	Grades six-eight	In grade six English vocabulary taught for the English content-based classes for	Higher proficiency in English was not achieved

				future grades, in grades seven and eight. English used as the medium two afternoons per week	

REFERENCES

Abello-Contesse, C. (2013). Bilingual and multilingual education: an overview of the
field. In C. Abello-Contesse, P. Chandler, M. Dolores López-Jiménez, & R.
Chacón-Beltrán (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education in the 21st century
building on experience*. (pp. 3-23). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? recasts, prompts, and L2
learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, *28*, 543-574. doi: 10
10170S0272263106060268

Björklund, S. (2005). Toward trilingual education in Vaasa/Vasa, Finland. *International
Journal of the Sociology of Language,* 171, 23-40.

Björklund, S., & Suni, I. (2000). The role of English as L3 in a Swedish immersion
programme in Finland: impacts on language teaching and language relations. In
J. Cenoz & U. Jessner (Eds.), *English in Europe: The acquisition of a third
language*. (pp. 198-221). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

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

Brinton, D., Snow, M., & Wesche, M. (2003). *Content-based second language
instruction*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press ELT.

Cultural ambassadors: North American language and culture assistants in Spain. (2014).
Retrieved from http://www.mecd.gob.es/eeuu/convocatorias-
programas/convocatorias-eeuu/auxiliares-conversacion-eeuu.html

Datos y cifras curso escolar 2011/2012. (2011). Retrieved from

http://www.mecd.gob.es/dctm/ministerio/horizontales/prensa/documentos/2011/0

9/datos-y-cifras-2011-2012?documentId=0901e72b80ea4d86

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2009). Communicative competence and the CLIL lesson. In Y. Ruiz

de Zarobe & R. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and language integrated*

learning evidence from research in Europe. (pp. 197-214). Tonawanda, NY:

Multilingual Matters.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language

pedagogy. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication*.

New York, NY: Routledge.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book An ESL/EFL*

teacher's course (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Díaz-Rico, L. (2004). *Teaching English learners: Strategies and methods*. Boston:

Pearson.

Fernández-Cezar, R., Harris, C., & Aguirre-Perez, C. (2009). *Secciones europeas-*

promoting bilingual programmes in Castilla-La Mancha, Spain. Retrieved from

International Conference ICT for language learning 2nd ed. website:

http://conference.pixel-online.net/ICT4LL2009/acceptedabstracts.php

Finch, A. E. (2009). European language education models: Implications for Korea.

English Teaching, 64(4), 95-122.

Gallardo del Puerto, F., Gomez Lacabex, E., & García Lecumberri, M. (2009). Testing

the effectiveness of content and language integrated learning in foreign

language contexts: The assessment of English pronunciation. In Y. Ruiz de

Zarobe & R. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and language integrated learning*

evidence from research in Europe. (pp. 63-80). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual

Matters.

Genesee, F. (2013). Insights into bilingual education from research on immersion

programs in Canada. In C. Abello-Contesse, P. Chandler, M. Dolores López-

Jiménez, & R. Chacón-Beltrán (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education in*

the 21st century building on experience. (pp. 24-41). Tonawanda, NY:

Multilingual Matters.

Gorter, D., & van der Meer, C. (2008). Developments in bilingual Frisian-Dutch

education in Friesland. *AILA Review AILA, 21*, 87-103. doi: 10.1075/aila.21.07gor

Iatcu, T. (2000). Teaching English as a third language to Hungarian-Romanian bilinguals.

In J. Cenoz & U. Jessner (Eds.), *English in Europe: The acquisition of a third*

language. (pp. 236-247). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

International Language Standards Explained. (2015). Retrieved from

http://www.cambridgeenglish.org/exams/cefr/

Lasagabaster, D. (2000). Three languages and three linguistic models in the Basque

education system. In J. Cenoz & U. Jessner (Eds.), *English in Europe: The*

acquisition of a third language. (pp. 179-197). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual

Matters.

Llinares, A., & Dafouz, E. (2010). Content and language integrated programmes in the

Madrid region: Overview and research findings. In D. Lasagabaster & Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain implementation, results and teacher training.* (pp. 95-114). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design.* Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mancebon, M., & Muñiz, M. (2007). Private versus public high schools in Spain: Disentangling managerial and programme efficiencies. *Journal of the operational research society*, *59*, 892-901. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jors.2602427

Maxwell-Reid, C. (2011). The challenge of contrastive discourse analysis: Reflecting on a study into the influence of English on students' written Spanish on a bilingual education program in Spain. *Written Communications*, doi: 10.1177/0741088311421890

Moughamian, A. C., Rivera, M. O., & Francis, D. J. (2009). Instructional models and strategies for teaching English language learners. Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.

Muñoz Lahoz, C., & Navés, T. (2007). CLIL in Spain. *Diposit Digital UB*, 160-165.

Muñoz, C. (2000). Bilingualism and trilingualism in school students in Catalonia. In J. Cenoz & U. Jessner (Eds.), *English in Europe: The acquisition of a third language.* (pp. 157-178). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Mureşan, V. (2011). In pursuit of authentic oral communication in the EFL classroom. *Romanian journal of English studies,* (8).

Norbert, F. (2011). *Bilingual competence and bilingual proficiency in child development.*

Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pérez Murillo, M. D. (2013). The students' views on their experience in a Spanish-English bilingual education program in Spain. In C. Abello-Contesse, P. Chandler, M. D. López-Jiménez, & R. Chacón-Beltrán (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education in the 21st century building on experience.* (pp. 179-202). New York: Multilingual Matters.

Pérez-Vidal, C. (2013). Perspectives and lessons from the challenges of CLIL experiences. In C. Abello-Contesse, P. Chandler, M. D. López-Jiménez, & R. Chacón-Beltrán (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education in the 21st century building on experience*. (pp. 59-82). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Ray, B., & Seely, C. (2005). *Fluency through TPR storytelling achieving real language acquisition in school.* New York, NY: Entry Publishing & Consulting.

Reichelt, M. (2006). English in a multilingual Spain. *English Today*, (03), 3-9. doi: http:dx.doi.org/10.1017/50266078406003026

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., & Catalan, J. (2009). The receptive vocabulary of EFL learners in two instructional contexts: CLIL versus non-CLIL instruction. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & J. Catalan (Eds.), *Content and language integrated learning: Evidence from research in Europe* (Vol. 41). (pp. 81-92). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. & Lasagabaster, D. (2010). The Basque autonomous community. In Lasagabaster, D. & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain implementation,*

results, and teacher training. (pp. 12-29). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge
Scholars Publishing.

Sánchez de Horcajo, J. J. (1995). Church, state and educational reform. In Boyd-Barrett,
O., O'Malley, P. (Eds.), *Education reform in contemporary Spain* (pp. 188-196).
New York: Routledge.

Serrano, R., & Muñoz, C. (2007). Same hours, different time distribution: Any difference
in EFL?. *System*, *35*(3), 305-321.

Szecsy, E. M. (2008). Communicative approach. In González, J. M. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia
of bilingual education* (pp. 156-159). doi:
http://ezproxy.hamline.edu:4254/10.4135/9781412963985

Whittaker, R., & Llinares, A. (2009). CLIL in social science classrooms: Analysis of
spoken and written productions. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & R. Jiménez Catalán
(Eds.), *Content and language integrated learning evidence from research in
Europe* (Vol. 41). (pp. 215-234). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Ting, Y-L. T. (2011). CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training. *ELT
Journal*, *65*(4), 495-498.

Ytsma, J. (2000). Trilingual primary education in Friesland. In J. Cenoz & U. Jessner
(Eds.), *English in Europe: The acquisition of a third language*. (pp. 222-235).
Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.