EduLingua

4/1 (2018)

Alkalmazott nyelvészeti folyóirat

Journal of Applied Linguistics

Impresszum

EduLingua

Alkalmazott nyelvészeti folyóirat

Journal of Applied Linguistics

Kiadja/Published by:
LoGoS Kutatócsoport
Szegedi Tudományegyetem, Angoltanár-képző és Alkalmazott Nyelvészeti Tanszék

Felelős kiadó:
Doró Katalin

A szerkesztőség és kiadó címe:
6722 Szeged, Egyetem u. 2.
Telefon: 62/544-024
E-mail: logos.szeged@gmail.com
Honlap: elteal.ieas-szeged.hu/logos

Megjelenik:
évente kétszer

Elérhető:
ingyenes, nyílt hozzáférésű az elteal.ieas-szeged.hu/edulingua címen

ISSN 2415-945X

EduLingua

Alkalmazott nyelvészeti folyóirat

Journal of Applied Linguistics

IV. évfolyam 1. szám

Volume 4 Number 1

2018

LoGoS
LANGUAGES GOALS STRATEGIES

Tartalomjegyzék
Table on Contents

Editorial

This issue of EduLingua is a collection of articles presented at a thematic seminar that we organized within the 14th ESSE (the European Society for the Study of English) Conference in Brno, Czech Republic. The ESSE conferences embrace a wide range of fields, including linguistics, literary, cultural and translation studies as well as English language teaching and learning, and unlike many other conferences, the ESSE adopts a bottom-up approach, which means that ESSE members co-convene seminars (i.e. thematic sessions) that they themselves come up with. The 2018 ESSE conference in Brno welcomed around 700 participants, who could attend, among other events, four plenary lectures, four roundtables, 18 parallel lectures and 67 seminars. The conference therefore can be regarded as one of the largest events in English and American studies that have taken place in the Czech Republic.

As members of ESSE national organizations we decided to propose a seminar within which scholars from different countries and backgrounds could meet, network, share experience and discuss the current state of the art in both local and global contexts of teaching English as a foreign language. We therefore opted for a rather general title Current Trends in Teaching English as a Foreign Language and outlined the possible formats of presentations as case studies introducing and/or evaluating the implementation of innovations as well as critical analyses, reviews and empirical research reports.

We appreciate that the field of English language teaching and learning has been earning a more prominent place at the ESSE conferences. It was a nice surprise for us that, alongside other seminars offered on teaching English for specific purposes and for special needs, our seminar attracted many interesting paper proposals from which we selected 12 papers for presentation. The papers from the Czech Republic (5), France (2), Hungary, Japan, Romania and Spain (2) were presented in three sessions, which included papers on language teaching, such as teaching strategies for bilingual teaching, space design in the language classroom, assessment in the Waldorf School, the use of film adaptations, or the adaptation of WebQuests. In addition, there were three papers on teacher education which addressed national policies and teacher education in France, final year teacher trainees' perspectives on effective teachers, and the role of translation in teacher education. Finally, there was a group of papers related to language learning and use, such as a corpus analysis of prepositions used by students in school-leaving essays, research on listening comprehension enhanced by 3D sound or introduction of a research project in the area of peer interaction.

Each of the three sessions was attended by many scholars from different countries and backgrounds who listened to the presentations and contributed to the lively discussion between individual presentations and sessions. The overall impression and

feedback that we received from the seminar participants were very positive and this issue can serve as evidence of the productive nature of the event.

This special issue comprises four articles which represent the thematic variety of the seminar. The paper by Věra Sládková analyzes the use of prepositions and adjectives by (presumably intermediate) Czech learners of English in their school-leaving essays and reveals that the learners overuse elementary adjectives and that they tend not to complement adjectives with prepositions. A discrepancy between the expected proficiency and the actual state of affairs can also be observed in the second paper by Jill Partridge Salomon, who discusses issues related to language policy and primary teacher education in France. While these two papers address the mainstream population, the article by Kateřina Dvořáková deals with the assessment in a Waldorf School in the Czech Republic. Assessment in this alternative school concentrates more on the pupils, their personalities and self-image, which results in formative and verbal forms of final reports which Dvořáková analyzes. Last but not least, the paper by Jesús Ángel González and Javier Barbero Andrés evaluates a way of developing internationalization at a Spanish university by introducing selected aspects of CLIL (content and language integrated learning). While the lecturers are generally aware of the need for a change in their ways of teaching, the study reveals that they may not yet be ready to adopt a different approach. Although all the four papers address an issue in language learning and teaching in a national or a more local context, it follows from the papers that some issues, tensions or recommendations seem to be of a more general nature. For instance, the relationship between an expected or desired state and the actual reality (be it the complexity of learner language, assessment, language proficiency of teachers, or teaching methodology) is reflectedin all four papers.

As seminar convenors we would like to thank all the presenters and participants for their contribution to a very productive dialogue, one of whose outcomes is this issue. We also appreciate the help of Linda Nepivodová and Nicola Fořtová, who helped us organize the event. As editors, we would like to thank many people who have contributed to the preparation and publication of this special issue, particularly all the authors and reviewers for their careful preparation and rigorous reviewing of the papers.

We are very happy to have contributed to this outcome of the seminar and we hope to be able to meet again at the 15th ESSE conference in Lyon in 2020.

Katalin Doró
František Tůma

DOI:10.14232/edulingua.2018.1.1

TANULMÁNYOK

STUDIES

Prepositions used with adjectives in English essays written by Czech secondary school students

Věra Sládková
Masaryk University in Brno

DOI:10.14232/edulingua.2018.1.2

This article focuses on the frequency and accuracy of dependent prepositions which complement the adjectives in CZEMATELC 2017, a corpus consisting of 390 essays from the written part of the national school-leaving exam leading to certification of secondary education in the Czech Republic. The research findings reveal that the learners used adjectives from A1 to B2 level, according to the CEFR. A limited number of A1 adjective lemmas was considerably overused, but showed the lowest proportion of dependent prepositional complementation. As learners tended not to complement the adjectives at A2 – B2 proficiency levels either, adjective-preposition collocations frequently co-occurring in native speaker corpora were identified for further remedial work. In addition, corpus-based discovery-learning was proposed as a solution because it encourages awareness and gradually leads to learner autonomy.

Key words: adjectives, dependent preposition, prepositional phrase, collocation, data-driven learning

1. Introduction

When teaching prepositions, English teachers should be aware of the influence of L1 on the pedagogical outcomes and, at the same time, be familiar with a range of strategies to diminish it. One way to deal with this problem, which would also address the issue regarding the polysemous nature of prepositions, is to teach them as collocations in combination with co-occurring words. The article attempts to address the issue of selecting adjective-preposition collocations for teaching by investigating a learner corpus and to highlight discovery-learning activities based on native speaker as well as learner corpora.

2. Prepositions co-occurring with adjectives

2.1 Dependent prepositions

Prepositions are "linking words that introduce prepositional phrases" (Biber, Conrad, & Leech, 2002, p. 28) and specify the relationship between two or more entities that they link, or express various other abstract relations. With the exception of stranded prepositions, they are inseparable from their complement, which can be a noun phrase, a gerund or an adverbial clause (Carter & McCarthy, 2006; Leech & Svartvik, 1993). Although many linguists find it hard to agree whether to categorise them as functional or lexical words, Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad and Finegan claim that prepositions

have "the ambiguous status of having borderline lexical membership while at the same time qualifying as functional words" (1999, p. 74) and argue that they can have both free and bound meanings. In English, bound prepositions can complement a verb, an adjective, a noun and an adjunct in a clause. The choice of the particular preposition is determined by the word the prepositional phrase complements. Bound prepositions contribute very little or no meaning, so they are largely called dependent prepositions in pedagogical grammar. They can act as one language unit with the preceding word, thus creating chunks of language with a high probability of co-occurrence.

2.2 Adjective complementation and CEFR levels

The adjective which determines what preposition must follow acts as subject predicative complementing a copular verb. Apart from a prepositional phrase, it can also be complemented with *to-infinitive*, or a *that-clause*. According to the *English Grammar Profile* (EGP), an online tool based on continuous research carried out on the *Cambridge Learner Corpus* (CLC), which provides detailed information about which language forms used with a particular meaning typically appear in learners' production tasks at a particular language level, both of these types of complementation are expected to be found in learners' production at B1 level, which is the required level for successful completion of the school-leaving exam in English in the Czech Republic. The EGP, however, does not offer a specific "can do statement" concerning prepositional phrases for this level, but it requires A2 learners to be able to form a very limited range of prepositional phrases and use them to complement adjectives.

2.3 Previous research

Previous research concerning Czech speakers and their use of adjective-preposition collocations is limited to Dušková's (1969) error analysis of texts written by Czech post-graduate students and Sparling's (1990) reference book aimed at helping Czech speakers of English to avoid typical errors.

In the international context, a large body of research has been aimed at collocations, but adjective-preposition collocations have been investigated mainly as collocational errors. They were found to be the second most problematic collocations in the oral production of Iranian learners by Sadeghi and Panahifar (2013). Other studies (Jafarpour & Koosha, 2006; Kulsitthiboon & Pongpairoj, 2018) compare various ways to teach them to data-driven learning.

2.4 Three approaches to teaching prepositions

The Prototype Approach (Lindstromberg, 1996) to teaching prepositions, which requires spatial or "prototypical" meaning as the starting point, recommends teachers to

look for examples of the most dominant meaning and to teach it first before showing the learners the figurative (i.e. psychologically related) meaning in other phrases with the same preposition. This approach favours the use of pictures and diagrams and claims to allow deeper learning than the so-called Traditional Approach (Lorincz & Gordon, 2012), which requires learners to focus on prepositions individually within a particular context and to create long lists to be learnt by heart. The shift from abstract definitions, which can be very difficult to comprehend, to concrete examples is apparent in the Collocation Approach (Sinclair, 1991). It encourages learners to pay attention to "the company [the prepositions] keep" (Kennedy, 1991, p. 215), i.e. looking for sequences of patterns containing prepositions, noticing recurring combinations, and learning prepositions in connection with words with a high probability of co-occurrence. This approach is based on the collocational principle (Sinclair, 1991) according to which people tend to process formulaic sequences of words as a single unit. Repeated exposure to these sequences is likely to facilitate learners' acquisition as Mueller's (2011) research has shown.

3. Corpora and language teaching

The concept of using corpora in language learning was developed by Johns (1991), who proposed using concordance printouts to stimulate discovery learning by observing similarities and differences in authentic language samples taken from corpora, creating hypotheses and testing them. In his view, the learner assumes the role of a researcher and the teacher becomes more a facilitator of the learning process than the provider of language input. Instead of top-down processing whereby the learners are given the rules in a rather passive way and are required to apply them when using the language, data-driven learning (DDL) as this concept is also known, requires bottom-up processing of examples in context in order to formulate conscious, or even unconscious, generalisations concerning patterns of structure and meaning. This explicit approach to learning requires an active attitude from the learners and is cognitively demanding because the learners are presented with linguistic data and have to recognise patterns and regularities in the language use. Gabrielatos acknowledges that DDL can be compatible with various methodological approaches "that accept explicit focus on language structure and use" (2005, p. 25) and favour noticing and awareness-raising activities. Moreover, corpora-based discovery-learning can be exploited in different phases of a lesson, such as during presentation, revision and feedback stages, and in preparation for skill-based activities or during them. According to Gabrielatos, it can be incorporated in a wide spectrum of lessons whose aims can range from "totally teacher-centred to totally learner-centred" (2005, p. 12). Tan (2000) proposes *Investigative-oriented learning* (IOL) in which corpus-based work is integrated within the analytical stage of task-based learning during which the teacher usually highlights the language features that have been or should have been used during the task stage. She

distinguishes three skills (noticing, hypothesising and experimenting) that learners develop with the help of the corpora before proceeding with the last stage of a task-based activity.

Using corpora alongside course books can help teachers overcome a major problem they frequently face when they cannot find enough examples of language features they want to focus on. This is in part due to the fact that the latest course books tend to rely mostly on authentic texts which contain a natural density of language phenomena. Although corpora cannot replace out-of-class extensive reading, Gabrielatos claims that they "can offer condensed exposure to language patterns" (2005, p. 11) with the advantage of both extensive and intensive reading because the learners can observe a particular language feature taken from a large number of texts and at the same time concentrate on it. The learners have to be guided by the teacher (Bennett, 2010; Gabrielatos, 2005) until they acquire the necessary noticing skills which enable them to recognise patterns independently. Besides, language proficiency also needs to be taken into consideration when deciding how much guidance is needed. Gabrielatos (2005) holds that corpus-designed activities should direct learners away from the tendency to discover single correct answers and fixed rules and towards noticing alternatives and their contingency.

Corpus-designed activities are generally divided into hands-on and hands-off activities (Boulton, 2012). Computer-based hands-on activities, also known as hard version (Leech, 1997), require learners to have direct access to a corpus, whereas hands-off activities, or soft version, require the teacher to explore the corpus and create a set of activities, usually in paper form, for analysis in the classroom. These teacher-prepared activities may be more suitable for learners at low levels and those without any experience with DDL because the teachers can select sentences at the right level of difficulty and adapt them for a particular purpose (Gabrielatos, 2005). Many researchers (Ackerley, 2017; Bardovi-Harlig, Mossman & Su, 2017; Boulton & Cobb, 2017) are currently trying to obtain experimental evidence in order to compare the effectiveness of both approaches for particular groups of learners or language features.

Several studies (Barabadi & Khajavi, 2017; Boulton & Cobb, 2017) have found DDL to be more effective than using skills-based communicative approaches, probably because DDL is based on form-focused instruction, visual input, and repeated exposure to language features and expects active cognitive involvement from learners, which should gradually lead to their greater independence. The improved attitudes of students to learning after DDL was evidenced by Huei Lin (2016), who also noticed that non-native teachers felt more empowered by the use of corpora because they themselves developed a greater awareness of the language. Jafarpour and Koosha (2006) compared two approaches to teaching prepositions and their collocational patterns and found that a DDL approach based on concordancing outperformed conventional teaching. Vyatkina (2016) compared the hands-off DDL approach to traditional instruction when teaching low-intermediate L1 English learners of German and found it to be more effective for

learning new verb-preposition collocations, but equally effective for improving the knowledge of previously learned collocations.

Corpora in teaching writing have been largely associated with learner corpora, which enable a more precise description of learner language used in written communication in order to identify areas that need special attention in teaching. Comparative studies have focused mainly on the overuse and underuse of specific features of interlanguage in comparison to the language of native speakers, whereas error-analyses have tended to identify problematic language choices in the finished texts (i.e. Chuang & Nesi, 2006; Hinkel, 2005; Jaworska, Krummes, & Ensslin, 2015; Lee & Chen, 2009). However, recently, corpora have been used by learners to discover patterns when preparing for writing or during the writing itself, as well as for self-correction and remedial work after writing. These two different approaches to using corpora to improve writing have been termed pattern hunting and pattern refining by Kennedy and Miceli (2017), who present an account of a successful attempt to equip learners with the skills to both observe a corpus hands-on and to borrow chunks of language in order to enrich their writing and improve its accuracy. Tono, Satake and Miura (2014) reveal that learners are more likely to correct omission and addition errors than misformation errors when consulting a corpus.

4. Methodology

4.1 Research aim

If we want to improve teaching in order to facilitate the development of production abilities, it is necessary to identify the areas that require special attention and suggest teaching strategies which have been found to be effective through research. Gathering authentic samples of learner language from a particular exam situation and subjecting them to thorough analysis by means of corpus analytical tools is one way to do this. Moreover, learner data could be further exploited to create teaching materials and remedial activities informed by native speaker corpora in order to gradually prepare learners for corpus-based discovery-learning. The aims of this study are therefore as follows:

(1) To determine to what extent Czech secondary school students attempted to exploit the regularity of adjective-preposition co-occurrence in their school-leaving exam essays written in 2017.

(2) To identify the accurate and inaccurate uses of prepositions complementing adjectives.

(3) To ascertain if there is any relationship between the frequency and/or accuracy of adjective-preposition collocations in the studied essays and the CEFR level of the adjectives used.

(4) To propose how the results of the research and the data from the learner corpus CZEMATELC 2017 could be used to create remedial activities.

4.2 Research design

Before attempting to describe adjective-preposition collocations in learner language, it is worth clarifying that this specific lexico-grammatical feature is approached in the sense outlined by Halliday (1992), who views grammar and lexis as the notional ends of a lexicogrammatical continuum. It is analysed from the perspective of Pattern Grammar (Hunston & Francis, 2000), which allows grammar to be the starting point of the analysis, although lexis is its main focus. As the learner language is expected to be much more variable than native speaker language, it is important to avoid comparative fallacy, i.e. failure to acknowledge the unique features of interlanguage. Consequently, frequency analysis, which can also draw attention to language feature avoidance (Ellis & Barkhuizen 2005, p. 98), was chosen as the main research method. The identification of adjectives followed by dependent prepositions was carried out by means of a freely available online corpus analytical tool, AntConc 3.4.4w (Anthony, 2014). The manual frequency counts had to be accompanied by detailed qualitative analysis of the context because learner language is full of inconsistencies and therefore has to be checked to see if a particular form is used with the appropriate meaning. This mixed research paradigm is best interpreted in relation to an external model which can make the frequency data meaningful. As a result, the relationship between the frequency of correctly and incorrectly used dependent prepositions and the CEFR level of adjectives was ascertained by a simple statistical comparison of the percentages of adjectives assigned to individual CEFR levels according to the *English Vocabulary Profile* (EVP). This online tool was chosen despite the fact that CLC, a 50 million-word corpus on which EVP is based contains a relatively small share of language samples from native speakers of Slavonic languages, including Czech speakers of English (Proudfoot, 2010), hence it is questionable if the specified linguistic forms used to express meaning aligned to each CEFR level apply also to Czech speakers of English. However, Salamoura and Saville claim that the large amount of language samples across all major language families allows extensive research of the involvement of the mother tongue in "a learner's linguistic profile [and] cross-linguistic differences per CEFR level is one of the main premises under investigation" (2010, p. 109).

4.3 Context and participants

The essays were written by final-year students in Czech upper-secondary education (i.e. aged 19 and above), the majority of whom had studied English for 11 years. Czech was most likely their first language. In most cases, English would have been their L2, but it could also have been their L3 or L4, which would imply considerably less time spent on English language instruction (in extreme cases only 4 years). As well as English, the learners might have been also learning German, French, Spanish or Russian. However, the detailed information about the learners is unavailable for the legal reasons as confidentiality has to be strictly observed in the case of a high-stake exam.

4.4 Learner corpus

The CZEMATELC (Czech Maturita Exam Learner Corpus) 2017 consists of 390 essays which were written in May 2017 by 195 students and obtained by means of consent from the Centre of Educational Assessment (CERMAT). It is a random sample of essays because the sets of essays from each school were chosen randomly by a computer at CERMAT and allotted to individual assessors, one of whom is the author of this study. The analysed essays represent 0.455% of all essays based on the same assignment and written at the same time within 60 minutes. The raw corpus contains 44,044 tokens and 2,765 types.

The corpus consists of two different types of essays: a longer one (120–150 words) and a shorter one (60–70 words). The longer one was a story about an unexpected visitor and the shorter one required the students to ask a friend to lend them a bicycle. In both of them, the students were prompted in Czech about what to include in each paragraph. The students were allowed to use Czech-English or English-English dictionaries which can contain appendices with grammar explanations, but dictionaries with "essential descriptions of particular text types" (Centrum pro zjišťování výsledků ve vzdělávání (Centre of Educational Assessment), 2017, p. 1–2) were not allowed.

4.5 Procedure

Firstly, an alphabetical list of all types was created by means of AntConc 3.4.4w (Anthony, 2014). The types that could be identified as correctly spelt adjectives and the types that looked similar to adjectives (e.g. *affraid*) or correctly or incorrectly spelt adverbs were viewed in concordance lines to see if they occupied the attributive or predicative positions typical of adjectives. Those words whose form and/or function could be attributed to adjectives were categorised according to their position in the sentence and the way in which they were complemented (i.e. prepositional phrase, *that-clause*, *to-infinitive*, adverbial clauses, no complementation). The aim was to find out the frequency with which the identified adjectives were used in attributive and predicative positions, select those that frequently co-occur with prepositions if they

occupy predicative positions, and to pinpoint the successful and unsuccessful attempts to complement them with prepositional phrases.

For this reason, the accuracy of dependent prepositions was judged with the help of the *Cambridge Advanc*ed *Learner's Dictionary* (2008). In cases where the dependent preposition or the type of complementation used in CZEMATELC 2017 were not found in the dictionary, a relatively large reference corpus, the *Brown Family (C8 tags)* consisting of 5,748,130 tokens and 121,888 types, was used. It includes texts of a wide range of genres both from American and British English: the *Brown Corpus* (texts from 1961), the *Frown Corpus* (texts from 1992), the *LOB* (texts from 1961) and the *FLOB* (texts from 1991). If any instances of the investigated phenomena with the appropriate meaning were found in the reference corpus, they were considered accurate regardless of the frequency of their use. As the reference corpus did not contain current language, a university educated native speaker of British English (M.A. TESOL, DELTA) was consulted in case of any doubt and when no correspondence was found.

Finally, the adjectives found in CZEMATELC 2017 that tend to be complemented with prepositional phrases were assigned to the CEFR levels at which they are commonly used in productive tasks by learners using the *English Vocabulary Profile* and the relationship between the frequency and accuracy of dependent prepositions used with them at individual levels was investigated.

4.6 Limitations

Several factors could have influenced the results of the research. Firstly, the corpus is relatively small, which could raise doubts concerning balance and representativeness (cf. McEnery et al., 2006). Balance was achieved by including an equal number of essays based on the same prompts. This ensures close comparability and reduces the importance of the need for a large corpus. Nevertheless, analysing essays based on the same assignment has a tremendous impact on the results because the task restricts the range of language features used and considerably influences the frequency of their use.

Secondly, the corpus represents merely examples taken from an exam situation, which may render the examples unrepresentative of Czech secondary school students' performance as a whole. However, analysing language samples from an exam situation will certainly help to inform the teaching in preparation for the exam.

Thirdly, the research does not attempt to describe the students' production purely in terms of accuracy. It focuses only on adjectives and the correct use of dependent prepositions that follow them regardless of the accuracy of the rest of the sentences.

Finally, the results can also be influenced by the analytical tool and the method used. Frequency analysis does not provide any explanations and reveals only the frequency data concerning the features the researcher decides to count, so a reliable analytical tool is very important. For this reason, AntConc 3.4.4w (Anthony, 2014) was

chosen because it can analyse a raw corpus, and the necessary manual analysis is relatively fast. However, human error should be taken into consideration.

5. Results and discussion

Based on the *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2008), CZEMATELC 2017 contains 50 lemmas of adjectives within the A1 – B2 language proficiency levels on the CEFR that could potentially be complemented by prepositional phrases. Two of them *allergic* and *enraged* could not be assigned to a particular CEFR level, hence they were included within adjectives at B2 level for statistical purposes and one of them *(easy*) was complemented by a preposition in such a way that together they created an idiomatic expression which was out of the scope of this research. Therefore it was not analysed further. Within the studied adjectives, there are also 12 lemmas with some kind of spelling inconsistency, such as **tipical*, **alergic*, **affraid*, **carefull, *suprised* (n=22), **supprised*, **exietet*. Several adverbs, for example *badly* (n=2), *carefully* (n=1) and *gratefully* (n=1), carried the same functions in the sentences as adjectives, so they were included in the analysis as well as all the inconsistently spelt adjectives. The learners also confused adjectives with suffixes –ed/-ing, for example: *exciting* (n=1) and**suprising* (n=1), as well as the meaning of the following adjectives: *afraid* vs *worried* and *scared* vs *scary*.

The raw frequency of the studied adjectives was 705. However, the learners attempted to complement them with prepositional phrases only in 53 cases. This means that only 7.5 percent of all the analysed adjectives were complemented by either a correct or incorrect preposition, or it was clear that a preposition was omitted. Moreover, the learners used a correct dependent preposition in only 34 instances. The data in Table 1 show the frequency information for the individual CEFR levels.

Table 1 Comparison of raw frequency of analysed adjectives at different CEFR Levels

CEFR level	Raw frequency	Lemmas	Percentage of attempts	Number of attempts	Correct prepositions	Success rate
A1	482	12	5.8%	28	19	68%
A2	115	13	14%	16	10	62%
B1	97	18	6.2%	6	4	67%
B2	11	4+2	27.3%	3	1	33%
Total	705	49	7.5%	53	34	62%

Source: CZEMATELC 2017

As Table 1 shows, the learners appear to have been reluctant to complement adjectives with prepositional phrases with dependent prepositions in order to create more complex syntactic structures. This could be attributed to the typological proximity between Czech and English because the learners' mother tongue can only offer an exact equivalent in exceptional cases for the simple reason that most English adjectives

followed by dependent prepositions would be translated using different structural patterns. When relating the lemmas to language proficiency levels it would seem that the learners tended to overuse a limited number of A1 lemmas and rarely attempted to complement these adjectives with prepositional phrases (only in 5.8 percent of instances). However, the success rate is comparatively high at 68 percent. This may imply that the learners relied on a limited number of well-known adjectives which they encountered at the beginning of their English language instruction in simple syntactic structures, but they might not have acquired them adequately in combination with prepositional phrases later. This assumption is based on Philip (2007) who complains that teaching of collocations and new meanings of items that have already been learnt tends to be neglected.

With the growing level of difficulty, the raw frequency of adjectives at individual CEFR levels decreased. However, the number of lemmas grew, with the exception of B2 level. This group also showed the highest proportion of attempts to complement adjectives with prepositional phrases, but the success rate in terms of the correct use of prepositions is rather low at 33 percent. One possible interpretation could be that the learners were reluctant to take risks in an exam situation and therefore avoided using vocabulary on the margins of their language proficiency or beyond. The average success rate of 62 percent for all levels might also imply that the learners opted to complement adjectives with prepositional phrases only when they were relatively certain.

Table 2 reveals that the learners tended to use adjectives predominantly in predicative positions without complementing them with prepositional phrases. A1 adjectives appear to be exceptional because the difference between the numbers of adjectives used in attributive (n=210) and predicative positions (n=236) was relatively small. The data also reveal that the number of inappropriately used prepositions is so low that it is very difficult to make a general observation about error patterns, although the influence of the mother-tongue may lie behind the incorrect use of the preposition *on* and several omissions.

Table 2 Adjectives in attributive and predicative positions at A1 – B2 Levels on the CEFR

CEFR level	Attributive position	Predicative position				
		Without prepositional complement	Correct prepositions	Incorrect prepositions	Omission	Confused meaning
A1	210	208	19	9	0	0
A2	2	97	10	2	2	2
B1	8	83	4	0	1	1
B2	0	8	1	2	0	0

Source: CZEMATELC 2017

5.1 A1 adjectives

The raw frequency of A1 adjectives is 482, but 36 of them were identified in greetings and incoherent sentences, so they were discarded from further analyses. The remaining ones are represented by 12 lemmas with very high frequency. The most frequent were: *good* (n=211), *happy* (n=144), *nice* (n=61), *bad* (n=14), *sorry* (n=13), *hard* (n=10), *tired* (n=7), *famous* (n=7). Some of them occupied predominantly attributive positions in sentences, namely the adjective *famous*, which is used only in this position as in (1).

1) **After the cinema we was at the famous restaurant Amigo in České Budějovice.* (1C-17-1.txt)

Most of the A1 adjectives in predicative positions assumed the role of subject predicative without being complemented further. Their number is relatively high as shown in Table 3. The table also shows that the learners complemented some of the adjectives with *to-infinitive* or various clauses as in (2) and (3).

2)* *I was so happy to see Diana after long time*. (1C-17-11.txt)
3) **I said, that I'm sorry, that I don't know, who is it*. (1P-17-1.txt)

Thorough analysis of both the clauses in which the learners used to complement the adjectives and the sentences without any complementation appear to indicate that merely a few sentences in the corpus would be considerably improved if prepositional phrases were used, largely because the learners would have avoided dealing with complicated grammar that leads to errors or misunderstandings. Moreover, a cursory look at the A1 adjectives in the reference corpus *Brown Family (C8 tags)*, reveals that even native speakers rarely complement these adjectives with prepositional phrases (i.e. *good at* – 0.7%, *good for* – 1.6%, *happy about* – 1.6%, *happy with* – 4%). A considerably higher density of these phenomena in learner texts would therefore be unnatural. The only A1 adjectives that co-occur with prepositions more frequently in the corpus were: *different from* (8.6%), *sorry for* (11.7%) and *tired of* (27%). Consequently, these collocations require more attention when teaching.

Table 3 A1 Adjectives in predicative position not complemented by prepositional phrases

Adjective	To-infinitive	That-clause	Reason clause	When-clause	If-clause	Without any complement	Total
happy	10	25	40	5	3	44	125
good	1					28	29
nice		2				17	19
bad						7	7
sorry	2	2			1	6	11
hard						5	5
tired		1				6	6
clever						3	3
bored						1	1
different						1	1
important						1	1

Source: CZEMATELC 2017

The number of correctly used dependent prepositions complementing A1 adjectives is relatively low and it can be illustrated by the following examples (4) and (5).

4) *Is Thursday good for you*? (2M-17-7.txt)
5) *I wasn't very happy about this visit*. (1M-17-3.txt)

No omissions were identified and the number of incorrect dependent prepositions was also very low. As can be seen in Table 4, complementing the adjective *happy* with the preposition *from* is the most frequent error in this group of adjectives. However, this error only appears three times as in (6) and could be attributed to mother tongue influence. The confusion between two prepositions that can complement one adjective can be seen in (7). The learner probably blended two constructions: people can be *good to* other people, but a thing or situation can be *good for* them. The cross-linguistic influence is more noticeable in the overuse of the preposition *on* that incorrectly complements several adjectives across all four language proficiency levels. In this group of adjectives, it complements the adjective *good* as in (8), especially as the whole sentence appears to be an exact translation from Czech.

6) **He was nice and so friendly. I was so happy from him*. (1L-17-11.txt)
7) **It will be really good to me, if you borrow me your bike*. (2H-17-12.txt)
8) **Now she is hospitalized and she is good on it.* (1J-17-4.txt)

Table 4 A1 Adjectives with dependent prepositions

Adjectives	Correct prepositions		Incorrect prepositions	
good	good **for** sb	4	good **on** sth	2
			good **to** sb	1
happy	happy **about** sth	1	happy **from** sb	3
	happy **for** sb	1	happy **of** sth	1
	happy **for** sth	6		
hard	hard **for** sb	1	hard **in** sth	1
important	important **for** sb	1		
nice	nice **to** sb	4	nice **from** sb	1
			nice **too** sb	1
sorry	sorry **for** sth	1		
Total		**19**		**10**

Source: CZEMATELC 2017

5.2 A2 adjectives

The A2 adjectives in the studied school-leaving essays seldom assumed attributive positions because they largely belong to a group of adjectives that have a stronger natural preference for predicative positions (cf. Biber et al., 2002). A2 adjectives in the corpus complemented the following verbs: *to be* (n=102), *to feel* (n=9), *to make* (n=3), *to look* (n=2), however, in most cases they were not complemented further. Apart from prepositional phrases, they were complemented with *that-clauses* merely five times. The adjective *surprised* was complemented with a *that-clause* four times (9) and the adjective *mad* once (10).

9) *I was very surprised that he was still speaking Czech very well…*(1D-17-2.txt)
10)**When I heard doorbell ringing I was pretty mad that I must leave my computer.* (1D-17-7.txt)

This group also shows the second highest proportion of attempts to complement the adjectives with prepositional phrases with a greater than average success rate. This may be explained by the fact that many of these adjectives (such as *afraid of, worried about, full of, interested in*) are already presented with dependent prepositions in elementary and pre-intermediate course books, which can be considered "one of the primary sources of [foreign language] input in the classroom" (Tono, 2004, p. 45). If extensive opportunities to practice them in different types of exercises is lacking, they are at least included in the input activities. However, the raw frequency of attempts (n=16) and the slightly greater than average success rate seem to be low, especially as the above mentioned adjective-preposition collocations (*interested in* – 58%, *worried about* – 35%, *afraid of* – 29%, *full of* – 24%) show a high percentage of instances of co-occurrence in the reference corpus. It can be argued that an attempt should be made to look for ways to enhance their acquisition. All the successful and unsuccessful attempts

to complement these adjectives in CZEMATELC 2017 are presented in Table 5. The adverb-adjective confusion and inappropriate spelling of the adjective *careful* can be illustrated by the two following examples. The first one uses an incorrect preposition (11), and the second one, which does not mention the bicycle directly, uses a correct dependent preposition (12).

11) **I promise, i will be very carefully at your bike. Please answer me asap*. (2E-17-4.txt)
12) **… for that one day and I will be very carefull with it*. (2E-17-2.txt)

Dependent prepositions were omitted twice. The first example, (13), is in a collocation which does not tend to cause problems to Czech learners and the second example, (14), an adjective followed by a clause, might be attributed to the fact that the learner was trying to complement the adjective in a similar fashion to that possible in Czech by separating the clause with a comma.

13) **This invite was full* happy feeling, memories because…* (1S-17-5.txt)
14) **I didn't expect anyone, so I was quite interested*, who could it be*. (1I-17-3.txt)

The corpus also contains two examples (15) and (16) in which the dependent prepositions appear to be used correctly, but the adjective *afraid* seems to be used instead of the adjective *worried.* This is probably due to the influence of Czech, in which the exact equivalent for fear or being afraid is also commonly used when talking about worries.

15) **I gave him some piluls on sick. I afraid about him, but he was fine he had only diarrhoea*. (1S-17-6.txt)
16) **I am a little bit afraid about leaving me again.* (1F-17-12.txt)

Table 5 A2 Adjectives with dependent prepositions

Adjectives	Correct prepositions		Incorrect prepositions		Omission		Confused meaning	
afraid	afraid **of** sth	2					afraid **about** sth	**2**
busy	busy **with** sth	1						
careful	careful **with** sth	1	careful **at** sth	1				
full	full **of** sth	3			full *sth	1		
interested	interested **in** sth	1			interested * sth	1		
mad	mad **at** sb	1						
surprised			surprised **from** sb	1				
worried	worried **about** sb	1						
Total		10		2		2		2

Source: CZEMATELC 2017

5.3 B1 adjectives

The B1 adjectives in CZEMATELC 2017 have a lot in common. Most of them assume predicative positions without being complemented further, with the exception of seven adjectives that the learners tried to complement with prepositional phrases and six adjectives that were complemented with *to-infinitive* and/or different clauses. This is documented in Table 6. The only adjective that appears merely in attributive positions is the adjective *typical/tipical* (n=7) and the adjective *grateful* (n=16), which appears in this position only once.

Table 6 B1 Adjectives in predicative position not complemented by prepositional phrases

Adjective	To-infinitive	That-clause	Wh-clause	If-clause	Reason clause	Without any complement	Total
amazed			1			1	2
curious			1			0	1
excited	1	1				3	5
grateful		1	1	3		10	15
satisfied		1				1	2
scared	2	1			3	32	38

Source: CZEMATELC 2017

The relatively high frequency of the adjective *scared* (n=39) might have been affected by the task to a certain extent because many of the learners exploited the feeling of fear

in their narratives about an unexpected visitor. It appears eight times in the form of *scary*, which suggests that learners tend to confuse the meaning of these adjectives. This adjective is also complemented in several different ways. It is complemented with *to-infinitive* (17), with subordinate clauses starting with *because* (18) and with a *that-clause* (19), although in the last example the adjective *scared* more likely expresses the meaning of the adjective *worried*.

17) **I was wery surprised and a bit scared to open the doors but when I looked out…*(1P-17-6.txt)
18) **We was so scary because our favorite movie was scary movie…*(1P-17-11.txt)
19) **I always wanted to met my dad, but I was scared that we wont understand each other.* (1B-17-5.txt)

This confusion is similar to that in the only example in which the adjective is complemented by an inappropriate preposition (20).

20) **This moment I never won't to experience again, because I was so scared of my life and I was from this "an unexpected visitor" never home alone.* (1P-17-8.txt)

As evidenced in Table 7, four adjectives at this level appear only once, but they are always complemented with a prepositional phrase with a correct dependent preposition. These adjectives are *concentrated* (21), *frightened* (22), *proud* (23) and *suitable* (24).

21) *I was highly concentrated on studying for my school leaving exam* (1K-17-3.txt)
22) **Nothing was happend but we was really frightened of him.* (1F-17-13.txt)
23) *I'm very proud of my father and his outstanding work.* (1H-17-2.txt)
24)… *on Wednesday at 5 PM if it is suitable for you.* (2F-17-16.txt)

This may indicate that they were acquired together as collocations. However, their very low frequency may imply collocation avoidance which can be identified even in the written production of advanced learners (Nesselhauf, 2003; Philip, 2007). Interestingly though, three of these adjective-preposition collocations (*proud of* – 41%, *suitable for* – 28%, *satisfied with* – 27%) also tend to frequently co-occur in the reference corpus. The high percentage of co-occurring instances applies also to *concentrated on* (22%), which appears in CZEMATELC 2017 merely once, and *amazed at* (35%) and *typical of* (26%), which were not found at all.

Table 7 B1Adjectives with dependent prepositions

Adjectives	Correct prepositions		Incorrect prepositions		Omission		Confused meaning	
concentrated	concentrated **on** sth	1						
curious					curious *sth	1		
frightened	frightened **of** sth	1						
proud	proud **of** sb	1						
scared							scared **of** sth	1
suitable	suitable **for** sb	1						
Total		4		0		1		1

Source: CZEMATELC 2017

5.4 B2 adjectives

Only individual instances of B2 adjectives, with the exception of **alergic* (n=2) and *enthusiastic* (n=5), were found. Interestingly, these two adjectives (*allergic to* – 27%, *enthusiastic about* – 13.5%) frequently co-occur with the prepositions in the reference corpus. The latter is also the only adjective at this level that is complemented once with a *that-clause*. As evidenced in Table 8, the only adjective correctly complemented with a preposition in this group is *exhausted* (25).

25) *I came home exhausted from work and wanted to pour a glass of…* (1L-17-2.txt)

The two following examples of incorrect complementation (26) and (27) come from one essay.

26) **But John is alergic on cheese and milk. I forgot it.* (1S-17-6.txt)
27) **Now I never forget on his alergic on cheese and milk. (1S-17-6.txt)*

They illustrate incorrect spelling of the adjective and also possibly the influence of the mother-tongue both on the spelling of the adjective and on the choice of the preposition because the exact equivalent of this preposition would follow this adjective in Czech. The low frequencies of B2 adjectives and the low success rate with regards to complementing them with dependent prepositions may imply that the difficulty of B2 vocabulary was beyond the learners' abilities. Moreover, it would seem that they were unwilling to take risks with language and therefore relied on simple syntactic structures because they knew that accuracy was an important criterion that would affect their grade.

Table 8 B2 Adjectives with Dependent Prepositions

Adjectives	Correct prepositions		Incorrect prepositions	
allergic			*allergic **on** sth	2
exhausted	exhausted **from** sth	1		
Total		2		2

Source: CZEMATELC 2017

5.5 Adjective-preposition collocations selected for teaching

In common with other studies (see e.g., Nesselhauf, 2003; Philip, 2007), this research attempted to determine which collocations need to be taught explicitly by identifying several adjective-preposition collocations at relevant CEFR levels which appear both in the learners' production and also tend to co-occur strongly in the reference corpus *Brown Family (C8 tags)* (see Table 9).

Table 9 Collocations selected for teaching

CEFR level	Collocations
A1	tired of, sorry for, different from
A2	interested in, worried about, afraid of, full of
B1	proud of , amazed at, suitable for, satisfied with, typical of, concentrated on
B2	allergic to, enthusiastic about

6. Conclusion and implications for teaching

The study aimed to investigate the frequency and accuracy of adjective-preposition collocations in CZEMATELC 2017 to see which collocations and how successfully were acquired and to select collocations for teaching. Corpus-based discovery-learning based on data not only from a native speaker corpus, but also from CZEMATELC 2017 is proposed.

The adjectives that could be potentially complemented with prepositional phrases range between A1 to B2 levels. However, the majority of learners opted not to complement most of them with prepositional phrases, which may imply that they failed to acquire adjectives with dependent prepositions as collocations. This raises serious doubts about the overall proficiency of Czech secondary school students because collocational knowledge was found by Williams (2000) to correlate strongly with the general proficiency of EFL learners. The number of correctly and incorrectly used adjective-preposition collocations was so low, that identifying error patterns and patterns of appropriate use was very difficult. However, the L1 influence as well as the tendency to complement correctly B1 adjectives with very low frequency was noticeable.

The collocations that have been selected on the basis of this research as requiring special attention in teaching should be taught as one unit and observed both in texts and

hands-off activities derived from native speaker corpora. Secondary schools are among those institutions where hands-on activities would be difficult to apply and where the relatively low language proficiency and inexperience of learners with corpus tools would create further barriers to adopting data-driven learning. However, hands-off activities that stimulate observation of adjective complementation in simulated concordance lines may aid input enhancement by emphasising the target structure. Repeated exposure through several activities may also provide input enrichment. The first phase, when learners work in groups and share their discoveries and support each other, should be followed by a clarification from the teacher that enables the confirmation or correction of hypotheses. As an additional tool, it is suggested to observe selected sentences and/or paragraphs from CZEMATELC 2017 because highlighting the features of learner language on their own could make some writing problems seem more obvious. In addition, being able to improve those sentences using appropriate collocations might be an important step towards consolidating collocation knowledge and developing writing skills.

References

Ackerley, K. (2017). Effects of corpus-based instruction on phraseology in learner English. *Language Learning & Technology, 21*(3), 195–216.

Anthony, L. (2014). *AntConc*. Tokio: Waseda University. Retrieved from www.laurenceanthony.net/software/anconc/

Barabadi, E., & Khajavi, Y. (2017). The effect of data-driven approach to teaching vocabulary on Iranian students' learning of English vocabulary. *Cogent education, 4,* 1–13. Retrieved from: https://www.cogentoa.com/article/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1283876.pdf

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Su, Y. (2017). The effect of corpus-based instruction on pragmatic routines. *Language Learning & Technology*, *21*(3), 76–103.

Bennett, G.R. (2010). *Using corpora in the language learning classroom - corpus linguistics for teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Leech, G. (2002). *Longman student grammar of spoken and written English.* Harlow: Pearson.

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English.* Harlow: Pearson.

Boulton, A. (2012). Hands-on/hands-off: Alternative approaches to data-driven learning. In J. Thomas & A. Boulton (Eds.), *Input, process and product: Developments in teaching and language corpora,* (pp. 152–168). Brno: Masaryk University Press.

Boulton, A., & Cobb, T. (2017). Corpus use in language learning: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 67*(2), 348–393.

Cambridge University Press. (2015). English Grammar Profile. Retrieved from http://englishprofile.org/english-grammar-profile/egp-online

Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (2006). *Cambridge grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Centrum pro zjišťování výsledků ve vzdělávání (Centre of Educational Assessment). (2014). *Katalog požadavků zkoušek společné části maturitní zkoušky* (Catalogue of requirements for the common part of the school-leaving exam). Praha: Author.

Centrum pro zjišťování výsledků ve vzdělávání (Centre of Educational Assessment). (2017). *Písemná práce z cizích jazyků* (Written part of the school-leaving exam in foreign languages). Praha: Author.

Chuang, F-Y., & Nesi, H. (2006). An analysis of formal errors in a corpus of L2 English produced by Chinese students. *Corpora, 1*(2), 251–271.

CQPweb v3.2.29. (2008–2016). Brown Family (C8 tags). Retrieved from https://cqpweb.lancs.ac.uk/.

Dušková, L. (1969). On sources of errors in foreign language learning. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 7*(1), 11–36.

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

English Profile. (2012). English Vocabulary Profile. Retrieved from http://vocabulary.englishprofile.org/staticfiles/about.html

Gabrielatos, C. (2005). Corpora and language teaching: Just a fling of wedding bells? *TESL-EJ, 8*(4), 1–39.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1992). Language as system and language as instance: the corpus as a theoretical construct. In J. Svartvik (Ed.*), Directions in corpus linguistics: proceedings of the Nobel Symposium 82, Stockholm, 4 – 8 August 1991,* (pp. 61–77). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hinkel, E. (2005). Hedging, inflating, and persuading in L2 academic writing. *Applied Language Learning, 15*(1, 2), 29–53.

Huei Lin, M. (2016). Effect of corpus-aided language learning in the EFL grammar classroom: A case study of students' learning attitudes and teachers' perceptions in Taiwan. *TESOL Quarterly, 50*, 871–893.

Hunston, S., & Francis, G. (2000). *Pattern Grammar: A corpus-driven approach to the lexical grammar of English.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jafarpour, A., & Koosha, M. (2006). Data-driven learning and teaching of collocation of prepositions: the case study of Iranian EFL students. Research on foreign languages. *Journal of Faculty of Letters and Humanities, 49*(200), 1–31.

Jaworska, S., Krummes, C., & Ensslin, A. (2015). Formulaic sequences in native and non-native argumentative writing in German. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 20*(4), 500–525.

Johns, T. (1991). From printout to handout: Grammar and vocabulary teaching in the context of data-driven learning. *ERL Journal, 4*, 27–45.

Kennedy, C., & Miceli, T. (2017). Cultivating effective corpus use by language learners. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 30*(1-2), 91–114.

Kennedy, G. D. (1991). Collocations: Where grammar and vocabulary teaching meet. In S. Anivan (Ed.), *Language teaching methodology for the nineties,* (pp. 212–229). Singapore: RELC.

Kulsitthiboon, S., & Pongpairoj, N. (2018). Cooperative corpus consultation for acquisition of adjective + preposition collocations. *Journal of Language Studies, 18*(3), 57–72.

Lee, D. Y. W., & Chen, S. X. (2009). Making a bigger deal of the smaller words: Function words and other key items in research writing by Chinese learners. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18,* 281–296.

Leech, G. (1997). Teaching and language corpora: A convergence. In A. Wichmann, S. Fliegelstone, T. McEnery, & G. Knowles (Eds.), *Teaching and language corpora,* (pp. 11–23). Harlow: Longman.

Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1993). *A communicative grammar of English*. Harlow: Longman.

Lindstromberg, S. (1996). Prepositions: Meaning and method. *ELT Journal, 50*(3), 225–237.

Lorincz, K. & Gordon, R. (2012). Difficulties in learning prepositions and possible solutions. *Linguistic Portfolios, 1*(1), 1–5.

McEnery, T., Xiao, R., & Tono, Y. (2006). *Corpus-based language studies: An advanced resource book.* London: Routledge.

Mueller, C. M. (2011). English learners' knowledge of prepositions: Collocational knowledge or knowledge based on meaning? *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics, 39*(4), 480–490.

Nesselhauf, N. (2003). The use of collocations by advanced learners of English and some implications for teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 24*(2), 223–242.

Philip, G. (2007). Decomposition and delexicalisation in learners' collocational (mis)behaviour. In *Online Proceedings of Corpus Linguistics 2007*. Retrieved from http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/publications /CL2007/paper/170_Paper.pdf

Proudfoot, S. (2010). A corpus-led exploration of lexical verb use in Main Suite Writing papers. In H. Khalifa & I. Vidakovič (Eds.), *Research notes 41/2010*, (pp. 26–31). Cambridge: University of Cambridge ESOL Examinations.

Sadeghi, K., & Panahifar, F. (2013). A corpus-based analysis of collocational errors in the Iranian EFL learners' oral production. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 4*(4), 53–78.

Salamoura, A., & Saville, N. (2010). Exemplifying the CEFR: criterial features of written learner English from the English Profile Programme. In I. Bartning, M. Martin, & I. Vedder (Eds.), *Communicative proficiency and linguistic development: intersections between SLA and language testing research,* (pp. 101–132). Eurosla.org: Eurosla.

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance and collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sparling, D. (1990). *English or Czenglish? Jak se vyhnout čechismům v angličtině*. Praha: SPN.

Tan, M. M. L. (2000). *Prepositional clusters: investigative-oriented learning and English language teaching*. PhD thesis. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.

Tono, Y. (2004). Multiple comparisons of IL, L1 and TL corpora: The case of L2 acquisition of verb subcategorization patterns by Japanese learners of English. In G. Aston, S. Bernardini, & D. Stewart (Eds.), *Corpora and Language Learners* Vol. 17, (pp. 45–66). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tono, Y., Satake, Y., & Miura, A. (2014). The effects of using corpora on revision tasks in L2 writing with coded error feedback. *ReCALL, 26*(2), 147–162.

Vyatkina, N. (2016). Data-driven learning of collocations: Learner performance, proficiency, and perceptions. *Language Learning & Technology*, *20*(3), 159–179.

Walter, E. (Ed.). (2008). *Cambridge advanced learner's dictionary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, B. J. (2000). Testing ESL learners' knowledge of collocations. *ELT Journal, 35*, 115–122.

Current trends in teaching English as a foreign language. The case of French primary schools

Jill Kay Partridge Salomon
Université de Limoges, France

DOI:10.14232/edulingua.2018.1.3

During his speech announcing the gradual introduction of compulsory language teaching in French primary schools from September, 2002, Jack Lang, then Minister of Education, described himself as an 'activist' for the renovation of the teaching of foreign languages and of linguistic diversity. Lang was, of course, alluding to the reputation of the French as not being inclined to learn foreign tongues. Since then, various reforms have been introduced, the most recent one being the compulsory teaching of a foreign language from age six, which was introduced in September, 2015. Furthermore, despite Lang's call for linguistic diversity, English has been predominantly taught in primary education and this situation is unlikely to change. This paper will be particularly concerned with the current situation of the teaching of English in primary schools in France, focusing primarily on the training of future primary teachers.

Keywords: primary education; teacher training; EFL

1. Introduction

Each child of this country is a child of Europe and a citizen of the World.[1]

In 1957, the Treaty of Rome advocated the freedom of movement of its citizens within the European Community, the prerequisite being to learn the languages of their European partners. However, one can wonder at the extent to which all the nations of the now enlarged European Union have done their utmost to promote the learning of the languages of the member states. In fact, it was not until 2005 that, for the first time, the portfolio of a European Commissioner explicitly included responsibility for multilingualism to member states (A new framework strategy for multilingualism 2005).[2] Although the teaching of at least one foreign language in secondary education around Europe has been the norm for many years, a notable evolution in the recent past in language teaching has been the generalized introduction of compulsory language teaching in primary schools. France is far from an exception as the history of foreign language teaching in primary schools in France is relatively recent.

---

[1] 'Chaque enfant de ce pays est un enfant de l'Europe et un citoyen du monde.' Jack Lang (2001).

[2] *"This document is the first Commission Communication to explore this policy area. It complements the Commission's current initiative to improve communication between European citizens and the institutions that serve them. It also: reaffirms the Commission's commitment to multilingualism in the European Union; sets out the Commission's strategy for promoting multilingualism in European society, in the economy and in the Commission itself; and proposes a number of specific actions stemming from this strategic framework."*

Teacher training institutions in France are entering a period of turmoil with probable reorganization in the near future. The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to examine and assess the current situation of the teaching of English as a foreign language in French primary schools in order to prepare for this shift in policy and pave the way for improvement. I posit that the training provided currently is insufficient for the reforms that are being proposed. In order to better comprehend the current situation, I will expose the main turning points of foreign language teaching in primary education since the turn of the century, laying particular focus on the training of future primary school teachers.

I will be analyzing the official frameworks defining the curricula of foreign language teaching for primary education in France since 2002. Unfortunately, except for three issues of the French foreign language teaching journal *Les Langues Modernes* (Kevran & Deyrich, 2007; Kevran, 2011; Dahm et al., 2017) very little academic research has been carried out on this subject, a gap in literature that this article attempts to fill. I will also be particularly interested in the experiences of primary school teachers and trainees and teacher trainers of foreign languages in primary education.

2. Background to the teaching of foreign languages in primary education

From 1989 there was a project of controlled experimentation in the teaching of a modern foreign language in primary schools in France, yet this was not compulsory and only involved certain schools. Rather like in the United Kingdom, there was always a great amount of resistance to language learning in France (Duverger, 2009), with the traditions of Jacobinism and the centralism of the French Ministry of Education and the notion of national monolingualism and even linguistic protectionism. However, this was increasingly seen as a handicap for various reasons, not least economic. However, this situation came to an end with the then socialist Minister of Education for France, Jack Lang.

2.1 The revolution in foreign language teaching

In January, 2001, Jack Lang gave a famous speech on the teaching of foreign languages in primary education (Lang, 2001):

> "In the future, our objective is for each child to learn two modern languages, at an age when the quality of his/her musical ear is at its peak. The teaching of a second foreign language will begin in Year 6".[3]

This was an extremely forceful, focused, personal speech. Lang speaks of being 'a militant'. He reiterates 'my will' four times along with 'my determination', 'my

[3] *«Notre objectif est que tout enfant apprenne à l'avenir deux langues vivantes à l'âge où son oreille musicale est à son sommet. L'enseignement de la deuxième langue commencera en 6e."*

conviction', 'my engagement' and 'I have made a commitment'. He describes himself as being 'obstinate' and does not fear using the first person pronoun 'I' seventeen times to further illustrate his personal implication in the project. Furthermore, he was prepared to finance his ambitious project to the best of his abilities.

2.2 Reasons for the reform

Lang gave two main reasons behind the introduction of foreign languages in primary classrooms. The first was the belief that 'the younger the better' the idea that young children are intrinsically better language learners, and will therefore become more proficient more quickly. This view is of course questionable. The Critical Period Hypothesis, first proposed by Penfield and Roberts (1959)[4] highlights the importance of age in foreign language proficiency, however other factors, such as environment and motivation also play a major role (Larson-Hall, 2007; Myles, 2017). The second was his wish to preserve the French language in multilingual Europe. He was convinced that learning a foreign language helps in developing language skills in one's native language by better comprehending its singularities and its similarities with other languages. For the first time in the institutional history of France, the official education framework of 2002 published by the Ministry of Education (*Bulletin Officiel N°4, 2002*), formulated curricula concerning foreign and regional languages in primary schools. These texts were applicable to everyone. They were mandatory. Gone were the days when teaching a foreign language was optional or elitist, a time when certain researchers claimed that the introduction of another language could perturb pupils' learning of their native language, prevent them from learning to read or provoke dyslexia or other cognitive disorders (Duverger, 2009).

2.3 The new measures

Lang subsequently introduced a series of new measures regarding the teaching of a foreign language in primary education. Foreign languages now became a bona fide subject in primary education with the curriculum straddling primary school and the first year of middle school.[5] As far as the training of teachers was concerned, there would be professional development in foreign languages for primary school teachers with a system of accreditation. From 2003, future primary school teachers were to be trained to become proficient enough in a foreign language in order to teach it as a subject. This was to be validated by an examination. However, in order to counterbalance the lack of qualified language specialists during the transition period, there was to be a massive

[4] Penfield, W., & Roberts, L. (1959). *Speech and brain-mechanisms.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
[5] Primary education is compulsory from the age of 6 in France.

recruitment of foreign language assistants and native speakers living locally[6]. Secondary school teachers of foreign languages would also be used to bridge the gap.

Logistically, local authorities (who finance the running costs of primary school education in France) were to equip classrooms for this new subject. Furthermore, pedagogic material such as text books and adapted multi-media was to be created, along with a government website (EDUSCOL) with suggestions for lesson plans and activities.[7] A platform of cyber correspondence was also to be established so that pupils could correspond with pupils from two other European countries. A system now entitled 'e-twinning'.

2.4 The choice of languages

Although Lang was convinced that English should be learnt at some stage in a child's schooling, he also promoted other European languages and also regional languages of France, thus promoting the country's linguistic diversity. These were: Breton (Celtic), Basque (Vasconic), Occitan (Romance), Alsatian (Germanic). He lamented the fact that in 2001, only 24% of pupils studying a foreign language in primary school, were studying a language other than English. A more alarming fact was that only 10% of pupils were learning a foreign language other than in English in Year 1 of lower secondary school (Lang, 2001).

2.5 Consequences of the reform

Lang's reform was initially concerned with Year 5 (CM2), then Year 4 (CM1) the next year, etc. The consequence was that older generation teachers felt compelled to take lower level classes in favour of newly appointed teachers freshly out of training college and certified in teaching a foreign language, generally English. This was the first drawback of what was announced as a pedagogical revolution (Ribierre-Dubile, 2017). Older teachers generally did not speak a foreign language and waited with dread for the day they would have to teach English, when it became the turn of the Cours Préparatoire – Year 1 (cf. Table 1). However, the framework act of 8th July, 2013 governing education made the teaching of a foreign or regional language compulsory from year 1 upwards from September, 2016.

---

[6] These native speakers would be under the supervision of foreign language tutors who would give guidance on content and teaching methods. However, the use of the native speaker in foreign language teaching is a complex question (Andreou & Galantomos, 2009). Certain researchers (e.g., Cook, 1999) even question the appropriateness of using native speakers in foreign language teaching.

[7] The main Éduscol website is aimed primarily to help teachers, as well as educational professionals, by providing information, official texts, and resources available to support teachers and educational professionals in their work within schools (Éduscol, the Ministry of Education website).

Table 1 Classes in French primary schools

Cours préparatoire	(CP) Year 1	age 6 to 7
Cours élémentaire 1	(CE1) Year 2	age 7 to8
Cours élémentaire 2	(CE2) Year 3	age 8 to 9
Cours moyen 1	(CM1) Year 4	age 9 to 10
Cours moyen 2	(CM2) Year 5	age 10 to 11

2.6 Subsequent reforms

Subsequent Ministers of Education did not lay such great importance on foreign language learning in primary education and the budget originally put in place by Lang was reduced drastically over the years. Furthermore, the constant changes of curriculum with each new Minister of Education, even within the same majority party, along with a lack of clear objectives (Duverger, 2009) and coherent progression, has greatly jeopardized foreign language teaching in primary education, despite ambitious curricula with obvious consequences on teacher training programmes.

3. Teacher training in France

From September, 2010, the training of primary school teachers started to take place in specialized Masters through Instituts Universitaires de Formation des Maîtres (IUFM)[8]. This was to answer ministerial demands that all Masters should prepare students for employment (Catroux & Gruson, 2011). In 2015, the IUFMs were replaced by Écoles supérieures du professorat et de l'éducation (ESPE)[9]. These specialized institutes now integrate both university instruction and teacher training with vocational work experience. Currently, to qualify as a primary school teacher in France, one must already hold a Bachelor degree and be enrolled in the first year of the Master MEEF (Teaching, Education and Training)[10] programme (or already hold a Masters degree). At the end of the first year, students must sit a competitive examination[11], and if successful, they continue into the second year of the Masters programme. During this second year, students work part time in a primary school while completing their Masters degree. Furthermore, reaching level B2 in a foreign language has become a prerequisite for obtaining the diploma allowing students to become a qualified primary school teacher, thus gaining tenure.

[8] University Institute of Teacher Training.
[9] Advanced School of Teaching, Training and Education.
[10] (Métiers de l'Enseignement, de l'Éducation et de la Formation)
[11] "concours"

3.1 Assessment of language skills

The competitive exam for entry into primary school teaching no longer includes foreign language assessment as this was felt to be a financial burden for the French Ministry of Education (Duverger, 2009). Indeed, there has been much debate over the years as to the requirements and level of foreign language teaching. In 2006, the guidance and planning law for the future of schools (the Fillon Act) introduced mandatory oral assessment in the competitive exam. Future teachers were to have reached the B2 level on the CEFR scale. There was a choice of six possible languages: Arabic, English, German, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish. This oral assessment was abolished in 2009, with the introduction of the Masters MEEF degree in teaching. With the introduction of the new framework in 2014 the Ministerial Decree (*arrêté du 27 août 2013*) stipulates that henceforth, the training of future primary teachers should integrate the teaching of at least one foreign language in order to obtain a B2 level on the CEFR framework.

3.2 Overcoming the deficiencies in foreign language skills of primary teachers

Since the reform implemented by Lang in 2002, one of the underlying issues has been overcoming the deficiencies in foreign language proficiency/skills of primary school teachers. Although a CEFR level of B2 in a first foreign language is required for the baccalauréat examination at the end of secondary school, only 24.74% of pupils actually attain this level. Furthermore, despite the fact that a foreign language is compulsory throughout Bachelor degree courses, only 37.44% of students at the end of their degree obtain a B2 level (Observatoire TOEIC – 2009). Therefore, many students do not have the required language proficiency before entering the Masters programme (MEEF). For Cambridge (Cambridge Assessment English, 2018) "[i]t takes approximately 200 guided learning hours for a language learner to progress from one level of the Common European Framework of Reference to the next". A report by the General Inspector (Manès-Bonnisseau & Taylor, 2018, p. 2) states that France comes last in the European league tables for foreign language proficiency, and advocates a major reform of language teaching and learning.

The present situation is thus far from logical as the foreign language skills of future primary teachers are not assessed before entering the Masters programme even though they will be required to teach this compulsory subject. The number of hours allocated to each subject during the two years Master programme (MEEF) differs greatly from one ESPE (teaching training college) to the next (Manès-Bonnisseau & Taylor, 2018, p. 33), and foreign language instruction is no exception. Nevertheless, most of them offer between twenty and forty hours of English language teaching and English teaching methods For those who enter the Masters programme having reached only an A2 or B1 level of foreign language proficiency, they would require more than

two hundred hours of instruction to acquire a B2 level of the CEFR and become an independent user.

In the teacher training institute (ESPE) of Limoges, in which I teach English and English teaching methods, teaching hours have been constantly reduced. Since September, students in the first and second years of the Masters programme only receive twenty-four hours of English tuition per academic year. Additionally, year one students receive fourteen hours of English teaching methods, with nine hours for the second year students. For primary school teachers to feel confident in their teaching of English, they need a thorough preparation in both the language and teaching methods, which for the moment, is not the case. Besides, only English is offered as a foreign language at both the ESPE and in primary schools.

To improve the language skills of first year Masters students, the ESPE of Limoges offers a three week work placement in primary schools in the UK. This is made possible thanks to its partnership with the Keele and Staffordshire Teacher Education Department of Keele University, Staffordshire. At the end of the internship, students are required to teach the class of the English primary teacher they have been shadowing. This can be on any subject on the curriculum. Subsequently, students are encouraged to correspond with their English counterparts.

3.3 Teacher training in English and English teaching methods: the dilemma

As seen above, since 2015, student teachers now work part time in a school and are required to teach a foreign language right from the beginning of the second year of their Master programme. The difficult task is to train these students to obtain a level of B2 but also to prepare them to teach and work with young learners (Stunell, 2017). The dilemma is to conciliate the two objectives in the time allotted and to ensure the continuity between their training in college and that in primary schools. According to Stunell (Stunell, 2017) even if a student teacher with a B2 level in foreign language skills is better able to teach that language than one who only has a B1 level, teaching young learners efficiently demands more skills than just language proficiency. Teaching a foreign language class to young learners differs to teaching young adults (the use of gestures and other aides to facilitate comprehension, space management in the classroom, the use of graded language for young learners in order to give instructions, getting pupils to repeat, etc). She questions whether future primary school teachers can be taught the specific competences of teaching a foreign language to young learners especially if their own level of language use is not as proficient as it should be. She evokes the notion of self efficacy as exemplified by Bandura (1997). For MA and Cavanagh, (2018, p. 134) “teacher self-efficacy […] is the extent to which teachers, including pre-service teachers […], believe they are capable of achieving certain specific teaching goals”. Indeed, student teachers are fully aware of their lack of skills as far as foreign language teaching is concerned.

3.4 Foreign language "insecurity"

As part of their Masters degree, students are required to research a topic concerning an aspect of primary school teaching. A former Masters student carried out a survey for her Masters dissertation, entitled *Difficulties of Teaching a Foreign Language at Primary School Level* (Manach, 2017). These are some of the replies to the question 'Is English a difficult language to teach?'

> *"Yes, I'm embarrassed and I haven't got a good accent."*
>
> *"Yes, because of the pronunciation."*
>
> *"Yes, because I haven't got the necessary skills, especially in pronunciation."*
>
> *"I haven't got enough vocabulary and I don't master the syntax and grammar sufficiently."*[12]

It is worth noticing that students are more concerned with the imperfection of their language skills than the actual aspect of teaching. Overall, 40.9% of students replied that they felt motivated at the idea of teaching English and/or considered it a challenge. Conversely, 36.4% affirmed that they felt ill at ease teaching English and 22.7% actually claimed they dreaded having to do so.

Even experienced teachers have problems teaching a language even when guided by mentors. They feel badly prepared to implement the curriculum, especially using the action-oriented approach[13] advocated by the education authorities. The apprehension felt by teachers reflects the specificity of this subject, which differentiates itself from other subjects due to the skills it requires (Marchois & Delmote, 2015, p. 6). Foreign languages are the object of study and the medium in which they are studied (although some elements of the lessons may be explained in French to aid comprehension). This explains why so many primary school teachers feel little equipped to teach a foreign language. Their concern relates to the following aspects: their proficiency in language use, but especially the belief they have in their own capabilities; the aptitudes necessary to teach a language at primary level. It is thus vital to convince them that they do not need to be highly proficient to teach a foreign language at primary school (Marchois & Delmote, 2015, p. 6). There is a desperate need of training to set up a graded curriculum for foreign languages as the official texts/curriculum offer more of a list of objectives to reach in order to attain the A1 level, rather than a programming and progression of the contents over the cycles.

---

[12] Translated from French by the author.

[13] With this approach, learners become 'social agents' (CEFR, 2001: 9), learning in a social learning environment, developing not only linguistic skills, but pragmatic and communicative skills as well. (Council of Europe, 2001a: Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. https://rm.coe.int/16802fc1bf. Last accessed 7/01/2019).

According to the General Inspector for English, Chantal Manès-Bonnisseau, the current situation of the teaching of foreign languages in primary schools is unsatisfactory. She posits that the training in foreign languages received at teacher training college does not equip future primary teachers with the necessary skills to teach a language at primary level. In a recent report (Manès-Bonnisseau & Taylor, 2018), one of her recommendations is the reintroduction of compulsory foreign language assessment before entering the Master MEEF programme, which would take the form of an oral examination. This should ensure the necessary foreign language proficiency of students undertaking a career in primary education.

The report underlines the uncomfortable situation in which many primary school teachers find themselves when forced to teach a foreign language and advocates more precise curricula guidelines in foreign language, with annual benchmarks. Only between 10 to 15% of primary teachers have majored in a foreign language up to at least Bachelor level. Moreover, foreign languages are not or very rarely included in the compulsory eighteen hours of annual professional development for primary school teachers. Besides, primary education inspectors seldom inspect foreign language classes, mainly due to their own lack of competence in foreign language skills and pedagogy. Moreover, as the teaching of Maths and French are all important in the French education system, many teachers do not welcome being forced to teach a foreign language, which, for them, uses up precious class time. Consequently, the passage from primary to lower secondary school is unsatisfactory as far as foreign language teaching is concerned.

3.5 Transitioning between primary and secondary education

Education in primary and lower secondary school is divided into cycles[14] (rather like the key stages in British education), initially introduced in 2002 by Lang. Since 2016, stage 3 now straddles both primary school and the first year of middle/lower secondary school in order to reinforce pedagogic coherence and consistency (*Programmes pour l'école primaire , BO n°11, 26 novembre 2015*). The continuity and the progressivity of learning between the 3 levels of primary and year 1 of lower secondary education are now a priority of the new curriculum in France.

However, the transition from primary to secondary schools causes concern. Many primary schools filter into the same lower secondary school. In order to establish a coherent curriculum, it is necessary to coordinate the foreign language teaching aims between the two levels. However, this takes time and organized planning. Some secondary school foreign language teachers actually start language teaching from scratch, which may affect learners' long-term motivation (Graham, 2016, p. 682). Locally, small groups of teachers from both primary and lower secondary schools are

[14] Cycle 1 (ages 3 – 6), Cycle 2 (ages 6-9) and Cycle 3 (ages 9 – 12).

working together to coordinate progression. In Brive, a town in the Education district of Limoges, a group of such teachers are working on a project using authentic English story books right from nursery school level (age 3) through to Year 1 of lower secondary school. Their objective is to produce ready to use lessons for their colleagues in both primary and lower secondary school, based on storybooks. Their ultimate aim is to render the language skills of pupils entering secondary school more homogeneous.

4. Conclusion

During a speech at the Sorbonne, on 26th September, 2017, the French President, Emmanuel Macron, clearly underlined the direct relationship between mastering foreign languages and the construction of a united and democratic sovereign Europe (cited in Manès-Bonnisseau & Taylor, 2018, p. 22). Encouraging the learning of two foreign languages has been a priority in language policy since 2002, as seen above, yet the reality has been somewhat different. Officially, the range of languages is wide, however, in reality, the hegemony of English is still omnipresent. A recent European Commission report, published on 25th May, 2018, strongly urges member states to reinforce the development of pupils' multilingual competences by preferring a multidisciplinary approach to teaching (Council of Europe, 2018). Nevertheless, even though researchers and European officials concur that member states should encourage multilingualism, the situation differs from one state to another. English has become the lingua franca and is predominantly taught all over Europe. The predicament of which languages to teach still causes some debate in France. Despite political commitment to multilingualism, English remains the first foreign language taught in school, and often the only choice in primary and lower secondary schools.

The path has been long and sinuous since Lang's ambitious speech in 2001, however one can call into question the progress that has been accomplished. The report recently published by the General Inspector for English, Chantal Manès-Bonnisseau (Manès-Bonnisseau & Taylor, 2018) advocates a series of measures to improve teacher training as far as foreign languages are concerned. Unsurprisingly, these closely echo those implemented back in 2001 by Lang. The route therefore seems to have been a circular one. As a final note, Emmanuel Macron has decided to lower the age of compulsory schooling from the age of six to three from September, 2019, a measure which may affect foreign language teaching. Nevertheless, unless motivated and qualified teaching staff are recruited, the foreign language skills of French primary school children are unlikely to improve.

References

Andreou, G., & Galantomos, I. (2009). The native speaker ideal in foreign language teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 6*(2), 200–208. Retrieved from http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v6n22009/andreou.pdf.

Arrêté du 27 août 2013. [Ministerial Decree, 27th August, 2013]. Retrieved from https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000027905257&dateTexte=&categorieLien=id

Bandura, A. (1997). Self efficacy: The exercise of control. Worth Publishers.

Bulletin officiel spécial n°2 du 26 mars/n°11 du 26 novembre 2015. Retrieved from http://cache.media.education.gouv.fr/file/MEN_SPE_11/35/1/BO_SPE_11_26-11-2015_504351.pdf

Cambridge Assessment English, 2018. Retrieved from https://support.cambridgeenglish.org/hc/en-gb/articles/202838506-Guided-learning-hours

Catroux, M. (2011). La recherche dans les masters de formation des professeurs des écoles in La formation des enseignants du premier degré. *Les Langues Modernes,* 3, 35-44. APLV.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(2), 185–209.

Duverger, J. (2009). École élémentaire et enseignement des langues. *Tréma, 28*, 1–6.

EDUSCOL Retrieved from http://eduscol.education.fr/cid66998/eduscol-the-portal-for-education-players.html

European Council Proposal for a Council Recommendation on a comprehensive approach to the teaching and learning of languages. Brussels, 22.5.2018. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2018/EN/COM-2018-272-F1-EN-MAIN-PART-1.PDF

Graham, S. (2016). Motivational trajectories for early language learning across the primary–secondary school transition. *British Educational Research Journa*l, *42*/4, 682–702.

Kevran, M. & Deyrich, M.-C. (2007). Les langues en primaire: quelles articulations? *Les Langues Modernes,* 4.

Kevran, M. (2011). La formation des enseignants du premier degré. *Les Langues Modernes,* 3.

Kevran, M., & Gruson, B. (2011). Enjeux et défis de la "mastérisation" in Kevran, M. (ed) (2011), 3, 13-18.

Kevran, M., & Jeudy-Karakoç, N. (2017). Pour une éducation langagière cohérente de l'école au college. In R. Dahm, N. Leroy, & E. Magnat, E. (Eds), Enseigner les langues de l'école au college: quelles continuités? *Les Langues modernes,* 2, 28-34.

Lang, J. (2001) Déclaration de M. Jack Lang, ministre de l'éducation nationale, sur l'apprentissage des langues vivantes à l'école primaire. Paris, 29th January.

Larson-Hall, J. (2008). Weighing the benefits of studying a foreign language at a younger starting age in a minimal input situation. *Second Language Research, 24*(1), 35–63.

Loi d'orientation du 8 juillet 2013 [Framework Act 8th July, 2013] Retrieved from http://www.education.gouv.fr/cid102387/loi-n-2013-595-du-8-juillet-2013-d-orientation-et-de-programmation-pour-la-refondation-de-l-ecole-de-la-republique.html

MA, K., & Cavanagh, M. S. (2018). Classroom ready? Pre-service teachers' self-efficacy for their first professional experience placement. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(7), 133–151. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n7.8

Manach, C. (2017). *Les obstacles à l'enseignement de l'anglais*. Limoges. ESPE: Université de Limoges. Unpublished Masters dissertation.

Manès-Bonnnisseau, C., & Taylor, A. (2018). Propositions pour une meilleure maîtrise des langues vivantes étrangères. Oser dire le nouveau monde. Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale. Retrieved from http://www.education.gouv.fr/cid133908/propositions-pour-une-meilleure-maitrise-des-langues-vivantes-etrangeres.html

Marchois, C., & Delmote, G. (2015). Enseigner les langues vivantes à l'école. Canopé Editions Retz.

Myles, F. (2017). Learning foreign languages in primary schools: is younger better? *Languages, Society and Policy*, 1–8. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.9806

Observatoire TOEIC – 2009. Retrieved from http://docplayer.fr/11559400-L-observatoire-toeic-2009-des-niveaux-d-anglais-en-france.html

Programme des langues étrangères et régionales à l'école primaire anglais, Bulletin Officiel N°4 29 août 2002. [School curricula for foreign and regional languages in primary education, Official Bulletin N°4, 29th August, 2002] Retrieved from http://www.education.gouv.fr/bo/2002/hs4/default.htm

Ribierre-Dubile, N. (2017). L'apprentissage des langues vivantes étrangères: entre continuité et rupture au cycle 3. In R. Dahm, N. Leroy, & E. Magnat, E. (Eds), Enseigner les langues de l'école au college: quelles continuités? *Les Langues modernes,* 2, 44 -59.

Stunell, K. (2017). Le micro-enseignement dans la formation des professeurs des écoles en langue vivante. In R. Dahm, N. Leroy, & E. Magnat, E. (Eds), Enseigner les langues de l'école au college: quelles continuités? *Les Langues modernes,* 2, 60-67.

Assessment and final reports in foreign language lessons: A case study from a Czech Waldorf school

Kateřina Dvořáková
University of South Bohemia, České Budějovice, Czech Republic

DOI:10.14232/edulingua.2018.1.4

Waldorf schools strive to create learning opportunities for well-rounded growth of the individual through the faculties of thinking, feeling and willing. Assessment, as perceived and practised in these schools, should in the first place be a means of supporting learning and development. Waldorf assessment abstains from grading, is qualitatively oriented, and deals with academic achievements as well the pupils' artistic, emotional and physical development, both individually and as a group. This illustrative case study examines essential theoretical principles regarding assessment in Waldorf pedagogy and how these are practically implemented in a Czech elementary Waldorf school. Its empirical aim is to explore final reports from English as a foreign language in primary and lower-middle school and study how they reflect and respect the essential theoretical principles regarding assessment at Waldorf schools.

Key words: Waldorf pedagogy, primary and lower secondary school, foreign language teaching, assessment, final report

1. Introduction

In the Czech Republic the first Waldorf schools were founded in 1990, while worldwide Waldorf education celebrates its centenary in 2019. They differ from mainstream schools, among other aspects, in their organization, philosophical grounding in anthroposophy, and by offering two foreign languages from the first class. Lutzker (2013) confirms that a unique approach is also implemented in the field of assessment: "In an age of standardized testing in which teachers and pupils all over the world are required to work towards measurable, comparable, pre-defined goals, our focus on creativity and transformation presents a clear contrast and an alternative." (p. 13).

Let us begin by briefly considering the etymology of the word *assessment.* It has two roots, the Latin *assidere/adsidere*, which literally means *sit beside*, and the Anglo-French *assesser*, which means *judge the value of something such as property for the purpose of taxation*. While the first meaning implies the image of a teacher standing by and supporting a learner, the second one emphasizes the qualities of measuring and determining the value of something (Sievers, 2017, p. 213). In Waldorf pedagogy, as we will see, assessment is approached much more in line with the first meaning.

2. General assessment principles in Waldorf pedagogy

Assessing the work of students has always been one of the teacher's main tasks. In humanistic methodologies, assessment should be constructive and non-judgmental. Its crucial function has been to promote a positive self-image of the student as a person and learner. The type of assessment used at Waldorf schools is referred to as "alternative", which is significantly different from the traditional paper-and-pencil and short answer tests. Grades are commonly not used and the focus is on the individual student's overall progress. Alternative assessment looks at the holistic performance of the students by highlighting their abilities and their overall improvement. (Coombe, 2018, p. 9)

In the Waldorf context, teachers reflect daily on what took place during the lessons so that they can get a good grip on how students have taken up, understood, and processed the material of instruction. Thomas (2005) posits that this practice helps teachers separate the important from the unimportant, develop a sense for quality and it enables teachers themselves to begin a learning process in the evaluation of the student's school work. He also adds:

> In school, as well as in life, there is a 'what', a 'how' and a 'who'. The 'what' consists of measurable facts, the 'how' contains a relationship between the learner and the teacher, and the 'who' indicates something that is unique, not immediately tangible but rather future-oriented, a kind of message from the future. (2005, pp. 20, 22)

Rawson (2015) elaborates on this idea:

> What we understand about a person is something unique; it cannot be standardized, generalized, or measured. It is also never complete, but always remains open. We generally assess the past, what has already happened. But assessment also means getting a sense of what is emerging, what is in a state of becoming. … This means that we have to create space in our assessment for the person's potential development and doing this well can even help a healthy future to come about. (2015, p. 30)

According to Rawson (2005), evaluation means having aims. Evaluation criteria must correspond with the pedagogical aims for the various ages and support each child's development. Waldorf educators should be concerned with more than assessing or making learning outcomes visible: "Our task is at the same time to strengthen the learning process through evaluation. It is part of our education task to value the learning process itself as an outcome." (2005, p. 27) Complete assessment should include self-assessment, peer-assessment and teacher assessment. These three different perspectives respect the social context and enrich the cultural climate of schools. (Rawson, 2015; Thomas, 2005).

At primary school, verbal assessment is based on observation. Each pupil is assessed individually which means that he or she is not compared with other pupils but

solely in respect to his or her individual dispositions and potential. The focus of assessment is on active participation in lessons, ability to concentrate, quality of work, relationship to the subject, and ability to work individually as well as cooperate with the teacher and classmates. The pupils' own books are also assessed in terms of accuracy as well as their aesthetic quality.[1] Tests are usually not introduced before the 4th or the 5th school year. Self-assessment, on the other hand, is promoted from early primary years. At lower secondary school, new forms of assessment, such as oral presentations, reading and writing assignments, or long-term projects come to the forefront as well as home preparation and homework assignments. Tests with clear criteria are used to find out whether students have reached what they had set out to achieve. Students are commonly not awarded grades on tests. Their result is expressed either in points or as a percentage. Primary and lower secondary Waldorf pupils (classes 1-9) in the Czech Republic receive verbal assessment, which is usually "translated" into marks in the 8th and 9th class for the purpose of secondary school admission, and it must

1) be comprehensible for the students and the parents,
2) motivate students to achieve the set goals and improve,
3) contain strategies for future growth and development,
4) support the pupil's integrity,
5) be polite and avoid generalized statements.

Czech Waldorf students receive a so called final report at the end of every semester, which corresponds with the above mentioned general guidelines for verbal assessment. They do not contain grades and include comments about the student's performance, achievements, results and class participation. Affective factors such as attitude, motivation and effort ought to be included to provide a holistic profile of the student. Rawson (2015, p. 39) points out that reports should seek to be fair, objective, straightforward, sensitive and they should address each individual's strengths and weaknesses. Bald or generic comments lacking context as well as clichés are considered unhelpful.

3. Assessment in foreign language lessons

The Waldorf approach to assessment is made possible due to the fact, among other things, that the pedagogy promotes long-term relationships between teachers and their classes. The longer time they spend together, the more the teachers can learn about their students and their lives, understand their personal challenges, and reflect these in their assessment. Ideally, there is one class teacher for the entire primary and lower-secondary periods. Foreign language teachers have the same opportunity to work with one group of learners from their very beginnings of study to various stages of

[1] As commercial textbooks are not used in Waldorf schools, pupils create their own book for each subject.

proficiency in the upper-level classes. Wiechert (2013, p. 7) points to the fact that Rudolf Steiner, the founder of the school, had an idea that foreign languages should be taught by the same person in the first eight years, but in real life this happens rather rarely.

Sievers (2017, pp. 214-217), a foreign language Waldorf teacher, also stresses the importance of establishing clear and reasonable criteria to ensure a fair assessment. She distinguishes three types of assessment:

a) assessment <u>for</u> learning (subject orientated)
b) assessment <u>of</u> learning (outcome orientated)
c) assessment <u>as</u> learning (process orientated)

In assessment for learning the teacher's main goal is to accompany and support their learners. They use various means of formative assessment, such as observation, providing feedback on written/oral assignments or conversations with students. Feedback can be written or oral, it should be descriptive, it should focus both on what has been achieved and what has yet to be achieved, and provide suggestions on how to improve and move forward. This type of assessment is also referred to as *ipsative* (self-referenced), in which the achievements of the individual are not measured against general standards, but only against the person's own 'standards' or previous achievements. Assessment of learning, also known as summative, is outcome orientated. In mainstream education it commonly means measuring performance against standardized criteria. In Waldorf education it means summing up what has been done and it usually occurs at the end of a learning unit. The pupils' achievements are compared with given criteria or standards, and their results are commonly expressed in numbers of letters. Last but not least, assessment as learning is related to self-directed learning and thus requires a certain degree of awareness of the learning process and the ability to reflect on it. For these reasons it is most effectively used in the upper school years.

Sievers (2017) is convinced that the main aim of assessment is to enhance the pupils' learning and development. Furthermore, similarly to most Waldorf educators, she finds grading or introducing grades too early to be detrimental to learning:

> When grades are given too early, we can observe that pupils tend to identify with the grades they get. They don't say 'this time my achievement was on level 4 because…', they rather say 'I am a four.'… Grades are often experienced as the end of the process. Something has come to an end, has had a label put to it and can now be stored away – or can even be forgotten altogether. (2017, p. 221)

She also claims that the most commonly used means of assessment work with the following:

> a) naturally occurring evidence (collected in any form that relates to the competence or capability in question)
> b) witnessed/oral evidence (e.g. oral presentations)
> c) written evidence (homework performance, lesson books, writing assignments, tests, portfolios)

Similarly to Sievers, we can find critical remarks on using grades in Templeton (2007):

> To put it bluntly, a mark (or a grade) very quickly takes on the character of a reward like the biscuit for the dog: if I perform the trick well, I get a reward, if I don't I am told off. The result with children is that very soon they will learn what they have to do to get a good mark (or the teacher's praise), which in turn may lead to certain children being only interested in the mark and not in the actual task or subject they are supposed to learn about. (p. 206)

Pupils with poor grades are soon labelled as unsuccessful, which is extremely difficult to get rid of because "only rarely do youngsters feel encouraged to work harder through a bad mark!" Similarly, Ireland (2015, p. 45) in her research on assessment in Waldorf schools in the USA reported that Waldorf teachers believe that giving letter grades too early ruins children's enthusiasm for learning. Finally, Zachos (2004, p. 7) proposes that all means of assessment must be used pedagogically, and that is not possible when grades are assigned: "We may in some way be serving our school, our children's parents, our need to control student behaviour or a college admission process, but we are not serving the process of learning."

4. Final reports: a case study

4.1 Methodology

Final reports at Waldorf schools aim at characterizing pupils' cognitive, affective, social, psycho-motor and aesthetic development over a period of time and motivating them for further learning. The first part of every report contains the pupil's general characteristics and it is followed by assessment from all the subjects. The content of the report should surprise neither the parent nor the pupil. Reports from individual subjects, including foreign languages, also contain two parts: the first one is a summary of main aims and lesson content, the second one assesses the pupils' performance.

The empirical aim of this illustrative case study is to explore final reports from English as a foreign language over the entire period of primary and lower-middle

schooling, and study how they reflect and respect the essential theoretical principles regarding assessment at Waldorf schools described in the previous two chapters.

I was able to read approximately one hundred reports from various schools in the Czech Republic. In the end I chose the reports of three pupils who differed significantly in terms of their academic achievement as well as personal development. Two boys, Peter and Matt, and a girl, Jane (pseudonyms) all attended the same class at the Waldorf school in České Budějovice from the first to the ninth year in 2006-2015. These reports allowed me to follow the pupils throughout the entire primary and lower-secondary period. A further reason for including reports from this particular school is that there was a single teacher teaching English to this class from year 1 to year 9 (teacher A, female, a qualified English teacher). From year 5 onwards the class was co-taught by another teacher (teacher B, male, a qualified English teacher).

The reports had originally been written in the pupils' mother tongue, Czech, and were then translated by me for the purpose of this study. As for the format, at primary school the reports are written principally to the parents, at lower secondary school they are addressed directly to the students.

Four reports of each selected student in different phases of primary and lower-secondary schooling will be presented in full in sections 4.3-4.5 and analysed in detail in section 5. In addition to examining the reports, I conducted informal interviews with the respective teachers to explain or clarify certain points and references in the reports. These interviews were conducted in Czech, the teachers' mother tongue.

4.2 Final reports: a general introduction

Every final report contains a general introduction, the same for every student in the class, which summarizes the main aims and the content of the lessons over the given period. Following are two examples from the students' year four and seven. The first one was produced by teacher A in 2010, the second one together by both teachers in 2013.

Year 4

In the fourth year the pupils are involved in a lot more reading and writing in their English lessons than before, but rhythmical activities such singing, recitation and speech exercises still play a very important role. Pupils are also beginning to learn vocabulary in a more conscious and systematic way. The main topics were describing a person, school subject, parts of the body and the structures can and have got. Every week they listen to a chapter from the book Charlie and the Chocolate Factory narrated by the teacher.

Year 7

This year students have learned to express themselves in the future tense using the structures will and going to. They have explored several more areas in grammar (object pronouns, conjunctions, imperative, prepositions of time, comparative and superlative forms of adjectives). Free writing was practised by exchanging letters with students from our partner school in Italy and through several writing assignments. The cultural topic of the year was Ireland. The students were learning about this country through poetry, music and literature. They finished working with their reader Ghosts at the Castle and started reading a new magazine. As part of a cooperation project with class 2 they translated into Czech a book called The Little Polar Bear and made it into a reader for their younger classmates.

4.3 Final reports of Matt

Matt was described by his teachers as a very friendly, outgoing and cheerful boy. In most subjects he worked with a lot of enthusiasm but he often lacked confidence and focus. He put a lot of effort into all types of tasks and activities but he frequently struggled with meeting the expected criteria.

Year 4 (written by teacher A)

I have nothing but praise for Matt's home preparation for his English lessons which has always been patiently supported by his family. Thanks to this extra practice Matt has been able to participate a lot more in various activities. He appears to be more confident this year and in spite of experiencing difficulties in the subject, he seems to have quite a positive relationship to English. Together with three other classmates he completed a shortened version of the final test, which showed that he generally understood the different themes and areas covered this year. It is very important to note that he is able to remember, pronounce and copy new words correctly. He still finds writing English words from memory immensely challenging.

Year 5 (written by teacher A)

Matt is such a toiler! He compensates his language difficulties with unwavering home practice which positively affects his results in English. All his home assignments, both written and oral, have turned out very well, namely his independent recitation of not just one but two poems. There were fewer mistakes in his final test this time. He still finds it difficult to pronounce more complex words and spontaneously respond to questions but he is making gradual progress. Matt deserves praise for his assiduous effort. I wish him strong will and determination to keep up his good work to meet the upcoming requirements next year.

The primary reports from English confirmed Matt's industrious and reliable nature and his willingness to overcome obstacles and do his best. They also depicted some of the difficulties he was facing in foreign language acquisition, such as pronunciation and correct spelling of words. Both these features continued to play a major role in the lower-secondary years.

Year 8 (written by teacher B)

Dear Matt, you've worked quite hard. This year, however, your results were poorer than they used to be. Most of your test scores were under-average. On the one hand, they showed that you had not fully grasped all the grammar, but on the other, you might not have studied enough on your own. Unfortunately, you don't have the needed confidence in speaking, writing and understanding both spoken and written English, which could only improve if you maintained regular home preparation. Your oral presentation about General Patton was one of the accomplishments this year I would like to highlight, however. There was good language, interesting content and you managed to present it to class comprehensibly and essentially without looking into your notes. I also enjoyed the writing assignment about your typical day. You made quite a few mistakes but compared with your previous works it was much longer and more coherent. I hope these partial successes will motivate you to work hard next year.

Year 9 (written by teacher A)

Dear Matt, English has never been an easy subject for you and everything you've learned and achieved has been earned by your hard work. I've always admired your determination. You have been able to find a way of effectively coping with various tasks. Your results have always reflected the effort you had put in. On the whole you've made more progress in writing than in speaking. Self-confidence has always been an issue with you. Sometimes you did not have enough of it but after these nine years of hard work you can surely be proud of yourself. I hope that you will be able to use the acquired skills in real situations and perhaps even improve them a step further in the future.

4.4 Final reports of Peter

Peter had a difficult start at primary school. In the first years it was extremely challenging for him to become involved in lessons and participate in them, not only in English. He was described by his teacher as very shy, and with less ability to concentrate than expected for his age. He was often unsuccessful at various tasks, and he required special assistance. This could be noticed in his first reports.

Year 3 (written by teacher A)

In the second half of the third year, similarly to the first, Peter experienced very good days, during which he was working actively and with joy, and not very good days when he was tired, less focused, and not willing to participate in lessons. Peter has made progress this year but he has not sufficiently mastered the lesson content. He has learned a lot of words, he can understand familiar commands and answer simple questions. He does quite well in copying words but when he writes from memory he writes phonetically. It would be very useful if he reviewed and practised writing English words. I would also like to note my appreciation for his participation in our class play, which he managed wonderfully both from the language as well as the social points of view.

Year 5 (written by teacher B)

Peter appears to be very quiet in our lessons, he does not actively participate much. It often takes him a long time to respond when he is called and he relies too much on the help of others. I would really appreciate more initiative on his part during lessons as well as during home preparation. He is rather shy in speaking, but he is beginning to express himself nicely in writing where he likes to play with language and uses a dictionary to learn new words and phrases. I could see all that in his description of My best friend. Overall, Peter has made slight progress in all areas, but he still needs to improve his speaking, class participation, and home preparation.

At lower secondary school Peter started to be more independent and confident. His approach to learning and consequently also his school results changed dramatically, as can be seen in the following two reports.

Year 7 (written by teacher B)

Dear Peter, in the sixth class you started to be less shy in English lessons and this year I can say that you have been fully involved and active in all our activities. You have undergone an enormous change in your attitude to the subject and the result is that you have really improved in all areas. You understand the texts we read with ease and you are able to write a whole page of text which is comprehensible, meaningful and interesting. What I have to highlight most is your newly discovered courage to speak. I also appreciate the fact that you have joined an after-school English club and passed the YLE Movers. You should be really proud of your achievements and that's why I was a bit surprised to read how poorly you view your results in self-assessment. Please think about every sentence in this report and try to see your new strengths clearly and don't underestimate yourself. If you keep up your good work in the years to come, you have a chance to become a very good user of English.

Year 9 (written by teacher A)

Dear Peter, when I look back and see you in your first years at school and compare this picture with who you are at the end of the ninth year, it seems a bit like a miracle to me. Over the years you have become a self-confident and ambitious student capable of overcoming many obstacles and coping with great challenges. That is how I've perceived you in our English lessons. The turning point was the start of lower-secondary school when you gradually began to show to us what you know and what you can do. You have learned a great deal but sometimes you are too modest about your skills and abilities. From the bottom of my heart I wish you all the best in your future and I hope you will grow further and meet inspiring teachers and classmates.

4.5 Final reports of Jane

Unlike Matt and Peter, Jane has been a very motivated and successful pupil in all subjects. According to her reports, she never experienced any difficulties in any area and she has been demonstrating a special interest foreign languages since the first years.

Year 4 (written by teacher A)

I can confirm what Jane expressed in her self-assessment this year: she has coped with all aspects of learning English with great confidence and creativity. Her written work is especially wonderful, precise and also aesthetic. She shows interest in learning more than what we do in our lessons. She likes to use a dictionary and she likes to learn English at home with her parents, which shows how honest her motivation is. The only area she could improve in is her speaking. Jane should not be afraid to speak up even when she is not absolutely sure that her answer is correct.

Year 5 (written by teacher A)

Beyond any doubt, Jane is a talented foreign language learner. She understands perfectly, she can answer questions and make her own sentences. She enjoys thinking about how languages work. She has read both readers with ease and full comprehension. When she reads aloud, she reads fluently with correct pronunciation. Her writing is excellent too, she tries to make her assignments interesting, uses wide vocabulary, and only rarely makes mistakes. She was the one who suggested that we turn our reader Jack and the Beanstalk into a play and in her free time she rewrote it into a script. For next year I hope that she will be more active during lessons as well as more friendly and caring about her classmates' needs.

As both the fourth and the fifth-class reports reveal, Jane was very keen on learning English and she looked for opportunities to improve beyond the class requirements. Her initiative to write a script (together with several classmates and in cooperation with the two teachers) actually resulted in the production of a class play which the pupils performed at the end of the school year to fellow schoolmates as well as at a drama festival in Prague. The following two reports attest that she was able to carry on with her exceptional personal effort and maintained her intrinsic motivation to learn English even during her teenage years.

Year 7 (written by teacher B)

Dear Jane, you have just completed another successful school year. I would say that your skills and abilities are far beyond the expectations at elementary schools. Your speaking is clear and confident though sometimes perhaps a bit too fast, and your writing, such as the Biography of Dr. Watson, often just took my breath away. I admire how capable you are of using grammar and vocabulary we had not learned at school and how naturally you integrate what you learn into your productive expression. I don't think that you need any recommendations from me at this point about how to improve because you know what to do and you also do it! I am overjoyed at the progress you are making.

Year 9 (written by teacher A)

Dear Jane, you have been reading words of praise in your reports all nine years. You deserve that praise for your consistent effort, concentration, participation and genuine interest in foreign languages. In the past two years you have progressed enormously as a result of your own extra effort and you are now able to express yourself in both speaking and writing on a large number of topics. Your current level highly exceeds the expected level of a ninth-grader. I wish you favourable conditions for further growth of your well-built foundations and a loving relationship to foreign languages all throughout your life.

Matt, Peter and Jane attended the same class in their Waldorf school for nine years. They represent three markedly different types of foreign language learners with diverse skills, talents and abilities as well as challenges and difficulties which are depicted in their final reports. The following section summarizes the Waldorf pedagogy approach to assessment and discusses whether the presented foreign language reports are in accordance with the proclaimed principles.

5. Discussion

As it has emerged from the literature review in the theoretical part of this paper, assessment in Waldorf education should be:

1) comprehensible, constructive, without generalized statements;
2) non-judgemental, polite and helpful.
3) include self-assessment, peer-assessment and teacher assessment;
4) provide a holistic picture of the learner;
5) motivate, promote a positive self-image, and support the pupil's integrity;
6) focus on creativity and transformation as opposed to measurable standards;
7) be future-orientated and capture "what is emerging, what is in a state of becoming".

Do the selected reports reflect and respect these essential assessment principles of Waldorf pedagogy? By analysing the final reports of three Waldorf students I have found the following:

Points 1 and 2

All three students' reports refer to concrete skills and abilities, the pupils' participation, motivation, home preparation and relationship to the subject. They describe the pupils' development in these areas comprehensibly and specifically. Various details are included in the reports, e.g. Matt did a successful oral presentation on General Patton in year 8, Peter produced an interesting writing assignment titled *My best friend* in year 5, Jane voluntarily turned her class 5 *Jack and the Beanstalk* reader into a script. All the reports are individual-referenced, i.e. the pupils are not compared to other pupils, only to their previous performances. I did not identify any part or passage which could be considered cliché, impolite or insensitive. Moreover, all the students received recommendations and suggestions for further improvement at some point: Matt was encouraged to maintain home preparation to avoid further decline of his results and gain more confidence (Year 8), Peter should practise spelling of words in writing (Year 3), Jane was prompted to be more active in lessons to improve her speaking (Year 4 and 5).

Point 3

The analysed documents represent teacher assessment and some of them contain comments regarding self-assessment. Teacher A confirms Jane's view of herself and her English skills (Year 4) and teacher B encourages Peter not to underestimate himself and see the progress he has just begun to make in English in a clearer and more positive light (Year 8). Due to their nature the reports do not contain any reference to peer assessment. However, according to the information provided by the interviewed

teachers, peer assessment is frequently used in their lower-middle school English lessons, especially to evaluate homework assignments and oral presentations. Self-assessment in foreign languages is regularly used every year from class 3 in this particular school, but it is not expected to be included in the final reports.

Points 4 and 5

All the reports are based on the teachers' observations as well as other forms of assessment, namely writing assignments, oral presentations, working with readers and using a dictionary to name a few. The affective factors such as the pupils' motivation, attitudes, and effort, appear very significant in the Waldorf teachers' approach to assessment and they are always included in the final report comments. In fact, they seem to be the central theme of the reports in the primary years and in the final Year 9 reports, but they are also substantial in all the other lower-secondary reports. The teachers highlight concrete progress or improvement as well as the pupils' unique qualities: Matt is a toiler (Year 5 and also in Year 4 and 9), Peter passed Cambridge YLE Movers, but he is not able to view his progress objectively (Year 7), Jane can correctly use even language and structures she did not learn at school. While the overall impression is that of positively worded and motivating assessment, which focuses on what the pupils can do rather than not, there are points of criticism in all the pupils' reports, which are in my opinion expressed in a tactful and motivating manner (e.g. Matt, Year 8 and Peter, Year 5).

Points 6 and 7

Creativity appears to be an appreciated value, especially in all Jane's reports and in Peter's lower secondary reports. Matt struggles with meeting even basic standards in the subject and the central theme of all his reports seems to be motivation and encouragement to keep up the hard work he has been putting into learning English. Peter's development is in my opinion an example of what could be understood by the term transformation. We can clearly trace his gradual growth from being a timid, passive pupil with difficulties in various areas of language acquisition (Years 3 and 5) to becoming a confident user of English (Years 7 and 9). Teacher B speaks of "enormous change in attitude to the subject" and a "newly discovered courage to speak" in his Year 7 report, teacher A speaks of a "miracle" in her Year 9 concluding report. It is rather challenging to evaluate whether the documented assessment is future-orientated and captures "what is emerging, what is in a state of becoming". To some extent we can say that there is orientation towards future in the encouragement each pupil receives to keep up good work or improve: Matt (Year 5, 8 and 9), Peter (Year 7 and 9), and all Jane's reports. It is further reinforced by acknowledging extracurricular activities of the pupils related to the subject as well as skills and abilities exceeding classroom experience

(Matt and Jane). The reports could be viewed as personal messages from teachers to their students. In addition to that, the ninth-class reports do not refer only to the achievements of the school year but offer a sort of a summative look at how the pupils grew and developed in English throughout primary and lower-secondary school and a very personal wish from the teachers for the future.

Could the Waldorf assessment principles be applied in other settings? While in Western Europe and North America it is a well-established tradition even in mainstream education to use comments and reports as part of assessment at various levels of education, usually in combination with grades, in countries such as the Czech Republic, grading still prevails while verbal comments and/or written reports are rare, with the exception of alternative schools. To produce a written report is much more time-consuming than to produce a grade. Both teachers A and B estimate that it takes them approximately 30 minutes to produce a report for one student in one subject, and on top of that they spend additional time discussing and proofreading the reports of their colleagues. Teacher A explained that before writing a report, she always pictured each child in the context of the whole learning period and thought about what the child really needed to hear most. She had often read previous reports of the child before writing a new one to address the most important issues and report on the child's progress. Both teachers described report writing as challenging, often extremely tiring, but also enriching, especially when progress has been observed. These special demands are most likely to be the chief limitations to a wider use of this assessment technique.

6. Conclusion

The case study was created to demonstrate how final assessment in foreign language instruction, with a particular emphasis on final reports, is rendered at a Czech Waldorf school. While illustrative of this setting, it does have some limitations. The focus of the study is very narrow as it only shows how three pupils were assessed in their English lessons in one school by two teachers in one country. A broader focus would very likely show a larger variety of approaches. Suggestions for further research would therefore include exploring the practice in other educational contexts, carrying out comparative studies within the Waldorf movement in other countries, and investigating the theme from the perspective of its recipients, i.e. the students or even parents.

The selected reports offer a qualitative, descriptive, in-depth views into the issue. They are in line with the essential theoretical principles regarding assessment at Waldorf schools and in this respect may be considered as examples of good practice. They correspond, without doubt, with the *assidere/adsidere* meaning of the word assessment. Last but not least, they reveal the benefits of having the opportunity to work with and accompany students over a long period of time. That is an indubitable privilege of Waldorf teachers, who thus have the chance to perceive their pupils in the

process of growing and becoming, which appears to have a very significant impact on how they conceive assessment.

References

Coombe, C. (2018). *An A to Z of second language assessment: how language teachers understand assessment concepts*. London, UK: British Council.

Internal materials regarding assessment from Czech Waldorf schools in Ceske Budejovice, Brno, Olomouc, Pardubice and Prague.

Ireland, H. (2015). Assessment for learning in Waldorf classrooms. *The Research Institute for Waldorf Education Research Bulletin, 20*(2), 43-46.

Lutzker, P. (2013). Creativity and transformation in language learning and teaching. *Journal of the Pedagogical Section at the Goetheanum, 48*, 13-22.

Rawson, M. (2005). The role of evaluation and examinations within Waldorf education within different age groups. In D. Mitchell (Ed.), *Evaluation, homework and teacher support* (pp. 25-36). Fair Oaks, CA: AWSNA Publications

Rawson, M. (2015). Assessment: A Waldorf perspective. *The Research Institute for Waldorf Education Research Bulletin, 20*(2), 30-42.

Sievers, U. (2017). *Creative teaching, sustainable learning: A holistic approach to foreign language teaching and learning*. Norderstedt: BoD.

Templeton, A. (2007). *Teaching English to teens and preteens: A Guide for Language Teachers*. Szeged: hevesim.

Thomas, R. (2005). Evaluating, judging, testing and learning. In D. Mitchell (Ed.), *Evaluation, homework and teacher support* (pp. 19-24). Fair Oaks, CA: AWSNA Publications.

Wiechert, CH. (2013). Cosmopolitan goals and ways of achieving them. *Journal of the Pedagogical Section at the Goetheanum, 48*, 4-12.

Zachos, P. (2004). Discovering the true nature of educational assessment. *The Research Institute for Waldorf Education Research Bulletin, 9*(2), 7-12.

From EMI to CLIL: Methodological strategies for bilingual instruction at university[1]

Jesús Ángel González and Javier Barbero Andrés
University of Cantabria

DOI:10.14232/edulingua.2018.1.5

We report on a small-scale study carried out in the University of Cantabria, Spain, which investigated teaching strategies and methodology for CLIL at the tertiary level. The study was carried out in two stages: in the first one we designed a questionnaire for primary and secondary school teachers, and interviewed 10 CLIL teachers. The focus was on teaching strategies and methodology, with the explicit aim of collecting advice applicable to the tertiary level. In the second stage we have tested these tips in a university context through a second questionnaire and round of interviews. We have interviewed 10 EMI university lecturers and asked them about methodological strategies, and specifically about the advice suggested by their colleagues. Our findings suggest that CLIL teachers from lower levels are well acquainted with CLIL methodology and that EMI practitioners at university find their advice very useful, although they show reluctance towards deeper methodological changes.

Key words: CLIL, EMI, teaching strategies, methodology, bilingual education

1. Introduction: CLIL and EMI

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has been defined as "a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language" (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010, p. 1). Since it was born in a primary and secondary school context, it is only natural that most of the research carried out about it has taken place in those two levels and not at a tertiary level, but this has been changing slowly in the last few years. Wilkinson (2004) and Fernández (2009), and, more recently, Fortanet (2013), Lasagabaster and Doiz (2016), O'Dowd (2018), and Schmidt-Unterberger (2018) have considered the possibility and challenges of implementing a CLIL approach at the tertiary level, or ICLHE (Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education), as CLIL at university is frequently called.

This ICLHE-focused research is, in fact, becoming more and more necessary due to the increase of English-only programs and bilingual programs in public and private universities in Europe. Wachter and Maiworm (2014) documented this increase with a longitudinal study that shows an exponential increase in programmes taught in European Higher Education Institutions: from 700 programmes in 2002 to 8,089 in 2014. Similarly, a survey of 70 European universities by O'Dowd (2018) found that only 7% stated that they were offering no courses at all in English. According to Wilkinson, the fact that English is "increasingly gaining ground as the language of

[1] This research was supported as part of the project *Bilingual teaching and learning in Cantabria: From primary to tertiary education*, funded by the University of Cantabria, UC 2016-GRE-10.

instruction in universities" has started to provoke resistance even in English-friendly countries like the Netherlands and has fostered "a massive increase in academic studies on the phenomenon of English-taught degree programmes and courses" (2018, pp. 1-2). As Coleman phrased it, English is "the language of higher education in Europe" (2006, p. 1), and Dearden (2015) has shown that we can find a similar trend in the rest of the world. This increase means that bilingual teaching affects now a wider spectrum of students, including those who do not have the necessary proficiency to follow cognitively demanding University-level classes in English. As a result, in places like Southern Europe where previously EMI (English Medium Instruction) practitioners did not have to consider a different methodology, now CLIL (or ICLHE) has become necessary to make complex content available to students with a limited knowledge of English. According to Wachter and Maiworm (2014), the spread of EMI instruction in Southern Europe is not as extensive as in Central and Northern Europe, possibly as a result of a lower level of English proficiency. In the specific case of Spain, however, national and regional policies (including the generalization of bilingual teaching) have been implemented in the last few years to improve English proficiency in primary and secondary schools. Similarly, "the number of EMI programmes in [Spanish universities] has clearly increased in the last five years as have the international students attending Spanish HEIs [higher education institutions]" (Dafouz, 2018, p. 5). The combination of this increase and a comparatively low English proficiency among the students has meant that many EMI programmes in Spain need to keep the dual focus on language and content typical of CLIL (Dafouz, 2018).

Before moving on to the description of our study, it is important to establish the terminological differences between EMI and CLIL, as well as the methodological implications of CLIL. In general, we can say that EMI is used in tertiary settings in countries where English is not the mother tongue, as shown in this definition:

> EMI (English Medium Instruction) entails the use of the English language to teach academic subjects in countries or jurisdictions where the first language (L1) of the majority of the population is not English. *It may or may not include the implicit aim of increasing students' English language abilities*, (Brown & Bradford, 2017, p. 330, based on Dearden, 2015, *our italics*)

In contrast, CLIL tends to be used in primary and secondary schools where the final goal is to develop language proficiency *and* content knowledge:

> CLIL is an approach to education that integrates language and content learning; planning for, fostering, and assessing both, though the focus may shift from one to the other. *CLIL is also a method of teaching which draws heavily on constructivist and socio-cultural notions of learning* to provide students with opportunities for meaningful input and output in L2 and meaningful engagement with content (Brown & Bradford, 2017, p. 331, *our italics*)

As summarized in Table 1, EMI refers only to University programmes taught in English (no other language), it has a more global dimension than CLIL (which is mainly European), and it may have ideological implications. Besides, and this is important for our purposes here, it may ignore language learning completely, since its main aim is the internationalization of the University (a top-down process), that is to say bringing in students from abroad who are supposed to be already proficient in English. In contrast, CLIL is used for a variety of languages (not only English), it was developed in Europe (where we can find most of the examples of CLIL programmes), and it was at first a bottom-up local or regional process, even though now we can find more examples of top-down programmes. Since it was created in order to deal with students who were not proficient in their L2, one of the objectives, together with content, has always been language learning. As a result, it has become "more than an approach; a widely accepted method of teaching CLIL courses has emerged" (Brown & Bradford, 2017, p. 330).

Table 1 EMI vs. CLIL

EMI	CLIL
• English only (not L1) • Global (ideological implications) • Top-down (internationalization) • Focus on content, not language • No particular interest in methodology	• Several languages • Mainly European. • Bottom-up at first, later more top-down. • Double focus on content and language. • Specific methodology

So, what does this specific CLIL method or methodology imply? Brown and Bradford have summarized some of its main features: CLIL lessons are expected to engage students in the four communicative skills and to balance the students' receptive and productive experience with the target language; teachers approach language lexically rather than grammatically; content is based on a curriculum rather than on topics of general interest or current affairs; classes need to pay attention to four key elements of CLIL teaching, known as the four Cs of CLIL (content, communication, cognition, and culture) and, finally, CLIL lessons rest on constructivist principles of active and cooperative learning and the co-construction of knowledge (Brown & Bradford, 2017, pp. 330-331, based on Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010). To these elements, we should add the following (related or inter-related to the previous ones):

1) Teachers should provide context to context-reduced language tasks (Halbach, 2012)

2) Since the priority of CLIL is the content rather than the language (Ball, Kelly, & Clegg, 2015, p. 36; the term they use for this is "conceptual fronting"), it is necessary to make key language salient by embedding and scaffolding students'

performance through modelling, posing of questions or breaking up the tasks to make them more manageable (Halbach, 2012)

3) Use visual support (images, diagrams, slides)

4) Support student output (Ball, Kelly, & Clegg, 2015, p. 44)

5) Following constructivist principles, focus on the students' experience, and therefore activate prior knowledge (Dale, Van der Es, & Tanner, p. 2010)

The authors of this paper considered, after revising the EMI and CLIL literature reviewed previously, that rather than simply informing EMI teachers at our institution about the teaching strategies inherent in CLIL methodology, it would be very interesting to build bridges between different levels of education, take advantage of the experience of our colleagues in primary and secondary education and ask them which of these methodological principles they thought would be important for their university colleagues. The aim of the study, therefore, was not to ask them about the principles of CLIL methodology (which we have summarized above), but which teaching strategies related to "the CLIL method" could be applied at university in classes were content is more demanding from a cognitive point of view and where students' English proficiency is higher than in secondary school but often lower than required for those tasks.

2. The study

2.1 Context to the study

The institution where this research has been carried out is the University of Cantabria (UC), a medium-sized institution in Northern Spain that, like many others in Europe, has been increasing the number of courses in English noticeably in the last few years. The UC is the only public HEI in the small autonomous region of Cantabria. With a student body of approximately 10,000, it is a research-oriented university that receives around 400 incoming students every year and sends out a similar number. It is part of several international networks (*Santander, Compostela, AUIP, CINDA*) and is very active internationally not only in Erasmus+, but also in bilateral agreements with universities from the USA and Latin America. The increase of courses in English at the UC is part of an internationalization strategy aimed both at the attraction of English-speaking students and at the "internationalization at home" of Spanish students, who are required to hold a B2 certificate in English in order to graduate. As a result, the University offers a total of 152 courses in English in all its degrees, taught by lecturers who are required to have a C1 level in English in order to be part of the EMI programme. There are two types of courses taught in English: those specifically

designed for exchange students (normally students with a B2-C1 level of English or even native English speakers) and courses which are part of regular Bachelor or Master's Degrees (and therefore mostly taken by Spanish students with a proficiency in English ranging approximately from A2+ to C1, but with a high percentage of A2-B1 students). Although Schmidt-Unterberger argues against the use of CLIL or ICLHE in higher education settings, due to the fact that "language development is not amongst the set learning objectives" (2018, pp. 2-3), this is not the case in our university. The A2-B1 students are strongly motivated to reach B2 level, but their English is hardly enough to follow cognitively demanding contents in English, which is why a CLIL methodology seems to be the most appropriate in this context. These EMI courses are offered in the third or fourth year, so most of the students' ages range roughly from 20 to 25.

2.2 Materials and methods

The study was carried out in two stages, as part of two different projects of teaching innovation at the University of Cantabria. In the first stage (2011-2012), whose description and results have been published in González and Barbero (2013), we designed a set of questions for primary and secondary school teachers, with 16 questions going from the more general aspects of CLIL to specific questions about methodology and, more specifically, methodological advice for university teachers. We then interviewed 10 teachers working in primary and secondary schools, both public and state-subsidized schools. In the sample we included both CLIL teachers (teaching 7 different subjects) and English-language teachers taking part in CLIL programs, but all of them with a reasonable experience with CLIL (from 2 to 12 years). The set of questions was the basis for the semi-structured interviews, which were carried out by the authors in English or Spanish (depending on the participants' mother tongue), and following McCracken's suggestions about the "long interview" (McCracken, 1998). They were then transcribed by an assistant, and coded into categories and analysed in detail by the authors. Taking into account all the teachers' answers, we developed a summary of their advice, which we called a *methodological decalogue* for university lecturers in bilingual programmes (González & Barbero, 2013, p. 18).

In the second stage (2012-2017), we tested the decalogue in a university context in two different ways: first, in 8-hour training courses for teachers in six different instances from 2012 to 2017 (a course called "CLIL: Methodological Orientations for a Better Practice" supported by a blog called "From Bilingual Teaching to CLIL" that can be found at http://bilingualteachingunican.blogspot.com), where the attendants provided informal feedback about the decalogue; and then, in a second round of interviews with 10 university lecturers with experience in EMI from very different backgrounds and colleges (see Table 2 below).

Table 2 Colleges and courses

Colleges	Courses
• Education • Electrical Engineering • Civil Engineering • Chemical Engineering • Medicine • Mathematics • Economy	• Children´s Literature and Literary Education • English Phonetics • English Acquisition as a Foreign Language • Foreign Language Teaching and Learning • Research Methodology in Language Acquisition • Electrical Drives • Energy Systems • Molecular Biology of the Cell • Fundamental Pharmacology • Drug Dependence and Addiction • Statistical Inference • Macroeconomics • International Business: a European Perspective • International Business Economics: Modelling and Simulation • European Economic Policy • Open Economy Macroeconomics

Excluding two courses created by the university for exchange students with a better level of English, all the other courses taught by our participants are part of a Bachelor's or Master's degree and therefore mainly attended by Spanish students with various levels of English, as mentioned before. The 10 University lecturers teaching these courses include 7 men and 3 women with a variety of linguistic and professional backgrounds. Their ages range from 30 to 65, they all had had some previous experience teaching in English (both in Spain and abroad), and, with the exception of a native English speaker and an English philologist with a C2 in English, they all have a C1 in English, with more self-declared proficiency in written than oral skills. Class size is highly variable (from 10 to 60 students), as well as the teaching conditions: some of the classes are lectures, whereas others include laboratory practice or the possibility of splitting groups for more practical sessions. This kind of variety highlights one of the basic difficulties when implementing CLIL at a tertiary level, namely the heterogeneity of degrees and teaching contexts.

In the first questionnaire (for primary and secondary school teachers) we inquired about different topics related to their teaching practice, such as linguistic competence, teacher training, experience as a CLIL teacher, theoretical knowledge about CLIL, materials, cooperation between language and content teachers, skill balance, general difficulties, advantages of CLIL, or use of ICT, but the main focus was on methodology and teaching strategies, the final question being: "What kind of methodological advice would you give to university lecturers who would like to implement CLIL at the University of Cantabria?" (the complete set of questions was published in González & Barbero, 2013).

The main focus of our set of questions for university lecturers (see Appendix) was the decalogue, but we offered the participants the chance to speak about their experience more freely. Therefore, the participants also spoke about the EMI program at UC and about general questions of organization and educational policy, like the professional or economic benefits of being involved in such a program, or the main difficulties that they encountered teaching in English. All the semi-structured interviews were carried out in English or Spanish (depending on the participants' mother tongue), and they were recorded and subsequently transcribed using a procedure similar to the one used in the first stage. They are confidential and anonymous and each took approximately 30 minutes.

3. Results

3.1 First stage: primary and secondary school teachers' recommendations concerning CLIL

The most important results we obtained in the first stage were the methodological recommendations, which we summarized in the aforementioned methodological decalogue, already published in our 2013 study:

1) Communication is a must. English should be used as much as possible, but the mother tongue can also be used in case of communication blockage. "Translanguaging" (Kim, 2018) is perfectly acceptable.

2) Scaffolding is essential. Identify language demands and provide support strategies. Use visual aids and written language whenever necessary. All students, but particularly all those whose listening skills are not the best, will appreciate the use of slides summarizing the main ideas stated in class. Model and break up the tasks if appropriate.

3) A reference lexical corpus is required for every task. Advance work (with warm-up activities like video comprehension, Webquests or the like) on specific vocabulary should be done prior to the explanation of cognitively challenging content.

4) Use ICT, in particular software and on-line material, in English.

5) Use a student-centred approach. Put yourself in the students' position. Provide the opportunity for as much hands-on learning as possible. Use pair work and group work.

6) In assessment, content should be a priority over language: linguistic competence in the foreign language is an added value which should be rewarded, but the lack of fluency in the foreign language should not be a major obstacle for a positive evaluation

7) Use diverse assessment instruments: self-assessment, peer assessment, rubrics, and language and content portfolios.

8) Repeat and consolidate. Present information in different formats.

9) Plan carefully in order to be flexible.

10) Turn problems into opportunities. Be bold as far as methodology is concerned and take advantage of this new educational context to work on a different paradigm. Teachers are facilitators and mediators between language and content, not mere transmitters of knowledge. Assess your own teaching practice (with instruments like the EPOSTL, or "The CLIL Teachers' Competences Grid"). (González and Barbero, 2013, p. 18)

We can see that most of these tips (like the emphasis on lexis, the scaffolding techniques, or the constructivist student-centred approach) also appear in the summary of CLIL methodology that we have provided in section 1, which means that in general the teachers we interviewed are well acquainted with CLIL teaching techniques and that they believe that most of these principles and techniques can also be applied in tertiary Education. As an example, we can see some of the comments provided by the teachers:

> Participant #1: *A CLIL teacher must be really open to new methodological approaches and to new ways of assessment. The thing is: how do you assess students who are studying your content through the foreign language? And how do you facilitate that assessment process? Many times you have to put yourself in the place of the student, which is something we teachers are not very used to doing.*
>
> Participant #6: *They should forget about traditional teaching. I feel sorry for those professors who try to preserve that approach!! Student groups should be smaller, classes should be based on debate-based continuous interaction.*
>
> Participant #7: *Professors should not take for granted that their students have the level of English they are supposed to have.*
>
> Participant #8: *Visual aids are really important, if students have that kind of material they understand everything much better and in that sense ICTs are essential.*
>
> Participant #9: *They should look for more practical ways to show content to students. Traditional teaching simply does not work and ICT should have a very relevant role together with collaborative work.*

3.2 Second stage: university lecturers' responses about CLIL implementation

In the second stage, we recorded the reaction of our university participants to the decalogue provided by their colleagues. In general, we can say that the university lecturers reacted favourably to the suggestions. We have organized their reactions,

depending on their agreement with their recommendations, in three different groups: complete agreement, partial agreement, and disagreement.

3.2.1 Complete agreement with the recommendations

All the participants showed complete agreement with the following recommendations: 2, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9. They all use PowerPoint slides and other forms of visual support such as images or diagrams, although some of them were not familiar with the concept of scaffolding. Participant #2, for example, mentions several forms of methodological support: "*The methodology should be different. For example, we should use more linguistic simplification and visual aids, more repetitions and paraphrasing, as well as more interactive strategies*" (#2). All the interviewees place particular emphasis on lexis, and 6 of them provide the students with a glossary or another form of lexical support (#3). They all use ICT, particularly Moodle and the internet, where they find worthwhile teaching material such as videos or presentations (#4). Since they consider their job to teach content, they don't worry too much about language accuracy. In three cases, they openly admitted that they do not care about language accuracy at all; much more so for assessment, where content is the only priority. Participant #4 mentions some of the strategies used in order to minimize language-related mistakes in assessment: "*We normally deliver multiple choice tests and short answer tests. We don´t take into account the possible linguistic mistakes they may have. They don´t tend to have difficulties in these tests. Oral presentations are different, the higher their level is, the better for their presentations, we must admit that definitely influences their final marks…*" (#6). They all tend to repeat things in different formats: Four of them mentioned combining theory and practice in order to consolidate content and skills (#8). While all of them spend a long time planning the classes, they are also ready to be flexible and use more time than previously planned if they feel that students have not understood a certain point (#9). Let us remember that in most of these university courses, there is much more freedom than in subjects of primary and secondary education, which are more constricted by a common curriculum, so in that sense lecturers can afford to be more flexible than their colleagues: Three actually mention that you need to skip topics when you teach in English, but that does not seem to be an unsurmountable problem.

3.2.2 Partial agreement with the recommendations

The participants have shown partial agreement with tips number 1, 7 and 10. While they all agree that communication is essential, four of them said that they only use English (#1). Let us remember that there are many types of courses taught by these lecturers, and in some of them, they teach exchange students more proficient in English than in Spanish. While most teachers use a variety of assessment procedures (in our University,

only 60% of the final mark can be based on a final exam, so they all need to use other forms of continuous assessment), half of them feel reluctant to use self-assessment or peer-assessment techniques. Participant #6, for example, says that, "*I think that the idea of continuous assessment and alternative forms of assessment is not serious. In the real world, you risk your neck every day. What I need to make sure is that at the end of the day they master some basic statistical techniques. That's it*" (#7). Although they like the sentence "turn problems into opportunities", they are not so convinced about the implications. More specifically, six participants say that they are not convinced that teaching in English means that they are working in a new educational context or a different paradigm. Participant #4, for example, points out, *"When I teach in English, I don't think I do anything differently. The content is the same, and apart from maybe checking more often that they are following you, I do the same things*"; and participant #1 does not think that there are important methodological changes: "*I think that the methodology is similar, but the rhythm changes. The students need more time and space to assimilate things*" (#10).

3.2.3 Disagreement with the recommendations

Finally, the tip they have agreed with the least is Tip #5 ("use a student-centred approach") which is the one most related to the constructivist-collaborative approach and the one that would imply the deepest changes in methodology. Nine of them think that they would like their students to work in pairs or groups, but they say they cannot do it in their classes, in some cases because the classes are overcrowded, in others because of the characteristics of the content that they have to teach. Eight lecturers mention that they are very reluctant about the student-centred approach, and the teacher's role as facilitator. In fact, three of the participants blame the students themselves, because they do not accept it or do not want to change their traditional, more passive role. This reluctance also crops up in other parts of the questionnaire. For example, although nine participants are familiar with the term CLIL, to the question: "Do you think that teaching in English implies not just code-switching but also a methodological change?" four consider EMI as simply changing the language of teaching. And when asked about teaching techniques, the commonest one mentioned by the teachers is still the lecture, used frequently by eight of the participants and occasionally by two. The following two comments illustrate the teachers' reluctance with the student-centered approach:

> Participant #10: *I can see the teachers changing their role as facilitators, but not the students changing their more passive role, because they expect to have things done for them, and work as little as possible. And this has nothing to do with the language… I think that people ask too much from teachers, when it should actually be the opposite.*

> Participant #9: *I agree with the student-centred approach, you should teach students how to learn on their own, but it doesn't happen. The students don't accept it, because they think that what they are doing is not being validated by their teacher.*

3.2.4 General questions about the EMI program

As shown before, we also asked the participants about other more general questions related to EMI, or the particular organization of EMI at their university, and their answers are in general consistent with the literature about EMI and CLIL. Most of them are quite happy with the program and they mention personal reasons like professional development (teaching specialization), personal fulfilment, or the satisfaction of having overcome a challenge, although they also mention the reduction in teaching load, which, at the time, meant that credits taught in English counted twice as much as credits taught in Spanish. The positive aspects of EMI they mention most often are the improvement in students' English proficiency (8 lecturers), and the internationalization of the students' body (6). As an example, we can see this comment from one of the participants:

> Participant#5: *I´m very happy with this program. Personally, it gives me a lot and I really think we should keep on working on it all in the long term.*

As to the problems related to teaching in English, material production does not seem to be an issue, since most of the bibliography used in those courses is already in English. As far as assessment is concerned, most of the participants have found ways to minimize the effect of students' low English proficiency in their assessment, as mentioned before: multiple-choice tests, lab tests, or other forms of assessment with limited L2 production. The participants complain about lack of training (both methodological and linguistic, even though all of them have at least a C1 level), about the students' level of English, and about organizational issues related to budget restrictions, like the number of students in class or professional compensations. From a more holistic point of view, some of them wonder about the coherence of teaching in English in Spain, and whether having just a few courses in English in a degree is enough. The following comment illustrates this point:

> Participant #7: *Maybe we've gone too far with this obsession with English. Why should everything be taught in English? I think we should rethink it all and filter a little bit what kind of content or subjects we want to teach through English. Sometimes students have the perception that passing subjects in English is easier as teachers tend to be more lenient, and I´m talking about Medicine studies…!!*

4. Discussion

Among the limitations of the study we first need to mention the small scale and range: it is based on a limited number of participants from only one university. However, we have found considerable agreement in the opinions expressed by our participants. In the first stage of our research, we were able to establish that CLIL practitioners at primary and secondary schools have a very clear understanding of the methodology and teaching techniques implied by CLIL, and that they think that most of these strategies are applicable at a tertiary level. In the second stage we have been testing these tips in a university context through a second set of questions and round of interviews. We have seen that EMI teachers at our university found the decalogue based on the experience of their colleagues from primary and secondary education very useful for their teaching practice. They showed complete agreement with 60% of the tips and partial agreement with 30%. In addition, they seem to be very conscious of the students' linguistic needs and they try to help them to learn the content by using conceptual fronting, repeating, scaffolding, embedding, making language salient, and using ICT. However, although our findings suggest that EMI practitioners at our university seem to be willing to teach in English, and are ready to change many aspects of their teaching methods, they do not seem to be ready to make the deeper changes necessary to implement a CLIL methodology in tertiary education, CLIL's "enriched pedagogy" which is "its major achievement" according to Ball, Kelly & Clegg (2015, p. 4). Therefore, we have to agree with O'Dowd (2018) ("lecturers themselves often do not believe in or see this need for a methodological shift … to more student-centred approaches", p. 3) and Dearden and Macaro (2016) who detected a "distinct lack of awareness of a need to change pedagogy in order to help students … to cope with content delivered through a second language", although they found that instructors seem to be "relatively open to the need for a revised pedagogy" (p. 479).

The implications of these findings seem to be far-reaching. First of all, it is important that both university administrators and lecturers become aware of the fact that teaching in a foreign language is a process that involves not simply changing the language of instruction, but also the manner in which the classes are managed, prepared and taught. This means that, in line with O'Dowd (2018), Dafouz (2018), and Wilkinson (2018), we think there is a need of specific training for the instructors taking part in these programs. This training should involve not only linguistic tools, but also, and more importantly, a redefinition of teaching and assessment methods. Another implication is that both language teachers and researchers should help to build more bridges between different levels of education. We tend to think of knowledge transfer as a top-down process (from higher education to lower levels), but our study suggests that there is much to be learned from bottom-up processes too, particularly if we focus on pedagogy and teaching techniques.

5. Conclusion

This article has presented the findings of a two-stage study which has aimed at building a bridge between different levels of education. Having detected a need for a change in teaching strategies in our EMI context, we decided to ask the CLIL practitioners for advice and therefore designed a set of questions for primary and secondary school CLIL teachers. The results of this first stage (the recommendations summarized in a decalogue of methodological tips) were found very useful by the university lecturers, who are very much aware of the need to make cognitively demanding content available to students with a limited proficiency in English. Having said this, the lecturers do not seem to be ready to go beyond conventional lecture-based teaching and embrace a CLIL student-centred approach. This paper hopes to raise awareness of the need to incorporate the best contributions of the CLIL method in EMI contexts where the students have a limited proficiency in English.

References

Ball, P., Kelly, K., & Clegg J. (2015). *Putting CLIL into practice*. Oxford: OUP.

Brown, H., & Bradford, A. (2017). EMI, CLIL & CBI: Differing approaches and goals. In Clements, P., Krause, A., & Brown, H. (Eds.), *Transformation in Language Education* (pp. 328-334). Tokyo: JALT.

Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching,* 39(1), 1-14.

Coyle, D., Hood P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: CUP.

Dafouz, E. (2018). English-medium instruction and teacher education programmes in higher education: ideological forces and imagined identities at work. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21*(5), 540-552. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1487926.

Dale, L., Van der Es W., & Tanner, R. (2010). *CLIL Skills*. Leiden: ICLON.

Dearden J. (2015). *English as medium of instruction: A growing global phenomenon.* London: British Council.

Dearden, J., & Macaro, E. (2016). Higher education teachers' attitudes towards English Medium Instruction: A three-country comparison. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 6*, 455-486.

Fernández, D. J. (2009). CLIL at the university level: Relating language teaching with and through content teaching. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning, 2*(2), 10-26.

Fortanet, I. (Ed.). (2013). *CLIL in higher education: Towards a multilingual language policy.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

González, J. A. & Barbero, J. (2013). Building bridges between different levels of education: Methodological proposals for CLIL at university. *Language Value, 5*(1), 1-23.

Halbach, A. (2012). Adapting content subject for bilingual teaching. *Encuentro, 21*, 34-41.

Kim, S. (2018). "It was kind of a given that we were all multilingual": Transnational youth identity work in digital translanguaging. *Linguistics and Education, 43*, 39-52.

McCracken, G. (1988). *The long interview*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lasagabaster, D., & Doiz, A. (eds.). (2016). *CLIL Experiences in secondary and tertiary education: In search of good practices.* Bern: Peter Lang.

O'Dowd, R. (2018). The training and accreditation of teachers for English Medium Instruction: an overview of practice in European universities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21*(5), 553-563. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1491945.

Schmidt-Unterberger, B. (2018). The English-medium paradigm: A conceptualization of English-medium teaching in higher education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21*(5), 527-539. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1491949.

Wächter, B., & Maiworm F. (eds.). (2014). *English-taught programmes in European higher education*. Bonn: Lemmens.

Wilkinson, R. (ed.). (2004). *Integrating content and language. Meeting the challenge of multilingual higher education*. Maastricht: Universitaire Pers Maastricht.

Wilkinson, R. (2018). Content and language integration at universities? Collaborative reflections. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 23*(5), 607-615. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1491948.

Appendix: Questions for university lecturers

1. In general terms: how would you define your current linguistic competence in English?
2. Which is the most difficult basic skill for you? Why?
3. Do you still teacher-train in activities related with English? How?
4. Do you know the following acronyms and the methodological approach which they imply? CLIL/EMI/ICLHE
5. Do you think that teaching your subject in English implies, together with a linguistic code change, a methodological change?
6. What kind of basic reference material do you use in your classes? Textbooks? Materials from the Internet? Materials of your own production?
7. What kind of teaching techniques do you use in your classes?
8. How do you assess your subject? Do you take into account the initial English level of your students? If that's the case, how do you do it?
9. How would you describe your students´ linguistic competence according to their basic skills?
10. Name the three biggest difficulties you find teaching your subject in English.
11. What kind of positive aspects do you find in teaching your subject in English?
12. What is the role of ICT in your classes? Which are the best ICT resources in your opinion?
13. What kind of professional or economic benefits do you obtain from teaching your subject in English?
14. How would you qualify the current situation of your university in terms of teaching subjects in English?
15. How would you improve this current situation?

16. What's your opinion about the following methodological decalogue? Do you think it would be applicable in your teaching context?

List of Contributors

Javier Barbero Andrés has a PhD in English Philology and a Degree in Spanish Philology (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain) His research interests center on Content and Language Integrated Learning. He has enjoyed research stays in different countries, teaching simultaneously at secondary and tertiary levels since 1996. He has been an active member of international research projects such as the multidisciplinary *Globe Project*, and University of Cantabria's *Elaboración de guías metodológicas y de recursos docentes para la enseñanza bilingüe.* He works both for the Regional Education Authority of Cantabria and the Department of Philology of the University of Cantabria.

Kateřina Dvořáková is a lecturer at the University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice, Czech Republic. Her main subjects at the English department are primary ELT methodology, classroom communication skills and using drama in foreign language instruction. She also supervises teaching practice in primary and lower-secondary schools. Her research focus includes the teaching of foreign languages at Waldorf (Steiner) schools, innovative approaches in foreign language instruction and assessment techniques. She is also the co-author of English textbooks for both primary and lower-secondary levels.

Jesús Ángel González is a professor of English at the University of Cantabria, Spain, where he teaches English language and American literature. He holds an M.A. in Spanish from the Pennsylvania State University and a PhD in English from the University of Salamanca, Spain. He has published *La narrativa popular de Dashiell Hammett: Pulps, Cine y Cómics* (Valencia University Press, 2002), co-edited *The Invention of Illusions: International Perspectives on Paul Auster* (Cambridge Scholars, 2011) and written a number of articles on Applied Linguistics, as well as on American Literature. His most recent research deals with the American West and bilingual teaching at university.

Jill Kay Partridge Salomon is a senior lecturer at ESPE (Teacher Training Institute) at Université de Limoges, France and affiliated to CeReS, the Research Centre for Semiotics. She teaches English and English Teaching Methods and coordinates Research in a Masters Program for future primary school teachers. Her research interests focus on the use of authentic material in the teaching of English L2 to primary level pupils. She is currently part of an Erasmus+ project on Inclusive Pedagogy.

Věra Sládková has been studying at the PhD program in ELT Methodology at Masaryk University in Brno in the Czech Republic and building CZEMATELC, a learner corpus

consisting of English essays written by Czech secondary-school students as part of their school-leaving exam since 2016. The interlanguage features she has analyzed by means of corpus analytical tools in her dissertation research to date include commas, verb-preposition and adjective-preposition collocations.