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OUTLINE OF THE SESSION

• **PART I:** CONTEXT OF THE STUDY
  – SOCIAL: Bologna’s European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and multilingualism
  ─ THEORETICAL: INTEGRATED Content and Language (ICL)
    • In Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research

• **PART II:** ICL for the Economics students: An empirical study
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EUROPEAN APPROACH LANGUAGES

– European strategy towards multilingualism
  • 1995: White Paper on Education and Training:
  • Towards a learning society
    – (1+2 formula)
  1. Formal instruction with an early start
  2. Erasmus mobility scheme
  3. Curricular content through a foreign language CLIL
    (Pérez-Vidal 2011)

– Young European
  Plurilingual speakers

CHALLENGE: INTERNATIONALISATION
EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA (EHEA)
Bologna Declaration
EHEA’s LINGUISTIC POLICIES

- LANGUAGES FOR ALL....YES!!
  - The Bologna ethos...
    - ECTS transparency
      - 3 year degrees
      - 2 year masters
  - Mobility of students
    - Schengen Treaty
  - Integrated Content and Language/English Medium Instruction (ICL/EMI)
    - Alcon y Michavila 2012; Fortanet 2013; Lasagabaster y Sierra 2013; Coleman 2013; Pérez-Vidal 2014
    - The Journal of Language Policies,
ICLHE I

– EMI programmes have *tripled* in the *last decade*, with as many as 2,400 courses running in the non-English speaking member states.
  – Wächter and Maiworm’s, 2008 ACA report

– English-taught programmes (ETP) at Bachelor and Master “are a very young […] and still *not a mass phenomenon*”, with 2% of the total 40 million HE student population participating in them.

– Dafouz & Smit, 2013 AILA monograph
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ICL and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research
ICL A CHARACTERISATION I

• “Classrooms are widely seen as a kind of language *bath* which encourages naturalistic language learning and *enhances the development of communicative competence* (…) with learning through acquisition rather than through explicit teaching [focus-on-form] and learners acting as language *users not as novices.*”

> Dalton-Puffer 2007
ICL AND SLA

– TWO CENTRAL ISSUES:

• QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF INPUT AND INTERACTION:

 TIME
Larger Amounts Of time of exposure

Distribution

Success in L2 acquisition

Large amounts in ICL

?
QUALITY OF INPUT and INTERACTION

SA
- MASSIVE EXPOSURE Outside The Classroom
  - Sociolinguistically varied (multiple speakers, situations, degrees of formality)
  - Massive opportunities for output practice

icl
- ACADEMIC EXPOSURE
  - Restricted to the classroom/academics
  - Focus on meaning (Curricular content)
  - Larger opportunities for use

FI
- POOR EXPOSURE
  - Restricted to the classroom
  - Focus on form (EFL content)
  - Fewer opportunities for output

Kasper & Rose 2005; Long 1996; Van Patten 2003
ICL POTENTIAL BENEFITS

• ”While CLIL programmes rarely offer the same amount of contact with the language as actual immersion programmes [i.e. SA], they do contribute to the passive language skills by enlarging the number of different speakers which learners are confronted with face-to-face and by (potentially) offering additional reasons for reading.”

Dalton-Puffer 2008

ICLHE ACTUAL EMPIRICAL FINDINGS…

– Smit and Dafouz (2013: 7) identify three areas of research into the impact of ICLHE programmes: **classroom discourse, teachers’ roles, and English-medium policy documents.**
  
  • SLA empirical studies are extremely scarce …
  
  • So far very few studies on students language progress
  
  • Exploratory studies focusing on lecturers’ attitudes and quality of input
  
  • Most EMI professors do not correct students language errors. (Airey 2012, Costa 2012)
  
  • Professors in the fields of physis, business and engineering prefer EMI instruction (Airey 2012, Unterberger 2012)
    – Findings by John Airey show little overall difference between Sweedish and English lectures in regards to content. (2011)
PART II

THE (PRELIMINARY) STUDY
AIMS

• Analyse the effects of EMI in the case of students in Economics degrees at UPF
  – Linguistic
  – Non-linguistic
    • Motivation, interculturality, beliefs, international posture
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- **RQ1** Would learners enrolled in English-MediumInstruction (EMI) programmes make progress in their English abilities? As measured through
  - Oral comprehension, written production, lexico-grammatical ability and grammar

- **RQ2** Would gains differ on the basis of accumulated time of exposure in EMI classrooms?
DESIGN

Longitudinal over 1 year
Pre-test/Post-test Design
2 Data collection times (T1,T2)
TWO GROUPS: Immersion (IM); Semi-immersion (SIM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>EMI</td>
<td>EMI</td>
<td>EMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>EMI 1/0 sbjs.</td>
<td>EMI 1 sbjs.</td>
<td>EMI 1 sbjs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1 T2
PARTICIPANTS

- **EMI PROVISION WITHIN THE PLAN OF ACTION FOR MULTILINGUALISM (PAM) (2007-2013)**

- **Group Immersion (IM):** University learners (n= 11C/5L)
  - International Bussiness English (IBE) at UPF
    - Non-language specialists
  - L1 Catalan/Spanish Bilinguals (9) + international students (2)
    studying in Barcelona aged 17-19 (M=18.2) 5 female 6 male
  - Teachers both native and non-native
  - Initial level (B.1.-B.2.)

- **Group Semi-Immersion(SIM):** University learners (n= 14L)
  - Economics.Management, Bussiness & Admin
    - Non-language specialists
  - L1 Catalan/Spanish Bilinguals (N=12) + international (N=2) studying
    in Barcelona aged 17-19 (M=18.2) 8 female; 6 male
  - Teachers both native and non-native
  - Initial level (B.1.-B.2.)
Results UPF Diagnostic tests (PDL) 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graus/grups</th>
<th>1r curs</th>
<th>2n curs</th>
<th>Total PrePAM</th>
<th>3r i 4rt curs</th>
<th>Total Grau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1r tr.</td>
<td>2n tr.</td>
<td>3r tr.</td>
<td>1r tr.</td>
<td>2n tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GECO1</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GECO2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GECO3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GECO4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GADE1</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GADE2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GADE3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GADE4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA1</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TREATMENT under PAM

Total EMI ECTS (SIM: Economics)
- GECO1: 6%
- GECO2: 31%
- GECO3: 47%
- GECO4: 16%

Total EMI ECTS (IM)
- 100%

Total EMI ECTS (SIM: Finances)
- GADE1: 6%
- GADE2: 37%
- GADE3: 7%
- GADE4: 50%

Total EMI ECTS (SIM: Business & Management)
- GMA1: 41%
- GMA2: 59%
ORAL COMPREHENSION

WRITING

LEXICO-GRAMMATICAL ABILITIES

GRAMMAR

ADVANCED PROFICIENCY LEVEL LISTENING TEST (AUTHENTIC LIVE BBC RADIO INTERVIEW)

COMPOSITION (OPEN ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAY QUESTION)
“Someone who moves to a foreign country should always adopt the customs and way of life of his/her new country, rather than holding on to his/her own customs”

ADVANCED PROFICIENCY LEVEL CLOZE TEST (20 ITEMS)

GRAMMAR TEST (20 SENTENCE MANIPULATION TASK)

INDIVIDUAL LINGUISTIC PROFILE QUESTIONNAIRE
DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

• Two hour session
• Out-class situation
• Tests were the same at the two data collection times
  – Listening 15’
  – Cloze 15’
  – Grammar 15’
  – Composition 30’
  – Orals 30’ (NOT PRESENTED TODAY)
    • Students were financially rewarded (however we experienced attrition)
ANALYSES

– **Listening rating** with a quantitative evaluation procedure:
  - 😊 1 point per correct answer
  - 😞 no point (0) if incorrect answer

– **Composition rating** with a qualitative evaluation procedure
  - Friedl & Auer (2007) Analytic scale
    - FOUR domains (1-5 scale each: 5= very good; 1=poor)
      - Vocabulary
      - Grammar
      - Task Fulfillment
      - Organization

– **Cloze & Grammar rating** with a quantitative evaluation procedure
  - 😊 1 point per correct answer / 0.5 point for second best answer
  - 😞 no point (0) if incorrect answer
PART II

Results

Non-parametric tests:

Wilcoxon Signed Rank test (SPSS)

p > .05
### IM and SIM GROUPS: DESCRIPTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TESTS</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST_T1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST_T2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAM_T1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAM_T2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOZE_T1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOZE_T2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP_T1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP_T2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59,524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IM GROUP: DESCRIPTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST_T1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>80,0</td>
<td>58,882</td>
<td>11,1664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST_T2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46,7</td>
<td>73,3</td>
<td>57,143</td>
<td>12,0568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAM_T1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>77,5</td>
<td>44,545</td>
<td>17,8472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAM_T2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47,5</td>
<td>67,5</td>
<td>57,143</td>
<td>8,3452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOZE_T1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17,5</td>
<td>62,5</td>
<td>33,409</td>
<td>14,7594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOZE_T2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>67,5</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>14,8605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP_T1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>85,0</td>
<td>53,182</td>
<td>14,7093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP_T2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45,0</td>
<td>85,0</td>
<td>62,857</td>
<td>14,3925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST_T1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26,7</td>
<td>73,3</td>
<td><strong>49,521</strong></td>
<td>13,7528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST_T2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26,7</td>
<td>73,3</td>
<td><strong>48,100</strong></td>
<td>15,7190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAM_T1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>75,0</td>
<td><strong>31,964</strong></td>
<td>18,0592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAM_T2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>67,5</td>
<td><strong>43,571</strong></td>
<td>17,3957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOZE_T1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>52,5</td>
<td><strong>31,964</strong></td>
<td>13,8737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOZE_T2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>55,0</td>
<td><strong>32,321</strong></td>
<td>14,2594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP_T1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>80,0</td>
<td><strong>50,000</strong></td>
<td>14,4115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP_T2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>85,0</td>
<td><strong>57,857</strong></td>
<td>12,9666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IM vs. SIM GROUP: DESCRIPTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IM GROUP</th>
<th>SIM GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIST_T1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 58,882</td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 49,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 11,1664</td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 13,7528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIST_T2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 57,143</td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 48,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 12,0568</td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 15,7190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAM_T1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 44,545</td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 17,8472</td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 18,0592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAM_T2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 57,143</td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 43,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 8,3452</td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 17,3957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLOZE_T1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 33,409</td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 14,7594</td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 13,8737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLOZE_T2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 47,500</td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 32,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 14,8605</td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 14,2594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMP_T1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 53,182</td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 14,7093</td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 14,4115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMP_T2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 62,857</td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong> 57,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 14,3925</td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong> 12,9666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WILCOXON SIGNED RANK TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Comprehension LISTENING</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Lexico-Grammatical CLOZE</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>SIM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>SIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance values from the Wilcoxon signed rank test
Comparing the median differences between Time 1 and Time 2
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

LEARNERS BENEFITS FROM ICLHE/EMI

- **RQ1:**

**IM GROUP**
- Writing and grammar tend to improve, and particularly lexico-grammatical abilities
- Listening does not tend to improve

**SIM GROUP**
- Writing and lexico-grammatical abilities tend to improve and *grammar improves significantly*
- Listening does not improve

- **RQ2:**
  - Cannot be addressed as there is no domain in which both groups significantly improve and can be compared.
CONCLUSIONS

- ICL impacts progress in grammar.
  - Grammar is the most sensitive domain of competence.
  - Lexico-grammatical abilities follow.

- Listening is the least sensitive domain of competence.

- The difference in total amount of L3 time of exposure in the IM and the SIM programmes of exposure has a slight effect which however does not reach significance.
FURTHER RESEARCH

- Conduct the study with a larger sample for both groups
- Analyze oral data
- Conduct classroom observation sessions
- Tap into teachers’ and students’ views
  - Questionnaires
  - Recall tasks
  - Think aloud tasks
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