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OUTLINE OF THE SESSION

• It is a folk belief that *Practice makes best* and this has been claimed to be also true for languages:

• **PART I:** CONTEXTS OF ACQUISITION
  – Formal instruction (FI)
  – Study Abroad (SA)
  – Content and Language Integrated Learning (ICL)

• **PART II:** The Barcelona *Study Abroad and Language Acquisition* (SALA) project (2004):
  • Research findings (adult university learners)
    • Listening
PART I

CONTEXTS OF ACQUISITION
PART I

Introduction

CONTEXTS OF ACQUISITION
European strategy towards multilingualism

  - (1+2 formula)
  1. Formal instruction with an early start FI
  2. Curricular content through a second/foreign language ICL (CLIL/ICLHE)
  3. Mobility scheme SA Comenius/Erasmus
     (Pérez-Vidal 2009)

- Young European Plurilingual speakers

CHALLENGE: INTERNATIONALISATION
THREE LEARNING CONTEXTS
SECONDARY / TERTIARY EDUCATION

SA Study Abroad Immersion
Second Language Context

CLIL / ICL Semi-immersion
Foreign Language Context

FI Formal Instruction
Foreign Language Context
ICLHE in the EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA (EHEA) Bologna Declaration

- LANGUAGES FOR ALL....!!!!
ICLHE

– English Medium Instruction (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.
RESEARCH OBJECTIVES II

- European recommendations vis-à-vis multilingualism
  - SLA???
- ANALYSE THE EFFECTS
  - Linguistic
  - Non-linguistic
    - Motivation, interculturality, beliefs, international posture
PART I

Characterising contexts of acquisition
SA A CHARACTERISATION

• “The instructed learner assumes the status of the naturalistic learner during a period of residence in the TL community while often simultaneously following language or content courses, carrying out different, social and leisure activities, and even working.”

(Howard, 2007)
SA POTENTIAL BENEFITS

• “SA is allegedly an acquisition-rich context, in which learners may avail themselves of higher quantity and quality input, interaction and feedback [than in FI]. This should bring about changes in learners’ L2 knowledge systems and skills, [particularly oral] and, consequently, in their external verbal behaviour (...), however, research reveals that transfer of knowledge and skills from FI to SA is far from obvious.”
  (DeKeyser, 2007)

ICL: A CHARACTERISATION I

• "A common denominator [for CLIL / ICLHE] is that a non-L1 is used in classes other than those labelled as ‘language classes’…its use may range from occasional foreign-language texts to the whole curriculum."

(Nikula, 2007)
“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)
CLIL: 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)

A CHARACTERISATION

• The experience of learning often in poor input conditions, taught by teachers, who may not be confident in the target language, or in their methodology, and with little or none out of class exposure.”

(Pérez-Vidal, forthcoming 2014)

FI POTENTIAL BENEFITS

• Knowing **about** the language, rather how to use it, feeling as **novices** rather than users of the language, and **not really seeing much progress** in one’s own TL competence over the years (in our context from age 6 to age 18).

• (Students’ views)
PART I

Context, contact and SLA research

CONTEXTS OF ACQUISITION
CONTEXT VARIABLES IN SLA

I. Macro-level variables: input/output; quantity and quality of input, interaction and feedback in context

II. Micro-level variables: how learners take advantage of contact opportunities on the basis of individual abilities to communicate

III. Architecture/design of educational programmes

(Pérez-Vidal forthcoming)
MACROLEVEL VARIABLES

– TWO CENTRAL ISSUES:

– QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF INPUT, INTERACTION AND FEEDBACK:

TIME

Housen 2009; Muñoz (ed.) 2012
Larger Amounts Of time of TL exposure And PRACTICE Distribution

BEST at L2 acquisition

SA/ICL/FI
QUALITY and QUANTITY OF INPUT and INTERACTION

SA
• MASSIVE EXPOSURE/INPUT & PRACTICE OPPORTUNITIES Outside The Classroom
  – Sociolinguistically varied (multiple speakers, situations, degrees of formality)
  – Massive opportunities for output practice

ICL
• ACADEMIC EXPOSURE & PRACTICE ONLY in the classroom
  – Restricted to the classroom/academics
  – Focus on meaning (Curricular content)
  – Larger opportunities for use

FI
• POOR EXPOSURE & PRACTICE ONLY in the classroom
  – Restricted to the classroom
  – Focus on form (EFL content) (unless TBLT)
  – Fewer opportunities for output

MICROLEVEL VARIABLES
LEARNER CONTACT

SA / ICLHE / FI

– Age
– Personality
– Aptitude
– Self-regulatory ability and motivation

(Dörnyei, 2006; Dörnyei and Skehan 2003)

➢ The ability for taking advantage of TL contact opportunities in the different learning contexts
• “We need to investigate further the ways in which learners differ in their ability and readiness to benefit from the extracurricular communicative opportunities available during SA... which make it possible for different contact opportunities with the TL, hence greater gains in linguistic proficiency.”

(Freed, Segalowitz & Dewey 2004: 296)
# PROGRAMME DESIGN  
(SA/ICLHE /FI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme features</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Length and intensity</td>
<td>5. Previous preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Second/Foreign language setting</td>
<td>6. Point in the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ‘Other’ TL contact (extra-curricular, leisure…)</td>
<td>7. Academic out-of-class assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Initial language level</td>
<td>8. Further organised ‘extra’ opportunities for contact (trips, ICT use for TL access)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Pérez-Vidal forthcoming 2014)
GAINS

• SA
  • Oral production is the winner.
  • Literacy the looser.
  • Lexical, pragmatic strategic and sociolinguistic competence in between.
  • Grammar and phonology yield mixed results.
  • Collentine, 2009, Llanes 2011, Sanz 2014

• CLIL
  • Oral production is not the winner.
  • Literacy is, particularly lexis, writing, reading and grammar.
  • Pragmatic strategic and sociolinguistic competence in between.
  • Ruiz de Zarobe et al. 2011
ICLHE ACTUAL EMPIRICAL FINDINGS…

- Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra (2013) identify three areas of research into the impact of ICLHE programmes:
  - Classroom discourse
  - Teachers’ roles
  - 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)
THE ‘GRADATION OF CONTEXTS’ HYPOTHESIS

- Phonetic and phonological development
- Pragmatic, sociolinguistic, cultural abilities
- Oral development
- Lexis

FI  <  CLIL  <  SA

FI  >  CLIL  >  SA

- Accuracy
- Academic skills

Pérez-Vidal (2011: 116-17) in Ruiz de Zarobe, Sierra & Gallardo del Puerto (eds.). Peter Lang

• SUBJECT TO INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES (VARIATION)
THE ‘COMBINATION OF CONTEXTS’ HYPOTHESIS

Pérez-Vidal (2011: 117-18) in Ruiz de Zarobe, Sierra & Gallardo del Puerto (eds.). Peter Lang
PART II

THE BARCELONA SALA PROJECT
OPPORTUNITY 1

- A yearly Study Abroad programme involving 90 students majoring in English at a university in Barcelona (2000)

- A fantastic research opportunity!!!!!!
“There are perhaps few contexts as potentially rich and complex as study abroad.”

(Dufon & Churchill, 2006)
OPPORTUNITY 2

- A Faculty of Economics and Management with 3 types of degrees (2008):
  - 1. Entirely taught through the Medium of English (100%)
  - 2. Half-taught through the Medium of English (50%)
  - 2. No English (during year 1 and 2) (0%)

- To measure the effects of EMI programmes with different intensity of instruction (time differences), on the development of target-like proficiency in English.
  - Another fantastic research opportunity!!!!!!
PART II

Research findings: Study Abroad

SALA’S STUDY ABROAD (SA) RESEARCH

• To measure the effects of a compulsory 3-month Study Abroad period, following Formal Instruction, on the development of target-like proficiency, motivation, beliefs and intercultural abilities in English, and its long-term effects, 15 months upon return from SA.
SA RESEARCH QUESTIONS

• **RQ1** Would learners make greater progress in the FI context than in the SA context in their English abilities, *linguistic and extralinguistic*?

• **RQ2** Would gains differ on the basis of individual learner features?
### DESIGN

**Longitudinal pre-test / post-test design over 3 years.**

**4 Data collection times**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</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>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grup 1 SA-FI</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40h</td>
<td>40h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40h</td>
<td>40h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **FI**: Pre-test
- **SA**: Post-test
- **40h**: Hours
PARTICIPANTS

• **Group 1: FI & SA:** EFL university learners \( n=90 \)
  - Language specialists
  - L1 Catalan/Spanish Bilinguals studying in Barcelona aged 17-25 \( \bar{x}=18.2 \) 91.9 % female
  - ERASMUS-SOCRATES European Exchange scheme (U.K., U.S.A., Canada, Australia)

• **Group 2: Baseline data** L1 English Erasmus students (only tested once)
  - \( n=28 \)
  - Erasmus exchange students in Spain
  - From the U.K. and the U.S.A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Length of Stay Abroad (LoS)</td>
<td>3 MONTHS, UNSHELTERED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SA living conditions</td>
<td>RESIDENCES, FLATS TRAVEL IN GROUPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Opportunities for employment</td>
<td>SOME WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pre-departure language level</td>
<td>B.2.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pre-departure preparation</td>
<td>ON-LINE MODULE (IRIS database, York)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Point in the curriculum</td>
<td>FIRST TERM, 2nd year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Academic assignments abroad</td>
<td>OPTIONAL DIARY (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Re-entry conditions</td>
<td>FI (2 TERMS=80 hrs.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SKILLS AND INSTRUMENTS

- **ORAL PRODUCTION**
- **WRITTEN PRODUCTION**
- **ORAL PERCEPTION & COMPREHENSION**
- **MOTIVATION & ATTITUDES BELIEFS INTERCULTURALITY**

**INTERVIEW ROLE-PLAY READING ALOUD**

**COMPOSITION LEXICO-GRAMMATICAL & CLOZE TESTS DIARIES**

**PHONOLOGICAL DISCRIMINATION TEST LISTENING TEST**

**SA CONDITIONS, INDIVIDUAL PROFILES, ATTITUDES & MOTIVATION QUESTIONNAIRES**
ANALYSES

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

- **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

- **Orals and Compositions’ rating**
  - Quantitatively: Fluency, Accuracy & Complexity (Lexical and Grammatical)
  - Orals (Phonetic acoustic and subjective measures)
PART II

Overall results

– STUDY ABROAD RESEARCH: THE BARCELONA SALA PROJECT
SALA FINDINGS: SA vs. FI GAINS

- Oral Interview
  - Fluency * LLL (Low level learners show *larger gains)
  - Accuracy +
  - Complexity (grammatical)
  - Complexity (lexical) +
- Oral Role Play
  - Fluency * LLL
  - Accuracy + LLL
- Pronunciation Reading Aloud
  - Accuracy scores * LLL
  - Vowel quality and VOT:
  - Foreign accent scores +
- Phonology (AXB discrimination task) Perception test FI * LLL
- Listening Radio Interview * LLL
- Writing Composition
  - Fluency *
  - Accuracy +
  - Complexity (grammatical)
  - Complexity (lexical) *
- Lexico-grammatical Cloze & Transformation test *
- Attitudes, motivations, beliefs Questionnaire *
- Interculturality *
SA GAINS: SUMMARY I

• Oral and written linguistic production was significantly more fluent and contained fewer pronunciation errors (deletion, insertion, substitution, stress misplacement).
  – When measured through integrative tests.

• Listening comprehension was significantly better after SA.

• Lexico-grammatical tests also yielded significant improvement after SA.
  – Discrete-point tests

• Substantial, albeit non-significant, improvement as far as foreign accent and morphosyntactic accuracy measures go.

• Phonological discrimination had improved significantly after FI.
SA FINDINGS: SUMMARY II

- They were significantly more open to new cultures, and their attitudes had also been sensitive to context changes.

- When compared to native speakers baseline data
  - NNSs drew nearer to NS performance except for grammatical and phonological accuracy and even reached them in written fluency.

- Gains obtained while abroad were retained in the long-run, 15 months upon return, except in the case of intercultural gains.

- Those learners with lower levels showed to make the largest progress in oral fluency and pronunciation accuracy and listening.
PART II

The students’ voices

STUDY ABROAD RESEARCH: THE BARCELONA SALA PROJECT
“And so, after three months, the time has come for me to close this diary. These pages have been, so to call it, my dearest company to capture ideas, to reflect on the things I have learnt all through the way.”

“I think that staying abroad has been a very useful experience. It has been a great chance to practice my speaking, to improve my style and my accent, to increase my knowledge of vocabulary and to get used to listening to English people.”

L.M. (Nottingham)
PART III

STUDY ABROAD RESEARCH: The Barcelona SALA project: a closer look

- Listening
- Motivation, attitudes & beliefs
LISTENING


STUDY ABROAD RESEARCH: The Barcelona SALA project: a closer look
Theoretical Background: Listening in SLA

- LISTENING: less researched skill in SLA (Vandergrift 2003; 2007)
  - Even more so in SA research

- Listening while abroad
  - Bidirectional (natural communication)

- Listening in Formal Instruction (FI)
  - Unidirectional (academic practice)
Theoretical Background: The nature of listening

- A covert process which mixes (Hulstijn, 2003)
  - Linguistic knowledge
  - Extra-linguistic/World knowledge
  - Sociopsychological dimension (gesture and culturally-bound cues, pragmatics; affective factors-anxiety, motivation)
    - (Vandergrift & Goh, 2009)
Theoretical background: Research on SA listening

SA with gains

- Allen & Herron (2003); 6 weeks (French)
- Kinginger (2008) 1-term (French)
- Tanaka & Ellis (2003) 15-week (English)
- Llanes & Muñoz (2009) 3-4 weeks (English)
Methods

- Listening Test
  - Authentic excerpt from an interview (3.30 min)
  - Recorded from the BBC World Service Radio
  - Pop music group
  - Non-scripted approach (authenticity)
  - Discontinuous background noise

- Language
  - Speech rate normal to fast
  - RP and London accent
  - Different degrees of formality
  - Free of slang, but young adults speech
Methods

- Listening Test
  - Item type
    - One textual input
    - Variety of question formats (three)
      - Fill-in-the-gap questions
        - listening for specific information
      - Multiple-choice questions
        - listening for gist
      - True/False questions
        - listening for gist
Results

- **Listening Performance**: Longitudinal Development 15 months (FI + SA)

  - Significant main effect of time on listening performance. [RM-ANOVA]

  - Scores significantly different between T2- T3 but not T1-T2. [Bonferroni-adjusted pairwise comparisons]

  $p < 0.001$
Results

- **Listening Performance:** Comparison between NSs and NNSs

  NSs obtained significantly higher results than NNSs at each data collection time. [Non-parametric Wilcoxon’s test]

  \[ p < 0.001 \]
Results

- **Listening Performance**: Gains in the different learning contexts (FI - SA)

Significant larger gains in SA context than FI context. [paired sample t-test]

\[ p < 0.05 \]
Results

- **Onset Level in Listening** (score at T1)
  - 2 groups:
    - High Onset Level (*H-OL*)
      - $N=28$  $\ Mdn=9$
    - Low Onset Level (*L-OL*)
      - $N=47$  $\ Mdn=6$

  Differences in listening onset level between these two groups were statistically significant. [Non-parametric Wilcoxon’s test] $p < 0.001$
Results

- **Onset Level in Listening** (score at T1)
  - Listening scores after the SA (T3) were still significantly different between the two groups.
    - $H$-OL group ($Mdn=10$)
    - $L$-OL group ($Mdn=8$)
  - Gains during SA period were not significantly different for the two groups.
  - But, gains for the whole 15-month period (FI+SA) were significantly different between the groups.
    - $H$-OL group ($M=.68$)
    - $L$-OL group ($M=2.32$)

[All comparisons: Non-parametric Wilcoxon’s test]

$p < 0.001$
Results

- **Long-term effects**: performance at T4
  - Subgroup of 33 participants.
  - Followed for 30 months.
  - T4: 15 months after SA

\[ p < 0.001 \]
Results

- **Long-term effects:** performance at T4

Significant main effect of time on listening performance. [RM-ANOVA]

Scores significantly different between T2-T3 but not T1-T2 or T3-T4. [Bonferroni-adjusted pairwise comparisons]

\[ p < 0.001 \]
Discussion and Conclusions

- Participants showed progress in their listening ability during the period under study, and significantly so during the SA period.

- Practice may have played a role, particularly the kind of listening practice involved in the SA context (DeKeyser 2007)
Discussion and Conclusions

- SA revealed to be more beneficial than FI in terms of gains.
  - Beneficial effect of natural environment
  - Opportunities for bi-directional practice of listening in social interaction.
  - In line with findings from previous research (Brecht et al., 1995; Allen & Herron, 2003; Kinginger, 2008)
Discussion and Conclusions

- The listening onset level played a role in the listening scores after the SA.
  - More skilled and less skilled learners at the onset of the study (T1) remained so after returning from abroad (T3).
  - Low Onset Level group obtained significantly larger gains than the High Onset Level group.
    - In line with other SA studies on different skills (Meara, 1994; Towell, Hawkins & Bazergui, 1996) and attributed to a ceiling effect for high level performers.
Discussion and Conclusions

- Such higher gains obtained by the Low Onset Level group were found when both the FI and SA context were taken together, supporting the SALA general hypothesis of the benefits of the combination of both contexts. (Pérez-Vidal, 2011)
CLOSING REMARK

• Skill-acquisition theory: “Learners [can] spend their time abroad doing what is very hard to do in the classroom, and much easier during prolonged practice abroad: completing the process of proceduralization, which takes minimal time and effort, and making substantial progress towards automaticity… a process which requires large amounts of practice in a variety of situations.”

(DeKeyser 2007:217)
PART II

Research findings: ICLHE

THE BARCELONA SALA PROJECT
ICLHE 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>EMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>EMI 1/0 sbjs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1 and T2 indicate data collection times.
PARTICIPANTS

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

• **Group Immersion (IM):** University learners (n= 11C/5L)
  – International Business 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, Business & 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.)
TREATMENT under PAM

Total EMI ECTS (SIM: Economics)

- GECO1: 6%
- GECO2: 16%
- GECO3: 31%
- GECO4: 47%

Total EMI ECTS (SIM: Finances)

- GADE1: 6%
- GADE2: 7%
- GADE3: 37%
- GADE4: 50%

Total EMI ECTS (SIM: Business & Management)

- GMA1: 41%
- GMA2: 59%

Total EMI ECTS (IM)

- 100%
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

Research findings: ICLHE

THE BARCELONA SALA PROJECT
Non-parametric tests:

Wilcoxon Signed Rank test (SPSS)

$p > .05$
## IM vs. SIM GROUP: DESCRIPTIVES

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

LEARNS ONE YEAR 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

- One year of 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.
A PRACTICAL VIEW

• “... a (...) better integration of the state-side language curriculum with the overseas experience so that students can approach the combination of basic courses, overseas practice, and advanced courses as a long-term process of skill acquisition instead of a series of disjoint experiences .... .”
THANK YOU!!!

Special thanks also go to the participants in the project...

And to the SALA’s research team (2004-2014)…!
Las lenguas extranjeras como vehículo de comunicación intercultural
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