English Language Teaching:
Theory, Research and Pedagogy

Lee McCallum *Editor*

English Language Teaching

Policy and Practice across the European Union

Springer

English Language Teaching: Theory, Research and Pedagogy

This series publishes latest research-based developments in English language teaching in selected geographical areas around the world. The series seeks to engage with three main areas, namely theory, research and pedagogy/teaching. The aim of the series is to connect 'research' and 'practice' through all types of research from action research to more theoretical studies on aspects of English language teaching that inform classroom practice. The series will feature relevant localized research conducted by teachers of English at all levels in their particular geographical context. The series will publish latest theoretical, empirical and pedagogical developments in a specific ES/FL geographical area. Some of the volumes feature individual countries like Pakistan, Iran and China. Other volumes comprise recognized geographical areas like South America, Asia, Europe, Southeast Asia, Africa, the Gulf, Australia and New Zealand and/or MENA/Middle East etc. The series is truly international, with each volume providing the opportunity to compare and learn from experiences of researchers and teachers around the world. Each volume is edited by key figures in the field, while contributors are drawn from across the globe and from a variety of backgrounds. The series is intended for students, scholars and practitioners in the field of English Language Teaching.

More information about this series at https://link.springer.com/bookseries/16403

Lee McCallum
Editor

English Language Teaching

Policy and Practice across the European Union

Springer

Editor
Lee McCallum
Centre for Academic Writing
Coventry University
Coventry, UK

ISSN 2662-432X ISSN 2662-4338 (electronic)
English Language Teaching: Theory, Research and Pedagogy
ISBN 978-981-19-2151-3 ISBN 978-981-19-2152-0 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-2152-0

Acknowledgements

I would like to sincerely thank the contributing authors for their hard work on this edited volume. Your patience and dedication to your contributions has been much appreciated and has gone a long way to making this volume as strong as possible. Thanks also to the peer and volume reviewers and for their diligence and insightful comments. Finally, I would like to thank my parents and husband for their continued support in my career.

Praise for *English Language Teaching*

"This volume provides an important contribution to contemporary research on pedagogical practices throughout the EU and the challenges faced at each level of education. I am especially impressed by the connections made between the impact of ELT policies and the classroom, and the potential role of technology in improving learning and teaching. The book represents a high-quality introduction for anyone interested in ELT in this region, and further afield."

—Dr. Tony Clark, *Principal Research Manager, Cambridge University*

"This much-needed volume is an excellent snapshot of English Language Teaching in the European Union. The 19-chapter book takes the reader on a panoramic tour of European classrooms in a rich curation of case studies across primary, second and third-level public and private education settings, exploring policies, practices and methodologies. It is an important time capsule of the salient ELT themes of our time in the EU."

—Dr. Anne O'Keeffe, Senior Lecturer, *Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick, Ireland*

Contents

Editor and Contributors

About the Editor

Lee McCallum is a Lecturer in Academic Writing at the Centre for Academic Writing and ASPiRE Research Fellow in the Centre for Arts, Memory and Communities at Coventry University in the UK. She holds an M.Sc. in TESOL and Applied Linguistics from the University of Stirling and an Ed.D. in TESOL from the University of Exeter. She is also a Fellow of the Higher Education Academy in the UK. She has held teaching and research posts in Spain, Saudi Arabia, China, the USA and the UK. Her research focuses on exploring the production and assessment of academic written language in learner and professional writing. Her work has been published by Cambridge University Press, Palgrave Macmillan, Springer and Routledge. She has also contributed widely to international and local journals and serves as a peer reviewer for journals such as Assessing Writing, Language Assessment Quarterly, System, English for Specific Purposes and Teaching English with Technology.

Contributors

Bafort Anne-Sophie University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium

Burazer Lara University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Cavalheiro Lili ULICES / NOVA University of Lisbon, Lisboa, Portugal

Cheung Yin Ling Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, Singapore

Cifone Ponte Maria Daniela University of La Rioja, Logroño, Spain

Coady Maria University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, US

Coumel Marion Department of Psychology, University of Warwick, University Road Coventry, London, UK

Curry Niall Coventry University, London, UK

Suárez Maria del Mar Facultat d'Educació, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

Dufossé Sournin Sophie University of Limoges, Limoges, France

Gesa Ferran Facultat de Filologia i Comunicació, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

Guerra Luis ULICES / University of Évora, Évora, Portugal

Gómez-Parra María Elena University of Córdoba, Córdoba, Spain

Ita Olszewska Aleksandra Center for Multilingualism in Society across the Lifespan (MultiLing), University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

Kay Partridge Salomon Jill University of Limoges, Limoges, France

Kałdonek-Crnjaković Agnieszka University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland

Kormpas Georgios Vlassios Al Yamamah University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Markowska-Manista Urszula University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland

McCallum Lee Coventry University, Coventry, UK

Romero Muñoz Eloy Campus Saffraanberg, Sint-Truiden, Belgium; Université Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3, Paris, France

Ng Chiew Hong Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, Singapore

Pereira Ricardo ULICES / ESTG-Polytechnic of Leiria, Leiria, Portugal

Richter Karin University of Vienna, Vienna, Australia

Schurz Alexandra Department of English and American Studies, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

Skela Janez University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Tafazoli Dara University of Newcastle, Callaghan, Australia

Thacker Kerrilyn Antwerp International School, Antwerp, Belgium

Vandenbroucke Mieke University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium

Vraštilová Olga Hradec Králové, Czech Republic

Weissenbäck Andreas University of Vienna, Vienna, Australia

List of Figures

List of Tables

Part I
Exploring the Impact of ELT Policies on EU Classrooms

Chapter 1
English Language Teaching in the EU: An Introduction

Lee McCallum

Abstract This introductory chapter sets out the rationale, aims and the theoretical tenets that ultimately shape the organization of this edited volume. The chapter begins by providing an overview of the European Union (EU) in terms of its structure, key goals and specifically its language policy position. The chapter then moves on to establishing the need for an edited volume that focuses exclusively on the English Language Teaching (ELT) that is taking place at the current time across the EU. It then presents and summarizes the core underpinnings with which ELT in the EU today appears to be shaped by as evidenced in the chapters in the volume. The chapter concludes by providing a summary of the chapters and the unique contributions they make to understanding the complex and often multidimensional concept of ELT that exists in the region at the present time.

Keywords ELT policy · ELT practice · Language policy · Language methodology

Background

The EU as it is known today started out as an economic community in 1958 with six member states: Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. Today, the EU has expanded to 27 member states: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, and Sweden (European Union 2020a). These member states play a role in following the EU's broad goals. These goals include promoting peace, its values, and the well-being of its citizens; offering freedom, security and justice without internal borders; promoting sustainable development through sensible and stable prices and economic growth, and a competitive market economy, and environmental protection;

L. McCallum (✉)
Coventry University, Priory Street, Coventry CV1 5FB, UK
e-mail: lee.mccallum@coventry.ac.uk

L. McCallum (ed.), *English Language Teaching*, English Language Teaching: Theory, Research and Pedagogy, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-2152-0_1

combating social exclusion and discrimination; promoting scientific and technological progress; enhancing economic, social and territorial cohesion and solidarity among EU countries; respecting its rich cultural and linguistic diversity and establishing an economic/monetary union whose currency is the Euro (European Union 2020b).

To fully understand what the European Union is, and which member states are included in it, it is important to mention how notions of 'Europe' and the 'Council of Europe' fit into such an understanding (Phillipson 2008). Phillipson (2008) unpacks the fuzzy concept of 'Europe' and indicates how, depending on context, Europe may be taken to be several different concepts. Primarily, Europe may be considered as:

- A toponym: A territory or geography.
- An econonym: A common market with a common currency (albeit not all member states have adopted the common currency).
- A politonym: A mixture of independent states in a complex new unit (with some traits of a federation).
- An ethnonym: Cultures which share a common Christian past (some see this as a reason for excluding Islamic Turkey as a member state).

In developing an understanding of the EU, the Council of Europe needs to be separated as it includes many more member states than the EU. For example, The Council of Europe contains 47 members including Norway, Switzerland, Russia, and Turkey which are not members of the EU (Phillipson 2008; Council of Europe 2020). The Council of Europe has a specific focus on protecting democracy and human rights in Europe (Council of Europe 2020).

Underpinning the goals of the EU is the principle that member states share common ground in several ways including a common currency and cultural beliefs. Yet, at the same time, there remains a degree of independence and diversity to be promoted both within each member state and in the EU as a whole. This is made clear in the EU's approach to setting out its policy on language.

As part of the EU's goal to 'respect its rich cultural and linguistic diversity' (European Union, 2020b), the EU has 24 official languages: Bulgarian, Croatian, Czech, Danish, Dutch, English, Estonian, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Irish, Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Maltese, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Slovak, Slovenian, Spanish, and Swedish. The focus on these 24 languages makes it clear that at the forefront of the EU's language policy is the promotion of linguistic diversity. This is set out explicitly in Article 3 of the Treaty of the European Union (TEU) which states that the EU 'shall respect its rich cultural and linguistic diversity'. Such EU goals are also set out in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, legally binding by the Treaty of Lisbon, with discrimination on language grounds strictly prohibited in Article 21 and a clear obligation that the EU must respect linguistic diversity found in Article 22.

As part of its promotion for diversity, the EU language policy views foreign language competence as a basic skill that all EU citizens need to acquire to improve their educational and employment opportunities. Under this policy, member states' citizens should learn two additional languages other than their mother tongue from an

early age (European Union 2020c). Phillipson (2008) points out that since 1945, there has been a move toward English being the most widely learned foreign language in Europe, taking over from French, German, and Russian. More recently, the expansion of English Language Teaching (ELT) has been linked, not only to the movement in the EU, but as part of a wider movement in globalization and the role English plays as a lingua franca in business and higher education (Johnson 2009; Phillipson 2008).

However, in recognition of the demand for English, the European Commission have acknowledged the potential negative consequences such a strong demand may have on national languages in member states and the influence it may have on learning other foreign languages. Phillipson (2008, p. 259) refers to the European Commission's position where they state that: "Learning one lingua franca is not enough…English alone is not enough" and they acknowledge the challenge English presents to national languages by stating: "In non- anglophone countries recent trends to provide teaching in English may have unforeseen consequences on the vitality of the national language" (The European Commission, cited by Phillipson 2008, p. 259).

Despite this recognition, there continues to be notable expansion of the use of English across levels of education in the EU. This expansion can be best illustrated with the increasing use of Content-Based Instruction (CBI) which has been broken down into two strands: CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), mostly used across primary and secondary levels of education in the EU, and the increasing use of EMI (English as a Medium of Instruction) in higher education (Matthew-Graham et al. 2018). CLIL has its roots in German-Franco programmes, but it has spread to most parts of Europe with it being mentioned in EU policy (Dalton-Puffer 2008) and is also seen as a Euro-centric phenomena that is deeply embedded into the needs of the EU (Perez-Cañado 2012; Airey 2016). With regards to its widespread implementation in the EU, it has been found to have a positive correlation with learning English as a foreign country in several member states (e.g., see the review in Sylvén, 2013). As its name suggests, CLIL integrates language and content along a continuum, without an implied preference for one or the other, but it should be pointed out that the language focus is not as intense as an immersion environment where the language is often an official language (Pérez-Cañado 2012). Airey (2016) reinforces this by saying the focus on disciplinary content in CLIL is what makes it unique and that broadly CLIL is a methodology which combines the learning of a non-language subject with language learning (e.g., both content such as science or geography and English are taught together). There is also a degree of flexibility in its provision although some EU member states specifically set out how many subjects should be taught in English and from when in the curriculum they should be focused on (Sylvén 2013).

A frequently cited working definition of EMI is provided by Dearden (2014, p. 2) where EMI is defined as: "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". Airey (2016) highlights that in EMI contexts, English is simply mentioned as the language which is used to teach the course content. Although the terms CLIL and EMI have somewhat blurry boundaries, it

can be pragmatically put that these approaches to instruction involve the use of a non-mother tongue language (in this case) to focus on content/and or language.

Another avenue of expansion that is pertinent to an understanding of the role of English and that of language policy in the EU is the creation of a European Higher Education Area under the 'Bologna Process'. This process directly influences the emphasis given to the English in higher education by some EU member states (Phillipson 2008, p. 260). Airey (2016) sets out how the Bologna Process led to a framework allowing university degrees to be credited between different European countries. Airey (2016) emphasizes that such a process was driven by the fact it could help the EU achieve its aims of its citizens speaking at least two foreign languages as most students on exchange at different universities would presumably be taught in the local language. However, many universities have since taught their courses in English and therefore the Bologna Process has led to an increase in EMI at university level. Airey (2016) points out that this increase has worked against some countries as it marginalizes not only the local language but also the minority languages that exist in the country.

All the tensions mentioned between linguistic diversity and the perceived dominance of English continue to be questioned and speculated upon today because of the UK voting to leave the EU in 2016 (commonly referred to as 'Brexit'). There has been much speculation as to the future status of English as a foreign language and an official EU language with Modiano (2017) speculating that the post-Brexit world will facilitate a recognizable variety of Euro-English within the EU. Modiano (2017) explains how such a 'Euro-English' involves citizens of member states taking ownership of the English being used and form or promote a non-native variety of the language that is specific to the EU. This belief is strongly opposed, discussed, and acknowledged by others (e.g., Bolton and Davis 2017; Faingold 2020; Phillipson 2017; Seargeant 2017). There are also question marks over what such a 'Euro—English' would 'look' like in spoken and written forms and how this would be markedly different from standard British or American models of the language (Phillipson 2017). Equally, there is empirical evidence to suggest that in individual member states there is still a strong preference not only for British English but also American English as well as a push for simply promoting communicative fluency (Forsberg, Mohr and Jansen 2019).

Many of the issues above are also rooted in wider discussions taking place around World and Global Englishes with past and recent work in these fields noting the politics of language use and the contextual complexity that ELT exists in as well as the need for negotiation of a 'local' English and one that is appropriate to local contexts of use (e.g., see Baker 2020; Canagarajah 2006; Heath and Galloway 2015, 2019). Although Heath and Galloway's extensive work in these areas has a dominant Asian focus, the same trends and implications are equally applicable to the issues faced in the EU at the present time.

In this light, the present volume is very much inspired by and grounded in exploring existing practices, tensions, and trends in the teaching of English across all levels of education in the EU. Such a volume is much warranted at the current time in the face of the continuing popularity of English as a language worth learning and at the same time, its continuing official language status in the EU.

The volume therefore has the following aims:

- To provide an overview of current policies, practices, and issues in ELT across the EU.
- To evaluate these current policies and practices and encourage deep reflection as to what shapes teaching, learning, and assessment in individual EU member states and the EU more holistically.
- To shed light on the different and/or similar practice that occurs across the region and encourage readers to reflect on the wider implications of this.

These broad aims mean the volume has a wide intended readership spanning:

- ELT instructors with an interest in the practice of ELT across multiple language skills and areas of policy.
- ELT course designers with an interest in material and syllabi design and how these connect to wider course design decisions.
- ELT programme and course managers who have a responsibility to develop ELT programmes and/or integrate ELT into wider academic programmes.
- ELT material writers who have an interest in how pedagogic materials are designed, revised, and ultimately evaluated across the European Union context.
- Students enrolled on TESOL training courses who are required to show an understanding of TESOL methodologies, theories, and controversial aspects of teaching practice.

Since the volume cuts across the theory and practice interface as well as the interface that exists between teaching and assessment, it can function well as a reference work. Readers can use the volume to read about their respective interests in ELT or indeed their particular interest in a specific EU member state. The volume can also be used as a resource on graduate TESOL programmes to highlight existing theories and their application in teaching and assessment in real-world EU contexts.

The Organization of the Volume

Considering these emerging themes, the volume is organized into four parts. Part I: '*Exploring the Impact of ELT Policies on EU Classrooms*', looks closely at policies in ELT, both through a wide-ranging holistic lens and a narrower context-specific lens. In the first chapter, **Ng Chiew Hong** and **Cheung** and provide a comprehensive research review of how Englishization in tertiary education has been discussed across 11 EU member states in the *European Journal of Language Policy* from 2011 to 2020. Part 1 then focuses on a series of individual EU member states and particular theories and policies that shape practice in these contexts. **Cavalheiro**, **Guerra,** and **Pereira** look at how aware teachers and learners are of issues of learning and using English in a multilingual contexto in Portugal. **Olszewska, Coady,** and **Markowska-Manista** present a study on teacher education programmes in Poland through the lens of linguistic imperialism and question the impact of English on Polish education.

Vandenbroucke, **Bafort,** and **Thacker** cover the issue of using L1 in the classroom to improve English language proficiency in international schools in Belgium. **Richter** and **Weissenbaeck** explore another important policy decision in their study of the accents that Austrian students prefer. In the last chapter of Part I, **McCallum** unpacks how contextual practices and policies in language schools in Spain and teacher beliefs come together to shape teachers' identities as they teach young learners and adults in different private language schools.

Part II: '*Exploring Challenges and Practices in Primary Education*' presents a number of theoretical and empirical chapters that provide current approaches to the fundamentals of foreign language teaching. **Salomon and Dufossé Sournin** offer a broad exploration of the benefits and challenges of teaching English for pre-service teachers in France. **Kałdonek-Crnjaković** reflects on the crucially underexplored issues at play in providing English language instruction to students with ADHD in Poland. The remaining two chapters focus more exclusively on particular language skills. **Cifone Ponte**'s chapter explores how textbook speaking activities play a role in building young learners' plurilinguistic and pluricultural understandings in Spain; while **Vraštilová**'s chapter focuses on supplementing reading instruction and its development in the Czech Republic.

Part III: '*Exploring Pedagogic Practices and Models in Secondary and Tertiary Education*' explores innovative practices and models that are most likely to be adopted in secondary and/or tertiary level education. **Schurz and Coumel's** chapter introduces Part III by drawing attention to how teachers bring grammar and fluency under the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) to life in their classes. **Schurz and Coumel's** chapter enhances our understanding of classroom practices in these areas by comparing teachers' practices and beliefs across multiple EU member states. **Suárez and Gesa** look at the influence of videos on vocabulary development on a module on a media studies degree programme at a university in Spain. The final two chapters present broad pedagogic models and ideas. **Curry** revisits the use of contrastive analysis and shares several pedagogically motivated ideas on how this historical area of theory can be revamped to inform ELT in the EU. **Romero Muñoz** also provides a new slant on traditional theories by offering a position chapter on whether usage-based theories of language can be used in English language teaching in the EU.

As the last part of the volume, Part IV: *'Exploring Broad Applications of Technology-Enhanced Teaching and Learning*' sheds light on the use of technology in teaching and assessment across different contexts. **Tafazoli** investigates the views teachers working in Spain have of Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) using a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis. In a similar manner, **Gómez-Parra** also investigates the use of technology in Spain. Her chapter illuminates the past, present, and future technology training needs of bilingual pre-service teachers. **Burazer** and **Skela** also have an interest in the views of pre-service teachers. Their chapter uncovers the experiences of pre-service teachers in Slovenia when transitioning to online instruction at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. In the final chapter, **Kormpas** examines the perceptions of teachers and

language centre owners in Greece regarding their online teaching practices during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The 18 empirical chapters in the volume draw attention to five key themes. These themes emerge across the volume and should be remembered as readers engage with both individual chapters and the volume as a whole to consider their relevance and application in their own contexts:

1. ELT stakeholders need to recognize the potentially dominating effect English may have on national languages and other viable foreign languages that could be learned.
2. ELT stakeholders need to promote teacher education and training that raises awareness of this linguistic imperialism and the expectations that this reality may present to their expected roles in the ELT classroom.
3. ELT stakeholders need to be aware of the contextual, social, and political realities that govern learning, teaching, and assessment and how these influence teachers' perceptions of their roles and their motivation to carry them out in their particular settings.
4. Teachers should be encouraged to go beyond the key tenets of a particular teaching methodology and critically analyze how it may work in their context to teach language skills and student groups.
5. Teachers should be continually encouraged to reflect on their own practices so as to be open to change and innovation. They should use this reflection to take home messages about where their teaching practice and skills sets could be enhanced to match the changing teaching environments that they find themselves in.

Overall, the chapters and the themes help illuminate multiple tensions and issues with regards to policy decisions and implementations. The chapters also shed light on how particular language skills are taught across multiple different countries and levels of education. As a volume, the chapters raise several important questions about individual contexts and practices as well as questions about how ELT in the EU will develop in the future. We hope the chapters promote wider discussions with readers and ELT stakeholders more widely.

References

Airey J (2016) EAP, EMI or CLIL? In: Hyland K, Shaw P (eds) The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes, Routledge, pp 71–84

Baker W (2020) English as a lingua franca and transcultural communication: rethinking competences and pedagogy for ELT. In: Hall C, Wicaksono R (eds) Ontologies of English: conceptualising the language for learning, teaching, and assessment, Cambridge University Press, pp 253–272

Bolton K, Davis DR (2017) Brexit and the future of English in Europe. World Englishes 36(3):302–312

Canagarajah S (2006) Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca. Annu Rev Appl Linguist 26:197–218

Council of Europe (2020) Distinguishing between the CoE and the EU. https://www.coe.int/en/web/about-us/do-not-get-confused
Dalton-Puffer C (2008) Outcomes and processes in content and language integrated learning (CLIL): current research from Europe. In: Delanoy W, Volkmann L(eds) Future perspectives for English language teaching, pp 139–157
Dearden J (2014) English as a medium of instruction—a growing global phenomenon. British council report: E484. ISBN 978–0–86355–761–3
European Union (2020a). Member states. Available at https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/countries_en
European Union (2020b). Available at https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/eu-in-brief_en
European Union (2020c). Available at https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/eu-languages_en
Faingold ED (2020) Language rights and the law in the European Union. Palgrave Macmillan
Forsberg J, Mohr S, Jansen S (2019) The goal is to communicate: communicative competence and target varieties in TEFL practices in Sweden and Germany. European J Appl Linguist 7(1):31–60
Graham KM, Choi Y, Davoodi A, Razmeh S, Dixon LQ (2018) Language and content outcomes of CLIL and EMI: a systematic review. LACLIL 11(1):19–37
Heath R, Galloway N (2015) Introducing global Englishes. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315734347
Heath R, Galloway N (2019) Global Englishes for language teaching. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316678343
Johnson A (2009) The rise of English: the language of globalization in China and the European Union. Macalester Int 22(1):131–168
Modiano M (2017) English in a post-Brexit European Union. World Englishes. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12264
Pérez-Cañado M-L (2012) CLIL research in Europe: past, present and future. Int J Biling Educ Biling 15(3):315–341
Phillipson R (2008) Language policy and education in the European Union. In: Hornberger NH (ed) Encyclopedia of language and education, Springer, pp 255–265
Phillipson R (2017) Myths and realities of European Union language policy. World Englishes 36(3):347–349
Seargeant P (2017) The symbolism of English on the Brexit battleground. World Englishes 36(3):356–359
Sylven LK (2013) CLIL in Sweden—why does it not work? A metaperspective on CLIL across contexts in Europe. Int J Biling Educ Biling 16(3):301–320

Lee McCallum is a Lecturer in Academic Writing at the Centre for Academic Writing and ASPiRE Research Fellow in the Centre for Arts, Memory and Communities at Coventry University in the UK. She holds an M.Sc in TESOL and Applied Linguistics from the University of Stirling and an Ed. D in TESOL from the University of Exeter. She is also a Fellow of the Higher Education Academy in the UK. She has held teaching and research posts in Spain, Saudi Arabia, China, the USA, and the UK. Her research focuses on exploring the production and assessment of academic written language in learner and professional writing. Her work has been published by Cambridge University Press, Palgrave Macmillan, Springer, and Routledge. She has also contributed widely to international and local journals and serves as a peer reviewer for journals such as Assessing Writing, Language Assessment Quarterly, System, English for Specific Purposes, and Teaching English with Technology.

Chapter 2
Teaching and Learning English in the European Union: A Research Review

Chiew Hong Ng and Yin Ling Cheung

Abstract Much research has investigated the language policy of English language teaching in the European Union. However, a systematic review of research literature that focuses on the conceptual frameworks and the benefits and challenges of teaching and learning English at the tertiary level would offer a valuable means to bring together and unpack claims made in extant published research. This chapter critically reviews papers published by the *European Journal of Language Policy* from 2011 to 2020 on Englishization or English gaining importance as a lingua franca in the educational domain. Thematic discourse analysis was used on the articles related to language policy in 11 EU member states (Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Poland, Spain, and Sweden). Results show key benefits (e.g., the use of English as lingua franca, medium of instruction, content, and language integrated learning) and challenges (e.g., lack of clarity in language policy and language choices in practical situations). The findings reveal the prevalent conceptual frameworks used by *European Journal of Language Policy* researchers to look at teaching and learning concerns. The chapter concludes by proposing ways to strengthen English teaching in the existing curriculum such as incorporating project-based learning for content and language integrated learning.

Keywords Research review · ELT in the EU · Language policy

Introduction

It is estimated that "English language (EL) is spoken by about 1.5 billion non-native speakers" (Frath 2017, p. 227). English is increasingly a code for communication without specific linkage to Great Britain or other English-speaking nation (Surmont et al. 2015). English is ubiquitous, and there is pressure on European Union (EU)

C. H. Ng · Y. L. Cheung (✉)
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, Singapore
e-mail: yinling.cheung@nie.edu.sg

C. H. Ng
e-mail: chiewhong.ng@nie.edu.sg

L. McCallum (ed.), *English Language Teaching*, English Language Teaching: Theory, Research and Pedagogy, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-2152-0_2

governments to include English in the education system (Surmont, Struys and Somers 2015). This chapter reviews how the topic of Englishization in tertiary education is discussed in the literature in relation to these conceptual frameworks: EMI, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), multilingualism and plurilingualism in the context of EU. An increasing number of higher education programmes are being offered through English in the EU. This has created a dichotomy between multilingualism and English Medium Instruction (EMI) for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) (Lauridsen 2016). According to Dimova et al. (2015, p. 1), "scholars have explored EMI under different labels and with different objectives, such as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)". However, to Jenkins (2019, p. 7), "EMI takes place most often at tertiary level, whereas CLIL is more often to be found at secondary and, increasingly, also primary level". In the university context, research has emerged in terms of 'Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education' (ICLHE) (Moratinos-Johnston et al. 2019). As a systematic review of research literature that focuses on the conceptual frameworks and the benefits and challenges of teaching and learning English at the tertiary level as a research gap, three research questions are used to address this gap.

Research Questions

Given the focus on Englishization, EMI, multilingualism and plurilingualism in the EU context, the three research questions for the present study are:

1. What are the key benefits of teaching and learning English in the HEIs in EU?
2. What are the challenges of teaching and learning English in the HEIs in EU?
3. What are the conceptual frameworks guiding research into teaching and learning English in the HEIs in EU?

The analytical approach of thematic discourse analysis is described in the methodology section before the findings are presented. The chapter concludes by proposing ways to enhance English teaching in the existing HEI curriculum for EL such as incorporating project-based learning when it comes to content and language integrated learning.

Literature Review

Englishization, English as Medium of Instruction and Content and Language Integrated Learning

Lanvers and Hultgren (2018, p. 1) define Englishization as "the increasing presence, importance and status of English at all levels in the educational domain". It

is the spread of English as lingua franca (ELF) or *Englishization* through English as Medium of Instruction (EMI) (Kirkpatrick 2011), an increase of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) via English, or English replacing other foreign languages (Lanvers 2018). Wilkinson and Gabriëls (2021) highlight how EMI programmes in higher education in Europe is increasingly looked at from the perspective of Englishization to discuss issues such as English displacing other languages or language policy and legislation affecting Englishization. A longitudinal overview of the process of Englishization in Danish HEIs led Dimova et al. (2021) to conclude that Englishization has resulted in initiatives for better implementation of EMI. According to O'Dowd (2018, p. 553), European HEIs offering programmes in English through EMI can "support the internationalisation of universities, to make study programmes more accessible to international students and to enhance the international prestige of academic staff". This originally started in the north-western part of Europe but a survey by Wächter and Maiworm (2014, p. 36) demonstrated that for EMI programmes in Europe there are now more than 8,000-degree programmes offered in English outside the UK and Ireland or "8,089 English-Taught Programme(s)". Lauridsen (2016) reported the spread of EMI programmes in France, Germany, and Spain with a significant number of local students also enrolling in EMI programmes. Rowland and Murray (2020) interviewed six lecturers and conducted focus group with twelve students from Italy on teaching and learning using EMI for MSc programme in Biomedical Sciences to find them being positive about the benefits of EMI despite facing linguistic challenges. However, Macaro et al. (2018, p. 38) conducted an in-depth review of 83 studies in HE to highlight these issues in EMI: whether the content teachers possess the required linguistic competence to teach in English, the level of English proficiency of EMI students in HE, "the kind of 'accommodation' needs to be made for EMI students", the variety of English to be used and whether Englishisation undermines "the status of the home language and 'domain loss' of lexical items". EMI pedagogies are less concrete and consistent as they are guided by local HE policies which can very across institutions. For instance, O'Dowd (2018) reported on the findings of a survey of 70 European universities carried out in 2014–2015 to highlight eclecticism in teacher training approaches and accreditation for teachers working in EMI: either no provision of training or the adopting of many different approaches to EMI training. O'Dowd (2018) also observed the lack of agreement among universities regarding the minimum level of English to teach ranging from B2 (43%) to C2 (13%) from the survey respondents.

EMI can involve Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and immersion programmes (Coleman 2006; Lanvers and Hultgren 2018) as well as Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education (ICLHE) which to Carrió-Pastor (2021) is a term used for research for European HEIs. In Spain, Arnó-Macià and Mancho-Barés (2015) reported ICLHE students being aware of their low language proficiency level causing comprehension problems and inability to express complex content knowledge in English. Moratinos-Johnston et al. (2019) compared 155 students' linguistic self-confidence and perceived level of English according to the number of ICLHE subjects taken at university. They found students taking more ICLHE courses being

accustomed to using English in their content classes and this boosted their linguistic self-confidence and perceived level of English.

Instead of EMI and CLIL, researchers have argued for "English-Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings (EMENUS)" (Dafouz and Smit 2016) to better reflect the diversity of HE contexts with English as a language of instruction and learning with languages other than English playing different roles. In relation to EMENUS, Dafouz and Smit (2020) also offer the ROAD-MAPPING framework with six dimensions: roles of English (RO), academic disciplines (AD), (language) management (M), agents (A), practices and processes (PP), and internationalisation (IN) and glocalisation (ING). Curry and Pérez-Paredes (2021) investigated how the internationalisation process by EMEMUS unfolded in a Spanish university context by adopting Dafouz and Smit's ROADMAPPING framework (2016, 2020) to analyse the practices and processes of EMEMUS lecturers at a Spanish university.

Multilingualism and Plurilingualism

The European Commission (2013, p.6) has stated that "proficiency in English is de facto part of any internationalisation strategy for learners, teachers and institutions … [but] … multilingualism is a significant European asset … and should be encouraged in teaching and research throughout the higher education curriculum". The EU has promoted multilingualism since its inception. To fulfill one of the major aims of the Lisbon Strategy 2000 (Jones 2005), government leaders in the EU at the occasion of the Barcelona Council of March 2002 agreed to enhance individual multilingualism in terms of acquiring practical skills in at least two other languages besides mother tongue (Darquennes 2011).

The Council of Europe (2001, p. 168) defines plurilingualism as the ability "to use languages for the purposes of communication and to take part in intercultural action" while Griva and Iliadou (2011, p. 29) deem it "basic individual competence and a main prerequisite in the multilingual and multicultural European context". Ull and Agost (2020, p. 56) make a distinction between plurilingualism as "the individual's ability to speak more than two languages and switch between languages" and multilingualism as the coexistence of different languages used separately in society. The new CEFR too distinguishes between "multilingualism (the coexistence of different languages at the social or individual level) and plurilingualism (the dynamic and developing linguistic repertoire of an individual user/learner) … to express oneself in one language (or dialect, or variety) and understand a person speaking another" (Council of Europe 2018, p. 28). Plurilingual approaches in higher education have been through the adoption of different approaches such as English-medium Instruction (EMI), CLIL or ILCHE, Integrating Content and Language/ICL (Smit and Dafouz 2012) or EMEMUS (Dafouz and Smit 2016). Yanaprasart and Melo-Pfeifer (2021) revealed how teachers' multilingual and plurilingual repertoires were valued by the German and Swiss university students when these students were

asked about their perceptions of expatriate nonnative teachers. However, the discussion data from Catalonia pre-service teachers in the study by Birello et al. (2021) showed how positive views about being plurilingual speakers did not translate into confidence in teaching in multilingual classrooms due to the lack of practical teaching resources and experience.

In summary, in the EU context, teaching and learning of English has led to the need to study how Englishization affects tertiary education in terms of EMI and CLIL as European HEIs offer more programmes in English to attract both EU and international students. Due to international mobility, students in the university are increasingly multilingual and necessitates English as lingua franca to enable communication between speakers of different first languages so "the relationship between multilingualism and Englishization is of a mutually perpetuating dynamics, whereby increased multilingualism also leads to increased use of English" (Dimova et al. 2015, p. 5). While internationalizing through Englishization, European HEIs also have to ensure multilingualism and plurilingualism to encourage the use of local languages for language diversity.

Methodology

Data Collection

To address the research questions, this study searched for peer-reviewed journal articles in *European Journal of Language Policy* from 2011 to 2020 as the journal looks specifically at language issues in the European context. The journal has been ranked as Q1 in 2020 for language and linguistics in Scimago Journal and Country Rank. The keyword-screening method was applied to publication titles, abstracts, keywords, and text. These were the keywords: "Englishization", "English teaching and learning," "English learning," "tertiary", "higher education", "English as Medium of Instruction (EMI)", "multilingualism", "plurilingualism" or "conceptual framework". 72 articles out of more than 160 articles from 2011 to 2020 were shortlisted for close reading. Upon reading the actual articles, only 30 articles from 11 EU member states (i.e., Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Poland, Spain, and Sweden) pertaining to teaching and learning English in HEIs were selected for analysis (see Table 2.1 in Appendix for the 30 studies). This study eliminated those publications not related to HEIs though they deal with EL teaching and learning in relation to primary or secondary contexts.