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Abstract
This study examines the Comenius exchange project between Da Vinci, Kattegattgymnasiet in Sweden and Liceo Scientifico F. Vercelli in Asti, Italy from both a qualitative and a quantitative angle. This exchange project was working with immersion. The purpose of this essay is to investigate to what extent second language learning is achieved in an immersion project. The essay aims to answer the following thesis questions:

- What are the learning outcomes of this exchange project, focused on immersion?
- What are the advantages, and disadvantages of an exchange project, focused on immersion?

To undertake this study, I travelled to Asti and distributed a quantitative questionnaire to the students in this project. Qualitative interviews were conducted with the two main teachers and the students, as well. The data was then processed and analyzed, along with my theoretical framework: second language acquisition theory and immersion.

The results show that the Swedish students were better at speaking; the Italian teacher focused more on grammar, that the objectives sometimes were unclear and that language development occurred. The study also provides the data that tells us that there might be challenges with your colleagues and that it is time-consuming.

For further research I suggest a focus on why language development features in a project like this. It would also be interesting to analyze a project like this by observations of the linguistic content of the lessons and the specific differences between Italy and Sweden.
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1. Introduction
As a future language teacher, I wanted to broaden my horizon and look for useful methods and projects for my English C-essay. I wanted it to be directed towards something of practical use for my future profession, as well as strengthening my resume.

The Swedish curriculum demands that the education in English should prepare students to use strategies for overcoming communication breakdowns or problems, as well as developing the students’ ability to adapt their language for different situations (Skolverket, 2011). There are opportunities for working with this in the domestic classroom. However, there is always the possibility to resort to one’s native language. That is why I believe that exchange projects are very interesting for language learning. Fortunately, an opportunity arose to have a closer look at an exchange projects when Anna Fårhaeus, one of my teachers at Högskolan in Halmstad, advocated that it was possible to work together with a school in Halmstad and one in Asti, Italy.

The two schools are at high school level and are called Da Vinci, Kattegattgymnasiet (Sweden) and Liceo Scientifico F. Vercelli (Italy). Da Vinci is a part of the high school Kattegattgymnasiet in Halmstad, Sweden. The two groups of students were both in science programs. They were a part of an exchange project called “Comenius”, where students are supposed to work with learning agreements. Learning agreements mean that the students and teachers agree upon certain goals that are supposed to be strived for during such a project. This particular project was already in progress. This meant that the Italian students had already been to Sweden, and the Swedish students now were in Italy with the Italian students. In this project, there were ten Swedish students and ten Italian students.

There were two teachers particularly involved in this project. The Swedish teacher was called Henrik, and the Italian teacher’s name is Donatella. The project stretched for two semesters: a whole school year. The students were to spend three months in the exchange country. This meant that the students ended up spending six months together: three in their own country and three in the exchange country.

I learned that the teachers in this project were working with a method called “immersion”; this made me focus on this specific method of teaching. However, I needed a theoretical perspective for my research and I found out that there had already been other studies that incorporated second language acquisition theory into the analysis of different immersion programs.
1.1 Purpose and Problem Formulation
For my future profession as language teacher, I wanted to investigate to what extent second language learning is achieved in an exchange project, focused on immersion. Moreover, I aimed to identify challenges and possible pitfalls, regarding this type of exchange project, for future reference. Consequently, my thesis questions were as follows:

- What are the learning outcomes of this exchange project, focused on immersion?
- What experiences, and perceptions are there of the participants in this exchange project, focused on immersion?

2. Theoretical Framework
The purpose of this section is to assist in the analysis and understanding of the exchange project from an SLA (second language acquisition) perspective and the teaching method called “immersion” that was used in said project.

The literature and research on SLA theories is extensive. Since the purpose of this particular section is to give an overview on SLA theories, I have chosen mainly to refer to *Introducing Second Language Acquisition* by Saville-Troike. However, two elements of SLA theory will be revised more closely. For my thesis questions and this particular project, I have elected to explore input and output theories as well as the concepts of learning and acquisition.

When it comes to immersion, I will present different perspectives and an overview from various articles. This will aid me in the analysis of the different schools’ approaches to SLA teaching and may give me new insights on what one can expect when entering an exchange project similar to this one.

2.1 SLA, Overview
According to Saville-Troike (2006), SLA is defined as the study of individuals or groups who are learning a language after already having learned their first language (L1). Even though this additional language may be in fact the third or fourth language to be learned, it is called a “second language” (L2). The second language may also be referred to as the “target language” (TL). Saville-Troike (2006) also mentions informal and formal L2 learning as components of SLA. Informal L2 learning takes place in naturalistic settings, while formal L2 learning takes place in classrooms (Saville-Troike, 2006, p. 2).

The SLA field of study is mixture linguistics and different subfields of psychology, such as applied linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and social psychology. Important features of linguistics are the linguistic competence (underlying knowledge) and linguistic performance (actual production). Psychologists emphasize the cognitive processes involved when acquiring a language.
Sociolinguist promotes variability in linguistic performance, or communicative competence (how effective the communicator is in reaching its goals). Social psychologists emphasize identity, social motivation, interactional and larger social contexts of learning. Applied linguistics may take one or several of these perspectives, as well as focusing on implications of theory and research for teaching L2.

To understand SLA theory, one needs to be aware that there might be contrasting research results in existence, depending on what perspective is taken.

Besides the various perspectives on SLA theory, Saville-Troike (2006) states that it may be necessary to divide SLA into different functions, since this might affect what type of vocabulary and level of complexity to strive for. The author lists four distinctions: second language, foreign language, library language and auxiliary language. For my essay, I will only use the two first distinctions, because the two latter concern specific literature or official functions in another language than the native tongue.

The distinction second language refers to a language required for education and employment and is socially dominant in a particular context. An example of learners in this distinction might be a minority group or immigrants who speak another language natively. The second distinction foreign language refers to situations when the L2 is not used in the learners’ immediate social context. However, it might be used in future travel or communicating with another culture. Foreign language can be either studied as a curricular requirement or as an elective in school.

The Monitor Model, by Stephen Krashen (1978), is a model with an internal focus. The much-debated model is a collection of five hypotheses on how L2 is acquired. One of them is relevant for my analysis, the “input hypothesis”. This hypothesis suggest that comprehensible input, if there is enough of it, leads to language acquisition. The necessary grammar to go along with the input, automatically follows (Saville-Troike, p. 45).

Two of the most important terms of learning a second language is the input and the output that the learners are exposed to and have to create (Ellis, 2000, p. 243). Saville-Troike (2006) says that second language acquisition only can take place when the learner has access to SLA input. This input might come in both spoken and written form (Ellis, 2000, p. 26).

Even though all SLA theories recognize the importance of input, the role of input differs and is a controversial question. The role of input is distinguished into three different views: the behaviorist, the mentalist, and the interactionist.
According to Ellis (2000), the behaviorist theories emphasize that acquisition is controlled by external factors. The behaviorist theories do not consider any inherent abilities of the learner. The speaker controls what input the learner receives, and in its turn internalizes and imitates. The learner is regarded as a passive medium, and the accomplishments of the learner are judged by feedback in the shape of positive reinforcement or correction (Ellis, 2000, p. 243).

Input also has an important role in mentalist theories. However, it merely acts as a trigger that initiates internal language processing. This mechanism triggers an innate knowledge of possible forms that any language can take, within the learner. Mentalist theories advocate that input by itself is insufficient to acquire the rules of the target language (Ellis, 2000, p. 244).

In a major shift in thinking in linguistics and psychology, mentalist theory emerged in the 1960s and 1970s as a reaction to the environmental perspective. Instead, mentalist theory took the perspective of innate properties of the human mind. Ellis (1997) presents a few principles for this theory. These principles claim that only human beings have the capability of language learning, that input only acts as a trigger for language acquisition and that the human mind has a faculty for language learning such as other faculties designed for cognitive processes like logical reasoning. According to this theory, this faculty is the dominant factor of language acquisition (Ellis, 1997, p. 32).

Furthermore, there is another approach known as the “interactionist theory”, which is separated into two rather different perspectives. Cognitive interactionist theories claim that neither the linguistic environment nor the learners’ internal mechanisms are superior in SLA. It is rather a matter of a complex interaction between both of them (Ellis, 2000, p. 244).

The other perspective of the interactionist theory is a social interactionist theory that emphasizes the importance of verbal interaction for the learner to make sense of facts of the L2. Ellis (2000) mainly focuses on two questions to investigate interaction and input:

1. What are the characteristics of the input that L2 leaners typically receive?
2. How does the input influence L2 acquisition? (Ellis, 2000, p. 245)”

These two questions consider research on both descriptions of L2 input and explanations of how input affects acquisition. Along with these two questions, Ellis (2000) proposes several methods for investigating input and interaction (Ellis, 2000, p. 245).

Studies on input have generally focused on two issues. By distinguishing what native speakers actually say or write, studies have come up with the term “input text” to label it instead of making assumptions of the type of language native speakers produce. Input discourse is another type of
study that focuses on the special type of language that is used when speakers address language learners. This type of study also includes an examination of how interaction affects the input learners receive (Ellis, 2000, p. 246).

There are several variations of input discourse theories. Among these are foreigner talk (FT), briefly described as a native speaker’s adjustment of speech when speaking to a non-native speaker (Ellis, 2000, p. 251). However, this essay will focus on interlanguage talk (ILT). The reason for this choice is that interlanguage focuses on the language between learners, and not between a learner and a native speaker (Ellis, 2000, p. 265).

ILT often constitutes the primary source of input to learners. Ellis (2000) emphasizes two important issues with ILT. The first issue presented is that ILT has been found to be less grammatical, and insufficient in terms of target language standards, than FT.

The second issue with ILT concerns whether ILT has the same capacity to negotiate meaning as FT. Studies have found that learners prompt each other more frequently than a native speaker would prompt a non-native speaker. There are clearly differences between ILT and FT. However, one advantage of ILT is the opportunity for more frequent negotiation of meaning, which is of great importance from a psycholinguistic perspective (Ellis, 2000, p. 266).

Ellis (2000) distinguishes four broad approaches or hypotheses in studies of the relationship between input/interaction and L2 acquisition. I will briefly describe these four approaches.

The input frequency hypothesis claims that L2 acquisition is determined by the frequency with which different linguistic elements take place in the input. Even though Ellis (2000) states that there is little evidence that suggests input frequency affects L2 acquisition, a reasonable deduction might be that input frequency, combined with other factors, might influence L2 development (Ellis, 2000, p. 273).

The second hypothesis, comprehensible input, refers to the influential input hypothesis of Krashen (1981; 1985; 1989). This hypothesis asserts that learners progress according to a natural order by comprehending input on a level slightly above their current competence. Also contained in this hypothesis is the learner’s affective disposition, which might indicate that comprehensible input is not sufficient for acquisition. A third principle of this theory suggests that input becomes comprehensible when put into context. Finally, learner production is not a contributing factor to acquisition, but rather a result of acquisition. Ellis (2000) refers to Long (1985) who claims that the third principle of Krashen’s theory can be challenged. Long emphasizes the magnitude of interactional modifications that occur when negotiating meaning, due to a communication problem.
In other words, Long makes a case that interactional input is more efficient than non-interactive input (Ellis, 2000, p. 273).

Ellis (2000) continues and asks what type of linguistic/conversational adjustments promote comprehension of input, and whether certain kinds of adjustments are more efficient than others. Ellis refers to several studies on the matter. Among the findings, from several researchers, is the importance of speech rate. When it comes to non-interactive adjustment, the studies that have been conducted show a significant difference in comprehension between native speakers and non-native speakers, related to speech rate. Even though a non-native speaker has achieved a high level of proficiency, they will struggle with comprehending a recording with a high speech rate (Ellis, 2000, p. 274).

Research also concluded that linguistic modification, such as simpler syntax and vocabulary, did not consistently lead to comprehension of input. However, elaborative modification did a better job and had a consistent effect on comprehension, provided that the level of the linguistic difficulty did not exceed a certain level. There is also research presented by Ellis that suggests that non-native speakers who struggle with formulating a certain grammatical structure might still be able to understand the structure in the speech of others (Ellis, 2000, p. 275).

The opposite side of interaction, output, will also be addressed here. Output is the language we create when talking to another person and is controversial in terms of language development (Ellis, 2000, p. 280). Even though interaction provides the learners with the opportunity to produce output, this has no effect on acquisition, according to Krashen (1985), while other researchers have argued that output is a contributing factor to the development of ILT (Ellis, 2000, p. 280). Swain (1985) argues for the comprehensible output theory, meaning that learners need the opportunity to use their linguistic resources to become fully grammatically competent. When learners encounter communicative failures, they are impelled to work on their output, making it more precise, coherent and appropriate (Ellis, 2000, p. 282).

2.2 Focus on Immersion as a Method
Immersion is an educational model, usually used in elementary schools, and it occurs where students are educated in a non-native language. It can occur at two levels: total immersion and partial immersion. Total immersion initially teaches the whole curriculum in the foreign language. Content instruction in the L1 gradually becomes a part of the education later on. In partial immersion, at least 50 percent of the time is spent teaching school subjects in the foreign language. Many immersion programs aim towards both oral and written proficiency for the students. Despite this, little explicit foreign language instruction is included in the curriculum. There may not be a foreign language curriculum with clear objectives or language elements, such as functions,
vocabulary and grammar. It is more the case that the students acquire language from each other or from the content instruction. Students enrolled in an immersion program that are not on a level of language proficiency close to native speakers might still be assessed as successful (Swain and Johnson, 1997; Genesee, 1994).


Graser (1998) addresses the challenge of being an immersion teacher by acknowledging that an immersion teacher is integrating the work of two teachers into a lesson. By teaching content through the immersion language, it is necessary for the teacher to design lessons to teach language and vocabulary, as well as the new content (Graser, 1998, p. 1).

For my essay, the incentives for growth of immersion programs in modern times are an interesting phenomenon. According to a study by the Centre for Applied Linguistics, there has been a steady increase of immersion programs in the US until 2006. Lenker and Rhodes (2007) explain the growth of immersion programs in America as a consequence of five factors:

- parental pressure for language programs with goals of high levels of proficiency
- increasing interest in multicultural approaches to education
- an increased variety of alternatives when it comes to choice of education
- a substantial amount of research pointing towards the effectiveness of immersion programs.
- a growing acknowledgement of the need for Americans to be proficient in foreign languages for personal, educational, economic and national security reasons (Lenker & Rhodes, 2007, p. 3).

One can argue that these incentives are likely to be similar to the ones in Sweden and Italy.

Gaffney (1999) considers the effects of immersion, referring to Wiss (1989), as being consistently proven positive by research. This goes for most students. However, research has singled out a group of students who do not perform as well as the majority of the students. This group is referred to as "developmentally immature". These students do not possess sufficient cognitive and linguistic skills to cope with the bilingual academic context (Gaffney, 1999, p. 4).

Cohen and Gómez (2004) treat the outcomes of immersion somewhat differently. Referring to several studies, they suggest that immersion students may struggle when it comes to complex verb tenses, such as those needed to use conditionals and subjunctives. For example, Cohen and Gomez (2004) refer to Potowski (2004) who concluded that sixteen 8th grade students were deficient in these linguistic areas in the target language Spanish after nine years in an immersion program.
Cohen and Gomez (2004) refer to Genesee (1987), who argues that the reason for students not developing a native-like level of linguistic skills and communicative repertoire is that they are able to get by without it, merely using limited and basic skills (Cohen & Gomez, 2004, p. 5-6).


Cohen and Gomez (2004) suggest that an important issue with immersion is "how much explicit grammar instruction the students will tolerate before they get turned off to the experience". This is one of the main reasons for grammar instruction being downplayed in immersion programs. Another perspective on the matter is that experts feel that grammatical form, even the complex ones, would be acquired over time without formal instruction (Cohen & Gomez, 2004, p. 6).

Beside the issue of grammar and formal instruction, immersion programs are usually evaluated in terms of outcomes, such as level of achievement in foreign language proficiency. Cohen and Gomez (2004) therefore turn to the processes in acquisition and refer to a study of French language immersion students in Australia, by de Courcy (2002). This study concludes that comprehensible input in the target language will not be sufficient to facilitate language learning. There needs to a balance between input and output for language learning to occur (Cohen & Gomez, 2004, p. 6).

Cohen and Gomez (2004) use a process-oriented study, by Cohen (1998), that concluded that some fifth and sixth-grade immersion students in St. Paul resorted to English for solving word problems in math instead of Spanish, especially when encountering complex problems. The study found that students used online-translation when problems occurred instead of solving it with the target language. (Cohen & Gomez, 2004, p. 7).

3. Methods

Vinterek (2007) emphasizes the importance of establishing what is to be studied before considering how the study will be conducted. To answer my thesis questions, I decided that I needed different types of data and that is why I opted for both a questionnaire and interviews. The questionnaire is intended to measure quantitative and simpler aspects of the immersion program, while the interviews are incorporated to get a better understanding of complexities in this exchange project.

In this section, I will describe the construction of the questionnaire and interview. Hence, the nature of the questions and justification of my methods will follow. The presentation will be divided into the questionnaire, and the interview.

Originally, the method for this essay was planned with a research colleague. The original plan was divided into two essays along the process. For this reason, a selection of questions regarding
language instruction, assessment and input and output are distinguished from the questionnaire and interviews. Those are the elements that are relevant for my essay and will be coursing through the methods chapter as well as the analysis chapter.

In accordance with the principles of research ethics, the teachers, students and schools involved were informed well ahead of the study. Denscombe (2009) refers to the importance of the consent of the respondents (Denscombe, 2009, p. 231). The informants’ identity has to be guaranteed not to be compromised as well (Denscombe, 2004, p. 212).

I will present the two teachers here more thoroughly as well. Henrik, who is an English teacher, is the teacher in charge of the exchange project at the Swedish school Da Vinci, Kattegattgymnasiet. He is the one who made the assessments of the Swedish students and also communicated with them when they were in Italy. He traveled there a few times during the project to see how the students were doing. He speaks both Italian and English, which made the communication between the two schools better. Donatella is the English teacher at Liceo Scientifico F. Vercelli, who is responsible for the exchange project. She assessed the Italian students on their language development. The two teachers have known each other for some time and have worked together in the past with a similar project.

3.1. The Questionnaire
Denscombe (2009) explains the type of situations where questionnaires are particularly appropriate. Among these situations is one in which the purpose of a study demands standardized data, without any personal interaction between the researcher and the research objects, and where the respondents can be expected to answer the questions from their own experience or knowledge.

Furthermore, Denscombe (2009) explains that it is important to distinguish facts from opinions. The questionnaire aims to measure specific details of the exchange project. However, it is more directed towards opinions or experience from these specific details. The main reason for this is that the outlook on students being able to answer questions explicitly about immersion and SLA-theories seemed poor. A selection of questions and answers concerned with language instruction, assessment, immersion and student input and output will be in my analysis.

According to Ejvegård (2009) it is imperative that the questionnaire measures what is intended, because there would be no time for re-takes. The questions should not be too numerous or of a leading nature. Questions that are not clear are likely to give me incomprehensible answers or a far too broad range of answers. It is asserted by Befring (1994) that the questions need to be of a level that is expected to be in line with the students’ knowledge about the exchange project. This is because, if the questions fail to deliver a reliable base of answers, or the rate of answers were to be too low, it would be impossible to take the questionnaire into account in my analysis.
Denscombe (2009) puts forward a set of principles around questionnaires that are important for my study:

- questions need to be relevant to the target group
- avoid leading questions
- only include questions relevant for the particular research
- assure that questions are not misunderstood
- minimize the risk of eliciting responses like: “I don’t know”
- create short and uncomplicated questions
- the questions should not include gratuitous assumptions

The order of the questions has been designed to conform to Denscombe’s (2009) guidance: the order of the questions should not lead the respondent to give answers that are based on an earlier response. In accordance with Denscombe (2009), the order of the questions is also set in such a way as to categorize them into different genres. These genres relate to immersion, input and output, language instruction and assessment. For my essay, the selection of questionnaire questions is as follows:

- To what extent do you feel that students get the chance to speak during class, in Sweden/Italy?
- How much direct language instruction (grammar, form etc) did you get from the teacher in Sweden/Italy?
- During this exchange period, in which situations do you feel that you develop your English skills?
- How has this exchange affected your competence and confidence with English? (See appendix)

3.2. The Interviews
Denscombe (2009) accounts for interviews as an appropriate research method for gathering more complex and subtle phenomena than the kind of data the researcher obtains from a questionnaire. Emotions, perception, experiences and opinions are better collected by interviews (Denscombe, 2009, p. 232). Since the purpose of my essay was to investigate to what extent second language learning is achieved in an exchange project, focused on immersion, these complex phenomena are of great interest.
The interviews were conducted in a semi-structured manner. This means that there were predetermined topics and questions, but there was still room for follow-up questions when needed. This also means that the researcher has to be flexible, and be able to formulate and explain the right follow-up questions (Denscombe, 2009, p. 234).

The interviews were strictly verbal and did not include any visual aids (Befring, 1994, p. 69). The interview was conducted in English, not in the respondents’ native tongue. This might have had an effect on the respondents’ ability to provide the study with reliable or comprehensible answers (Befring, 1994, p. 70). That is why the questions, especially for the students, needed to be carefully constructed.

4. Results
For a C-essay, a significant amount of data was collected. To make a manageable and efficient analysis, I have opted for the creation of four result modules, made up of different types of questions. Later, these modules will be utilized in my analysis of the results as well. These modules, or categories, are created from questions regarding immersion, input and output, language instruction and assessment (See Appendix 1.).

At this stage of the essay, it may be wise to be reminded of the research questions for this study: “What are the learning outcomes of this exchange project, focused on immersion” and “What experiences, and perceptions are there of the participants in this exchange project, focused on immersion?”. The result is a collection of replies from a questionnaire for students, and interviews with teachers and students, based on the purpose of this study. Out of ten students from Sweden, eight participated in the interviews and answered the questionnaire. There were eight students that took part in the interviews and replied to the questionnaire, out of ten.

4.1 The Student Interviews and Questionnaire

4.1.1 Input and Output
For question number 6, the students were allowed to fill out several options if they wanted to. For this reason there is a variance in the number of replies between the Italian and Swedish students and the other questions, as well.

The Swedish students’ responses to: ”During this exchange period, in which situations do you feel that you develop your English skills?”.

According to the Swedish students they developed their English skills best with their exchange buddies. There were six students that responded With my exchange buddies, two Watching TV and one replied Abroad on vacation.
The Italian students’ responses to: "During this exchange period, in which situations do you feel that you develop your English skills?"

Seven students responded that they developed their language in the best way with their exchange buddies, and six students stated that they did so in school. Four of the students replied that they developed their English skills \textit{Watching TV}, and three replied \textit{On the Internet}.

The Swedish students’ responses to: "How much direct language instruction did you get from the teachers in Sweden?"

The students replied in the direction of direct language instruction being a scarce element of the teaching in Sweden. There were three students who indicated that direct language instruction was given \textit{Quite rarely}. However, there were two students who replied that language instruction
occurred *Often*. The rest of the informants were scattered in the alternatives below often, leaving no reply on language instruction being held *Every lesson*.

The Swedish students’ responses to: "How much direct language instruction did you get from the teachers in Italy?"

Four out of eight students responded that the teacher in Italy rarely gave any direct language instruction, whereas two indicated that language instruction was given *Quite often*. The alternatives *Every lesson* and *Quite rarely* were not used.

The Italian students’ responses to: "How much direct language instruction did you get from the teachers in Sweden?"
According to the Italian students, direct language instruction was given *Quite often* in Sweden. Four of the respondents replied that was the case, and three chose *Quite rarely* as their alternative. Just one student opted for language instruction being provided on a rare basis.

The Italian students’ responses to: "How much direct language instruction did you get from the teachers in Italy?"

The Italian students were more inclined to reply that direct language instruction was a common part of the teaching in Italy. Three students indicated that it was given *Every lesson*, two *Often* and two *Quite often*. 1 student replied that direct language instruction was provided *Quite rarely* in Italy.
The Swedish students’ responses to: ”To what extent do you feel that students get the chance to speak during class, in Sweden?”
This question generated eight student responses that indicated that all of the Swedish students had experienced that the percentage of speaking time was 60% or more during class in Sweden.

9. To what extent do you feel that students get a chance to speak during class, in Sweden?

The Swedish students’ responses to: ”To what extent do you feel that students get the chance to speak during class, in Italy?”
There were seven out of eight students who replied that the percentage of speaking time in the Italian classroom was twenty or more. Only one student replied 40% or more.

10. To what extent do you feel that students get a chance to speak during class, in Italy?

The Italian students’ responses to: ”To what extent do you feel that students get the chance to speak during class, in Sweden?”
Question number 9 provides the data of six students answering that the speaking time of students in Sweden is 60% or more, while two students replied 40% or more.

9. To what extent do you feel that students get the chance to speak during class, in Sweden?

The Italian students’ responses to: "To what extent do you feel that students get the chance to speak during class, in Sweden?"
The data from question number 10 shows that six students answered 20% or more, and two students indicated that the speaking time of students was 40% or more.

10. To what extent do you feel that students get the chance to speak during class, in Italy?

4.2.1 Immersion
When answering the question about awareness of the teacher learning intentions, the Swedish students mainly agreed that the language is the most important factor, not the content. However, there were some concerns, among the Swedish students, over the fact that they struggle to
understand what Donatella wanted. This means that some of the students expressed that there was a difference in emphasis between Sweden and Italy when it comes to the language and content relationship. These replies pointed towards Donatella’s teaching being more focused on content.

One of the Swedish students mentioned that it is good if two things can be learned at the same time. This student believed that Donatella focused more on content than Henrik. The student also added:

”The teacher in Sweden can choose more what to do and like what subjects they want to talk about. Here it’s more strict and they have like a plan they should follow and the most important thing is to do every page in the book and do as many things as possible, not that you learn something” (Swedish student, Interview)

According to another Swedish student, there is a difference in how the Italian and Swedish teachers approach the content and language relationship. This student said that the students learn more about content than language in Italy, and the other way around in Sweden.

The Italian students are not as unanimous as the Swedish students when it comes to this question. Some of the students replied that English is a means of learning about different subjects, in Sweden and Italy. One of the Italian students mentioned that it is not so important what is studied, but to learn how to study.

Another Italian student expressed the view that that it was not apparent what type of learning the teachers intended. However, the student speculated that the language was the most important factor from the teachers’ point of view.

The question: ”How have you been working with you individual learning agreement?” generated answers from the Swedish students that highlighted the responsibility to work on their own. The students stated that they tried to follow the plans they received from their teachers. There were some concerns in the replies about not understanding everything in the learning agreements, which led to stressful situations where the students fell behind their classmates in Sweden.

The Italian students expressed similar problems with understanding parts of the learning agreement, and falling behind as a result. A student from Italy mentioned that there were some tests in Sweden, in English and physics. These tests were evaluated by Henrik and then sent to the Italian teacher for grading.
4.2.2 Assessment

In the response to the question: "In what way do you feel that your teachers’ measure your development in English?" the informants provided a broad range of perspectives on the assessment in the project.

Student 1A replied that the assessment was quite similar in Sweden and Italy. The student also said that Donatella collected the Swedish student’s results and sent them to Henrik.

The assessment in Sweden is better, according to one Swedish student. The main reason for this is that it is easier to understand what is expected. This student was not aware of any assessment being made in Italy, but suggested that Henrik probably would check their development after the project, back in Sweden. The same goes for yet another Swedish student. This student replied that Henrik always talks to the students about what is going on and their grades. The same student also said that there were not many occasions for testing in Italy, especially not speaking. This goes along with the reply from another student from Sweden as well: "here they don’t count speaking as high as knowing the grammar”.

One of the Swedish students expressed something quite different. The student referred to the national tests in Sweden as the only real assessment. The student’s experience from the English lessons in Sweden was that they were fun, but not effective for learning.

One of the Italian students replied that one way of measuring the development was that his classmates and himself became more fluent in English during the project.

Another Italian student explained that Donatella “interviews” the Italian students on a number of occasions during a school year. The student said that it was somewhat ambiguous what was actually assessed in these interviews. This student had no clear impression of whether it was their ability as English speakers, or the assignments that had been completed, that was the foundation for these interviews.

An Italian student referred to oral tests in both Sweden and Italy, but claimed it was much easier in Sweden because things are discussed thing in a group. This student claimed that this was better than having a tense discussion face-to-face with a teacher, as they do in Italy with Donatella.
4.3 The Teacher Interviews

4.3.1 Language Instruction
When faced with the question: Do you provide concrete language instruction every lesson?

Donatella answered that every lesson contains grammatical instructions. She also replied that they have a period every five years when they work with grammar for three hours per week. She added that, during the two first years, the focus is on grammar and the most important structures and functions. The real language, or communication, starts in the third years, she concluded.

Henrik’s responses to the same questions were not as fixed on language instruction for every lesson. In his reply, he mentioned that it depends on what they are working with. He said that he is "more like a tutor than a teacher, helping them.” Furthermore, he stated that he generally does not conduct concrete language instruction in front of class, but rather he gives individual instructions.

4.3.2 Immersion
Henrik replied that they work a lot with immersion, on the question: "What is CBI to you?” He mentioned a project that integrated English with biology and physics. During the time the Italian students spent in Sweden, they had a debate about genetics in English, Henrik explained. Henrik went on to list some other projects where English and another subject had been combined: ” We also had Physics projects and engineering projects in English, and History and Literature projects in English.”

To the very same question, Donatella answered that they try to ”reconnect” the subjects, no matter what subjects it might be. She gave the example of a final exam where the students are faced with an exam that sums up language, history, literature, philosophy, ethics and science. In her reply, she also said that the students needed to ”create a sort of report of their own according to English…” She explained that the need for students to see a connection between their textbook, "Blue”, and mathematics or science, for example. She concluded that they start with this kind of work early on with the students.

On the question: ”Do you think that the students are aware of what you are teaching? For example; if you talk about kangaroos in Australia, is it the kangaroos that are important or the language used when talking about it?” Henrik’s main point was that ” the outcome of the teaching and the learning situation is much more than both the teacher and the students are aware of.” He added that it might, on the one hand, be said that the students are aware of the learning objectives. However, on the
other hand, it would be impossible to list all the things ”we really learn”. Henrik suggests that the more complex and authentic the learning situation is, the more diverse the outcome will be, but these complex situations make it almost impossible to identify all of the learning that takes place, Henrik concluded.

To the same question, Donatella’s answer basically just reveals that the relationship between content and language depends on what she is teaching.

When the interview reaches the question: ”How was it working with the students and their learning agreement?”, Henrik replied that it was too busy. The biggest issue with the learning agreement was the lack of time to sit down and talk about the learning agreements, said Henrik. Henrik explained that the process of getting information from the teacher involved, and translating the information to English was time consuming.

Donatella answered the same question differently. She claimed that she did not have any problems with the learning agreements, and that the students had been attentive and careful to follow the agreements.

Both of Henrik and Donatella experienced that the cooperation with their colleagues was problematic. They answered the question: Were there any obstacles with your colleagues when working with this? In some subjects, Henrik had a good rapport with his colleagues and could collaborate and make plans. In contrast to this, Donatella had no real support from her colleagues. Both of the teachers stated that the inhibitions from their colleagues harmed the students, because they had to catch up a substantial amount of work after the project, especially in Italy. Donatella explained that this problem was partly a consequence of a traditional didactic perspective among the Italian teachers. Henrik also added that he had very little time to explain the project, and would have liked much more time for the project to be more effective.

4.3.3 Input and Output
In his reply to the question: ” Is speaking among students a recurrent element of your classroom work? Choose from the alternatives 60% or more of class, 40% or more or 20% more,” Henrik reports that his students are supposed to speak English during his lessons. Henrik estimates that the students use up 60% or more of the speaking time.

Donatella answered that the students talk a lot during her lessons, 60 % or more.
Henrik’s and Donatella’s response to the question: ”When it comes to communicating in English, what were the largest differences between the Swedish and Italian students?” both point towards the Swedish students being better at speaking. Henrik perceived that the Italians seemed more afraid of speaking than the Swedes. The Swedish students speak more freely and fluently, according to Henrik. However, he mentioned that he could ”notice and enormous development among the Italian students” during the project. Henrik added that the Swedish students sometimes lack some knowledge in grammar.

Donatella said: ”the biggest difference when it comes to communicating in English between the Italian and the Swedish ones is that you are used to listening to English for example watching films, in general conversation or just because of the media, while we are not. So the only possibility that for Italians to learn English and try to become quite fluent in English is just at school.” (Donatella, Interview)

This quote also points to the notion that the Swedish students are better at speaking, but gives the question another perspective.

4.3.4 Assessment
Henrik refers to the national tests, oral presentations, debates, speeches and written assignments when answering the question: ”Which type of assessment do you use to measure the students development in English?”. He also replied that he rarely uses traditional testing, and when he does it is usually simple grammar tests to check the students’ homework. Vocabulary is not either a major part of Henrik’s assessment.

When Donatella answers the same question, she accounts for different levels and methods of testing during the first, second and third year for the students. During the first and second year, the assessment consists of simpler standardized tests, where the student is supposed to just fill out the correct answer. During the second year, the students’ writing is assessed more as well. According to Donatella, it is important to focus on the students’ ability to express their own opinion, rather than just recycling facts from the Internet. To her, this might be more important than grammar in some cases. She tries to motivate the students and pick up on their progress.

5. Analysis
This section will also be presented with the same categories as in the result section: Input and output, Language instruction, Immersion and Assessment. These categories will be discussed and
analyzed in the light of the theoretical framework of the essay: SLA-theories and immersion. Where there is room for debate, in the result of the different categories, I will aim to provide different angles and possible explanations.

5.1 Input and output
In the questionnaire, both the Swedish and the Italian students claim that the best way for them to develop their language is to do so with their exchange buddies. However, there are a remarkable number of Italian students who include the context of school as an important factor for their English language development, while the Swedes do not. The fact that the students spend time together in school probably contributes to this result. The fact that the Swedish students did not make this connection is rather interesting. My theory on this is that the student groups, the Italian and the Swedish, view the question a bit differently. The Swedish students may be inclined to regard the learning situation with their exchange buddies to something outside of school completely, while the Italian students do not seem to make this distinction.

As for the teachers interview, the result seems to point towards an agreement between the teachers. This agreement means that the Swedish students are better at speaking, and that it is due to Swedes being more exposed to English through media. Both Henrik and Donatella claim that the students use up 60% or more of the speaking time during class. Regarding Henrik’s reply, this correlates with the result from the questionnaire where the students are asked to what extent they were given the opportunity to speak, in both Sweden and Italy. However, Donatella’s reply is in great contrast to what the Italian and Swedish student reply to this question. One might argue that the lack of speaking time in the Italian classroom is what leads to the notion that the Swedish students are better at speaking than the Italian, with input and output being crucial for SLA according to research.

5.2 Language instruction
In general, the Italian students experienced that direct language instruction was a more reoccurring element of the lessons in both Italy and Sweden, compared to the Swedish students. The Italian students managed to provide an answer that correlates with the information given by the teachers about the frequency of concrete language instruction. Henrik replied that he works with individual tutoring more than concrete language instruction in front of class. This might have led to some confusion about language instruction amongst the Swedish students. Hence the indistinct replies, from the Swedish students in the questionnaire.
This result may be linked to what Cohen and Gómez (2004) expressed about immersion students not developing a native-like level of linguistic skills. Moreover, they address the issue of “how much explicit grammar instruction the students will tolerate before they get turned off to the experience”. This might be quite a major issue, especially with the Swedish students. The fact that they usually do not receive very much language instruction may have led them to not really recognising it when it was given in Italy. This notion accords with Henrik’s reply about Swedish students lacking some grammatical competence.

The fact that the Italian students developed their language during the project combined without a substantial grammar and vocabulary intervention throughout the project may be a consequence of the idea of some experts that learners develop their grammar over time anyway, though.

5.3 Immersion
Henrik and Donatella seemed to have totally different opinions on the effectiveness of the learning agreements. This is slightly odd, but does not have to mean that one of them is wrong. Donatella claimed that her students had been very attentive and careful to follow the agreement. When the responses from the students are examined, it is obvious that both the Italian and the Swedish students experienced some difficulties with the learning agreement. The greatest difficulty seemed to be falling behind their regular classmates, due to incomprehensible learning agreements. In this sense, the reply from Donatella might be misinformed.

When Henrik and Donatella discussed the students’ awareness of their intentions, the replies show that both of the teachers believe that the questions are difficult to answer. It comes down to circumstances and situations, when looking at student awareness. Henrik points out that it is hard to really know what is being learned in immersion. Even though the students might be aware of the objectives, other things may come in to play. This leads to my conclusion that there is a lot of learning in an immersion project, for which might be hard to account. However, this need not be viewed negatively. It may go along with what my research overview on immersion says about learning taking place even without explicit language instruction.

A conclusion from the replies, in which the students discuss the awareness of the learning intentions, is that the Swedish students were more certain of the differences between Henrik’s and Donatella’s approach to content and language and that the Italian students had a more holistic outlook on the relationship between language and content. It can be argued that the Swedish
students did not fully comprehend what Donatella’s intentions were. Since both of the teachers stated that they were working with immersion, this conclusion comes to mind.

One also has to take into consideration that both Henrik and Donatella experienced some difficulties with their colleagues in this project. The learning outcomes and overall experience of this project might therefore have been slightly compromised. From an immersion perspective, the collaboration among colleagues is crucial for a successful exchange project. Henrik touches upon something that might be the key here. The fact that he had very little time to explain this project to his colleagues might have been the biggest problem in working out a plan for collaboration. If such a large project with so many teachers did not have a communal understanding of the effectiveness of immersion, proven by research, perhaps this was the main issue.

5.3 Assessment
It seems that the assessment of the exchange project was somewhat unclear, at least for the students. However there are some patterns in the replies of the students. Both the Italian and Swedish students appeared to be more content with the Swedish assessment for two main reasons. Firstly, some students believed that it was easier to know what was expected in Sweden and, secondly, it was more comfortable to be assessed in Sweden. This was because there was more pressure in the situations for assessment in Italy, according to the students. From the interviews with the students and the teachers, I conclude that the interviews between Donatella and the students are such situations.

However, there seemed to be some uncertainty over how the work was being assessed whilst abroad. Some students thought that the work done in the exchange country was to be assessed after the project, along with the language development. However, there were also students who replied that the work they were doing was sent back home to their regular teacher for assessment.

Both Henrik and Donatella claim that they use written assignments for assessment. This is not really mentioned by the students. It is possible that the students did not regard the written assignments as testing. Both of the teachers said that they assess the students through oral tests, which the students confirm. The difference here is that the oral tests in Sweden, according to the students, were conducted in groups while the oral tests in Italy were individual.
It was mentioned by Henrik that grammar and vocabulary do not play a major part of his assessment. This goes along with what some of the Swedish students replied, namely that Donatella was more focused on grammar than Henrik.

6. Research Challenges and Limitations to the Study
There were some challenges with this study. They will be accounted for in this section to gain further understanding of this study and the exchange project that was studied.

A great challenge was constructing the questionnaires and interviews because of the inequality in knowledge of SLA theories between the students and us. The questions had to be formulated at a level that measured what was intended, but still at a comprehensible level for the students. Another aspect of this challenge was analyzing quite simple and rough data with immersion and SLA-theory, without really having asked questions too explicitly regarding immersion and SLA.

Another challenging factor to this study was that Donatella and Henrik did not have the same plan or the same prerequisites for this project. The communication with Henrik ahead of the trip was easier than with Donatella, since there were meetings and phone calls with Henrik ahead of the trip and just e-mails with Donatella. Combined with the fact that the planning for the trip was time-consuming, some of the questions for this study were not framed as accurately as they could have been.

7. Conclusions
When concluding this essay, I want to return to where we started, with the purpose of my essay: For my future profession as language teacher, I wanted to investigate to what extent second language learning is achieved in an exchange project, focused on immersion. Moreover, I aim to identify challenges and possible pitfalls, regarding this type of exchange project, for future reference, as well as my problem formulations:

- What are the learning outcomes of this exchange project, focused on immersion?
- What are the advantages, and disadvantages of an exchange project, focused on immersion?

The most pertinent discovery, in my mind, was that of the complexity of learning in a project like this. I think Henrik expressed this in the best way when he said that it is almost impossible to actually establish all the things that the students really learned in this project. The students developed their language even though they indicated that they sometimes were confused about the objectives and that it was hard to catch up after the project. Henrik emphasized this as well, when saying that the students achieved a higher level than before the project.
Another of my conclusions is that this project has vast potential because the students developed their language despite some difficulties. If this type of learning was gained from a project, without clear cut objectives and follow up on the learning agreements, one can only imagine what could have taken place with the aid of all the teachers at the two schools. The conclusion also makes me think that there is always something to be gained from an experience like this.

Linguistically, I am tempted to regard the differences between schools and students as a matter of tradition. When I write “tradition”, I mean that English may have a tradition of being the de facto second language of Sweden, whereas it is generally regarded as an entirely foreign language in Italy. Even though the students and the teacher in Italy have recognized that English is an important medium for communication, the cultural differences are probably a contributor to the differences.

Since there were clearly differences in the methods of the teachers, when it comes to language instruction, it is possible that the mixture of the strict language instruction in Italy and the teaching in Sweden was a success from an SLA-perspective, as well as an immersion point of view. Combining the Italian focus on grammar and form with the Swedish focus on speaking might have been what was so effective in the end.

So far, I have mostly listed advantages with this immersion projects. Even though the overall conclusion of this exchange project is positive, I managed to single out some disadvantages, as in challenges and possible pitfalls. Among my conclusions is that, without establishing the different strengths of the teachers’ styles, the students might be confused about the differences rather than being helped by them. Another conclusion is that the students experienced a substantial amount of stress, and to avoid that calls for careful planning. The learning agreements, the assessments and objectives need to be clearer to the students to prevent this anxiety. I have concluded that the support of the headmaster and colleagues are crucial. This conclusion is a good one for every large-scale project one undertakes.

For future research, it would be interesting to look into why the previously mentioned language development occurs. The students are not linguistic experts, but still they seem to have developed their language together. One might ask if it was due to the fact that they experienced a new teaching style, with different content and perspectives, or if it was because of the increased frequency of L2 interactions that achieved it. If I had more time at my disposal this study could have investigated the linguistic content of the teachers lessons. A study that included observations from the lessons in Sweden, as well as the ones in Italy, would have been an interesting complement to this study. This would have eliminated, or at least helped to overcome, some of the research challenges.
8. Summary
For my future profession as a language teacher, I wanted to explore something that would help my practice. A fortunate opportunity to analyze an exchange project emerged, and I took it. This seemed to be exactly what I was looking for. This particular project was already in progress and it involved working with immersion. Besides obtaining knowledge about this kind of exchange project, I also wanted to investigate and evaluate immersion as a method from an SLA-point of view, mainly focusing on language instruction, assessment and input and output.
To do this, I sought answers to the questions in my problem formulation:

• What are the learning outcomes of this exchange project, focused on immersion?
• What are the advantages, and disadvantages of an exchange project, focused on immersion?

In order to find answers to these questions, I travelled to Asti, in Italy, to interview the students in this exchange project and hand out questionnaires to them. The teachers of this project were included as well, in interviews. This meant that I used both a qualitative method as well as a quantitative to answer my research questions.

This study has shown that the main challenge with the project was that it was time-consuming and that the objectives were, at times, unclear to the students. It also showed that the students seemed happier with the assessment in Sweden than the one in Italy. Most of the informants agreed that the Swedish students were better at speaking, due to more exposure to English via the media. The teachers expressed the view that there were difficulties with their colleagues as well. The result showed that the greatest differences between the teaching styles of Henrik and Donatella were their focus on grammar and amount of speaking time they provided to the students.

The conclusions of my study have given me some ideas for future research, such as establishing why the language development occurs. It would have been interesting as well to further analyze this kind of exchange project, by observing the linguistic content of the lessons in Italy and Sweden.
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Appendix 1
Categories for Result and Analysis

Immersion

Teacher interview:

- What is CBI to you?
- How was it working with the students and their learning agreement?
- Where there any obstacles with your colleagues when working with this?

Student interview:

- How have you been working with you individual learning agreement?
- Are you as a student aware of what the teacher wants you to learn? If your teachers for example talks about kangaroos in Australia, is it the kangaroos that are important or is it the language you learn when you talk about it?

Language instruction

Teacher interview:

- Do you provide concrete language instruction every lesson?

Questionnaire:

- How much direct language instruction (grammar, form etc) did you get from the teacher in Sweden?
- How much direct language instruction (grammar, form etc) did you get from the teacher in Italy?

Input and output

Teacher interview:

- Is speaking among students a recurrent element of your classroom work? Choose from the alternatives 60% or more of class, 40% or more or 20% more,
- When it comes to communicating in English, what were the biggest differences between the Swedish and Italian students?
Questionnaire:

- To what extent do you feel that students get the chance to speak during class, in Italy?
- To what extent do you feel that students get the chance to speak during class in Sweden?

Assessment

Student interview:

- In what way do you feel that your teachers’ measure your development in English?

Teacher interview:

- Which type of assessment do you use to measure the students development in English?
Appendix 2
Questionnaire

Before we get started:
Content = what the lesson is about, for example crime in the U.S.
Language instruction = when the teacher tells you about rules and functions of grammar and spelling.
What is your nationality? ______________________________

1. How often are errors pointed out by the teachers in Sweden?
☐ Every chance they get  ☐ Often  ☐ Quite Often  ☐ Quite rarely  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

2. What kind of errors are corrected by the teacher in Sweden? Choose two of the most common.
☐ When I speak freely  ☐ When I write  ☐ When I read out loud  ☐ None

3. How often does the Italian teacher point out errors?
☐ Every chance they get  ☐ Often  ☐ Quite Often  ☐ Quite rarely  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

4. What kind of errors are corrected by the teacher in Italy? Choose two of the most common.
☐ When I speak freely  ☐ When I write  ☐ When I read out loud  ☐ None

5. Write down where you think Da Vinci is and where iLiceo scientifico F Vercelli is. They can be on either side or on the same side. Use the lines in the boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content is taught in English.</th>
<th>Content is used to learn English.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content learning is most important.</td>
<td>Language learning is most important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language learning is not as important.</td>
<td>Content learning is not as important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content determined by course goals</td>
<td>Language work set up by English course goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students tested on content.</td>
<td>Students tested on language skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. During this exchange period, in which situations do you feel that you develop your english skills?
□ In school  □ With my exchange-buddies  □ Abroad on vacation  □ Playing video/computer games  
□ On the Internet  □ Watching TV

7. How much direct language instruction (grammar, form etc) did you get from the teacher in Sweden?
□ Every lesson  □ Often  □ Quite often  □ Quite rarely  □ Rarely  □ Never

8. How much direct language instruction (grammar, form etc) did you get from the teachers in Italy?
□ Every lesson  □ Often  □ Quite often  □ Quite rarely  □ Rarely  □ Never

9. To what extent do you feel that students get the chance to speak during class, in Sweden?
□ 60% or more of class  □ 40% or more of class  □ 20% or more of class

10. To what extent do you feel that students get the chance to speak during class, in Italy?
□ 60% or more of class  □ 40% or more of class  □ 20% or more of class

11. Do you feel more confident with the English language in your hometown, than in the exchange country?
□ Yes  □ No  □ The other way around

12. How has this exchange affected your competence and confidence with English?
□ Big improvement  □ Slight improvement  □ No change  □ My English is worse than before the exchange
Appendix 3
Student Interview

1. Be spontaneous. What is the biggest difference between Da Vinci and this school?

2. How does it feel having no choice but trying to communicate in English?

3. What is the best with learning English?

4. Can you give us some examples of how this exchange has affected you? Are you more confident when it comes to using English now?

5. How can you work with motivating yourself in learning English?

6. How do you think it would feel if your new exchange buddies were native English speakers?

7. How have you been working with your individual learning agreement?

8. Are you as a student aware of what the teacher wants you to learn? If your teacher for example talks about kangaroos in Australia, is it the kangaroos that are important or is it the language you learn when you talk about it?

9. When a teacher marks an error, do you feel that you can pick up and learn to use the right grammar or word?

10. How do you think that your teacher should correct an error?

11. In what way do you feel that your teachers’ measure your development in English?
12. If I were to say:

a) go __went___ gone

b) What is the difference between its and it’s? This is the verb to be. And this is for example…it’s not a verb. My, your....pronouns?

c) They are or they is? They are.

d) When you are faced with things like this, do you have a set of rules in your head or do you just know what is right?
Appendix 4
Teacher Interview

1. When it comes to communicating in English, what were the biggest differences between the Swedish and Italian students?

2. Do you provide concrete language instruction every lesson?

3. What kind of errors do you normally correct and how do you correct them?

4. How was it working with the students and their learning agreement?

5. Which type of assessment do you use to measure the students development in English?

6. What has been most rewarding for you these past months?

7. Were there any obstacles with your colleagues when working with this?

8. What is CBI to you?

9. Is speaking among students a recurrent element of your classroom work? Choose from the alternatives 60% or more of class, 40% or more or 20% more.

10. Do you think that the students are aware of what you are teaching? For example; if you talk about kangaroos in Australia, is it the kangaroos that are important or the language used when talking about it?