ACS | CENTRE FOR INSPIRING MINDS

Part of ACS International Schools

Individualising
language instruction

A literature review

October 2018

**INVESTIGATE
INNOVATE
INSPIRE**

Catherine Copeland

Context

This literature review has been prepared by Catherine Copeland and reviewed by Deborah Portiche, Rob Surminski, Benedict Hren and Latifa Hassanali.

Catherine Copeland has held teaching and leadership positions in schools in The Netherlands, Spain, the United Kingdom and Canada. Her experience in international education has helped her to develop multicultural sensitivities, and a keen interest in global and international mindedness, 21st century learning concepts and collaborative leadership in professional learning communities.

Her specific interest in language development stems from her early career, teaching French as a Second Language in Canada, her native land. She had the opportunity to be educated in both French and English in a late immersion pilot programme in Canada and later in France.

Catherine's keen interest in multilingual language development in schools is the primary focus of her own professional growth and research. As the Director of Global EDGEucation, Catherine was a presenter at the 2017 ECIS English as a Second Language and Mother-Tongue conference focused on Multilingualism in Schools, which took place in Copenhagen, Denmark as well as the 2014 Conference in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, and is a conference leader at the Mediterranean Centre for Innovation in Education, based in Spain. Catherine is a student in the Educational Doctorate Programme at the University of Bath, UK, and holds a Masters of Educational Sciences Degree from the University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Through the Centre for Inspiring Minds, ACS International Schools French Teacher, Deborah Portiche, and Dutch Teacher, Rob Surminski, have initiated work on a new practitioner-led action research project. Their project will investigate how individualised learning and blended learning strategies can be used to enhance language learning for students enrolled in Native Language Enrichment classes and Language B courses where the target language is the same as their home language.

To follow the progress of this research project or to learn more about the other practitioner-led research projects at ACS International Schools, visit our website at http://cim.acs-schools.com

Introduction

The field of bilingual and plurilingual language learning is vast and covers many different contexts worldwide. This literature review will look at home language learning in schools where English is the language of instruction (typical of many international schools, including ACS International Schools), rather than the English as an Additional Language (EAL) learning angle.

To this end, this literature review will focus on research published over the last 10 years and relevant to the research question asked by the ACS International Schools researchers:

> How does the use of individualised teaching and blended learning strategies in Middle School French Native Language Enrichment classes and High School Dutch Language B classes improve native French and Dutch speakers' academic reading and writing skills in their home language?

For the purposes of this literature review, the Centre for Inspiring Minds recommends that the reader has read three previous literature reviews, also published by the Centre for Inspiring Minds, which introduce the concepts of bilingual and plurilingual learners and learning. Both are available on the Centre for Inspiring Minds website.

The first is the 2016 literature review, "Working with Bilingual and Plurilingual Learners," written by Dr. Dina Mehmedbegovic, a lecturer in Education at the University College London Institute of Education (IOE). This review discusses mother tongue language learning, bilingual, multilingual and plurilingual learners and research related to the benefits of bilingualism.

The second is the 2017 literature review, "Engaging with Identity Languages," written by this author, Catherine Copeland. This review explores the role of identity in language learning and focuses on EAL language learning and aspects of using dual language texts and translanguaging in international middle school classrooms.

As discussed in these first two literature reviews, different researchers and authors use a range of terms to describe similar things. For the purpose of this paper, we will use 'home language' in reference to mother tongue, native language or the strongest language of background and the term 'L1' to refer to the student's strongest language for literacy learning. The term 'Native Language Enrichment' (NLE) refers to the optional after

school classes offered at ACS International Schools to help students continue to develop their home language.

Unpacking the terminology can be problematic and confusing. The issue of using the term 'native speakers' is that it presumes that all native speakers have a rich language experience in their mother tongue. In international schools this is often not the case. Some native speakers have very poor literacy skills in their home language and can be far from fluent as they have been educated in other language environments. However, students may bring linguistic tools from their other language learning when building their home language literacy skills.

A third literature review, published by the Centre for Inspiring Minds in 2017, "The Role of Technology in Self-directed Learning," by Heather Francis, provides a good basis for further research and information related to the use of technology as a learning tool. Francis reminds readers that preparing students to be "self-directed, autonomous learners" is an important goal for teachers in 21ˢᵗ Century classrooms (Francis, 2017). This goal reminds educators that technology use involves mastery of important skills that learners need to master in order to curate their own learning – in school and beyond. She also points out that one implementation challenge that confronts many teachers is how to develop technology literacies in classes where students' foundational English and home language literacies varies widely.

Nowhere is this more obvious or complex than in the 'native language enrichment' classes in international schools (often Language B classes for students outside of their home/heritage country). Students in these classes have an extremely varied experience and background of literacy skills in their home language, which creates challenges for the teacher working to address their individual language learning needs. Often other barriers exist such as limited lesson time and parental expectations, which add additional pressures to the challenge.

Nevertheless, the plethora of benefits for students to learn in their home language has been thoroughly explored in "Engaging with Identity Languages" (Copeland, 2017). This literature review, entitled "Individualising Language Instruction," will deepen the focus on the research and practice of individualising learning for these bilingual students in their Native Language Enrichment classes and Language B courses, and will take a look at the overlapping pedagogies, theories and research related to this area of international education.

Differentiation, individualisation and personalisation

There are many teaching strategies that can be used to address the varied learning needs and differences of individuals or groups of learners in the same classroom. Three common teaching strategies are differentiation, individualisation and personalisation. While each of these strategies is different, understanding their differences is key to recognising their potential to improve learner outcomes. In general, 'differentiation' and 'individualisation' are teacher-centered, whereas 'personalisation' is learner-centered.

We like to think that all learning is learner-centred, providing appropriately challenging, authentic and meaningful learning opportunities and experiences where students are motivated to learn. The reason that differentiation and personalisation are considered teacher-centred is that the learning goal, learning activities and assessment methods are determined by the teacher. In personalised learning, the learner typically has a more prominent role in negotiating and setting learning goals, establishing assessment criteria and self-evaluating progress and achievement.

Let's first take a look at the familiar concept of differentiation. At its core, teaching involves the design and delivery of activities and assessments that motivate learners and spark the learning process. Today's teachers are aware of the need to differentiate in order to engage and make learning relevant for all learners. This teacher-led practice is known as 'differentiation'.

Differentiation is where all the students in the class have the same learning goals, but the teacher differs the methods or approaches of instruction for different learners, tailored to their learning differences and needs. In a 'differentiated' learning environment, the composition of learner groupings is typically informed by formative assessment data, and learners benefit from responsively adapted instruction, learning activities and assessments, rather than a 'one-size-fits-all' approach (Bray and McCluskey, 2013).

Differentiated classroom environments may have stations where students or groups of students with similar learning needs can approach the learning goals in different ways; or the teacher may provide different media or learning resources to allow students or groups to engage with the content in different ways and to demonstrate their mastery of the content based on developmentally appropriate performance criteria. The learning standards, content, resources, and assessment methods are

chosen by the teacher based on the learning needs of the class groupings.

Student-centred personalisation refers to another type of customized learning. A range of studies (Blanchard, 2009; Drexler, 2010; Hargreaves, 2005; McLoughlin and Lee, 2010; Paludan, 2006; Sebba et al., 2007) argue that personalised learning depends both on the development of independent learner capacities and also on the effectiveness of the teacher to modify the curriculum in order to meet standards and addresses the learning needs, differences and interests of individual learners.

Personalised learning is often associated with the marketisation of education; with the idea that it engages the student in the co-production of their learning (Bragg, 2012). Personalised learning entails a range of teaching approaches that cater for individuals, such as ''cooperative learning, mentoring, valuing experiential learning, incorporating learners' personal and social experience, using ICT, and providing individual support'' (Campbell et al., 2007).

The research on the actual implementation of personalised learning remains vague, ambiguous and context related. Sebba et al., (2007), say personalised learning comprises five key components:
- assessment for learning
- effective teaching and learning (including grouping and ICT)
- curriculum entitlement and choice
- school organisation, and
- relationships beyond the classroom.

Additionally, The UK Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF, 2008) outlined nine features of good practice in personalised learning pedagogies. They include:
- high-quality teaching and learning
- target setting and tracking
- focused assessment
- intervention
- pupil grouping
- the learning environment
- curriculum organisation
- the extended curriculum, and
- supporting children's wider needs.

Many features of personalised learning are not well defined or supported by research at this time. As David Hopkins (DfES, 2004) articulates:

"It's building schooling around the needs and aptitudes of individual pupils, shaping teaching around the way different youngsters learn. It's also about making sure that the talent of each pupil is supported and encouraged, and about personalising the school experience to enable pupils to focus on their learning. . .[P]ersonalised learning has to be a system-wide achievement so that it impacts on every student in every school."

Finally, individualisation, which like differentiation is also considered teacher-centred, refers to instruction that connects individual learners with their passions and interests, while addressing the standards of a mastery-based curriculum (Bray and McClaskey, 2013). Students are actively involved in selecting learning content, setting learning goals and assessing their progress against these goals. The rate at which students proceed is based on individual mastery. For example, students might take longer to progress through a certain topic, skip topics that cover information they already know, or repeat topics they need more help on." (US Dept. of Education, 2010)

One aspect that each of these three different approaches has in common is that they all depend on data that allows the teacher and the students to understand individual learners' "zone of proximal development' (ZPD). ZPD is "the distance between the actual development level, as determined by independent problem solving, and the level of potential development, as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vgotsky, 1978, p. 86). In simpler terms ZPD distinguishes what a student can do independently from what they can do with support, and also from what they are not developmentally able to do, even with support. Determining the ZPD for individual learners requires a range of data about the individual learners, including – but not limited to – a range of cognitive and non-cognitive assessment data.

Assessment of, for and as learning

'Assessment of learning' dominates individualised learning, but plays a supporting part in differentiated learning and personalised learning. Assessment of learning refers to tools or strategies designed to assess what the learner knows and can demonstrate, or the extent to which they have met particular learning goals or standards.

According to Bray and McClaskey (2013), effective assessment of learning requires the teacher to provide:

- a rationale for undertaking a particular assessment of learning at a particular point in time
- clear descriptions of the intended learning
- processes that make it possible for students to demonstrate their competence and skill
- a range of alternative mechanisms for assessing the same outcomes
- public and defensible reference points for making judgements
- transparent approaches to interpretation
- descriptions of the assessment process
- strategies for recourse in the event of disagreement

'Assessment for learning' is an essential practice in differentiated and personalised learning. Assessment for learning is an iterative process through which the teacher uses assessment data to inform teaching strategies. This includes the use of diagnostic pre-assessments, as well as formative and summative assessments. It also includes the use of a range of less formal assessments, including learning conversations, teacher observations, student self- and peer-assessments, or student interviews.

Bray and McClaskey (2013) propose that assessment for learning involves:
- aligning instruction with the targeted outcomes
- identifying particular learning needs of different groups
- selecting and adapting materials and resources
- creating differentiated teaching strategies and learning opportunities for helping individual learners move forward in their learning; and
- providing immediate feedback to learners.

Lastly, "assessment as learning" is typically associated with personalised learning. It involves the learner's reflection of their learning process and understandings, making changes according to their self-assessments and communicating. The outcome of this student-centred approach is that it supports a deeper understanding of the learning process and prepares students for self-directed or student-curated learning.

Again, Bray and McClaskey (2013) suggest that the teacher's role in assessment as learning is to:
- model and teach the skills of self-assessment
- guide learners in setting goals, and monitoring their progress toward them
- provide exemplars and models of good practice and quality work that reflect curriculum outcomes
- work with learners to develop clear criteria of good practice

- guide learners in developing internal feedback, or self-monitoring mechanisms to evaluate and question their own thinking, and to become comfortable with the ambiguity and uncertainty that is inevitable when learning something new.
- provide regular and challenging activities to practise, so that learners can become confident, competent self-assessors
- monitor learners' meta-cognitive processes, as well as their learning, and provide descriptive feedback; and
- create and environment where it is safe for learners to take chances and where support is readily available.

Blended learning

Over the years in English-medium international schools, more and more efforts have been introduced to give students opportunities to maintain and further develop their (non-English) home languages or their L1. These programmes are varied and are often not aligned with the curriculum of the school or the literacy standards of the countries where the language is the official language or language of instruction. Instructors of Native Language Enrichment classes are not always qualified teachers and may struggle to provide effective or meaningful language arts instruction in the limited time they have for curriculum planning and delivery. In addition, the classes typically include learners with a broad range of proficiencies in their home language, and in their English language skills.

One way Native Language Enrichment teachers or instructors and World language teachers may address the unique needs of home language learners is through the use of on-line resources, which learners can access during or outside school time. These online resources may extend, supplement or reinforce the face-to-face learning that takes place in classes and courses.

> "The term 'blended learning' is generally applied to the practice of using both online and in-person learning experiences when teaching students. In a blended-learning course, for example, students might attend a class taught by a teacher in a traditional classroom setting, while also independently completing online components of the course outside of the classroom. In this case, in-class time may be either replaced or supplemented by online learning experiences, and students would learn about the same topics online as they do in class, i.e., the online and in-person learning experiences would parallel and complement one another." (https://www.edglossary.org)

As with other educational concepts, the term 'blended learning' has more than one interpretation. It can also be used to describe 'hybrid learning,' which combines online, face-to-face, one-to-one tutored instruction (synchronous on-line learning) with autonomous learning (self-study). Blended learning research suggests that it yields better learning outcomes than on-line learning alone. According to the Department of Education (2010), a combination of face-to-face instruction and autonomous on-line learning with relevant content is more effective than either alone because blended learning increases the time learners spend studying, thereby improving their learning outcomes.

However, there are very few studies that look at the efficacy of blended learning in primary and secondary school environments. Moreover, there are even fewer which look at the efficacy of blended learning with a language-learning lens. (Blake, 2008, 2009).

One study (Schechter et al., 2015) found that a blended learning program combined with a strong English as an Additional Language curriculum could be beneficial in that:

> "digital technology can leverage teachers' time, allowing teachers to identify and address areas of need through a time efficient but individualized data-driven approach that can be implemented within the schedule and time constraints of a typical classroom."

The authors of the research go on to say that:
> "effective instruction involves clear goals for the student, content that is explicit, systematic, and scaffolded with immediate modeling and corrective feedback, familiar instructional routines, and ongoing monitoring of student performance."

Using a blended learning approach could allow students to work at their own pace, and that may accommodate a more individualised program (Johnson, Perry, & Shamir, 2010). As well as supporting an individualised learning path, technology can also provide the teacher with data on student performance, which can then help the teacher to target their instruction and enable them to better monitor student progress. This is especially true of on-line educational resources that have built-in stealth formative assessment tools, which the teacher can access to review how the students used the resource.

Online learning may also encourage active student participation, which for many shy speakers may bring them out of a passive learning zone and provide a safe environment for interacting more fully with the learning

materials. Therefore it could be said that the blended learning approach may encourage more active learning. Equally, technology may help the teacher customise and provide individualised instruction in the student's zone of proximal development with more efficiency.

Another form of blended learning is called 'flipped learning'.
> "Flipped Learning is a pedagogical approach in which direct instruction moves from the group learning space to the individual learning space, and the resulting group space is transformed into a dynamic, interactive learning environment where the educator guides students as they apply concepts and engage creatively in the subject matter." (Flippedlearning.org)

Flipped learning may be used in differentiated, individualised or personalised learning. Depending on the approach, the role of the teacher or student in directing the learning will vary, as will the types of assessments used.

Flipped learning should not be confused with a 'flipped class' where typically the teacher provides video tutorials to watch at home followed by active classroom-based learning activities. Jong and Shang (2016) explain that a flipped classroom:

> "is about revitalising the classroom time with teacher-supported higher-order constructivist learning activities, and moving the traditional lower-order behaviourist learning activities outside the classroom."

A flipped classroom aims to:
> "engage teachers in the preparation and selection of learning support materials, structured in such a way that they can be used by students whenever and wherever they want. It also aims to support different rhythms and learning styles and allow the teacher to be a 'guide on the side' in the classroom" (Creative Classrooms Lab, 2013)

It is argued that this method helps the teacher engage students in deeper learning, as instruction time is reduced and more time in class is dedicated to actively exploring and deepening knowledge. Some platforms such as Padlet, Popplet, Lino-it, Class Do-jo and Mindmup, etc., could be useful for sharing content with students on a particular topic.

In a more recent overview of technology strategies for language learning, Zhou and Wei (2018) state that:

"new thoughts, practices, and research protocols are needed to cope with the rapidly growing new technologies (e.g., smart phones, tablets, 3D glasses, real-time virtual interactive tools) and new learning environments (e.g., virtual reality, mixed reality, and immersive, intelligent strategies in technology-enhanced language learning environment)."

In addition they add:
"there is a need to equip learners with strategies for effective human-computer and socio-cultural interaction."

They also acknowledge that there is little research in this field and state that:
"more research is needed to explore how 21st Century L2 (and L1) teachers and learners handle strategies and self-regulated learning in technology normalized day-to-day classroom operations."

And they recommend that:
"in addition to knowing about teaching methodologies and assessments of language learning in traditional ways, language teachers in digital realms also need to be equipped with knowledge and skills to: (1) identify technical attributes specific to the new technologies that can be feasibly integrated into and engaged with classroom instruction, and (2) design technology-enhanced pedagogy with language learning orientation for their students."

Project-based learning

Two other approaches being used in education, which may be of interest to language teachers, are "problem-based learning" and "project-based learning." Problem-based learning is student-centred. The teacher works with the students to set the learning goals for a subject-based topic that is broad and open-ended, offering opportunities for applying a range of problem-solving approaches. Student learning is enhanced through student presentations to the class that reveal the range of learning strategies used. As such, problem-based learning is more compatible with personalised teaching. On the other hand, project-based learning is more teacher-directed and more compatible with differentiated and individualised teaching.

In project-based learning, the teacher typically sets the learning goals and students work collaboratively to address topics that are transdisciplinary in nature. The projects are usually based on questions or problems with

complex tasks designed to engage students in design thinking, research, decision making and collaborative work, culminating in a finished product or presentation (Savery, 2006).

Thomas (2000) explains that:
> "project-based learning projects are focused on questions or problems that "drive" students to encounter (and struggle with) the central concepts and principles of a discipline. [The] projects involve students in a constructive investigation. [They] are realistic – not school-like. [And the] projects are student-driven to some degree."

Although there is little empirical research on second and foreign language learning and project-based learning, the existing research shows many benefits to authentic language learning using project-based learning, as it taps into learners' intrinsic motivation and offers opportunities for a deeper understanding of the topic as well as allowing students to apply theoretical knowledge in practice (Beckett, 2006).

Many mainstream learning resources for project-based language learning exist, although few of them are supported by research regarding their efficacy. To understand how to apply project-based learning in language lessons, there are some excellent videos to explain the process. One, in French, describes how a teacher engages her students through a project-based learning approach involving the creation of videos, posters and summative public presentations (Source: https://youtu.be/sdD5o6nnts4).

Universities in the Netherlands use project-based learning in many of their programmes, especially those related to Science and Medicine, and much research is focused on this tertiary level. However, there was a recent study, in nearby Flanders, of project-based learning in secondary schools. The study assessed the effects of project-based learning on student motivation and reported positive outcomes (De Witte et al., 2016).

The trend is for Language teachers to explore and apply new teaching strategies and their associated technologies for language teaching and learning. The methods of blended learning and project-based learning show great promise for enhancing individualised language learning. As with other areas of emerging education practice, more research is needed in the area of language learning and more specifically, home language learning.

Other strategies for individualised language learning

A review of Content Language Integration Learning (CLIL) theories (Copeland, 2017), found a body or research investigating the learning outcomes of CLIL. Several studies found that CLIL was beneficial for acquiring language skills and students scored better than students who followed traditional curricula (Cross & Gearon, 2013; Va´rkuti, 2010). CLIL improved listening, vocabulary acquisition and speaking skills. The benefits for reading and writing have not been as clearly demonstrated, but one assumes still beneficial as well (Dalton-Puffer, 2008).

Technology could have a huge impact on learning in which CLIL is applied by providing educators with linguistic support and by providing a tool that allows for the individualisation of content. Internet access allows teachers to prepare and conduct activities incorporating existing Internet resources that use a range of languages (Wojtowicz, Stansfield, Connolly, & Hainey, 2011). The Internet and other kinds of electronic media encourage language use, student interaction and collaboration, participation and active learning, and even intercultural awareness (Vlachos, 2009).

Another strategy that is useful for translanguaging and CLIL is for the students to develop a useful dictionary/glossary or phrase book with their multiple languages of Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) vocabulary (Cummins, 2008). This can be done on a Google App or on a software program such as 'Quizlet' (a game-based memory tool for vocabulary learning based on a quiz format). This helps students scaffold useful technical language terms as they proceed through their studies.

A shared multilingual forum or platform would be another tool that could use IT and facilitate face to face discussion and communication between teachers and students for a blended learning approach, especially for writing and research activities (such as a Google Ed shared document). Students and teachers can simultaneously pose questions, exchange ideas and post comments. Discussions can take place in the target language or bilingual exchanges can enhance scaffolding. Other features from Google 'Add-ons' can integrate digital audio recordings and provide translations. These can enhance blended learning communication. Additionally, students can do research whilst writing to help them scaffold their understanding and language learning during their task.

Translanguaging pedagogies offer more strategies to link learning from mainstream classrooms to native language classrooms. Translanguaging is carefully planned language integration where students learn explicit

vocabulary in both languages, allowing them to develop literacy proficiency both in the language of instruction and their home language.

Research and projects can be done in the Native Language Enrichment classes and shared with English teachers for further work. Native Language Enrichment teachers and instructors, teaming up with mainstream teachers, would be one way to align and deepen learning for students. This reflects the idea that the individualisation of language learning is a collaborative, whole school approach where the identity of the students and their individual learning needs are recognized and supported in a 'Global Language Community' (GlobalEDGEucation.com).

Formative assessment tools for language learning

As discussed in "Engaging with Identity texts" (Copeland, 2017), when we enter into the area of non-English language assessment in international schools, we find a complex maze of possibilities and are confronted with complex assessment challenges. For Native Language Enrichment teachers and instructors, each nation or language they represent may offer a plethora of assessments. However, home language speakers, who may have limited academic experience with national curricula from their home language countries, are not likely to have home language literacy levels typical for a person their age living in the home language nation. Therefore, the standardised tests used by the home language countries will not likely address the learning objectives or goals established by the Native Language Enrichment teachers or instructors.

As outlined earlier, assessment of, for and as learning should help guide native language teachers towards appropriate strategies depending on the goal they want to achieve. Self-assessment and reflection are excellent strategies for assessment as learning.

When it comes to language learning – whether it's a home language, the language of instruction (English), or additional languages – assessment is more helpful when the whole school adopts a common approach and a common language. For example, both the French and Dutch national curricula are aligned to the Common European Reference Framework (CEFR), which provides teachers with 'Can do' statements and descriptors. Assessments for languages from outside Europe may not be officially aligned with CEFR. However, a lot of the assessments offer similar "Can Do" statements that could be cross-referenced to the CEFR so that everyone is using the same terminology.

One such language proficiency tool stands out as it aligns to the American Common Core Standards and specifically articulates these for home language learning. This is the New York State Common Core Initiative, Home Language Arts Progressions (HLAP). These can be then aligned with curricular objectives such as with the International Baccalaureate (IB) and their marking system. This offers a useful starting point to review curriculum and learning competencies. Then proficiencies and competencies can be aligned between various classes within the international school. The familiar levels A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2 are broken down into literacy areas of reading, speaking, writing and listening.

Another useful tool that can further help align assessment and learning activities is EAQUALS, created by the British Council. EAQUALS is an inventory of proficiency levels that can be integrated into the classroom at each CEFR level. Although this is designed for English language learning, it can easily be used as a guide for any language learning. This can help provide a common platform for language across a school so that all learning is described using the same criteria and terminology for proficiencies.

Considerations for this action research

ACS International Schools are English medium schools. Its Native Language Enrichment teachers and instructors, and some Language B course teachers, face the challenge of meeting the home language learning needs students with varying capabilities in their home languages. The challenge of this action research project is that most of the language learning research in primary and secondary schools focuses on learning English as an Additional Language and how this can be supported using a learners L1 – and not home language learning.

As far fewer research papers have been undertaken from this perspective, dual language bilingual theories provide important models for teaching strategies that can mutually benefit both English and home language learning. They encourage us to look beyond our language learning silos to look and to consider how the experiences of the whole child could benefit from home language, L1, L2 and other language teachers working together. It would be really useful to explore how Native Language Enrichment teachers and instructors could collaborate with mainstream subject teachers to align the curriculum and to explore where translanguaging and CLIL strategies would be helpful to the student, and how technology could be useful to support this cross-linking of languages and subject content.

Global EDGEucation recommends that international schools use CLIL strategies to link the Native Language Enrichment classes with the curricular content of the mainstream or EAL classroom (as dual language translanguaging will help build student knowledge and scaffold learning). The group also recommends that Native Language Enrichment teachers and instructors use the CEFR- EAQUALS inventory or another similar tool such as the HLAP to assess students' levels of language proficiency in different areas.

This would enhance continuity and deliver additional learning benefits. Assessment information from national curricula can be linked to the inventory so that all Native Language Enrichment teachers and instructors and mainstream teachers are using the same terminology, competencies and levels to describe student language learning. The above-mentioned tools should prove useful in designing and delivering individualised learning and using assessment of learning to inform student progression.

If we revisit the definition of individualisation – an instructional method that uses a range of resources and technologies, that is modified based on the needs of the individual learner, and that uses formative data to determine individual pacing, proficiency and progression toward established common learning goals – one could argue that it would be a teacher-centred, collaborative planning approach which considers the multiple complexities of bilingual or multilingual language learners that could prove the most beneficial to our student learners and their individualisation of language learning.

Bibliography

Beckett, G. & Chamness, P. (2006). Project-based Second and Foreign Language Education: Past, Present and Future. Information Age Publishing. Greenwich, CT.

Blake, R., Wilson, N., Cetto, M., & Pardo-Ballester, C. (2008). Measuring oral proficiency in distance, face-to-face, and blended classrooms. Language Learning and Technology, 12(3), pp. 114-127.

Blake, R. (2009). The use of technology for second language distance learning. The Modern Language Journal, 93, pp. 822-835.

Blanchard, J. (2009). Teaching, Learning and Assessment. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Bragg, S, (2014) Education, consumerism and personalisation. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 35 (2), pp. 308-315.

Bray, B. & McCluskey, M. (2013). A Step-by-step Guide to Personalised Learning. Learning and Leading with Technology, International Society for Technology in Education, Canada.

Bretzmann, J. (2013). Flipped 2.0: Practical Strategies for Flipping your Class. Bretzmann Group LLC, Wisconsin.

Campbell, R., Robinson, W., Neelands, J., Hewston, R., & Mazzoli, L. (2007). Personalised learning: Ambiguities in theory and practice. British Journal of Educational Studies, 55(2), pp. 135–154.

Cohen, A. D. (2018). Moving from theory to practice: A closer look at language learner strategies. In Oxford, R. & Amerstorfer, C. (Eds.), Language Learning Strategies and Individual Learner Characteristics: Situating Strategy Use in Diverse Contexts. Bloomsbury, London. pp. 31 – 54.

Copeland, C. (2017). Engaging with Identity Languages – A Literature Review. Centre for Inspiring Minds. ACS International Schools. Cobham, UK. Retrieved from http://cim.acs-schools.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Engaging-with-Identity-Languages-a-literature-review.pdf

Cross, R., & Gearon, M. (2013). Research and evaluation of the content and language integrated learning (CLIL) approach to teaching and learning languages in Victorian Schools. Melbourne Graduate School of Education, The University of Melbourne.

Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In: Cummins, J. and Hornberger, N. (eds). (2008). Encyclopaedia of Language and Education. Vol. 5: Bilingual Education (2nd edition). Springer Science + Business Media, Boston.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2008). Outcomes and processes in content and language integrated learning (CLIL): Current research from Europe. In W. Delanoy & L. Volkmann (Eds.), Future Perspectives for English Language Teaching. Carl Winter, Heidelberg, pp. 139 – 157.

Department for Children, Schools & Families, United Kingdom (DCSF). (2008). Personalised learning: A practical guide. DCSF Publications, Nottingham.

De Witte, K. & Rogge, N, (2016). Problem-based Learning in Secondary Education: Evaluation by an Experiment. Education Economics, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 58–82.

Department for Education and Skills (DfES). (2004). A national conversation about personalised learning. Department for Education and Skills, London.

Drexler, W. (2010). The networked student model for construction of personal learning environments: Balancing teacher control and student autonomy. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 26(3), pp. 369 – 385.

Dweck, C. (2000). Self-theories: Their Role in Motivation, Personality, and Development. Psychology Press. Philadelphia, PA.

Francis, H. (2017). The Role of technology in Self-Directed Learning – A Literature Review. Centre for Inspiring Minds, ACS International Schools. Retrieved from http://cim.acs-schools.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/The-role-of-technology-in-self-directed-learning-FINAL.pdf

Griffiths, C., & Oxford, R. (2014). The twenty-first century landscape of language learning strategies: Introduction to this special issue. System, Vol. 43, pp. 1 – 10.

Hargreaves, D. (2005). Personalising learning 4: Curriculum advice and guidance. Specialist Schools and Academies Trust, London.

Hauck, M., & Hampel, R. (2008). Strategies for online learning environments. In Hurd, S. & Lewis, T. (Eds.), Language Learning Strategies in Independent Settings Multilingual Matters, Bristol. pp. 283 – 302.

Johnson, E., Perry, J., & Shamir, H. (2010). Variability in reading ability gains as a function of computer-assisted instruction method of presentation. Computers & Education, Vol. 55, pp. 209–217.

McLoughlin, C., & Lee, M. (2010). Personalised and self-regulated learning in the Web 2.0 era: International exemplars of innovative pedagogy using social software. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 26(1), pp. 28–43.

Mehmedbegovic, D. (2016). Working with Bilingual and Plurilingual Learners – A Literature Review. Centre for Inspiring Minds, ACS International Schools, Cobham, UK. Retrieved from http://cim.acs-schools.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Working-with-bilingual-and-plurilingual-learners.pdf

Miyazoe, T. & Anderson, T. (2010). Learning outcomes and students' perceptions of online writing: Simultaneous implementation of a forum, blog, and wiki in an EFL blended learning setting. System, Vol. 38, pp. 185 – 199.

Paludan, J. (2006). Personalised learning 2025. In OECD. Schooling for Tomorrow: Personalising Education. OECD Publishing, Paris. pp. 83 – 100.

Savery, J. (2006). Overview of problem-based learning: Definitions and distinctions. Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-based Learning, Vol. 1(1).

Sebba, J., Brown, N., Steward, S., Galton, M., & James, M. (2007). An investigation of personalised learning approaches used in schools. Department for Education and Skills, London.

Schechter, R. Macaruso, P., Kazakof, E., & Brooke, E. (2015), Exploration of a Blended Learning Approach to Reading Instruction for Low SES Students in Early Elementary Grades. Computers in the Schools, Vol. 32, pp. 183 – 200.

Thomas, J., (2000) A Review of Research on Project-Based Learning. Buck Institute, San Rafael, CA. Retrieved from http://www.bie.org/images/uploads/general/9d06758fd346969cb63653d00dca55c0.pdf

US Department of Education (2010). Transforming American Education: Learning Powered by Technology. Education Publications Center, Alexandria, VA. Retrieved from https://www.ed.gov/sites/default/files/netp2010.pdf

U.S. Department of Education (2010). Evaluation of Evidence-Based Practices in Online Learning A Meta-Analysis and Review of Online Learning Studies. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/evidence-based-practices/finalreport.pdf

Va´rkuti, A. (2010). Linguistic benefits of the CLIL approach: Measuring linguistic competences. International CLIL Research Journal, Vol. 1(3), pp. 67 – 79. Retrieved from http://www.icrj.eu/13/article7. html

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA.

Wojtowicz, L., Stansfield, M., Connolly, T., & Hainey, T. (2011). The impact of ICT and games based learning on content and language integrated learning. Proceedings of the International Conference ICT for Language Learning. Florence, Italy. pp. 1 – 7.

Zhou, W., & Wei, M., (2018). Strategies in Technology-enhanced Language Learning. Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, Vol. 8 (2). pp. 471 – 495.

Additional resources

Common European Reference for Languages (CEFR)
https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/

EAQUALS
https://englishagenda.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/attachments/books-british-council-eaquals-core-inventory.pdf

New York State Bilingual Common Core Initiative
https://www.engageny.org/resource/new-york-state-bilingual-common-core-initiative

The Centre for Inspiring Minds
ACS International Schools
West Lodge
Portsmouth Road
Cobham, Surrey
KT11 1BL

On-line at http://cim.acs-schools.com
On Twitter @acscim