



LETREN
FAKULTATEA
FACULTAD
DE LETRAS



L1-based Communication Strategies in CLIL and NON-CLIL Learners of L3 English

Patricia Olo Jiménez

Degree in English Studies

Supervisor: Dr. María Martínez Adrián

English and German Philology department

Area of English Philology

Academic Year: 2016/2017

Acknowledgements

First of all, I am especially grateful to all the students at *IES/BHI Zizur Mayor* who answered the questionnaires and to all the teachers who allowed me to collect data from their students. Without their contributions, this study would have not been possible.

Likewise, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Dr. María Martínez Adrián for her precious help, constant support, encouragement and guidance throughout all the stages of this work. I am indebted to her due to her dedication and availability at all moments. I also owe her my interest in the field of SLA. I would also like to express my heartfelt thanks to all my teachers and professors since Kindergarten education until this last year of my university degree for everything they have taught me through all these years.

On a more personal level, I would like to thank my family for their unconditional love, support, encourage and understanding in my hard times. For everything they have done for me: “What and how we learn, depends very much on the company we keep” (Gibbons, 2002 in Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols, 2008: 139).

Abstract

The use of first language (L1)-based Communication Strategies (CSs) in oral and written second language (L2) production has been extensively researched in Second Language Acquisition (SLA). As regards Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) settings, studies seem to evince that CLIL learners do not resort as frequently to their L1 as NON-CLIL learners do (i.e. Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010). Nevertheless, little is known about L2 learners' self-reported opinions regarding their use of L1-based CSs (borrowing, foreignising and calque) by means of written questionnaires (Martínez Adrián, Gallardo del Puerto, & Basterrechea, forthcoming). Specially, there is scarcity of this kind of studies comparing CLIL to NON-CLIL learners' self-reported opinions as their proficiency in English as a foreign language (EFL) increases.

Consequently, the present preliminary study will try to fill this gap by (i) examining the effect of CLIL on secondary school learners' self-reported opinions on L1-based CS use; (ii) and the effect of proficiency on the self-reported use of L1-based CSs.

The sample consisted in 78 Basque/Spanish bilingual learners of L3 English from 2nd and 4th year of compulsory secondary education from four intact groups which differed in grade and exposure to CLIL instruction. The Quick Placement Test (QPT) was used to test general proficiency and a questionnaire taken from Gallardo del Puerto, Basterrechea, & Martínez Adrián (forthcoming) ; Martínez Adrián et al. (forthcoming) was administered for examining learners' self-reported opinions on their use of L1-based CSs.

Results show that CLIL students in year 2 and in year 4 outstripped their NON-CLIL peers in general proficiency. Moreover, CLIL learners in year 2 performed slightly better than NON-CLIL students in year 4. In terms of amount of L1-based CSs, CLIL learners in both grades reported to use these strategies to a lesser extent than their counterparts. The communicative nature of CLIL programmes can account for the quantitative differences. As for types of CSs, NON-CLIL learners reported to use foreignisings to a higher extent than their CLIL peers in both grades. On the contrary, as for borrowings and calques differences between CLIL and NON-CLIL learners were not found. This study has also proved that learners reported a less frequent use of L1 strategies as proficiency increases due to a higher command of the target language (TL).

In addition, self-reported opinions suggest that foreignisings are not typical of advanced students. In the same vein, borrowings and calques ranked lower as learners' proficiency increases in both settings. Findings are discussed in light of learners' grade and the nature of CLIL instruction.

Keywords: Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), L1 influence, Communication Strategies (CSs), L3 English Acquisition, EFL learners

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	i
Abstract	ii
1. Introduction	1
2. CLIL	2
2.1. Definition and Features	2
2.2. CLIL in Spain	3
2.3. Research Outcomes in Spain	4
3. Communication Strategies	6
3.1. Taxonomies of CSs	6
3.1.1. L1-based CSs	8
3.2. Research on Communication Strategies	9
3.2.1. L1-based CSs and type of setting (CLIL vs. NON-CLIL)	9
3.2.2. L1-based CSs and proficiency in CLIL and NON-CLIL	12
4. Research Questions	13
5. Methodology	14
5.1.1. Participants	14
5.1.2. Instruments	15
5.1.3. Procedures	17
6. Results	18
6.1. Oxford Placement Test	18
6.2. Self-report Questionnaire	18
7. Discussion	20
8. Conclusion	23
References	26
Appendix 1. General Background Questionnaire	31
Appendix 2. Quick Placement Test	32
Appendix 3. Self-report questionnaire on CSs	41

1. Introduction

In the last decades, the European Union has promoted the implementation of a new educational approach to foreign language instruction known as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). Its pivotal aim is to enhance the ability to communicate in a foreign language (henceforth FL) due to the demands of our globalized society. Even if research is in early stages and its benefits are not clearly purported, CLIL is suggested to have an effect on the overall linguistic proficiency (Lasagabaster, 2008). Moreover, one of the linguistic areas positively affected by this programme appears to be vocabulary knowledge (Gallardo del Puerto & Gómez Lacabex, 2013; Ruiz de Zarobe & Lasagabaster, 2010). In this light, research seems to evince that CLIL learners do not resort to their first language (henceforth L1) as a communication strategy as frequently as NON-CLIL learners do (see Agustín Llach, 2009; Celaya, 2007; Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010; Martínez Adrián & Gutiérrez Mangado, 2015a).

Communication strategies (henceforth CSs) are widely known as all those devices foreign language learners employ when they face certain communication problems because of a deficient knowledge of the FL lexicon (Poulishse, 1987). CSs can be classified into interactional (Tarone, 1977), conceptual and linguistic (Poulishse, 1990 in Poulishse, 1993). The latter classification is broken down into morphological creativity and L1-based CSs. In terms of L1-based CSs, learners resort to them when they need to fill a lexical gap in the FL. This paper will follow the categorization of L1-based CSs depicted in Poulishse (1990, in Poulishse, 1993): borrowings, foreignisings and calques.

Much of the research on the use of L1-based CSs has mainly analysed L2 oral or written production (e.g. Agustín Llach, 2016; Cenoz, 2003). In contrast, research dealing with learners' self-reported opinions by means of written questionnaires is still scarce (i.e. Purdie & Oliver, 1999 with young students in an ESL context; Gallardo del Puerto, Basterrechea, & Martínez Adrián, forthcoming with children in an EFL context). Furthermore, the great bulk of lexical transfer studies have centred on NON-CLIL settings (Cenoz, 2001; Cenoz 2003; Muñoz, 2007). In recent years, some studies have compared NON-CLIL to CLIL learners in terms of L1-based strategy use, but this line of research is still preliminary. The present paper will try to fill this gap by conducting a pseudo-longitudinal study in which the self-reported opinions of CLIL and NON-CLIL learners in 2nd and 4th year of compulsory secondary education will be

compared. By administering a questionnaire, the potential effect of CLIL on L1 use will be elucidated and the general trend observed in CLIL and NON-CLIL EFL learners when performing L2 oral and written production tasks will be verified.

To this end, this paper is organised as follows. Section 2 begins with a description of CLIL programmes and its main features together with an overview of the results of empirical research comparing CLIL and NON-CLIL regarding general proficiency and specific areas of language. Section 3 presents the different theoretical approaches to the study of CSs with special focus on L1-based strategies. This section finishes with a comprehensive review of previous studies conducted on L1-based CSs depending on two factors: setting (CLIL vs. NON-CLIL) and foreign language proficiency. In section 4 the research questions of the study are addressed while in section 5 its methodology is described. Next, in section 6 the results of the study are presented and subsequently discussed in section 7. Finally, section 8 concludes the paper.

2. CLIL

Due to the fact that this paper focuses on CLIL, this section will offer a definition of CLIL, its main features, its current situation in Spain as well as an insightful overview of its most relevant research outcomes.

2.1. Definition and Features

One of the main aims of the curricula across Europe in education since the early nineties is to foster foreign language learning due to the evident linguistic demands of our globalised and multilingual society. In order to promote multilingualism, CLIL is an approach coined in 1996 by UNICOM, University of Jyväskylä (Finland). Its selection out of all the existing approaches was influenced by the prominent results of immersion programmes in Canada and bilingual programmes in America (Ruiz de Zarobe, 2011). This approach involves “using a language that is not a student’s native language as a medium of instruction and learning for primary, secondary and/or vocational-level subjects such as maths, science, art or business” (Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols, 2008: 11). It can be defined as an umbrella term because it encompasses other approaches like ‘content-based instruction’, ‘immersion programmes’ or ‘bilingual education’, among others (Mehisto et al., 2008: 12). Indeed, as Tarnopolsky (2003) suggests, CLIL can be considered as the European version of content-based programmes.

Johnson and Swain (1997, in Martínez Adrián, 2011: 95) proposed several remarkable characteristics of immersion programmes. As Martínez Adrián (2011) points out, some of them are extremely helpful to the better understanding of CLIL contexts:

- (i) The L2 is the medium of instruction.
- (ii) Overt support exists for the L1.
- (iii) Learners have a limited knowledge of the L2.
- (iv) Teachers are sufficiently competent.
- (v) The L2 curriculum parallels the L1 curriculum.
- (vi) The classroom culture is that of the L1 community, not that of the L2 community.

Another relevant feature of CLIL programmes is its dual focus (Mehisto et al., 2008: 11).

- (i) Language learning is included in content classes (e.g. maths, history, geography, etc).
- (ii) Content from subjects is used in language-learning classes. The language teacher incorporates the vocabulary, terminology and texts from other subjects into his or her classes.

According to Tarnopolsky (2003), this dual focus is what differentiates CLIL from other instructional approaches like immersion programmes where students receive instruction through the target language (TL) but linguistic aspects are not included.

In general, CLIL tries to simulate natural context acquisition by providing real input to learners as well as a great focus on communication (Navés, 2009). Hence, learners immersed in this programme are more likely to perceive English as a communicative tool rather than as a language subject to be passed. The reason for this difference might be the fact that CLIL learners differ quantitatively and qualitatively from their NON-CLIL counterparts in terms of FL exposure. Whereas mainstream EFL learners only attend EFL classes focusing exclusively on form, CLIL learners attend both content classes imparted in the FL and EFL classes (Agustín Llach, 2016).

2.2. CLIL in Spain

In Spain, EFL learners seem not to be fully capable of communicating themselves in English even if they have been studying this language for years (Agustín

Llach, 2009). In this context, mainstream schools and high schools in Spain are increasingly implementing CLIL in their curriculum in order to achieve greater communicative competence in FLs. These curricula can remarkably vary from one region to another but Ruiz de Zarobe and Lasagabaster (2010) distinguished two main contexts in Spain:

- (i) Monolingual communities where Spanish is the official language. In this context, students are instructed in Spanish and in another foreign language when CLIL is implemented. In this type of settings, the foreign language is acquired as L2.
- (ii) Bilingual communities where Spanish and other co-official regional languages such Basque in the Basque Country and Navarre, Catalan in Catalonia and Balearic Islands and Galician in Galicia are vehicular languages. In these communities, instruction is done in both co-official languages and in another foreign language in CLIL settings. In this context, bilingual speakers acquire the foreign language as a third language (L3).

2.3. Research Outcomes in Spain

Recent investigations conducted in two Spanish bilingual communities (the Basque Country and Catalonia) have revealed that the CLIL approach has positive effects on learners' general proficiency. In Catalonia, Navés and Victori (2010) observed that CLIL learners' writing skills at primary grades were as good or in some cases better than those of learners enrolled in NON-CLIL programmes a few grades ahead. In the same vein, a study conducted by Navés (2011) on general proficiency and writing skills with CLIL and NON-CLIL learners from grades 5 to 10 concluded that CLIL learners did as well as NON-CLIL learners up to three grades ahead in reading, dictation and grammar proficiency tests; and in fluency, lexical complexity and syntactic complexity in the written domain. In the Basque Country, Lasagabaster (2008) showed that secondary CLIL learners outstripped their NON-CLIL counterparts in every test done to measure grammar competence and language skills (reading, writing, speaking and listening). In the same vein, the analysis of oral data in Gallardo del Puerto and Gómez Lacabex (2013) showed that secondary CLIL learners outstripped their NON-CLIL counterparts in grammar, fluency and vocabulary.

In the light of these studies, Ruiz de Zarobe (2011) pointed out that reading, receptive vocabulary, speaking and writing are areas of language competence favourably affected by content-based approaches.

However, the benefits of CLIL in certain specific areas of language competence are not so clear-cut. For instance, the degree of Foreign Accent (FA) seems not to be mitigated in CLIL settings (Gallardo del Puerto, Gómez Lacabex, & García Lecumberri, 2009; Gallardo del Puerto & Gómez Lacabex, 2013). In terms of morphosyntactic features, Martínez Adrián and Gutiérrez Mangado (2009) found no statistically significant differences between CLIL and NON-CLIL learners regarding the use of null subjects, null objects and negation. As regards the suppliance of the suppletive forms, affixal tense and agreement morphemes (third person singular -s, past tense -ed, auxiliary and copula *be*) Villareal Olaizola and García Mayo (2009) found similar performance in CLIL and NON-CLIL learners. In the same fashion, Martínez Adrián and Gutiérrez Mangado (2015b) concluded that CLIL gains did not extend to the acquisition of verbal morphology since there were no differences in the production of inflectional morphology between a CLIL and a NON-CLIL group with the same age and amount hours of exposure at the time of testing. Likewise, the differences between CLIL students and their NON-CLIL counterparts were not significant when the production of wrong word order and variety of tenses used were considered in (Martínez Adrián & Gutiérrez Mangado, 2015a). In light of these findings, Ruiz de Zarobe (2011) reached the conclusion that syntax, productive vocabulary, informal/non-technical language, writing and FA are areas where clear gains are not observed in CLIL.

Based on the findings observed regarding specific aspects of language, several researchers (García Mayo, 2012; Martínez Adrián, Gallardo del Puerto & Gutiérrez Mangado, 2013; Martínez Adrián & Gutiérrez Mangado, 2015b; Ruiz de Zarobe & Lasagabaster, 2010) have advocated more focus-on-form in CLIL classrooms in order to improve particular areas of language such as syntax, productive vocabulary, accuracy in writing and FA (Ruiz de Zarobe, 2011). Indeed, according to Lyster (2007), content-based and form-focused instructional options should be counterbalanced in order to obtain the maximum benefits of meaning-oriented approaches.

In the next section, the most relevant taxonomies of CSs as well as the most pivotal L1-based CSs studies for this paper will be reviewed.

3. Communication Strategies

As the present study focuses on students' self-reported opinions regarding L1-based CSs, this section will first provide a comprehensive review of the main taxonomies of CSs. Then, L1-based CSs will be presented and consequently a bulk of studies dealing with L1-based CSs on the basis of two significant factors: setting (CLIL and NON-CLIL) and foreign language proficiency will be reviewed.

3.1. Taxonomies of CSs

The interest of studying CSs in the field of SLA dates back to Váradi (1973 as cited in Gallardo del Puerto et al., forthcoming) who proposed some CSs which later researchers would take into consideration. There are two main theoretical perspectives from which CSs in SLA can be studied. On the one hand, the psycholinguistic perspective considers CSs as the underlying cognitive processes in the speaker's mind in order to overcome a gap in communication in the TL (Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Poulisse, 1993). On the other hand, the interactional perspective treats CSs as social interactions where both the speaker and the listener are involved (Tarone, 1977; Tarone & Yule, 1987).

Several taxonomies of CSs have been developed: Tarone's taxonomy (1977), Faerch and Kasper's taxonomy (1983) and the one by the Nijmegen group (Poulisse, 1990, in Poulisse, 1993). In this paper a review of Tarone's taxonomy (1977) (interactional) and the one by the The Nijmegen project (psycholinguistic) (Poulisse, 1990, in Poulisse, 1993) will be provided since the questionnaire administered to the participants of this study is adapted from Purdie & Oliver (1999) who based their questionnaire on these taxonomies (taken from Gallardo del Puerto et al., forthcoming; Martínez Adrián et al., forthcoming). Tarone's (1977) classification distinguishes five main types of CSs: avoidance (topic avoidance, message abandonment), paraphrase (approximation, word coinage, circumlocution), conscious transfer (literal translation, language switch), appeal for assistance, and mime. Poulisse's (1990, in Poulisse, 1993) taxonomy divides CSs into conceptual strategies and linguistic strategies. Within the former, two types of CSs are distinguished –analytic (circumlocution, description, paraphrase) and holistic (superordinate, coordinate, subordinate). Linguistic strategies are also broken down into two types – transfer (borrowing, foreignising, calque) and morphological creativity. Table 1 and 2 display both classifications:

Table 1. Tarone's taxonomy of CSs (based on Tarone, 1977:197)

Communication Strategy	Learner's production	Target language
1) Avoidance a) Topic avoidance b) Message abandonment	- The water (mumble)	Mushroom The water spills
2) Paraphrase a) Approximation b) Word coinage c) Circumlocution	Labor Person-worm Something, I don't know what's waterpipe its name. That's, ah, that's Persian and we use in Turkey, a lot of.	Work Caterpillar Waterpipe
3) Conscious transfer a) Literal translation b) Language switch	He invite other person to drink. Balon	They toasted each other. Balloon
4) Appeal for assistance	What is this?	Waterpipe
5) Mime	and everybody say [claps everybody hands).	Everybody applauds.

Table 2. The Nijmegen project's typology of CSs (based on Poulisse, 1993: 163)

Archistrategies	Communication strategies
Conceptual	1. Analytic (circumlocution, description, and paraphrase): “it’s green, and you usually eat it with potatoes, and Popeye eats it for ‘spinach’”(from Poulisse, 1993:163)
	2. Holistic (superordinate, coordinate, or subordinate term): vegetables for ‘peas’, hammer for ‘tools’ and table for ‘desk’, (from Poulisse, 1993:163)
Linguistic	3. Morphological creativity: to ironize for ‘to iron’ and appliances for ‘letters of application’ (from Poulisse, 1993:163)
	4. Transfer (borrowing, foreignising, and calque): cuffer for ‘hairdresser’ (from French <i>coiffeur</i>) (from Poulisse 1993:163)

3.1.1. L1-based CSs

This section will delve deeper into the transfer strategies proposed by Poulisse (1990): borrowings, foreignisings /lexical creations and literal translations /calques.

Borrowings are insertions of L1 words in the L2 production without any attempt to adapt them to the TL (Celaya & Torras, 2001). (1) illustrates an instance of borrowing:

(1) I got *pelo* brown (English Hair)

Foreignisings, on their part, are adaptations of L1 words to the target language structure so that they sound or look like the intended target language (cf. Celaya & Torras, 2001), as observed in (2):

(2) I am good *deportis* (English Sportsman/ sportswoman)

Finally, calques are L2 words as the consequence of L1 literal translation (cf. Celaya & Torras, 2001), as shown in (3):

(3) I have a *table study* in my bedroom (English desk from Spanish “*mesa de estudio*”)

3.2. Research on Communication Strategies

The study of CSs in FL learning have been mainly investigated by means of oral and written production in the case of NON-CLIL learners. More limited research comparing CLIL to NON-CLIL learners has been done. More recently, CLIL learners have been examined in terms of their self-reported use of CSs. Nevertheless, this type of research is still preliminary and more studies are needed comparing CLIL to NON-CLIL learners. The use of written questionnaires has been considered by some researchers an unreliable instrument due to the possible multiple interpretations an item might be given (Khan & Victori, 2011 in Martínez Adrián et al., forthcoming). Nevertheless, research conducted by Purdie and Oliver (1999 in Martínez Adrián et al., forthcoming) with primary learners learning English as a L2 in a natural context proved the validity of this instrument with young learners. These authors analysed the self-reported opinions on the use of learning and communication strategies by ESL learners. In this study, they reported a lower use of CSs in favour of other type of learning strategies.

As regards the studies that have investigated oral and written production, L1-based CSs have received the greatest attention. Findings reveal that there are several factors that might affect the frequency and choice of L1-based CSs, but the ones that have been the central focus of research are type of instruction (CLIL vs. NON-CLIL) , proficiency (e.g. Agustín Llach, 2009; Agustín Llach, 2014; Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010; Martínez Adrián & Gutiérrez Mangado, 2015a) and age (Celaya & Torras, 2001). In this paper, type of instruction and learners' proficiency will be the prime focus of study.

The review of studies provided in the following sections based on research outcomes in CLIL and NON-CLIL contexts and the effect of proficiency on L1-based CSs use will illuminate the discussion of the results obtained in the present exploratory study regarding L1-based CSs: borrowings, foreignisings and calques. It is also worth mentioning that most of these studies also followed Poulisse's (1990 in Poulisse, 1993) taxonomy.

3.2.1. L1-based CSs and type of setting (CLIL vs. NON-CLIL)

As for the effect of CLIL may have on L1-based CSs, researchers have analysed written and oral L2 productions both in primary and secondary education.

In the case of studies comparing CLIL learners to NON-CLIL learners on the use of L1-based strategies in primary learners' written compositions, Celaya (2007)

examined the number of borrowings and lexical inventions produced by CLIL and NON-CLIL learners. This author concluded that CLIL learners produced borrowings to a lower extent than regular learners did at grades 5 and 7. However, surprisingly, the percentages for both groups regarding lexical inventions were approximate. Additionally, this dovetails with Agustín Llach (2014) who reported that borrowings were very rare among CLIL learners in 4th grade of primary. Similarly, Agustín Llach (2009) reported that CLIL and NON-CLIL learners at grade 6 (age 12) differed quantitatively and qualitatively in the production of L1-based CSs. Firstly, NON-CLIL participants committed more borrowings, coinages and calques than CLIL learners did although the differences were significant only in the case of borrowings. Secondly, in both contexts, calques were the most frequent CSs. However, whereas foreignising was the second most common category in the CLIL group they were the least frequent for NON-CLIL participants. Finally, borrowings were the least frequent type of transfer among CLIL subjects but the second most common for the NON-CLIL group.

Likewise, in a recent longitudinal and cross-sectional study from 4th to 6th grade of primary education, Agustín Llach (2016) found that CLIL students in grade 6 produced significantly less instances of borrowings in a written task than their NON-CLIL counterparts. However, surprisingly both groups produced many borrowings, a fact that as Agustín Llach (2016: 90) explains can be attributed to “the inability of learners to generalize L2 rules, i.e. lack of metalinguistic awareness”. Regarding lexical inventions, CLIL subjects produced more lexical creations than their NON-CLIL peers for all the three data collection times, although the difference did not reach statistical significance.

In secondary education, Celaya and Ruiz de Zarobe (2010) reported that lexical inventions are not affected by CLIL programmes since the percentages of its production between the analysed CLIL and regular groups were very similar. Nevertheless, in line with Celaya (2007), CLIL might affect the production of borrowings since NON-CLIL groups showed a higher percentage of borrowings than CLIL groups. Additionally, Manzano Vázquez (2014) found that NON-CLIL learners produced higher instances of borrowings and lexical inventions than their CLIL counterparts did, whereas CLIL learners relied on calques to a higher extent.

In sum for written production, it appears that CLIL learners resort to their L1 not so frequently as NON-CLIL learners do. As for the types of L1-based strategies,

research outcomes seem to evince that CLIL learners produce less instances of borrowings than their NON-CLIL peers do. Nevertheless, a clear tendency has not been found for the categories of foreignisings and calques.

Regarding oral production among primary students, Gallardo del Puerto (2015) conducted a cross-sectional study comparing CLIL to NON-CLIL learners in 4th and 6th grade. In 4th grade, statistical significant differences were not found in the overall amount of transfer lapses (i.e. borrowings, foreignisings and calques together) between CLIL and NON-CLIL learners. As for the types of L1-strategies, NON-CLIL learners produced significantly more borrowings, whereas calques were found to be significantly more common among CLIL learners. As for foreignisings, statistical differences were not found between both groups. In 6th grade, the production of transfer lapses was found to be significantly higher in NON-CLIL learners when compared to the CLIL ones. In terms of the different types of lexical transfer, even if statistical differences were not found, mean scores showed that the same tendencies observed in grade 4 were found in grade 6. That is, NON-CLIL learners produced more borrowings and foreignisings than CLIL learners did, whereas the mean scores for calques were higher among CLIL learners.

In secondary education, Martínez Adrián and Gutiérrez Mangado (2015a) found that CLIL learners used their L1 to a lower extent in transfer lapses, i.e. borrowings and foreignisings (categorization depicted in Cenoz, 2003), although the differences were not statistically significant. Additionally, Gallardo del Puerto and Gómez Lacabex (2013) reported that CLIL learners further relied on target-language-based knowledge whereas NON-CLIL learners were more likely to resort to their L1 in order to complete the task. This result aligns with Martínez Adrián et al., (forthcoming) who reported CLIL primary learners' self-reported opinions regarding their use of CSs. The effect of CLIL was found to be overruled by the one of proficiency because learners reported to resort less frequently to L1-based CSs rather than to L2-based CSs, being the latter ones typical of more advanced learners. The rich and contextualized input CLIL learners constantly received and the strategies used by their teachers such as paraphrases seem to determine their preference for L2-based CSs.

Despite the fact that quite recent research has been conducted on the use of L1-based CSs in CLIL settings, research in this area is still thin on the ground and more investigations comparing CLIL to NON-CLIL learners are needed.

3.2.2. L1-based CSs and proficiency in CLIL and NON-CLIL

In order to explore the effect of proficiency on L1-based CSs several longitudinal or pseudolongitudinal investigations have been conducted to the present.

As regards pseudolongitudinal studies dealing with written tasks, Agustín Llach (2011) observed how the production of borrowings decreased significantly from less proficient learners in 4th grade to higher proficient learners in 6th grade. On the other hand, more advanced learners showed significantly more instances of calques than less proficient learners did. Regarding coinages, its increase as learners mastered higher levels of the TL was very low. In line with this research, Celaya (2007) reported a decrease of borrowings and an increase of lexical inventions with grade (grade 5 to grade 7). Similarly, Celaya and Ruiz de Zarobe (2010) found that learners aged 12 presented a higher percentage of borrowings than learners aged 16. The findings regarding the increased use of foreignisings in higher proficient learners go in line with the tendency observed in a considerable amount of studies analysing written compositions which reported a greater resort to this strategy among more advanced learners (Agustin Llach, 2011; Agustín Llach, 2014; Celaya, 2007). Nevertheless, no inferential statistical analyses were carried out in the last two aforementioned studies in order to exclude the effect of probability.

In the case of longitudinal studies conducted to date, Agustín Llach (2016) found that borrowings increased in a written assignment with age over the last three years of primary education. These results run counter previous research findings (Celaya, 2007; Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010). Regarding lexical inventions, Agustín Llach (2016) observed an increase in the production of lexical creations with grade although the differences were not statistically significant. In contrast, in another recent pseudolongitudinal study, Arratibel Irazusta (2015) found that less proficient learners in secondary education produced more transfer lapses (borrowings and foreignisings) than more advanced learners in an oral task, being the differences only significant in the case of foreignisings.

Other pseudolongitudinal studies have investigated the self-reported use of CSs in three different low proficiency groups among CLIL young learners by means of a written questionnaire (Gallardo del Puerto et al., forthcoming). In the case of L1-based strategies, a marginal statistical difference was found in the case of foreignisings, being

this strategy more commonly reported among lower proficient learners. This result supports the existing evidence observed in CLIL learners' oral production (Arratibel Irazusta, 2015; Gallardo del Puerto, 2015), strategy that has not been found to be characteristic of more advanced learners as previously thought (Agustín Llach, 2011; Agustín Llach, 2014; Celaya, 2007).

All in all, the general finding that emerges from these (pesudo) longitudinal studies as proficiency increases is that EFL learners do not resort to L1-based strategies with such frequency. As for the types of L1-based CSs, learners that are more proficient produce fewer borrowings both in oral and written production whereas calques appear to be more common as proficiency increases. However, findings concerning the use of foreignisings are quite contradictory, since its increased use with proficiency found in some investigations (Agustín Llach, 2011; Agustín Llach, 2014; Celaya, 2007; Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010) is not supported by more recent research (Arratibel Irazusta, 2015; Gallardo del Puerto, 2015).

In the light of the empirical findings reviewed, the next section will pose the research questions of the present exploratory study.

4. Research Questions

As observed in the review of studies conducted in CLIL contexts, the main bulk of studies dealing with CSs has been carried out by means of oral and written tasks. However, research on learners' self-reported opinions regarding their use of CSs is in its infancy. More specifically, research comparing CLIL to NON-CLIL learners' self-reported opinions as FL proficiency increases is non-existent. Thus, this paper aims to fill this gap by comparing CLIL and NON-CLIL learners' self-reported opinions from 2nd to 4th year of secondary education by means of a written questionnaire. Specifically, based on previous empirical findings regarding the effect of CLIL and FL proficiency on the use of L1-based CSs, the following questions are addressed:

RQ 1: Are there any quantitative and qualitative differences in the self-reported use of L1-based strategies between CLIL and NON-CLIL learners?

RQ 2: Are there any quantitative and qualitative differences in the self-reported use of L1-based CSs between less and more proficient learners?

5. Methodology

This section will describe the methodology of this study where participants, instruments and procedures are progressively covered.

5.1.1. Participants

The participants of the present study were 78 Spanish/Basque bilingual students from one state-funded high school in Navarre learning English as a L3 in 4 intact classrooms. They are immersed in what is known in Navarre as linguistic model D, where Basque is the language of instruction for all subjects except for Spanish and English language courses (see Heras Aizpurua, 2016). This context has been defined as additive trilingualism (Cenoz & Valencia, 1994), where Basque, the language of instruction, is a minority language in Spain and on the other hand, Spanish is the majority language (see also Cenoz, 2008). Hence, in this context English is generally taught as a L3. Among the participants, there are three different sets of learners regarding their L1: (1) Basque and Spanish are their L1, (2) Spanish is their L1 and Basque their L2, (3) Basque is their L1 and Spanish their L2.

As displayed in Table 3, participants were divided into four groups considering their type of instruction and their current year of instruction, which determines the number of hours of exposure: (1) a CLIL 1 group (n=23) of 12-13 years old in 2nd year; (2) a NON-CLIL 1 group (n=14) with the same age as the previous group but less hours of exposure; (3) a CLIL 2 group (n=22) of 15-16 years old in 4th year; and (4) a NON-CLIL 2 group (n=19) with students of the same age, also in 4th year with a total number of hours of exposure lower than CLIL 2 but similar to the CLIL 1 group. Additionally, 59% of the sample received extracurricular English lessons with an average of 2 hours per week in the past few years.¹

All the groups started at the same age (3-4) and received the official number of hours of instruction of EFL (3 per week) through their academic years. Apart from these hours of formal English instruction, CLIL 1 received Science and Technology through English in grade 7 and 8. On the other hand, CLIL 2 studied Technology in English in grade 7, Technology and Science in grade 8, Science in grade 9 and Maths in grade 10. Hence,

¹ Note that in recent similar investigations conducted by means of questionnaires (Gallardo del Puerto et al., (forthcoming); Martínez Adrián et al., (forthcoming)), students receiving extra-curricular hours of EFL have not been excluded of the sample since nowadays the vast majority of learners receive additional hours of exposure. Otherwise, our sample had been so limited that it would have prevented us from making generalizations about the results.

the CLIL 1 group was exposed to CLIL instruction for one-and-a-half year and the CLIL 2 group for three –and-a-half years by the time the study was conducted.

Table 3. The participants

Group	Grade	Age at testing	Age at first exp.	Length of exp. in years	Exposure to CLIL	Total n° hours
CLIL 1 (n=23)	8 (2 nd year)	12.96	4.21	9-and-a-half academic years	1-and-a-half academic year	1331
NON-CLIL 1 (n=14)	8 (2 nd year)	13.07	4.02	9-and-a-half academic years	-	1054
CLIL 2 (n=22)	10 (4 th year)	15.18	3.95	11-and-a-half academic years	3-and-a-half academic year	1757
NON-CLIL 2 (n=19)	10 (4 th year)	15.05	3.21	11-and-a-half academic years	-	1276

5.1.2. Instruments

The data reported in this paper was gathered by means of three different instruments: a general background questionnaire, a general English proficiency test and a self-reported questionnaire on CSs.

Participants were administered the background questionnaire (see Appendix 1) in order to collect data related to their personal information as well as to their linguistic background such as onset age and hours of exposure to the TL.

Moreover, learners' general English proficiency was measured by means of the standardized Quick Oxford Placement Test (QPT) (see Appendix 2) which has been widely used in SLA (Martínez Adrián & Gutiérrez Mangado, 2015ab). It was organized in two parts: Part 1 (the first 40 questions) administered to all students and Part 2 (20 questions) only for the CLIL 4 group since some of them scored 36 or above in the first part. Part 2 was not handed out in the other groups since none scored 36 or above.

Finally, a self-report questionnaire taken from Gallardo del Puerto et al., (forthcoming) & Martínez Adrián et al., (forthcoming) who adapted it from Purdie & Oliver (1999) was administered in order to analyse learners' opinions regarding CSs. Learners were told to express their opinion in a traditional five-point Likert-type scale, in which the minimum score for each item was 1 (I strongly disagree) and the maximum 5 (I strongly agree). This last questionnaire consisted in 40 statements in Spanish about learning strategies, out of which 11 randomized items focused on CSs. These last items corresponded to conceptual, linguistic and interactional strategies. Gallardo del Puerto et al., (forthcoming) & Martínez Adrián et al., (forthcoming) selected from Purdie & Oliver (1999) - who based their questionnaire on Oxford (1989) and O'Malley & Chamot (1990)- the following strategies: guessing, miming, morphological creativity, dictionary, predicting and paraphrasing. They also included avoidance and appeal for assistance from the classification of Tarone (1977) (see Table 1). Finally, they incorporated linguistic strategies such as transfer, which is divided into borrowing, calque and foreignising (Poulisse, 1990 in Poulisse, 1993) (see Table 2). These three L1-based strategies are the focus of analysis for the present study (shaded in dark grey in Table 4). Table 4 displays the distribution of categories with their corresponding items.

Table 4. Distribution of CSs in the self-reported questionnaire from Gallardo del Puerto et al., (forthcoming) & Martínez Adrián, et al., (forthcoming).

Purdie & Oliver (1999)	Guessing	Si no entiendo algo en inglés, trato de adivinar lo que quiere decir.
	Miming	Si no sé cómo decir algo en inglés, uso las manos para mostrar lo que quiero decir.
	Morphological creativity	Si no sé cómo decir algo en inglés, me invento palabras nuevas.
	Dictionary	Si no entiendo lo que significa algo cuando leo en inglés, lo miro en el diccionario.
	Predicting	Cuando alguien me habla en inglés, trato de adivinar lo que va a decir justo a continuación.
	Paraphrasing	Si no sé cómo decir algo en inglés, uso otras palabras que significan lo mismo.

Poulisse (1990)	Borrowing	Cuando no sé decir algo en inglés, lo digo en euskera o castellano.
	Calque	Cuando no sé decir algo en inglés, traduzco palabra por palabra del euskera o castellano (por ejemplo, ‘my favourite <u>plate</u> ’ en vez de ‘my favourite <u>dish</u> ’.
	Foreignising	Cuando no sé decir algo en inglés, adapto la palabra del euskera o castellano al inglés (por ejemplo, ‘go to the <u>bosqu</u> ’ en vez de ‘go to the <u>forest</u> ’.
Yule & Tarone (1990)	Avoidance	Cuando no sé decir algo en inglés, evito referirme a ello.
	Appeal for assistance	Cuando no sé decir algo en inglés, pido ayuda a otra persona (profesor, compañero, mamá, papá,...).

5.1.3. Procedures

All tests were done in one session and a half during class time. Students were informed that none of the results would have an impact on their marks in any subject. They were given clear instructions in their L1 as well as an example both in written form and orally in order to clarify what they were supposed to do.

Firstly, they were administered the background information (10 minutes approximately) and afterwards the QPT. They were given 30 minutes to complete Part 1 (the first 40 questions). In the case of CLIL 4, the second part was handed out for which the time allotted was 15 minutes. Finally, they completed the self-reported questionnaire on CSs, for which they were allowed 20 minutes on average.

In terms of the statistical analyses, just descriptive statistics was employed since we have not been trained to conduct statistical analyses in our Degree of English Studies. Hence, in the case of the QPT maximum, minimum scores, means and standard derivations were calculated. Regarding the self-reported questionnaire, mean scores (between 1 and 5) and standard deviations were calculated both for the whole set of strategies and for each individual strategy in each grade and group (CLIL and NON-CLIL).

Having developed the research methodology of the study, the next section will progressively present the results of the QPT and the ones of the self-report Questionnaire.

6. Results

6.1. Oxford Placement Test

Table 5 presents the results of the QPT. As can be observed, the CLIL 1 group was categorized between Elementary and Lower Intermediate, whereas the NON-CLIL 1 group as Elementary. In 4th year, the CLIL group was classified between Lower Intermediate and Upper Intermediate level and the NON-CLIL group in an Elementary level. As shown in Table 5, CLIL 2 was the most proficient group, whereas NON-CLIL 1 the least one. Moreover, CLIL 1 performed slightly better than the NON-CLIL group two grades ahead.

Table 5. Oxford Placement Test

	Mean	Max.	Min.	SD
CLIL 1	23.35 (A2-B1)	34	18	3.11
NON-CLIL 1	17.36 (A2)	21	12	3.34
CLIL 2	38.9 (B1-B2)	52	28	6.28
NON-CLIL 2	22.72 (A2+)	29	20	2.4

6.2. Self-report Questionnaire

In this section, the results of the written questionnaire as regards the whole sample and each of the four different groups separately will be presented. Table 6 displays these results for all L1-based strategies and individual L1-based strategies (borrowings, calques and foreignisings). Mean scores (between 1 and 5) and standard deviations (in parentheses) have been provided.

Table 6. Means and standard deviations for reported use of CSs.

STRATEGIES	ALL GROUPS	CLIL 1	NON-CLIL 1	CLIL 2	NON-CLIL 2
All L1-based strategies	3.4 (0.47)	3.56 (0.58)	3.8 (0.46)	2.88 (0.25)	3.37 (0.59)
Borrowing	3.84 (1.1)	4.22 (0.8)	4.14 (1.29)	3 (1.35)	4 (0.94)
Calque	3.24 (1.3)	3.35 (1.11)	3.29 (1.64)	3.05 (1.25)	3.26 (1.19)
Foreignising	3.14 (1.45)	3.13 (1.35)	4 (1.41)	2.59 (1.44)	2.84 (1.6)

The first line of Table 6 shows that, when the whole sample and all L1 CSs are analysed, learners reported a moderate-to-high use of L1-based CSs with a mean value of 3.4 (SD=0.47). In this case, the comparison of the means obtained by CLIL and NON-CLIL learners in both groups indicates that CLIL learners reported a lower use of L1-based CSs in both grades than their NON-CLIL peers: 3.56/ 3.8 in 2nd year and 2.88/3.37 in 4th year. When CLIL and NON-CLIL groups are analysed and subsequently compared, intergroup differences as regards types can be observed. In terms of the category 'borrowing', there were remarkable agreements between CLIL 1 and NON-CLIL 1 with a high reported use of this category. However, greater differences were observed when CLIL 2 and NON-CLIL 2 were compared. Whereas NON-CLIL 2 reported a high use of borrowings with a mean value of 4, CLIL 2 reported a moderate use of this strategy with a mean value of 3. In the case of calques, the four groups reported a moderate-to-high use of this strategy with slight differences in their mean values, being CLIL 2 the one who reported to use it to a lesser extent with a mean value of 3.05. Finally, regarding the strategy of foreignising, the intergroup comparison of the mean values indicates that in both grades, CLIL groups reported to use foreignisings to a lesser extent than their NON-CLIL counterparts.

As for the analysis of the factor of proficiency, mean values of the four groups show that as proficiency increases in CLIL and NON-CLIL groups, the reported use of L1-based CSs gradually and slightly decreases, values being moderate (between 2.88 and 3.37). Regarding the strategy of borrowings, mean scores show that as proficiency increases the self-reported use of this strategy decreases both in CLIL and NON-CLIL groups. It is worth noting that the decrease is more acute between CLIL 1 and CLIL 2 (4.22 vs 3) rather than in NON-CLIL groups (4.14 vs 4). In terms of calques, self-reported opinions evince that as proficiency increases there is a slight decrease in the use of this strategy, being values moderate in both CLIL and NON-CLIL groups (3.35 vs 3.05 / 3.29 vs 3.26). Finally, when self-reported opinions of CLIL and NON-CLIL learners' regarding foreignisings are analysed, the reported use of this strategy decreases with proficiency. In 2nd year, CLIL learners reported a moderate-to-high use of this strategy with a mean value of 3.13 whereas in two grades ahead, CLIL students attested a moderate use of foreignisings (2.59). In the case of NON-CLIL groups, learners in 2nd grade reported a high use of this strategy (4), whereas the ones in 4th year attested to use it moderately with a mean value of 2.84.

These results will be discussed in light of the factors of setting (CLIL vs. NON-CLIL) and general FL proficiency in the next section.

7. Discussion

In this section, the two research questions posed for the present study will be discussed.

With respect to the first research question (*Are there any quantitative and qualitative differences in the self-reported use of L1-based strategies between CLIL and NON-CLIL learners?*), in terms of amount, there are differences between CLIL and NON-CLIL learners in the use of L1 as a communication strategy. In both grades, CLIL learners reported a lower use of L1-based CSs than their NON-CLIL peers (3.56 vs 3.8/2.88 vs. 3.37). This is consistent with previous research (see Agustín Llach, 2009; Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010; Martínez Adrián & Gutiérrez Mangado, 2015a) which found that CLIL learners did not resort with such frequency to the L1 as NON-CLIL learners did both in oral and written production. This result may be accounted for by the fact that CLIL learners use the foreign language as a tool for communication in the CLIL programme they are immersed in. Moreover, these quantitative differences could be explained not only by the great exposure to the FL in CLIL instruction programmes but also by the different type of input they receive. CLIL learners are exposed to a more natural and contextualized input than mainstream EFL learners, and hence, L1 transfer might be rarer in this communicative approach which tries to simulate natural language acquisition. Additionally, results of the present study and the ones reported in previous investigations (Navés & Victori, 2010; Navés, 2011; Lasagabaster, 2008) suggest general proficiency benefits in favour of CLIL learners even when compared to NON-CLIL learners one or two grades ahead (Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010). The fact that CLIL learners master higher levels of proficiency in the FL could account for the lower use of L1-based strategies in CLIL learners.

On the other hand, as for the types of L1-based strategies used, borrowings seem not to be affected by the factor of CLIL in the 2nd year of secondary education. At this grade, both CLIL and NON-CLIL groups reported a high use of borrowings (4.22/4.14), being this strategy reported to be the most preferred one in both groups. This result is in sharp contrast to previous research (Agustín Llach, 2009; Agustín Llach, 2016; Celaya, 2007; Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010) which found that CLIL learners produced fewer

borrowings than their NON-CLIL peers. This lack of differences might be due to the fact that CLIL 1 had been immersed only for one year and a half by the time they were tested and hence the benefits of CLIL were not still visible in the domain of communication strategies. In fact, even if both groups at grade 10 surprisingly reported a high use of borrowings, the difference between CLIL 2 and NON-CLIL 2 is more acute (3 vs. 4), suggesting a benefit of CLIL in the long run regarding borrowings. For the high mean scores of this strategy, Agustín Llach (2016) suggests that showing preference for borrowings can be related to an acute increase in the difficulty of L2 vocabulary. In addition, she points out that CLIL is more demanding in cognitive terms, and hence this might explain the fact that borrowings are among the preferred L1 strategies in both CLIL groups. In terms of calques, CLIL learners at grade 8 reported a slight higher use of this strategy when compared to their NON-CLIL learners of the same grade (3.35/3.29). Nevertheless, in grade 10, NON-CLIL learners reported a higher use of calques than their CLIL peers (3.05/3.26). This may indicate, like in the case of borrowings, that CLIL makes learners to resort less frequently to calques when they have been immersed in this programme for a certain period of time. This mismatch clashes with previous research which found more instances of calques among CLIL learners' written production (Manzano Vázquez, 2014). On the contrary, in the case of foreignisings a clear tendency can be observed. In both grades, CLIL learners reported a less use of this strategy than their NON-CLIL counterparts did (3.13 vs. 4/2.59 vs. 2.84). These findings run counter to previous research which reported a greater use of foreignisings among CLIL learners due to their higher amount of exposure and general proficiency (Agustín Llach, 2009; Agustín Llach, 2016). However, Celaya (2007: 47) explains lack of differences in lexical creations due to the fact that "(...) a CLIL programme does not provide learners with more tools "to create" L2 vocabulary".

In light of these findings, one can claim that CLIL helps EFL learners to be lesser dependent on L1-based CSs and to resort to other type of communication strategies. Besides, results of the study evince that NON-CLIL learners resort to foreignisings more frequently than CLIL learners do, a clear tendency that has not been found in the case of calques or borrowings.

Regarding the second research question (*Are there any quantitative and qualitative differences in the self-reported use of L1-based CSs between less and more proficient learners?*), self-reported learners' opinions reveal that as proficiency increases, learners

tend to resort less frequently to L1-based strategies. In both settings, i.e. CLIL and NON-CLIL, mean scores regarding L1-based strategies decrease as learners' proficiency increases. In CLIL, the differences are more noticeable, being mean scores from high-to-moderate to moderate (3.56/2.88), whereas in NON-CLIL mean scores decrease from high to high-to-moderate (3.8/3.37). This can be supported by the fact that the difference in proficiency between the two grades is more acute in CLIL (from A2-B1 to B1-B2) rather than in NON-CLIL (from A2 to A2+). This correlates with previous findings (Agustín Llach, 2011; Arratibel Irazusta, 2015; Celaya, 2007; Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010; Gallardo del Puerto et al., forthcoming) which showed a higher use of L1-based strategies among lower proficient learners due to their insufficient command of the target language whereas advanced learners were considered to use other types of strategies such as L2-based CSs. Findings of the present study suggest that proficiency exerts influence on the quantity of L1-based strategies used by learners, being more common among low proficient learners. This might be due to the fact that more proficient learners do not have so many gaps in the FL and they do not feel the need to fill the lexical gap with their L1.

As for qualitative differences, learners' self-reported opinions suggest that as proficiency increases, the use of borrowings decrease in both contexts. The decrease is more remarkable between CLIL groups rather than between NON-CLIL groups since CLIL learners in 2nd year reported a high use of this strategy (4.22) and the ones in 4th year reported a moderate use (3), whereas NON-CLIL groups reported a high-to-moderate use of borrowings in both grades (4.14/4). This finding correlates with previous research that suggested a decrease in borrowing use as proficiency increased (Agustín Llach, 2011; Celaya, 2007; Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010) but clashes with a recent longitudinal study which found an increase of borrowings over the last three years of primary education (Agustín Llach, 2016). Furthermore, the results obtained in the present investigation may suggest that proficiency exercises a greater influence on the category 'borrowing' when a certain level of foreign language proficiency is achieved, in this case an Intermediate level (the case of CLIL 2). It might be the case that when a certain level of FL is mastered, learners' metalinguistic awareness grows and they become aware of their TL speech and all the linguistic devices used. As for the category 'calque', self-reported opinions appear to evince that as proficiency increases, the use of this strategy is slightly reduced in both settings (3.35 vs. 3.05 in CLIL/ 3.29

vs. 3.26 in NON-CLIL). This is in line with previous research which found significant differences between less and more advanced learners in the production of calques (Agustín Llach, 2011). Finally, data shows that as learners gain proficiency in the FL, the strategy of foreignisings is reported to be less resorted in both settings (3.13 vs. 2.59 in CLIL/ 4 vs. 2.84 in NON-CLIL). Indeed, the most proficient group, i.e. CLIL 2, attested to use this strategy less frequently than the other groups whereas, the least proficient group (NON-CLIL 1) reported to use foreignisings more frequently than more proficient groups. This result clashes with previous research (Agustín Llach, 2014; Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010) which concluded that more advanced learners produced more foreignisings than low proficient learners since a certain level of L2 mastering is needed to resort to this strategy. Nevertheless, this general trend has not been found in recent research where the strategy ‘foreignising’ does not seem to be characteristic of more advanced learners (Agustín Llach, 2016; Arratibel Irazusta, 2015; Gallardo del Puerto, 2015; Gallardo del Puerto et al., forthcoming).

All in all, as for the effect of proficiency on L1-based CSs use, the analysis and subsequent comparison of learners’ self-reported opinions evince that as learners’ proficiency in the FL increases, L1-based CSs use decreases. Furthermore, self-reported opinions suggest that none of L1-based CSs are typical of more advanced learners.

8. Conclusion

Due to the rapid growth of CLIL programmes in the last decade throughout Spanish EFL curricula, research has focused on shedding light on the gains the CLIL approach can offer to EFL learners. However, research conducted so far has not reached definite conclusions. The present study has aimed to provide more empirical evidence to this field by analysing the effect of CLIL and proficiency on EFL secondary school learners’ self-reported opinions on their use of L1-based CSs.

On the one hand, this study has revealed that CLIL learners not only obtained better scores in the general proficiency test than their NON-CLIL counterparts in the same grade, but also performed quite similar to the NON-CLIL learners two grades ahead who have been exposed to English for approximately the same amount of hours. This may imply that CLIL has a beneficial effect on proficiency growth. Moreover, results show that this general proficiency benefit is more clearly visible as grade increases, which could be explained by the effect of the accumulated hours of CLIL.

Secondly, descriptive statistics of the self-reported opinions suggest that Content-based instruction enhances less use of L1-based CSs due to its communicative nature. As for the types of L1-based strategies, differences were not found in the self-reported opinions of CLIL and NON-CLIL groups when borrowings and calques were analysed. However, a clear tendency is observed in the case of foreignisings since this category is reported to be more frequently used among NON-CLIL learners.

The third general conclusion drawn from the present exploratory study is that as proficiency increases, learners do not resort with such frequency to L1-based strategies. Regarding types of L1-based strategies, as learners gain proficiency in the FL, the reported use of borrowings decrease in both settings, although the difference is more acute in CLIL. As for calques, there is also a slight decrease in the self-reported use of this strategy with proficiency in both settings. Finally, self-reported data shows that foreignisings are not typical of more advanced learners since their self-reported use of this strategy decreases as proficiency increases in both CLIL and NON-CLIL settings.

In general, it seems that both CLIL and proficiency are crucial factors to analyse the scope of L1-based CS use. The communicative nature of CLIL and a greater domain of the TL when proficiency increases lead learners to resort to a lesser extent to their L1. That is, CLIL and more proficient learners do not use L1-based CSs so frequently as NON-CLIL and less proficient learners do. In the case of CLIL, data shows that there are only qualitative differences in the category of foreignisings, being more common in NON-CLIL learners. As for proficiency, data show that neither borrowings nor calques or foreignisings are typical of advanced learners.

Nevertheless, due to the descriptive and exploratory nature of the study, these conclusions should be taken with caution. Firstly, a more comprehensive test of general proficiency which includes other linguistic skills such as listening, reading or speaking would have measured learners' English level more accurately. Moreover, analysis of the data with inferential statistics would have allowed me to see if intergroup differences reach statistical significant differences or not.

In terms of pedagogical implications, the analysis of learners' self-reported opinions regarding L1-based CSs suggests that L1 use is not really an acute problem. Learners resort to the L1 as a temporary scaffold in order to overcome L2 communicative difficulties (oral production) or to complete a given task (written production) since L1

reliance diminishes as proficiency increases. In this sense, the use of the L1 should not be severely punished in EFL classrooms. Teachers should be aware of the fact that L1-based strategies are more common among less proficient learners whereas L2-based strategies are widely used by advanced students (Gallardo del Puerto et al., forthcoming). Additionally, L1 use can be beneficial in EFL classrooms for explaining complex concepts that learners may have problems with and should not be perceived as a rival of the TL (Gené Gil, Juan Garau, & Salazar Noguera, 2012). In this context, L1 and L2 use should be balanced. That is, teachers should confine the use of L1 to explain difficult concepts, but should promote L2-based CSs such as paraphrases which would allow learners to perceive the L2 as a communicative tool. In this light, it seems that CLIL is beneficial both in terms of general proficiency and promoting less L1 use in favour of more advanced L2-based strategies. Hence, its implementation should be considered in all educational institutions so that learners could benefit from it.

Despite the limitations of the study, results might be suggestive of further avenues to future research. Triangulation of the self-reported opinions analysed in this study with oral and written data gathered from the same subjects would be convenient. Moreover, a longitudinal study comparing these four groups at higher levels of proficiency would shed more light on the effect of proficiency on self-reported opinions about L1-based CSs as well as on the effect of CLIL in the long run.

References

- Agustín Llach, M. P. (2009). The Role of Spanish L1 in the Vocabulary Use of CLIL and non- CLIL EFL learners. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & M. J. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe*, pp.112-129. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Agustín Llach, M. P. (2011). *Lexical Errors and Accuracy in Foreign Language Writing*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Agustín Llach, M. P. (2014). Exploring the lexical profile of young CLIL learners. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 2(1), 53–73. DOI: 10.1075/jicb.2.1.03agu
- Agustín Llach, M. P. (2016). Age and type of instruction (CLIL vs. traditional EFL) in lexical development. *International Journal of English Studies*, 16 (1), 75-96. DOI:10.6018/ijes/2016/1/220691
- Arratibal Irazusta, I. (2015). *'They start to busqu the jump'*. A pseudolongitudinal study of crosslinguistic influence in L3 English CLIL learners. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of the Basque Country: Vitoria.
- Celaya, M.L. (2007). I study *natus* in English: lexical transfer in CLIL and regular learners. In R. Monray & A. Sánchez (Eds.), *25 years of Applied Linguistics in Spain: Milestones and Challenges*, 43-49.
- Celaya, M. L., & Torras, M. R. (2001). L1 influence and EFL vocabulary: do children rely more on L1 than Adult learners? Proceedings of the XXV AEDEAN Conference. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- Celaya, M. L., & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2010). First languages and age in CLIL and NON-CLIL contexts. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(3), 60-66. <http://www.icrj.eu/13/article6.html>
- Cenoz, J. (2001). The Effect of Linguistic Distance, L2 Status and Age On Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufessen & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*, pp. 8-19. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cenoz, J. (2003). Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Implications for the organization of the multilingual mental lexicon. *Bulletin VALS-ASLA (Vereinigung für angewandte Linguistik in der Schweiz)*, 78, 1-11. <http://www2.unine.ch/cla/page23129.html>

Cenoz, J. (2008). Learning Through the Minority: An Introduction to the Use of Basque in Education in the Basque Country. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 21(1), 1-4. DOI: : 10.2167/lcc338.

Cenoz, J., & Valencia, J. F. (1994). Additive trilingualism: Evidence from the Basque Country. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 15, 195-207. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716400005324>

Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman.

Gallardo del Puerto, F. (2015). 'L1 influence in CLIL vs. EFL schoolchildren: A study of codeswitching and transfer lapses'. Paper presented at the 33th AESLA International Conference, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, 16-18 April

Gallardo del Puerto, F., Gómez Lacabex, E., & García Lecumberri, M. L. (2009). Testing the Effectiveness of Content and Language Integrated Learning in Foreign Language Contexts: The Assessment of English Pronunciation. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & R. M. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe*, pp. 63-80. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Gallardo del Puerto, F., & Gómez Lacabex, E. (2013). The impact of additional CLIL exposure on oral English production. *Journal of English Studies*, 11, 113-131. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18172/jes.2620>

Gallardo del Puerto, F., Basterrechea, M., & Martínez Adrián, M. (forthcoming). The effect of target language proficiency on the use of compensatory strategies by young CLIL learners. Submitted to *International Journal of bilingualism and bilingual education*.

García Mayo, M. P. (2012). The relevance of attention to form in communicative classroom contexts. *Estudios de Lingüística Inglesa Aplicada*, 11, 11-45. http://institucional.us.es/revistas/elia/11/art_2.pdf

- Gené Gil, M., Juan Garau, M., & Salazar Noguera, J. (2012). A case study exploring oral language choice between the target language and the L1s in mainstream CLIL learners and EFL secondary education. *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas*, 7(1), 133-146. DOI: 10.4995/rlyla.2012.1129
- Heras Aizpurua, A. (2016). *The impact of CLIL: affective factors, content-related vocabulary & gender differences*. Unpublished TFM. University of the Basque Country: Vitoria-Gasteiz.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2008). Foreign language competence in content and language integrated courses. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 1, 30-41. DOI: 10.2174/1874913500801010030
- Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and Teaching Language through Content: A Counterbalanced Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Manzano Vázquez, B. (2014). Lexical transfer in the written production of a CLIL group and a non-CLIL group. *International Journal of English Studies*, 14 (2), 57-76. DOI: 10.6018/j.166251
- Martínez Adrián, M. (2011). An overview of Content and Language Integrated Learning: origins, features and research outcomes. *Huarte de San Juan. Filología y didáctica de la lengua*, 11, pp. 93-101. <http://hdl.handle.net/2454/9341>
- Martínez Adrián, M., & Gutiérrez Mangado, M. J. (2009). The Acquisition of English Syntax by CLIL Learners in the Basque Country. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & R. M. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe*, pp. 176- 196. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Martínez Adrián, M., Gallardo del Puerto, F., & Gutiérrez Mangado, M. J. (2013). Phonetic and Syntactic Transfer Effects in the English Interlanguage of Basque-Spanish Bilinguals. *VIAL, Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 51-83. <http://vialjournal.webs.uvigo.es/pdf/Vial-2013-Article3.pdf>
- Martínez Adrián, M., & Gutiérrez Mangado, M. J. (2015a). L1 Use, Lexical Richness, Accuracy and Syntactic Complexity in the Oral Production of CLIL and NON-CLIL Learners of English. *Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies*, 37(2), 175-197.

- Martínez Adrián, M., & Gutiérrez Mangado, M. J. (2015b). Is CLIL instruction beneficial in terms of general proficiency and specific areas of grammar? *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 3(1), 51-76.
- Martínez Adrián, M., Gallardo del Puerto, F., & Basterrechea, M. (forthcoming). On self-reported use of communication strategies by CLIL learners in primary education.
- Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. P. (2008) *Uncovering CLIL. Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Muñoz, C. (2007). 'Cross-linguistic influence and language switches in L4 oral production'. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4, 73-94.
- Navés, T. (2009). Effective Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Programmes. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & R. M. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe*, pp.22-40. Bern: International Academic Publishers.
- Navés, T., & Victori, M. (2010). CLIL in Catalonia: An Overview of Research Studies. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & D. Lasagabaster (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher training*, pp. 30-54. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Poullisse, N. (1987). Problems and solutions in the classification of compensatory strategies. *Second Language Research*, 3(2), 141-153. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/026765838700300204>
- Poullisse, N. (1993). A Theoretical Account of Lexical Communication Strategies. In R. Screuder & B. Weltens (Eds.), *The Bilingual Lexicon*, pp. 157-189. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2011). Which Language Competencies Benefit from CLIL? An Insight into Applied Linguistics Research. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, J. M. Sierra & F. Gallardo del Puerto (Eds.), *Content and Foreign Language Integrated Learning: Contributions to Multilingualism in European Contexts*, pp. 129-153. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Tarnopolsky, O. (2013). Content-based instruction, CLIL, and immersion in teaching ESP at tertiary schools in non-English-speaking countries. *Journal of ELT and Applied*

Linguistics, 1(1), 1-11. http://www.jeltal.com/yahoo_site_admin/assets/docs/content-Based_Instruction.318125758.pdf

Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report. In H. D. Brown, C. A. Yorio & R. C. Crymes (Eds.), *On Tesol 77: Teaching and Learning English as a Second Language: Trends in Research and Practice*, 194-203. Washington D. C.

Tarone, E., & Yule, G. (1987). Communication Strategies in East-West Interactions. In Larry E. Smith (Ed.), *Discourse Across Cultures: Strategies in World Englishes*, pp.49-65. NY: Prentice-Hall.

Villareal Olaizola, I., & García Mayo, M. P. (2009). Tense and Agreement Morphology in the Interlanguage of the Basque / Spanish Bilinguals: CLIL versus non- CLIL. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & R. M. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe*, pp. 157- 175. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Appendix 1: general background questionnaire

Información general	
1.	Nombre: _____
2.	¿Cuántos años tienes? _____
3.	¿Eres CHICO o CHICA? _____
4.	Curso: _____ ESO
5.	¿Cuál es la primera lengua que aprendiste en casa? 1. Euskara 2. Castellano 3. Las dos 4. Otra (¿cuál?) _____
6.	¿En qué idioma hablas con las siguientes personas? Con tu madre _____ Con tu padre _____ Con tus hermanos/as _____ Con tus amigos _____
7.	Hablo.... Castellano 1. Nada 2. Poco 3. Bien 4. Perfecto Euskara 1. Nada 2. Poco 3. Bien 4. Perfecto Inglés 1. Nada 2. Poco 3. Bien 4. Perfecto Otro (¿cuál?) _____ 1. Nada 2. Poco 3. Bien 4. Perfecto Otro (¿cuál?) _____ 1. Nada 2. Poco 3. Bien 4. Perfecto
8.	¿A qué edad empezaste a hablar...? Castellano _____ Otra lengua que no sea inglés (¿cuál?) _____
9.	¿A qué edad EMPEZASTE a estudiar inglés? _____ años
10.	¿Dónde empezaste a aprender inglés? <input type="checkbox"/> En el colegio <input type="checkbox"/> Academia <input type="checkbox"/> Otro (especificar) _____
11.	Además de en el colegio, ¿has recibido alguna vez clase particulares de inglés? <input type="checkbox"/> SI <input type="checkbox"/> NO (Si la respuesta es SÍ)... ¿Cuántas horas semanales? _____ horas ¿Durante cuántos años? _____ años

Appendix 2: Oxford Quick Placement Test

**Oxford University Press
and
University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate**

Name:

Date:

**quick
placement
test**

Version 1

This test is divided into two parts:

Part One (Questions 1 – 40) – All students.

**Part Two (Questions 41 – 60) – Do not start this part unless told to do
so by your test supervisor.**

Time: 30 minutes

Photocopiable © UCLES 2001

Part 1

Questions 1 – 5

- Where can you see these notices?
- For questions 1 to 5, mark one letter A, B or C on your Answer Sheet.

- 1

Please leave your room key at Reception.

A in a shop
B in a hotel
C in a taxi
- 2

Foreign money changed here

A in a library
B in a bank
C in a police station
- 3

AFTERNOON SHOW BEGINS AT 2PM

A outside a theatre
B outside a supermarket
C outside a restaurant
- 4

CLOSED FOR HOLIDAYS Lessons start again on the 8 th January
--

A at a travel agent's
B at a music school
C at a restaurant
- 5

Price per night: £10 a tent £5 a person
--

A at a cinema
B in a hotel
C on a camp-site

Questions 6 – 10

- In this section you must choose the word which best fits each space in the text below.
- For questions 6 to 10, mark **one** letter **A**, **B** or **C** on your Answer Sheet.

Scotland

Scotland is the north part of the island of Great Britain. The Atlantic Ocean is on the west and the North Sea on the east. Some people (6) Scotland speak a different language called Gaelic.

There are (7) five million people in Scotland, and Edinburgh is (8) most famous city.

Scotland has many mountains; the highest one is called 'Ben Nevis'. In the south of Scotland, there are a lot of sheep. A long time ago, there (9) many forests, but now there are only a (10)

Scotland is only a small country, but it is quite beautiful.

6 A on B in C at

7 A about B between C among

8 A his B your C its

9 A is B were C was

10 A few B little C lot

UFOs – do they exist?

UFO is short for 'unidentified flying object'. UFOs are popularly known as flying saucers, (16) that is often the (17) they are reported to be. The (18) "flying saucers" were seen in 1947 by an American pilot, but experts who studied his claim decided it had been a trick of the light.

Even people experienced at watching the sky, (19) as pilots, report seeing UFOs. In 1978 a pilot reported a collection of UFOs off the coast of New Zealand. A television (20) went up with the pilot and filmed the UFOs. Scientists studying this phenomenon later discovered that in this case they were simply lights on boats out fishing.

- 16 A because B therefore C although D so
- 17 A look B shape C size D type
- 18 A last B next C first D oldest
- 19 A like B that C so D such
- 20 A cameraman B director C actor D announcer

Questions 21 – 40

- In this section you must choose the word or phrase which best completes each sentence.
- For questions 21 to 40, mark **one** letter **A, B, C** or **D** on your Answer Sheet.

- 21 The teacher encouraged her students to an English pen-friend.
A should write B write C wrote D to write
- 22 They spent a lot of time at the pictures in the museum.
A looking B for looking C to look D to looking
- 23 Shirley enjoys science lessons, but all her experiments seem to wrong.
A turn B come C end D go
- 24 from Michael, all the group arrived on time.
A Except B Other C Besides D Apart
- 25 She her neighbour's children for the broken window.
A accused B complained C blamed D denied
- 26 As I had missed the history lesson, my friend went the homework with me.
A by B after C over D on
- 27 Whether she's a good actress or not is a of opinion.
A matter B subject C point D case
- 28 The decorated roof of the ancient palace was up by four thin columns.
A built B carried C held D supported
- 29 Would it you if we came on Thursday?
A agree B suit C like D fit
- 30 This form be handed in until the end of the week.
A doesn't need B doesn't have C needn't D hasn't got
- 31 If you make a mistake when you are writing, just it out with your pen.

- A cross B clear C do D wipe
- 32 Although our opinions on many things , we're good friends.
A differ B oppose C disagree D divide
- 33 This product must be eaten two days of purchase.
A by B before C within D under
- 34 The newspaper report contained important information.
A many B another C an D a lot of
- 35 Have you considered to London?
A move B to move C to be moving D moving
- 36 It can be a good idea for people who lead an active life to increase their of vitamins.
A upturn B input C upkeep D intake
- 37 I thought there was a of jealousy in his reaction to my good fortune.
A piece B part C shadow D touch
- 38 Why didn't you that you were feeling ill?
A advise B mention C remark D tell
- 39 James was not sure exactly where his best interests
A stood B rested C lay D centred
- 40 He's still getting the shock of losing his job.
A across B by C over D through

Part 2

Do not start this part unless told to do so by your test supervisor.

Questions 41 – 50

- In this section you must choose the word or phrase which best fits each space in the texts.
- For questions 41 to 50, mark **one** letter **A, B, C** or **D** on your Answer Sheet.

The tallest buildings - SKYSCRAPERS

Nowadays, skyscrapers can be found in most major cities of the world. A building which was many (41) high was first called a skyscraper in the United States at the end of the 19th century, and New York has perhaps the (42) skyscraper of them all, the Empire State Building. The (43) beneath the streets of New York is rock, (44) enough to take the heaviest load without sinking, and is therefore well-suited to bearing the (45) of tall buildings.

- 41 A stages B steps C storeys D levels
- 42 A first-rate B top-class C well-built D best-known
- 43 A dirt B field C ground D soil
- 44 A hard B stiff C forceful D powerful
- 45 A weight B height C size D scale

SCRABBLE

Scrabble is the world's most popular word game. For its origins, we have to go back to the 1930s in the USA, when Alfred Butts, an architect, found himself out of (46) He decided that there was a (47) for a board game based on words and (48) to design one. Eventually he made a (49) from it, in spite of the fact that his original (50) was only three cents a game.

- 46 A earning B work C income D job
- 47 A market B purchase C commerce D sale
- 48 A took up B set out C made for D got round
- 49 A wealth B fund C cash D fortune
- 50 A receipt B benefit C profit D allowance

Questions 51 – 60








- In this section you must choose the word or phrase which best completes each sentence.
- For questions 51 to 60, mark **one** letter **A, B, C** or **D** on your Answer Sheet.

- 51 Roger's manager to make him stay late if he hadn't finished the work.
A insisted B warned C threatened D announced
- 52 By the time he has finished his week's work, John has hardly energy left for the weekend.
A any B much C no D same
- 53 As the game to a close, disappointed spectators started to leave.
A led B neared C approached D drew
- 54 I don't remember the front door when I left home this morning.
A to lock B locking C locked D to have locked
- 55 I to other people borrowing my books: they always forget to return them.
A disagree B avoid C dislike D object
- 56 Andrew's attempts to get into the swimming team have not with much success.
A associated B concluded C joined D met
- 57 Although Harry had obviously read the newspaper article carefully, he didn't seem to have the main point.
A grasped B clutched C clasped D gripped
- 58 A lot of the views put forward in the documentary were open to
A enquiry B query C question D wonder
- 59 The new college for the needs of students with a variety of learning backgrounds.
A deals B supplies C furnishes D caters
- 60 I find the times of English meals very strange – I'm not used dinner at 6pm.
A to have B to having C having D have

Appendix 3: Self-report Questionnaire on CSs

























En la siguiente tabla presentamos algunas frases y nos gustaría que nos dijese con qué figura las relacionarías.







































































- Si estás **de acuerdo** con la frase marca con una **X** la casilla  y si estás **muy de acuerdo** marca con una **X** la casilla  .
- Si estás **en desacuerdo** con la frase marca con una **X** la casilla  y si estás **en muy desacuerdo** marca con una **X** la casilla  .
- Si no estás **ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo** con la frase marca con una **X** la casilla .
























































Ninguna respuesta está bien o mal. Solamente nos interesa saber cuál es tu opinión así que, por favor, responde lo que te parezca mejor.


























A continuación te presentamos un ejemplo, para que sepas cómo se debe marcar la casilla.

Ejemplo: <i>Me gusta hablar en inglés.</i>	 	 X			 
1. Cuando aprendo algo nuevo en inglés, pienso cómo se relaciona con cosas que ya sé.	 				 
2. Intento utilizar las palabras del inglés de	 				

diferentes maneras.					
3. Cuando no sé decir algo en inglés, evito referirme a ello.					
4. Resumo las cosas nuevas que escucho o leo en inglés.					
5. Si no entiendo algo en inglés, trato de adivinar lo que quiere decir.					
6. Cuando aprendo algo nuevo en inglés, lo uso en una oración con el fin de poder recordarlo mejor.					
7. Me gusta leer en inglés.					
8. Si no entiendo lo que alguien está diciendo en inglés, le pido que lo diga más despacio o que lo repita.					
9. Trato de usar el inglés de muchas maneras diferentes.					
10. Si no sé cómo decir algo en inglés, uso las manos para mostrar lo que quiero decir.					
11. Cuando aprendo algo nuevo en inglés, me hago una imagen en mi cabeza para recordarlo en un futuro.					
12. Cuando leo algo nuevo en inglés, primero leo por encima y después lo leo más detenidamente.					

13. Me gusta que los hablantes nativos me corrijan si digo algo mal en inglés.	 				 
14. Me doy cuenta de lo que hago mal en inglés y trato de hacerlo mejor.	 				 
15. Si no sé cómo decir algo en inglés, me invento palabras nuevas.	 				 
16. Cuando aprendo algo nuevo en inglés, pienso cómo suena de tal manera que me ayude a recordarlo.	 				 
17. Me gusta escribir notas, cartas y/o en mi diario en inglés.	 				 
18. Me gusta practicar la conversación en inglés.	 				 
19. Pongo atención cuando alguien habla en inglés.	 				 
20. Si no sé cómo decir algo en inglés, uso otras palabras que significan lo mismo.	 				 
21. Cuando aprendo algo nuevo en inglés, lo escribo para recordarlo mejor.	 				 
22. Intento encontrar parecidos entre las palabras de mi lengua materna (euskera y/o castellano) y las del inglés.	 				 
23. Si no entiendo algo en inglés, pido ayuda.	 				 

24. Intento encontrar la manera de ser mejor aprendiz de inglés.					
25. Si no entiendo lo que significa algo cuando leo en inglés, lo miro en el diccionario.					
26. Suelo estudiar las cosas nuevas que aprendo en inglés.					
27. Trato de encontrar reglas en inglés.					
28. Me gusta trabajar con otros para mejorar mis resultados en inglés.					
29. Trato de usar el inglés tan a menudo como sea posible.					
30. Cuando alguien me habla en inglés, trato de adivinar lo que va a decir justo a continuación.					
31. Cuando aprendo algo nuevo en inglés, lo repito una y otra vez.					
32. Cuando no sé decir algo en inglés, adapto la palabra del euskera o castellano al inglés (por ejemplo, 'go to the <u>bosqu</u> ' en vez de 'go to the <u>forest</u> ').					
33. Para averiguar el significado de una palabra en inglés, me fijo en alguna de las partes de esa palabra que me resulte familiar.					
34. Reflexiono sobre lo que me gustaría aprender en inglés.					

35. Cuando no sé decir algo en inglés, pido ayuda a otra persona (profesor, compañero, mamá, papá,...).					
36. Practico los sonidos del inglés.					
37. Cuando no sé decir algo en inglés, traduzco palabra por palabra del euskera o castellano (por ejemplo, 'my favourite <u>plate</u> ' en vez de 'my favourite <u>dish</u> ').					
38. Cuando no entiendo lo que leo en inglés, traduzco palabra por palabra.					
39. Reflexiono acerca de mi progreso en el aprendizaje del inglés.					
40. Cuando no sé decir algo en inglés, lo digo en euskera o castellano.	