The difference in levels of Language Awareness between EFL VWO students and CLIL VWO students and its effect on noticing FF

A task of noticing false friends between English and Dutch

Céline van Soest
s4294807
BA Thesis
English Language and Culture
Semester 2
Primary supervisor: S.S. Bultena
Secondary supervisor: Dr. S. van Vuuren

Abstract

Various research has shown the importance of language awareness (LA) in second language education. For my research I wanted look into the levels of language awareness in second year secondary school students from the bilingual and regular VWO track, and how these levels relate to the specific task of noticing false-friends pairs between English and Dutch. Research has shown that students who receive bilingual education are more advanced in various aspects of language learning than students who do not receive bilingual education. One of these aspects is vocabulary. It is therefore to be expected that students from the bilingual track score better in a vocabulary task, in this case noticing false-friends. Moreover, students who receive bilingual education are generally more exposed to English than students from the regular track, and bilingual education generally focusses more on the importance of learning English than regular education does. It is therefore to be expected that students from the bilingual track have a higher language awareness than students from the regular track. If these expectations are deemed valid by my research, it can also be expected that there is a correlational between levels of language awareness and the ability to notice false-friends. To support these expectations various components have been incorporated in my research: a LexTALE, a language background and awareness survey, and a false-friends task. The results from these components provided evidence that there is not significant difference in levels of language awareness between students from the bilingual track and students from the regular track, but that there was a significant difference in scores on the false-friends task. Furthermore, the results showed a significant correlation between levels of language awareness and scores on the false-friends task. From these results it could be argued that although there is no significant difference between the two groups regarding their levels of language awareness, raising language awareness in students from the regular track as well as students from the bilingual track is beneficial for increasing their lexical knowledge, while

decreasing their chances of wrong lexical interpretations in for example reading comprehension.

Key words: Language Awareness, bilingual education, CLIL, second language (L2), proficiency, false-friends, EFL

Word count: 10,157

Number of pages: 43

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, S.S. Bultena, for her support, her encouragement, her confidence in my capabilities, and her valuable feedback. Second, I would like to thank J. Geenen, whose helpful advice and positive attitude during the BA Thesis seminars kept my spirits up. I would also like to thank my fellow students, whose peer reviewing meant a great deal to me, and the schools that agreed to help me with my research.

Table of Contents

1 – Introduction

The statuses of languages change continuously, and while English was considered a language of the bourgeoisie during the Middle Ages, its status now is that of a world language. The Ethnologue keeps track of all living languages and categorizes them in stages of development. Also, they keep track of the L1 (first language) population of the language, meaning the population that speaks the language as a first language. When looking at the status of English in the language cloud provided by the Ethnologue, it becomes clear that English has one of the largest L1 populations in the world, and is classified as an institutional language, meaning that not only the L1 population uses the language, but other communities and institutions as well (Ethnologue, 2018). Taavitsainen and Pahta (2003) pointed out that English is spoken by more people than several decades ago, and that this number is growing still (p. 3). The new status of English has brought new terms with regards to English as well. When referring to English as a world language, the terms 'Global English', 'World English', 'International English', and 'Euro-English' have been used frequently. The latter refers to the use of English in Europe, and highlights the observation that in Europe, English has been used by various communities with different language background as the main means of communication, or the 'lingua franca' (Taavitsainen & Pahta, 2003).

Although the language cloud of the Ethnologue provides an idea of the size of the L1 population and shows that it is one of the most frequently used languages by the L2 population, meaning those who speak English as a second language, it does not discriminate between the different groups of L2 speakers. This distinction has been made by Taavitsainen and Pahta (2003), who argued that speakers of English can be divided into three groups. These groups are the L1 speakers of English, the L2 speakers of English, and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) speakers. The main difference between L2 speakers and EFL speakers is that English is frequently used in the environment of the L2 speakers, whereas EFL speakers

only occasionally use English in for example the English classroom, or on holiday.

In the Netherlands, a distinction can be made between EFL speakers and L2 speakers as well. In recent years, the status of English has been shifting from EFL to L2, and various reasons can be given for this shift. In Finland, a similar shift has been observed, and Taavitsainen and Pahta (2003) explained how the influence of English has grown in popular culture and entertainment, and how TV programmes and films more often use subtitling instead of dubbing. The same can be observed in the Netherlands. Only certain TV channels in the Netherlands use dubbing, which are often channels for children, and also films are only dubbed when their main audience is children. Also, many households in the Netherlands have access to a large amount of international TV channels, many of which are English spoken channels. It can therefore be argued that English has made its way into the daily life of many Dutch citizens. It has also been pointed out by Taavitsainen and Pahta (2003) that code-switching has become more frequent in non-English-speaking countries, particularly among the younger generations. As a result, English has not only gained more status on the receptive level, but also on the productive level. It can therefore be argued that English in the Netherlands has shifted from an EFL status to an L2 status, and the interest in bilingual education has grown.

Data from a research by Huibregtse (De Graaf & Koopman, 2006, p. 16) showed that there are no negative consequences for the acquisition of the L1 as a result of receiving bilingual education. Moreover, the Dutch, unlike some other European nationalities such as the French and Spanish, are possibly more interested in or more inclined to learn other languages. The Ethnologue (2018) mentions that in the Netherlands there are over 15 million L2 users of English, while English is not included in the language list for either France of Spain. Dutch is not spoken by many other nationalities, and it can be argued that we understand the importance of learning other languages, especially the lingua franca.

Moreover, this interest in learning other languages might mean Dutch people generally have a higher language awareness (LA) than other nationalities. However, it also could mean that students who choose to do the bilingual programmes, regardless of their nationality, have a higher language awareness than those who choose the regular programmes, because choosing the bilingual programme could indicate that the student is interested in learning other languages. Since there has been an increase in secondary schools offering bilingual education, many secondary school students have the possibility to choose for this form of education. LA has been defined by the Association of Language Awareness as "explicit knowledge about language, and conscious perception and sensitivity in language learning, language teaching and language use" (as cited in Svalberg, 2007, p. 288). It includes the awareness, attention, and noticing of differences and similarities between language, and this awareness may lead to higher proficiencies, including an increase in lexical knowledge.

2 – Theoretical Background

2.1 – EFL teaching and bilingual education in the Netherlands

As the status of English in the Netherlands has changed, the reasons for wanting to learn the language have changed as well. When English was still developing as a world language and had yet not gained the status of an L2 in the Netherlands, learners had other reasons for learning English than they do now. De Bot (2007) provided several reasons for wanting to learn English in today's climate, and of those reasons was because of the increase of job opportunities. Many international companies have settled themselves in the Netherlands and are looking for employees that are fluent in multiple languages for the purpose of communicating with, for example, potential clients and other offices around the world. However, not only in business has English gained more influence. De Bot (2007) explained that development in media has also led to more input from other languages, especially English. Most TV and Netflix programmes are English-spoken, and posts on social media

platforms such as Facebook and Twitter are often in English, too.

As a results of the growing influence of English in the daily lives of Dutch citizens, educational institutions are not the only places where people come into contact with other languages (De Bot, 2007, p. 274). This provides educational institutions with opportunities to change existing language teaching methods, and may result in an even better understanding of the language being learned, as formal language instruction has been supported by a larger amount of input from the language being learned. The status change of English has not affected educational institutions with regards to their importance in the language learning process. This has been supported by a study by Bonnet et al. (De Bot, 2007, pgs. 274-275), of which the results showed that schools still play a prominent role in the acquisition of languages in different countries in Europe.

The teaching of second languages and the processes that are involved in second language learning have, similarly to the status changes of languages, developed over the last few decades. Jarvis (1983) explained that in the time of his research, not much was known about the process that involves second-language teaching and learning. However, much more research can be found on the topic at the present time, including research on methods in language teaching, bilingualism, and L1 to L2 transfer. Jarvis argued that this is a positive development that will be beneficial with regards to second language learning and teaching, and that it may help us design new methods and use new technologies regarding the topic. However, it can be argued that the research into methods of second language teaching and learning will continue on, as new technologies may change these methods in the future, and as the statuses of language are always changing as well.

At the time of his research, Jarvis (1983) explained how the mind-set of teachers and other parties that are involved with education and educational programmes should be changed. He argued that these parties, instead of assuming that their understanding of

languages is what makes language education effective, rather need to ask questions concerning the learning. 'Who are they', 'what do they need to learn', and 'how much do the learners need to understand' are questions that could be asked regarding second language teaching. Since then it can be argued that educational institutions have made progress regarding these questions. Many schools offer more advanced language courses, and the development in bilingual education has provided secondary school students with more options with regards to internationalization. Not only has bilingual education been introduced in secondary schools, but also in primary schools. A considerable amount of research has been done on the acquisition of second and third languages at earlier stages in life, and the positive outcomes of these researches have resulted in primary schools offering English to younger children than before, with some schools even providing the opportunity for children to start learning English and other languages in their first year of primary school (Unsworth, Persson, Prins, & De Bot, 2014; Nuffic, Vroeg vreemdetalenonderwijs, 2018). It is believed that when children acquire a language earlier on in life, they will obtain an overall higher proficiency level in this language than when the language is learned as an adult (Gass, 2013, p. 434). Consequently it becomes a part of their communication skills, rather than a language that they have to learn. Dutch people are more interested in learning other languages, especially the lingua franca, because they understand the importance of learning other languages when the L1 is not spoken by many other nationalities. In such circumstances where there is only a small L1 population, this population is highly motivated to learn a language that is spoken by a larger amount of people, most often the lingua franca. In other words, in order to be motivated to learn other languages, learners must know for what purpose they are learning another language, and they must feel a personal need to learn that language (De Bot, 2007, p. 274).

English is the lingua franca in today's society, and for that reason English has become

an obligatory course in secondary schools. However, because of the still growing status of English and the motivation of the Dutch to learn other languages, there has been a growing offer in bilingual education, or Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). This form of education aims at developing a language by using it as the means for learning, as well the goal of learning (De Graaf & Koopman, 2006, p. 15). In secondary schools in the Netherlands that offer CLIL, at least half of the subjects in the first three years of secondary school are taught in English. This includes subjects such as history, geography, and biology. The L2 is the main means of communication in class, and students are often encouraged to speak in the L2 outside of classes as well. In the last two or three years of secondary school the amount of the L2 used in non-language subjects is less than in the first three years, but unlike students from the regular track in the same year, CLIL students receive less explicit linguistic instruction, and classes often offer more variation including more literature and discussing international topics. In their last year students are offered the opportunity to take CLIL exams, which will provide the students with an international certificate that grants them access to almost all universities worldwide.

The main reasons for introducing CLIL in Dutch secondary schools were to improve language proficiency in a European language, to prepare and orientate students for an international society, and to prepare students for studying abroad or studying a subject that is taught in English (De Graaf & Koopman, 2006, p. 15). A considerable amount of research has been done on the influence of CLIL on the fluency of English and the effects on the L1, and the results showed that students who have received CLIL were more proficient in English than those who have not received this form of education, and no negative effects have been found on the L1, nor did it have any negative consequences for the grades received in school subjects that are taught in the L2 (De Graaf & Koopman, 2006, p. 17).

The biggest difference between CLIL and English as a Foreign Language (EFL)

classes is that the former includes more interaction with and in the L2, especially in other classes, but in the English classroom as well. De Graaf and Koopman (2006) explained that students benefit from immersion in the L2 regarding their reading and listening skills, which are classified as receptive skills. However, if students were to benefit from CLIL in productive skills such as writing and speaking as well, they additionally have to receive explicit instruction in grammar. It can therefore be argued that in CLIL, both explicit instruction and immersion, or an increased input, are used to improve the students' proficiency in English (De Graaf & Koopman, 2006, p. 18), whereas students who follow the regular programme mostly receive explicit instruction. That being said, in recent years, Dutch schools that do not offer a bilingual programme have begun to experiment with communicative language teaching. This form of teaching copies the immersion in the L2 from the CLIL methods, and may be beneficial regarding the improvement of communicative skills in students who do not receive CLIL (Hendrickson, 1991).

This increased exposure to the L2 that CLIL students receive can improve certain language skills more than others. Agustín-Llach (2016) has found that CLIL showed positive influences with regards to certain metalinguistic skills such as vocabulary and morphology, but not with skills such as syntax or pragmatics. A study by Sylvél (Agustín-Llach, 2016, p. 78) found that bilingual students often benefit from CLIL where vocabulary is concerned, as they are exposed to technical and academic vocabulary outside the language classroom. Admiraal, Westhoff and De Bot (2006) have found that there was a growth in receptive word knowledge throughout multiple school years, but the growth was largest during the students' first year. They also found that the mean score of the CLIL students was significantly higher than the mean score of the control group in an EFL vocabulary test at the start of the programme (p. 84). However, the results did show that there was no significant difference in the development of mean scores between the CLIL group and the control group. This means

that the CLIL group did not acquire vocabulary faster than the control group. Although the rate of acquisition did not differ significantly, they did find that at a receptive level the CLIL students had a significantly higher word knowledge, and, as a result of the increased exposure and the expectation of these students to actively use English in other classes, the new vocabulary they acquired will soon be part of their productive lexical knowledge. Furthermore, this increased exposure may also result in a higher level of LA.

2.2 – Language Awareness

Ever since the publication of Hawkin's *Awareness of Language* in 1984, researchers have been interested in the LA of second language learners (Kennedy, 2012, p. 398). Although LA consists of various components, it is generally defined as having explicit knowledge about language, and being sensitive to languages. Otwinowska (2016) further explained that LA occurs when attention is focussed on the knowledge the L2 learner already possesses. It is not the same as consciousness, which is defined as the process of attaining this knowledge. LA can therefore be defined as the result of this process (p. 117). Its connection to different skills regarding language learning has also been an interesting matter to researchers. Kennedy's (2012) research was aimed at the relationship between LA and the pronunciation of English of L2 speakers. Kennedy and Trofimovich (Kennedy, 2012, p. 399) found that there was a positive relationship between language awareness and pronunciation ratings, and between qualitative awareness and measures of L2 exposure and use. They explained that qualitative awareness means that learners are aware that a language is a means of communication, and not simply something that consists of linguistic items that have to be acquired (Kennedy, 2012, p. 399). Kennedy's aim was to clarify the relationship between particular kinds of LA and particular types of L2 use (p. 399). Two aspects of LA that Kennedy (2012) mentioned were the quantitative and qualitative conceptions of language and language learning. Quantitative awareness refers to the notion that some learners view language learning as a

process in which linguistic items have to be learned and acquired, and that with time, practice and effort their proficiency in the language will increase (Kennedy, 2012, p. 401). Because this form of awareness involves the learning of linguistic rules, it is most likely formed in an educational setting. Qualitative awareness, in contrast, is shown when learners view languages as a means of communication, and when these learners extract meaning from the input they receive from the L2 (Kennedy, 2012, p. 401). This form of awareness is likely larger in learners who are exposed to the L2 on a regular basis.

An aim of CLIL is to enhance the proficiency of learners of English, but this may not be the only effect. De Graaf and Koopman (2006) proposed an observation-tool for effective bilingual education that teachers can use, and it included the idea that teachers could make learners aware of language forms, activing their language awareness (p. 22). In other words, teachers are tasked with pointing out language phenomena and making sure their students become aware of them. Various examples have been given by De Graaf and Koopman (2006) on how to achieve this, including the suggestion for teachers to include their students in the thinking process. This highlights the idea of CLIL to not only make the language a goal but also a means to reach the goal. Another element of CLIL that highlights this idea is the fact that content from other classes such as history and geography is taught in the L2. This means that L2 learners not only learn the rules of a language in the language classroom, but also receive input in other classes. Quantitative awareness, as described by Kennedy (2012), can therefore be at the same level in students from both the regular programme as well as the CLIL programme, while qualitative awareness should be higher for learners from the CLIL programme. However, Kennedy's (2012) study revealed that a higher level of qualitative awareness did not mean that there was an increase in L2 use as well. Although it was shown useful on a receptive level, it can be questioned whether a higher level of qualitative awareness is important regarding language learning in a broader sense.

Moreover, the recognition of LA in general provided no certainty concerning its usefulness either. It can be questioned whether learners become better language users after knowing more about languages, and if teachers are able to provide better instruction. Those who teach with the concept of LA in their minds believe that a higher language awareness will indeed lead to an improvement of language learning and teaching (Svalberg, 2007, p. 290). For that reason, Svalberg (2012) proposed various ideas on how to gain more knowledge about LA, as it can be beneficial for developing teaching methods regarding second language learning and teaching. Previous research has already shown that learners with lower levels of LA are less likely to interact in the L2 and thus limit the knowledge they gain from the input, and that learners with a higher level of LA learn more of the L2's characteristics through interaction, and look for ways to diversify their L2 use.

Although a relationship between LA and L2 productive knowledge has been found, more research can be done on the regarding the nature of this relationship (Kennedy, 2012, p. 399). So far, only a few methods exist to assess LA in relation to L2 use, and these methods provide only a small amount of insight with regards to the use of an L2 (Kennedy, 2012, p. 400). Furthermore, they are not useable for a short study on learners' levels of LA. Svalberg (2012) therefore proposed ideas for research on several topics in relation to LA, for example the engagement with language. It was argued that LA can be seen as a process or as a product, and sometimes both. LA as a product means that LA is formed through language engagement, and LA as a process means that learners already possess LA which shows itself "in the form of language and language-related knowledge, beliefs and attitudes" (Svalberg, 2012, p. 377). It was also argued that someone who is engaged with language has a positive attitude towards languages and sees it as a means of communication, rather than something that has to be learned. Those who are truly engaged with language can be argued to possess LA, and as LA

has been considered to be at least beneficial on a receptive level, students with higher levels of LA possibly have a higher receptive lexical knowledge and are better at noticing cognates.

2.3 – Cognates and false-friends

Along with the change in statuses of languages and the methods of second language teaching, languages themselves have also changed over the last centuries, and will keep changing in the future. Many researchers have looked into the evolution of languages, one of which is Croft (2008). Croft provided a considerable amount of information on the evolution of languages, but the most important argument he presented is that language change occurs through language variation, and language variation occurs through the copying process, or an imperfect imitation as Croft called it (p. 221). In an earlier article Croft argued for a model displaying language change, in which is shown that language use, rather than language acquisition, is the cause of evolving linguistic structures (p. 222). As a result of languages continuously changing and evolving, new languages may occur over the course of time, and other languages grow apart from each other, but still have a common root. Croft has also studied language families and their influence on cognate sets, which are interlingual word pairs that presumably have a common ancestor (p. 224).

Knowing about these cognate pairs between languages may help second language learners reading texts in the second language, and may lead to learners acquiring a language's lexicon faster and better. Garrison (1990) explained that learners, when confronted with cognate pairs, will soon realize how these pairs work, and will recognize certain patterns, enabling them to translate other unknown words using these patterns. The noticing of cognate pairs is often easy when affixes are involved. When a learner notices that a certain affix in the L2 always is another certain affix in the L1, the learner has recognized the pattern and will be able to translate other words with these affixes as well. Between English and Dutch, learners may notice that English words ending in –*ship* can be translated into Dutch by using the suffix

–schap. For example, 'friendship' becomes 'vriendschap'. However, learners must be made aware that although this way of translating is easy and practical, it does not work for every word. Not all English words ending in *–ship* will translate to a Dutch word ending in *–schap* and have the same definition. The English word 'spaceship', for example, does not translate to the Dutch 'ruimteschap'. Learners may recognize the *–ship* ending in 'spaceship' as a suffix, while it is actually a compound word. If the learner is yet not aware that it involves two separate words instead of a word and a suffix, it may result in wrong translations and wrong interpretations. As LA includes the noticing of differences and similarities between languages, learners who notice these patterns faster and with less effort than other learners may have a higher level of LA.

As it is believed that students who receive CLIL have at least a higher receptive lexical knowledge than students who do not receive CLIL, it can be assumed that those students notice cognates. In psycholinguistics, cognates are defined as "words that share aspects of spelling, sound and meaning across languages" (Sunderman & Schwartz, 2008, p. 527). In general linguistics, the requirement that the words share a common ancestry is included as well.

The definition for a cognate is, however, broad. A distinction can be made between full cognates, partial cognates, and deceptive cognates. In the case of full cognates, two words look alike, sound alike, and share the same definition, without other words from either language looking and sounding alike as well, without sharing the same definition. An example of a Dutch-English cognates are the nouns 'boek' and 'book'. These two words sound alike, look alike, and have the same definition. Therefore, the overall definition of cognates refers particularly to full cognates.

Partial cognates are different from full cognates in that, apart from having a word in the other language that shares the same form, sound and meaning, this other language also has

a word that looks and sounds alike, but does not have the same meaning. Sunderman and Schwartz (2008) did a study on the effect of partial cognates between English and Spanish on lexical processing. They provide an example of the cognate pair 'grave-grave', where the English word can mean a 'burial place' or it can be a synonym for 'serious'. In Spanish, however, the word can only mean 'serious' (p. 528). Between English and Dutch, such partial cognate pairs exist as well, for example the pair 'bank-bank'. In Dutch it can either mean a sofa, or a place where you can withdraw money. In English, the latter definition is a possibility, but it can also mean the side of a river.

When L2 learners encounter cognates, they use their L1 to transfer the knowledge that they already possess in the L1 to learn these new words, as well as other words in the L2. For example, when a Dutch L2 learner of English encounters the word 'communicative' in an English text, the information the learner has of that word from the L1 can be transferred to the lexical knowledge the learner has of the L2. The learner will realize that the word is similar in sound and form to the Dutch word 'communicatief', and conclude that the must have the same definition as well. However, it is possible for L2 learners to overgeneralize their understanding that words that look and sound alike also have the same meaning, while this is not always true. Words that look and sound similar, but do not share the same definition are deceptive cognates, or false friends. For example, the Dutch 'warenhuis' and the English 'warehouse' is a false-friends pair. The Dutch word refers to a large store where you can buy a wide variety of items, whereas the English word refers to a large storage building. The occurrence of false friends, with which the similarities in form and sound but difference in definition are meant, is often accidental, but may also occur as a result from language variation and change (Otwinowska, 2016, p. 46).

In order to explain the underlying noticing process in bilinguals when presented with a text, a model has been created. The bilingual interactive activation (BIA) model proposed that

when bilinguals encounter a string of letters forming a word, it "excites a number of words in the reader's mind which compete as to which provides the best match for what has been seen" (Sunderman & Schwartz, 2008 p. 528). Because a bilingual knows two languages with roughly the same proficiency in both languages, words from each language are competitors for the best match for what the reader has encountered (Sunderman & Schwartz, 2008, p. 528). Although words from both language are activated, once a match between the string of letters and the words has been found in one language, the competitors from the other language are eliminated. Sunderman and Schwartz (2008) argued that because bilinguals are equally proficient in both languages, the information about words in both languages are activated simultaneously (p. 528). As a result, it was assumed that bilinguals are faster at noticing full cognate pairs than monolinguals, while they are slower at noticing partial cognate pairs because the competition between multiple meanings across two languages slows down the translation process. This assumption was supported by the results of Sunderman and Schwartz's (2008) study, which reported that partial cognates were recognized less accurately than full cognates.

The noticing of cognates can be useful in various language tasks, including reading comprehension. Proctor and Mo (2009) looked at the cognate recognition in English of Spanish speaking bilinguals by using a reading vocabulary test that includes Spanish-English cognates, and they argued that vocabulary plays an important role in reading comprehension, both in the L1 and the L2. They also proposed the idea that cognate recognition could be useful for Spanish-English bilinguals while reading academic texts in the L2, because highly frequent words in Spanish have cognate counterparts in English which are low frequency, and often used in academics (Proctor & Mo, 2009, pgs. 126-127). English and Spanish have a shared Latin base, and as a result, Spanish-English bilinguals can use their knowledge of Spanish to learn more difficult and less frequent words in English without explicitly learning

the meaning of these words. The results of Proctor and Mo's (2009) study, in which participants had to complete the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Comprehension subtest and the Cognate Awareness Test, showed that Spanish-English bilinguals scored better than monolingual English speakers in the cognate recognition task. Because cognate awareness seemed to have a positive effect on reading comprehension tasks for bilinguals, it was suggested that L2 learners of English who speak a language that is typologically similar could benefit from explicit instruction in depth and breadth of vocabulary knowledge and cognate awareness. Proctor and Mo (2009) argued that more research may be done with regards to cognate recognition and its possible advantages.

As the recognition of cognates could be beneficial in reading comprehension, noticing false friends may be beneficial in reading comprehension as well. When learners notice and recognize cognates while reading in the L2, lexical knowledge from the L1 is transferred and helps the reader apply meaning to the words. However, when L2 learners are unaware of false friends, especially in the earlier stages of acquisition, readers may apply the wrong definition to a word because of a wrong transfer of L1 knowledge. Learners could therefore benefit from explicit instruction on cognates and false friends, so that at least at the receptive level, including reading comprehension, L2 learners do not misinterpret a whole text as a result of misinterpreting certain words in the text.

2.4 – The relationship between CLIL, LA, and noticing false friends

Teachers who are involved in CLIL are particularly interested in raising awareness regarding similarities and differences between languages, and this is often done by having the students focus on word forms. This means a difference should be found between EFL and CLIL groups with regards to LA, since EFL students do not receive this specific instruction to focus on form. Moreover, one of the ideas of LA is that it involves the noticing of differences and similarities between languages. This should mean that CLIL students would also notice false

friends more accurately than EFL students, regardless of their general proficiency in English. I was interested in finding a significant correlation between LA and the noticing of false friends. With this research I wanted to look at the levels of language awareness in Dutch second-year secondary school students from the regular VWO track and CLIL track. Furthermore, I wanted to look at the relationship between language awareness and the performance in the specific task of noticing false-friends between English and Dutch. Is there a significant correlation between the levels of language awareness and the ability to notice English-Dutch false-friends between regular VWO students and bilingual VWO students, which cannot be explained by the participants' general proficiency in English alone?

 To answer these questions three hypotheses have been tested:

1. VWO students from the CLIL track have significantly higher levels of language awareness in their second year of secondary school than VWO students from the regular track.
2. VWO students from the CLIL track have a higher lexical knowledge in their second year of secondary school than VWO students from the regular track.
3. Students who have a higher level of language awareness score significantly better on the false-friends task.

For this research I have collected data from participants. The participants were asked to fill in a Google Survey, which was comprised of three components. These three components were the LexTALE, a language background and awareness survey, and a task regarding false friends. The results from my research could contribute to recent discussions concerning language teaching in secondary schools, in particular the explicit instruction on differences and similarities between languages and their lexicons. Additionally, the results could support the idea that raising language awareness, and specifically cognate awareness, could be beneficial in language learning.

The next chapter gives an overview of the design of my research, including an explanation on the materials used. Chapter 4 contains the results of my research, and in the fifth and final chapter my findings have been discussed and a conclusion to this research has been given.

3 – Method

3.1 – Participants

For my research 40 Dutch VWO students from their second year of secondary school have been tested, of which 13 were male and 27 were female. Their ages ranged from 12 to 14 years old. The students are from both the regular VWO track and the CLIL VWO track, with 23 students from the regular track and 17 students from the CLIL track. Various schools from over the Netherlands have been asked to participate in my research, which means that all participants were likely to have different language learning backgrounds.

Students from the second year of secondary school have been selected for this research because they have had enough explicit instruction concerning vocabulary to have gained an adequate level of lexical knowledge where common English words are involved. However, their exposure to the English language is still quite minimal as opposed to students from their third year in secondary school or higher. It can be expected that students from the CLIL track have been more exposed to the English language.

Only students who have a Dutch nationality and a Dutch language background have been used for my research, because the research focusses on the ability of students with a Dutch language background to notice false friends.

3.2 – Materials

As a means to answer my research question a survey on Google Forms has been created in which different elements have been incorporated. These elements included a consent form, in which students verify that they have a Dutch nationality and a Dutch language background,

and accept that their responses will be analysed anonymously, a LexTALE (Lexical Test for Advanced Learners of English), a language background and awareness survey[1], and a false-friends noticing task[2].

3.2.1 – Lexical Test for Advanced Learners of English (LexTALE)

The LexTALE is a short yes/no vocabulary test that approximately takes five minutes to finish. It is free which makes it easy for me to use in my research. Although the LexTALE is designed to measure the English competency of advanced learners, and may therefore be slightly difficult for beginning learners of English, it is the most accessible and most accurate test I could find to measure my participants' proficiency of English.

The LexTALE has been designed to determine a language learner's English vocabulary knowledge and overall English competency. Lemhöfer and Broersma (2012) explained that in research on bilingualism, researchers mostly relied on self-ratings from the participants and questionnaires to determine a learner's proficiency. This method of determining proficiency was not considered to be valid, and other objective tests were "too costly, impractical, unknown, or inaccessible for researchers to use" (Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2012, p. 326). LexTALE was therefore created to, in the first place, assess a learner's vocabulary knowledge. Lemhöfer and Broersma (2012) explained that LexTALE can also be used to measure English proficiency because vocabulary knowledge is a part of the overall proficiency. They therefore argue that "LexTALE could be used as a rough indication of proficiency when no other, more accurate measure is available" (Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2012, p. 328). For that LexTALE has been used to measure the participants' English proficiency.

---

[1] See Appendix 1
[2] See Appendix 2

3.2.2 – Language background and awareness survey

With my research I wanted to look at the level of language awareness of second year VWO students and how there could be a difference in levels of language awareness between students from the regular track and students from the CLIL track. Determining such a level is difficult, mostly because there exists no test that can do this. In the past, language awareness has been determined mostly by doing a longitudinal study in which participants are observed and in which participants keep a log containing their thoughts on learning a new language. Another problem with this method is that it does not result in scores that can be used in a comparative analysis.

Using this method was not an option for my research, and a self-developed questionnaire has therefore been used in which the participants gave ratings from 1 to 10 on particular statements that reflect different elements concerning language awareness. The questions were presented in Dutch so that the participants fully understood the questions. First, the participants were asked to answers a few questions on their language learning background and on their opinion of the English language. Answers to these questions have not been used to determine the language awareness score, but can provide additional information when analysing the results. The questions used for determining the participants' language awareness include statements on the importance of learning other languages, in particular English, statements on how the participants learn other languages, and statements on the participants' motivation to learn other languages.

3.2.3 – False-Friends Test

The last component of my research was a self-developed false-friends test. It contained English sentences in which a word was written in caps, accompanied by Dutch words that looked and sounded similar, and did or did not share the same definition. This test contained 40 elements in total, of which 25 English-Dutch pairs were false-friends, and 15 were control

pairs. For the purpose of my research the psycholinguistic definition of cognates has been used, as the common ancestry of the cognate pairs have not been verified.

Most of the control words that have been used in the test, which were all full cognates, come from the appendix in the Master Thesis of Perales (2017). This appendix contains English-Dutch translations and a p-value, which indicates how well the participants in Perales' research did in a vocabulary test. Most of the cognate pairs that have been selected from this list have a p-value that is 1 or almost 1, which means that Perales' participants performed (almost) perfectly on these items. This makes them suitable as control words for my research.

The false-friends pairs that have been used for this research can be found online (Learndutch, 2018; Language Partners, 2018). The test included pairs that learners of English learn early on, for example names for animals. As a result, it can be expected that the participants notice a false-friends pair such as 'eekhoorn' and 'acorn' more accurately than words that are frequently used in for example academic papers or newspaper articles. I expected that, given my hypothesis that CLIL students have a higher language awareness than students from the regular track, CLIL students would perform better in this false-friends recognition task.

3.3 – Procedure

The 40 participants in this research were all given the same survey in which they had to complete the abovementioned tasks. After giving consent and acknowledging that they met the prerequisites the participants were asked to do the LexTALE on the test's webpage. Afterwards the participants were asked to fill in the score they received in the LexTALE before moving on to the next part of the research. The second part of the research was the language background and awareness survey. After filling in this survey, the participants were asked to complete the self-developed False-Friends test. As mentioned before, the test

consisted of 40 items. Every item was given on its own, and the participants had to decide whether or not the given Dutch word was a correct translation of the words in capitals in the English sentence. After finishing this exercise, the participants were given one last question, which asked how the participants had decided on their answers in the previous task. The answer to this question can give an additional perspective on the participants' language awareness. Statistical analyses have been conducted to look into the performances between the two groups in every test, and the correlation of the different components of my research in every group.

4 – Results

4.1 – Lexical Test for Advanced Learners of English (LexTALE)

Filling in a LexTALE score proved to be difficult for some participants. One participant did not fill in a score, and 2 participants gave scores that do not cohere to the results normally given in LexTALE. For that reason it was decided to leave these entries out of the analyses of the LexTALE. Furthermore, the LexTALE gives scores in percentages. However, the other tests in my research have given scores between 1 and 10. In order to have a clear overview in terms of correlational analyses it was decided to transforms the scores in percentages to scores between 1 and 10. This means that decimal scores have been rounded off to a score between 1 and 10 with one decimal. Table 1 displays the means and the standard deviations of the LexTALE for both groups.

Table 1. Means and standard deviations of the LexTALE scores for both test groups

	Education type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
LexTALE	Regular VWO	21	6,90	1,19
	Bilingual VWO	16	7,23	,99

An independent samples t-test on the LexTALE scores to compare the two education types showed that on average, participants from the CLIL track had a higher proficiency (M = 7.2, SE = 0.25), than the participants from the regular track (M = 6.9, SE = 0.26). This difference, -0.3, BCa 95% CI [-1.0742, 0.4242], was not significant t (35) = -0.88, p = .385; furthermore, it represented only a small-sized effect, d = 0.34.

4.2 – Language background and awareness survey

In order to determine the participants' levels of LA a choice had to made on which questions would be used from the Language Background and Awareness Survey, of which the complete version can be found in Appendix 1. The following questions and the participants' answers to these questions have been used to determine their levels of LA:

- How important is it to you to learn English?

- Statement: "When learning a language I especially learn the grammatical rules and the vocabulary."

- Statement: "When learning a language I especially look at how the language is used in practice."

- Statement: "I learn languages because I think it is important and enjoyable to know multiple languages."

- Statement: "When I am learning a language I often notice differences and similarities between languages."

- Statement: "I learn languages because I am obligated to do so in school."

The participants' scores for the last statement have been mirrored, meaning a 1 became a 10, a 2 became a 9, a 9 became a 2, etc. The reason for doing so is because a higher score to this statement reflects a lower level of LA. As explained in the section on LA, language is considered more a means of communication, rather than something that has to be learned in a class-setting.

In order to provide an overall score for LA the participants' scores have been added up to each of these questions and divided it by 6 (the number of questions). As a result, an overall score for the level of LA were between 1 and 10. The other questions that have not been used to determine levels of LA can be used to provide an additional overview of the participants' backgrounds are their effects on the participants' scores. Table 2 displays the means and the standard deviations of the Language Awareness survey for both groups.

Table 2. Means and standard deviations of the Language Awareness of both test groups

	Education type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
LA	Regular VWO	23	6,80	1,52
	Bilingual VWO	17	7,28	1,15

An independent samples t-test on the language awareness scores to compare the two education types showed that on average, participants from the CLIL track had a slightly higher level of LA (*M* = 7.3, *SE* = 0.28), than the participants from the regular track (*M* = 6.8, *SE* = 0.32). This difference, -0.5, BCa 95% CI [-1.3698, 0.4168], was not significant *t* (38) = -1.08, *p* = .287; furthermore, it represented only a small-sized effect, *d* = 0.43.

4.3 – False-Friends Test

The False-Friends test consisted of 40 items of which 25 were false-friends pairs. To calculate an overall score for this test the participants received one point for each correct answer on the false-friends pairs, which means they could score 25 points in total. The false-friends pairs have been circled in Appendix 2. The points scored have then been divided by the maximum points possible and multiplied by 10 so it gave a score from 1 to 10, allowing scores to have

one decimal. Table 3 displays the means and the standard deviations of the False-Friends test

for both groups.

Table 3: Means and standard deviations of the false-friends task of both test groups

	Education type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
False-Friends	Regular VWO	23	7,79	1,04
	Bilingual VWO	17	8,71	,55

An independent samples t-test on the false-friends task scores to compare the two

education types showed that on average, participants from the CLIL track scored better at the

False-Friends test ($M = 8.7$, $SE = 0.14$), than the participants from the regular track ($M = 7.8$,

$SE = 0.22$). This difference, -0.9, BCa 95% CI [-1.4346, -0.3946], was significant t (35) = -

3.57, $p = .001$; furthermore, it also represented a large-sized effect, $d = 0.87$

4.4 – Correlational analyses

In order to find a correlation between LexTALE scores, LA scores, and scores on the false-

friends task, a correlation analysis has been performed. No distinction has been made between

the regular track and the CLIL track, and because it involves correlations, the missing values

from the LexTALE are now missing values for LA scores and False-Friends test scores as

well. Bias corrected and accelerated bootstrap 95% CIs are reported in square brackets. The

correlational analysis showed that LexTALE scores were significantly correlated with LA

scores, $r = -.32$ [-.683, -.226], with $p < .005$, but were not significantly correlated with scores

on the False-Friends test, $r = -.03$ [-.460, .466]. However, scores on the False-Friends test

were significantly correlated with LA scores, $r = .53$ [.233, .703], with $p < .001$.

4.5 – Age of acquisition and attitude towards learning English

As the statistics showed no significant difference between the students from the regular VWO track and the CLIL VWO track regarding language awareness but did show a significant difference regarding the scores on the false-friends task, I wanted to look into other possible explanations for why the analysis did show a significant correlation between language awareness and scores on the false-friends task. For that reason I have analysed responses to other questions that are incorporated in the language background survey. Responses to the following two questions have been used for this analysis:

- How old were you when you started learning English?
- How enjoyable do you find it to learn English?

The younger students were when they first started learning English, the more they have been exposed to the language. As a result, this may have had an influence on their receptive word knowledge, including knowledge about false friends. Also, a positive attitude towards English may have influenced students' exposure to the language. Attitude can therefore also have had an influence on participants' receptive word knowledge, without having explicit knowledge of cognates or false friends.

Regarding the first question, participants could choose between three age ranges in which they started learning English. For this second question participants were asked to give a score between 1 and 10, with 1 meaning 'absolutely not' and 10 meaning 'very much'.

A correlation analysis has been performed to find correlations between the age of acquisition, LA scores, and scores on the false-friends task. No distinction has been made between the regular track and the CLIL track. The correlation analysis showed that the age of acquisition was not significantly correlated with LA scores, $r = -.11$ [-.516, .223], and was also not significantly correlated with scores on the False-Friends test, $r = -.21$ [-.514, .110].

Another correlational analysis has been done to find correlations between the joy in

learning English, LA scores, and scores on the false-friends task. Again, no distinction has been made between the regular track and the CLIL track. The analysis showed that the joy in learning English was significantly correlated with LA scores, $r = -.38$ [.098, .614], with $p < .005$. However, it was not significantly correlated with scores on the False-Friends test, $r = .29$ [.009, .520].

Chapter 5 – Discussion and conclusion

5.1 – Discussion

The analyses performed showed that there was no significant difference in LexTALE scores between the regular VWO students and the CLIL VWO students, and that there was also no difference in LA scores between the two groups. They did show, however, that there was a significant difference between the two groups regarding scores on the false-friends task, and that there was a significant correlation between LA scores and the scores on the false-friends task.

Unlike the results of the research mentioned by De Graaf and Koopman (2006), the results from my research showed no significant difference between the English proficiency of regular VWO students and CLIL VWO students that were tested in my research. The LexTALE is considered a reliable method of determining English proficiency, which means the method I used cannot account for the difference between my results and the results from previous research. However, my results might be divergent because of the small sample that was collected for this research. I was unable to collect enough data for this research, which means the results are not a good representation of a larger population. Also, the data for this test contained missing values. Nonetheless, I will use the data that has been collected to answer my research questions, remaining aware that my findings are not representative.

The results from the self-developed language awareness survey showed, as with the LexTALE, no significant difference between the regular VWO students and the CLIL VWO

students. In contrast to the LexTALE, this survey to determine students' level of language awareness was self-developed. This means that it is uncertain whether this survey is a reliable method of determining someone's level of language awareness. However, the results of this survey are interesting, because according to De Graaf and Koopman (2006), students from the CLIL track are exposed to teaching methods that are supposed to activate language awareness. However, as the results from my research do not show a significant difference between the regular and the CLIL track, it can be questioned whether language awareness is only activated through teaching methods that are specific in CLIL education, or if language awareness is also activated in students from the regular track through methods of explicit instruction used in the English classroom. Additionally, these results could also be explained by an above average interest in learning English for some individuals in relation to others in their group. This would mean that LA is not only a result of different teaching methods, but can also be a part of the individual without the influence of explicit instruction. As a result, differences in LA could occur within the group of regular VWO students.

Unlike with the LexTALE and the language awareness survey, the results from the false-friends task do show a significant difference between the regular VWO students and the CLIL VWO students. CLIL students scored significantly better than students from the regular track, although they do not have a significantly higher level of language awareness. These results are in line with the findings of Proctor and Mo (2009) that CLIL learners score better than monolingual EFL learners in cognate recognition tasks. However, a correlational analysis showed that there is a significant correlation between the level of language awareness and the scores in the false-friends task. These findings seem to contradict each other. Notwithstanding, it could be possible that there was a difference within the groups, rather than a difference between the groups. Although the analysis did not show a group effect, individual results may explain the correlation between LA scores and scores on the false-friends task.

This would mean that higher levels of LA do lead to a better performance in the false-friends task, and that EFL learners can also have higher levels of language awareness. Following this research, it cannot be concluded that CLIL has a significant influence on levels of LA.

Interestingly, the analysis showed no significant correlation between the LexTALE scores and scores on the false-friends task. This means that the difference in the scores of the false-friends task between the two groups cannot be explained by the students' proficiency. This result is interesting because the LexTALE tests proficiency on the basis of receptive word knowledge, which is also being tested in the false-friends task. For that reason a significant correlation between the LexTALE scores and the scores on the false-friends task was expected. However, the LexTALE was designed to determine the proficiency of advanced learners of English. My participants were in their second year of secondary school and can therefore not be considered advanced learners of English, and their test results may thus not provide an accurate perspective regarding their proficiency. This might explain the outcome of the correlational analysis for the LexTALE scores and the scores on the false-friends task.

It is possible that these inconsistencies can be related to design of my research, which consists of only one component that has been considered reliable, and two self-developed components. With the language awareness survey, whether the approach taken to determine a score was the most suitable can be questioned. Furthermore, when designing the false-friends task, false-friends pairs were chosen that could be deemed as false-friends pairs when looking at the English-Dutch translation students in their second year of secondary school are mostly likely presented with. Following this idea some pairs in this research have been labelled as false-friends, while in some contexts, however, they are not. The pairs I am uncertain of are 'invalid-invalide', 'small-smal', 'slim-slim', 'offer-offer', and 'hard-hard'. Although these pairs are in fact not false-friends in all cases, they were still included in my task as false-

friends because the Dutch translations given are either only partial cognates, false-friends in the sentence that is provided, or are so uncommon that students in their second year of secondary school will not have learned these Dutch words as correct translations for their English counterparts. Nonetheless, marking them as wrong when determining a score for the false-friends task might not have been appropriate. If these pairs had been scores as correct, the statistical analyses might have produced different outcomes that could provide a more clear perspective concerning the research questions. Another option would be to not include these pairs in the task.

Finally, the results from another correlation analysis showed that there was no significant correlation between the age of acquisition and the level of language awareness, and that there was also no significant correlation between the age of acquisition and the scores in the false-friends task. Moreover, the results showed that there was a significant correlation between the joy in learning English and the level of language awareness, but that there was no significant correlation between the joy in learning English and the scores in the false-friends task.

5.2 – Conclusion

In summary, my hypothesis that VWO students from the CLIL track have significantly higher levels of language awareness in their second year of secondary school than VWO students from the regular track has therefore been falsified. However, my second hypothesis, which stated that CLIL students score significantly better on the false-friends task than students from the regular track, is supported by the results in Table 3. Also, my third hypothesis, which stated that students who have a higher level of language awareness score significantly better on the false-friends task, is partially supported by the results from the correlational analysis. However, this does not provide an explanation for why there is no significant difference between the two groups regarding their levels of language awareness in contrast to the

significant difference regarding their scores on the false-friends tasks, and therefore further research may be done to explain this inconsistency. The significant correlation between the joy in learning English and the level of language awareness provided some insight on this matter, but as my own research contained some questionable decisions and flaws, it is not a reasonable representation of a larger population. Notwithstanding this conclusion, my research may still provide an interesting and useful basis for further research regarding language awareness in second language education, and its relation to vocabulary learning.

References

Admiraal, W., Westhoff, G., & De Bot, K. (2006). Evaluation of bilingual secondary

    education in the Netherlands: Students' language proficiency in English. *Educational*

    Research and Evaluation, 12(1), 75-93. doi:10.1080/13803610500392160

Agustín-Llach, M. (2016). Age and type of instruction (CLIC vs. traditional EFL) in lexical

    development. *International Journal Of English Studies, 16*(1), 75-96.

    doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2016/1/220691

Croft, W. (2008). Evolutionary linguistics. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 37*, 219-234.

    Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/20622622

De Bot, K. (2007). Language teaching in a changing world. *The Modern Language*

    Journal, 91(2), 274-276. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4626013

De Graaf, R., & Koopman, G.J. (2006). *Didactische richtlijnen bij tweetalig onderwijs:*

    Onderzoek naar didactische gedragingen van docenten bij tweetalig onderwijs.

    Utrecht: Drukkerij Zuidam & Uithof B.V.

Ethnologue. (2018, June 10). English in the Language Cloud [webpage].

    Retrieved from https://www.ethnologue.com/cloud/eng

Garrison, D. (1990). Inductive strategies for teaching Spanish-English

    cognates. *Hispania, 73*(2), 508-512. doi:10.2307/342861

Gass, S.M. (2013). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. New York, NY:

    Routledge.

Hendrickson, J.M. (1991). On communicative language teaching. *Hispania, 74*(1). DOI:

    10.2307/344583

Jarvis, G. (1983). The psychology of second-language learning: A declaration of

    independence. *The Modern Language Journal,67*(4), 393-402.

Kennedy, S. (2012). Exploring the relationship between Language Awareness and second

    language use. *TESOL Q, 46*, 398-408.

Language Partners. (2018, June 14). False friends between Dutch and English [webpage].

    Retrieved from https://www.languagepartners.nl/engels/false-friends-between-dutch

    and-english/

Learndutch. (2018, June 14). False friends [webpage]. Retrieved from

    https://www.learndutch.org/false-friends/

Lemhöfer, K., & Broersma, M. (2012). Introducing LexTALE: A quick and valid Lexical Test

    for Advanced Learners of English. *Behavior Research Methods, 44*, 325-343.

Nuffic. (2018, June 14). Vroeg vreemdetalenonderwijs [webpage]. Retrieved from

    https://www.nuffic.nl/primair-onderwijs/vroeg-vreemdetalenonderwijs-vvto

Otwinowska, A. (2016). *Cognate vocabulary in language acquisition and use: Attitudes,*

    awareness, activation. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Perales, A. A. (2017). *Do Dutch/English cognates and word frequency affect English*

    vocabulary testing in secondary bilingual education?: Evidence from the Peabody

    Picture Vocabulary Test (Master Thesis). Retrieved from Radboud University

    Scriptierepository.

Proctor, C., & Mo, E. (2009). The relationship between Cognate Awareness and English

    comprehension among Spanish–English bilingual fourth grade students. *TESOL*

    Quarterly, 43(1), 126-136. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/27784991

Sunderman, G., & Schwartz, A. (2008). Using cognates to investigate cross-language competition in second language processing. *TESOL Quarterly, 42*(3), 527-536. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40264482

Svalberg, A. (2007). Language Awareness and language learning. *Language Teaching, 40*(4), 287-308. doi:10.1017/S0261444807004491

Svalberg, A. (2012). Language Awareness in language learning and teaching: A research agenda. *Language* Teaching, 45(3), 376-388. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000079

Taavitsainen, I., & Pahta, P. (2003). English in Finland: Globalisation, language awareness and questions of identity. *English Today, 19*(4), 3-15. doi:10.1017/S0266078403004024

Unsworth, S., Persson, L., Prins, T., & De Bot, K. (2014). An investigation of factors affecting early foreign language learning in the Netherlands. *Applied Linguistics, 36*(5), 527-548. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt052

<u>Appendices</u>

Appendix 1

(Taal)achtergrond

Hier volgen een aantal vragen over jouw taalachtergrond en jouw mening over het leren van taal.

Geslacht

- o Man
- o Vrouw
- o Zeg ik liever niet

Welk soort onderwijs volg je?

- o Regulier VWO/Atheneum/Gymnasium
- o Tweetalig VWO/Atheneum/Gymnasium

Welke andere talen heb je geleerd? Meerdere antwoorden mogelijk.

- ☐ Engels
- ☐ Frans
- ☐ Duits
- ☐ Spaans
- ☐ Chinees
- ☐ Italiaans
- ☐ Anders: _____

Hoe oud was je toen je begon met het leren van Engels

- o Jonger dan 8
- o 8-10 jaar oud
- o 10-12 jaar oud

Hoe zou jij je algemene vaardigheden met betrekking tot het Engels scoren?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Zeer slecht	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O uitstekend

Hoe leuk vind je het om Engels te leren?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Helemaal niet leuk	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O geweldig

Hoe zelfverzekerd ben je om in het Engels te communiceren?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Helemaal niet	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	heel erg

Hoe belangrijk vind je het om Engels te leren?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Helemaal niet	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	heel erg

Stelling: "Bij het leren van een taal leer ik zoveel mogelijk de grammatica regels en de woordjes."

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Helemaal niet mee eens	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	helemaal mee eens

Stelling: "Bij het leren van een taal let ik op hoe de taal gebruikt wordt in de praktijk."

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Helemaal niet mee eens	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	helemaal mee eens

Stelling: "Ik leer talen omdat dit moet op school."

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Helemaal niet mee eens	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	helemaal mee eens

Stelling: "Ik leer talen omdat ik het belangrijk en leuk vind om meerdere talen te kennen."

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Helemaal niet mee eens	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	helemaal mee eens

Stelling: "Wanneer ik een taal leer merk ik snel de verschillen en overeenkomsten tussen talen op."

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Helemaal niet mee eens	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	helemaal mee eens

Stelling: "Wanneer ik een taal leer merk ik snel de verschillen en overeenkomsten tussen talen op."

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Helemaal niet mee eens	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	helemaal mee eens

Appendix 2

Is het de juiste vertaling?

Hierna volgen 40 items, waarbij het jouw taak is om aan te geven of het gegeven woord een juiste vertaling is van het/de woord(en) in HOOFDLETTERS in de zin. Is het een goede vertaling, selecteer dan 'ja'; is het niet de juiste vertaling, selecteer dan 'nee'.

De zin zal altijd in het Engels zijn, het gegeven woord in het Nederlands. Probeer niet te lang na te denken over elk item, en GEBRUIK GEEN WOORDENBOEK. Dit is heel belangrijk.

Dit deel van het onderzoek duurt ongeveer 5-8 minuten. Daarna volgt nog 1 vraag.

1. You were very BRAVE, standing up to him like that.

17. **braaf** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

○ Ja
○ Nee

2. The girl did not know what to do, so she asked for HELP.

18. **hulp** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

○ Ja
○ Nee

3. These clothes are made of strange FABRIC.

19. **fabriek** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

○ Ja
○ Nee

4. That painting is ACTUALLY a fake.

20. **actueel** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

○ Ja
○ Nee

5. He stuffed his MOUTH with food.

21. **mond** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

○ Ja
○ Nee

6. Your reason is INVALID.

22. invalide *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

○ Ja

○ Nee

7. You could see the CASTLE in the distance.

23. kasteel *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

○ Ja

○ Nee

8. If I don't eat I am going to STARVE.

24. sterven *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

○ Ja

○ Nee

9. The girl cried because she had hit her ELBOW.

25. elleboog *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

○ Ja

○ Nee

10. A beautiful and big FOUNTAIN is located in the city centre.

26. fontein *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

○ Ja

○ Nee

11. BEWARE of the dangers of texting and driving.

27. bewaren *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

○ Ja

○ Nee

12. There was a parrot on the man's SHOULDER.

28. schouder *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

○ Ja

○ Nee

13. That is a very SMALL door.

29. **smal** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

14. The birthdays of every family member are written on the CALENDAR.

30. **kalender** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

15. That girl is very SLIM.

31. **slim** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

16. The cat has scratched its owner with its sharp CLAWS.

32. **klauwen** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

17. There are many MUGS in the cabinet.

33. **muggen** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

18. The firefighters are in CONTROL of the fire.

34. **controleren** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

19. He is GLAD that you came by.

35. **glad** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

20. That man always PEERS through my window.

36. peren *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

21. I would like to make you an OFFER.

37. offer *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

22. The pencils are SORTED by colour.

38. gesorteerd *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

23. I am the WORST painter ever.

39. worst *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

24. You will EVENTUALLY win if you keep trying.

40. eventueel *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

25. Watch out for DEER on the road.

41. dier *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

26. The VASE on the table is empty.

42. vaas *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

27. My sister has sprained her ANKLE.

43. enkel *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

28. I WILL go with you.

44. willen *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

29. The candle's FLAME is getting bigger.

45. vlam *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

30. Do you own a CANOE?

46. kano *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

31. The STAGE is too small for six people.

47. stage *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

32. What is the MEANING of this?

48. mening *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

33. Have you heard of the GENIE who grants wishes?

49. genie *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja

◯ Nee

34. I like going to the COAST during the summer holidays.

50. **kust** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja
◯ Nee

35. It was very HARD to obtain these items.

51. **hard** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja
◯ Nee

36. That farmer grows RARE fruits and vegetables.

52. **rare** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja
◯ Nee

37. I don't like going to the WAREHOUSE.

53. **warenhuis** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja
◯ Nee

38. The HEDGE between our garden and our neighbours garden is very high.

54. **heg** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja
◯ Nee

39. A lot of ACORNS have fallen to the ground.

55. **eekhoorns** *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

◯ Ja
◯ Nee

40. Do you have any PETS?

56. petten *
Markeer slechts één ovaal.

- ⬭ Ja
- ⬭ Nee