

New Challenges in the Teaching and Learning of Modern Languages in Twenty-First Century Europe

IGNACIO M. PALACIOS MARTÍNEZ
UNIVERSITY OF SANTIAGO DE COMPOSTELA

Although the original paper presented in the XI AICLU conference was concerned with both challenges and developments in the teaching and learning of modern languages in Europe, I have now decided to restrict myself to challenges only for reasons of space and because several issues regarding recent developments and initiatives in this particular area have already been published elsewhere (Trim, 1981; Fermín Sierra & Hernández González, 1999; Cenoz & Jessner, 2000; Council of Europe, 2000; 2001; Trim & Van Ek, 2001; Palacios, 2004) and they are also easily accessible in a wide range of documents and formats. This implies that in this article I will be mainly dealing with what I consider to be the most important challenges language teaching professionals will have to face in the future in the short and long run. By language teaching professionals I mean not only teachers but also administrators, materials producers, educational authorities and planners, teacher trainers, language testers, applied linguists, researchers and anyone who may be directly or indirectly related to this field.

No one can deny that language teaching has gone through important changes in the last few decades as a result of several conditioning factors: progress in general Linguistics, Pedagogy and Psychology, new findings of second language acquisition theories and important sociological transformations, namely the growing nature of a globalised world with the rapid widespread of new technologies, and the multiple contacts and exchanges of peoples and communities with different language, social and cultural backgrounds. All this proves that language teaching does not exist in the abstract but it is influenced by a wide range of individual factors and sociological and pedagogical variables of different nature. Back to 1972, Wilkins already referred to this issue as follows:

Language learning, like any other kind of learning, will partly depend on characteristics of the learners, and for an understanding of this we will look to sociology and social anthropology. Fairly obviously, the context in which learning takes place will be important. We cannot ignore the resources that are available to the teacher. We can see what assistance can be provided by technology and how far proper administrative arrangements can be made to

facilitate language learning. Language learning is not considered to be in isolation from other developments in education either (Wilkins, 1972: 215).

In the last decades the learning of languages has become a priority and this has been especially true in the European continent where institutions such as the Council of Europe and the European Union have searched for unity and have favoured the mobility and mutual knowledge of European citizens.

In spite of all the efforts that have been made to promote modern language education, we are all aware that there is still a long way to go and that new initiatives and measures of different character should be taken up in the next few years if we really want to have European citizens who are not, so to speak, illiterate in the knowledge and actual use of modern languages.

In the pages that follow, I will raise a number of questions stating what will be the most important challenges Europeans will have to confront sooner or later as regards the teaching and learning of modern languages. I will also attempt to give a tentative reply to those questions or at least provide some guidelines that could be explored. Some of these will still remain open because of their own wideness and abstraction, some others will be left incomplete because of their difficulty for finding a firm answer.

- 1. In 2002, the European Union Heads of State and governments set a long-term objective: all citizens should be able to speak two languages in addition to their mother tongue. This is generally known as the mother tongue plus 2. How can this objective be achieved? What educational policies should be adopted in this direction?**

The first question that should be addressed is what we really mean by “being able to speak a language”. In my view, this means being able to communicate efficiently, that is, being able to make oneself understood and to understand other speakers of the language. It is true that the linguistic and teaching situation in the different European countries varies considerably from one to the other¹ but at least several general considerations can be provided.

First of all, modern languages should occupy a central place in the primary and secondary school curriculum and they should not be regarded as secondary or just complementary; they should be considered of vital importance for the personal and

academic development of the learner. In this line, resources should be invested on the production and provision of teaching materials and on effective teacher training programmes. It is advisable that pupils should start with the study of one foreign language from an early age and after 4 or 5 years they be introduced in the second modern language.² A third optional foreign language could also form part of the school curriculum at the upper secondary level. It should be borne in mind that, according to the figures obtained in the last Eurobarometer dealing specifically with languages (see note 1), 50% of the Europeans support the view that every European citizen should be able to speak at least two foreign languages.

The Council of Europe in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment* (CEF) (2001, 171-173) gives an account of two main possible scenarios or curriculum models where this could be effective. In the first setting the first foreign language is introduced in primary education with the aim of promoting language awareness, that is, it is important that children understand that there are people who speak a different language from their own and they get prepared to move away from ethnocentrism. At lower secondary school the first foreign language is continued trying to develop the learners' communicative competence; at the same time the second foreign language is introduced with an emphasis on comprehension over production skills. Finally, at the upper secondary level, the first foreign language starts being used for regular activities and for the teaching of other disciplines. Simultaneously, the second foreign language is maintained concentrating on the organisation of discourse and on different text types. Side by side with these two foreign languages, a third optional one is offered by promoting the use of learning strategies pupils have already experienced and acquired with the two previous languages.

In contrast with the former scenario, in the second curriculum model the first foreign language is introduced at primary educational stages with an emphasis on communication. At lower secondary school learners are made aware of their approach to language learning in the study of their native, first and second foreign languages. At this stage while developing communicating skills in the first foreign language, teachers could pay special attention to the socio-cultural and sociolinguistic features of the second foreign language. In this line texts taken from different media could be used for this general aim. In this second model, as depicted by the Council of Europe, learners at the upper secondary level would opt for a third foreign language for mainly vocational

purposes, according to their professional or academic orientation. In short, we can say that in the two curriculum models learners have access and contact with three foreign languages although these are studied in the two models with different perspectives and purposes.

In theory, these two scenarios seem to be perfectly feasible; however, the conditions and the language learning and teaching tradition of countries such as Spain, Italy, France, Greece, Poland, Portugal, United Kingdom, to mention just a few, clearly indicate that this ideal plan is not easy to be followed and implemented. It would be perhaps better to start with more modest objectives and then aim at more ambitious ones. I would claim the education system is working if a learner at the end of their secondary education is competent in one foreign language and can “survive” in a second one. Furthermore, it is also important that children and teenagers acquire the skills and familiarise with the tools to be able to learn languages on their own without the physical presence of a tutor or a teacher. More emphasis should be then placed on the learning component rather than on the actual teaching.

As regards the methodology to be used, and in line with the principles outlined above, this should be practical and communicative. Languages should be studied in order to be used rather than to be known. Language learning cannot just be the progressive assimilation of linguistic knowledge. Teachers in charge of the language courses should exchange ideas and work together designing and planning a number of activities which could be applied to all the languages taught in the institution.

In the last few years content based learning (CBL), or content and language integrated learning (CLIL) has gained more and more popularity throughout Europe; not only at higher education level but also at primary and secondary stages. Having multilingualism as the ultimate aim, the practitioners of this method teach the different subjects of the curriculum through the foreign language. This means that students learn both content and the modern language simultaneously. This model may adopt different forms according to the role played by the foreign language used as medium of instruction. In total immersion programmes all subjects are taught in the foreign language while in some partial immersion contexts 50% or even a lower proportion of schooling is conducted in the target language. These content-based programmes may bring very positive results in the long run but they should be very carefully planned taking into account the sociolinguistic situation of the learners and their needs as well as the availability and training of the teachers who are involved in them.³

Pedagogic tools such as the European Language Portfolio (ELP) could also help in that direction so that students after a number of years can become plurilingual and obtain a global linguistic competence, being able to draw connections across languages and being aware of the importance and role of all the languages they are acquainted with.⁴

All this will not be achieved without the aid of the administration and of the learners' parents and tutors. Educational authorities should establish the teaching and learning of languages as a top priority with huge investments and large scale programmes to attain this end. This principle is apparently strongly supported by 67% of Europeans who explicitly claim that language teaching should become a political priority (Eurobarometer 64.3, 2006: 60).

In the light of this, all schools, for example, should be provided with a language resource centre and other language learning facilities so that students can have ample access to them and can learn and practice the language autonomously. Parents and tutors should also be made aware of the importance of languages by organising talks and short seminars where all these issues would be discussed at length. Finally, extracurricular activities and initiatives to promote the knowledge of modern languages should be conducted so that learners understand that the use of languages is important and that they can do a wide range of things with them. Moreover, learners should be made sensitive to the educational and cultural values associated with the study of languages; the learning of a language does not consist only in the command of a code but it has further implications, namely familiarity with a new culture and community, the fostering of attitudes of tolerance, respect and openness towards other customs and habits, and new ways of interpreting reality.

It is true that the command of two languages by European citizens is not something that can be accomplished in a short time but the first stones should be laid on so that this far-reaching target can be met in the long if not in the medium run. No doubt, new technologies such as the internet can also play a central role since they help break barriers and bring people together.

2. How can minority languages survive and their learning be favoured or, at least, not neglected in a global Europe/world?

Europe is an old continent with a long tradition and its rich linguistic diversity should not be discarded or ignored; rather the opposite, minority languages should be promoted and should not be abandoned. Educational authorities have the obligation to preserve this linguistic heritage that forms part of our own culture and, ultimately, of our own human condition. This is, in fact, one of the three basic principles included in the preamble to Recommendation R (82) 18 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe that is transcribed in the first pages of the CEF.

The rich heritage of diverse languages and cultures in Europe is a valuable common resource to be protected and developed, and ... a major educational effort is needed to convert that diversity from a barrier to communication into a source of mutual enrichment and understanding (Council of Europe, 2001: 2).

When one starts exploring the world of minority languages in Europe, we realise how important it is. There are more than sixty different minority languages in Europe and over 40 million people speak them.⁵ Consequently, there is no reason why these languages should receive little or no attention at all. The latter are perfectly compatible with the study of the so considered more international languages. The CEF repeatedly mentions that we should search for “more effective international communication with respect for identity and cultural diversity”. It is true that a certain tension may arise between the need for improving communication and the promotion of language diversification as Dobson (2006-17) rightly points out. However, this apparent conflict implies a challenge that we have to acknowledge and confront. In the light of this, the school curriculum should reserve a place for minority languages in those territorial areas where these fulfil an important social, cultural and communicative function. Learning to value our languages and those around us help us in the study of new additional ones since they all form part of our global communicative competence.⁶

It should also be kept in mind that languages can also be studied at different levels. The descriptors of the common reference levels allow us to assess and recognise partial competences, promoting mutual comprehension and drawing connections and comparisons between them. Once again there is a call for working all together from the administration to the different practitioners in the search of common goals.

3. How can foreign languages be made life-long learning goals and how can they be made available to all Europeans?

One of the problems we at present confront is the lack of continuation or follow-up in the learning of languages. Our children devote a number of years to the study of languages but on many occasions, curiously enough, they abandon this activity with the completion of their secondary school. It seems as if they have just learned it all or at least enough of it, and they would not require to expand their language knowledge. Although, as mentioned above, the general picture changes considerably from country to country, this is not usually the case. Most European secondary school graduates obtain the minimum skills to communicate in only one foreign language but they still necessitate further practice. Furthermore, the need for practising the language is essential to keep it alive if one does not want to fossilise, backslide or simply forget about the language. This is precisely so because of the special condition of the second language acquisition process as the majority of specialists in this area has explained (Selinker, 1992; Brown, 1987; Krashen, 1988; Ellis, 1994). This may justify why the study of foreign languages should be made a life-long learning objective and go beyond the boundaries of a school or even a university curriculum. Very frequently massive investments of money and resources are made without considering how to make a follow-up of them. If people after 18 or so gradually forget about the foreign languages they studied for a long period of time to the point that they cannot minimally communicate with them, we are really wasting energy and resources.

Since the beginning of the 80's of the previous century, a network of public schools of languages in Spain, generally known as *Escuelas Oficiales de Idiomas* (EOI), that is, Official Schools of Languages, was set up with the aim of responding to this deficiency in the system. This has contributed to a relative improvement in the knowledge of foreign languages by Spaniards but it has not really solved the problem. One feels that the offer of language courses as part of the higher education system is a positive policy with a view to making language learning as long-life learning as possible but it is not enough. This has more to do with teaching and learning habits that have to be revised and, if necessary, modified. In a language learner-centred curriculum typical of our times, as mentioned above, an emphasis should be laid on learning rather than on teaching and on learning to learn more than on anything else. Learners should be given the tools to learn on their own, they should be made more autonomous and more responsible for their own learning. Teachers should raise learning awareness so that students, when they finish their compulsory education, know how to cope with language

learning and have the skills to keep on broadening their knowledge and practising the language. In addition to this, languages should be a requirement in most university degrees as is the case in many USA higher education institutions, or at least students should be given the possibility of choosing them as optional courses with the same academic value and weight as any other discipline.

Grants and scholarships to follow language courses in the native countries should also be granted to those student applicants with a good academic record and a limited family income; school exchanges across different countries should also be promoted, being accompanied with financial and administrative aid. The educational administration should also finance any programme and research project that would search for the development of language skills. Obviously, all this will require a follow-up programme and an evaluation of all these actions to make sure that resources are not wasted but spent adequately.

The creation of language resource centres or “Houses of Languages” or “Language Institutes” with a similar organisational structure and rationale to that of public libraries could also help in that direction. These would be the right environments to consult a dictionary or a reference manual, to listen to a CD in the foreign language studied, to read a novel in the target language, to consolidate grammar or vocabulary by doing exercises with the provision of self-check answer keys, or simply to watch a film in the foreign language. The premises and infrastructures of these institutions could also serve as the meeting point for people who want to gather together to practice a language or to exchange views on different cultural areas of the target language communities. Thus, the layperson would know that there are places where they can go to keep up the language competence they already possess and even improve it. If the setting up of a network of language resource centres entailed a considerable outlay, particular areas of the existing public libraries could be easily transformed for that purpose with the appropriate learning materials. Ideally there should also be specialised staff who would work as language tutors and advisors dealing with general questions and queries, and at the same time organising and coordinating the activities conducted in those establishments.

Pedagogical materials such as the European Language Portfolio (ELP) can also help to make language learning as life-long learning. One of the principal aims of the ELP is precisely to keep a record of all our language experiences and progress from early age to adulthood. The conception underlying it is to keep up-to-date in the

language learning process so that we can be in almost permanent contact with the languages we know and we are learning at different stages of our life. All our language experiences have a place in the ELP, from our own native language to our second, third or fourth languages; furthermore, one of its advantages is that any kind of language competence or knowledge obtained is valued, independently of whether it was achieved in formal academic settings or in informal contexts. The language passport, apart from providing an overview of our condition as language learner, makes us self-assess in the languages we know and asks us to take a clear position about it. The language biography places concentrates on the pedagogical side by encouraging us to reflect upon different language learning and intercultural experiences and training us in the use of learning strategies. Finally, the dossier tries to put it all together acting as a documental proof of the statements and decisions made previously with the rest of the components of the ELP. The need for updating all these documents at regular periods of time promotes language learning as a constant and permanent process, and makes the learner aware of the importance of language practice.

Apart from the preceding life-long language learning actions and initiatives of an academic nature, we could also think of some other with a more social role. Without intending to be exhaustive, we could refer to the showing of films in the original version of their production by providing, if necessary, the subtitles in the corresponding L1. This is a policy already adopted in some member states of the European Union, such as the Scandinavian countries, that could be easily extended to all of them as the benefits seem to outnumber the possible negative effects.

Governments should also try to present to the citizenship the most relevant administrative norms and regulations in three or different languages as this would help readers to arouse their curiosity for learning languages and would allow them to compare the different versions. If at the beginning, this could be critically regarded as unnecessary or irrelevant, with the time it would be considered as a normal procedure and it would have positive effects on language learning.

Mass media would also have an important function to play. They should not be satisfied with including in their year schedule some lessons of foreign language courses; programmes in other languages different from the official or national could also be shown at certain slots of the day for those interested in language learning.

The above are just mere examples of simple actions that could be taken. There are evidently many others that could be carried out; it is just a question of being

imaginative to come up with additional plans which could serve this purpose and which may be simple, easy to be implemented and not necessarily very expensive.

4. How can the Common European Framework of Reference (CEF) be implemented and become really effective?

No doubt, the CEF, published in 2001, meant a great innovation in language learning in Europe. The CEF had its origin in the conference held in Rüslikon in 1991. The participants in this meeting were aware of the impact of previous work carried out by the Council of Europe as the Threshold Level. They perceived that a more global work was urgently required. There was certainly the need of having a reference manual which could give unity and coherence to language learning and teaching in all the member states, favour co-operation among educational institutions of the different countries, set the basis for a common recognition of language certificates and qualifications, and establish common objectives for all those involved in language teaching and learning. The first stage of this long way to plurilingualism in the context of pluriculturalism was completed with the publication and diffusion of this document; now we face the second and transcendental stage: the implementation and put into practice of the principles suggested in it.

It is important that all language teachers and learners can have access to it and can be informed of their main purposes and contents. As is at times a dense book, principally addressed to language specialists, simplified, summarised or reduced versions of it should be available to all, with particular reference to those sections of utmost relevance: general objectives pursued, approach adopted, common reference levels and assessment. According to the profile of the learners, teachers could include as part of their language courses an informative session about all these questions, underlining the important need of working all together to achieve plurilingualism in Europe and drawing attention on the importance of adopting attitudes of respect and tolerance for any linguistic and cultural identity. The ELP certainly moves in that direction and is helping to disseminate the objectives and principles of the CEF; however, it is regarded by some as too academic and as a teaching instrument which presents serious problems to be integrated with the normal teaching activities within formal education. We need more practical examples of its development and actual use in the classroom at different levels. Teachers demand practical guidelines that may help

them work with it in the classroom with average learners. The existing teacher's guide of the ELP is useful and helpful in that respect although more materials for teachers in that line could fill the gap generally existing between theory and practice.

An effort should also be made by educational authorities, language teaching institutions, language testers and materials producers to accommodate and adapt to the principles established in the CEF. An informal survey carried out through the analysis of web pages of universities, language schools and publishers in several European countries clearly indicates that this adaptation process is moving very slowly; there are still many teaching institutions that ignore all together the common European reference levels and continue to operate with the traditional and most of the times ambiguous labels of basic, beginner, pre-intermediate, intermediate, upper intermediate, advanced, etc. Something similar happens with some of the modern language textbooks that do not take on board the principles and implications of the CEF. This shows that more implementation work should be conducted if we really want to make the CEF operational and effective.

In line with this, teacher training programmes for modern language teachers should include a module on the main objectives, principles and implications of both the CEF and the ELP. Special attention should be devoted to the common reference levels. Teachers should get fully acquainted with the nature of the descriptors and should learn how to apply them to their own teaching situation. The ELP with its double informative and pedagogical functions should also be the object of study. As mentioned above, teachers like learners need real and concrete examples of what can be done with these instruments. The creation of interest groups for teacher development along these lines could also be very positive. Innovations in language teaching will not be entirely successful unless teachers are well-informed about them and they have received the adequate training for carrying them out.

5. How can students' mobility programmes be improved?

No one would at present deny that students' mobility programmes are playing an important role in the European educational system and are having very positive benefits for the improvement of education in general terms. All these programme exchanges, Socrates-Erasmus, Comenius, Gruntwig, Leonardo, etc are favouring the mutual knowledge and understanding of Europeans, the reciprocal recognition of qualifications obtained in different academic contexts, the development of language and intercultural

skills, and the fostering of attitudes of tolerance and respect towards diverging communities from their own. The students and teachers who participate in programmes of this type generally have very positive views about them and do not regret having taken part in them.

In spite of this optimistic picture, there is still room for improvement and that is precisely the topic at issue in the following. I will be focusing particularly on questions affecting language learning; administrative issues will not be considered as they fall outside the scope of this paper.

Firstly, the language courses generally offered to mobility students are of a general nature disregarding their linguistic, academic and personal needs and interests. It would be advisable to have first general intensive language courses and then specific seminars taking into account the nature and subject matter of the subjects they are going to take. This means that after following preliminary intensive courses, these students could be then classified into three or four groups according to their field (Humanities, Law and Social Sciences, Health Sciences and Technical Sciences) where more emphasis would be placed on academic skills and on the vocabulary typical of their speciality. In other words, there is the need of courses which can suit adequately to these students' lacks and needs. From a language perspective, it could also be a good idea to take advantage of the resources of having speakers of different language backgrounds to organise conversation clubs and tandem exchanges so that the foreign and national students would be mutually benefited and would develop their language skills. Furthermore, this could help to integrate foreign students into the ordinary life of the host university and students.

Secondly, we perceive the lack of teaching and learning materials addressed specifically to mobility students and which have learners' needs directly in mind. The profile of mobility students is quite special since they have to learn the target language for several specific purposes: a) to be able to deal with typical situations of daily life (going shopping, making a phone call, asking for and giving information, giving personal details, renting a room or a flat, talking about themselves, booking a ticket, etc.); b) to be in a good position to follow university studies in the foreign language. This implies attending lectures actively, taking notes, reading, summarising and extracting relevant information from academic texts, understanding messages and directions, writing essays and reports, doing oral presentations and interacting effectively with teachers and peers; c) to have the necessary intercultural skills to

accommodate to a new cultural environment with different customs, habits, traditions, values and conventions from their own; d) to be prepared personally and emotionally to face changes in their life as a result of a complete new situation.

In this respect, the CMC project has made a great contribution since it has developed and produced teaching and learning materials that have mobility students permanently in mind. All the personal, academic and cultural requirements mentioned above are perfectly met with the two CMC modules. Furthermore, it is also characterised by its flexibility since it can be used as a self-study package, in combination with a traditional course and even most of the units can be exploited independently.

Thirdly, there are very few follow-up evaluation studies intended to assess the effects and repercussions of these programmes which have been conducted from multiple perspectives. If these actions are not seriously and periodically assessed, it is difficult to know what has to be implemented and how they can be improved in the future. Benefits would also be gained from the experience of previous students in the same or similar situations.

Fourthly, local and host coordinators should play a more relevant role. Intercommunication should be favoured and monitored by the university international offices and should not be left to the discretion of the professionals involved.

In this paper I have adopted the attitude of looking ahead to the future to reflect upon the challenges we will have sooner or later to confront in the teaching and learning of modern languages in Europe. It was not my intention to provide firm answers or solutions but to raise a number of questions that will have to be carefully discussed by representatives of the different sectors involved in this field. It is evident that the teaching and learning of languages should be given special priority in the next few years if we want to construct a European union where its citizens show attitudes of tolerance and mutual respect, cooperate among themselves in all walks of life, not only economically but also socially and culturally, develop personally, improve professional skills and competences and understand one another.

I am totally convinced that the knowledge of languages will definitely pave the way for all that and European and national authorities, decision makers at the different levels should be fully aware of it.

References

- Brinton, Donna M., Snow, Marguerite, and Bingham Wesche, Marjorie. (1989). *Content-Based Language Instruction*. New York: Newbury House.
- Brown, H. Douglas. (1987). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, New York: Prentice Hall.
- Cenoz, Jasone, and Genesee, Fred. (1998). *Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and Multilingual Education*. Cleveland: Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, Jasone, and Jessner, Ulrike. (2000). *English in Europe. The Acquisition of a Third Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, David. (1987). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, David. (2000). *Language Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dobson, Alan. (2006). Algunos aspectos de las políticas del Consejo de Europa para la educación lingüística: El *Marco Común Europeo de Referencia* y el *Portfolio Europeo de las Lenguas*. In: Cassany, Daniel (ed.), *El Portfolio europeo de las lenguas y sus aplicaciones en el aula*. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, pp. 13-35.
- Ellis, Rod. (1994). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, Robert Keith, and Swain, Merrill. (1997). *Immersion Education: International Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krashen, Stephen. (1988). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Lengyel, Zsoltak, and Singleton, David. (1995). *A Critical Look at the Critical Period. The Age Factor in Second Language Acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- López Boullón, Rosa. (2004). Learning through content: a way towards multilingualism. In: Lorenzo Modia, María Jesús (ed.), *All in All: A Plural View of Our Teaching and Learning*. A Coruña: Universidade da Coruña, British Council and APIGA, pp. 177-186.
- Muñoz, Carmen (ed.) (2004). *Age and the Rate of Foreign Language Learning*. Clevedon. Multilingual Matters.

- Palacios Martínez, Ignacio M. (2004). La enseñanza y el aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras: Una perspectiva europea. In: Salaberri Ramiro, Sagrario (ed.), *Nuevas formas de aprendizaje en lenguas extranjeras*. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, pp. 155-184.
- Selinker, Larry. (1992). *Rediscovering Interlanguage*. London: Longman.
- Siguan, Miguel. (1996). *La Europa de las lenguas*. Madrid: Alianza S.L.
- Singleton, David, and Ryan, Lisa. (2004). *Language Acquisition: The Age Factor*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Snow, Catherine E. and, Hoefnagel-Hoehle, Marian. (1977). Age differences in the pronunciation of foreign sounds. *Language and Speech* 20: 357-365.
- Trim, John. (1981). *Project 4-Modern Languages Programme 1971-81: Report Presented by the CDCC Project Group 4 with a Resume*. Council of Europe: Strasbourg.
- Trim, John, and Van EK, Jan Ante. (2001). The work of the Council of Europe in the field of modern languages, 1957-2001. Retrieved October 15, 2007, from:
<http://ecml.at/efsz/files/Trim.pdf>.

¹For further information on this area, see the special Eurobarometers (EB54.1 and EB64.3, *European and languages and Europeans and their languages* respectively, dating from 2001 and 2006, published by the Directorate General for Education and Culture of the Council of Europe).

Being aware of the great differences existing in the provision of foreign language teaching across the European Union member states, the Barcelona European Council of March 2002 decided to establish a linguistic competence indicator to provide these countries with information that could be used to introduce changes and adjustments in their approach to foreign language teaching and learning. This action plan will be carried out in the next three years and it will consist of the administration of a proficiency test to a selected group of students. Similar criteria will be used in all the countries involved in order to obtain reliable and comparable results.

² The importance of the age factor and its impact on language learning together with the implications for the organisation of the curriculum has been widely discussed in the literature. See, for example, Snow and Hoefnagel-Hoehle (1977), Lengyel and Singleton (1995), Singleton and Ryan (2004) and Muñoz (2006).

³ More information on this approach to language teaching can be obtained in Cenoz & Genesee (1998), Brinton, Snow & Bingham Wesche (1989), Johnson and Swain (1997) and López Boullón (2004).

⁴ The CEF makes a very useful distinction between the concepts of “multilingualism” and “plurilingualism”. Multilingualism is simply the knowledge of several languages. Plurilingualism, however, implies not only the command of several languages but the building up of “a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact (2001: 4). According to this approach, languages are not kept in independent and separate mental compartments; language users are competent in different languages and are able to draw connections and comparisons between them, applying strategies that will favour communication.

⁵ Crystal (1987:37) lists the following ones as indigenous to Europe (not counting those belonging to immigrant minority communities): Basque, Breton, Catalan, Corsican, Alsatian, Flemish, Occitan, Galician, Romansch, Maltese, Flemish, Vlaams, Frisian, Lappish language, Romani and Sardinian. In 1982 the European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages –EBLUL was created by the European Union with the aim of protecting and preserving these languages.

Further information about minority languages in general is available at the following websites: <http://ww2.eblul.org:800/ebul/Public_bureau> and <<http://ww2.lingualianet:8080/agares/Public>>. The webpage of the Regional and Minority Languages in the European Union is: <http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policies/lang/languages/langmin/regmin_en.html>

The Council of Europe (2001) provides data on the status of minority languages in the educational system of most European countries. If interested in this subject, see Siguan (1996), who gives an overall picture of the European linguistic fragmentation while Crystal (2000) discusses at length the phenomenon of language death and the consequences of it.

⁶ For research and other general issues concerning third language acquisition, see Cenoz & Jessner (2000).