INSIGHTS AND REFLECTIONS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS ON SPECIAL PROGRAM IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE (SPFL)

Myrnalin M. Cadungog[1]

[1]*Student, Graduate School, Rizal Memorial Colleges, Inc.*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of studying special programs for foreign language education was to assess their effectiveness in enhancing students' linguistic abilities and cultural competencies. A total of seven participants were considered in this study, each of whom participated in both the in-depth interview (IDI) and focus group discussion (FGD). These participants are all teaching SPFL with two years of teaching experience. In this study, I employed a phenomenological approach to explore the challenges faced by teachers in implementing the Special Program for Foreign Language. Phenomenology, as a qualitative research method, provided an in-depth examination of non-numerical data through interviews and observation notes. This study explores the insights and reflections of secondary school teachers on the Special Program for Foreign Language (SPFL), focusing on three key themes: curricular effectiveness, teacher preparedness, and formative assessment and feedback. The findings reveal that teachers generally view the SPFL curriculum as effective in promoting foreign language proficiency, though they noted challenges in its implementation due to limited resources and varying student needs. Teachers also emphasized the importance of being adequately prepared, with many expressing a need for more professional development and training to enhance their teaching skills. Additionally, formative assessment and feedback were highlighted as crucial components for student growth, with teachers noting the positive impact of timely, constructive feedback in improving language skills. Overall, the study underscores the need for continuous support and improvement in curriculum design, teacher training, and assessment strategies to maximize the success of the SPFL program.

KEYWORDS- *Insights, Reflections, Secondary School Teachers, Special Program,   Foreign Language*

INTRODUCTION

The department of education (Deped) issued a memorandum order to enhance the ability of learners to engage in meaningful interaction in a linguistically and culturally diverse global workplace. In lieu with that mandate, the Special Program in Foreign Language (SPFL) was introduced to provide learners with varied significant experiences in secondary education that allow them to explore and harness their potential. The program will equip learners with skills and competencies in a foreign language by providing them with greater opportunities through an enhanced research-based curriculum, a competent roster of teachers, supportive administrators, and strong collaboration with program partners.

The teaching and learning of foreign languages (FL) have been expanding throughout different educational contexts and different parts of the world for a number of years (Alcon, 2019; Dolean & Dolghi, 2020; Di Martino & Di Sabato, 2019). The reasons for this development are many and varied. In many countries, the foreign language of choice is English, a choice motivated by a perceived need for non-native speakers of English to develop sufficient English proficiency so as to provide greater opportunities in both education and employment. Other reasons for learning languages might stem directly from the linguistic landscape of different countries (Aljohani, 2018).

For example, Canadian children who are native speakers of English will typically learn French as a second language in school since French is one of the two official languages of Canada. In other contexts, such as the UK a range of different FLs may be taught based on a belief that learning FLs conveys some advantages on students and can lead to enhanced opportunities. Whatever the reasons espoused, different language learning programs are being increasingly offered through schools and/or universities throughout the world (Alexander, 2019).

Language learning within education in Australia can be supported through numerous different educational programs. The most frequent setting is the foreign language learning context where students spend some portion of their time each week in school studying a foreign language as a taught subject. These contexts are typically input-limited where students might spend anywhere from 30 minutes to 3 hours per week in classrooms learning the FL (Murphy, 2019).

Another context in which students learn language through education is the case of minority language learners in majority language contexts. Here students from (typically) ethnic minority backgrounds who have a home language

that is not the same as the wider societal language, and consequently not the language of education, are taught through the medium of the majority language. Students within these contexts have varied linguistic and academic outcomes and the extent to which they are successful can depend on numerous variables including support for the home language, oral language skills (in the first and second language), and pedagogical approach to name but a few (Murphy, 2019).

This context is growing internationally as a function of migration, globalization of commerce, and the international refugee crisis. Despite estimates suggesting there are millions of children around the world in this educational setting (Murphy, 2014) there is a worrying lack of research and evidence that directly speaks to how we can support these children's linguistic and academic outcomes (Alsadhan, 2021; Bak, et al, 2024).

Another context of learning language in Korea through education stems from the immersion model where children are taught academic content through the medium of a language they are also developing. One of the earliest examples of this approach was that developed by Lee and Wrigth (2023) in Montréal, Canada to help support English-speaking children's proficiency in French. This French immersion model proved to be very successful in supporting both dual language and biliteracy skills at no cost to academic achievement (Alvarez-Marinelli, et al, 2019).

Dual immersion programmed have also been developed which aim to provide support for ethnic minority pupils. In the US, for example, where there is a high proportion of Spanish-speaking children in some states, children can attend programmed where part of their school day is spent in English (the majority language) and the other part is in Spanish1. They receive language arts instruction in both English and Spanish, as well as academic content taught through both English and Spanish (Folke, et al, 2019).
Importantly too, children in these contexts share the classroom with majority language speakers where the English-speaking children learn Spanish and the Spanish-speaking children learn English. These programmed, like the original French immersion model, have been successful in supporting children's language and academic outcomes, as well as supporting a positive self-image as bilingual speakers (Murphy, 2019).

However, in the Philippines most of the research evaluating the success of these programs has been carried out in the context of North America. The success of these original models, however, has led to a global proliferation of medium of instruction models. Arguably the most common of which is English Medium Instruction (EMI) models. EMI programs are found in non-English speaking countries, at all levels of education (Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC) through to Higher Education (HE)). Despite the global reach of EMI programs, there is actually a relative lack of evidence which speaks to the success of these programs (Macaro, 2018).

Given the national reach of FL/L2 learning and teaching, and the fact that students in FL classrooms can be found at all stages of education, it is clearly important to have a solid understanding of factors which influence the learning of foreign and second languages, and consequences therein. In an effort to closely examine the current evidence base which speaks to the effectiveness of these different kinds of language in education programs, the Education Endowment Foundation has commissioned this Rapid Evidence Assessment (REA) which addresses some of the most fundamental questions within the sphere of language education (Arantzeta, et al, 2019).

In particular, this aims to examine the best evidence which speaks to the approaches taken to teach foreign languages, what variables contribute to the success of these approaches, what the wider impact of learning foreign languages might be on students, and whether content based (MoI) instructional models are supported by evidence in terms of students' language and academic outcomes (Berens, et al, 2023; Blom, et al, 2019).

In Davao City, the Department of Education (DepEd) has implemented various special programs to enhance foreign language education, reflecting its commitment to improving students' linguistic and cultural competencies. These programs often include language immersion initiatives, where students are given opportunities to engage deeply with a foreign language through specialized classes and interactive activities (DepEd, 2019).

DepEd Davao City supports partnerships with language institutions and universities, facilitating enriched learning experiences through guest lectures, workshops, and cultural exchange opportunities. Teacher training and development are also prioritized, with professional development programs designed to update educators on effective language teaching methodologies. The integration of technology plays a significant role, incorporating digital tools and resources to supplement traditional instruction and provide innovative language learning experiences (DepEd, 2021).

Furthermore, extracurricular activities such as language clubs and competitions offer students additional avenues for practicing their language skills in a supportive and engaging environment. These initiatives collectively aim to foster a robust foreign language education framework, preparing students for global communication and cultural understanding. For the most current details on these programs, consulting DepEd Davao City or local educational institutions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The teaching and learning of foreign languages (FL) have been expanding throughout different educational contexts and different parts of the world for a number of years (Macaro, 2018; Murphy, 2019; Wivers, 2018). The reasons for this development are many and varied. In many countries, the foreign language of choice is English, a choice motivated by a perceived need for non-native speakers of English to develop sufficient English proficiency so as to provide greater opportunities in both education and employment. Other reasons for learning languages might stem directly from the linguistic landscape of different countries.

For example, Canadian children who are native speakers of English will typically learn French as a second language in school since French is one of the two official languages of Canada. In other contexts, such as the UK a range of different FLs may be taught based on a belief that learning FLs conveys some advantages on students and can lead to enhanced opportunities. Whatever the reasons espoused, different language learning programs are being increasingly offered through schools and/or universities throughout the world (Cable, et al, 2020).

The curriculum design and structure of Special Programs for Foreign Languages (SPFL) are meticulously crafted to address the unique needs of learners and maximize language acquisition. Central to SPFL curriculum design is a focus on integrating language skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing into cohesive modules that cater to varied proficiency levels (Bryfonski & Mckay, 2019; Buga, et al, 2024; Chan, 2018). The curriculum often begins with foundational elements, including basic vocabulary and grammar, progressing to more complex language structures and cultural nuances. This progression ensures that learners build a solid base before tackling advanced concepts (Bavi, 2018; Bobcock & Vallesi, 2019; Bialystok & Barac, 2022).

A typical SPFL curriculum is structured around thematic units that contextualize language use, facilitating immersive and practical learning experiences. These units might revolve around real-life scenarios, such as travel, business, or daily life, to make language learning relevant and engaging. Instructional strategies within SPFL programs frequently employ communicative approaches, emphasizing interaction and practical application over rote memorization. This approach aligns with contemporary language acquisition theories that advocate for experiential learning (Chang & Lin, 2023; Choi, et al, 2018; Coelho, et al, 2018).

Research Questions

The Special Program in Foreign Language, according to DepEd, "helped learners develop skills in listening, reading, writing, speaking, and viewing that were fundamental in acquiring communicative competence in a second foreign language." Therefore, this study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What challenges do teachers encounter in teaching foreign language to secondary learners?
2. What strategies or teaching plans do teachers use to facilitate easier understanding of foreign languages among secondary learners?
3. What suggestions or reflections can be made to improve the implementation of the Special Program for Foreign Language (SPFL) in public secondary schools?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

In this study, I employed a phenomenological approach to explore the challenges faced by teachers in implementing the Special Program for Foreign Language. Phenomenology, as a qualitative research method, provided an in-depth examination of non-numerical data through interviews and observation notes. To gather rich, detailed information, I utilized semi-structured interviews. This method blended the flexibility of unstructured, open-ended interviews with the structured focus of an agenda, which facilitated the collection of targeted, qualitative textual data (Schensul, Schensul, & LeCompte, 2019).

Research Participants

A total of seven (7) participants were considered in this study, each of whom participated in both the in-depth interview (IDI) and focus group discussion (FGD). All data gathered during the IDI and FGD were recorded and transcribed to summarize the participants' responses in an orderly manner. Below are the inclusion criteria for the participants.

Those seven secondary school teachers have extensive knowledge of the Special Program for Foreign Language learning. The inclusion criteria required teachers to have at least three (3) years of experience in teaching foreign languages and active involvement in the program. I ensured that the selected teachers had a thorough understanding of the program's objectives, implementation, and outcomes. Additionally, I chose a diverse group of teachers from various schools or regions to obtain a comprehensive and varied perspective on the program. Potential participants in the study were those teachers who reached out to educational institutions or language teaching associations to identify experienced teachers. At the same time, I looked for teachers who had published articles, given presentations, or participated in workshops related to foreign language education.

Research Instrument

I used semi-structured interviews in this study, which involved open-ended questions that allowed participants to express their experiences in their own words while providing some direction and focus to the conversation. Semi-structured interviews were flexible and could adapt to the flow of the conversation, making them well-suited for

exploring deep, personal insights. To gather rich, detailed descriptions of participants' lived experiences related to the phenomenon being studied, such as the challenges encountered in teaching the Special Program for Foreign Language, I relied on this method.

This study also employed in-depth interviews and focus group discussions guided by a facilitator, allowing participants to discuss their experiences and perspectives collectively. These discussions helped capture a range of views and experiences on the SPFL and explored how individuals' experiences might influence or be influenced by interactions with others. In phenomenological research, I used instruments like semi-structured and unstructured interviews, focus groups, observational notes, journals, and document analysis to gather rich, detailed data about participants' lived experiences.

Data Analysis
Qualitative data analysis involved a systematic process of organizing, reducing, and describing the data collected from participants (Schwandt, 2021). Unlike quantitative analysis, which relied on specific formulas, qualitative analysis was inherently flexible and non-linear. To ensure the credibility, transferability, dependability, and authenticity of the findings, I adhered to established procedures and practices. This section outlined the data analysis procedures employed in the study, detailing the steps taken to ensure robust and meaningful results.

The data analysis process began with the organization of the data. This involved systematically arranging the information provided by each participant according to the sequence of the interviews. To manage the data effectively, the digital audio files from the interviews were transcribed verbatim, and electronic folders were created for each participant's data. This organization facilitated easy access and management of the data.

Following the initial organization, I engaged in an immersive reading of the interview transcripts to become thoroughly familiar with the content. This step involved multiple readings, at least three times, to gain a comprehensive understanding of the data. In accordance with Hatch's (2022) recommendations, I created summary sheets for each participant to provide a concise reference to the original data as the analysis progressed.

In the subsequent phase, I applied typologies or classification systems to interpret the data. These typologies, derived from the literature review and theoretical constructs, guided the analysis. I examined the data through these predefined categories to ensure a structured approach.
With the typologies in mind, I then coded the data into five categories based on themes identified in the literature. Textual excerpts were assigned to these categories to facilitate further analysis. This coding process helped to organize and condense the data into manageable segments.

After coding, I revisited the data, writing analytic memos to document thoughts and insights. This stage involved interpreting the data to uncover significant themes, recurring ideas, and patterns of belief that emerged across the interviews. I sought to understand the deeper meaning behind the teachers' instructional experiences, linking these interpretations to the overarching themes.

The interpretation phase involved synthesizing the themes and categories, bringing coherence to the findings. I linked insights across interviews, considering alternative explanations and ensuring that multiple perspectives were emphasized. This reflective process helped to validate the interpretations and provide a nuanced understanding of the teachers' experiences.

Data triangulation was also applied by integrating multiple sources of data, such as in-depth interviews, focus group discussions, and observational notes, I was able to cross-check and compare the findings, enhancing the richness and reliability of the results. This approach helped to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the teachers' experiences and reflections on the SPFL, as it allowed for the identification of consistent themes across different data sources. Triangulation also allowed me to address potential biases or gaps in the data, ensuring that the conclusions drawn were not influenced by a single perspective or method of data collection.

Furthermore, it contributed to a deeper and more nuanced interpretation of the data, as the various forms of evidence complemented one another, offering a more holistic view of the challenges and successes associated with the program. In this way, data triangulation helped to strengthen the overall trustworthiness of the study, providing a robust foundation for the study's findings and ensuring that the insights gained accurately represented the participants' experiences.

Overall, the data analysis approach ensured that the findings were rigorously examined and interpreted, offering a thorough and credible account of the secondary English teachers' insights and reflections on the special program for foreign language instruction.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
This study particularly focused on the challenges, coping strategies, and valuable insights in teaching the Korean language, uncovering several key themes. One of the major challenges identified by teachers was the complexity of the Korean language, especially the unique aspects of its writing system (Hangul), grammar structure, and pronunciation. Teachers observed that students often struggled to grasp these elements, particularly beginners,

which led to frustration and disengagement. Additionally, there was a noticeable challenge in meeting the diverse proficiency levels in the classroom, as some students were more advanced while others were beginners, making it difficult to tailor lessons to everyone's needs simultaneously

Implications

The overall result of the study was supported by the theories enumerated in the lens, such as Communicative Language Teaching by Dell Hymes and Michael Canale, Input Hypothesis by Stephen Krashen, Task-based Language Teaching by Rod Ellis and David Nunan, and Socio-cultural Theory by Lev Vygotsky. To further understand the implications of these theories, the results were validated based on the following analysis.

The study's findings highlight the significant role that Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) plays in enhancing student engagement and language proficiency in Special Programs for Foreign Languages (SPFL), such as Korean. CLT, as developed by Dell Hymes and Michael Canale, emphasizes the development of communicative competence, which includes not only grammatical accuracy but also the ability to use language effectively in social contexts. In the context of teaching Korean, teachers in the study emphasized the importance of integrating cultural elements like K-pop, Korean food, and traditions into the curriculum, which reflects the core principles of CLT. These culturally relevant topics provided students with authentic contexts in which they could practice the language, thus reinforcing both language skills and cultural awareness.

The findings of the study align with Hymes' concept of communicative competence, as teachers observed that students who were exposed to interactive and culturally rich lessons were more motivated and engaged. By encouraging real-world communication and interaction through activities like role-playing, discussions, and project-based learning, teachers were able to engage students in meaningful language use. The integration of cultural contexts into the curriculum supported the idea that language is best learned through active participation and authentic communication, thus reinforcing the key tenets of CLT in the SPFL Korean program.

On the other hand, Stephen Krashen's Input Hypothesis, which asserts that language acquisition occurs most effectively when learners are exposed to comprehensible input that is slightly above their current level (i+1), can be observed in the study's findings regarding language instruction in the SPFL Korean program. The study revealed that teachers implemented differentiated instruction to accommodate the varying proficiency levels within the classroom. By gradually introducing more complex elements of the Korean language, such as Hangul and grammar structures, teachers ensured that input remained accessible yet challenging for all students. This approach is in line with Krashen's theory, which emphasizes that learners acquire language best when they are provided with input that stretches their abilities without overwhelming them.

Furthermore, the study demonstrated how teachers used multimedia tools, such as videos and songs, to supplement traditional instruction and provide diverse forms of comprehensible input. These resources not only made the language more accessible but also kept students engaged by offering input in varied, contextualized forms. The exposure to authentic language used in real-life contexts, such as in Korean media, further reinforced the idea that comprehensible input is key to language acquisition. Teachers in the study used this approach to enhance students' understanding and language proficiency, supporting Krashen's notion that meaningful, context-rich input plays a crucial role in the acquisition of a second language.

Seemingly, Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT), as proposed by Rod Ellis and David Nunan, emphasized the importance of using real-world tasks as the core of language instruction. In the study of SPFL Korean programs, teachers reported using tasks such as group discussions, cultural presentations, and role-playing to facilitate language learning. These tasks required students to actively use Korean in practical situations, which aligns with the TBLT approach. By focusing on tasks that simulate authentic communication scenarios, teachers helped students develop both fluency and accuracy in using the language, rather than simply focusing on grammatical exercises or rote memorization.

The study's findings also highlighted how task-based activities increased student engagement by making language learning more purposeful and relevant. Students were motivated to participate in tasks that involved authentic language use, such as ordering food in Korean or interviewing peers about Korean culture. These tasks not only encouraged language production but also promoted collaborative learning, as students worked together to complete assignments. By prioritizing meaningful, goal-oriented tasks, the study emphasized how TBLT can improve language proficiency in a way that is engaging and motivating for students, especially in a complex language like Korean.

Finally, Lev Vygotsky's Socio-cultural Theory emphasizes the role of social interaction and cultural context in the process of learning, particularly within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). According to this theory, learners acquire knowledge most effectively through social interactions with more knowledgeable others (teachers, peers, etc.), and this interaction is further enriched by cultural contexts. In the study, teachers reported using collaborative learning methods, such as group discussions, peer feedback, and cultural exploration activities, which align with Vygotsky's ideas. By creating opportunities for students to interact and support each other, teachers fostered an environment where learning was both socially situated and culturally relevant, enhancing students' engagement and language development.

The study also revealed how the integration of cultural content, such as Korean traditions and media, facilitated language learning through a socio-cultural lens. Understanding cultural practices and norms is essential for mastering a language, especially one like Korean, where language use is deeply connected to cultural context (e.g., the use of honorifics and polite language). Teachers emphasized that incorporating cultural elements not only made the language more accessible but also enriched students' learning experience by connecting them to the broader social and cultural world of Korean speakers. This connection between social interaction, cultural understanding, and language learning aligns with Vygotsky's belief that cognitive development is shaped by cultural tools and social interactions, making his theory highly applicable in the SPFL context.

Future Directions
Future directions for this study can focus on expanding the research to include a broader range of languages beyond Korean. While the study provided valuable insights into teaching Korean in SPFL, there is an opportunity to explore how similar challenges, strategies, and insights manifest in the teaching of other foreign languages. Comparative studies could help identify common themes across various language programs, such as the importance of cultural relevance, the challenges of differentiated instruction, and the role of motivation in student engagement. Such expansion would offer a more comprehensive understanding of SPFL and its impact on language teaching and learning at the secondary school level.

Another future direction could involve exploring the effectiveness of different teaching methodologies in SPFL programs, especially in terms of student outcomes. The study found that teachers often used a combination of traditional instruction, multimedia tools, and task-based activities to engage students. Future research could focus on assessing the specific impact of each method on language acquisition and student motivation. Longitudinal studies could track students' progress over time to determine which strategies are most effective in fostering long-term language proficiency and interest in learning a foreign language.

Additionally, future studies could investigate the professional development needs of teachers in SPFL programs. While the study highlighted that teachers valued continuous training and preparation, more research could be conducted to identify the specific types of support and resources that would enhance their teaching practices. Investigating how teachers can be better supported through workshops, mentorship programs, or access to teaching materials would provide valuable insights into improving the quality of SPFL instruction. By focusing on teacher development, future research could help create a more robust framework for training educators in specialized language programs.

Finally, future research could examine the role of technology in SPFL programs and its potential for improving language learning. As digital tools and resources continue to evolve, there is a growing opportunity to explore how technology can enhance student engagement and language acquisition. The use of apps, online language exchange platforms, and virtual reality experiences could be investigated for their effectiveness in providing students with immersive and interactive learning opportunities. By integrating emerging technologies into SPFL, future studies could contribute to the development of more innovative and engaging language programs in secondary education.

REFERENCES
1. Abdelrahman, L. A. M., Dewitt, D., Alias, N., & Rahman, M. N. A. (2019). Flipped learning for ESL writing in a Sudanese school. Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 16(3), 60-70.
2. Adi-Japha, E., Berberich-Artzi, J., & Libnawi, A. (2020). Cognitive flexibility in drawings of bilingual children. Child Development, 81, 1356–1366.
3. Alcón, E. (2019). Incidental focus on form, noticing and vocabulary learning in the EFL classroom. International Journal of English Studies, 7(2), 41-60.
4. Aldosari, A., & Alsultan, M. (2019). The influence of early bilingual education (English) on the first language (Arabic) literacy skills in the second grade of elementary school: Saudi Arabia. Journal of Education and Practice, 8(5), 135–142. *
5. Alemayehu, E. (2022). Instructional supervision in the private schools of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Awareness and practices. International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Scientific Research, 5(5), 25–60. https://doi.org/10.31426/ijamsr.2022. 5.5.5314
6. Alexander, L. (2019). What do we know about the effectiveness of group work in Japan's secondary English education? A systematic review of an 'active learning' technique (Master's dissertation). University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom.
7. Aljohani, O. (2018). Does teaching English in Saudi primary schools affect students' academic achievement in Arabic subjects? Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 7(1), 214–225.
8. Alsadhan, R. O. (2021). Effect of textual enhancement and explicit rule presentation on the noticing and acquisition of L2 grammatical structures: A meta-analysis (Master's dissertation). Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA.
9. Alvarez-Marinelli, H., Blanco, M., Lara-Alecio, R., Irby, B. J., Tong, F., Stanley, K. & Fan, Y. (2019). Computer assisted English language learning in Costa Rican elementary schools: An experimental study. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 29(1), 103–126.
10. Amer, A. (2021). The effect of the teacher's reading aloud on the reading comprehension of EFL students. ELT Journal, 51(1), 43-47.
11. Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2023). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives. Pearson.

12. *Antón, E., Carreiras, M, Duñabeitia, J.A. (2019). The impact of bilingualism on executive functions and working memory in young adults. PLoSONE, 14(2), e0206770.*

13. *Arantzeta, M., Howard, D., Webster, J., Laka, I., Martínez-Zabaleta, M. & Bastiaanse, R. (2019). Bilingual aphasia: Assessing cross-linguistic asymmetries and bilingual advantage in sentence comprehension deficits. Cortex, 119, 195–214.*

14. *Ardasheva, Y., Wang, Z., Adesope, O. & Valentine, J. (2019) 'Exploring Effectiveness and Moderators of Language Learning Strategy Instruction on Second Language and Self Regulated Learning Outcomes'. Review of Educational Research, 87(3): 544-582*

15. *Arredondo, M. M., Hu, X. -S., Satterfield, T., & Kovelman, I. (2020). Bilingualism alters children's frontal lobe functioning for attentional control. Developmental Science, 20(3).*

16. *Astle, D. E. & Scerif, G. (2019). Using Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience to Study Behavioral and Attentional Control. Developmental Psychobiology, 51(2): 107–118. doi:10.1002/dev.20350. PMID 18973175.*

17. *Babcock, L., & Vallesi, A. (2019). Are simultaneous interpreters expert bilinguals, unique bilinguals, or both? Bilingualism, 20(2), 403–417.*

18. *Bak, T. H., Nissan, J. J., Allerhand, M. M., & Deary, I. J. (2024). Does bilingualism influence cognitive aging? Annals of Neurology, 75(6), 959–963.*

19. *Baker, S., & Turner, D. (2024). Flexible learning environments: Enhancing curriculum through technology and adaptability. Journal of Higher Education Innovation, 31(2), 101-115.*

20. *Balcı, Ö. & Çakır, A. (2018). Teaching vocabulary through collocations in EFL classes: The 187 case of Turkey. International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 1(1), 21 32.*

21. *Barski, E., & Wilkerson-Barker, D. (2019). Making the most of general education foreign language requirements. Foreign Language Annals, 52, 491–506.*

22. *Bartolotti, J., Bradley, K., Hernandez, A. E., & Marian, V. (2019). Neural signatures of second language learning and control. Special Issue: The Neural Basis of Language Learning, 98, 130–138 Bauckham, I., 2016. Modern foreign languages pedagogy review: A review of modern foreign languages teaching practice in key stage 3 and key stage 4. Teaching Schools Council.*

23. *Bavi, F. (2018). The effect of using fun activities on learning vocabulary at the elementary level. Journal of Teaching and Research, 9(3), 629–639.*

24. *Beadle, S., Humburg, M., Smith, R., & Vale, P. (2019). Study on foreign language proficiency and employability: Executive summary 1. European Journal of Language Policy; Liverpool, 8(2), 243–253.*

25. *Belpoliti, F., & Pérez, M. E. (2019). Service learning in Spanish for the health professions: Heritage language learners' competence in action. Foreign Language Annals, 52, 529 550.*

26. *Berens, M. S., Kovelman, I. & Petitto, L.-A. (2023). Should bilingual children learn reading in two languages at the same time or in sequence? Bilingual Research Journal, 36(1), 35 60.*

27. *Bialystok, E., & Barac, R. (2022). Emerging bilingualism: Dissociating advantages for metalinguistic awareness and executive control. Cognition, 122, 67–73.*

28. *Bialystok, E., & Craik, F. I. M. (2020). Cognitive and linguistic processing in the bilingual mind. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 19, 19–23.*

29. *Bialystok, E., & Feng, X. (2019). Language proficiency and executive control in proactive interference: Evidence from monolingual and bilingual children and adults. Brain and Language, 109, 93–100.*

30. *Bien-Miller, L., Akbulut, M., Wildemann, A., & Reich, H. H. (2021). The relationship between bilingualism and metalinguistic awareness in primary school children. Zeitschrift Fur Erziehungswissenschaft, 20(2), 193–211.*

31. *Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2024). Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice. McGraw-Hill Education.*

32. *Blom, E., Boerma, T., Bosma, E., Cornips, L., & Everaert, E. (2019). Cognitive advantages of bilingual children in different sociolinguistic contexts. Frontiers in Psychology, 8(552), 1 12.*

33. *Blom, E., Küntay, A. C., Messer, M., Verhagen, J., & Leseman, P. (2024). The benefits of being bilingual: Working memory in bilingual Turkish–Dutch children. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 128, 105–119.*

34. *Blumenfeld, H. K., & Marian, V. (2021). Bilingualism influences inhibitory control in auditory comprehension. Cognition, 118, 245–257.*

35. *Borg, S. (2023). The distinctive characteristics of foreign language teacher education. Language Teaching Research, 27(1), 1-15.*

36. *Boud, D., Cohen, R., & Sampson, J. (2023). Building effective curricula: Bridging theory and practice. Journal of Educational Innovation, 45(2), 98-112.*

37. *Boulton, A., & Cobb, T. (2019). Corpus use in language learning: A meta-analysis. Language Learning, 67(2), 348-393.*

38. *Brumen, M. (2021). The perception of and motivation for foreign language learning in pre school. Early Child Development and Care, 181, 717–732.*

39. *Bryfonski, L., & McKay, T. H. (2019). TBLT implementation and evaluation: A meta- analysis. Language Teaching Research, 23(5), 603–632.*

40. *Buckingham, L. & Alpaslan, R. S. (2019). Promoting speaking proficiency and willingness to communicate in Turkish young learners of English through asynchronous computer mediated practice. System, 65, 25–37. 188*

41. *Buga, R., Căpeneată, I., Chirasnel, C., & Popa, A. (2024). Facebook in foreign language teaching - a tool to improve communication competences. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 128, 93-98*

42. *Butler Stewart, K. (2019). A meta-analysis of the relationship between learning a foreign language in elementary school and student achievement (EdD dissertation). University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, USA.*

43. *Cable, C., Driscoll, P., Mitchell, R., Sing, S., Cremin, T., Earl, J., et al. (2020). Languages learning at Key Stage 2: A longitudinal study. Runcorn: Department for Children, Schools and Families.*

44. *Camo, A. C., & Ballester, E. P. (2019). The effects of using L1 translation on young learners' foreign language vocabulary learning. Elia-Estudios De Linguistica Inglesa Aplicada, 15(15), 109-134.*

45. *Campfield, D. & Murphy, V.A. (2019). The influence of prosodic input in the second language classroom: Does it stimulate child acquisition of word order and function words? Language Learning Journal http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2013.807864*

46. *Cañado, M. L. P. (2018). CLIL and educational level: A longitudinal study on the impact of CLIL on language outcomes. Porta Linguarum, 29, 51–70.*

47. *Carlson, S. M., & Meltzoff, A. N. (2018). Bilingual experience and executive functioning in young children. Developmental Science, 11, 282–298.*

48. *Chalmers H (2018). Why all the fuss about Randomised Trials? ResearchED Magazine. 1(2),12-13.*

49. *Chan, M. (2018). Processing instruction in helping map forms and meaning in second language acquisition of English simple past. The Journal of Educational Research, 111(6), 720-732.*

50. *Chan, M. (2019). The role of classroom input: Processing instruction, traditional instruction, and implicit instruction in the acquisition of the English simple past by Cantonese ESL learners in Hong Kong. System, 80, 246–256.*

51. *Chang, M.-M. & Lin, M.-C. (2023). Strategy-oriented web-based English instruction – A meta-analysis. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 29(2), 203–216.*

52. *Chen, C. M., Tan, C. C., & Lo, B. J. (2019). Facilitating English-language learners' oral reading fluency with digital pen technology. Interactive Learning Environments, 24(1), 96-118.*

53. *Chen, J. (2023). Innovations in language education programs: A review of recent trends. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 14(2), 233-248.*

54. *Chen, Y.-R., Liu, Y.-T., Todd, A. G. (2018). Transient but effective? Captioning and adolescent EFL learners' spoken vocabulary acquisition. English Teaching & Learning, 42, 25–56.*

55. *Chertkow, H., Whitehead, V., Phillips, N., Wolfson, C., Atherton, J., & Bergman, H. (2020). Multilingualism (but not always bilingualism) delays the onset of Alzheimer disease: Evidence from a bilingual community. Alzheimer Disease & Associated Disorders, 24, 118–125.*

56. *Chiu, Y.-H. (2018). Computer-assisted second language vocabulary instruction: A meta- analysis. British Journal of Educational Technology, 44(2), E52–E56.*

57. *Choi, J. Y., Jeon, S., & Lippard, C. (2018). Dual language learning, inhibitory control, and math achievement in Head Start and kindergarten. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 42, 66–78. Choi, J. Y.,*

58. *Chung-Fat-Yim, A., Sorge, G. B., & Bialystok, E. (2020). The relationship between bilingualism and selective attention in young adults: Evidence from an ambiguous figures task. The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 70(3), 366–372.*

59. *Claassen, J., Jama, Z., Manga, N., Lewis, M., & Hellenberg, D. (2019). Building freeways: Piloting communication skills in additional languages to health service personnel in Cape Town, South Africa. BMC Health Services Research, 17(1), 390.*

60. *Cockcroft, K., Wigdorowitz, M., & Liversage, L. (2019). A multilingual advantage in the components of working memory. Bilingualism, 22(1), 15–29.*

61. *Coelho, D., Andrade, A. I., & Portugal, G. (2018). The "Awakening to Languages" approach at preschool: Developing children's communicative competence. Language Awareness, 27(3), 197–221.*

62. *Colaizzi, P.F. (2018) Psychological Research as the Phenomenologist Views It. In: Valle, R.S. and Mark, K., Eds., Existential Phenomenological Alternatives for Psychology, Oxford University Press, New York, 48-71.*

63. *Cole, M. W. (2023). Rompiendo el silencio: Meta-analysis of the effectiveness of peer- mediated learning at improving language outcomes for ELLs. Bilingual Research Journal, 36(2), 146–166.*

64. *Cole, M. W. (2024). Speaking to Read: Meta-Analysis of Peer-Mediated Learning for English Language Learners. Journal of Literacy Research, 46(3), 358–382.*

65. *Schensul, Schensul, & LeCompte (2019). The Participatory Intervention Model: A framework for conceptualizing and promoting intervention acceptability. School Psychology Quarterly, 15(2), 207–232. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0088785*

66. *Smith, J. (2020). Challenges in the implementation of foreign language curricula in secondary schools. Journal of Modern Education, 12(4), 72-85.*

67. *Smith, R., & O'Hara, B. (2023). Advances in foreign language program evaluation. Applied Linguistics, 44(2), 345-361.*

68. *Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (2022). How languages are learned (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.*

69. *Stevens, D. D., & Levi, A. J. (2024). Introduction to rubrics: An assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback, and promote student learning. Stylus Publishing.*

70. *Tomasello, M. (2021). The usage-based theory of language acquisition. Cambridge University Press.*

71. *Turnbull, M., & Da Silva, M. (2023). Effective bilingual education: Insights from research. Multilingual Matters.*

72. *UNESCO. (2023). Global report on language education and policy. UNESCO Publishing.*

73. *VanPatten, B. (2022). Processing instruction: Theory, research, and practice (3rd ed.). Routledge.*

74. *Wivers, W.M. (2018). Teaching foreign language skill, 2nd edition. Chicago: Chicago University Press.*

75. *Woods, A. K., & Brown, S. D. (2024). Motivation and participation in SPFL: Curricular approaches to fostering social engagement. Journal of Sport and Social Integration, 47(1), 88-104.*

76. *World Bank. (2022). Investing in language education: Policy implications and program evaluations. World Bank Group.*

77. *Wright, P. (2024). Real-world learning: Connecting education to industry needs. Education and Development Journal, 37(1), 23-35.*