



## Learning indicators of a foreign language in Spanish public university. Case study

M-Teresa Cáceres-Lorenzo\*, Marcos Salas-Pascual, Isabel-Cristina Afonso-de-Tovar, M-Jesús Vera-Cazorla, Yaiza Santana-Alvarado, Cristina Santana-Quintana<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (ULPGC), Canary Islands, Spain.*

### APA Citation:

Cáceres-Lorenzo, M-T., Salas-Pascual, M., Afonso de Tovar, I-C., Vera-Cazorla, M-J, Santana-Alvarado, Y. & Santana Quintana, C. (2017). Learning indicators of a foreign language in Spanish public university. Case study. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(1), 62-74.

Submission Date: 06/07/2016

Acceptance Date: 31/01/2017

### Abstract

This article investigates 292 postgraduate students of the University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (Canary Islands, Spain), through a Likert-scale questionnaire. This inquiry was about private, educational actions and learning valuation of a foreign language and its relation with the learning of one or several foreign languages. The analysis of the obtained information from the coefficient of Pearson's correlation shows us that 60% of the students has certificates in a foreign language, although the international mobility does not overcome 19%. This research must be extended in other Spanish universities in order to be able to evaluate the communicative competence according to the Europe 2020 strategy.

© 2017 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

**Keywords:** Learning foreign languages; European Higher Education Area; Spanish public university Spain; Europe 2020 strategy

## 1. Introduction

The introduction of Bologna Plan on the educational programs of Spanish university has introduced the learning of the foreign language as a generic and transverse competence in all the branches of knowledge (Raigón Rodríguez, 2015). The European Commission (EU) insists on the acquisition of several foreign languages as an indispensable way to make your way on the labor market (competitiveness, mobility and employability) (Riddell and Markowitsch, 2012; Eurostat, 2013). EU renews the previous, in 2013, with the creation of Erasmus+. This program includes the improvement of teaching and learning languages as one of its objectives. Similarly, in 2012, the Commission adopted a new strategy on research and innovation, besides the social one (Gaete Quezada, 2011), for the Program of International Cooperation (PIC) in research and innovation, especially with a view to the application of *Education and Training 2020* (Europe-2020).

The previous text confirms once again what it was already gathered in *European Higher Education Area* (EHEA). However, now it is intensified the suggestion that relates the learning of one or several foreign languages to the development of the European citizenship and the society-economy of the knowledge. At the same time, it insists on the conviction that the learning of different languages

\*Corresponding author. Tel.: +34-928458930  
E-mail address: [mteresa.caceres@ulpgc.es](mailto:mteresa.caceres@ulpgc.es)

is a powerful factor in the intellectual development that helps to the international mobility. In addition, it promotes the commitment with the permanent learning of languages, considering that the study of the language offers opportunities to acquire independence and autonomy as apprentices in the knowledge society (Heyworth, 2004; Coperías Aguilar, 2009).

The above mentioned offer of including a foreign language it becomes a reality in Spanish universities, with the following formative proposals, according to a gradient from best to least: “CLIL (with a fully content and language integration), English-Medium Instruction (EMI) (a content oriented approach with no linguistic goals) and CBI (a language-oriented approach)” (Aguilar and Muñoz, 2014: 2). In the ULPGC (Canary Islands, Spain) all the previous possibilities are offered. However, 60 % of the formative programs of this university uses EMI and CBI in 6-12 ECTS subjects. This coincides with other Spanish universities (Maíz-Arévalo and Domínguez-Romero, 2013).

We notice during the last five years that they were learning a foreign language for an academic requirement, and not for a need of future profession, in our labor like teachers in different titles of master's degree of different branches of knowledge of the ULPGC, in the direct contact with the students. Also, we demonstrate that many of them had not realized an international mobility (Erasmus or PIC). They did not seem to have interest to learn a new language. These postgraduate students passed the certification test in a foreign language in the B1 or Threshold level (first level of independent user, according to the CEFR) different from the mother language. The above mentioned linguistic requirement of academic nature is obligatory for all the graduated from the ULPGC, since it happens in other Spanish universities in its respective formative programs (Halbach, LázaroLafuente and Pérez Guerra, 2013; Raigón Rodríguez and LarreaEspinar, 2013). It is an evaluation question that joins Spain, as application of the Bologna Plan. The purpose is stimulating the student to develop the multilingual communicative competence.

In order to answer to the previous questions, we consider that there exist certain variables or indicators that accompany the learning of a foreign language in university students. We understand indicators as the quantitative or qualitative expression that allows for measuring the objective: that university Spanish student acquires one or two languages. The above mentioned indicators are in the linguistic, personal and intercultural profile of every individual. Additionally, students' educational actions were examined: registration of the parents in the bilingual education; the learning of another foreign language; worry for obtaining an official certificate before the accreditation of languages; participation in the Erasmus mobility and International Cooperation. They all are indicators of a development of the above mentioned communicative and intercultural competence (Feast, Collyer-Braham and Bretag, 2011; Jacobone and Moor, 2015). And finally, the valuation that the ones polled do of the acquisition of the foreign language: an academic or professional objective? Our interest by the last question is based on the hypothesis of which if university student understands the relation between the learning of foreign languages and the professional improvement, all the European recommendations associated with the communicative and intercultural competence they will stop being an academic requirement that it is necessary to overcome, to turn into more identical objectives to the professional reality presented from EU.

The analysis of the learning indicators leads us to recognize the motivation that makes it possible for a university student to be encouraged to acquire one or more foreign languages. Between the different types of motivation, they underline: intrinsic, extrinsic, instrumental and integration (Lasagabaster and LópezBeloqui, 2015). The differences between first two it refers to the internal and external factors that stimulate the apprentices. With regard to the instrumental and the integration (“integrative motivation”), the distinction is realized by the cultural aspect, though they often can be joined (Csizér and Dörnyei, 2005). The instrumental motivation investigated in this research it appears

under the duality (academic and professional valuation). The variables selected in this work as indicators of the learning are included in the previous typology. However, our purpose is to recognize the quantitative values of every indicator and the possible interrelationship, in our case study and with regard to other Spanish universities.

In spite of the importance of verifying the information that identify the needs and the variables that accompany the development of the multilingual competence in university context, there are few studies in the matter. Specially, because at this moment we handle divergent references that can indicate our approximation to Europe 2020 is progressive or regressive.

### *1.1. Literature review*

The EU construction is based on the promotion of mobility and intercultural understanding. This idea implies that language learning is integrated from the university constructed with the Bologna Plan (European Commission, 2012; Doiz, Lasagabaster and Saw, 2013; Jeoffrion et al, 2014). However, in the practice, Spanish universities are in the middle of the establishment process of a bilingual education system in the educational programs. The above mentioned introduction generates numbers of 50 % of centers in different universities and in certain branches of knowledge (Ramos García, 2013; Tsuchiya and Perez Murillo, 2015).

Spanish university institutions support the instruction in the official languages of every Autonomous Community. Simultaneously, they incorporate different levels of bilingualism in the educational programs. The most generalized solution is the incorporation of a certain number of hours in a foreign language, almost always in English. This implies the creation of an English subject for specific purposes, the incorporation of activities in a foreign language (draft of certain reports or summaries, assistances to presentations, workshops or seminars, oral exhibitions, elaboration of scientific poster, etc.) (Halbach, LázaroLafuente and Pérez Guerra, 2013), besides the above mentioned certification test in a B1 level (Raigón Rodríguez and LarreaEspinar, 2013). Paradoxically, Fernández - Santiago (2011) indicates that in new educational Spanish programs, from the implementation of the EHEA, some universities have reduced the hours of classes of these EMI and CBI subjects. This reduction implies that student takes responsibility of the training in a foreign language of an extracurricular way.

Researches indicate that in Spain there is a “new generation of students (and teachers) [in tertiary education], who will consider learning through to foreign language to common practice”(Dafouz and Núñez, 2009: 110). However, currently, this situation of bilingualism is not demonstrated yet in Spanish university (Sánchez-Hernández, Gallardo-Vázquez, CorchueloMartínez-Azua, 2014). So, the multilingual intercultural competence of the university student does not seem to be an obtained objective (López - Fernández, 2014). Reports of the barometer Europeans and their Languages (243 (2006) and 386 (2012)), it reveals that more than 50 % of the Spanish adult is unable to support a long conversation in a foreign language. In the same line, Gómez López, SolazPortolés and SanjoséLópez (2014) in the analysis of the reading comprehension of 96 students of the Teaching degree in the University of Valencia (Spain), they document that 84.5 % of the individuals with a B1 level in English, does not have the habit of reading scientific texts in this language, in spite of the requirements of the formative programs of the above mentioned institution. In addition, Sánchez Pérez, Manzano-Agugliaro and Salaberri Ramiro (2012: 12-13) have contributed in a longitudinal study with pre-university students in Almería (Spain) the following thing: “The analysis of the results in English at the Spanish University Entrance Test (PAU) obtained in the last 9 years (2002-2010) in the Andalusian district of Almeria show a 34% fail rate in general, which stands above the European average [...] This study reveals that, as a starting point for successful bilingual education in higher

education, the results in English of the entrance examination to university should be on average at least two points above the current”

The percentage of pre-university students that speaks two or more languages above the total, in Spain it is just 40.3 % opposite to 60.8 % of average in the EU. These indicators reveal the obvious distance that separates Spain from other European countries. The same thing does not happen in the mobility for the learning of the university higher students. 3.2 % far below of 7 % European average. The same thing does not happen in the Spanish that they take part in formative programs with ages between 25 and 64 years, which stay lightly over the EU, 10.7 % opposite to 9 %. Though clearly distantly of Europe 2020 objectives that is 15 % (Europe-2020).

Raigón Rodríguez and LarreaEspinar (2013) with 216 master’s degree students of Teaching Training of the University of Córdoba (Andalucía, Spain), they indicate that of students who obtained the certification of languages (B1), only 19.6 % was able to obtain an upper level. Three of every ten had obtained the accreditation for another reason that was not the access to the Master’s degree. That is to say, majority of the students did not consider certifying previously their linguistic competence. It prevails over them the academic valuation of the learning of a foreign language. In addition, in a research realized in the Economic School of the University of Extremadura (Spain), it concludes the following thing (Sánchez-Hernández, Gallardo-Vázquez and CorchueloMartínez-Azua 2014: 212):“In short, both the descriptive analysis of the survey data and the correlation analysis with the variable mobility revealed a clear gap between the students’ perception of their proficiency in other languages and the importance they attach to them for their future employment. There thus needs to be serious consideration of the possibility of planning and implementing teaching strategies aimed at bridging this gap”

Another side of the exposed thing, it would be the introduction in the Spanish education of CLIC or CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning or Content and Language Integrated Learning), besides other measures of improvement that incorporate more than two foreign languages in Primary and Secondary in many autonomous communities, Canary Islands included (Dafouz and Núñez, 2009; Falcón and Lorenzo, 2015). The results reinforce the idea of that we are before an imminent improvement of the multilingual competence. The presence of these students in the University is researched by Cáceres-Lorenzo (2014) with 43 students of first year of the degree of Modern Languages of the ULPGC. It was noticed high percentages of bilingual apprentices equally or higher to B1.

After the introduction of the EHEA, the Program Education and Formation 2020 shows the strategies that the EU must follow until that date, in order to obtain an intelligent, sustainable and conciliatory growth. European tertiary education takes part for its links with the research and the innovation as basic elements of the growth. The development of previous things brings the promotion of the mobility, the learning of new languages, but specially, the constant learning (Jarcau, 2014).

## *1.2. Research questions*

This study asks across a case study of a Spanish public university (University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria-ULPGC <http://www.english.ulpgc.es/>), in this context of insistence on the professional value of a foreign language and the need to realize international stays as contribution of the university to different dimensions of the European growth until 2020:

1. How many postgraduate students have a certificate in a foreign language, a stay of mobility, and are they learning a second language?
2. Is there a preference to a certain language?
3. What variables and indicators influence more on the learning?

4. What valuation have they got of the foreign language learning?
5. Is it viable to recognize that a progressive trend should be taking place in this aspect in higher education Spanish institutions?

## **2. Method**

### *2.1. Sample / Participants*

The inquiry was answered by 292 students (121 men and 164 women) of 36 different master's degrees, classified of the following way (in bracket number of students who answered to the inquiry): 7 titles of Arts and Humanities (71); 3 of Health Sciences (33); 13 of Social and Juridical Sciences (135); 9 of Engineerings and Architecture (29); and 4 of Sciences (23). To consider the representation of the sample, it has been used The ULPGC in figures (2014). This document, published on the web, gathers the numbers of the students who have finished a master's degree in the period between 2010-2014, with an average of 283 graduated ones between 2010 and 2014: 2010-2011 (188); 2011-2012 (342); 2012-2013 (282); 2013-2014 (319). As can be noted, the number of interviewed individuals is biggest than the average of those who have finished studies of master's degree in the estimated period. Therefore, we can consider it as a very representative number of postgraduate students of the ULPGC.

### *2.2. Instrument(s)*

To answer the research questions, master's degree students of the ULPGC of different branches of knowledge, they had to realize an inquiry designed by Raigón Rodríguez and LarreaEspinar (2013). The research is structured in three parts: an initial where the student is examined by personal questions (age, place of birth, mother language, gender; second part is dedicated to ask for the student training (academic training, if they have studied in a bilingual school or not, if they have an official certificate in a foreign language, if they have realized an Erasmus stay, if they have participated in some PIC and if they are studying another language at this moment). And finally, it consults them on their valuation on the importance of the knowledge of another language for the professional development or for their academic training and how it influences the learning of a language in both cases. The valuations were classifying from 1 to 5, being 1 nothing or never and 5 very much or always (Likert scale). Answers were grouped according to professional or academic questions.

### *2.3. Data collection and analysis*

The selected indicators appear in the Table 1. As can be noted, the research individuals have ages between 21 and 56. The most habitual place of birth it is Canary Islands (220 of the 292). The rest is distributed in the rest of Spain (32), Latin America (10), rest of Europe (8), Africa (8) and Asia (3). Regarding the mother language, most of the students takes the Spanish as a vernacular language (272), speakers of other languages are just a minority (Arabic 6, Chinese 2, French 3, Russian 2, German 1, Italian 1 and Russian 2).

**Table 1.** Statistical descriptive data

	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Minimum data</b>	<b>Maximum data</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Stand dev.</b>
<b>Personal variables</b>	Age	21.000	56.000	27.540	6.518
	Native language	1.000	10.000	1.379	1.599
	Birth place	1.000	8.000	1.523	1.327
	Branch of knowledge	1.000	5.000	2.280	1.297
	Gender	1.000	2.000	1.425	0.489
<b>Educational action</b>	Learning of a foreign language	1.000	2.000	1.744	0.429
	Official certification	1.000	2.000	1.378	0.481
	Bilingual school (CLIL)	1.000	2.000	1.882	0.321
	International cooperation	1.000	2.000	1.947	0.213
	Erasmus stay	1.000	2.000	1.814	0.389
<b>Purpose</b>	Academic	0.000	7.000	4.452	2.304
	Professional	0.000	7.000	4.719	1.702

To change these qualitative variables in quantitative and to be able to study the correlation, a value was established to each of the possible answers of every variable. These assignments are reflected in the Table 2.

**Table 2.** Values assigned by the authors for this specific research

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Ascribed value</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Ascribed value</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Ascribed value</b>	
<b>Birth Place</b>	Canaries	1	<b>Native Language</b>	Spanish	1	<b>Gender</b>	F	1	
	Rest of Spain	2		English	2		M	2	
	Rest of Europe	3		French	3	<b>Branch of knowledge</b>	Arts and Humanities	1	
	Spanish America	4		German	4		Social and Juridical	2	
	North America	5		Italian	5		Engineering and Architecture	3	
	Rest of America	6		Greek	6		Health Sciences	4	
	Africa	7		Arabic	7		Sciences	5	
	Asia	8		Chinese	8		<b>Other variables</b>	Yes	1
	Oceania	9		Russian	9			No	2
				Other	10				

The valuations were qualified, as it was already commented, from 0 to 5, from least to most estimation. Once obtained a table with quantitative values for every variable and individual it was applied the index of Pearson's correlation for its calculation. In the obtained correlation matrix, that is reflected in Table 3.

### 3. Results and discussion

The inquiries indicate that, in this case study, 60 % of the postgraduate students have official certification of some foreign language before the test of accreditation of the ULPGC. 55.46 % has obtained a B1 level; 34.28 % a B2; 14.28 % a C1; and 3.24 % a C2. This information shows an improvement with regard to the researches of Raigón Rodríguez and LarreaEspinar (2013). This previous research shows only a 19.6 % who was able to access to a higher level to B1. More than the half of the polled university students they learn a foreign language and they worry for obtaining a certificate before the obligatory nature of the test of certification. This is an indicator of which the linguistic requirement associated with the academic education in the degrees of Bologna Plan, it is being assimilated by students (Aguilar and Muñoz, 2012 and 2013). In spite of 88.36 % comes from a non CLIL Secondary, these include the learning of a foreign language between their formative objectives. For this reason, it exists an improvement with regard to the information of Sánchez-Pérez, Manzano-Agugliaro and Salaberri-Ramiro (2012). Some researchers indicate that the university student who is focused on the overcoming of an academic condition, they resign themselves to the obtaining of a B1, insufficient level for the accomplishment of professional tasks (Gómez López, SolazPortolés and SanjoséLópez, 2014). We estimate 41.80 % has from B2-C2, opposite to the rest that they keep B1.

Those who have certificates, 177 students of 292, 91% (161) study exclusively English. The rest provides certificates in German (9), Chinese (1), Spanish (2), French (3) and Portuguese (1). Likewise, of 40 % who appeared to the test of certification of the ULPGC, 20% also chooses English. The preference to English it coincides with other many Spanish university students (Lasagabaster, 2012).

With regard to the number of multilingual students, we verify that 6.16 % (18) possesses certificates in two or three languages. These polyglot university students of the ULPGC belong to Arts and Humanities (9), Social and Juridical Sciences (2), Engineering and Architecture (3) and Sciences (3). It is possible to make a comparison with 9 students of Arts and Humanities, who represent 11.68 % of the 71 of this branch. This result is very different to Cáceres Lorenzo (2015). In her study with students of first year of the Modern Languages degree (ULPGC), multilingual students constituted 20.93 % of total. In this study, the variable of those who had studied in bilingual schools during Secondary, it was representing 98 %, whereas in our case study, only 11.64 %.

Erasmus stay has been realized by 18.49 % (54). This number is very superior to European average that is 7 %. The same thing does not happen with 4.79 % (14) that realize a PIC. In this analysis there is verified that university students who carry out an action of mobility as Erasmus, they are involved in other international actions (Kehm 2005; Feast, Collyer-Braham and Bretag, 2011). Students' mobility is related intrinsically to the EHEA. Low numbers suppose a negative indicator of how the European convergence is demonstrated with regard to students (Papatsiba, 2006). The value of the international mobility does not seem to have so much importance for the university student, in spite of the fact that our information is higher than other European contexts. Though the results in the ULPGC indicate that Erasmus has a better monitoring that the PIC. On the questionnaire that completed for this research, atudents are not asked for the reasons of the non-participation. Consequently, we can suggest a future research of inquiry of the value for the university student of the social responsibility (Gaete Quezada, 2011) and of communication between cultures (Kehm, 2005) as part of the personal response.

An observation of Table 3 proves the existing correlation between all the variables (personnel, educational actions and the valuations) is not significant. There does not exist a variable that influences in a notable way the selected indicators. Highest correlation between these groups of variables is produced between the age and the professional valuation, -0.205. In this case it is a

negative correspondence. That is to say, a minor age causes a higher professional valuation. This information can be in agreement with the contributed ones for Dafouz and Núñez (2009). They were indicating that there will be a generation of apprentices of foreign languages, with a motivation not only academic in Spain very soon. A reflection of the previous thing, through the lens of types of motivation that moves students to learn a foreign language, it indicates that the low participation in the internationalization can indicate the need to research about the conciliatory motivation. The decisive influence of this motivation is described by Gardner (2005: 20): “[...] if an individual is highly motivated to learn another language, has an open and accepting approach to other cultural groups and/or a strong emotional interest in the target language group “[...] This type of motivation is associated with the intercultural aspect of the communicative competence, as Doiz, Lasagabaster and Saw (2014: 185) have indicated: “we propose that it is essential to raise language and cultural awareness in the implementation of multilingualism in higher education”.

Another correspondence, with a value of -0.172, is the one that exists between the branch of knowledge and the professional valuation. As the previous one, it is negative. So, it indicates that students with a humanistic training, they reach better numbers in the professional valuation. The reason could be that Art and Humanities (to whom a value of 1 was assigned) it includes students of Modern Languages and Translation and Interpreting, who logically consider the language as a fundamental objective for the professional career. The number of students with these characteristics it represents 16 % of total, and 45 % of the students of the above-mentioned branch of knowledge.

There is also a negative correlation of -0.141 between the place of birth and this professional valuation. That is to say, those who have a minor value in this parameter “place of birth” (born in Canarias, rest of Spain and Europe), they have a higher index of professional valuation. There is no significant correspondence between the personal analyzed variables or the educational activities and the academic valuation demonstrated by every student.

**Table 3.** Matrix of Correlations (Pearson)

Variable	Age	Birth Place	Native language	Gender	Branch of knowledge	Bilingual school	Official certification	Erasmus stay	PIC	Foreign language learning	Professional valuation	Academic valuation
Age	<b>1</b>	0.093	0.086	0.111	<b>0.138</b>	0.011	0.023	0.003	-0.011	-0.087	<b>-0.205</b>	0.008
Place of birth	0.093	<b>1</b>	<b>0.665</b>	0.084	0.030	-0.013	-0.044	-0.088	<b>-0.174</b>	0.095	<b>-0.141</b>	-0.078
Native language	0.086	<b>0.665</b>	<b>1</b>	0.095	0.098	-0.074	-0.073	-0.096	<b>-0.127</b>	-0.021	-0.068	0.031
Gender	0.111	0.084	0.095	<b>1</b>	<b>0.159</b>	<b>-0.116</b>	-0.039	-0.029	<b>-0.172</b>	0.010	-0.043	0.006
Branch of knowledge	<b>0.138</b>	0.030	0.098	<b>0.159</b>	<b>1</b>	-0.053	-0.062	0.031	-0.027	-0.020	<b>-0.172</b>	0.082
Bilingual school	0.011	-0.013	-0.074	<b>-0.116</b>	-0.053	<b>1</b>	<b>0.173</b>	0.048	0.071	-0.016	-0.093	-0.005
Official certification	0.023	-0.044	-0.073	-0.039	-0.062	<b>0.173</b>	<b>1</b>	0.027	<b>0.116</b>	-0.004	-0.100	-0.110
Erasmus stay	0.003	-0.088	-0.096	-0.029	0.031	0.048	0.027	<b>1</b>	<b>0.147</b>	0.068	0.015	-0.022
PIC	-0.011	<b>-0.174</b>	<b>-0.127</b>	<b>-0.172</b>	-0.027	0.071	<b>0.116</b>	<b>0.147</b>	<b>1</b>	0.081	0.007	0.010
Foreign language learning	-0.087	0.095	-0.021	0.010	-0.020	-0.016	-0.004	0.068	0.081	<b>1</b>	-0.051	-0.045
Professional valuation	<b>-0.205</b>	<b>-0.141</b>	-0.068	-0.043	<b>-0.172</b>	-0.093	-0.100	0.015	0.007	-0.051	<b>1</b>	0.303
Academic/curricular valuation	0.008	-0.078	0.031	0.006	0.082	-0.005	-0.110	-0.022	0.010	-0.045	<b>0.303</b>	<b>1</b>

*Values in bold are different from 0 with an alpha significance level=05*



Besides, if we calculate the correlation between the total of the realized activities and the professional valuation of the languages, between the above mentioned total and the academic, and between the total of both questions, educational realized actions and valuation of all the individuals (292), we obtain Table 4.

**Table 4.** Pearson's correlation between the valuations and educational actions

Correlation completed activities and professional valuation	0.141
Correlation completed activities and academic valuation	0.092
Correlation completed activities and total of valuations	0.128

None of the considered values is significant. For this reason it is reaffirmed that there is not a relation between both questions. This implies a certain disagreement, because students of our case study they affirm that they value very much the learning of a foreign language, but they do not demonstrate it in the educational actions.

We have confirmed the existence of 42 individuals (of 292) that have accumulated three or more educational actions related to learning language. Of them, 42.86 % values more the academic and formative aspects that they obtain on having learned new languages. However, only 26.19 % analyzes the possible improvements that they will obtain in the labor market. According to this information, the instrumental academic motivation is quantitatively more effective at the moment of increasing the idiomatic level of the university students, that the possible professional objectives. This distance already was pointed by Sánchez-Hernández, Gallardo-Vázquez and CorchueloMartínez-Azua (2014).

#### 4. Conclusions

To conclude, analyzed indicators in this research indicate an improvement in the university education with regard to the learning of a foreign language. However, we think it is not sufficient according to the offers of *Education and Training 2020*. Without a doubt, the improvement is proactive (Coyle, Hood and Marsh, 2010), but the development of a longitudinal study would explain with more precise information, the rate of the above mentioned progression.

In this research, there have not been kept in mind the possible social and cultural factors of Higher Education in Canary Islands (Spain), as Comajoan (2010) and Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2014) have proposed. We decided to consider the educational programs of the EHEA in Canary Islands, as a case study in the development of the Bologna Plan in Spain. Consequently, this investigation should complement with other studies that analyze the effective suitability of the level that one proposes across the test of certification of the university area, and the professional and mobility reality of every knowledge branch (Coperías Aguilar, 2009).

Regarding the learning of a foreign language, the university student of the ULPGC studies mainly English. This coincides with the rest of Spain and with the global trend of the university use of this language. But also, it opens new researches about the little monitoring of French, in a university placed in a territory close to African continent, and with great perspectives of creation of new employments in French speaking zones. With this approach the possible distance of the student is confirmed with regard to the reality of the possible professional opportunities of a foreign language.

## References

- Aguilar, M. & Muñoz, C. (2012). Lecturer and student perceptions on CLIL at a Spanish university. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15:2, 183-197. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2011.615906
- Aguilar, M. & Muñoz, C. (2014). The effect of proficiency on CLIL benefits in Engineering students in Spain International. *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 24, 1-18. DOI: 10.1111 / ijal.12006
- Cáceres Lorenzo, M-T.(2015). Variables en el desarrollo de la reflexión metalingüística (L1) de alumnos plurilingües en el primer año universitario. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada*, 272, 275–296. DOI: 10.1075 / resla.27.2.02cac
- Comajoan, L. (2010). La enseñanza de lenguas en España y el reto del multilingüismo europeo. *Hispania*, 93: 1, 123-129.
- Coperías Aguilar, M J. (2009). Intercultural communicative competence in the context of the European higher education area. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 9:4, 242-255. DOI: 10.1080/14708470902785642
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Csizér, K. & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The internal structure of language learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89, 19-36. DOI: 0.1111 / j.0026-7902.2005.00263.x
- Dafouz, E & Núñez, B. (2009). CLIL in Tertiary Education: Devising a New Learning Landscape. E. Dafouz y M. C. Guerrini (comp.) (pp. 101-112). *CLIL Across Educational Levels*. Madrid: Richmond.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J. (2014). What does ‘international university’ mean at a European bilingual university? The role of languages and culture. *Language Awareness*, 23:1-2, 172-186. DOI: 10.1080/09658416.2013.863895
- Europe (2020). Retrieved on June 9, 2016 from: [http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index\\_es.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_es.htm)
- European Commission (2012). Retrieved on March 1, 2016 from: [http://ec.europa.eu/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/index_en.htm)
- Europeans and their Languages* (2006). Retrieved on March 1, 2016 from: [http://ec.europa.eu/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/index_en.htm)
- Europeans and their Languages* (2012). Retrieved on March 1, 2016 from: [http://ec.europa.eu/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/index_en.htm)
- Eurostat (2013). Retrieved on July 13, 2016 from: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/help/new-eurostat-website>
- Falcón, E. & Lorenzo, F. (2015). Linguistic policies for teaching Spanish L2 in European education systems. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 178, 78-86. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.03.150
- Feast, V., Collyer-Braham, S., & Bretag, T. (2011). Global experience: The development and preliminary evaluation of a programme designed to enhance students’ global engagement. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 48, 239–250. DOI: 10.1080/14703297.2011.593701

- Fernández-Santiago, M. (2011). Integration or immersion? A comparative study at the tertiary level. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 4, 49-64. DOI: 10.5294 / laclil.2011.4.1.5
- Gaete Quezada, R. (2011). La responsabilidad social universitariacomodesaño para la gestiónestratégica de la Educación Superior: el caso de España. *Revista de Educación*, 355, 109-133.
- Gadner, R. (2005). *Integrative motivation and second language acquisition*. Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics/Canadian Linguistics Association Joint Plenary Talk. Retrieved on July 13, 2016 from: <http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/caaltalk5final.pdf>
- Gómez López, A., SolazPortolés, J. & SanjoséLópez, V. (2014). Competencia en lenguaInglesa de estudiantesuniversitarios españoles en el contextodel EEES: nivel de dominiolingüístico, estrategiasmetacognitivas y hábitoslectores". *Revista de Educación*, 363, 154-183. DOI: 10.1016/S2007-2872(15)30005-6.
- Halbach, A., Lázaro Lafuente, L. & Pérez Guerra, J. (2013). La lenguainglesa en la nuevauniversidaddel EEES. *Revista de Educación*, 362, 105-132. DOI: 10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2011-362-154
- Heyworth, F. (2004). Why the CEF is important. In K. Morrow (Ed.), *Insights from the Common European Framework* (pp. 12-21). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobone, V. & Moro, G. (2015). Evaluating the impact of the Erasmus programme: skills and European identity. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40:2, 309-328. DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2014.909005
- Jarcau, M. (2014). Intercultural education important component of lifelong learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 142, 421-426. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.704
- Jeoffrion, C., Marcouyeux, A., Starkey-Perret, R., Narcy-Combes, M-F. & Birkan, I. (2014). From multilingualism to plurilingualism: university students' beliefs about language learning in a monolingual context. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 27:1, 8-26. DOI: 10.1080/07908318.2014.887724
- Kehm, B. M. (2005). The Contribution of International Student Mobility to Human Development and Global Understanding. *US-China Education Review*, 2 (1), 18-24.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2012). El papeldelinglés en el fomento del multilingüismo en la Universidad. *Estudios de lingüísticainglesaaplicada*, 12, 13-44. DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2012.670241
- Lasagabaster, D. & López Beloqui, R. (2015). The Impact of Type of Approach (CLIL Versus EFL) and Methodology (Book-Based Versus Project Work) on Motivation. *PortaLinguarum* 23, 41-57.
- López-Fernández, O. (2014). University teaching experience with the electronic European Language Portfolio: an innovation for the promotion of plurilingualism and interculturality. *Cultura y Educación: Culture and Education*, 26:1, 211-225. DOI: 10.1080/11356405.2014.908667
- Maíz-Arévalo, C. & Domínguez-Romero, E. (2013). Students' response to CLIL in tertiary education: the case of business administration and economics at Complutense University. *Revista de Lingüística y LenguasAplicadas*, 8, 1-12.
- MCER. Consejo de Europa (2003). Cambridge English Language Assessment. (*Marco Común Europeo de Referenciaparas lasLenguas: Enseñanza, Aprendizaje, Evaluación*). Madrid: Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, Instituto Cervantes, Editorial Anaya.

- Papatsiba, V. (2006). Making higher education more European through student mobility? Revisiting EU initiatives in the context of the Bologna Process. *Comparative Education*, 42:1, 93-111. DOI: 10.1080/03050060500515785
- Raigón Rodríguez, A.R. (2015). The impact of introducing foreign language requirements on the Spanish higher education system: The case of Córdoba University. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 5, 265–279. DOI: 10.1514/cercles-2015-0013
- Raigón Rodríguez, A.R. & Larrea Espinar, A.M. (2013). Análisis y percepción por parte del alumnado del requisito lingüístico en el acceso al Máster de Formación del Profesorado de Educación Secundaria. *PortaLinguarum*, 20, 63-75.
- Ramos García, A. (2013). Higher Education Bilingual Programmes in Spain. *PortaLinguarum* 19, 101-111.
- Riddell, S. & Weedon, E. (2012). Lifelong learning and the generation of human capital. In S. Riddell, Markowitsch, J. and Weedon, E. (Edit.), *Lifelong learning in Europe: equity and efficiency in the balance* (pp. 1-16). Bristol: Policy Press.
- Sánchez-Hernández, I, Gallardo-Vázquez, D. & Corchuelo Martínez-Azua, B. (2014). Students' perceptions among foreign languages in the EHEA. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 6, 205 - 214. DOI: 10.1108/JARHE-07-2013-0031
- Sánchez-Pérez, M., Manzano-Agugliaro, F. & Salaberri Ramiro, S. (2012). Punto de partida hacia el bilingüismo en Educación Superior: resultados de inglés en la prueba de acceso a la universidad desde una perspectiva de género. *Espiral. Cuadernos del profesorado*, 5, 3-15.
- Tsuchiya, K., & Pérez Murillo, M. D. (2015). Comparing the language policies and the students' perceptions of CLIL in tertiary education in Spain and Japan. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 8, 25-35. DOI: 10.5294/laclil.2014.8.1.3.
- ULPGC en cifras (The ULPGC in figures) (2014). Retrieved on June 9, 2016 from <https://www2.ulpgc.es/index.php?pagina=ulpgcencifras&ver=inicio>

## İspanya Devlet Üniversitesinde yabancı dilin öğrenme göstergeleri: Durum Çalışması

### Öz

Bu çalışma Las Palmas de Gran Canaria Üniversitesinde eğitim gören 292 lisansüstü öğrenci ile özel, eğitim hareketliliği ve yabancı dil öğrenmenin değerini ve ayrıca bunun bir ya da birden fazla dil öğrenme ile ilişkisini ortaya çıkarmak amacıyla yapılmıştır. Çalışma sonuçları, öğrenci hareketliliği oranı %19'u aşmamasına rağmen, öğrencilerin %60'ının yabancı dil sertifikasına sahip olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bu çalışma Avrupa 2020 stratejisine göre konuşma becerisini değerlendirebilmek için İspanyadaki diğer üniversitelere de yayımlıdır.

*Anahtar sözcükler:* Yabancı dil öğrenme; Avrupa yüksek öğrenim bölgesi; İspanya devlet üniversitesi, Avrupa 2020 stratejisi

## **AUTHOR BIODATA**

### **M-Teresa Cáceres-Lorenzo**

Professor in Spanish Philology at the University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (ULPGC). Specialized in Applied Linguistics, she is the Director of the ULPGC Educational Innovation workgroup "Devising new didactic resources for educational improvement according to the new European Higher Education Area" (GIE-7). She has published numerous works in national and international journals and conference proceedings with this workgroup.

### **Marcos Salas Pascual**

Specialized in the implementation of the ICTs in education, he is a member of the GIE-7.

### **Isabel Cristina Alfonzo-de-Tovar**

ULPGC Erasmus Mundus Program teacher and member of the GIE-7. She has participated and published her research related in the field of Applied Linguistics in various academic events.

### **Yaiza Santana-Alvarado**

Associate Spanish teacher at the ULPGC. Member of the innovation group GIE-7.

### **M-Cristina Santana-Quintana**

Lecturer of German at ULPGC. Bachelor of German and English (Mainz Universität) and PhD in German Philology. She has published several national and international articles on foreign language teaching. Member of the GIE-7.

### **M-Jesus Vera-Cazorla**

Lecturer of Applied Linguistics at the ULPGC. She has published several national and international articles on foreign language methods and online assessment. Member of the GIE-7.