

# **The Integration of Internationalisation in Secondary Bilingual Education in the Netherlands**

---

BA Thesis English Language and Culture, Utrecht University

**Name: A.C. Vredevoogd (Sanne)**

**Student number: 3347087**

**Thesis supervisor: dr. W.Z. van den Doel**

**Second Reader: dr. R.G.J.L. Supheert**

**Completed on: 21-08-2013**

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Bilingual Secondary Education in the Netherlands .....	8
2.1 Internationalisation Policy and the European Platform.....	8
2.2 ELOS.....	9
2.3 Bilingual Education .....	9
2.4 European and International Orientation.....	10
2.5 Common Framework for Europe Competence .....	13
2.6 Bilingual Education and Internationalisation .....	14
3. European and International Orientation in Education .....	16
3.1 Defining European and International Orientation .....	16
3.2 Measuring European and International Orientation .....	17
3.3 Teaching European and International Orientation .....	17
4. Internationalisation and Intercultural Competence .....	20
4.1 Defining Intercultural Competence.....	20
4.2 Measuring Intercultural Competence .....	21
4.3 Teaching Intercultural Competence.....	24
5. Gamification in Education .....	26
6. EIO versus Intercultural Competence .....	28
6.1 Defining Internationalisation .....	28
6.2 Measuring Internationalisation.....	29
6.3 Internationalisation and Teaching.....	30
7. Conclusion .....	32
Works Cited .....	34

## 1. Introduction

The internationalisation of education is a hot topic in the Netherlands; it is promoted in higher education as well as secondary education and even primary schools are starting with foreign language teaching at a young age (European Platform 2). Nowadays, internationalisation and English language skills seem to be a requirement in an academic environment and for working professionals in general (Europees Platform 2). An increase in international mobility is a probable reason for education authorities to stress English language learning and internationalisation, but developments in the European Union have formed the education policy in the Netherlands in such a way as to emphasise foreign language teaching and internationalisation (Oonk, "European" 26-27).

The formation of an EU education policy was, however, not an easy matter. The EU only published a resolution on education in 1976 and an initial resolution on the "European dimension in education" was made in 1988 (Oonk, "European" 24). The 1976 resolution identifies the European dimension as a subtheme in European education and the resolution from 1988 further elaborates on the possible aspects of this dimension, most importantly the integration of the European identity and knowledge of the different member states from historical, social, cultural and economic perspectives (Oonk, "European" 25). In the Treaty on European Union from 1992, the EU encourages "community action [that] shall be aimed at developing the European dimension in education, particularly through the teaching and dissemination of the languages of the Member States" (Oonk, "European" 24). This "European dimension" has continued to be an objective of education initiatives from the EU, an objective that includes the following aspects: European identity, foreign language learning, mobility, cultural heritage and active citizenship (Oonk, "European" 25). Remarkably, although EU policy promotes the learning of two foreign languages, English is

predominantly and increasingly used as a *lingua franca* in international situations in the EU (Oonk, "European" 28). Using a single *lingua franca* in the EU does seem to oppose the idea of multilingualism prescribed by EU policy; when a single foreign language is used in international encounters, the practical use of learning other European languages is diminished.

Unsurprisingly, Dutch education policy mirrors the inclusion of internationalisation in its education policy. The EU prescribes education guidelines that need to be implemented by the member states (Oonk, "European" 25). Internationalisation in education in the Netherlands was first included in a 1991 policy document from the Ministry of Education and describes internationalisation as "activities aimed at the structural enhancement of the international orientation and reputation of Dutch education so that education acquires maximum access to the knowledge and experiences at international level, can benefit optimally from international partnerships and programs, and can contribute to international cooperation" (5). This policy appears to imply that unless the Netherlands prepares its students by integrating internationalisation into the national curriculum, the opportunity to benefit from international relations in the EU would be missed. In 1993, therefore, the European Platform for Dutch Education was formed to facilitate the implementation of national and European policies relating to internationalisation (Oonk, "The Case" 98). The European Platform not only implements these policies, but also functions as the knowledge centre for internationalisation in education in the Netherlands; the European Platform funds research, coordinates with schools and determines the standard of internationalisation in schools. The European Platform also creates the internationalisation programmes available for secondary schools and judges the performance of schools that participate in these

programmes. This makes the European Platform the most important factor in the shaping of internationalisation in education in the Netherlands.

The emphasis on internationalisation in the original EU policies went hand in hand with the promotion of multilingualism. This led to the development of bilingual programmes in secondary schools in the Netherlands, where English bilingual programmes have proved increasingly popular (Oonk, "The Case" 103). Consequently, secondary schools all over the Netherlands have been opening bilingual departments; in 1993, there were five schools with a bilingual department, but now approximately fifteen percent of Dutch secondary schools have a bilingual department (Oonk, "The Case" 103). The bilingual programme is one of the internationalisation programmes developed and by the European Platform. According to the European Platform "internationalisation enhances education" and studying other subjects in a foreign language is part of that internationalisation (European Platform 3). The EU policies likewise mention foreign language learning as essential to developing the European dimension.

However, internationalisation in education seems to have become a goal in itself, without considering what goal it actually serves or even what it means in the context of education. The European Platform does not explain in any of their sources how and why "internationalisation enhances education", and since this is the organisation that implements internationalisation in secondary education, it is worrying that there is no satisfactory explanation from them about how internationalisation is to the advantage of schools and students in the Netherlands (European Platform 3). The European Platform does point out that globalisation is the reason for the need for internationalisation in education, but does not elaborate further (European Platform 3). Even the Dutch national policy only mentions its use as a form of prestige and possible necessity for international cooperation; it

is never questioned how internationalisation serves educational institutions or how it is necessary for international cooperation, but it is seen as an essential aspect of education (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap 5). It appears that internationalisation is becoming a buzzword, or something of a proxy for quality in education and it seems that the European Platform has trouble defining internationalisation within education. The European Platform uses the concept of European and International Orientation as described by Henk Oonk as the basis for its internationalisation programmes, but makes use of no other theory or model. Basing the bilingual programme integration of internationalisation on a single concept might be short-sighted. Additionally, there is also little to no mention made of culture and its role in language acquisition and internationalisation in the bilingual programme (European Platform, *Standaard*). The role of the intercultural as part of language and internationalisation might be an underappreciated aspect, while it has been pointed out as an integral part of both (Agar, *Language*). The teaching and measuring of internationalisation in the bilingual programme are outlined by the European Platform in the bilingual standard, but useful practices might be gleaned there from intercultural training, or even gamification in education.

The sources used to determine European Platform policy are confined to what has been published by the organisation. The concept of European and International Orientation (EIO) and related teaching and measuring methods are limited to what has been published by Henk Oonk and related authors on the subject. The topic of intercultural competence is confined to material relating to intercultural competence in education. The topic of gamification is mentioned since it is easily adopted in any education setting, but there are no sources that specifically deal with the gamification of internationalisation, because it is such a new development in teaching and testing methods. The paper will use the sources to

investigate the definition, teaching and measuring of internationalisation in education and determine how the integration of internationalisation can enhance secondary bilingual education in the Netherlands. The current state of affairs should be analysed, so accordingly the bilingual programme as developed by the European Platform will be discussed in Chapter 2. The definition, teaching and measuring methods of internationalisation according to the European and International Orientation (EIO) will be covered in Chapter 3. Intercultural competence and training is defined and explained in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 introduces gamification as a teaching and measuring method. Chapter 6 compares the definitions, teaching methods and measuring devices of internationalisation.

## **2. Bilingual Secondary Education in the Netherlands**

The European Platform is the organisation that decides on internationalisation policy in education in the Netherlands. This chapter will elaborate on the European Platform and the contents of its bilingual programme and how internationalisation is integrated into the curriculum.

### **2.1 Internationalisation Policy and the European Platform**

The European Platform promotes internationalisation in education for the sake of quality in education (European Platform 3). This echoes the 1991 policy document that states internationalisation as a necessary component of education: “Our world is internationalising at a rapid pace. Today’s pupils are tomorrow’s global citizens. To prepare them for living, learning and working in an international society, it is of the utmost importance that internationalisation is integrated into school curricula and policy” (European Platform 3). The European Platform believes the internationalisation of education to be analogous to quality, which is necessarily true. The European Platform lists a large variety of internationalisation activities for schools to use in their curricula, as well as programmes that range from international days, to exchanges and bilingual education. Two programmes developed by the European Platform offer a curriculum that fully integrates internationalisation into the curriculum: ELOS and bilingual education. The focus of this thesis will be on bilingual education because of the EU emphasis on a European dimension that includes foreign language learning, as mentioned Chapter 1. Moreover, the European Platform describes the use of a foreign language in the bilingual programme as part of internationalisation (European Platform 8).

## **2.2 ELOS**

ELOS started as a pilot in 2004; students following this programme should reach a competence level of B2 in two languages according to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and reach Level 5 of the Common Framework for Europe Competence (CFEC) (European ELOS Network). Aside from these goals, ELOS schools have to comply with the ELOS standard as developed by the European Platform. The similarity between the bilingual programme and ELOS is the use of the Common Framework for Europe Competence. This framework is key to the internationalisation of the curriculum, as it used as a base for teaching and measuring the degree of internationalisation in schools. The Europe competence framework identifies a progression in knowledge, skills and attitude.

## **2.3 Bilingual Education**

Bilingual education started in Dutch secondary schools in 1989 (European Platform). This programme focuses on improving the language proficiency and European and International Orientation (EIO) of students. Instead of Dutch, English is used as the language of instruction in most subjects to improve language skills. The school with a bilingual programme can become an official bilingual education school four years after starting the programme, as long as they adhere to the bilingual education standard and pass the examination from the European Platform (Europees Platform). The standard contains all the requirements that a bilingual programme at school will have to meet in order to be officially recognised as a bilingual education school. Aside from the language proficiency requirements and the direct references to the Common Framework for Europe Competence (CFEC) there are no specific

requirements or definitions. The European Platform states in their standard for bilingual education that students should “have acquired knowledge”, “have partaken in activities” and “focus on internationalisation” without specifying how and to what degree this should be done (Europees Platform 1-7).

## 2.4 European and International Orientation

The standard for bilingual education contains several requirements that are based on the European and International Orientation (EIO). This concept is linked to a model called the Common Framework for Europe Competence (CFEC). This model is used by the European Platform to measure the level of internationalisation and judge the teaching and content in class. The requirements in the textboxes are all translated from Dutch and are all part of the bilingual education standard as used by the European Platform:

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At the end of the third form students should meet the internationalisation requirements stated within the core goals, at least in the subjects history, geography and economy, and can talk about it with relative ease and understanding. (Europees Platform 2)</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At the end of the third form students will have:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Acquired EIO knowledge within subjects</li> <li>○ Taken part in internationalisation projects</li> <li>○ Taken part in at least one international collaboration project. (Europees Platform 2)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At the end of the entire six-year period, students will produce an essay,</li> </ul>  |

<p>presentation, project and/or conversation in English that makes clear reference to a theme that pertains to European or international developments. (Europees Platform 2)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At the end of the six-year period, students will have: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Acquired additional EIO knowledge within the subjects</li> <li>o Taken part in internationalisation projects</li> <li>o Taken part in at least one international collaboration project (Europees Platform 2)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The curriculum is characterised by a particular attention to internationalisation. (Europees Platform 3)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The school makes clear in its policy plan for the bilingual department what role EIO has in the school and in the programme. (Europees Platform 3)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The school will use the Common Framework for Europe Competence (CFEC) in shaping the EIO programme. (Europees Platform 3)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- European and International Orientation will manifest itself in the curriculum through special programmes and projects. (Europees Platform 3)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The student will actively take part in different internationalisation activities (that interpret the internationalisation goals set by the school) like exchanges, international work placements or study visits, or other collaboration projects. (Europees Platform 3)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- International activities of students are documented, for example in a portfolio.</li> </ul>

(Europees Platform 2)
- There is a varied programme with activities like English-language school trips, theatre visits, Model United Nations, Junior Speaking Contest, European Youth Parliament, etc. (Europees Platform 3)

- <b>Core goal 18:</b> English as a world language <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The student learns what role English as a <i>lingua franca</i> plays in international contact.</li> </ul>
- <b>Core goal 38:</b> Geographical knowledge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The student learns to map out an image of the Netherlands and the rest of the world with regards to current social, physical, political and personal aspects of people and places.</li> </ul>
- <b>Core goal 45:</b> European Collaboration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The student learns of European Collaboration and how the European Union works for the Netherlands and how it fits in with the rest of the world</li> </ul>
- <b>Core goal 47:</b> War, Peace and Human Rights <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The student learns how to put conflicts, events and wars in perspective, how these influence people and communities and how important human rights and international cooperation are.</li> </ul>

The standard describes the internationalisation goals of the bilingual programme in terms of knowledge gained and activities joined. The student is required to produce

something measurable in order to determine his or her success in gaining the required knowledge, like a portfolio. Aside from mentioning the Common Framework for Europe Competence (CFEC) as the guideline for internationalisation, exact teaching methods are not described. This gives the school freedom in how to interpret the standard, but no instruction as to what constitutes a good lesson or activity. The clearly measurable results of the bilingual programme are the knowledge and skills gained by students, but that leaves the change in attitude that is also required of students according to the Common Framework of Europe Competence (CFEC) unmeasured. Skills and knowledge could be measured in a regular test, but standardised testing makes it exceedingly difficult to measure an abstract concept like attitude.

The goals formulated in the bilingual standard do not follow the model for Europe competence precisely and exclude any goals relating to students' attitudes. The omission of attitude goals might impact the overall effectiveness of the internationalisation of the curriculum as the Common Framework for Europe Competence's inclusion of attitude goals would indicate that it is essential to the internationalisation of the bilingual programme.

## **2.5 Common Framework for Europe Competence**

The Common Framework for Europe Competence (CFEC) is structured like the Common European Framework of Reference; however, it describes the stages of Europe competence learning rather than language learning. The CFEC distinguishes four different domains, which are labelled EIO 1 to 4. Each domain has three aspects: knowledge skills and attitude and each domain has six levels of advancement. Unlike the ELOS programme, the programme for bilingual education does not specify to what level in the framework sixth form students

should have advanced. An example of a domain would be EIO-1, “I am an informed European citizen who can access, process and evaluate knowledge relevant to Europe and the wider world, and act upon it” (ELOS 2). The student has more knowledge, is more skilled and has a different (improved) attitude as he or she advances through the levels. The knowledge Level 1 of EIO-1 states, “I have basic knowledge of the geography in Europe and a general idea of European history” and the level 6 statement is “I know in which fields European and international institutions exert an important influence, and can explain the consequences for citizens, giving concrete examples” (ELOS 2). The Common Framework for Europe Competence (CFEC) is designed to create a link between theory and school practice, but it does not seem to be an ideal system. For instance, EIO-4.1.3 states “I am willing to work as a part of a team on new ideas” as an attitude goal, but it is unclear how this goal should be attained (ELOS 3). There are 64 goals in the Common Framework for Europe Competence and not all of them are transparent or easily introduced into a curriculum, as evidenced by the attitude goal.

## **2.6 Bilingual Education and Internationalisation**

Internationalisation policy is devised by the EU and implemented in the Netherlands by the European Platform. The European Platform has developed the standard that is used to implement and test bilingual education in secondary schools. The bilingual education standard requires schools to improve the language proficiency of students as well as their European and International Orientation (EIO). The latter is the concept of internationalisation used in the bilingual programme. The standard is unclear about how to attain attitude goals but still states them as necessary for EIO development. It is unclear how

certain skills and attitudes can be acquired and how to recognise the level of competence within the Common Framework for Europe Competence.

### 3. European and International Orientation in Education

In Chapter 2, it has been established that European and International Orientation (EIO) is central to the standard developed by the European Platform for the bilingual programme in secondary school. EIO is the manifestation of internationalisation in the bilingual programme curriculum. This chapter will explore the definition, teaching and measuring methods of internationalisation as described in the Common Framework of Europe Competence (CFEC) and according to the concept European and International Orientation (EIO).

#### 3.1 Defining European and International Orientation

European and International Orientation (EIO) is a fairly novel concept; Henk Oonk first introduced it in his 2004 doctoral thesis on internationalisation in secondary education. He defines EIO as “European and international orientation of all educational activities intended to provide specific knowledge, understanding and skills in the field of European and international developments” (Oonk, *Europese integratie* 84). Maslowski, Oonk and van der Werf remark that “an adequate approach to EIO is considered as a contribution to the establishment of European citizenship” and emphasize the need for a neutral EIO concept to find the right balance between national and European identity (5). There are some concerns about whether students risk losing the Dutch identity in favour of a European identity (193-4). However, Maslowski, Oonk and van der Werf justify an international approach to education by saying that pupils these days find themselves in a situation where a shift from multiculturalism to a shared citizenship is necessary and “if they are to function properly as citizens within the European Union, pupils should be knowledgeable about the process of European unification, the institutions, and the activities” (5). Maslowski, Oonk and van der

Werf assume that being situated in a position where they need to balance a national, European and global identity, pupils are in need of more knowledge, skills and a different attitude towards their own identity and that of others. Accordingly, maintaining a national identity requires an international orientation and the latter is therefore an important part of education, as opposed to a threat to their national identity.

### **3.2 Measuring European and International Orientation**

The bilingual education programme uses European and International Orientation (EIO) as the definition for internationalisation in bilingual education. To measure the level of EIO, the Common Framework for Europe Competence (CFEC) and a portfolio are used (Czetwertynska 245), as mentioned in the bilingual education standard. The Common Framework for Europe Competence (CFEC) is not an ideal way of measuring EIO; it was noted in Chapter 2 that the Common Framework for Europe Competence does not give explicit directions for assessment. Other forms of assessment can also be used by the schools themselves to measure the competence of their pupils, such as self-evaluation, tests, essays and presenting research (Oonk, "Theoretical" 204). However, it remains difficult to test the improvements in attitude that the framework suggests. There is also no diploma or any type of formal recognition for EIO competences at the moment, excepting the school portfolio. Making EIO progress measurable thus remains a problem in education.

### **3.3 Teaching European and International Orientation**

Schools face problems when using the Common Framework of Europe Competence (CFEC) as the basis for their curricula. In Dutch ELOS schools, research has shown that while

teachers use approved internationalisation materials and teaching methods, the Common Framework of Europe Competence (CFEC) is not used very often to integrate internationalisation into the teaching programme (Maslowski, Naayer and Oonk, *Effecten internationalisering* 32). According to Oonk, the scope of the framework prohibits teachers from including all domains in their teaching and covering the entire Common Framework of Europe Competence (CFEC) in their classes, which has an adverse effect on the learning of their pupils ("Theoretical" 205).

Another issue arises with pupils in Dutch schools: the multicultural pupil population in Dutch schools would rather discuss intercultural differences on a class, school or local level than in a European context (van der Werf, Oonk and Maslowski 150). Topics that would be ideal to discuss in a European context, like respect, the environment or tolerance are often treated in a broader international or far smaller local context. This also causes teachers to treat the topic of Europe in assignments like a knowledge aspect instead of letting students engage with the topic in the hope to change attitudes (van der Werf, Oonk and Maslowski 150). In this way, the attitude change that is called for in the Common Framework of Europe Competence (CFEC) does not happen, undermining internationalisation goals.

When bilingual programmes start with solid instruction and knowledge-based learning, Oonk and van der Werf think that EIO skills and attitudes will develop and grow according to the levels of the Common Framework of Europe Competence (264). There is, however, no guarantee that the student's knowledge, skills and attitudes will necessarily develop along the lines of the framework, even if teachers do strictly keep to the curriculum.

Moreover, studies show that there is little to no difference between second and fifth Formers when it comes to attitudes towards Europe (Maslowski, Naayer and Oonk, *De*

*Europese* 104). The fifth Formers had acquired more knowledge about Europe, but otherwise there were no clear differences. The research shows that the knowledge that bilingual students have about Europe is connected to their interest in collecting the requisite information (Maslowski, Naayer and Oonk, *De Europese* 104). Bilingual students do tend to have more knowledge about Europe as opposed to those in the ELOS programme. Pupils rarely seem to acquire more knowledge on the occasion of exchanges, acquiring general life skills instead (Bandura en Sercu 88). Knowledge acquisition appears to be very dependent on the interests of the individual pupils (Maslowski, Naayer and Oonk, *De Europese* 106).

## **4. Internationalisation and Intercultural Competence**

Chapter 3 discussed how European and International Orientation is used to internationalise education. This chapter will focus on the aspect of internationalisation that was omitted in the previous definition, the cultural or intercultural competence. Different ways of teaching and measuring intercultural competence might also be applicable to the bilingual programme.

### **4.1 Defining Intercultural Competence**

The term internationalisation remains difficult to define. Oonk called the process of internationalisation European and International Orientation (EIO). Hans de Wit defines it differently; he quotes Jane Knight in his 2010 research paper, where internationalisation is first defined as “a process of integrating an international and cultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” and later as “integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension” (8-9). Internationalisation in the bilingual context would mean the integration of an international, cultural and global dimension into bilingual education in secondary schools. In order to integrate an international, intercultural or global dimension into education, students and teachers will have to develop certain skills and competences. Rather like internationalisation, intercultural competence suffers from being used in a variety of contexts with different meanings. Arnd Witte mentions in his 2011 book on intercultural competence:

The sloganisation may soon reach a level that will render the already vague notion totally useless, assigning buzzword status to both ‘intercultural’ and ‘competence’, a tendency which can only be reverted or even stopped if the concept is restructured

more clearly, and, with a perspective on potential practical applications, anchored firmly in the reality of language learners and language teachers. (1)

The desire for intercultural competence to be used in practical application is what is important. Clear boundaries must be set about what is meant when the term intercultural competence is used. Linguists are familiar with competence as used by Noam Chomsky, it is the cognitive knowledge required to use language (Witte and Harden 3). Culture is a socially produced, dynamic phenomenon that provides a framework of rules, norms, values, beliefs and behaviours. Michael Agar takes the idea of a framework even further and also makes language an essential part of culture, or as he calls it: “languaculture” (15). Witte makes it clear that interculture is the plane where two cultures meet and form an in-between (2). The dynamic nature of culture implies that the interculture is equally dynamic. When the notions of interculture and competence are combined, the concept of intercultural competence is formed. Intercultural competence is the ability to navigate the interculture between people that is constantly changing as the individuals reflect and adapt to different environments; it is the ability to communicate across and between cultures.

#### **4.2 Measuring Intercultural Competence**

It is difficult to measure or test the level of intercultural competence, because intercultural competence is a very broad term. Lies Sercu gives a comprehensive view of possible assessment methods, and demonstrates that no ideal or clear method has been developed yet (Sercu, “Assessing” 17). The simultaneous assessment of language development and intercultural development might also be challenging, as it is possible that poor language skills could influence intercultural competence scores (Sercu, “Assessing” 19). Moreover, as

opposed to questioning whether assessment is necessary for the school, Sercu makes a point about whether scoring intercultural competence is necessary for learning (“Assessing” 19). Sercu makes a valid point that learning need not necessarily be tracked and scored precisely, however, without any type of testing method in place there would be no results to show an organisation like the European Platform. Sercu proposes a model that identifies skills that need developing in different levels (“Assessing” 30-31). However, the model would be hard to use since the skills are not made explicit. In addition, the model also requires constant reflection from the students, which could be a futile exercise because of their lack of intercultural experience. Existing assessments, which are used in the professional world, use a combination of quantitative measures and simulations games or scenario-based assessments. A combination of measures seems to be the best solution so far, although simulation games and role-playing scenarios are not commonly used in secondary education in the Netherlands. For teachers to be able to test intercultural competence, they would need to be adequately informed about the different testing methods.

Existing methods of gauging competence are, however, usually lacking as well. Many of the methods only test knowledge, which, as already established in Chapters 2 and 3, is not the full scope of international or intercultural competence. Liddicoat and Scarino criticise several testing methods that could be used to determine intercultural competence; enactment tasks do not necessarily require competence and skills tests are decontextualised and have no sliding scale to determine progression (72, 56). Only testing behaviour and skills is not sufficient either, but it is an improvement over only testing intercultural knowledge. Liddicoat and Scarino believe in a method that elicits linguistically and culturally appropriate language use; this method requires the student to be both a participant and an analyst, which will also capture what cultural framework the student is using (59-69). Unfortunately,

Liddicoat and Scarino do not specify how exactly to elicit this culturally appropriate language use. It is possible that is a form of scenario-based testing where students also reflect on their own and each other's behaviour. However, testing methods should include a sliding scale model and test a range of skills, knowledge and behaviours.

Not only is there a need to know how to test intercultural competence, but also what to test. Byram identified five things to know, or five *savoirs* about intercultural competence: *savoirs* (knowledge), *savoir-comprendre* (to interpret or relate), *savoirs-faire* (to discover), *savoir-etre* (attitudes) and *savoir-s'engager* (cultural awareness) (Sercu 3). The different *savoirs* support each other in the model. To be interculturally competent a person must have some sort of cultural knowledge and the skills to understand, discover and relate to other cultures. However, this person must also be culturally aware and have the right attitude in order to engage with others. Darla Deardorff uses the elements of intercultural competence as indicated in a national study conducted in the United States. The elements that were agreed on were: attitudes, knowledge, skills, internal outcomes (aspects within in the individual) and external outcomes (behaviour, communication). These elements are also interdependent (Deardorff 40-41). Note how the different elements or aspects of intercultural competence do not actually change very much, aside from being worded slightly differently by Byram and Deardorff. The models agree on a knowledge aspect, skill aspects, attitude and behavioural aspects.

What can be concluded from these models is that knowledge is only a small part of intercultural competence. Witte, like Scarino and Liddicoat, reflects on the need for self-observation and interaction with others, since all the intercultural aspects can be improved by interaction and reflection; students can gain knowledge, practice skills and behaviour through interaction and adapt their attitudes and frameworks by reflecting on it (100-101). It

is the processes of interaction and reflection that seem to be most adequate in testing intercultural competence.

#### **4.3 Teaching Intercultural Competence**

Witte already stated the need for self-observation and interaction when improving intercultural competence. However, the motivation of the student is possibly most important of all:

If the learner does not want to invest in the learning process, intercultural competence will remain at a low level, even if s/he is immersed in the other culture because the foundation for acquiring intercultural competence which has been laid in institutional foreign language learning is not exploited any further, and therefore learned knowledge may fossilize, or even regress. (Witte 104)

The ideal conditions for improving intercultural competence appear to be high motivation and student morale in class. The necessary expertise and motivation are required of the teacher.

Some foreign language teachers might see the inclusion of intercultural competence as irrelevant to their lessons, as was mentioned by some teachers in the answers from a Liddicoat and Scarino questionnaire (62). Castro and Sercu echo this partially; they mention that foreign language teachers do generally put more emphasis on teaching linguistic skills (24). Research by Bandura and Sercu also indicates that teachers' perceptions directly affect the way in which they shape their teaching practice (65), which could mean that intercultural competence and culture is not as entrenched in foreign language teaching practices as could be expected from available literature on the connection between

language and culture (Agar). Language teachers appear to be firm on the separation of language and culture in the different questionnaires, which means that language and intercultural competence are not necessarily directly connected in their minds and in their teaching practices. Following the idea of Agar's languaculture, it should be possible for language and intercultural competence to go hand in hand. Since all teachers in bilingual education teach in a foreign language, they all should be aware and capable of teaching languages and intercultural skills.

## 5. Gamification in Education

A different approach to teaching and testing is gamification. Gamification is “using game-based mechanics, aesthetics, and game thinking to engage people, motivate actions, promote learning, and solve problems” (Kapp 66). The engagement necessary for pupils to improve their intercultural and international competence is within reach when a teacher applies the rules of gamification. Games are motivating and engaging because of their cognitive, emotional and social impact (Domínguez, Saenz-de-Navarrete en de-Marcos 381). Educators could build an education tool that has the potential to be as addictive as *Farmville*. For cognitive impact, a game needs rules, it is the basic level design of a game. Emotional impact is caused, for instance by a reward system like collecting experience points. Social impact can be made in the shape of a leaderboard or a list of obtainable achievements.

To give a more relevant example; a framework like the framework of Europe competence is very suitable for gamification. There is already a levelling system present in the framework, since there are different levels in the domains. Award a student experience points for completing an assignment on European politics, answering a question right about foreign culture or helping a fellow student and pupils can level up once a set amount of experience points is reached. The assignments that are completed by students can be formulated as quests and extra experience points can be awarded to students who completed the quest the fastest or in the most creative way. All of these suggestions already create cognitive, emotional and social impact. The assignments are the rules, the experience points and levelling are the rewards system and awarding more points in class to individuals who do well creates a social interaction. The rules can be as simple as a teacher can make them and provide students with an engaging learning experience. The quests and levelling

system make for a detailed lesson plan with clear goals and it also provides a way to track progress in different fields without having to resort to written tests. It is only unfortunate that gamification is currently in its pioneering days when it comes to applications to different fields, like education.

## **6. EIO versus Intercultural Competence**

This Chapter will compare and contrast the different approaches to defining, teaching and measuring internationalisation mentioned in Chapters 3, 4 and 5 in order to determine how internationalisation can enhance education.

### **6.1 Defining Internationalisation**

There are two major differences between how internationalisation is defined, one of which is the emphasis on European orientation by European and International Orientation (EIO) and the other is the inclusion of an intercultural dimension and intercultural competence in the definition by Witte in Chapter 4. The EIO emphasis on Europe can be traced back to the EU policies mentioned in Chapter 2. The wish to create better international opportunities might be the cause for the European orientation being so important in European and International Orientation (EIO). The intercultural dimension included in the other definition of internationalisation demonstrates a different viewpoint, one that makes culture an essential part of the internationalisation process, just like language learning is also part of that process in bilingual education. The European Platform uses the European and International Orientation (EIO) to define internationalisation in their bilingual education standard. There is no mention of culture in the standard. The lack of acknowledgement of culture as part of internationalisation shows a lack of insight on behalf of the European Platform and proves an attitude to culture and language that might not be beneficial to the internationalisation of bilingual education. Maslowski, Oonk and van der Werf also do not see culture as an integral part of language and internationalisation. Instead of European and International Orientation (EIO), perhaps the term intercultural competence should be used

in Dutch education policy, because interaction in an international environment implies that people are interacting in an intercultural environment.

## **6.2 Measuring Internationalisation**

EIO uses the Common Framework of Europe Competence (CFEC) as a template for measuring internationalisation progress. Knowledge, skills and attitude, the three domains of the CFEC, cannot be adequately measured. This is partly because of the scope of the CFEC and partly because attitude is a complicated domain to gauge. On the other hand, intercultural competence covers the aspects of knowledge, skill, attitude and behaviour as mentioned in Chapter 4. There is no single way to measure intercultural competence, but Witte and other researchers conclude that testing intercultural competence requires interaction, reflection and a variety of testing tools. The aspects or domains of Common Framework of Europe Competence (CFEC) and intercultural competence are similar. The inclusion of the behavioural aspect from intercultural models is useful, because behaviour is motivated by attitudes, giving teachers a better opportunity to gauge the attitudes of pupils. The idea of creating an interactive environment also has merit; it would enable teachers to create a multidisciplinary test in which the students can use all of their intercultural competence to demonstrate their ability. The European Platform only requires pupils to do a project in order to prove their progress in Europe competence. This is an area in which bilingual education can improve to a large extent and in which gamification can also be used, since an interactive environment is requisite.

### 6.3 Internationalisation and Teaching

The Common Framework of Europe Competence (CFEC) is difficult to work with in a traditional, practical teaching setting. It is interesting to note, however, that the Common Framework for Europe Competence (CFEC) makes use of level advancement, which means that teaching or learning accumulates experience to advance to the next level. This is an opportunity to implement gamification in teaching. The Common Framework for Europe Competence is especially suitable since the template already has the basic requirements for game mechanics like levelling and earning experience points. Creating milestones between earning experience points keeps students engaged, while making it easier for teachers to say when a student has reached a certain level. Devising a type of reward system to go with level advancement would also increase positive emotions and engagement of students; they could earn points of their final grade or a look at a test for a few minutes before they have to take it. There are many possibilities, without necessarily needing more funds to apply this framework in a more efficient and engaging way.

Using a definition for internationalisation that includes culture as an essential part of the process and creating a more detailed framework similar to the Common Framework of Europe Competence would provide the European Platform with a much improved framework. Also, Oonk and Witte both claim that pupils themselves play the largest role in what and how much they improve their internationalisation knowledge, skills and other aspects. What is clear is that teaching in a setting where pupils need to improve their intercultural or international competence should go beyond teaching facts and skills. Pupils need to adjust the way they think, act and interact. The only way for this to be successful is for the pupil to be engaged. The European Platform should encourage teachers to

experiment with gamification; it provides the teachers and pupils with an interactive environment and an opportunity to create a more engaging way of teaching.

## 7. Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to investigate how the integration of internationalisation can enhance secondary bilingual education in the Netherlands is. International and European Orientation (EIO) is how the European Platform defines internationalisation in education and the process of internationalisation is measured by the framework of Europe competence. The bilingual curriculum is also based on the same framework. Another way of defining internationalisation in education is by using the term intercultural competence. There are several models that attempt to measure and teach intercultural competence, but they have in common that a single method is not going to cover the breadth and depth of the concept. None of the sources on internationalisation seems to have perfect solutions to the questions of how to teach and measure internationalisation. However, a teaching process that includes interaction and reflection seems to be a good starting point. The largest difference in how internationalisation is defined is the lack of the concept of culture in European and International Orientation, while intercultural competence is about culture and how it influences interaction. Despite its deficiencies, the Common Framework of Europe Competence (CFEC) offers some opportunities to experiment with gamification as a way to teach and measure internationalisation in bilingual education. The integration of internationalisation is not as flawless as the European Platform would lead to believe and is no guarantee for quality education. However, should the European Platform find a way to incorporate interculture into its definition of internationalisation and experiment with gamification and an adapted Common Framework of Europe Competence (CFEC), they might have a better way of enhancing education.

Reflecting on this thesis, the choice to involve multiple points of view to analyse the integration of internationalisation did expose problems within current education policy. It

was, however, disappointing that there was relatively little concrete information about teaching and testing methods. Perhaps didactic sources could provide more information for further research on that topic. The topic of gamification in education is interesting and this new way of engaging with educational material certainly warrants further research. In particular, gamification as a method of interactive teaching is a topic worth researching. It should be kept in mind that gamification does not necessarily require computers or great financial involvement, which also makes it easier for research to be conducted on the subject. The relative scarcity of experiments with gamification and teaching models means that there is an opportunity to pioneer the use of game elements in teaching.

## Works Cited

- Agar, Michael. *Language Shock*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1994.
- Bandura, Ewa and Lies Sercu. "Culture Teaching Practices." *Foreign Language Teachers and Intercultural Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2005. 75-89.
- Castro, Paloma and Lies Sercu. "Objectives of Foreign Language Teaching and Culture Teaching Time." *Foreign Language Teachers and Intercultural Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2005. 19-38.
- Czetwertynska, Grazyna. "Assessment of EIO." *Internationalisation in Secondary Education in Europe: A European and International Orientation in Schools, Policies, Theories and Research*. Ed. Ralf Maslowski, Henk Oonk and Greetje van der Werf. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing, 2011. 245-256.
- Deardorff, Darla K. "Intercultural Competence in Foreign Language Classrooms: A Framework and Implications for Educators." *Intercultural Competence: Concepts, Challenges, Evaluations*. Ed. Arnd Witte and Theo Harden. Bern: Peter Lang, 2011. 37-54.
- Domínguez, Adrián, et al. "Gamifying learning experiences: Practical implications and outcomes." *Computers & Education* 63 (2013): 380-392.
- ELOS. "Common Framework for Europe Competence." 5 2010.
- European ELOS Network. "ELOS Standard for Schools." April 2010.
- European Platform. *Internationalisation Enhances the Quality of Education*. Haarlem: European Platform, 2012.
- . *The European Platform*. 2012. 10 11 2012.
- <<http://www.europeesplatform.nl/sf.mcgi?3326&cat=64>>.
- Europees Platform. "Internationaliseringseisen binnen de Kerndoelen." 29 9 2010.

- . *Persoonlijke ontwikkeling en internationale oriëntatie: Oud-leerlingen over TTO*. Haarlem: Europees Platform, 2012.
- . *Standaard tweetaling onderwijs: Engels - Havo/VWO*. Haarlem: Europees Platform, 2012.
- Kapp, Karl M. "Games, Gamification, and the Quest for Learner Engagement." *T+D* 66.6 (2012): 64-68.
- Koole, Tom and Jan ten Thije. "The Reconstruction of Intercultural Discourse: Methodological Considerations." *Journal of Pragmatics* 33 (2001): 571-587.
- Liddicoat, Anthony J. and Angela Scarino. "Eliciting the Intercultural in Foreign Language Education at School." *Testing the Untestable in Language Educations*. Ed. Amos Paran and Lies Seracu. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2010. 52-76.
- Maslowski, R., et al. *De Europese en internationale oriëntatie in het tweetalig onderwijs*. Groningen: GION, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 2011.
- . *Effecten van internationalisering in het voortgezet onderwijs- een analyse van de implementatie en effecten van een Europese en internationale oriëntatie*. Groningen: GION, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 2009.
- Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap. *Grenzen verleggen: Nota internationalisering van het onderwijs [Widening Horizons: Memorandum on Internationalisation]*. The Netherlands, Den Haag: SDU, 1991.
- Oonk, Henk. "European Union Policy." *Internationalisation in Secondary Education in Europe: A European and International Orientation in Schools, Policies, Theories and Research*. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing, 2011. 21-32.
- . *De Europese integratie als bron van onderwijsinnovatie : een onderzoek naar de betekenis en de resultaten van de internationalisering in het voortgezet onderwijs in Nederland*. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2004.

— . "The Case of the Netherlands." *Internationalisation in Secondary Education in Europe: A European and International Orientation in Schools, Policies, Theories and Research*. Ed. Henk Oonk, Greetje van der Werf and Ralf Maslowski. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing, 2011. 97-107.

— . "Theoretical Aspects of European and International Orientation." *Internationalisation in secondary education in Europe: a European and International Orientation in Schools; policies, theories and research*. Ed. Henk Oonk, Greetje van der Werf and Ralf Maslowski. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing, 2011. 189-212.

Oonk, Henk and Greetje van der Werf. "The Theoretical Basis of a European and International Orientation in Education." *Internationalisation in Secondary Education in Europe: A European and International Orientation in Schools, Policies, Theories and Research*. Ed. Henk Oonk, Greetje van der Werf and Ralf Maslowski. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing, 2011. 257-267.

Sercu, Lies. "Assessing Intercultural Competence: More Questions than Answers." *Testing the Untestable in Language Educations*. Ed. Amos Paran and Lies Sercu. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2010. 17-34.

— . "Teaching Foreign Languages in an Intercultural World." *Foreign Language Teachers and Intercultural Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2005. 1-18.

Werf, Greetje van der, Henk Oonk and Ralf Maslowski. "Internationalisation Policies in Europe: An Analysis." *Internationalisation in secondary education in Europe: a European and International Orientation in Schools; policies, theories and research*. Ed. Greetje van der Werf, Henk Oonk and Ralf Maslowski. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing, 2011. Internationalisation in secondary education in Europe: a European and International Orientation in Schools; policies, theories and research.

Wit, Hans de. *Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe and its assessment, trends and issues*. The Hague: NVAP, 2010.

Witte, Arnd and Theo Harden. "Introduction." *Intercultural Competence: Concepts, Challenges, Evaluations*. Ed. Arnd Witte and Theo Harden. Vol. 10. Bern: Peter Lang, 2011. 1-16.

Witte, Arnd. "On the Teachability and Learnability of Intercultural Competence: Developing Facets of the 'Inter'." *Intercultural Competence: Concepts, Challenges, Evaluations*. Vol. 10. Bern: Peter Lang, 2011. 89-108.