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Introduction

Countries where English as a Foreign or Additional Language (EFL/EAL) is taught have undergone the pressure of a worldwide trend by which English is being included in school curricula from the early years of education (Banfi 2015). Such is the situation of Teaching English to Young Learners (TEYL) within the last decade in most countries in Latin America, and, in this chapter, we will focus on Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Uruguay.

As indicated in our title, we bring into discussion some voices from Latin American contexts from which we could draw sources to substantiate our research, while not claiming to represent the vast region in a conventional sense. We take this stand because we do not believe in reified views of EFL or EAL, of teaching and learning, of Young Language Learners (YLLs) or of bilingualism – a related notion that underlies the discourse generated by the TEYL enterprise.

Despite the complex sociopolitical backdrop in which TEYL is expanding in Latin America (Ramírez-Romero and Sayer 2016), reports on the national programs launched in these countries usually focus on the urge to educate bilingual learners for the international globalised scenario in which proficient command of English is required for communication and for the workplace. Nonetheless, there are researchers (Guevara and Ordoñez 2012) who problematise this linguistic imposition across diverse sociolinguistic teaching-learning contexts, especially when children under the age of five are taught English before becoming literate in their own mother tongue. Other concerns raised are the dearth of specialised teacher preparation and of teaching resources that take into account the social, cognitive and affective development of young learners as well as the lack of consideration for social and historical local issues.

Some central concepts need to be defined. First, the notion of language, here understood as social practice (Fairclough 1989). Taking a political and critical view of language use, we are inspired by César and Cavalcanti’s (2007) metaphor of language as a kaleidoscope, thus breaking away from reductionist dichotomies such as oral/written, literate/illiterate, standard/
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nonstandard, among others. Furthermore, we align ourselves with a post-structuralist perspective of language, which includes psychological and affective dimensions, and does not conceive language as a mere ‘instrument of communication’ (Revuz 1998, p. 217).

The second idea regards the teaching and learning of EFL/EAL by taking a critical stance towards a tradition of English teaching as transmission of linguistic rules. This might be the case when it is taken for granted that once learners learn linguistic rules, as well as cultural conventions that underpin language use, they will get their message across. Following Kincheloe (2004) and Ramanathan (2002), Polo and Guerrero (2010) also point out that English teachers tend not to problematise the sociopolitical aspects embedded in English Language Teaching (ELT), nor the asymmetry among different curricular components.

A third notion regards the age range covered within TEYL. In reaction to the acknowledged attempt to establish a specific age range for the area, Pinter (2006, p. 2) argues that ‘all children are unique, and two children at the same chronological age can exhibit markedly different characteristics’. Araos (2015) asserts that TEYL is understood as teaching English to children from five to 11 years old. Yet, despite the developmental individualities identified among YLLs and the little empirical support available, a major trend worldwide is to introduce TEYL at earlier and earlier ages (Cameron 2001, 2003), under the justification that it encourages motivation, expands intercultural experiences and prepares children for the future. This issue will be critically appraised later in this chapter.

The fourth key issue to be addressed is the systematic association being made between TEYL and the alleged social advantages of bilingualism. Given the scope of this chapter, our intention is to briefly acknowledge some of the implications for the settings in which immersion or bilingual programs have been implemented. The international drive for multilingual education, which can be traced back to the UNESCO 1999 conference (Banfi 2015), is based on an unproblematised definition of bilingualism as ‘the ability to use two languages in everyday life’ (Byers-Heinlein and Lew-Williams 2013, p. 97).

The fifth key idea that needs to be critically reflected upon is the centrality of technology in TEYL classrooms. When discussing innovation in YLLs’ classrooms, Banfi (2015) describes some TEYL programs in Latin America and stresses the expanding role that publishers and technology development companies have played in this scenario. In alignment with Banfi, Figueiredo (2014, p. 159) raises the danger involved in an excessively ‘festive’ view of digital literacies, which leads schools to embrace technology in order to attract and entertain YLLs.

Historical perspectives

This section will offer a panoramic overview of the historical perspectives of TEYL in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Uruguay. While in most of these countries EFL has been compulsorily incorporated into primary schools, mainly by national programs, in Brazil there is no official national program aimed at TEYL.

In Argentina, the teaching of a foreign language is mandatory in primary and secondary schools under the 2006 National Education Law (Ley de Educación Nacional 26.206) and most provinces have tended to select English, starting at the age of six. In 2013, the local project Jornada Ampliada was implemented, integrating English and art in the later years of primary school.

In Chile, the inclusion of EFL in primary education was part of a reform implemented in 1998 by the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), as an explicit attempt to advance quality and equity in Chilean education (MINEDUC 2012; 2013). The justification was that English
would be needed increasingly to participate in the global economy and information network. The English Opens Doors Programme (EODP) was created by MINEDUC in 2003 in agreement with the United Nations Development Programme, proposing actions that foster the improvement of national economic competitiveness and provide opportunities to enable all students in public schools to learn English (Araos 2015).

Concerned with the quality of English teaching/learning and the students’ future competitiveness in the workplace, the National Bilingual Program (NBP) started in Colombia in 2004 as an initiative of the Ministry of Education (MEN). It provides all students with opportunities to become bilingual in English and Spanish and was originally designed to last from 2004 to 2019, with the cooperation of the British and North American governments regarding in-service teacher development (Mejía 2009). The MEN also implemented the ‘Basic Standards of Foreign Language Competences: English’, a document created in 2006, based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFRL) (Byram and Parmenter 2012). Mejía (2009, p. 104) claims that ‘the National Bilingual Programme’s aims are quite ambitious’.

In Uruguayan programs, English has also been considered essential for the country to integrate the global market. However, as Brovetto et al. (2007) state, the focus has been on teaching English through a succession of programs that have not necessarily fulfilled these requirements. Differently from Argentina, Chile and Colombia, Uruguay had the initiative to socially include students through the use of technological resources and, in 2007, proposed the Ceibal Plan. First developed in public schools, the program was based on the One Laptop per Child Program and was adapted to Uruguayan educational settings.

According to Oliveira (2015), the Ceibal Plan in English was implemented as a way of beginning TEYL and of improving teachers’ proficiency. In 2014, students from four to seven years old were finally given a tablet with ludic activities. By 2015, the program had already reached 570 schools, 3,300 groups and 80,000 YLLs in fourth, fifth and sixth grades.

Brazilian policies prescribe the teaching of at least one foreign language starting at the sixth grade of Basic Education – National Education Base and Guidelines (Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação, Brasil 1996) and Foreign Language National Curricular Guidelines (Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais-Língua Estrangeira, PCN-LE, Brasil 1998). Even though it is possible to choose among English, Spanish, French or any other language according to local decision, English has been, by far, the first choice.

The PCN-LE, prepared by a group of university professors, defined the basic guidelines for the teaching of foreign languages in schools from grades six to nine but not for the previous ones. Despite this lack of orientation, for decades, EFL has been taught from pre-kindergarten to fifth grade in several schools of the private sector and language courses. Gimenez (2013) indicates that TEYL programs have been implemented in the public sector, primarily in São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Minas Gerais, Paraná and Rio Grande do Sul, to improve the quality of education and to follow the new demands of globalisation.

**Critical issues and topics**

Taking a critical perspective towards TEYL in Latin America, and echoing research on this theme (Ramírez-Romero and Sayer 2016; Moraes Bezerra and Aceti 2015), four issues will be addressed in the following subsections.
The very age of young language learners

It is important to understand the worldwide trend by which TEYL is being introduced at earlier and earlier ages (Garton et al. 2011), a trend also found in the case of the countries surveyed in this chapter. However, there seems to be little empirical research support in the literature for the notion that younger second language learners learn more efficiently or successfully than older learners (Singleton 1989, p. 37, cited in Nunan 2013, p. 234; Cameron 2003).

Based on Pinter (2011; 2012) and Zandian (2012), Araos (2015, p. 20) notes that YLLs need to be considered a particular group of learners, ‘especially because their learning experiences and motivations are different from adults and teenagers’. Some contemporary sociologists (Corsaro 2011) urge practitioners to consider children’s specific characteristics, respecting their cognitive, affective and social growth. Linse (2005, cited in Nunan 2013, p. 235), in the United States, and Valenzuela (2016), in Chile, have argued for a ‘whole-learner’ approach, by taking a holistic, anthropological and educational view on classroom management, classroom organization and teaching techniques. In Brazil, Rocha (2007) asserts that YLLs need to feel comfortable and self-confident when involved in learning situations.

The imperialistic attitude and the imposition of English bilingualism

Some importantly interrelated aspects are central to a critical discussion of language policies and TEYL educational practices in Latin America. As reported in evaluations of the national programs which have incorporated the teaching of English as a compulsory subject in the Primary Education curricula of Argentina, Chile and Colombia, authors from these countries (Corradi 2014; Araos 2015; Guevara and Ordoñez 2012, respectively) question the imposition of English at early ages and the policy of bilingualism. The notion of Spanish-English bilingualism has been problematised, especially in countries with long traditions of bilingualism and multilingualism in indigenous languages. Mejía (2009, p. 105) highlights the plurilingual composition of Colombian society, which presents ‘around 65 separate indigenous languages in existence, as well as two native Creoles, Colombian Sign Language and Romani’. Relevant bilingualism has always been present in Uruguay, with Spanish being the general language but, as linguistic diversity is considered positive, in certain border regions Italian and Portuguese are taught in primary schools. Although Brazil has no official Portuguese-English bilingual policy, Maher (2013, cited in Liberali and Megale 2016, p. 97), points out that besides Portuguese, ‘two hundred and twenty two languages are spoken in Brazil’.

Parra et al. (2012) voice a similarly critical position on TEYL programs as ideological processes of control. We can relate this standpoint to Phillipson’s ideas about linguistic imperialism, which the author defines as being ‘asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between a dominant language and other languages’ (Phillipson 1992, p. 47).

The production and/or use of specific materials

Our understanding of the Latin America situation is that public and private institutions tend to adopt or adapt imported models because pedagogic coordinators and teachers perceive a
lack of materials that meet their ‘sense of plausibility’ (Prabhu 1987) in their diverse classroom realities.

Research carried out in Chile by Araos (2015) shows that in order to minimise teachers’ reliance on internationally published materials and resources, the Ministry of Education has adapted coursebooks to the Chilean National Syllabus, which is consistent with the international standards of the CEFRL. Pedagogic materials produced in Brazil by some private schools engaged in TEYL have shown strong allegiance to what is published by foreign publishing houses (Soares 2007; Tílio and Rocha 2009). It is noticeable that these decisions are highly dependent on imported models.

The Brazilian National Textbook Program (PNLD), a federal project created to provide public sector teachers and students with textbooks for every subject, has not yet included materials for TEYL. In some Brazilian states, however, isolated initiatives have tried to address the issue of materials production for young learners in public schools.

**Initial and continuing teacher education for TEYL**

The prevailing orientation towards increasing efficiency in technique-oriented teacher training practices must be questioned. As Miller (2013) points out, it is necessary to implement a move from efficiency to criticality and ethics in initial and continuing teacher education. This movement is especially relevant, as ethically oriented EYL teachers can contribute to the critical and ethical education of YLLs.

Abrahams and Farias’s (2010, p. 46) critical interpretation of English language teacher education programs in the Chilean context is that they have ‘a technical training component that disregards both the role of language as social practice [...] and the importance of (action) research’.

The delicate situation concerning teacher education in Colombia is that the NBP favours market-based teacher development and does not consider particular aspects of different cultures living in the country (Vargas et al. 2008).

In Brazil, most undergraduate Modern Languages (Letras) programs are not yet prepared to meet the needs of TEYL teachers (Tonelli and Cristóvão 2010). On the other hand, some actions are geared towards promoting discussion of theoretically supported practices in TEYL at the pre-service level (Moraes Bezerra 2011) and in-service teacher education (Santos 2010).

**Current contributions and research**

As compared to the widespread interest in implementing TEYL around the world, and more specifically in Latin America, it is surprising to see that ‘systematic reflection on these issues often lags behind the implementation of policies that are driven by political imperatives’ (Banfi 2015, p. 15). Despite the scarcity of systematic academic investigation in TEYL in Latin America perceived by Ramírez-Romero and Sayer (2016), this section presents a sample of studies to illustrate the body of research work conducted in the Latin American countries examined in this chapter.

In the context of bilingual education in Argentina, Renart (2005) focuses her case study on the development of communicative competence of seven-year-old children who are in two bilingual-biliterate programmes. Based on a detailed analysis of the children’s discourse, the observed teaching practices and teachers’ language input, the author reinforces
that, in order to understand communicative competence development, there is a need to reconsider the role of the learner, the input offered by the teaching context and the relation between the two (Renart 2005, p. 1942).

Compulsory TEYL in Chilean primary education was problematised by Araos (2015). Through a survey study and an intervention project, the investigator critically examined the challenges faced by Chilean early primary school teachers and the contextual factors that can facilitate or hinder the teaching-learning process. The findings of this research reveal that contextual features, ‘such as limited time for planning, lack of parental involvement and a mismatch between policy and school reality, affected the teaching-learning process’ (Araos 2015, p. ii).

Although many official programmes concerning the teaching of English in public primary schools have been proposed in Colombia, Mejía (2009) observes that not many studies about the results of these proposals have been carried out. Among these studies, Valencia Giraldo (2007) investigates how teachers in Bogotá positioned themselves regarding the language policies, such as the NBP (MEN 2004). The study suggests that ‘the top-down model applied in language and education planning in Colombia leaves many voices silenced and does not allow for participation in these processes’ (Mejía 2009, p. 110).

Cobo et al. (2016) describe an innovative large-scale action research involving Uruguay’s participation in a global network of schools in six other countries (Australia, Canada, Finland, the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United States). The aim of this project was to implement a pedagogical approach called ‘deep learning’ where students are expected to develop their creativity, their ability to solve problems and to work collaboratively in an interdependent world.

In Brazil, Tonelli and Ramos (2007) as well as Rocha, Tonelli and Silva (2010) have been systematically compiling most of the research carried out in this area. With a focus on the advantages and disadvantages of teaching a foreign language to young learners, Rocha (2006, 2008) shows that the age factor does not operate alone, but is influenced by many other factors, such as teachers’ lack of preparation to teach young children, the quality of both the teaching programs (immersion, situated teaching, critical learning/teaching) and the teaching materials (Carvalho 2007). Research dealing with the personal characteristics needed by a professional in the area of Language Education for Children (Raquel Carvalho 2005) can be complemented by a study on the importance of teachers’ and young learners’ mutual construction of beliefs on learning a foreign language (Scheifer 2009).

Working with Exploratory Practice (Allwright and Hanks 2009), Leoni (2016) monitored groups of young learners at an NGO project in a low-income community in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. She understood that she could propose ‘constant inquiry about the reality in the classroom’ (ibid., p. 28) and also could conduct reflexive practices about the groups’ social affective conflicts. Similarly, Griffio (2017) reports her work with YLLs in a Brazilian bilingual school, where she proposed a written activity and a discussion about noise in the classroom. This led to deeper understandings of learners’ social roles at school and their relationship with teachers and coordinators. Inspired by Vygotsky (1987), Peixoto (2007, p. 25) and her colleagues, working on their students’ puzzles or questions, understood that ‘in groups, students can accomplish more – and better – than any individual alone’.

As mentioned earlier, research in Latin American TEYL is not abundant and needs to be encouraged, so that sounder research-based suggestions for practice can be made.
Recommendations for practice

Based on a social view of childhood (Benjamin 1984), a sociocultural perspective of the classroom (Wells and Claxton 2002) and an ethical-professional view of teachers and learners as key developing practitioners of learning (Allwright and Hanks 2009), we believe that teaching, as any social practice, is intrinsically local and situated. Following a critical perspective (Freire 2001), we consider it unwise to make one-size-fits-all recommendations. In order to avoid or resist acritical implementation of TEYL programs, these need to be negotiated with (future) teachers, learners, teacher educators and parents in each of the countries of Latin America, so as to reflect their local wishes and needs in terms of TEYL.

Drawing on the sample of academic and practitioner research reported in this chapter, it is possible to hope for resistance to large-scale or country-wide policies to come from classrooms, where teachers and their (young) learners, based on their sense of plausibility (Prabhu 1987) and on local possibilities, know what they need and can do. Our overall proposal for implementation is that more voices from YLLs’ classrooms be heard and shared systematically through publications or events.

Classroom language teaching and learning of the local vernacular(s) and English as an additional or foreign language – understood as social practice and not as a set of grammar rules – can become, even with young learners, the potential locus for negotiating situated meanings as well as personal opinions, beliefs and arguments (Pinter and Zandian 2015). These could be about issues of local interest, such as the usefulness of learning languages, the quality of classroom life and, whenever feasible, life outside the classroom. In our view, it is also desirable to replace structuralist conceptions of language by post-structuralist views (Fairclough 1996), as a way of transforming behaviouristic automatization of grammatical structures into teacher-learner or learner-learner meaningful interaction (Pontecorvo et al. 2005). Such contemporary notions need to inform teacher education curricula and teacher development programmes so as to disseminate these less-known perspectives among pre-service and in-service first and foreign language teachers. Familiarised with such views, it is hoped that language professionals can feel better equipped to co-construct meaningful language interaction with students of any age, especially YLLs.

The centrality of positive and negative affect in the social co-construction of foreign language classrooms has emerged more and more in contemporary research on teachers’ and learners’ lived emotions and identities (Zembylas 2005; Lewis and Tierney 2013; Barcelos 2013, among others). This aspect is, also, highly relevant for TEYL, if the area wishes to contribute to the development of (language) learners as practitioners of learning for life (Allwright 2006). As they implement their pedagogic practice, teachers of YLLs can find inspiration in ethical principles – they need to understand and respect their YLLs’ capabilities, by creating opportunities for meaningful collaborative work and for mutual development (Nóbrega Kuschnir 2003).

A recommendation for practice, based on our own work as teacher educators, comes from the perceived need to integrate language learning and practitioners’ (learners’ and teachers’) local reflexivity. Such integration has been developed within the framework of Exploratory Practice, characterised as an investigative and inclusive way of teaching (Allwright and Hanks 2009; Hanks 2017). Along these lines, some TEYL practitioners have been systematically involved in teaching while they work for understanding. Over the past twenty years, English classes have been inspired by the Exploratory Practice framework and have inspired pre-service and in-service teachers alike (Miller and Barreto 2015; Miller et al. 2015). Following the Exploratory Practice principles, pre-service teachers have been
planning their classes in order to build local understandings instead of working to solve problems (Moraes Bezerra et al. 2016).

As we understand it, the shared experiences show that teachers and their learners can become involved in constructing knowledge about their locally intriguing issues in and around their YLLs’ English language classrooms.

**Future directions**

This section echoes local realities voiced by the authors whose texts helped us construct this chapter. We share the view that further research has to be conducted, involving learners, teachers, teacher educators, supervisors and policy makers. Thus, deeper understandings of the practices may emerge, helping these agents to be more participative in TEYL choices and decisions. The following sections detail some areas that deserve careful attention for the future development of the field.

**Teacher education in TEYL**

When English is compulsorily introduced as part of a foreign language or bilingual policy into the curriculum of YLLs, the education of primary school teachers needs to become a central matter. Should future teachers engage in practical language and/or pedagogic courses or should they be encouraged to get a university degree? Do Latin American colleges and universities offer adequate programs that cater to pre-service and in-service teacher needs regarding knowledge of English, as well as theoretical and methodological aspects related to TEYL? These and many other questions have been asked by researchers in the area, such as Tonelli and Cristóvão (2010) and Santos (2010), but further research is needed. Teacher education curricula should be mapped, analyzed and discussed in view of the professional profile expected by educational institutions. Another focus of interest for teacher educators could be to motivate future teachers to reflect on the complexity of TEYL classroom life, working to understand its inextricable connections with first and second language literacy development.

Still in the realm of teacher education, the importance of the level of English required of EFL teachers, and of TEYL teachers in particular, needs to be problematised. Teachers’ low proficiency language level, generally leading to a lack of confidence in the use of English in oral classroom interaction, has been highlighted as a global issue by Copland et al. (2014). It is our belief that TEYL teacher educators could encourage collaborative reflection about the specific needs and difficulties of pre-service and/or in-service teachers so as to work towards fluency development, for their professional use as well as for their personal aims.

**YLLs’ teachers as practitioner researchers**

It is important to map specific initiatives for pre-service and in-service teacher education programs, so as to investigate whether they offer adequate language instruction, a theoretical basis for the development of professional practice and a space for teacher reflection. Pre-service and in-service teachers can thus be encouraged to join the practitioner researcher movement and contribute to the field (Pimenta and Ghedin 2002; Zeichner 2003; Allwright and Hanks 2009; Burns et al. 2017). Allwright and Hanks (2009) state that language learners are practitioners of learning, and, as such, they must be involved in the work to understand the puzzles related to the ‘quality of their language classroom life’ (Gieve and Miller 2006).
Likewise, as mentioned earlier, we make a plea for the introduction of ‘children’s perspectives’ by doing research ‘with’ young learners through participatory activities (Pinter and Zandian 2015). In agreement with these ideas, we understand that pre-service and in-service teachers should consider involving YLLs in their research practices, not as mere participants but especially as research collaborators.

**Pedagogies for YLLs**

A genre-based TEYL seems promising, since the use of language happens within social practices and the use of a variety of genres can enhance the cooperative building of multiliteracies, which is ‘needed to live a critical and protagonist citizenship’ (Rocha 2009, p. 263, our translation). TEYL practices can be aligned with the rationale of critical literacy, as advocated by Lankshear and McLaren (1993) and Janks (2010, 2012). Adopting a critical stance can lead us to rethink the role of sociohistorical aspects in discursive classroom practices (Almeida 2016; Copland, Garton, and Burns 2014).

It is relevant to consider social and affective aspects as they permeate the teaching/learning process and are central to the motivational attitude that learners have about their learning practices. Obviously, the very age and social status of YLLs should also be a pedagogic concern. Rather than picturing those students who suffer from poverty, family violence, parent unemployment or unwanted pregnancy (Correa and González 2016) as lazy or demotivated, teachers and researchers could adopt approaches that aim to encourage YLLs to construct a more positive view of themselves.

By the same token, teachers and researchers can work to promote critical (multi)literacies by adopting and researching materials (books, resources, software) produced in alignment with a sociocultural-historical perspective of learning and with the tenets of genre and critical literacy. Hence, the mere transposition of materials produced for global use by YLLs and their teachers in Latin America is not advisable and their implementation should be reviewed.

**TEYL policies in Latin America**

In addition to research on the themes above, foreign language policies for TEYL in Latin America must be reviewed if real accomplishments in the proficiency levels of teachers and students are to be made. First and foremost, funding is essential to nurture and sustain teacher development programs and to provide physical, didactic and technological resources for urban and rural schools. Policy makers should also be sensitive to the need of allotting more time for English language classes per week and should abandon top-down measures, which do not acknowledge the views of teachers, coordinators and teacher educators, that is, those in charge of implementing these policies. Instead of being called to validate and implement political decisions, these local stakeholders should have a different role and ought to voice their beliefs. Moreover, following Levinson et al. (2009), Correa and González (2016) claim that a more critical sociocultural view of policy making should be undertaken.

Drawing on Coleman’s (2011) and Rajagopalan’s (2009) thoughts, we stress our belief in the need to: understand how to manage the complexity of language planning and development, develop research in specific contexts, acknowledge that educational change takes time and effort, critically engage students with the English language in their environment, teach English without underestimating students’ mother tongues and respect YLLs’ potential do develop as practitioners of learning (Allwright and Hanks 2009).
A more specific language-oriented direction for the future of TEYL in Latin American countries could be to adopt a post-structuralist view of language (Revuz 1998), so as to inspire a more ethical and formative take on the worldwide initiative of TEYL. Hence, the field could move from an instrumental justification for the experience to a more holistic perspective. Language would no longer be taught to and learnt by YLLs as a code for social communication but as a centrally constitutive element of human life. At this point, we now return to Coleman (2011, p. 22), with whom we learn that ‘we need to venture out from our cosy and comfortable world of English language teaching and continue to ask ourselves challenging questions about the value of what we are doing’.

Further reading


   Focusing on changes in educational policy, the author problematises the offer of foreign languages, particularly English, in Latin America. She critically appraises (English as) foreign language programs launched by education authorities that aim for the expansion and coverage from kindergarten through secondary education.


   This issue provides significant photographs of TEYL in various countries around the world. In this publication, Chapter 6, written by Gimenez, and Chapter 19, written by Corradi, are of special interest since these authors offer a variety of insights on TEYL in Brazil and in Argentina, respectively.


   Rajagopalan’s article brings a relevant discussion on children’s language learning in multilingual contexts and the lessons that can be learned for language learning, in general. The article sets the background for the other articles in the same issue.


   The authors present an overview of articles about TEYL in Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Colombia, as well as in Mexico and Puerto Rico. The experiences, programs and policy processes related to the implantation of ELT in the region are discussed.
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