

A Journey through the Content and Language Integrated Learning Landscape

A Journey through the Content and Language Integrated Learning Landscape:

Problems and Prospects

Edited by

Carmel Mary Coonan, Luciana Favaro
and Marcella Menegale

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



A Journey through the Content and Language Integrated
Learning Landscape: Problems and Prospects

Edited by Carmel Mary Coonan, Luciana Favaro and Marcella Menegale

This book first published 2017

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2017 by Carmel Mary Coonan, Luciana Favaro,
Marcella Menegale and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without
the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-8920-2

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-8920-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures.....	viii
List of Tables.....	ix
Introduction to the Volume.....	xi
Chapter One.....	1
Introduction: The CLIL Context	
<i>Carmel Mary Coonan</i>	
Section I: Learning and CLIL	
Chapter Two.....	18
Developing (Language) Learner Autonomy through CLIL	
<i>Marcella Menegale</i>	
Chapter Three.....	29
CLIL in English in Sweden: Why, How and What? Student Perspectives	
<i>Ylva Sandberg</i>	
Chapter Four.....	45
Erasmus Student Perceptions of CLIL at a Finnish University	
<i>Alssen Elizabeth E.</i>	
Chapter Five.....	55
Subject Knowledge in CLIL: Which Factors Contribute to Positive Results?	
<i>Federica Ricci Garotti</i>	
Chapter Six.....	69
ESP vs. CLIL: What Comes First?	
<i>Martin Mikuláš</i>	

Section II: Teaching and CLIL

Chapter Seven.....	86
A Quantitative Instrument to Collect Data on CLIL Teacher Motivation <i>Ada Bier</i>	
Chapter Eight.....	105
CLIL Materials Development in Higher Education: Corpus Linguistics and Digital Tools <i>Giovanna Carloni</i>	
Chapter Nine.....	123
Defamiliarisation vs Automatism: The Cognitive Added Value of CL(English)IL—Humour and Other Strategies <i>Francesca Costa</i>	
Chapter Ten	140
Facilitation of Self-regulation in a CLIL On-line Learning Environment in Science <i>Chris Campbell, Ulla Freihofner, Simone Smala, Tony Wright</i>	
Chapter Eleven	150
The Challenge of Implementing Self-Regulated Learning in a CLIL Literature Course <i>Nancy Peled</i>	

Section III: CLIL and Training

Chapter Twelve	162
Adapting the CEFR to Italian CLIL Teacher Language <i>Geraldine Ludbrook</i>	
Chapter Thirteen.....	175
CLIL in Higher Education: What if...? <i>Flora Sisti</i>	
Chapter Fourteen	191
High School Science and Maths: Creating CLIL Materials from Non-CLIL Sources <i>Francesca I. Carducci</i>	

A Journey through the Content and Language Integrated
Learning Landscape

vii

Chapter Fifteen	202
Lesson Plan Analysis Study <i>Lenka Prochazkova Tejkalova</i>	
Contributors.....	211

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 3-1: Overview of theoretical view points: Learner Cognition (LC), Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), Subject-Didactics, Second Language Acquisition (SLA), Multimodal design
- Figure 4-1: Perceived gain of knowledge compared to expectations
- Figure 6-1: Dichotomy of CLIL and ESP
- Figure 6-2: Content and language continuum
- Figure 7-1: The motivation continuum (adapted from Deci and Ryan 2000, 237)
- Figure 7-2: The pilot scale
- Figure 7-3: The final version of the scale
- Figure 10-1: Example of the German biology online activity using EdStudio
- Figure 15-1: Lesson plan features seen as crucial and which appear in the lesson plans

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 3-1: Overview of participants
- Table 3-2: “Why?” Overview of students’ motivations for studying content in English
- Table 3-3: “How? What?” Overview of students’ practices and reflections with regards to studying content in English
- Table 4-1: Perceptions regarding improvement of language skills and areas
- Table 4-2: Perceptions of gaining content knowledge
- Table 4-3: Perceptions of how CLIL methodology improved language and content learning
- Table 5-1: Characteristics of the sample
- Table 5-2: Characteristics of the CLIL teachers
- Table 5-3: Details of the experimental and control groups
- Table 5-4: Results of the pre-tests in non-language subjects of all classes
- Table 5-5: Results of the tests in non-language subjects of all classes
- Table 5-6: Macro-strategies observed in CLIL classes Art a, Art 4b, Art 2, Economics 2
- Table 5-7: Range of the macro-strategies observed in CLIL classes Science and Economics 1
- Table 6-1: L(E)SP and CLIL differences
- Table 6-2: The role of language and content in CLIL and L(E)SP
- Table 6-3: Occurrence of expressions of future in economic texts
- Table 6-4: Scores
- Table 7-1: Comparison of eigenvalues from PCA and criterion values from parallel analysis
- Table 7-2: Pattern and Structure Matrix for PCA with Direct Oblimin rotation of four-factor solution (major loadings for each item are bolded)
- Table 7-3: Component correlation matrix
- Table 8-1: Keywords used to create a word cloud
- Table 8-2: 2-grams
- Table 8-3: 3-grams
- Table 8-4: 4-grams
- Table 8-5: 5-grams
- Table 8-6: 6-grams
- Table 9-1: Synoptic table showing the characteristics of the sample

- Table 9-2: Extra-linguistic strategies for teacher 01
Table 9-3: Extra-linguistic strategies for teacher 02
Table 9-4: Extra-linguistic strategies for teacher 03
Table 9-5: Extra-linguistic strategies for teacher 04
Table 9-6: Extra-linguistic strategies for teacher 05
Table 9-7: Extra-linguistic strategies for teacher 06
Table 9-8: Occurrences of extra-linguistic strategies according to the number of words
Table 11-1: Final exam results in the course “Analysis of Prose and Drama (in English)”—class average over five years
Table 13-1: Structure of courses activated
Table 13-2: CLIL Final Questionnaire for Teaching Staff 2011–2012
Table 14-1: Building a vocabulary resource
Table 15-1: The three most frequent features in questionnaires/lesson plan

INTRODUCTION TO THE VOLUME

An interest in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), in Europe and beyond, has increased exponentially since it first appeared on the scene in Europe in the early 1990's. CLIL has become a very much discussed topic in the literature on language education today with the number of publications pertaining to the field continuing to increase. Apart from the wealth of volumes published in English, there are also a great number published in the national languages of the countries where this form of language education is under discussion or already being implemented. The spread of scientific papers, methodological reflections, review articles, collections of research studies on the one hand, and of activities books, didactic materials, online blogs, etc. on the other, is an indication of this interest.

Researchers, teachers, teacher trainers, course planners and others involved in CLIL are constantly on the search for new studies to help them understand how CLIL is evolving and how best it can be implemented. As the concept CLIL is now informing the pedagogical principles of different educational realities, it is precisely for this reason that research and reflection are required to understand further its potential and implications, its inherent difficulties and possible applications. The volume *A Journey through the CLIL Landscape: Problems, Prospects* has been conceived with this idea in mind.

Rather than concerning itself with a macro dimension such as 'CLIL and language education policies' or 'CLIL models', (the initial perspectives broached by studies in the field), the volume fits into the line of studies and reflections that have recently begun to look more closely at the micro aspects of CLIL in order to understand issues related to the processes of learning and teaching and other aspects directly connected with classroom issues, such as the fruition of materials, language use, classroom instructional strategies, motivation, and support structures for classroom action.

The aim of the volume is to provide insights into the latest areas of research and reflection that are characterizing the field of CLIL in the second decade of the new millennium. The range of topics covered reveal, for example, a shift in interest towards CLIL at the tertiary level, focusing on lecturer and student perceptions and problems (motivation, support and

training, language competence and language use); they show an attention to specific issues related to subject learning outcomes and to learning environments (e.g., the place and role of ICT and software use in CLIL learning and teaching); they highlight the open issue of course design and materials design and tackle the important relation between ESP and CLIL. For the most part, the essays report the results of empirical research conducted in the above-mentioned areas.

The volume, which is introduced by C. M. Coonan with a chapter to contextualize the CLIL “landscape”, is divided into three Sections—learning/teaching/training—to highlight the current concerns in the CLIL field today.

The first Section, *Learning and CLIL*, focusses on the most significant factors affecting learning processes in CLIL contexts, namely, the cognitive and psychological aspects of CLIL learners. To open this section of the volume is the contribution by M. Menegale, who proposes an analysis of the points of contact between CLIL and learner autonomy (i.e., learning content, objectives, context, activities, use of target language, learning strategies and self-assessment), with the aim of highlighting why CLIL-based instruction would be so effective in promoting more student responsibility and learning awareness. Learner awareness is also the object of investigation discussed in the second paper of this section. The study reported by Y. Sandberg and based on a description and interpretation of student perspectives on CLIL programmes in the Swedish upper secondary school, provides insights into some aspects of learner cognition, by drawing attention to student perspectives on motivations, practices and reflections with regard to studying in a CLIL environment. Again, learner awareness is the central topic in the contribution by E. Alssen. However, this time, awareness is analyzed with the intention of improving course design and instructional strategies: the author, in fact, reports on a study investigating how Erasmus students perceived and valued CLIL teaching methods and learning modalities, in order to obtain comprehensive data to develop enhanced CLIL curricula. Teaching practices are, in fact, what seem to primarily affect learning outcomes. Driven by the aim of expanding the range of evidence-based studies which show the added value of CLIL, F. Ricci Garotti compares the results obtained by Italian CLIL learners in non-language subjects to those of non-CLIL learners. The study shows that diverse factors seem to influence the results of CLIL learning, e.g., learner familiarity with the kind of methodology underpinning CLIL (learner-centred pedagogy and active learning) and proper use of scaffolding teaching techniques to facilitate subject matter understanding, like “languageing”. These results serve to introduce the

paper which closes the first part of the volume and which deals precisely with language issues in CLIL learning. Here, M. Mikuláš points at the differences between the concepts of CLIL and ESP. On the basis of a corpus-based study and an empirical study conducted in university CLIL classes, the author demonstrates that general language proficiency does not automatically lead to specific language proficiency, highlighting how both content teaching and explicit language instruction need to be systematically considered and carefully integrated in a content and language based approach.

The second Section of the book is dedicated to *Teaching and CLIL* and deals with important aspects concerning the teaching process in CLIL, such as teacher motivation, materials development, teacher talk and the impact of new learning environments.

The first essay in this Section is by A. Bier, who presents an instrument devised to collect data on the motivation underpinning Italian teachers' decision to teach in CLIL. The author discusses and describes the development of this qualitative tool, a multi-item scale questionnaire that refers mainly to Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination Theory. The second contribution is by G. Carloni and sets forth how corpora can be used at the tertiary level to devise CLIL course-tailored corpus-designed activities. Referring to a sociolinguistics course taught through the medium of English at the University of Urbino, Carloni points out and illustrates the different steps taken to create corpus-designed activities, also based on the use of digital tools. Teacher talk is the topic of the next paper by F. Costa, who analyses non-conventional input presentation strategies based on humour. Relating an empirical study based on the observations of about twenty hours of lessons, the researcher illustrates how these strategies may have a function of positive defamiliarisation of the input, which could lead to a deeper learning of both language and content. This second Section of the volume closes with two works on self-regulation and CLIL. The qualitative study carried out by U. Freihofner, S. Smala, C. Campbell and T. Wright on the impact of a technology-enhanced learning environment in CLIL Science classes at junior high school focuses on the facilitation of self-regulation (SRL) and open inquiry processes and presents teacher observations of students using online learning tools while using a foreign language in technology-mediated inquiry activities. The study by N. Peled explores the issue of self-regulation in CLIL environments and arrives at the conclusion that the foreign language learning environment is a significant obstacle in attaining the most basic goals of SRL.

The third and last Section of the volume, *Training and CLIL*, looks at how teacher training for CLIL programmes is today organized, managed,

implemented. The main issues concerning training in CLIL are still nowadays connected, on the one hand, with the level of the foreign language competence required of CLIL (subject) teachers and, on the other hand, with some key pedagogical aspects needed for CLIL learning to be effective. The first point, namely CLIL teacher competence in the foreign language, is the central topic of G. Ludbrook's paper. After reflecting on the kind of proficiency this new educational figure—the CLIL teacher—needs to master, the author reasons on how the descriptors of the *Common European Framework of References for Languages* (CEFR) might be adapted to better suit (Italian) CLIL teacher language needs. The remaining contributions of the volume, instead, focus on the other issue affecting CLIL training, i.e., the methodology needed to successfully realize CLIL programmes. In her paper, F. Sisti, describes the application of the CLIL approach to the university course of Modern language teaching methodology, discussing the new dynamics that arose in the classroom, due to the more active learning and classroom interactivity generated by CLIL-based activities. F. Carducci, instead, presents some data collected during a ministerial teacher-training course aimed at providing subject teachers with the competences needed to teach their subject through the foreign language. In particular, the author comments on the production of CLIL materials by the participating teachers and presents some examples. Similarly, L. Prochazkova Tejkalova concentrates on teachers as CLIL materials creators: starting by analysing lesson plans prepared by CLIL teachers and CLIL teacher trainees, the author aims to create an analytic tool applicable to mathematics-based CLIL lesson plans, and to provide insights into the capacities of teachers and teacher trainees as materials designers.

The three Sections of this volume were conceived as different stops on an excursion where the reader can enjoy panoramic views of specific CLIL aspects. We hope you will enjoy the journey.

Luciana Favaro and Marcella Menegale

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: THE CLIL CONTEXT

CARMEL MARY COONAN

Introduction

The interest in Europe in *foreign language medium* programmes, which began in the 90's, has gradually gained impetus since the new millennium. CLIL is the term used to refer to these programmes. The growth of interest in CLIL is related to a certain dissatisfaction with the outcomes of the communicative approach, which has been the main approach to foreign language teaching and learning since the late 70's but which does not seem able, on its own, to deliver outcomes suitable for the challenges of the new millennium.

The spread of CLIL programmes throughout Europe has generated much research and theoretical reflection that is serving to highlight criticalities regarding not only its field of reference but also its practical application which, in specific contexts, risks nullifying its inherent potential.

Foreign language learning for the new millennium

The scenario regarding foreign language teaching and learning has, and is still, changing dramatically if we think back just 25-30 years ago—the space of a generation.

In the 80's-90's, there was a certain awakening regarding the foreign language situation, linked mainly to the issue of the formative role that foreign languages play in the making of a European citizen.

Processes that injected a new urgency and a new “view” into the field was the development of the phenomenon of globalisation, the internationalisation of society and, in Europe, the signing of the treaty of

Maastricht (or Treaty on the European Union—TEU) in 1992 and Schengen which came into being in 1999. Trade, commerce, transactions, and migration gained rapid motion; developments in transportation (e.g., low cost flights) and telecommunications (internet, Web 2.0) advanced rapidly. By the new millennium the world seemed to have shrunk, speed (travel and telecommunications) seemed to have impacted all walks of life and a new world language had appeared—English—which, although more and more essential, is, paradoxically, more and more insufficient. The need for languages was now beginning to make itself felt strongly, making the European Commission's call that all European citizens be competent in at least three European languages (European Commission 1995) seem more and more a concrete necessity.

It is against this scenario that new and urgent reflections developed on the state of *foreign* language learning and teaching. These reflections relate specifically to:

- the need for higher levels of competence in non-mother tongues with a view to creating a human capital capable of operating internationally, on a global scale;
- the need for competence in *several* European languages (Commission for the European Communities 2005);
- the new status of English as a lingua franca;
- the presence in schools of non-native speakers of the official school language;
- multicultural environments in educational systems;
- the adoption of inclusion policies;
- the concept of lifelong learning (European Commission 1995).

These matters are creating ripple effects at many levels with reflections underway on such issues as the introduction of earlier foreign language learning (e.g., at infant school level) and the extension of foreign language learning to higher levels of education and to other walks of society. Thus new learner types need now to be catered for (e.g., the very young, the elderly, those with special needs, academics, doctors, political asylum seekers...) and new learning environments need to be contemplated (not only schools or universities, but also prisons/detention centres, hospitals, lifelong learning centres, asylum seeker centres, etc.).

In particular, the ripple effect impacts on methodology, on the way to teach the foreign languages such that they are learnt better and are suitable for the challenges of the new millennium. In other words, the above directly imply the need to rethink the teaching approaches that characterised

foreign language teaching in the late 20th century.

Since the 1970's in Europe, the principal approach informing the teaching of foreign languages has been the Communicative Approach (CA), originally called the Notional Functional approach, upon which the Modern Languages Project of the Council of Europe based its Threshold Level. Today one might say that there are several versions of CA but all are characterised by a focus on meaning (-making) and communication, with the overall aim to promote communicative competence.

The concept of communicative competence (Canale and Swain 1980; Canale 1983) captures the complexity of the foreign language learning challenge (the language level; the discourse/text level; the skills level - listening, reading, writing and speaking; the strategic level; the sociolinguistic level; the extra-linguistic level) and the methodology developed for the promotion of this complexity has been considered suitable—at least for the 70's, 80's and 90's. Since the 90's, however, awareness has grown that, despite developments that have perfected certain aspects of the approach (e.g., the introduction of a more systematic treatment of grammar or the introduction of a task-based focus), the approach seems to fall short of the promise it holds.

Content and language integrated learning

Alongside CA (and also as a result of CA's difficulties in meeting the challenges of the new millennium), innovative approaches have developed in Europe to take on board the urgent issues of multilingualism, plurilingualism and interculturalism:

- Intercomprehension - an approach based on the principle of language families with great potential for the promotion of plurilingual competences (Blanche-Benveniste and Valli 1991; Benucci 2005; Doyé 2005);
- Approaches for Intercultural communicative competence (Byram 1997);
- *Eveil aux langues* programmes (Balsiger, Köhler, de Pietro, Perregaux 2012) which aim at creating awareness, interest, knowledge and (meta)cognitive skills regarding the phenomenon of language, different languages and culture(s).

These developments are not strictly speaking language *teaching* approaches and are still today far from being part of mainstream practice.

It may take many decades (if at all) for them to seep into the system and strongly characterise mainstream (foreign) language education programmes.

Together with the approaches mentioned above and which, like them, cannot be considered a language *teaching* approach proper, a new approach to foreign language learning has developed. This development is called CLIL.

The term is one of many that are being used today to refer to forms of non-native language medium teaching situations where the promotion of bilingualism (or multilingualism) is one of the specified goals of the programmes. The more traditional terms (as they have a longer history) are “Immersion education” which developed in Canada in the 80’s and “Bilingual Education”, primarily associated with Europe. We now witness the appearance of other terms, including:

- FLAC: foreign languages across the curriculum
- MLAC: modern languages across the curriculum

These two expressions are rooted in the acronym LAC (cf. below) which calls for the distributed responsibility of language development across the curriculum. It recognises the transversal linguistic nature of content and learning.

- FLMI: foreign language medium instruction; the acronym is a generic term to refer to the vehicular use of a foreign language.
- CLI: content and language integration
- EMI: English medium instruction

These latter two acronyms are mostly used with reference to the university or tertiary level (see below).

CLIL, associated mainly with secondary school education, is the only acronym that refers openly to “learning” indicating an awareness of the “delicacy” of this process in foreign language medium situations.

CLIL in Europe

In the new millennium CLIL has become a field of debate, discussion, reflection and research on an international scale, producing publications on a range of issues (Bruton 2013; Cenoz and Genesee 2014; Linares, Morton, Whittaker 2012; Dalton-Puffer 2007; Ruiz de Zaroba, Sierra and Gallardo del Puerto 2011; Ruiz de Zaroba and Jiménez Catalán 2009).

Two reports published for the European Commission (Eurydice 2006, 2012) paint an interesting picture *vis à vis* the spread of CLIL throughout Europe—a picture made possible on account of the definition the publications give of the term:

[...] the acronym CLIL is used as a generic term to describe all types of provision in which a second language (a foreign, regional or minority language and/or another official state language) is used to teach certain subjects in the curriculum other than language lessons themselves. (2006, 8)

[...] CLIL is the acronym for ‘Content and Language Integrated Learning’. This acronym is used as a general term to designate different types of bilingual or immersion education. It is necessary to distinguish two types of CLIL on the basis of the languages used to teach non-language subjects (subjects other than languages and their literature / culture):

Type A: Provision where non-language subjects are taught through a foreign language (status conferred in the central curriculum). The number of non-language subjects taught through the foreign language may vary according to schools and countries. In some schools (case 1), all non-language subjects are taught through the foreign language. In others (case 2), some non-language subjects are taught through the foreign language and others through the language of the governing or administrative body of the school. In this latter case, two languages are thus used to teach non-language subjects of the curriculum.

Type B: Provision where non-language subjects are taught through a regional and/or minority language or a non-territorial language or a state language in countries with more than one state language, and a second language, which may be any other language. In short, in these schools, the non-language subjects are always taught through two languages. In a very few schools, in addition to these two languages, a third is used to teach non-language subjects. The three languages include a minority and/or regional language, a state language and a foreign language. (2012, 380-382)

The above definitions highlight two defining aspects of CLIL: a. the *type* of medium languages involved (foreign, regional, minority, etc.); b. the *nature* of the non-language subject (“subject other than languages and their literature/culture”)—thus a foreign language literature taught through the relative foreign language would not be considered a CLIL programme. These two aspects are presented as key in defining the existence of CLIL or not.

We notice that CLIL is presented as an all-embracing term for “different types of bilingual or immersion education” and, on the basis of

this, we can see (from the various tables presented in the two publications, e.g., figures B9, B10, B11 [2012] and figure 1.1. [2006]), that CLIL is present in most European countries (with no CLIL provision in four countries: Iceland, Denmark, Greece and Turkey) and that it is *systematically* provided for across the education system in countries like Belgium, Luxembourg.

If indeed the criteria for defining CLIL is the use of a foreign *and/or* a second (minority, regional, etc., cf. quote above) medium language, then this can explain how it is possible to indicate a seemingly widespread CLIL situation for, although the term was coined in the 90's with reference to the new development of *foreign* language medium situations in mainstream educational systems, in the above publications the CLIL acronym has been extended to other medium language situations, the majority of which may well have existed for decades before the 90's, with their origins rooted in bilateral agreements at the end of World War Two (a long time, therefore, before the "sensitivities" which we find encapsulated in the acronym became apparent).

What promise do CLIL programmes hold?

Programmes that involve the use of a non-native language as a medium of instruction exist in most European countries. Those involving a *foreign* language medium are more recent, developing in tandem with the appearance of the CLIL acronym itself in the 90's. Unlike the more traditional Immersion education and Bilingual education models (generally associated with second language situations), CLIL programmes normally involve a limited number of school subjects (narrow range as opposed to broad range) and are often of a limited time span.

Great hope is placed in CLIL. However, there are several issues that need to be kept in mind in order to ensure they deliver: promotion of multilingualism, intercultural (communicative) competence and, especially, quality language learning.

Multilingualism

One of the main reasons for the support of CLIL by the European Commission (Marsh 2002) is the possibility it has for promoting and safeguarding European languages.

With reference to the situation of *foreign* languages, the data provided by Eurydice shows that CLIL programmes involve most major European languages, but English dominates (Eurydice 2012, 46). Indeed, if we take

Italy as an example, all Technical Institutions are obliged by law to use English in their CLIL programmes and, although all the Lyceums are free to choose their CLIL language, with English being the first foreign language of the students and also the most prevalent amongst the teaching staff, it becomes automatic that English become the preferred medium language. In fact, the only real possibility for a language other than English to be chosen lies in the obligation by law for the Linguistic Lyceums to promote two CLIL programmes in two different languages. This is the only guarantee in Italy that a language other than English be chosen.

Thus, the hoped-for intention that CLIL sustain the promotion of multilingualism (on a national and international scale) *may* fall short of the mark.

Multiculturalism and intercultural (communicative) competence

As far as regards the situation of *foreign* languages, it is thought that learning a non-language subject through a foreign language offers opportunities for an authentic cultural experience through contact with materials which, even when pedagogic, have been produced in different cultural traditions and from different cultural perspectives: e.g., topics in History or Philosophy are presented from different viewpoints; Economics may be taught adopting a different methodology (case-driven mode as opposed to the more theory-driven mode). Such experiences are important in their contribution towards building an awareness of cultural relativism and creating an intercultural competence.

The potential problem related to this aspect of CLIL mainly concerns a lack of awareness of the cultural dimension that can be offered by content and materials proposed in another language. A culturally “aseptic” CLIL does not capture the opportunities that CLIL offers in cultural terms. The teacher may view CLIL as merely a question of language change and nothing more. Thus, the *same* content is proposed but mediated through a different language. Alternatively, *different* content can be chosen (found on the internet, purchased abroad) but no focus may purposely be brought to bear on the different perspectives that the chosen content offers.

Furthermore, the cultural dimension is also implicated in methodological practices. CLIL requires methodological innovation in order for its potential to be met but the proposed strategies may clash with the teachers’ views (which are rooted in the pedagogical tradition of the country) of how content should be taught. Anecdotal data indicates that change may sometimes be perceived as a “cultural takeover” or “colonisation”¹ to the detriment of the

existing pedagogical tradition—which is known and well experimented. The teacher thus needs to overcome the psychological resistance to what is perceived as a cultural invasion.

Quality language learning

The choice to use a non-native language as a medium of instruction is part of a nation's (or region's or school's) language education policy. The choice is undeniably swayed by the conviction that using the language as a medium of instruction will lead to a better learning of that same language. This is presumed possible not only as a result of the increase in the number of hours that the student is exposed to it (apart from the curricular hours the foreign language normally occupies, the latter also “invades” the curricular hours of other non-language subjects), but also as a result of the closer and deeper knit between language and cognition. This knit is considered to lead to a competence that Cummins has termed Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) (Cummins 2000).

Taken at its face value, CLIL refers to a natural process highlighted by Halliday as far back as the 70's with reference to language education. Halliday saw language learning from three points of view: learning the language, learning about the language, learning through the language where learners “simultaneously engage in ‘learning language’ and ‘learning through language.’” (1993, 93) He saw the process of ‘learning through the language’ as a

dialectic of system and process [...] whereby (a) from acts of meaning children construe the system of language, while at the same time, (b) from the system they engender acts of meaning. (1993, 104)

In other words, the “dialectal system” highlights the reciprocal and integrated nature of learning (making meaning) and language development. Thus, all situations where a language is used as an instrument for learning is, *de facto*, a situation for both the learning of the language and for the learning of content (for meaning making).

Why was it necessary to coin the acronym CLIL? An explanation could be found in the specific learning conditions of *foreign/second* language medium programmes.

The CLIL acronym finds justification in a critical aspect of foreign language medium situations—just as the acronym LAC (Language Across the Curriculum) did in the 80's in Britain regarding the “normal” school language situations. The latter was coined after the alarming data in the Bullock Report (Department of Education and Science 1975) about

literacy levels in Britain, convincing the authorities of the need to spread the onus of language development (the national and official language of the school) across the curriculum, the onus to be shouldered by *all* teachers, not just the language teacher. The LAC acronym openly signalled a need for pedagogical intervention to give purposeful support to the process of language development.

In the same vein, CLIL serves to highlight an issue that researchers in immersion education brought to light in the 80's, namely that merely immersing the learner in the language of instruction (a non-mother tongue for him) does not automatically bring about the hoped-for language learning outcomes² (Swain and Lapkin 1989). Purposeful steps—which are essentially methodological—need to be taken to make sure it happens. Eurydice highlights this aspect:

CLIL is the platform for an *innovative methodological* approach of far broader scope than language teaching. Accordingly, it advocates stress how it seeks to develop proficiency in both the non-language subject and the language in which this is taught, attaching the same importance to each. Furthermore, achieving this twofold aim calls for the development of a special approach to teaching in that the non-language subject is not taught *in*³ a foreign language but *with* and *through* a foreign language. This implies a more *integrated* approach to both teaching and learning, requiring that teachers should devote special thought not just to how languages should be taught, but to the educational process in general. (2006, 7) (italics ours).

The above quote highlights the innovative nature of CLIL that consists in the special attention it devotes to the integration of teaching and learning of both language and content. For this reason, it may not be suitable to call *all* foreign (or second) language medium situations CLIL (as Eurydice does) if within them there is a lack of awareness of the learning issues and no steps taken to cater for them.

There are several problems underpinning the conditions for quality (language and content) learning in CLIL, which include:

a. Methodological tradition

CLIL states that the foreign/second language and the non-language content will be learnt together. The question that springs to mind is whether the conditions in which the CLIL programme embeds itself (e.g., a History course, a Maths course) are conducive to this.

Unlike the teaching of foreign languages which, by virtue of its “international” nature, is more easily informed and receptive of innovation in the fields of teaching and learning (teachers meet international

colleagues, go to international conferences, are very often abroad to brush up their linguistic and cultural competences, they operate school exchanges, etc.), the teaching of the so-called non-language disciplines experiences a more difficult situation because contacts of this sort have been less frequent (now, however, much easier with exchange programmes like Erasmus plus). The result is that, whereas in foreign language teaching there has been a shift of attention from a teacher/teaching/product focus to a learner/learning/process focus, this is coming about more slowly in the non-language subjects. With reference to Italy, it is visible in the preferred teaching format in the high school, which tends to be *ex-cathedra*, teacher-driven—similar, in other words, to a university lecture. The impact on the hoped-for dual-learning outcomes can be negative in that the student, being exposed to a lot of teacher-delivered input (the lecture) and a lot of reading of text book material, and with few opportunities for processing such input through learning activities, like discussion and writing, may not get an in-depth grasp of the content (due also to language-related comprehension difficulties) and may not learn the language (e.g., insufficient opportunities for using it). The language-sensitive nature of a CLIL programme requires that these aspects in the teaching and learning process be taken care of so that language development is guided and language problems (e.g., comprehension) are confronted. Without eliminating the lecture format altogether, it may need to be integrated with new teaching strategies, new group organization, new types and wider varieties of learning activities.

b. Teacher foreign language competence

Some European countries have established certification at B2 level in the foreign language as the requirement for CLIL teaching (Eurydice 2012, 94). In other countries, for example Italy, the certification required is level C1.

Although an acceptable benchmark, C1, as described in the *CEFR*, does not capture the kind of competence that the CLIL teacher requires in order to use the foreign language to successfully teach his subject. The teacher needs to master the language of the discipline, master the language to teach the discipline (be able to communicate effectively when explaining, describing, summarising, suggesting, hypothesising, exemplifying, etc.), and master the language of classroom management, of interaction, of dialogue.

A “general” C1 proficiency, as is normally tested, does not assess the specific proficiency required. New, different, assessment procedures and focuses need to be devised specifically for the purpose. (cf. Ludbrook, this volume)

c. Language awareness

Associated with the issue of levels of language competence for CLIL teachers is that of language awareness of CLIL teachers. By this we mean the types of knowledge a CLIL teacher needs to be equipped with in order to *understand* the CLIL teaching and learning environment. In some countries in Europe the CLIL teacher is also a foreign language teacher. This teacher will therefore have the professional preparation to deal with issues linked to comprehension (listening and reading in a foreign language), speaking/interacting and writing in a foreign language in the CLIL learning environment. In other countries however, as in Italy for example, the foreign language teacher is excluded from delivering CLIL programmes on the basis of his academic and professional training. Thus, it is the subject teacher who is encumbered with the responsibility but who, without specific training (linguistic and methodological), will lack fundamental knowledge concerning the role of language in learning and the further implications this has when the language concerned is a foreign language.

EMI/CLIL

The exponential increase in ETPs in tertiary education across Europe over the last 15 years⁴ has given rise to discussion and reflection on English medium instruction (EMI), in particular on the link CLIL-EMI and, as well, the myriad of issues that appear as a result of the use of English as a *lingua franca* (Björkman 2010; Björkman 2011; Becker and Kluge 2014; Beelen and Jones 2015; Coleman 2006; de Wit, Hunter and Coelen 2015; de Wit and Hunter 2015; Jenkins 2011; Jensen 2013; Mauranen 2010; Wilkinson 2004; Wilkinson and Zegers 2007; Wilkinson and Zegers 2008).

The EMI-CLIL link is particularly complex considering the strong pedagogical flavour of the CLIL acronym and the general disinterest towards pedagogy at the tertiary level. However, in consideration of the goals that Universities put forward for introducing English-taught programmes (ETP), the CLIL concept would seem to hold some importance.

Wächter and Maiworm (2014, 55-56) list six reasons⁵ that institutions state as the purpose for setting up ETPs. Two of these reasons (the most frequently mentioned by southern European institutions) are “abolition of language obstacles for the enrolment of foreign students” and “improvement of international competences of domestic students [...] by making domestic students ‘fit’ for global/international labour markets”.

If we take the expression “remove language obstacles” we can see how pertinent it is, not only for enrolment issues. English used as a medium of instruction/as a lingua franca in most European universities is a foreign language for both the students (domestic and non) and the lecturer. It is possible to hypothesise that, for the students, access to course content may be difficult on account of the foreign language medium. Furthermore, the reference to “international competences [...] ‘fit’ for global/international labour markets” must surely refer to the foreign language competence (as well as the intercultural competence) as the hope is that the domestic students’ foreign (English) language competence develop as a result of the EMI experience. These issues are at the heart of the CLIL concept as it takes on board the interrelationship between language and learning, directing our attention to the care needed to nurture this relationship in *foreign* language medium learning situations. The open issue for ETPs is the degree to which tertiary education is willing to assume responsibility for this care through informed methodological choices.

Notes

1. For example, inductive and constructivist-inspired methodologies are perceived to be American or British.
2. The same could be said about the content learning outcomes.
3. It is interesting to note that the above quote highlights the fact that the non-language subject is taught *with* the foreign language (the foreign language and subject learning are not considered as separate entities, they go hand in hand) and *through* the foreign language (the language is the channel through which learning (and teaching) takes place) but not *in* the foreign language (as if the texts and the oral discourse presented to the students were not elaborated *in* a foreign language, as if the language of the subject did not have its own specificity).
4. In the period 2001 “English medium-instruction was a rare phenomenon” (Wächter and Maiworm 2014, 27). By 2014 the increase was enormous, with the number growing from 2,389 in 2007 to 8,089 (+239%) in 2014. The steepest increase in that period (+866%) was in southwest Europe (Italy, France, Spain, Portugal) (Wächter and Maiworm 2014, 48).
5. - to sharpen the international profile of the institution; - to abolish the language obstacles for the enrolment of foreign students; - to improve the international competences of domestic students (intercultural understanding and “by making domestic students ‘fit’ for global/international labour markets”); - to compensate for shortages of the institution (lack of enrolments; greater revenue from tuition fees paid by foreign students); - to recruit “international academic staff and top talents, e.g., PhD students”; - to help students from Third World countries by providing high-level education.

References

- Airey, John. 2011. "Talking about teaching in English: Swedish university lecturers' experiences of changing teaching language." *Ibérica* 22: 35–54.
- Balsiger, Claudine, Dominique Béatrix Köhler, Jean-François de Pietro, and Christiane Perregaux, eds. 2012. *Eveil Aux Langues et Approches Plurielles. De la formation des enseignants aux pratiques de classe* (Espaces discursifs). Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Becker, Maercia R., and Denise C. Kluge. 2014. "Intelligibility of English as a Lingua Franca (Elf): Perception by Speakers of Brazilian Portuguese (Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Acquisition of Second Language Speech)." *Concordia Working Papers in Applied Linguistics* 5: 50–57.
- Beelen, Jos, and Elspeth Jones. 2015. *Redefining internationalisation at home*. Bucharest: Bologna Researchers Conference.
- Benucci, Antonella. 2005. *Le lingue romanze. Una guida per l'intercomprensione*, Torino: UTET.
- Björkman, Beyza. 2010. "So you think you can Elf: English as a Lingua Franca as the Medium of Instruction." *Journal of Language and Communication Studies* 45: 77–91.
- . 2011. "Pragmatic strategies in English as an academic lingua franca: Ways of achieving communicative effectiveness?" *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 950–964.
- Blanche-Benveniste, Claire, and André Valli. 1997. "L'intercompréhension: le cas des langues romanes". *Le français dans le monde, Recherches et applications*, 11.
- Bruton, Anthony. 2013. "CLIL: Some of the Reason Why ... and why not." *System* 41 (3): 587–597.
- Byram, Michael. 1997. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Canale, Michael, and Merrill Swain. 1980. "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing." *Applied Linguistics* 1: 1-47.
- . 1983. "From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy." In *Language and Communication*, edited by Jack Richards, and Richard Schmidt, 2-27. London: Longman.
- Cenoz, Jasone, Fred Genesee, and Durk Gorter. 2014. "Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking Stock and Looking Forward." *Applied Linguistics* 35 (3): 243–262.

- Coleman, James A. 2006. "English-medium Teaching in European Higher Education (State of the Art Article)." *Language Teaching* 39: 1–14.
- Commission for the European Communities. 2005. *A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Cummins, Jim. 2000. *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane. 2007. *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Classrooms*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- de Wit, Hans, Fiona Hunter, and Robert Coelen. 2015. "Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe: future directions." In *Internationalisation of Higher Education*, edited by Hans de Wit, Fiona Hunter, Laura Howard, and Eva Egron-Polak, 273–279. Brussels: European Parliament.
- de Wit, Hans and Fiona Hunter. 2015. "Understanding internationalisation of Higher Education in the European context". In *Internationalisation of Higher Education*, edited by Hans de Wit, Fiona Hunter, Laura Howard, and Eva Egron-Polak, 41–58. Brussels: European Parliament.
- Department of Education and Science. 1975. *The Bullock Report. A language for life*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Doyè, Peter. 2005. *Intercomprehension. Guide for the development of language education policies in Europe: From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- European Commission. 1995. *Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society*. Brussels: White Paper.
- Eurydice. 2006. *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe*. European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture. Brussels: Eurydice European Unit.
- . 2012. *Key data on teaching languages at school in Europe*. European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture, Brussels: ECEA Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.
- Halliday, Michael. 1993. "Towards a Language-Based Theory of Learning." *Linguistics and Education* 5: 93–116.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2011. "Accommodating (to) Elf in the international university." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 926–936.
- Jensen, Christian. 2013. "Students' Attitudes to Lecturers' English in English-medium Higher Education in Denmark." *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 13 (1): 87–112.
- Linares, Ana, Tom Morton, and Rachel Whittaker. 2012. *The Roles of Language in CLIL*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Marsh, David, ed. 2002. *CLIL/Emile: The European dimension: Action, Trends and Foresight potential*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Mauranen Anna. 2010. "Features of English as a lingua franca in academia." *Helsinki English Studies* 6, 6-28.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Yolanda, and Rosa M. Jiménez Catalán, eds. 2009. *Content and language Integrated learning; evidence from research in Europe*. (Second Language Acquisition–SLA). Bristol: Multilingual Matters,
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Yolanda, Juan M. Sierra and Francisco Gallardo del Puerto, eds. 2011. *Content and Foreign Language Integrated Learning;: contributions to multilingualism in European contexts* (Linguistic Insights. Studies in Language and Communication). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Swain, Merrill, and Sharon Lapkin. 1989. "Canadian immersion and adult second language teaching—What's the connection." *Modern Language Journal* 73: 150–159.
- Wächter Bernd, and Friedhelm Maiworm, eds. 2014. *English-taught Programmes in European Higher Education. The State of Play in 2014*. (ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education). Bonn: Lemmens Medien GmbH.
- Wilkinson, Robert, and Vera Zegers, eds. 2007. *Integrating Content and Language. Researching Content and Language Integration in Higher Education*. Maastricht: Maastricht University.
- Wilkinson, Robert, and Vera Zegers, eds. 2008. *Integrating Content and Language. Realizing Content and Language Integration in Higher Education*. Maastricht: Maastricht University.
- Wilkinson, Robert, ed. 2004. *Integrating Content and Language. Meeting the Challenge of a Multilingual Higher Education*. (Proceedings of the ICL Conference, October 23-25/2003). Maastricht: Universitaire Pers Maastricht.

