

Second medium-term programme of activities 2004-2007

Project D3 – CLILmatrix
The CLIL quality matrix

Central workshop report 6/2005
(Graz, Austria, 3-5 November 2005)

Project team:

Co-ordinator:

David Marsh (Finland)

Project team members:

Do Coyle (United Kingdom)

Stefka Kitanova (Bulgaria)

Anne Maljers (The Netherlands)

Dieter Wolff (Germany)

Bronislawa Zielonka (Poland)

The report can be accessed in English and French on the ECML website: <http://www.ecml.at>

The Executive Director of the ECML should be informed about any full or partial translation of the report and a copy of the translation should be sent to the ECML for information.

Contact address

The Executive Director
European Centre for Modern Languages
Council of Europe
Nikolaiplatz 4
A-8020 Graz
Austria
e-mail : information@ecml.at

Contents

Report of Central Workshop 6/2005: CLIL QUALITY MATRIX.....	5
Workshop Process Overview	5
Workshop Outcomes Overview: key issues resulting from interventions and discussion.....	5
Controversial Issues	8
Future Action.....	9
Addendum: Participant interventions.....	10
Approaching CLIL <i>Dieter Wolf (Germany)</i>	10
Communicating CLIL through Audio-visual Resources <i>Maria Jesús Frigols (Spain)</i>	26
The Central Role of Language Learning/Teaching Methodologies in CLIL <i>Áine Furlong (Ireland)</i>	27
CLIL in Hungary <i>Kovács, Judit (Hungary)</i>	29
CLIL in Finland <i>Heini-Marja Järvinen (Finland)</i>	31

Report of Central Workshop 6/2005: CLIL QUALITY MATRIX

David Marsh (Finland), Do Coyle (United Kingdom), Stefka Kitanova (Bulgaria), Anne Maljers (The Netherlands), Dieter Wolff (Germany), Bronislawa Zielonka (Poland)

Workshop Process Overview

This ECML Workshop focused on describing good practice in the educational approach termed Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). The workshop identified and considered essential conditions and competencies required so that quality can be achieved and sustained.

Dieter Wolff (Germany) opened the event with a keynote address ‘Approaching CLIL’ which guided the audience towards a shared understanding of CLIL, particularly with respect to language and subject teaching. The majority of the participants came from language education backgrounds, and this was an important stage in showing the position of CLIL with respect to other educational approaches such as languages for specific purposes and communicative language teaching. Stefka Kitanova (Bulgaria) followed with an example of good quality resources used in CLIL (Science Across the World). This presentation showed how various forms of materials and methodologies, and networking tools, can facilitate the work of the CLIL teacher. Anne Maljers (Netherlands) then gave a holistic example of how CLIL practice can be examined and established using a Quality Framework.

Participant interventions on Day 1 focussed on the position of CLIL within a language education framework, and cross-disciplinary experiences by which it transcends from language teaching through to education in other subjects.

Day 2 was opened by Do Coyle (UK) who showed examples of CLIL practice, tools for developing good practice, and insight into outcomes. This was followed by a set of participant interventions where specific experiences of developing good practice in CLIL were presented from Hungary, Finland, France, Ireland, Spain and Switzerland. Following this, sessions focused on building tools for establishing quality, diverse applications according to specific regions, and pre-requisite development steps and issues.

Day 3 started with a case study example of CLIL excellence by Peeter Mehisto (Estonia). The main focus concerned regional start-up and sustainable management. This was followed by a description of the importance of multi-media resources which can be used to support management and dissemination Maria Jesús Frigols (Spain). The remainder of Day 3 was devoted to specific participant needs and interests.

Workshop Outcomes Overview: key issues resulting from interventions and discussion

Defining CLIL

CLIL was adopted in 1996 as a generic ‘umbrella’ term to refer to diverse methodologies which lead to dual-focussed education where attention is given to both topic and language of

instruction. It is used to describe any educational situation in which an additional (second/foreign) language is used for the teaching and learning of subjects other than the language itself.

CLIL can be realized using very different models. Each one is determined by the context of the school and learners. CLIL invites a re-conceptualization of how we consider language use and learning. It enables development of an integrated educational approach which actively involves the learner in using and developing the language *of* learning; the language *for* learning; and language *through* learning. It has been referred to as education through *construction*, rather than *instruction*.

CLIL is therefore an educational approach which is essentially methodological. Changing the medium of instruction, for whatever reason, without adaptation of methods can easily lead to poor overall outcomes. Such a situation is common in various parts of the world. Achieving full integration of language and content in a dual-focused way is essential for achieving quality CLIL.

The CLIL ‘generic umbrella’ includes many variants. Some of these may be considered as primarily language teaching. Some can be seen as mainly content teaching. The essence of CLIL leads to it having status as an innovative ‘new’ educational approach which transcends traditional approaches to both subject and language teaching.

CLIL as one form of modern educational integration

The demands of the modern world resonate directly through to the classroom. The pressures of globalization and impact of the new technologies mean that education is responding to the knowledge and skills demanded in an increasingly ‘integrated’ world. Some educational systems have already developed integration of subjects to a high degree. CLIL can be seen as one form of ‘integrated learning’ designed to even better equip the learner with knowledge and skills suitable for the global age.

Increasing application of CLIL

In the past decade, the term CLIL has frequently surpassed older, more established terms such as bilingual education, content-based language learning, immersion, etc., in many environments.

This form of education has been common to specific types of educational institution, and localities, for many years. What is noticeable in the past decade is how the methodology is being increasingly introduced in a variety of schools and regions. Thus, it is both shifting from ‘special’ school environments into ‘mainstream’ contexts, and becoming increasingly more frequent. A major reason for this is because of the socio-economic imperatives identified in many countries. Globalization requires populations to be increasingly multi-skilled and mobile. CLIL has been identified by some political and administrative forces to be one means for achieving this in education.

Diverse Variants/Types of CLIL

Reports from the workshop team and the participants demonstrated a variety of CLIL across Europe. There are many CLIL models in education (see for example

www.clilcompendium.com and in 2006, the ECML publication CLIL Country Profiles). These models depend on aim, context and desired outcomes. Variants may be found at all levels of education from pre-school to tertiary. They differ according to choice of subjects, exposure time, target languages, and overall objectives. They may be modular or programme-based. That is, CLIL may be used in short thematic units (modules) using the foreign language as a working language involving relatively little time within the curriculum. Alternatively it may involve very high exposure such as in International Baccalaureate schools, or high exposure time, as typical of schools which offer some 50% of the curriculum in the foreign language.

Theory & Practice

Much has been discussed about CLIL in terms of language (e.g. does it threaten the learner's first language, does it really accelerate additional language learning?). But now, as the discussion in the workshop underlined as well, interest is focussing on cognition. For example, when you integrate content with language, is there an added value which can be achieved in terms of cognition and thinking skills? Is there a problem-solving capability which a learner can develop through CLIL which is hard to achieve when teaching through the first language?

In relation to methodology, it was argued that oral skills (typical of that aimed for through the use of communicative methods in language learning classrooms) are not enough for realizing the benefits of CLIL. Reading and writing comprehension and production are also seen as core factors in maximizing good practice, particularly in relation to cognitive and language development.

The theoretical foundations of CLIL now involve more than those relating to language acquisition. Learner cognition and motivation are two very significant issues now under discussion.

Research

CLIL practice has largely preceded research. It was reported that there is some established research available on interlinked aspects of language and content learning, and large-scale CLIL initiatives (e.g. Canada and immersion). However, research on the new 'mainstreamed' examples of CLIL, is only recently being initiated and reported. Participants expressed a need for pan European studies into CLIL.

Research fields within 'applied linguistics' which include focus on CLIL are second language acquisition, bilingualism, foreign language learning and applied psycholinguistics. Research activity is increasing in content learning, intercultural competence, evaluation, methodologies, and cognition.

Materials & Support Resources

There is increasing interest in the development of materials which suit variants of CLIL. A variety of text books and other resources were shared. Although there is no single location/portal where these materials are available, publishers and networks can be found which produce tailored materials and which offer resources that are highly adaptable (see, www.scienceacross.org, and www.euroclil.net for networking).

CLIL Languages

English is a language frequently used in contemporary CLIL. However, as experience of CLIL develops, other target languages are also adopted. Interventions during the workshop exemplified case studies from other major languages such as French, German, Italian, Spanish and Russian.

Integrated Management as Strategy and Practice

CLIL may be introduced top down through a centralized (regional/national) action, or as a bottom-up approach on a smaller scale in a school or municipality. Whichever is the case, an integrated strategic development approach is an important enabler in establishing integrity and achieving success. An Estonian case study showed that this strategy requires working with key stakeholders drawn from schools, ministries, local government and higher education. A stakeholder is any group or individual that can be affected by or can influence progress. Cooperating with these stakeholders requires various skills and tools so that synergy is fully realized. This means establishing some form of management system which simultaneously handles training/consultation, research, teaching materials and public relations (see www.kke.ee).

Quality Assurance in Schools

Standardization and quality assurance in CLIL has been increasingly developed in certain regions, as a report from the Netherlands showed. In this country, the CLIL schools have a self-supporting system, which is supported, but not solely governed by an external national agency (in this case, the European Platform for Dutch Education). This external agency provides a quality assurance process by which schools can show that they meet pre-defined criteria, and thus receive accreditation.

In summary, the CLIL school network recognizes the value of this form of quality assurance. It is seen as leading to standardization between the schools, recognition of CLIL within these schools, opening doors on greater cooperation in, (e.g. designing joint curricula, sharing materials development and teacher training, etc.) This is seen as leading towards overall strengthening of the school towards identifying and implementing success factors (see www.netwerktto.europeesplatform.nl).

Controversial Issues

CLIL involves a ‘sea-change’ of educational philosophy. Some participants argued that it invites controversy, simply because it may challenge the status quo. It threatens certain established ‘ways of thinking’, and offers opportunities for initiating change in education. Such change is heavily focussed on providing an educational experience which CLIL schools explore to even better equip learners for their future in the wider world.

(See www.europa.eu.int/comm/education/languages/index.html)

Future Action

There are critical issues to be developed for further implementation of Quality CLIL. Research ranked highly in the needs analysed during the workshop as this might provide the evidence needed to convince stakeholders and decision makers and describe good practice in CLIL methodologies which could be used to further develop teacher training.

There still seems to be a need to develop good quality materials for CLIL, especially for the languages less frequently used as languages of instruction.

Participants would highly appreciate possibilities for further networking. ECML expressed the willingness to explore this facility.

Addendum: Participant interventions

Approaching CLIL¹ *Dieter Wolf (Germany)*

1. Introduction

Although it always was the language policy of the European Union to accept the national languages of its member states, to protect European minority languages and to encourage multilingual communication, the absolute necessity to enable European citizens to speak at least two languages apart from their mother tongue, in order to preserve unity through diversity, was recognized only fairly recently (MT+2).

But educationalists all over Europe have not reached agreement yet as to the most efficient methodological approach to reach this ambitious goal. Looking at the results of foreign language teaching in our schools it becomes clear that only few students acquire the linguistic competence necessary for their future life in one foreign language, let alone two. Often students feel obliged to learn a language again once they have left school although they might have spent up to eight years learning it in school. The large number of *false beginners* found in vocational schools or evening classes shows how low most people rate their foreign language competence acquired in school. A recent survey undertaken by the European Union shows that in the European context on average less than 40 per cent of the population judge themselves capable of having a conversation on an everyday subject with a native speaker of one of the languages learnt in school.

These findings show that our present-day methodological approaches to foreign language teaching and learning do not seem to lead to the desired result, namely a near native-like competence in two foreign languages, which enables learners to interact competently in their profession and in everyday life.

New approaches which are more content- and process-oriented have been brought forward; they seem to be better suited to attain these goals. One of these is *Content and Language Integrated Learning*, an approach which will be focussed upon in my contribution.

1 This paper will be published in a longer version in 2006 in Karlfried Knapp (ed.): Handbook of Applied Linguistics. Heidelberg: Springer.

2. A Short Outline of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)

2.1. A Definition of CLIL

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) as an educational approach was developed in Europe and is, therefore, very strongly European-oriented. It is based on the well-known assumption that foreign languages are best learnt by focussing in the classroom not so much on language – its form and structure – but on the content which is transmitted through language. Compared to other content-based approaches the specific novelty of this approach is that classroom content is not so much taken from everyday life or the general content of the target language culture but rather drawn from content subjects or academic viz. scientific disciplines.

This different notion of content which is the most typical feature of the approach is of great interest in the current discussion on improving foreign language competence. First, the approach can be adapted to all levels of language teaching: primary, secondary and tertiary, for all curricula include academic content: primary curricula contain content areas on a very basic level, secondary curricula more specifically in content subjects (History, Geography, Mathematics), and tertiary curricula consist of academic subjects (Information Technology, Physics, Engineering, Sociology, Arts, Design etc.) which can at least partially be introduced into the students' language studies. And second, integrated content and language teaching saves time within the overall curriculum. If content and language are learnt and taught in integration and not in isolation the time available for the teaching/learning process of a content subject and a foreign language doubles; length of study time both for language and content subject can thus be reduced considerably, and as a consequence, more languages can be introduced into the curriculum and more time can be devoted to the study of each language.

Here is a definition of CLIL which I think we should take as a working definition for our workshop as well:

Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) is a generic term and refers to any educational situation in which an additional language and therefore not the most widely used language of the environment is used for the teaching and learning of subjects other than the language itself (Marsh & Langé 2000, iii).

In this context I will not be able to discuss this definition in detail, but I have done so in a number of publications which you will find in the bibliography.

2.2. Variants of CLIL

CLIL as an educational concept is not homogeneous; a rather large number of different variants can be distinguished. Variation depends on a number of factors of which the school type – primary, secondary, tertiary – is the most important. A CLIL approach varies according to whether it takes place in primary, secondary or tertiary education. Other factors responsible for variation are country-specific, i.e. environmental. They depend on the specific educational system and on the wider socio-linguistic context in which the approach is embedded. In the following a distinction is made between variants induced by typology and by the specific environment.

2.2.1. *Typologically induced variants*

The number of *primary schools* which have adopted some kind of CLIL approach is surprisingly high. A distinction must be made between at least two types of primary CLIL schools:

(1) The first type of primary CLIL schools exists in bilingual border regions, in France for example in Alsace, in Italy in Southern Tyrol or in the Aosta Valley. In Germany we find primary CLIL schools of this type also in large industrial centres, for example in Berlin, where primary classes include learners of often up to eight different mother tongues. In France and Italy the minority languages (German and French) are used as languages of instruction, in Germany the majority language or one of the larger minority languages is the language in which part of the content is taught. In Berlin this is Turkish, Greek, Spanish, Italian or Russian. So, primary CLIL is often but not always a combination of additive and maintenance bilingual education (cf. Baker 1996); learners maintain their family language while they are also acquiring a higher language competence in the society they live in.

(2) But purely additive bilingual education is common as well at primary level, for example when learners in Spain are taught part of their content curriculum in English, French or German. Here the language of instruction is neither the language spoken in the country or the learners' mother tongue. Often primary CLIL branches of this type are the outcome of parents' initiatives, based on private bilingual kindergarten and pre-schools.

From a survey which was undertaken recently (cf. Marsh, Maljers & Hartiala 2001) some important information was gathered as to organisational and structural aspects of CLIL in *secondary schools* in Europe. Although CLIL has developed differently in different European school systems there are a number of similarities which should be mentioned here in order to make the approach more transparent as an educational framework.

In general, CLIL schools or CLIL branches are organised in such a way that one or more content subjects (in general from the Humanities and Social Sciences) are taught in a foreign language for at least four years. The content subjects most frequently chosen are History, Geography and Social Sciences. The most frequently used languages are English and French, German ranking third. In general, it can be estimated that in secondary CLIL schools the age span of learners can reach from ten to eighteen years.

In *tertiary education* it is mainly vocational schools which have opted for teaching content through a foreign language. In these schools the content subjects are, in general, different from secondary schools, ranging from Information Technology to Economics and Business Studies, from Agriculture to Mechanics. In some of the smaller European countries like Finland or the Netherlands management or professional schools exist which educate their students entirely in a foreign language, usually English. In colleges and universities, however, CLIL is only rarely used as a methodological approach to language and content teaching. Apart from academic subjects like *English or French Studies* or teacher training programmes geared at future teachers of English or other languages which are at least partly taught in English or other respective languages, the number of academic subjects taught in a foreign language is still comparatively low. Even if languages are part of a university curriculum they are learnt separately and not in integration with the content of the academic subject.

2.2.2. Environmentally induced variants

I will now discuss the so-called environmental parameters which are responsible for the development of different forms of CLIL in different countries. A distinction can be made between four parameters:

1. Interpretation of the concept: Despite the fact that CLIL as a general educational concept is quite homogeneous in those countries in which it has been introduced, variation in the way it is interpreted can be observed. Variation can be represented on a scale which reaches from pure foreign language teaching on the one end to a form of content teaching in which the focus on language is almost non-existent, and the foreign language is predominantly used as a working language. The former interpretation could also be called a language-learning, the latter a content-learning interpretation. CLIL as a language learning approach is seen mainly as an innovative form of language teaching, and the potential available for content subject learning is less taken into account. It is assumed that by applying the CLIL concept the foreign language competence of the learner is improved. It is quite natural that on the basis of such an interpretation teaching is being influenced methodologically by foreign language teaching concepts; in some way this type can be classified as foreign language teaching using other contents than the traditional foreign language teaching contents. The other interpretation in which the foreign language is simply used as a working language leads to a different, content-oriented methodology which is strongly influenced by mother-tongue content subject teaching. In its purest form this concept strongly relies on the immersion idea, which assumes that learners inductively pick up the foreign language while working with content.

2. Choice of subjects: From the very beginning of CLIL this parameter has led to much discussion. Traditionally, subjects included in the Social Sciences or the Humanities were taught in a foreign language (History, Geography or Social Sciences). In some countries Natural Science subjects like Mathematics or Biology are taught – often still experimentally – in a foreign language. The discussion of the suitability of certain subjects or content fields with respect to teaching them in another language has not gone very far yet. It is fairly certain, however, that subjects belonging to the Humanities are more suitable when it comes to the promotion of interculturality, as they are characterised by culture-specific features which by contrast lead to consciousness-raising with respect to the cultural particularities of the target language culture. When looking at the countries which have implemented CLIL it can be seen that in almost all of them subjects from the Humanities are usually the natural choice while in some countries Natural Sciences subjects are also taught, at least experimentally.

3. Exposure time: It is only plausible that a decision about the time a learner should be exposed to content-subject learning in a foreign language leads to variation in the CLIL approach which is being adopted. The variants are characterised in particular by the number of subjects which are taught in the foreign language, and by the time (in months or years) learners are exposed to this teaching process. In the European context the time span lasts between exposure for several years (maximum seven years according to my knowledge) and only a few weeks. It is quite common that up to three content subjects are taught in a foreign language. Closely related to this and also influencing exposure time is the use of both native and foreign language in the classroom, i.e. a certain amount of content might be taught in the foreign and the rest in the learner's native language. Whereas in some countries a change of language of this kind is quite common, in others teachers tend to use the foreign language only in the classroom.

5. Linguistic situation: One of the most influential parameters influencing CLIL is the linguistic situation in which this approach is embedded. This becomes particularly clear when looking at the situation in the European Union where CLIL was first developed. The European Union is a political unit which can be characterised language-wise by two observable facts: linguistic variation within the boundaries of the EU and, additionally, linguistic variation within many of its member states. For the latter it is typical that the different languages spoken in one country are related differently to one another. The following examples will make this clearer:

- Two or more official languages are spoken in a particular political unit (Belgium: Flemish, French and German, Finland: Finnish and Swedish).
- Official and officially recognised minority languages are spoken in a particular political unit (Britain: English and Welsh).
- Official and not officially recognised minority languages are spoken in a particular political unit (Germany: German and Turkish).

In addition, almost all European countries have borders with countries in which other languages are spoken. This complex linguistic situation contributes to the development of different types of CLIL. In some cases it is the language which is the other official or officially recognised language which determines the choice of the CLIL language. In other cases the language of the neighbouring country is chosen as the CLIL language. This is quite common in regions which have a political border with the other country. It is understandable that in such linguistic contexts specific variants of CLIL develop, especially because learners are often in contact with this language in their extra-school life.

2.3. Modular CLIL

Modular CLIL can be defined as an approach to teaching content in a foreign language in non-language subjects over shorter periods of time. A History teacher who decides to teach part of the curriculum in the students' mother tongue and another part in a foreign language might serve as an example. He/she might wish to teach the history of the Nazi period in Germany in German or the French Revolution in French. Similarly, a Mathematics teacher could decide to teach the theory of probabilities in French, the first foreign language of his/her students. The rest of the curriculum would, however, be taught in the students' mother tongue. The content elements which the teacher chooses are usually called modules; they could also be called projects or thematic units. It is easy to see that although modular CLIL is theoretically possible in all schools it is related to a number of conditions which are often not fulfilled. First, the teacher has to have the linguistic competence in a foreign language to be able to teach content. Second, the students' linguistic competence in the CLIL language must be sufficient to follow the instruction. If the teacher is not a content but a language teacher it is important to ensure that he/she knows enough about the content subject to be able to teach it. Teachers who have a dual qualification in content and language teaching are, of course, best suited to teach CLIL modules.

There are quite a number of different contexts in which modular CLIL can be embedded in the classroom:

- Teachers teach thematic units or modules in the content subject using the foreign language as working language (cf. the above example).
- Content-subject related projects in the foreign language are set up. They can take place outside regular content-subject teaching periods.
- Projects are set up which comprise more than one content subject, so that learners learn on a more general level how to cope linguistically with content-related matter in a foreign language.
- International projects are set up in which learners use the foreign language in order to exchange ideas with learners from other countries. The internet is a helpful instrument in this context both for research and communication (Krechel, 2003).

The learning aims of modular CLIL are slightly different from regular CLIL. In a way, modular CLIL is an incentive to make learners understand how important a foreign language can be in understanding a content subject. Like regular CLIL it is a helpful tool to learn language registers which are useful in professional life. It is the language-for-specific-purposes aspect which is particularly attractive although learners will not be as competent as regular CLIL learners at the end of their studies. But in dealing with the foreign language within a content subject context they better understand the use of foreign languages in their education. This usually has a highly motivating effect for their language learning processes.

On the whole, modular CLIL is a useful concept to help implementing the CLIL idea into our school systems. It certainly cannot replace CLIL as such but it can serve as a bridge between traditional language and content teaching on the one hand and regular CLIL on the other.

3. Learning Psychological and Methodological Considerations

3.1. Learning psychological considerations

We mentioned already that foreign language teaching is not as successful as it should be. Lack of motivation, enthusiasm and interest are common with learners in many classrooms. Foreign language teaching is regarded as difficult; learners do not see any use in dealing with another language. The situation is similar in content teaching. Lack of motivation and interest seem to be less marked, however, than in language teaching. In recent discussions it is maintained that CLIL offers opportunities to improve this situation. In the following we will discuss some of the arguments from a learning psychological angle.

CLIL theoreticians argue that the learning environment created by CLIL increases the learner's general learning capacities and also his motivation and interest. The integration of content subject and language creates a learning environment which cannot be set up within isolated subject or language teaching. A CLIL classroom which is set up according to modern educational principles is a kind of workshop in which learners are not simply inundated with school knowledge but in which the reality of the school is connected with the reality of the world outside. The fictional world of the language classroom is substituted by something more real which interlinks with the world outside (cf. Barnes 1976).

CLIL theoreticians also argue that in CLIL the separate roles of the learner as a foreign language learner and a content subject learner merge into one role. He/she acquires the concepts and schemata of the content subject first in another language; this process is similar to first language acquisition where the child acquires the linguistic signs and the underlying concepts at the same time. Especially for the higher-ranking scientific facts and processes he/she builds up new concepts which are not influenced by everyday concepts developed in the learner's mother tongue. In CLIL the learner's concepts are foreign language based, the mother tongue concepts build on these foreign language concepts because the learner gets into contact with specific parts of the world around him first via the foreign language.

The learner's linguistic development is also influenced positively in a CLIL environment. The complex concepts which he develops help him to express himself adequately in the foreign language with respect to the contents of the content subject. And the fact that content subject learning has a scientific character contributes to the learner's developing an academic competence in the foreign language (cf. Cummins 1987, who coined the term CALP = *cognitive academic language proficiency* for this competence). In CLIL the learner acquires linguistic competencies which do not only extend beyond communicative competence but also relate much more to the use of the foreign language in professional life later on.

Another added value which is being discussed by CLIL theoreticians and which concerns both content subject and language relates to the content component. Content subject teaching deals with content which is appropriate to the learner's state of cognitive development, i.e. content he/she would also be taught in his mother tongue classroom at that time. Motivation, curiosity and involvement can therefore be raised much better through CLIL than through the contents of the traditional foreign language classroom (cf. Wolff 1997a).

3.2. Methodological considerations

For many years, when CLIL played only a minor role in institutionalised teaching and learning, methodological aspects were neglected to a large extent. In general, teachers taught their content subject in the foreign language just as they would have taught it in their mother tongue. Similarly, language teaching and learning in the CLIL classroom took place according to traditional language teaching methodology. In a way, the content of the content subject simply replaced the traditional content of the language classroom and apart from this the CLIL classroom looked like a traditional teacher-centred language or content subject classroom.

The situation has changed considerably in recent years. Educationalists and practising teachers have realised that the pedagogical potential of CLIL is higher than they had anticipated, and a number of more innovative advocates of CLIL insist that a specific CLIL methodology should be developed. (Wolff 1997b, Thürmann 2000, Abendroth-Timmer *et al.* 2004) The development of such a methodology is under way now for secondary CLIL; the methodological discussion centres around three general issues: promoting reading comprehension, focus on writing, developing methods in which language sensitive teaching and learning plays a central role. There can be no doubt that these issues reach far beyond the typical methodological discussions in language and content teaching.

Reading and reading skills are regarded as highly important in the CLIL classroom. Most of the acquisitional processes are related to reading comprehension: learners work with

documents and other sources in order to acquire knowledge in the content subject. Although reading strategies play an important role in all learning contexts, in CLIL they decide on the students' success or failure. A specific CLIL methodology has to take this into account: thus the promotion of reading strategies plays an important role in all methodological discussions. And it must not be forgotten that content subject work also includes specific reading skills: working with graphs, maps, charts etc. Specific processing strategies have to be acquired which help learners to process the information contained in these materials. In a way, the focus on processing strategies in the CLIL classroom is characteristic of a new methodological approach, an approach which is not only language- but also content-based. Learners do not read texts in order to learn language but in order to acquire knowledge in the content subject. This makes the whole learning process more skill-oriented both with respect to language and to content.

This is also true for the productive skills. Whereas in the communicative language classroom the promotion of oral skills is regarded as being particularly important, in CLIL classrooms writing skills take up a highly significant role. From very early on learners have to use the foreign language to write down the results of what they have studied: they compose reports, definitions, compile results of observations etc. Content subject language competence is to a large extent text competence (cf. Portmann-Tselekas 2002), and a CLIL methodology must be a methodology geared towards writing proficiency in the foreign language.

The most important point in the discussion is, however, the integration of content and language in the CLIL classroom. It has become clear from the experience we have with communicative and other related language learning approaches that purely meaning-focused language learning is not very successful: focus on form is as important, especially in institutionalised learning contexts. This is the reason why CLIL teachers opt for an approach which is content-oriented but at the same time language-sensitive. It is the content of the content subject which is in the centre of the learning-teaching process, but in order to deal with the content in the foreign language learners have to acquire both knowledge and skills which are necessary to manipulate this content. In the classroom this works according to the language-across-the-curriculum principle, i.e. language is focused upon whenever necessary.

Three aspects of language work have been discussed in some detail in recent years. One is terminology which has lost its overwhelming importance in the classroom. Especially in the early CLIL years teachers believed that content teaching could only work if students had the precise terminology in the foreign language at their disposal. Language work at that time simply consisted of learning lists of terminological expressions. Nowadays it is emphasized that the terminological inventory of a content subject can be differentiated into more general and more specific terms. As quite a number of CLIL specialists (for example Krechel 1995) put it, in CLIL one should begin by providing more general content subject-oriented terminology and should then slowly move towards more and more specific vocabulary.

The second aspect is more skill-oriented and concerns classroom discourse. Because of its content orientation classroom discourse plays a much more important role in CLIL than in a traditional language classroom. According to Thürmann (1999) discourse skills in a CLIL classroom can be analysed as consisting of two sets: one more general functional set consisting of speech acts like identify – classify/define – describe – explain – conclude/argue – evaluate and one more specific set which differs according to content subjects or groups of subjects, for example making inductions/stating laws – describing states and processes – working with graphs, diagrams, tables etc. – interpreting – writing reports. These pragmatic

categories can also be regarded as the building stones for vocabulary and vocabulary work in the classroom.

The last language-oriented methodological aspect to be mentioned here is concerned with the use of language in the classroom. Like in a modern communicative language classroom the foreign or CLIL language is used as frequently as possible. But in a CLIL classroom in which intercultural learning is based on the principle of contrastivity it can also be useful to work with first language materials. When looking, for example, at a historical event like the First World War from a French and a German perspective this multiperspectival view can only be developed in the students if they work with French and German materials, i.e. foreign language and mother-tongue texts. Methodologically, the CLIL classroom should not be characterised by monolingualism (i.e. using the foreign language exclusively) but rather by functional bilingualism, i.e. using the mother tongue and mother tongue materials when it is necessary to promote a multiperspectival, contrastive and integrated view of content. This approach is fairly new compared to the theories brought forward in foreign language teaching methodology where the exclusive use of the foreign language is seen as mandatory (cf. Otten & Wildhage 2003).

4. Controversial issues

4.1. The learner

There are a number of controversial issues related to the learner in a CLIL learning context. The first one has to do with the learners' language competence in their mother tongue. Learners, who are taught content subjects during their school career in another than their native language, are exposed to the academic registers of their first language for a shorter time than learners who are learning content in their native language. Experts argue that this might have negative effects on the development of the learner's native language. This problem should not be neglected; in most contexts, however, CLIL is operated in a way which reduces the inherent danger to a large extent. First, the number of the content subjects which are taught in another language are reduced to two or maximal three, i.e. the larger part of the content subjects is still taught in the learner's first language. Second, integrated content and language teaching is organised methodologically in such a way that the foreign language is not used without at the same time referring to the learner's native language: while dealing with a content subject topic, structures and lexemes are worked out contrastively which leads to the promotion of the learner's first language as well. An impoverishment of first language competence can be regarded as rather exceptional; it should be ensured, however, that only a limited number of content subjects are taught in the foreign language. This distinguishes CLIL from immersion programmes where usually all subjects are taught in the foreign language.

Specialists argue as well that there is a danger of impoverishment with respect to the learner's knowledge of the content subject, when it is taught only in a foreign language. This problem must be taken seriously, especially if school authorities demand that the learner's knowledge in the content subject should be as extensive as that of the "normal" mother-tongue learner. The problem is one of definition. If we understand by historical knowledge merely the historical facts listed in a text book (declarative knowledge) it is easily possible to define it. If, however, we also include procedural knowledge, i.e. knowledge on how to deal with historical content, it will be much more difficult to define it. In modern content subject

learning it is difficult to define content quantitatively and therefore equally difficult to define a learner's content subject knowledge.

The central problem of multilingual education in the context of CLIL, however, seems to lie in a societal phenomenon which is typical of most of the industrialised countries in the world and especially of Europe and the European Union. Especially in the large Western European countries but increasingly also in Southern Europe large groups of migrants have settled down whose children have learned two languages at a very early age, their first or family language - Turkish, Arabic, Hindustani, Russian, Croatian etc. - and the vernacular language of the country they live in. In general, these children have learnt their family language only orally; they can only rarely read or write it. At the same time, children of the migrant population have enormous problems with the vernacular language, whether it is German, French, Italian, English etc. They learn these languages only inadequately, especially as they are not specifically promoted in school, in particular with respect to the academic skills of reading and writing. In using Cummins' (1987) distinction between BICS (= Basic interpersonal communicative skills) and CALP (= Cognitive academic language proficiency) one could say that these children are fairly proficient with respect to BICS but that they have large deficits with respect to CALP. It is well known that the children of the migrant population more often fail in school because they lack academic proficiency (cf. Gogolin 1994), and it is therefore easy to conclude that they would have even greater difficulties, if they were taught content in another language. The comparatively small number of migrant children in German CLIL classes is a clear indication that their parents are being dissuaded by teachers and the school authorities to send their children to this kind of instruction.

One could argue at this stage that academic failure of migrant children is an important reason why CLIL can never become an educational approach from which all children benefit. This is a very strong argument against democratizing CLIL; I believe, on the contrary, that if we find the right way, it is still possible to integrate such problematic groups into a CLIL learning environment. Canadian research on immigrant children could lead us the way. Already during the seventies of last century it was shown in Canada and in the United States that immigrant children failed in school if they had not learned to read and to write in their family language. (Grosjean 1982:70) At that time the Canadian government set up so-called *heritage language programmes* in which immigrant children were promoted in their family language and also learned to read and to write in this language. These programmes still exist, and it became clear in the accompanying research that children who participate in them attain the same or even better academic results than English-speaking children (Danesi 1991, Cummins 1992). It is absolutely necessary that other countries where these problems exist follow the Canadian example. In some European countries such programmes exist as well but they are not sufficient in number to prepare all bilingual migrant children for a school system in which they will be confronted at an early stage with yet another language. If the world's industrial countries manage to offer extensive language programmes in which migrant children are promoted in their first language it will not be dangerous but rather advantageous to introduce CLIL into our respective school systems.

4.2. The school

Problems related to integrating CLIL into the school are not uncommon; we will discuss a few general issues here, but there are others typical for specific educational systems which cannot be taken up here (for more details cf. Marsh 2002).

One central problem related to implementing CLIL on a larger scale is the lack of teachers capable of teaching CLIL professionally. Apart from the German-speaking countries both in the European context and world-wide the type of teacher who is qualified in only one subject dominates. The additional training in the subject – a foreign language or a content subject – is quite a costly endeavour for a country which intends to implement CLIL. And even in Germany and Austria where a dual qualification at least for secondary schools exists it is necessary to provide additional training to teach in an integrated context. A way to resolve this problem could be to make use of native speakers who have studied a content subject in their respective mother tongue country. Such a solution would, however, necessitate foreign language teacher training.

A second problem which concerns the teaching and learning context has something to do with the materials used. Only in a few countries materials exist which were developed exclusively for CLIL. Text books do not exist; the materials available are usually booklets with text collections relating to the content subject. Many teachers develop their own materials; they exchange them with other teachers or use native-language textbooks for the content subject in their courses. In general, adaptations are necessary, however, although some teachers use these materials without adapting them. Publishers still hesitate to edit their own materials or textbooks. It is possible to solve this problem, however. In some European countries, for example, teacher associations have been founded in which teachers co-operate who teach content subjects in a foreign language. Such associations create databases in which teachers will find adequate materials.

Certification is another unsolved problem. Students who have gone through a CLIL course usually do not get a special diploma; the fact that they have done part of their studies in a foreign language is just mentioned in their school leaving certificate. A Europe- or even world-wide agency which distributes such diploma would be welcome. It could control the standards of CLIL in the respective countries and could deliver specific CLIL diploma which are valid in other countries as well and give students access to further education in these countries.

5. Research perspectives

Research on CLIL is, unfortunately, still in its infancy. This has something to do with the fact, that CLIL is a practically oriented educational approach in which, until recently, researchers did not show much interest. It has also something to do with the small number of CLIL classes which were available for observation and study. But it seems as if now a number of research projects have gone off the ground which are mainly conducted by young PhD researchers in the European context. The large number of CLIL schools especially in Germany and Austria have led to this growing research interest as well as the interest of the European Commission to promote this approach in order to foster multilingualism. Most of the research money comes from national agencies and from the European Union.

When looking at the first research results published in Germany recently (cf. for example Bonnet & Breidbach 2004) it can be seen that there are five general fields of interest on which this research centers:

1. Research on the acquisition of linguistic competence in a CLIL classroom.
2. Research on the acquisition of content subject competence in a CLIL classroom.
3. Research on the acquisition of intercultural competence in a CLIL classroom.
4. Research focusing on content subject methodology in a CLIL context.
5. Research on the evaluation of CLIL by teachers and learners.

Naturally, the first research field has by far been the most popular in recent years. Especially in the context of second language acquisition research conducted by Henning Wode for more than twenty years (cf. for example Wode 1999), some studies were published which looked at the linguistic development of kindergarten and primary school children. Although these studies are comparable to the Canadian studies on immersion children they show that small children are well capable of learning a foreign language in contexts in which content is not simply games, songs and play but which have an academic character. Wode's and his collaborators' research also shows that small children exposed to another language (in their case English) for some twenty to twenty-four hours a week learn this language according to the developmental principles discovered by SLA research (cf. Pienemann 1989). Wode's research was criticised by a number of people especially because he only looks at the linguistic development of children and does not see it in relationship with the development of content.

Research on the acquisition of content subject competence is fairly new. The reason for this is probably that most researchers are linguists or Applied linguists and do not know much about the academic disciplines underlying content subjects. A very interesting research projects which will be published soon, was conducted by Lamsfuß-Schenk. She was interested in the question whether there were differences in the learning of History content when learners were instructed in their mother tongue or in a foreign language. Lamsfuß-Schenk taught two parallel classes for one school year in History, one in German, the children's mother tongue, and one in French. After having analysed the results she tentatively comes up with the hypothesis that the children who have learnt the content subject in the foreign language develop more precise concepts to discuss historical content. Other research shows that CLIL learners do learn content equally well as learners who are instructed in their mother tongue.

Research on the development of intercultural competence is of a fairly theoretical nature. The question whether intercultural competence can be better developed in a CLIL classroom has not yet been tackled empirically: most researchers assume that intercultural competence and intercultural understanding are an outcome of the learning situation in a CLIL classroom (cf. de Florio-Hansen 2003). There are researchers, however, who claim that it is absolutely necessary to develop a new definition of interculturality in a CLIL context before intercultural competence can be investigated in such a classroom. Seen from this angle intercultural competence in CLIL must be regarded as a multiperspectival competence which allows learners to understand the different cultural perspectives underlying scientific approaches in different cultures. (An interesting example are the different ways of looking at history in French and German historiography). There can be no doubt that it will be very difficult to set up empirical research based on these theoretical reflections.

Research on content subject methodology in a CLIL context is interested in the question whether established content subject methodologies must be altered substantially in such a context. The empirical research on History and CLIL published by Helbig (2001) is influenced by foreign language teaching approaches and does not answer this question entirely, other research (cf. Hoffmann 2004) comes to the conclusion that the content subject

approach to CLIL must be seen rather as a prototype of how to deal with school subjects in an interdisciplinary way.

Research on the evaluation of CLIL by teachers and learners belongs to a fairly new qualitative research paradigm within which researchers try to gain information about the attitudes teachers and learners have about CLIL. This research is done with the help of structured interviews and classroom observations. Researchers argue that CLIL teachers but also learners know a lot about CLIL, about CLIL methodology and about the use of CLIL. The research available now (Dirks 2004, Viebrock 2004) shows that the naïve attitudes towards CLIL especially by students often coincide with the concepts developed in theory.

Bibliography

Baetens Beardsmore, H. (1993), *European Models of Bilingual Education*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (1996), *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. & Jones, S.P. (1998), *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Barnes, D. (1976), *From Communication to Curriculum*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bonnet, A. & Breidbach, S. (2004) (eds.), *Didaktiken im Dialog: Konzepte des Lehrens und Wege des Lernens im bilingualen Sachfachunterricht*, Frankfurt: Lang.

Cummins, J. (1987), “Bilingualism, language proficiency and metalinguistic development”, in Homel, P., Palij, M. & Aaronson, D. (eds.), *Childhood Bilingualism: Aspects of Linguistic, Cognitive and Social Development*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cummins, J. (1992), “Heritage language teaching in Canadian schools”, *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 24, 281-86.

Danesi, M. (1991), “Revisiting the research findings on heritage language learning: three interpretive frames”, *Canadian Modern Language Review* 47, 650-59

De Florio-Hansen, I. (2003), “Inhaltsbasiertes Fremdsprachenlernen. Bilingualer Unterricht auf dem Prüfstand”, *Praxis des neusprachlichen Unterrichts* 50, 11-19.

Dirks, U. (2004), “Kulturhüter oder Weltenwanderer? Zwei ideale Realtypen bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts”, in Bonnet, A. & Breidbach, S. (eds.), *Didaktiken im Dialog: Konzepte des Lehrens und Lernens im bilingualen Sachfachunterricht*, Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 129-140.

Genesee, F. (1986), “The baby and the bath water or what immersion has to say about bilingual education: Teaching and learning in bilingual education – Significant immersion instructional features”, *NABE Journal* 10, 227-254.

Genesee, F. (1987), *Learning through two Languages*, Cambridge, Mass.: Newbury House.

- Gogolin, I. (1994), *Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule*, Münster: Waxmann.
- Grosjean F. (1982), *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Hallet, W. (1998), "The Bilingual Triangle. Überlegungen zu einer Didaktik des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts", *Praxis des Neusprachlichen Unterrichts* 45, 115-125.
- Hallet, W. (2004), "Bilingualer Sachfachunterricht als interkultureller Diskursraum", in Bonnet, A. & Breidbach, S. (eds.), *Didaktiken im Dialog: Konzepte des Lehrens und Lernens im bilingualen Sachfachunterricht*, Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 141-152.
- Hatch, E. (1992), *Discourse and Language Education*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Helbig, B. (2001), *Das bilinguale Sachfach Geschichte. Eine empirische Studie zur Arbeit mit französischsprachigen (Quellen-) Texten*, Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Hoffmann, R. (2004), "Geographie als bilinguales Sachfach: Fachdidaktische Grundsatzüberlegungen", in: Bonnet, A. & Breidbach, S. (eds.), *Didaktiken im Dialog: Konzepte des Lehrens und Lernens im bilingualen Sachfachunterricht*, Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 207-220.
- Krashen, S. (1982), *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*, Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krechel, H.-L. (1995), "Inhaltsbezogene Spracharbeit im bilingualen Sachfach Erdkunde", in British Council/CREDIF/Goethe Institut (eds.), *Triangle 13*, Paris: Didier, 95-112.
- Krechel, H.-L. (2003), "Bilingual island-hopping: Bilinguale Module", in Wildhage, M. & Otten, E. (eds.), *Praxis des bilingualen Unterrichts*. Berlin: Cornelsen, 192-211.
- Kroschewski, A., Schuenemann, A. & Wolff, D. (1998), *A Resource Base for Bilingual Educators*, Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Lamsfuß-Schenk, S. (2002), "Geschichte und Sprache – Ist der bilinguale Geschichtsunterricht der Königsweg zum Geschichtsbewusstsein?", in Breidbach, S., Bach, G. & Wolff, D. (eds.), *Bilingualer Sachfachunterricht: Didaktik, Lehrer-/Lernerforschung und Bildungspolitik zwischen Theorie und Empirie*, Frankfurt: Lang, 191-206.
- Long, M. (1983), Long, M.H. (1983), "Native/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input", *Applied Linguistics* 4, 126-41
- Marsh, D. (2002), CLIL/EMILE – The European Dimension: Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential, Bruxelles: The European Union.
- Marsh, D., Maljers, A. & Hartiala, A.-K. (2001), *Profiling European CLIL Classrooms – Languages Open Doors*, Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Marsh, D. & Langé, G. (2000), *Using Languages to Learn and Learning to Use Languages*, Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Marsh, D., Marsland, B. & Maljers, A. (1998), *Future Scenarios in Content and Language Integrated Learning*, Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Otten, E. & Wildhage, M. (2003), "Content and Language Integrated Learning: Eckpunkte einer kleinen Didaktik des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts", in Wildhage, M. & Otten, E. (eds.), *Praxis des bilingualen Unterrichts*. Berlin, Cornelsen, 12-45.

Pica, (1994), "Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language acquisition? Conditions, processes, and outcomes", *Language Learning* 44, 493-527

Pienemann, M. (1989), "Is language teachable? Psycholinguistic experiments and hypotheses", *Applied Linguistics* 10, 52-79.

Platt, E. & Brooks, F.B. (2002), "Task engagement: A turning point in foreign language development", *Language Learning* 52, 365-400

Portmann-Tselikas, P.R. (2002), "Textkompetenz und unterrichtlicher Spracherwerb", in Portmann-Tselikas, P.R. & Schmölzer, Eibinger, S. (eds.), *Textkompetenz. Neue Perspektiven für das Lehren und Lernen*, Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 13-43.

Strohner, H. (1995), *Kognitive Systeme: Eine Einführung in die Kognitionswissenschaft*, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Thürmann, E. (1999), "Eine eigenständige Methodik für den bilingualen Sachfachunterricht?", in Bach, G. & Niemeier, S. (eds.): *Bilingualer Unterricht: Grundlagen, Methoden, Praxis, Perspektiven*, Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 75-93.

Viebrock, B. (2004), "Elemente einer subjektiven didaktischen Theorie: Was ein Lehrer über fremdsprachliches Lernen und Konzeptbildung im bilingualen Erdkundeunterricht denkt", in Bonnet, A. & Breidbach, S. (eds.), *Didaktiken im Dialog: Konzepte des Lehrens und Lernens im bilingualen Sachfachunterricht*, Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 167-178.

Wildhage, M. & Otten, E. (eds.), *Praxis des bilingualen Unterrichts*, Berlin, Cornelsen.

Wode, H. (1999), "Immersion teaching: A European perspective", in Garotti, F.R. (ed.), *L'immersione linguistica: Una nuova prospettiva*, Mailand: FrancoAngeli, 78-94.

Wolff, D. (1997a), "Content-based bilingual education or using foreign languages as working languages in the classroom", in Marsh, D., Marsland, B. & Nikula, T. (eds.), *Aspects of Implementing Plurilingual Education: Seminar and Field Notes*, Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Wolff, D. (1997b), "Bilingualer Sachfachunterricht: Versuch einer lernpsychologischen und fachdidaktischen Begründung", in *Initiativen für den Fremdsprachenunterricht an Hamburger Gymnasien*, Hamburg: Amt für Schule, 45-53.

Wolff, D. (2002), *Fremdsprachenlernen als Konstruktion: Grundlagen für eine konstruktivistische Fremdsprachendidaktik*, Frankfurt: Lang.

Wolff, D. (2003), "Content and language integrated learning: a framework for the development of learner autonomy", in Little, D., Ridley, J. & Ushioda, E. (eds.), *Learner Autonomy in the Foreign Language Classroom: Teacher, Learner, Curriculum and Assessment*, Dublin: Authentik, 211-222.

Zydati, W. (2000), *Bilingualer Unterricht in der Grundschule: Entwurf eines Spracherwerbskonzepts für zweisprachige Immersionsprogramme*, Ismaning: Hueber.

Communicating CLIL through Audio-visual Resources

Maria Jesús Frigols (Spain)

According to statistics only 7% of what we communicate is in the actual words which we use.

In Europe not only are we speaking different languages; our way of approaching facts also varies greatly from one country to another. This includes teaching and learning processes.

As CLIL practitioners, we are now one step ahead of the “what is it” question and facing the crucial one of “how to do it”.

Audiovisual resources help us fill the gap between what we say we do and how we actually do it, and in so doing they help us show others how to take theory into practice.

As CLIL practitioners, we aim to prepare our students for a more international society, providing them with skills for future work, helping them acquire intercultural competence, and supporting them to improve communication with others.

Audiovisual resources can help us motivate students, teachers and decision makers. They also enable us to check the CLIL process and disseminate achievements. That’s why some of us are using them as a quality frame tool.

During the last decade, CLIL pilot projects have been implemented by the education boards of most autonomous regions in Spain, involving public and privately-run primary and secondary schools.

In the Autonomous Region of Valencia, a CLIL experience – a pioneering project in vocational education in Spain – has been started at Cheste Vocational College (IFPS – CE Cheste).

It is a **modular project** carried out in **collaborative teaching**. Students in vocational streams can learn aeronautics, biochemistry, cookery, law, management/administration and IT through English and French.

Special attention is being paid to in-service teacher training, development of teaching materials, co-ordination of language and content teachers, and interaction with working-life representatives.

It is the intention of the Directorate for Vocational Education to progressively implement CLIL in vocational schools in the Autonomous Region.

The Central Role of Language Learning/Teaching Methodologies in CLIL *Aine Furlong (Ireland)*

The CLIL model described in this paper reflects the experience of the Waterford Institute of Technology (W.I.T.) Ireland. Parallel instruction of the language and the subject complements CLIL in French and Marketing, Italian and Art & Design. However, this brief outline refers to the French and marketing experience only. It is hoped that this model will increase the added value associated with language learning by making students better learners of the respective subjects of *French* and *marketing*.

The reasons for introducing CLIL in some language courses in W.I.T. are the result of what is now described as a language crisis in this English-speaking country (Little 2005).

Fewer and fewer third level students find any relevance in L2/3 learning. For many, the cognitive effort associated with the subject *language* is perceived to be too costly and does not yield the expected returns in terms of meaningful application opportunities at the time of learning and later. Therefore, the challenge is to create immediate relevance by generating meaningful cognitive experiences, outside of the subject *language*, and to transform these into meaningful communicative activities. At the third level, the challenge is even greater since CLIL also means dealing with difficult concepts and, sometimes, insufficient language to support the acquisition of these concepts.

In this model, four stages are systematically considered and comprise a **sensitising** stage, **research** and **development** stages, and finally, a **consolidation and synthesis** stage.

The **sensitising** stage is substantial and often takes the form of a de-construction process. The lecturer endeavours to trigger cognitive operations such as *noticing* in the learner's mind (Skehan 1998). In this context, *noticing* is enabled by the *recognition* of the material. The approach is very similar to the story-telling approach which relies on the fact that the learner is already familiar with the story; hence, unusual communicative listening activities (see Davies and Rinvolucri 1988), plurilingual exercises (e.g. a trilingual text), short written and/or reading activities (e.g. text manipulations) are very useful.

During the active **research** stage, students are given specific tasks where principles of autonomous learning and task-based learning come to the fore. Students are confronted for the first time with the text in its original form and take responsibility for their own learning. Mind mapping their understanding and generating the language around the mind map is a typical activity for this stage.

The **development** phase involves learners undertaking to teach aspects of the topic to peers by presenting mind maps of their understanding; this stage includes reliance on lexical approaches to learning and teaching and obviously, communicative characteristics.

The final stage **consolidates** language-specific features. Conceptual challenges around the content in the form of debates, the establishment of expert groups within the class and/or written tasks enable the **synthesis** of the new knowledge.

From the language lecturer's perspective, materials development becomes an essential feature of the CLIL adventure. Hence, Information Technology is indispensable to obtain authentic

materials, manipulate texts, provide reference tools and correct assignments that contain graphs, tables and pictures.

To conclude, the four stages outlined in this presentation suggest that the CLIL lecturer needs to be methodologically aware of the multiplicity of language learning and teaching approaches. Furthermore, it is proposed that consciousness of these language sensitive approaches can also help the lecturer to acquire some understanding of content and to build confidence when crossing over to other disciplines.

References

Coonan, C. M. (2004), 'Some issues in implementing CLIL'.

<http://www.fu-berlin.de/elc/bulletin/9/en/coonan.html>

Davis and Rinvulcri, M. (1988), *Dictation: New methods, New possibilities*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marsh D., Ontero A., Shikongo T. (eds) (2002), *Enhancing English medium Education in Namibia*, Finland: University of Jyväskylä.

Skehan, P. (1998), *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*, Oxford: Oxford University press.

Wolff D. (2002), 'Methodological success factors' in D. Marsh, A. Ontero and Shikongo T. (eds), *Enhancing English medium Education in Namibia*, Finland: University of Jyväskylä.

For plurilingual activities, see the LEA web pages at www.ecml.at

CLIL in Hungary

Kovács, Judit (Hungary)

In Hungary secondary CLIL started in 1987 (a top-down innovation), while primary CLIL started in 1989 (a bottom-up innovation).

Programmes are ongoing from the 1st grade up to the 8th (in case of primary schools), and from the 1st grade up to the 4th (in case of secondary schools) Once a subject is decided upon to be taught through a target language, the whole subject is taught this way. A modular system is uncommon.

Criteria towards CLIL programmes: a.) three subjects are to be taught in the target language, b.) the 35-50% of the students' time-table should be covered by the target language and c.) in the staff there should at least be one teacher whose first language is the target language of the programme.

CLIL in numbers:

Academic year:	1996-97	2002-03
Number of bilingual secondary programmes	51	121
Number of bilingual primary programmes	9	56
Total:	60	177

Chart 1: The number of bilingual programmes in Hungarian public education in the past years.
(Source: Vámos 1998 + own research).

Academic year	All primary schools in Hungary	Number of schools running bilingual programmes	Proportion
1996-97	3765	9	0,24%
2002/03	3421	56	1,64%

Chart 2: The proportion of bilingual programmes at the primary level of Hungarian education.
(Source: Statisztikai Tájékoztató, Alapfokú Oktatás 1996-97 Bp. 1998, MKM, Statisztikai Évkönyv, 2002/03 <http://www.om.hu>).

	1996-97	2002-03
Number of participants in secondary bilingual programmes száma	7420	12798
Number of participants in primary bilingual programmes	1597	10528
Total	9017	23326

Chart 3: The number of participants of bilingual education programmes in Hungary in the past years.
(Source: Vámos 1998, and own research).

Academic year	Total number of pupils	Number of pupils participating in bilingual programmes	Proportion
1996-97	965998	1597	0,17%
2002/03	930386	10528	1,13%

Chart 4: Proportion of pupils participating in primary bilingual programmes in Hungary.

(Source: Statisztikai Tájékoztató, Alapfokú Oktatás 1996-97 Bp. 1998, MKM). In 2002-03 the total number of primary schools in Hungary is: 3421 (Statisztikai Évkönyv, 2002/03 <http://www.om.hu>)

Target language	1996-97		2002-03	
	Secondary programmes	Primary	Secondary programmes	Primary
English	16	3	53	24
German	24	6	46	31
French	6	0	12	0
Italian	3	0	4	1
Spanish	1	0	5	0
Russian	1	0	1	0
Total:	51	9	121	56

Chart 5: The breaking of bilingual programmes according to their target language.

(Source: Vámos 1998, Kéttannyelvű Iskolák Egyesülete 2004, and own research).

Target language	Secondary level	Primary level
English	5618	3534
German	4827	69481
French	12322	0
Italian	357	46
Spanish	570	0
Russian	194	0
Total:	12798	10528

Chart 6: The distribution of pupils according to their language choice

(Source: Vámos 1998, and own research).

1 Number of pupils are not reported in six schools.

2 Number of pupils is not reported in one school.

CLIL in Finland

Heini-Marja Järvinen (Finland)

Background

CLIL type teaching has been popular in Finland for about fifteen years or a few more now. It was preceded by immersion, which started at the end of the 1980's and is practically confined to the Finnish-Swedish bilingual communities.

The most popular language in CLIL in Finland is English, but French, German, Russian and Swedish are also used. Swedish and Finnish are used in immersion type teaching.

Research into CLIL

1. Surveys

There are two major surveys conducted on CLIL type teaching. The earlier was carried out in the mid-1990s, and the more recent one in 2005. So far, the results of the 2005 survey have not been thoroughly analyzed, but some data are already available. The percentage of schools implementing CLIL has decreased from 11% in 1996 down to 6% in 2005. Of the subjects in CLIL in the 2005 survey, history (home economics in 1996) is now in first place in comprehensive schools. Biology and geography come next. In both surveys, history and science are the most popular subjects in upper secondary school. One of the open-ended questions that the surveys contain is a question related to possible problems that the teachers experience in implementing CLIL type teaching. The most frequent comments in the 2005 survey concerned CLIL teacher education (in-service courses), shortage of suitable materials, and a need for networking

2. Scientific study on CLIL

Research into CLIL type teaching in Finland is fairly recent and a number of areas are still unexplored. Existing research evidence is consistent with the findings of the Canadian immersion research: L1 skills do not suffer and L2 skills are far better than those attained in traditional language teaching. Receptive skills are better than productive skills. There is some indication that the implicit learning of the L2 in CLIL resembles the development of implicit language knowledge in L1. More research is needed and there are research projects going on with a primary focus on classroom research. There is ongoing research into writing and reading in CLIL (Järvinen), classroom interaction focusing on negotiation of meaning and of form (Järvinen), research into pragmatic competence (Nikula) and a collaborative project on learning history in English and Finnish, conducted by experts in history and language didactics (Virta & Järvinen).