





## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

2



CLIL – Content and Language Integrated Learning  
EMILE - Enseignement d'une Matière par l'Intégration d'une Langue  
Etrangère

CLIL and EMILE refer to any dual-focused educational context in which an additional language, thus not usually the first language of the learners involved, is used as a medium in the teaching and learning of non-language content.

Compiled and authored by David Marsh, University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

Public Services Contract 2001 – 3406 /001 – 001  
© Exclusive to the European Communities except where copyright or other right of ownership already exists.

Delivery: September 2002  
Produced: UniCOM, Continuing Education Centre, P.O.Box 35, FIN-40014, University of Jyväskylä, Finland.  
david.marsh@cec.jyu.fi

Art design and layout: Sanna Suonpää





CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION



3

# CLIL/EMILE

## The european dimension



Actions, Trends  
and  
Foresight Potential



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The realization of this report has benefited from insight, advice, feedback and support by: Hugo Baetens Beardsmore (Belgium); Margaretha Biddle (Sweden); Kees de Bot (Netherlands); John Clegg (United Kingdom); Do Coyle (United Kingdom); Fred Genesse (Canada); Gisella Langé (Italy); Anne Maljers (Netherlands); Carmen Muñoz (Spain); Teresa Naves (Spain); Arja Piirainen-Marsh (Finland); Sauli Takala (Finland) and Dieter Wolff (Germany).

We are also grateful to other contributors to the process:

Maija Aalto (Finland); Gunther Abuja (Austria); Alessandra di Aichelburg (Italy); Trees Aler (Netherlands); Rosa Aliaga (Basque Country, Spain); Kent Andersen (Italy); Maria Ariskoug (Sweden); Tuula Asikainen (Finland); Jolanta Balciuniene (Italy); István Baranyai (Hungary); Teresina Barbero (Italy); Viera Bennarova (Slovakia); Patricia Bertaux (France); Francesca Brotto (Italy); Aniko Bógnar (Hungary); Rosa Perez Bohigas (Spain); Fernanda Bonacho (Portugal); Katarina Bokorova (Slovakia); Monique Bouden (France); Nicolas Bounet (France); Francesca Brotto (Italy); Gunilla Carlecrantz (Sweden); Elizabeth Carlsson (Sweden); Riita Casarini (Italy); Teresa Castro (Portugal); Mary Chohey Paquet (Belgium); Anca Colibaba (Romania); Annick Comblain (Belgium); Megan Dauksta (United Kingdom); Hariett Dekkers (Netherlands); Anton Deley (Netherlands); Sigrid Dentler (Sweden); Vania Dinarda (Italy); Cristina Escobar (Spain); Kurt Egger (Italy); Katharina Entholzerk (Austria); Felix Etxeberria Balerdi (Basque Country, Spain); Livia Farago (Hungary); Maria Lim Falk (Sweden); Sylvia Fehling (Germany); Maria Felberbauer (Austria); Beth Forster (Spain); Romina Frendo (Spain); Birgitta van Gestel (Belgium); Arild Giske (Norway); Sigurdur Gudmundsson (Iceland); Antoinette Camilleri Grima (Malta); Gloria Graziella (Italy); Ellinor Haase (Netherlands); Glenn Hellekjaer (Norway); Itziar Hormaza (Basque Country, Spain); Joseph Huber (Austria); Viktoria Jendmyr (Sweden); Liss Kerstin (Sweden); Keith Kelly (Bulgaria); Joyce King (Denmark); Heini-Marja Järvinen (Finland); Pekka Jaatinen (Finland); Keith Kelly (Bulgaria); Joyce King (Denmark); Karitas Kvaran (Iceland); Edith Kismarjay (Italy); Pirjo Lammila-Räisänen (Finland); Priscilla Leather (Netherlands); Jana Lenghardtová (Slovakia); Takis Loulakis (Greece); Stefka Kitanova (Bulgaria); Nicolas Kravic (Austria); Vania Di Narda (Italy); Hjördis Lagneback (Sweden); Marie-Noëlle Lamy (United Kingdom); Leena Luostarinen (Finland); Morag MacNeil (Ireland); Vincenzo Macchiarola (Italy); Bruce Marsland (Finland); Thomas von Machui (Germany); Katherine Maillet (France); Antonello Maggipinto (Italy); Evelyne Martin (Italy); Erkki Matilainen (Finland); Gillian McLaughlin (Belgium); Peeter Meehisto (Estonia); Nada Redlich Michalská (Slovakia); Modest Molins (Spain); Noreen Moloney (Ireland); Ordanka Nenova (Bulgaria); Vania Di Narda (Italy); John Naysmith (United Kingdom); John Nixon (Sweden); Anne Ontero (Finland); Mirjami Olmiala (Finland); Maria Palm (Sweden); Maire Pelttari (Finland); Jana Petrova (Czech Republic); Karel Philipsen (Netherlands); Christa Piber (Austria); Niall Power (Portugal); Alberts Prikulis, (Lithuania); Josep Maria Puigdomènech i Armengod (Spain); Silvana Rampone (Italy); Anna-Liisa Rassi (Finland); Elke Resch (Austria); Eero Räikkönen (Finland); Satu Rosenqvist (Finland); Eija Liisa Sokka-Meaney (Finland); Maria Àngels Hernández Sierra (Spain); Eeva-Inkeri Sirelius (Finland); Majellia Sheehan (Ireland); Stase Skapiene (Lithuania); Brigita Silina (Latvia); Dolores Solé (Spain); Claude Springer (France); Hugh Starkey (United Kingdom); Janet Streeter (United Kingdom); Lone Steinhausler (Austria); Etelka Rozsa Szekeresne (Hungary); Liss Kerstin Sylvén (Sweden); Milan Štulrajter (Slovakia); Sirlu Taniloo (Estonia); Dimitris Toliás (Greece); Beverly Trayner (Portugal); Markku Tuomi (Finland); Christina Urmeneta (Spain); Viveca Verdin (Switzerland); Jérôme Vlana (France); Jan Willem Wassink (Netherlands); Catherine Wrangham-Briggs (United Kingdom); Jehannes Ytsma (Netherlands); Poór Zoltán (Hungary) and Wolfgang Zydatis (Germany).

And, finally, Sanna Suonpää, for patience, layout and design.



CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION



5

Function and form, action and knowledge are mutually dependent. Action without knowledge is blind, vacuous. Knowledge without action is sterile. Finding the correct balance is the key to successful learning and teaching.



John Trim, Language Teaching:  
Does a New Century Call for a New Agenda?  
EYL Dissemination Conference, Rotterdam,  
November 2001



**CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION**

Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential

6

**Contents**

<b>Summary</b> . . . . .	<b>9</b>
Executive Summary . . . . .	<b>9</b>
– Summary of Major Recommendations . . . . .	<b>12</b>
<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	<b>15</b>
Topic . . . . .	<b>15</b>
Objectives . . . . .	<b>15</b>
Compilation . . . . .	<b>16</b>
Structure . . . . .	<b>16</b>
Key Terms . . . . .	<b>17</b>
<b>External Expert Statements</b> . . . . .	<b>19</b>
Backgrounds . . . . .	<b>19</b>
◆ Hugo Baetens Beardsmore (Belgium) . . . . .	<b>20</b>
– L'impact d'EMILE/CLIL . . . . .	<b>20</b>
– The Significance of CLIL/EMILE . . . . .	<b>24</b>
◆ Do Coyle (United Kingdom) . . . . .	<b>27</b>
– Relevance of CLIL to the European Commission's Language Learning Objectives . . . . .	<b>27</b>
◆ Kees de Bot (Netherlands) . . . . .	<b>29</b>
– Geïntegreerd vak- en taalonderwijs (GVTO) in de Europese context . . . . .	<b>29</b>
– CLIL in the European Context . . . . .	<b>31</b>
◆ Carmen Muñoz (Spain) . . . . .	<b>33</b>
– CLIL-AICLE (Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lengua Extranjera) . . . . .	<b>33</b>
– Relevance & Potential of CLIL . . . . .	<b>35</b>
◆ Sauli Takala (Finland) . . . . .	<b>37</b>
– Laajempi näkökulma vieraiden kielten opetukseen . . . . .	<b>37</b>
– Positioning CLIL in the wider context . . . . .	<b>40</b>
◆ Dieter Wolff (Germany) . . . . .	<b>44</b>
– Zur Bedeutung des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts im Kontext des Mehrsprachigkeitskonzeptes der Europäischen Union . . . . .	<b>44</b>
– On the importance of CLIL in the context of the debate on plurilingual education in the European Union . . . . .	<b>47</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE: CLIL/EMILE in Europe: Emergence 1958 – 2002</b> . . . . .	<b>49</b>
◆ Synopsis . . . . .	<b>49</b>
◆ Supra-national European Initiatives & Evolution of Language Teaching . . . . .	<b>50</b>
– 1950s	
– 1960s	
– 1970s	
– 1980s	
– 1990s to the present day	



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

7

◆ Teaching Non-language Subjects through a Foreign Language: introduction and application of diverse terms . . . . .	55
– Mainstreaming	
– Bilingual Education	
– Immersion Bilingual Education	
– Inter-linked Terms	
◆ Adoption of the term CLIL/EMILE . . . . .	58
<b>CHAPTER TWO: CLIL/EMILE in Europe: Dimensions . . . . .</b>	<b>65</b>
◆ Synopsis . . . . .	65
◆ Reasons for CLIL/EMILE delivery . . . . .	65
– Culture	
– Environment	
– Language	
– Content	
– Learning	
◆ Theoretical Justification, Concerns & Debate . . . . .	70
– Introduction	
– Which Methods?	
– Which Learners?	
– Which Age?	
– What Exposure?	
– Threat to First Language?	
– Which Languages?	
– Which Subjects?	
– What Learner Competencies?	
– What Teacher Competencies?	
– Which Environments?	
– Which Variables?	
– Quality	
<b>CHAPTER THREE: CLIL/EMILE in Europe: Realization . . . . .</b>	<b>89</b>
◆ Synopsis . . . . .	89
– Pre-school & Primary	
– Secondary	
– Vocational	
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: CLIL/EMILE in Europe: Delivery . . . . .</b>	<b>95</b>
◆ Case 1 Experimental to Mainstream	France . . . . . 95
◆ Case 2 Urban Primary Cluster	Austria . . . . . 101
◆ Case 3 Urban Primary/Secondary Cluster	Finland . . . . . 104
◆ Case 4 Urban Multicultural Cluster	Germany . . . . . 108
◆ Case 5 Regional Primary/Secondary Network	Italy . . . . . 112
◆ Case 6 Regional Trilingual Cluster	Spain . . . . . 116
◆ Case 7 Regional Gender/ Discipline Bias	Italy . . . . . 120
◆ Case 8 Networked National Secondary	Netherlands . . . . . 124
◆ Case 9 Internal EU Border	Sweden-Finland . . . . . 129
◆ Case 10 External EU Border	Finland-Russia . . . . . 139
◆ Case 11 EU Pre-Accession Foreign-Minority Language	Estonia-Latvia . . . . . 144
◆ Case 12 EU Pre-Accession Foreign Language	Bulgaria . . . . . 147
◆ Case 13 Vocational Secondary	Hungary . . . . . 150
◆ Case 14 Vocational Tertiary	Netherlands . . . . . 154
◆ Case 15 Mixed Media Higher/Adult Education	United Kingdom . . . . . 158
◆ Case 16 Multimedia Interactive Technologies	United Kingdom . . . . . 162
◆ Case 17 Mixed Ability Secondary	Sweden . . . . . 167

<b>CHAPTER FIVE: CLIL/EMILE in Europe: Added Value.</b>	<b>173</b>
◆ Synopsis . . . . .	173
◆ The Economics of Language . . . . .	173
◆ Social Inclusion & Egalitarianism . . . . .	174
◆ Gender Mainstreaming . . . . .	175
◆ The Relevance & Value of Limited Competencies . . . . .	175
◆ Early Language Learning . . . . .	175
◆ Certification . . . . .	176
◆ Catalyst for School Development . . . . .	176
◆ Conclusion . . . . .	176
<b>CHAPTER SIX: CLIL/EMILE in Europe: Future Prospects.</b>	<b>181</b>
◆ Synopsis . . . . .	181
◆ Framing the Future . . . . .	181
◆ Problems & Solutions . . . . .	183
◆ Towards Establishing European Types . . . . .	184
◆ Reliability & Confidence . . . . .	185
◆ Mainstreaming . . . . .	186
◆ Learning Strategies . . . . .	187
◆ Modular & Theme-based Curricula . . . . .	188
◆ New Technologies . . . . .	189
◆ Teacher Professional Development . . . . .	190
◆ Stake-holding . . . . .	191
<b>CHAPTER SEVEN: CLIL/EMILE in Europe: Recommendations for Extending Delivery &amp; Good Practice</b>	<b>195</b>
◆ The European Dimension . . . . .	195
– Societal	
– Systems	
– Strategic	
◆ The National Dimension . . . . .	200
– Learners	
– Practitioners	
– Other Stakeholders	

**ANNEX: Reflection Document**





## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There is broad consensus within the European Union that a delivery gap exists between what is provided as foreign language education, and outcomes in terms of learner performance. Targets for requisite foreign language competencies are not yet being reached. The importance of linguistic diversity in education and training in making Europe *the most competitive and knowledge-based economy in the world*, means that existing language barriers need to be lifted.

There is a need to convert what is viewed in some ways as a language problem, into language potential, by examining how current approaches to foreign language education can be utilized, adapted or enhanced, so that member states may achieve the MT+2 formula within a short period.

From a historical perspective, the breadth, scope and nature of platforms for foreign language teaching have undergone significant shifts in relation to achieving best practice. This can be traced alongside steps taken to build social cohesion through European integration from the 1950s to the present day.

Two major issues affecting the profession in this period have been the widespread introduction of foreign language learning in mainstream education, and the steadily increasing recognition of the necessity for plurilingualism in order that member states, and their citizens, may contribute to, and benefit from, integration.

During 1980-1995, in particular, the foreign language teaching profession, and other stakeholders, sought educational solutions that would provide more young people with better skills in foreign languages. Some twenty or more teaching 'types' surfaced, nearly all of which highlighted the need to *focus on meaning alongside form* to achieve best practice with a majority of young people.

The hallmark of these initiatives was an integrated, process-oriented approach to language learning. The *requisites for success* lay in exposure. The need to provide more opportunities for foreign language exposure within a given school curriculum resulted in examining additional platforms to support and influence formalized language teaching.

This was not a question of claiming professional failure on the part of foreign language teaching. Some language teaching approaches were, and remain, notably successful. Rather it was an issue of offering extra, and often alternative opportunities, for young people to have exposure to largely functional environments for language acquisition and learning.

Those who pioneered some of the educational solutions experimented with over the last two

decades have known that calling for additional curricular time for foreign language learning within given curricula would have been largely unsuccessful. Existing demands on curricular time were then, as now, largely non-negotiable.

Integrating language with non-language content, in a *dual-focussed learning* environment, emerged as a solution. Apparent success with this type of educational approach in, for example, some private sector education and border schools, alongside implementation in other continents, was frequently cited to support development and experimentation.

Thus, a pragmatic and pro-active approach to foreign language learning emerged across Europe to improve capacity and achieve requisite and sustainable outcomes. This approach came to be termed *Content and Language Integrated Learning* (CLIL). (Enseignement d'une Matière par l'Intégration d'une Langue Etrangère - EMILE). As an innovative competence development enabler, CLIL/EMILE rapidly became a growth field across the spectrum of European language learning delivery in mainstream education from pre-school through to vocational education through the 1990s.

Though often driven by grassroots demand for greater multiple language proficiency, its growth has also resulted from top-down measures in certain countries. It has become a socio-pedagogical means by which to adapt one part of educational delivery to achieve best performance in the learning of languages that suits the times, particularly in relation to the labour markets, social cohesion, and the changing aspirations of young people, within the border-free European context.

The recent availability and use of the new technologies, in particular, has had considerable impact on learner attitudes. In terms of foreign language learning, older learners are increasingly unwilling to *learn now for use later*, but prefer to *learn as you use and use as you learn*, which suits the immediacy of purpose common to the times. Mobility and the imminent broadband roll out will further impact on learner attitudes towards how they learn, particularly with regard to foreign language teaching. Top-down measures have frequently been cited in terms of economic performance, and it is noticeable that the introduction of the approach has been high in some of the smaller and more recent member states, and in some pre-accession states as they prepare for reaping the economic benefits of integration through enhancing languages competence across their populations.

The recent European experience of CLIL/EMILE is clearly multi-faceted. This is not viewed as a weakness. On the contrary, it shows the extent to which the approach is used for achieving differing tangible outcomes that may concern development of languages; intercultural knowledge, understanding and skills; preparation for internationalisation and improvement of education itself.

Theoretical justification remains tentative because European pioneering initiatives are relatively recent. However, empirical and anecdotal evidence is favourable, particularly with regard to achieving results with broad school populations. Egalitarianism has been one success factor because the approach is seen to open doors on languages for a broader range of learners. It has particular significance in terms of early language learning and vocational education. Both of these complement its use with the often more academically-oriented secondary school populations which tend to comprise higher academic ability learners who are likely to enter higher education. It is viewed as inclusive because both below average and above average ability learners have been seen to benefit from exposure.

Research suggests that the intensity and timing of exposure (qualitative) may be more important than high exposure (quantitative), particularly with certain types of learners. Small-scale long-term exposure is therefore being viewed positively. Early introduction (4-12 years) is now increasingly under discussion as advantageous. There is no available evidence which would support the view that low (5-15% of teaching time) to medium



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

11

exposure (15-50% of teaching time) would threaten the first language. English language does not have a monopoly position, especially as we shift towards addressing the question of identifying specific competencies in different languages. In addition, teachers do not need to have native or near-native competence in the target language for all forms of delivery, although naturally they need a high level of fluency.

Realization of this approach in Europe is estimated as involving about 3% of schools. It should be noted that a large amount of language teaching involving early language learners can also be considered as a form of CLIL/EMILE. Although initial delivery has been strong in the secondary sector there are indicators that it is now increasingly entering primary and vocational education.

The added value of the approach is viewed according to different opportunities. First and foremost, this is in terms of providing greater individual economic opportunities and benefits which, in turn, provides greater overall economic return on investment in language education. In addition, there are issues such as enhancing social inclusion and egalitarianism through providing a greater range of young people with alternative platforms for learning languages which suit specific styles, particularly with regard to learning strategies; gender mainstreaming in terms of male and female performance in language learning; being able to take advantage of the benefits of naturalistic early language learning; recognizing and capitalizing on the relevance of limited and domain-specific competencies in languages; making learners linguistically prepared to take up their rights to study in other countries, and providing a catalyst for school development which leads to improvement of educational environments.

One of the most promising outcomes of European experimentation with this approach goes beyond enhancing language learning towards improving educational development, and thus it appears to be moving towards *justifying itself in terms of education*.

In order to establish the normality of plurilingualism, particularly with regard to achieving the MT+2 formula within the forthcoming years, a future-shaper needs to be considered which will achieve the desired outcomes within a specified period of time. The effects of national initiatives, European Commission actions, Council of Europe activities, and particularly grassroots demands, have resulted in the emergence of CLIL/EMILE as an educational innovation that *suits the times, needs and aspirations of learners*.

CLIL/EMILE is also linked to the opportunities arising from developments in eLearning and the new technologies, and particularly from the roll out of broadband networks, in relation to the impact these will have on adult education and lifelong learning. Enhanced understanding of good practice within those professions involved with foreign language learning, influences understanding of how learners best learn, and this will impact on other non-general education sectors.

CLIL/EMILE provides a framework for achieving best practice. By nurturing self-confidence with both young learners and those who have not responded well to formal language instruction in general education, converting knowledge into skill with more academic learners, and responding to the domain-specific and immediacy needs of adult learners, it supports the creative spirit which lies at the heart of all real and genuine individual language use.

CLIL/EMILE has emerged as a pragmatic *European solution to a European need*. The MT+2 formula is an ambitious undertaking. It is widely acknowledged that foreign languages are not sufficiently taught or learned in schools and that a considerable investment in this field is needed. A cost-effective, practical and sustainable solution may be found in this approach. It can satisfy the requisite language teaching capacity demands so as to strengthen the unequivocal connection between an individual's level of education and their opportunities for employability and adaptability, and greater prepare them for the linguistic and cultural demands of an increasingly integrated and mobile Europe.

A summary of major recommendations follows which endorses the importance of the new *Open Method of Coordination* which has been defined as a means of spreading best practice and achieving greater convergence towards the main EU goals... *as a fully integrated approach using variable forms of partnership which is designed to help member states to develop their own policies progressively.*

### Summary of major recommendations

#### Societal

- That a group of experts be commissioned to produce an *econometric analysis* report on the potential of CLIL/EMILE as a socio-economic driver which explicates languages knowledge as human capital within national economies.
- That a *fusion group* be created through member states being invited to identify appropriate national policy decision-making bodies, and key experts within them, that have a mandate to handle initiatives related to CLIL/EMILE.
- That a member state represented *think-tank* be created (50-60 people) during the Action Report drafting stage (2003) comprising policy-makers, examination board representatives, publishers, research implementation experts and other gatekeepers, to evaluate the feasibility of pre-determined low exposure forms of CLIL/EMILE at primary, lower secondary, upper secondary and vocational education.
- That exchange funding systems be specially geared (for example, through Comenius) towards supporting teachers (content and language) to visit, teach and job-shadow in CLIL/EMILE schools in other countries.
- That European expert bases on CLIL/EMILE combine to form a *consortium* with which to apply for trans-national research funding through the Sixth Framework 2002-2006 programme in order to identify, examine, and establish solutions for achieving the MT+2 formula.
- That *coordination* of communication flow, and strategic implementation, to and between national contexts, be conducted through the European Commission, or a body seen to be operating with its mandate, and operationalized for a trial period of 3 years. This would support the idea of an Open Method of Coordination which acts as a means to spread best practice in CLIL/EMILE, through coordinating but maintaining a decentralized approach allowing member states to apply situation-appropriate forms of implementation.
- That *Europe-wide documentation* on language learning such as Eurydice, is broadened in the future to include schools which systematically teach through a foreign language.

#### Systems

- That member state policy bodies responsible for language education be invited to identify *local examples of good practice*, possibly in conjunction with European Quality Label awards past and present, which can be used as localized 'landmark' examples.
- That a short authoritative text be produced as a *reflection document*, in conjunction with a range of European experts, designed specifically for local ministry of education policy-makers and other gate-keepers, which succinctly articulates the potential of CLIL/EMILE according to a range of implementation types as a trans-disciplinary endeavour.
- That CLIL/EMILE be used as an instrument for *promoting teacher mobility*. This would be facilitated if national agencies could provide special dispensations on harmonization

and recognition of teacher qualifications, even if temporary, for CLIL/EMILE schools.

#### Strategic

- That recommendations be drawn up which indicate the *required linguistic fluency of teachers* according to Common European Framework of Reference scales in relation to linguistic load of specified types and use of DIALANG.
- That *thematic CLIL/EMILE units* (25+ hours) be constructed to unify content areas in the form of modules, preferably drawing on topics which contextualise the European experience, and rendered into community languages.
- That a *resonance group* be formed comprising key experts previously involved with both Council of Europe and European Commission supported assignments and projects relating to forms of CLIL/EMILE (1990-2002).
- That a *European student research network* be established for universities and higher education colleges by which, often working virtually, students could carry out studies on CLIL/EMILE for graduation or post-graduate thesis work.
- That inter-disciplinary research on existing and future *multimedia interactive technologies* appropriate for trans-national CLIL/EMILE delivery be conducted by a consortium of universities and the private sector with special emphasis on provision of quality cost-effective hard and software for interactive multi-location CLIL/EMILE delivery.
- That *initial teacher training systems* which enable a trainee to specialise in both a content subject and a foreign language (for example, at primary level in Finland & Norway; and at secondary level in Austria & Germany) be examined and reported on with a view to pan-European extension.
- That the base-line data requirements for implementing *quality assurance* be designed and made available for local adaptation.
- That a *trans-national higher degree* programme be designed and implemented by key European centres of expertise in this field which could act as a catalyst in establishing a flagship academic programme for European CLIL/EMILE. This would then have a multiplier effect on trans-national initial and in-service education, and on research initiatives.

#### Practice

- That kindergarten, pre-school and primary schools be given special focus with regard to low exposure of CLIL/EMILE which combines the principles of 'language awareness' and 'language encounter' initiatives.
- That vocational sector colleges, not only business-oriented, be given special focus with regard to low to medium exposure through CLIL/EMILE which combines sector-specific target language(s) knowledge with job-specific communication competencies.
- That adult education providers should be given special focus with regard to mixed media distance education in CLIL/EMILE which is generational or sector-specific, but not bound to student places of domicile.



CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION





## INTRODUCTION

### Topic

This report is about the teaching of a subject through a foreign language which is hereafter referred to as CLIL/EMILE:

CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning

EMILE: Enseignement d'une Matière par l'Intégration d'une Langue Etrangère

CLIL and EMILE refer to any dual-focused educational context in which an additional language, thus not usually the first language of the learners involved, is used as a medium in the teaching and learning of non-language content.

### Objectives

This report comprises analysis, observations, comment and recommendations on CLIL/EMILE with respect to recent literature, actions, and developments in pre-primary, primary, general secondary, secondary vocational and further education. It analyses results of experimentation and outlines the extent to which the approach is used in Europe. Comment and conclusions focus on the relevance of CLIL/EMILE for the European Commission's overall language objectives, the potential of the approach for improving the quality of foreign language teaching, and increasing the number of successful foreign language learners. It presents examples of innovation and good practice, defines conditions for successful extension, and makes proposals for further developments in this area at the European and national levels.

### Compilation

The report was compiled using a dual-plane approach:

A consultancy group comprising key European experts representing diverse professional interests was formed so as to provide advice, guidance, feedback and input.

An advisory group was also formed which was instrumental in a search process by which existing publications, articles, unpublished research documentation and forthcoming publications and multimedia were examined. In addition existing networks, thematic network project groups, ad hoc professional interest groups and individuals were

approached through calls for information, internet searches and personal contact.

Information and data collection led to a process of consolidation leading to text construction. Even though a wide range of people have contributed to this process the author remains solely responsible for final interpretation and the views expressed herein.

### Structure

The report opens with a set of external statements provided by key European experts in differing fields of expertise on the relevance and potential of CLIL/EMILE. These include additional comment on recent developments and extension issues. Specific focus is made on the relevance of the approach for fulfilling the European Commission's overall language objectives, and its potential for improving the quality of foreign language teaching and increasing the number of successful foreign language learners.

Chapter 1 (Emergence) is a historical stock-taking exercise. It traces actions and developments in Europe in terms of what is now considered effective language learning, alongside the impact of integration on language learning needs, in respect to the emergence, position and role of CLIL/EMILE. This chapter contextualizes CLIL/EMILE within a pedagogical and socio-historical framework in order to establish the grounds for discussion of future relevance and potential. It can be considered as a non-core introductory text on the origins and position of CLIL/EMILE.

Chapter 2 (Dimensions) summarizes key development issues relating to recent literature, research outcomes and findings, actions, and events. It depicts the role of CLIL/EMILE as a multi-faceted educational innovation that is continuing to enter the whole educational spectrum from kindergarten through to adult education. In so doing it describes core issues relating to theoretical justification, concerns and debate, and introduces conditions and opportunities for successful extension.

Chapter 3 (Realization) examines specific types of actions, developments and implementation, and assesses the extent to which the approach is used in selected European countries.

Chapter 4 (Delivery) provides 17 case study profiles from 12 different countries that exemplify potentially interesting and high quality innovation, and best practice. Each case comments on transferability potential and provides indicators for successful extension.

Chapter 5 (Added value) focuses on successful extension. Identified tangible success factors, in terms of added value, are described alongside core development issues which would enable CLIL/EMILE to flourish in specific environments.

Chapter 6 (Future prospects) examines successful extension of CLIL/EMILE in terms of opportunities and development challenges. Claiming that contemporary European socio-political linguistic needs can only realistically be fulfilled through this educational approach, it looks at available options and provides comment on practical solutions.

Chapters 2-6 lay the groundwork for establishing the conditions for ensuring successful extension of this approach throughout the European Union and associated countries which are then formulated as recommendations.

Chapter 7 (Recommendations for extending good practice) comprises development steps that should be considered at the European level in addition to learner, practitioner and other stakeholder steps that are recommended at member state national levels.





## Key Terms

### Additional Language

Sometimes used instead of terms such as foreign, second or minority language, referring to any language other than the first language.

### Content-Language Ratio

Extent to which the focus is on the non-language content and the target language in any given lesson. This may vary from, for example, 90% content, 10% language in a lesson given by a geography teacher to, for example, 25% content, 75% language in a lesson, even in the same programme, given by a language teacher. If there is no dual-focus on language and non-language content within a lesson or course then it does not qualify as a form of CLIL/EMILE.

### Discourse Type

The type of communication found in the learning environment (for example, classroom). It is used to distinguish between discourse that is largely interactional (for example, with the main emphasis on social communication achieved through pairwork, group work etc.), and that which is largely transactional (where, for example, one person such as the teacher speaks and the main emphasis is on transmission of knowledge).

### Exposure

The proportion of CLIL/EMILE experienced by a learner through the curriculum in a school year

Low - about 5-15% of teaching time

Medium - about 15-50% of teaching time

High - over 50% of teaching time

### Learning Styles

Individual preferences for approaches to learning

### Learning Strategies

The ways in which individuals learn

### Plurilingual Attitudes

Attitudes that support the value of being able to use, to a greater or lesser extent, three or more languages.

### School Profile

The public image of a school.

### Trans-linguaging

Where more than one language is used in the CLIL/EMILE classroom environment. For example, a teacher may speak in one language, and a pupil reply in another. Alternatively, students may work as a pair speaking through one language, whilst analysing materials produced in another.



CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION





## EXTERNAL EXPERT STATEMENTS

### Backgrounds

Hugo BAETENS BEARDSMORE, Professor of English and Bilingualism, Vrije Universiteit Brussel and Université Libre de Bruxelles. Professional interests : multilingual education, language planning, sociology of language. Consultancy functions with the European Commission, The Council of Europe, the Basque Autonomous Government, the California State Department of Education, The Ministry of Education of Singapore, The Ministry of Education of Brunei Darussalam.

Kees de BOT is Chair of Applied Linguistics at the University of Nijmegen. His research interests are psycholinguistic aspects of multilingualism, language education, and language and aging.

Do COYLE, Senior Lecturer and Vice Dean in the Faculty of Education, University of Nottingham, UK. Teacher educator in CLIL at both pre- and in-service levels and a regular contributor to seminars in the UK, Europe and beyond. She has published widely in the field and is a researcher on CLIL methodologies.

David MARSH is a Field Specialist in applied linguistics and foreign language learning at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland. He has worked on short and long-time assignments in Australasia, Africa, Europe and Southeast Asia. Since 1990, he has conducted research, and produced a range of books, films and Internet tools on differing types of language-enhanced education.

Carmen MUÑOZ is Associate Professor in English Philology at the University of Barcelona. She has coordinated several research projects in FL acquisition, with special focus on the issues of age-related effects and trilingual language learning. She has also participated in TIE-CLIL which has produced training modules for CLIL teachers.

Sauli TAKALA is Docent in Applied Linguistics at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland. He specializes in language assessment, planning and policy. More recently, he has been involved with national and trans-national aspects of language testing and curriculum planning. He has been a core development expert in DIALANG.

Dieter WOLFF, Professor of Applied Psycholinguistics, University of Wuppertal. Professional interests: multilingual education, second language acquisition and foreign language learning, first and second language comprehension, New Technologies and language learning. Consultancy functions with the European Commission, the Goethe Institute, the Junta de Andalucia. Vice-president of AILA (Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée). Co-editor or board member of several national and international journals.

**Hugo Baetens Beardsmore**

## L'impact d'EMILE/CLIL

Les besoins linguistiques et scolaires très diversifiés de la majorité des citoyens européens sont pris en compte dans le *Livre Blanc* de 1995 publié par la Commission Européenne. La promotion de capacités trilingues pour un maximum de personnes, l'accent mis sur l'enseignement précoce d'une seconde langue et l'encouragement de l'enseignement de matières non-linguistiques par le biais d'une seconde langue en sont les éléments moteurs. L'étendue des possibilités permet de satisfaire les aspirations de groupes très divers, entre autres ceux qui soutiennent une langue minoritaire indigène, les descendants d'une immigration exogène, les enfants à grande mobilité, les frontaliers, sans parler des majorités unilingues désireuses d'augmenter leurs capacités linguistiques.

Les grandes lignes de ces initiatives de promotion multilingue recouvrent beaucoup des prises de position soutenues par le Conseil de l'Europe, le Bureau Européen des Langues moins Répandues, ou reprises dans des documents comme la Déclaration d'Oegstgeest ou la Charte Universelle des Droits Linguistiques.

La promotion d'EMILE/CLIL constitue une réponse à la demande grandissante de capacités linguistiques efficaces, grâce à la mise en valeur du souci principal de promouvoir non pas le bilinguisme ou le trilinguisme en soi mais l'éducation générale, où les capacités plurilingues représentent une « valeur ajoutée ». Lorsque l'enseignement plurilingue est bien conçu celui-ci peut être réalisé, sans porter atteinte à l'acquisition des connaissances et des capacités de base requises par le système scolaire. Pour citer Fishman (1989, 447) «L'éducation bilingue se doit de se justifier théoriquement en tant qu'éducation tout court.»

Des recherches entreprises par Gajo (2000), Gajo & Mondada (2000) et Gajo et Serra (200, 2002) ont porté sur des questions récurrentes dans tous les débats autour de l'éducation bilingue. Ces investigations ont identifié 3 étapes qui reflètent les avancées dans les domaines suivants, dont EMILE/CLIL représente l'étape ultime dans ces progrès. Les questions posées partout dans le monde tournent autour des problèmes suivants;

1 Le problème de la langue première: est-ce que la première langue se développera normalement malgré l'importance du temps imparti à l'instruction dans la langue 2?

2 Le problème de la langue 2: est-ce que la langue 2 sera mieux développée si une grande partie de l'instruction s'effectue dans celle-ci?

3 Le problème du contenu scolaire: est-ce que l'apprentissage d'une matière non-linguistique par l'intermédiaire de la langue 2 sera plus difficile et plus lent?

4 Le problème psychosocial: est-ce que l'éducation bilingue peut être appliquée à n'importe quelle sorte de population scolaire?

Table 1. Les 3 stades du développement dans l'éducation bilingue.

	Désignation	Orientation Didactique	Nature des Compétences	Techniques
1 <sup>ère</sup> étape	Immersion	Langage	Stratégique	Expérimentale/ Quantitative (le produit)
2 <sup>e</sup> étape	Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)	Langage	Morpho-syntactique ("grammaticale")	Expérimentale/ Quantitative (le produit)
3 <sup>e</sup> étape	"Enseignement d'une Matière par l'Intégration d'une Langue Etrangère" (EMILE)	Contenu scolaire	Discursive	Ethnographie/ Qualitative (le processus)

Les recherches initiales avaient tendance à [...] produire des réponses positives aux questions 1, 3 et 4 et des indications positives fortes à la question 2. Au début l'éducation bilingue était promue afin d'améliorer l'enseignement et l'apprentissage d'une seconde langue. La question centrale était donc la compétence en langue seconde.

La recherche canadienne sur l'immersion française soulignait principalement que l'instruction par l'intermédiaire de la langue 2 n'occasionnait aucun dommage « collatéral ». ...L'éducation bilingue était efficace pour la communication, mais les résultats en acquisition de la seconde langue laissaient à désirer. Les tendances les plus récentes apparaissent dans la phase 3. La recherche s'y est appliquée à la troisième question pour mesurer la nature de la valeur ajoutée en se concentrant sur une compétence accrue en langue 2 en plus des connaissances de la matière non linguistique. Cette question peut se résumer comme suit :

- Est-ce que le contenu du cours est mieux appréhendé dans une forme d'éducation bilingue?
- Quel est l'effet d'une éducation bilingue sur l'enseignement et l'apprentissage d'une matière non-linguistique?

Ces questions sont fondamentales, non seulement pour tout ce qui touche à l'acquisition des connaissances, mais également pour toute politique linguistique. L'éducation bilingue a besoin du soutien et de l'engagement des enseignants qui « prêtent » leurs disciplines aux buts linguistiques. Ces enseignants sont obligés de développer de nouvelles techniques pour l'enseignement de leur matière non-linguistique ou le contenu et le langage se prêtent mutuellement assistance, et ceci pour améliorer les progrès en éducation fondamentale.

La terminologie qui s'impose au niveau européen reflète implicitement ces nouvelles perspectives entre les 2<sup>e</sup> et 3<sup>e</sup> étapes. Nous sommes d'avis que l'acronyme français EMILE (proposé par Baetens Beardsmore, 1999) ne représente pas seulement une traduction de CLIL, mais également le stimulant nécessaire à la réorientation de la recherche en éducation bilingue. (Gajo & Serra, 2002)

EMILE/CLIL permet une grande flexibilité dans la programmation du curriculum et

l'organisation de l'horaire scolaire. Les possibilités vont de l'immersion totale précoce, à l'immersion partielle précoce, l'immersion tardive, ou encore des programmes modulaires où les matières enseignées par l'intermédiaire d'une seconde langue varient, comme cela se fait déjà en Allemagne (Mäsch, 1993) et au Royaume-Uni (Coyle, 2002). Les modules permettent aux matières non-linguistiques d'être traitées dans des combinaisons variables de langues, ce qui répond aux besoins de sauvegarde de la langue première, d'amélioration du niveau dans la langue seconde, de l'introduction d'une troisième langue, et à tous les besoins locaux et variés des différentes régions en Europe. Cette flexibilité permet également de faire face aux besoins liés aux différents niveaux de capacité des élèves, comme au Grand Duché de Luxembourg où des élèves inscrits dans les sections techniques bénéficient d'une partie des travaux pratiques fournis dans une seconde ou troisième langue (Lebrun & Baetens Beardsmore, 1993).

EMILE/CLIL est une réponse à un des problèmes majeurs dans l'enseignement linguistique, car il permet aux élèves de percevoir la pertinence immédiate de l'effort requis pour l'acquisition d'une deuxième ou troisième langue, tout en se focalisant sur l'apprentissage d'une matière non linguistique. Par ce moyen, on détourne l'attention du problème de la motivation dans les cours de langues classiques qui requièrent un investissement intensif et à long terme pour de maigres résultats souvent déprimants (Baetens Beardsmore & Kohls, 1988).

La mise en œuvre d'EMILE/CLIL exige une coordination accrue des efforts de tous ceux qui sont impliqués dans l'amélioration de l'éducation linguistique. Les examinateurs et les inspecteurs, dans leurs fonctions de garants des niveaux atteints, jouent un rôle primordial dans la promotion de l'éducation multilingue, mais sont souvent absents dans les phases initiales du développement des nouvelles orientations. Les représentants de l'industrie ont une contribution utile à fournir dans le développement d'EMILE/CLIL (par exemple, par l'intermédiaire des Chambres de Commerce dans les pays, comme la France, où ces instances ont un rôle éducatif important dans le relais entre l'école et la vie professionnelle).

Et finalement, les craintes éventuelles consécutives à la mise en route de tout bouleversement majeur dans le système éducatif (voir Baetens Beardsmore, 1988, *Qui a peur du bilinguisme ?*) ont besoin d'être adressées parmi les organismes syndicaux des enseignants et des représentants des parents, car souvent ces partenaires essentiels sont absents lors des débats concernant l'éducation bilingue et sa promotion.

#### Références

- Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1988 *Who's Afraid of Bilingualism?*, in *II Euskal Mundu-Biltzarra/ II Congreso Mundial Vasco*, Vitoria-Gasteiz, Servicio Central de Publicaciones del Gobierno Vasco, 75-90.
- Baetens Beardsmore, H. & Kohls, 1988 J. Immediate Pertinence in the Acquisition of Multilingual Proficiency: The European Schools, in *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 44, 4, 680-701.
- Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1999 Consolidating experience in plurilingual education. In D. Marsh and B. Marsland (eds), *CLIL Initiatives for the Millennium* (24-30). University of Jyväskylä: Continuing Education Centre.
- Coyle, 2002 *Against All Odds: Lessons from Content & Language Integrated Learning in English Secondary Schools, 2002* in So, D. & Jones, G. (eds), *Education and Society in Plurilingual Contexts*, Brussels, VUB Press
- Fishman, J. 1989 *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective*, Clevedon & Philadelphia, Multilingual Matters.
- Gajo, L. 2000 *Immersion, bilinguisme et interaction scolaire*. Paris: Didier, coll. LAL.
- Gajo, L. & Mondada, L. 2000 *Interactions et acquisitions en contexte*. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

23

- Gajo, L. & Serra, C. 2000 Acquisition des langues et des disciplines dans l'enseignement bilingue: l'exemple des mathématiques. *Etudes de linguistique appliquée*, 120.
- Gajo, L. & Sera, C. 2002 in So, D. & Jones, G. (eds), *Education and Society in Plurilingual Contexts*, Brussels, VUB Press.
- Lebrun, N. & Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1993 Trilingual Education in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, in Baetens Beardsmore, H. (ed.) *European Models of Bilingual Education*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 101-120.
- Mäsch, N. 1993 The German Model of Bilingual Education: an Administrator's Perspective, in Baetens Beardsmore, H. (ed.) *European Models of Bilingual Education*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 155-172.



**Hugo Baetens Beardsmore**

## The Significance of CLIL/EMILE

The European Commission's 1995 *White Paper* contains the potential to cover all possible combinations of language promotion to suit the diversified needs of the majority of the European population, through its support for trilingualism for all learners, its focus on an early start with language education, and its encouragement of teaching non-language subjects partially through the medium of a second language. Its broad terms of reference meet the needs of those in border areas, of lesser used language groups, of immigrant populations and mobile children, not to mention unilingual majority language speakers who wish to increase their linguistic capacities, reconciled in a general framework which allows for flexible implementation across Europe.

The terms of reference incorporate many of the language issues supported by The Council of Europe, The European Charter for Lesser Used Languages, the Declaration of Oegstgeest, the Universal Charter for Language Rights.

The propagation of CLIL/EMILE responds to the growing need for efficient linguistic skills, bearing in mind that the major concern is about education, not about becoming bi- or multilingual, and that multiple language proficiency is the «added value» which can be obtained at no cost to other skills and knowledge, if properly designed : " Bilingual education must justify itself philosophically as education." (Fishman, 1989, 447.)

Research by Gajo (2000) , Gajo & Mondada (2000), and Gajo & Serra (2000;2002) has addressed the major questions recurrent in all debates about plurilingual education. Their investigations have identified 3 stages which reflect progress on the following issues in bilingual education. CLIL/EMILE represents the latest stage in developments. Questions asked all over the world concern the following.

1. The L1-problem: will L1 develop normally despite an important amount of instruction time being conducted in L2?
2. The L2-problem: will L2 really develop better if an important amount of instruction time is conducted in it?
3. The subject-problem (school knowledge): does L2 complicate the subject learning and slow down progress in the curriculum subject?
4. The socio-psychological problem: is bilingual education appropriate for any student profile?



**Table 1. The 3 stages of developments in bilingual education**

	Emblematic designation	Didactic orientation	Communication competence	Data processing techniques
1 <sup>st</sup> stage	Immersion	Language	Strategic	Experimental/ Quantitative (product-oriented)
2 <sup>nd</sup> stage	Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)	Language	Morpho-syntactic ("grammatical")	Experimental/ Quantitative (product-oriented)
3 <sup>rd</sup> stage	"Enseignement d'une Matière par l'Intégration d'une Langue Etrangère" (EMILE)	Subject	Discursive	Ethnographic/ Qualitative (process-oriented)

"Research in the early stages tended to ... produce findings answering questions 1, 3 and 4 in the affirmative and question 2 in ... strong positive terms. Bilingual education was in fact developed in order to improve L2 teaching and learning. The most important question was therefore about L2 proficiency.

Canadian research in French immersion particularly stressed that instruction through a second language did not cause any "collateral" damage. ... Bilingual education was effective for communication, but L2 acquisition was found to require improvement. The latest trend appears in the third stage, where researchers cope with question 3 and try to ascertain whether bilingual education will provide added value in the form of greater L2 proficiency in addition to subject knowledge.

The question can be reformulated as follows:

- Is subject matter better learnt through bilingual education?
- What is the impact of bilingual education on subject teaching and learning?

This question is fundamental, not only for learning issues, but also for educational policies. Bilingual education must have the support of and commitment from subject teachers, who "lend" their discipline for language goals. They have to develop new methods of teaching their subject. Language and subject must take advantage of each other, for more general educational progress. 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> stage models can often be found in regions that have experimented with bilingual education for a long time (cf. The Aosta Valley).

The terminology adopted at the European level implicitly reflects the change of perspective from the second to the third stage. In our view, the new French acronym EMILE (proposed by Baetens Beardsmore, 1999) is not only an equivalent for CLIL, but also a cue for a reorientation in bilingual education research." (Gajo & Serra, 2002)

CLIL/EMILE allows for great flexibility in curricular design and time-table organisation, ranging from early total, early partial, late immersion type programmes, to modular subject-determined slots as implemented in Germany (Mäsch, 1993) and the United Kingdom (Coyle, 2002). The modular approach allows for subjects to be handled in different combinations of languages, thereby responding to the desire to safeguard L1 capacities, improving L2 capacities and introducing L3 or a variety of languages, according to perceived local contingencies. Flexibility also allows for a wide range of abilities to benefit from partial education through a different language, as is the case in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, where vocational and technical schools offer some of the practical

curriculum through L2 or L3 (Lebrun & Baetens Beardsmore, 1993).

CLIL/EMILE represents a response to one of the major problems in language education, namely that students are led to appreciate the immediate pertinence of the effort to acquire and use a 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> language while studying something else. This overcomes the motivational problem of classical language lessons based on intensive investment in time with long-term and often disappointing rewards in proficiency (Baetens Beardsmore & Kohls, 1988)

Implementation of CLIL/EMILE requires greater co-ordination of educationists than in past attempts at improving language education. Examination boards and the inspectorate, in their capacities as gatekeepers, play key roles in promoting multilingual education, yet are rarely involved in the planning stages of new developments. Representatives from commerce and industry have a useful contribution in formulating desiderata (for example, via the Chambers of Commerce in countries like France, where they play an important role in bridging the link between schools and the professions). Potential fears inherent to major educational changes (cf. Baetens Beardsmore, 1988, *Who's Afraid of Bilingualism?*) require reassurance among Teacher Unions and Parent Organisations, stakeholders rarely involved in debates on bilingual education.

#### References

- Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1988 *Who's Afraid of Bilingualism?*, in *Il Euskal Mundu-Biltzarra/ Il Congreso Mundial Vasco*, Vitoria-Gasteiz, Servicio Central de Publicaciones del Gobierno Vasco, 75-90.
- Baetens Beardsmore, H. & Kohls, 1988 J. Immediate Pertinence in the Acquisition of Multilingual Proficiency: The European Schools, in *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 44, 4, 680-701.
- Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1999 Consolidating experience in plurilingual education. In D. Marsh and B. Marsland (eds), *CLIL Initiatives for the Millennium* (24-30). University of Jyväskylä: Continuing Education Centre.
- Coyle, 2002 *Against All Odds: Lessons from Content & Language Integrated Learning in English Secondary Schools*, 2002 in So, D. & Jones, G. (eds), *Education and Society in Plurilingual Contexts*, Brussels, VUBPress
- Fishman, J. 1989 *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective*, Clevedon & Philadelphia, Multilingual Matters.
- Gajo, L. 2000 *Immersion, bilinguisme et interaction scolaire*. Paris: Didier, coll. LAL.
- Gajo, L. & Mondada, L 2000 *Interactions et acquisitions en contexte*. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires.
- Gajo, L. & Serra, C. 2000 *Acquisition des langues et des disciplines dans l'enseignement bilingue: l'exemple des mathématiques*. *Etudes de linguistique appliquée*, 120.
- Gajo, L. & Sera, C. 2002 in So, D. & Jones, G. (eds), *Education and Society in Plurilingual Contexts*, Brussels, VUB Press.
- Lebrun, N. & Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1993 *Trilingual Education in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg*, in Baetens Beardsmore, H. (ed.) *European Models of Bilingual Education*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 101-120.
- Mäsch, N. 1993 *The German Model of Bilingual Education: an Administrator's Perspective*, in Baetens Beardsmore, H. (ed.) *European Models of Bilingual Education*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 155-172.

**Do Coyle**

## Relevance of CLIL to the European Commission's Language Learning Objectives

The emergent conceptualisation of Content and Language Integrated Learning as a European construct in recent years is in my view deeply significant in terms of the European Commission's Language Objectives. Whilst approaches to learning and teaching which impact on more than one language – such as bilingual and immersion education and content-based language instruction - have become embedded in national programmes at the global level, European communities both individually and collectively have had to address the complex specificities of linguistic and cultural diversity. CLIL is central to this diversity whilst remaining constant in its drive to integrate both subject and language learning. Integration is a powerful pedagogic tool which aims to 'safeguard' the subject being taught whilst promoting language as a medium for learning as well as an objective of the learning process itself.

I advance then with a feeling of optimism that the early exploratory stages of CLIL rooted in the 1980s, have come to fruition with regard to a deeper understanding of the diverse nature of the operational demands required to integrate language and subject learning in different European contexts. Moreover, whilst the learning and teaching objectives and outcomes may be diverse in their detail, the aims of CLIL remain constant:

- that students should be given opportunities to learn subject matter or content effectively through the medium of a European language which would not be considered as the usual language for subject instruction in their regular curriculum
- that students should be given opportunities to use language/s in a variety of settings and contexts in order to enable them to operate successfully in a plurilingual and pluricultural Europe.
- that young people need support in developing specific and appropriate inter-cultural as well as linguistic knowledge skills and strategies, in order to function as autonomous mobile European citizens.

The potential of CLIL to support and develop plurilingual and pluricultural competence in our future citizens has been widely reported. Exploring and understanding better how this can, does or might function at regional, national and European levels is ongoing. Whilst this concept is itself not a new one - there exist already beacons to guide our collective thinking with examples of successful practice, and experienced or effective teachers making transparent theoretical principles – the flexibility demanded by our diversity is rapidly developing. Moreover, I believe that beyond this initial threshold, the next stage is to 'mainstream' CLIL so that more learners become participants in effective learning communities and that such experiences will become an entitlement during compulsory education extending to vocational, work and recreational contexts. CLIL will then be cast as a core component of the European Languages Portfolio.

So from what basis can such a vision flow? I can best describe this by referring to four key principles which I think CLIL promotes. The first principle places successful content or subject learning and the acquisition of knowledge, skills and understanding inherent to that discipline at the very heart of the learning process. However, more traditional transmission models for content delivery which conceptualise the subject as a body of knowledge to be transferred from teacher to learner may no longer be appropriate. The symbiotic relationship between language and subject understanding demands a focus on how subjects are taught whilst working with and through another language rather than in another language.

This shift has brought with it a need to redefine methodologies to take account of language use by both teachers and learners which encourages real engagement and interactivity. It has also brought with it teacher reflection on how best to teach and therefore embraces issues fundamental to the education process itself. CLIL therefore has implications for teacher education at both pre and in-service levels.

The second principle defines language as a conduit for both communication and learning. From this perspective, language is learned through using it in authentic and unrehearsed yet 'scaffolded' situations to complement the more structured approaches common in foreign language lessons. It also builds on the language learned and practised in those lessons by providing alternative opportunities to develop a wide range of language skills, strategies and competences needed to function in everyday plurilingual situations. Alternatively, it may be that linguistic competence acquired through language lessons may be transferred to another language in the CLIL setting where the foreign languages used are not the same. Whatever the case, CLIL serves to reinforce the notion that language is a tool which to have meaning and sense needs to be activated in contexts which are motivating for and meaningful to our learners. It also connects different areas of the learning curriculum into a meaningful and economic use of study time.

The third principle is that CLIL should cognitively challenge learners - whatever their ability. It provides a setting rich for developing thinking skills in conjunction with both basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive-academic language proficiency (CALP). Research suggests that these challenges encourage thinking to take place in different languages and at a deeper level of inter-cultural understanding involving both *savoir faire* and *savoir être*.

The fourth principle embraces pluriculturality. Since language, thinking and culture are inextricably linked, then CLIL provides an ideal opportunity for students to operate in alternative cultures through studies in an alternative language. Studying a subject through the language of a different culture paves the way for understanding and tolerating different perspectives. For me, this element is fundamental to fostering European understanding and making citizenship a reality.

The evolution of these four principles - the 4Cs - content, communication, cognition and culture/ citizenship - elevates CLIL to the position of major and significant contributor to the realisation of the European Commission's Language Policy. They demand a timely revisioning of learning in general and language learning in particular in our schools.

When 'language using' experiences are positive, when students are challenged to understand, think and reconceptualise prior learning in more than one language, when alternative perspectives are presented to our learners in different languages, then as the number of successful language learners increases, we can consider ourselves as having matured as a plurilingual and pluricultural learning society. CLIL's role is vital to that maturation process.

**Kees de Bot**

## Geïntegreerd vak- en taalonderwijs (GVTO) in de Europese context

Terwijl de behoefte aan hogere niveaus van taalvaardigheid gestaag toeneemt, blijkt de hoeveelheid onderwijstijd voor het vreemde-talenonderwijs in veel landen in Europa juist af te nemen. Door de eisen die ook door andere delen van het curriculum worden gesteld is de kans klein dat die trend in de nabije toekomst zal veranderen. Gezien die ontwikkeling is er behoefte aan nieuwe benaderingen als GVTO omdat daarmee zowel meer leerlingen een hoog niveau van taalvaardigheid kunnen bereiken en vorm en inhoud meer bij elkaar worden gebracht in het talenonderwijs.

In Nederland heeft deze vorm van tweetalig onderwijs de laatste 5 jaar een dramatische ontwikkeling laten zien. De beweging begon in het begin van de jaren 90 van de vorige eeuw met een handvol scholen, en nu zijn er tegen de 40 scholen die deze vorm van onderwijs aanbieden. Zowel de scholen als de ouders blijken zich bewust te zijn geworden van de kansen die dit onderwijs waarin tussen de 30 en 50 % van het curriculum in een andere taal wordt onderwezen, biedt. Het ministerie van onderwijs, cultuur en wetenschappen heeft vanaf het begin grote belangstelling getoond voor de GVTO, en heeft onderzoek naar de effectiviteit ervan over een aantal jaren gesubsidieerd. De uitkomsten van het evaluatieonderzoek, waarover is gerapporteerd in Huibregtse (2001) laten zien dat de leerlingen in de twee-talige stromen hogere cijfers voor Engels halen, een hogere score vertonen op een aantal toetsen en even hoog of hoger scoren op het eindexamen voor Nederlands en andere vakken. De attitudes van leerlingen en docenten zijn in het algemeen zeer positief en hoewel het programma voor beide groepen zwaar is, wordt het meer gezien als een uitdaging dan als een bedreiging.

Gedurende de laatste paar maanden is er een meer kwalitatieve evaluatie uitgevoerd van de scholen met een tweetalige stroom als deel van de ontwikkeling van kwaliteitscontrole systeem. De eerste indrukken die tijdens deze ronde zijn opgedaan maken duidelijk dat de invoering van GVTO een veel bredere invloed heeft op het onderwijskundig denken en handelen op scholen dan alleen het invoeren van een paar vakken in een andere taal. Door de veranderingen die nodig waren is vaak het hele programma doorgelicht en aangepast. Er is meer fundamenteel nagedacht over de relatie tussen vorm en inhoud in het talenonderwijs voor alle talen, en met name voor het Engels dat tot nu toe door de comfortabele positie die het heeft als verplicht vak weinig aan didactische vernieuwingen heeft laten zien. Het bewustzijn dat interactie in de klas en het genereren van output essentieel zijn is sterk gegroeid.

Wanneer het op de juiste manier wordt gedaan is GVTO deel van een benadering gericht op internationalisering van de studenten. Studenten op deze scholen zullen veelal in internationale organisaties terecht komen, dus vanuit carrièreperspectief is de wenselijkheid van een hoge taalvaardigheid in het Engels duidelijk. Minstens zo belangrijk is dat de leerlingen tijdens hun schooljaren door internationale activiteiten doordrongen raken van dat belang. Leerlingen vertellen dat het spreken van een vreemde taal tussen en met mensen die een zelfde moedertaal delen ondanks alles toch als vreemd en onnatuurlijk wordt ervaren. Alleen door werkelijk zinvolle internationale activiteiten waarvoor de leerlingen de vreemde taal dagelijks in relevante en natuurlijke interactie (bijvoorbeeld via e-mail of chatten) moeten gebruiken kunnen ze intrinsiek gemotiveerd worden om ook in de klassensetting de vreemde taal te spreken. Zonder dat soort stimulering blijken leerlingen in de klas al makkelijk terug te vallen op hun moedertaal.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

Het is duidelijk dat het geven van een of meer vakken in een vreemde taal niet hetzelfde is als GVTO. Het gaat om de werkelijke integratie van vak- en taalonderwijs, en die stap moeten veel scholen nog maken. Daarvoor is meer samenwerking nodig tussen taal- en vakdocenten, en samen dienen ze te zoeken naar een nieuwe didactiek die recht doet aan de beide delen die geïntegreerd worden.

GVTO zal leiden tot meer leerlingen met hogere taalvaardigheden. Deze nieuwe trend blijkt zijn best eigen advocaat te zijn: het succes van de voorlopers heeft veel scholen ertoe gebracht ook deze stap te nemen en dat is opmerkelijk succesvol gebleken, want de scholen leveren leerlingen af met hogere cijfers voor Engels, maar vaak ook voor andere vakken.

Tweetalige stromen zijn nu stevig verankerd in de meer academische vormen van het voortgezet onderwijs, maar het bewustzijn dat ook andere schooltypes en leerlingen van een jongere leeftijd zouden kunnen profiteren is groeiende. Het ideaal is een onderwijspad waarin vanaf het begin van het basisonderwijs tot in het hoger onderwijs twee- en liefst meertalige trajecten beschikbaar zijn.

30



**Kees de Bot**

## CLIL in the European Context

While the need for higher levels of proficiency in foreign languages is growing, the amount of time and number of lessons spent on foreign language teaching have gone down in many countries in Europe. Given the pressure from other parts of the curriculum, a change of this trend is not likely in the near future. Therefore, new approaches like CLIL are very much needed to both provide high levels of proficiency and at the same time to link form and content in language learning.

In the Netherlands this form of bilingual education has seen a dramatic growth over the last 5 years. The movement started with a handful of schools in the early 90s of the last century but is now the model in close to 40 schools all over the country. Both schools and parents have become aware of the potentials of this approach in which 30 to 50% of the curriculum is taught in English. The Ministry of Education has shown a keen interest in CLIL from the very beginning, and it has supported research to evaluate the outcomes over a number of years. These outcomes, as reported on in Huijbregtse (2001) are very encouraging and defuse fears about negative effects. The data show that the students in the bilingual streams reach higher levels of proficiency in English than the rest of the students, without any negative effects on their mother tongue or other school subjects. Attitudes are generally very positive, and both students and teachers see this development as an interesting challenge rather than as a threat.

During the last year, a more qualitatively oriented evaluation of schools with bilingual streams has been carried out as part of the development of a quality control system for bilingual schools. Preliminary results make it clear that the introduction of CLIL in schools has a major impact on thinking about teaching in general that goes well beyond the introduction of a few subjects taught in another language. The awareness of the need to connect form and content and modernize the didactics of not just English but also other foreign languages and the other subjects taught, stands out in all the discussions with teachers and school management. Until recently, there seemed to be little concern about effective and inspiring approaches to teaching English in particular, because it is mandatory and therefore not subject to critical evaluations by students. The changes brought in by the introduction of CLIL appear to have convinced teachers of English and the other foreign languages, that a new way of teaching is needed in which interaction and output are the keys.

If done properly, CLIL is part of a school approach geared towards internationalization of the students. Students in bilingual streams are likely to end up in international settings, so the relevance of the need for high levels of proficiency is obvious from a career perspective. But it should be clear that an international perspective and international activities during the school years are of eminent importance. For many students, speaking English as a foreign language in a setting in which all interactants share the same mother tongue is still awkward and unnatural. Only through international activities for which the foreign language needs to be used on a daily basis in natural conversational (including virtual/internet based) settings can students be intrinsically motivated to keep using the language in the school setting. Observations have shown that without such motivation, students tend to relapse into using their mother tongue during classroom activities.

It is obvious that teaching a subject in a foreign language is not the same as an integration of language and content, and many schools are still to make that transition. Language teachers and subject teachers need to work together much more than is the case now, and



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

together they should formulate the new didactics needed for a real integration of form and function in language teaching.

Good bilingual education appears to be its own best advocate: the success of the early beginners in the Netherlands have encouraged other schools to follow suit and they have done so with remarkable success, now delivering students with above average scores not only for English, but also for other languages and subjects.

Bilingual streams are now firmly based in the more academic forms of secondary education, but schools are beginning to explore the potential of such streams in other forms of education as well, both for the more vocationally oriented tracks and for younger children that are likely to benefit from it even more. The ideal is to have educational tracks in which bilingual, and preferably multilingual tracks are offered from early primary to tertiary education.

Huibregtse, I. (2001) Effecten en Didactiek van tweetalig voortgezet onderwijs in Nederland. Dissertation, University of Utrecht

32





**Carmen Muñoz****CLIL-AICLE (Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lengua Extranjera)****1. Importancia de CLIL-AICLE para los objetivos lingüísticos de la Comisión**

El enfoque AICLE es de importancia capital para el objetivo que tiene la Comisión de mejorar el aprendizaje de las lenguas europeas en sus Estados miembros. En este sentido es importante destacar que la tendencia general a avanzar la introducción de la enseñanza-aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras a la educación primaria no ha conseguido mejorar sustancialmente los niveles lingüísticos de los alumnos. Así lo han demostrado diversas investigaciones que se han realizado en diferentes lugares de Europa (Inglaterra, Escocia, España, ...), que han revelado que los niños no se benefician simplemente por iniciar el aprendizaje con anterioridad, si ello no va acompañado de un aumento de contacto significativo con la lengua, aunque puedan observarse mejoras en su motivación y actitudes hacia la lengua meta.

Estos resultados confirman el ritmo más lento de los aprendices más jóvenes, y la necesidad que tienen, para poder alcanzar y superar a los aprendices mayores, de cantidades masivas de exposición, cantidades similares a las de que disponen esos aprendices en los contextos de adquisición natural por inmersión. Dado que no es factible, ni posiblemente deseable, implementar programas de inmersión en lengua extranjera en todas ni en la mayoría de escuelas de los Estados miembros, AICLE puede constituir una manera efectiva de proporcionar mayor intensidad de exposición a la lengua meta así como oportunidades más frecuentes y ricas de usar la lengua de manera significativa.

En segundo lugar AICLE es relevante para el objetivo de la Comisión de que todos los ciudadanos europeos dominen dos lenguas europeas además de la lengua o lenguas maternas o nacionales. En ese sentido, es apropiado remarcar la conveniencia de un enfoque AICLE en las comunidades bilingües en las que las escuelas deben encargarse de entrada de la enseñanza-aprendizaje de dos lenguas nacionales. Añadir una tercera y una cuarta lengua puede presentar dificultades en cuanto a encontrar espacio y tiempo en el currículum. Ciertamente, con un número limitado de horas y las necesidades crecientes de nuevas enseñanzas (por ejemplo en nuevas tecnologías y en adquisición de nuevas habilidades) puede faltar el tiempo necesario para dedicarlo a la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras. Usar éstas como el vehículo de enseñanza de las asignaturas del currículum puede ser la única posibilidad de proporcionar suficiente exposición a esas lenguas a fin de garantizar el aprendizaje efectivo de dos lenguas adicionales.

**2) El potencial de AICLE para mejorar la calidad de la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras se manifiesta, por ejemplo, en los siguientes aspectos:**

1. Usar la lengua extranjera como vehículo de enseñanza y comunicación hace que el profesorado sea más consciente de las necesidades lingüísticas de los aprendices y estimula el comportamiento estratégico (por ejemplo estrategias didácticas para que el input sea comprensible y esté contextualizado).
2. La necesidad que tiene el profesorado de comprobaciones constantes de la comprensión de los alumnos aumenta el nivel de comunicación entre el profesorado y el alumnado (y entre los alumnos mismos).
3. AICLE promueve el aprendizaje incidental e implícito al concentrarse en el significado y la comunicación, y al proporcionar grandes cantidades de input, mientras que de manera complementaria la clase de lengua extranjera puede utilizar técnicas de atención a la forma lingüística en las áreas en que los aprendices así lo precisen.

4. AICLE potencia la fluidez, mientras que la clase de lengua tradicional va dirigida a la corrección gramatical.
5. AICLE "estira" la lengua del aprendiz y la capacidad de aprender la lengua, por ejemplo al empujar a los alumnos a producir lenguaje complejo y significativo.
6. La necesidad de apoyos visuales y de otro tipo en las clases AICLE aumenta la conciencia del profesorado de la necesidad más general de apoyo cognitivo e interactivo que tienen los aprendices de lenguas extranjeras, especialmente los aprendices más jóvenes.
7. La calidad de la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras también se beneficia del trabajo en equipo y de la enseñanza en pareja (tandem) del profesor de la asignatura y del profesor de lengua, dado que ello exige una constante reflexión y elaboración de las prácticas pedagógicas.

### 3. El potencial de AICLE para aumentar el número de buenos aprendices/ hablantes de lenguas extranjeras

Los siguientes aspectos, entre otros, pueden garantizar buenos resultados:

1. Los aprendices se benefician de la mayor calidad de la enseñanza y del input significativo y comprensible.
2. AICLE puede reforzar las habilidades de procesamiento del input de los aprendices, lo cual les prepara para adquirir habilidades de razonamiento complejo y contribuye al desarrollo cognitivo.
3. En AICLE la alfabetización tiene lugar en la primera lengua, lo cual es beneficioso para el niño. Más adelante las habilidades académicas se transfieren a las sucesivas lenguas.
4. En AICLE el filtro afectivo de los aprendices puede ser más bajo que en otras situaciones, puesto que el aprendizaje se da en un clima relativamente libre de ansiedad.
5. La motivación de los aprendices por aprender los conocimientos que se transmiten por medio de la lengua extranjera puede servir para fomentar y sostener la motivación hacia el aprendizaje de la lengua extranjera misma.

De manera más general se puede considerar AICLE en relación con los programas de inmersión. Europa es rica en experiencias de inmersión, tradicionalmente en escuelas privadas, y más recientemente en programas más amplios financiados públicamente. Un caso reciente ha sido el programa de inmersión en catalán en Cataluña, reconocido como una de las experiencias de aprendizaje de una lengua a gran escala de mayor éxito. AICLE se basa en los mismos principios que subyacen a los programas de inmersión de eficacia probada, tales como una preparación adecuada del profesorado, apoyo de los padres, actitudes positivas por parte de las familias y de la comunidad, prestigio de los programas, ... Sin embargo, los programas de inmersión y los programas de AICLE difieren en los objetivos que pretenden conseguir. Mientras que los primeros ofrecen un contacto más intenso con la lengua y persiguen niveles de competencia nativa o casi nativa, los programas de AICLE ofrecen un contacto menos intenso con la lengua meta y pretenden conseguir un nivel de competencia funcional. Además, dado que AICLE puede integrarse adecuadamente en el currículum reglado de la enseñanza obligatoria, puede constituir la única manera realista de aumentar la competencia en lenguas extranjeras del mayor número de jóvenes europeos.

**Carmen Muñoz**

## Relevance &amp; Potential of CLIL

**Relevance of CLIL for the Commission's overall language objectives**

The CLIL approach is directly relevant for the Commission's objective of improving the learning of European languages in its member states. In this respect it is important to note that the general trend towards beginning foreign language teaching/learning in primary education has not greatly improved proficiency levels. In fact, research that has been conducted in different European areas (e.g. England, Scotland, Spain) has shown that children's language proficiency does not benefit much from an early start that does not involve an increase in contact hours and meaningful exposure to the language, although there may be gains in terms of motivation and attitudes towards the target language.

These research results confirm the slower learning rate of younger learners, and the need they have, in order to catch up and eventually surpass the older learners, of having massive amounts of exposure, amounts similar to those learners have in a naturalistic acquisition through immersion. While immersion programmes cannot be materially implemented in all schools and all member states, CLIL may definitely constitute a way of providing a more intense exposure to the language and more and richer opportunities for using the language in meaningful ways.

Secondly, CLIL is relevant for the Commission's objective that all European citizens should have competence in two European languages on top of their mother tongue or national language/s. In this respect, the need of a CLIL approach in those European bilingual communities in which schools must account for the teaching/learning of two national languages already must be particularly emphasized. Adding a third and a fourth languages may be difficult to implement in terms of time in the curriculum. With a fixed number of hours and the increasing need of providing teaching in new areas (such as those related to the new technologies and the acquisition of skills) there may just not be enough time for devoting to foreign language teaching.

Using foreign languages as the medium of instruction of content subjects may be the only way of providing enough exposure to those languages in order to guarantee successful learning of two additional languages.

**The potential of CLIL for improving the quality of FL teaching can be seen in, for example, the following respects:**

1. Using the foreign language as the medium of instruction and communication makes the teacher more aware of the learners' linguistic needs and triggers tuned-in strategic language behaviour (for example, teacher's strategies to make input comprehensible and context-embedded).
2. The need for constant comprehension checks on the part of the teacher results in high levels of communication between teachers and learners (and among learners themselves).
3. CLIL fosters implicit and incidental learning by focusing on meaning and communication, and providing great amounts of input, while at the same time the FL class can keep a complementary focus-on-form approach in the needed language areas.

4. CLIL fosters fluency, whereas the typical FL teaching tends to focus on accuracy
5. CLIL stretches the learners' language and language learning potential through, for example, pushing learners to produce meaningful and complex language.
6. The need of visual and other types of support for CLIL classes makes the teacher aware of the more general need of cognitive and interactional support that foreign language learners, particularly younger learners, require.
7. The quality of FL teaching is also improved through the implementation of team-work and/or tandem teaching, which require from the FL teacher a continuous reflection on and elaboration of his/her teaching practices.

**The potential of CLIL for increasing the number of successful FL learners/speakers**

The following aspects may be seen as conducive to successful FL learning in CLIL:

1. Learners benefit from higher quality teaching and from input that is meaningful and understandable.
2. CLIL may strengthen learners' ability to process input, which prepares them for higher-level thinking skills, and enhances cognitive development.
3. In CLIL, literacy development takes place in the first language, which is cognitively beneficial for the child. Later, literacy skills will transfer to the additional languages.
4. In CLIL the learners' affective filter may be lower than in other situations, for learning takes place in a relatively anxiety-free environment.
5. Learners' motivation to learn content through the foreign language may foster and sustain motivation towards learning the foreign language itself.

More generally, CLIL may be considered in relation to immersion programmes. Europe is rich with experiences of immersion: full immersion has been traditionally provided in private schools, but also more recently in state-supported large-scale immersion programmes. One such case has been the programme of Catalan immersion in Catalonia, which has been recognized as one of the most successful large-scale language learning experiences.

CLIL is based on the same principles underlying successful immersion programmes, such as adequate teacher training, parental support, positive attitudes on the part of the families and the community, high prestige of the programmes, etc. However, full immersion and CLIL differ in the aims they try to achieve. In particular, while full immersion offers a more intensive contact with the target language and aims at native-like or near native-like competence in the target language, CLIL offers a less intensive contact with the target language and aims at achieving a functional competence.

Furthermore, because CLIL may be suitably integrated within the regular curriculum at compulsory school, it may constitute the only realistic way of increasing the competence in foreign languages of the largest number of young citizens.

**Sauli Takala**

## Laajempi näkökulma vieraiden kielten opetukseen

Vieraiden kielten opettaminen ja oppiminen ovat laajentuneet käsittämään yhä suuremman osan maapallon väestöstä – sekä lapsista että aikuisista. Joissain maissa, kuten myös Suomessa, koko ikäryhmä on opiskellut yhtä tai (kuten Suomessa) jopa useampaa vierasta kieltä jo muutaman vuosikymmenen ajan riippumatta kielenomaksumiskyvystä tai muista sellaisista tekijöistä, joiden pitkään uskottiin oikeuttavan tietyn ryhmän poissulkemisen tai vapauttamisen vieraan kielen opiskelusta. Muitakin huomattavia muutoksia kielenopetuksessa ja -oppimisessa on tapahtunut kuin pelkästään niiden kattavuus. Vieraiden kielten osaamisen rooli on selvästikin muuttunut: aiemmin kielitaitoa pidettiin lähinnä osana yleissivistystä, mutta nykyään se nähdään tärkeänä osana monien ihmisten ammatillista pätevyyttä.

Kielenopetuksen ja -oppimisen laajuuden ja kustannusten vuoksi kielisuunnittelusta ja kielenopetuksen suunnittelusta on tullut tärkeä osa inhimillisten voimavarojen (HR) suunnittelua (esim. Kaplan & Baldauf 1997; Takala & Sajavaara 2000; Piri 2001). Kielenopetuksen ja -oppimisen järjestelmän kehittäminen vaatii systemaattista suunnittelua ja arviointia. Vieraskielisen opetuksen (Content and Language Integration / CLIL) esiinmarssi on tuonut uuden kuvion, joka täytyy sovittaa nykyiseen kielenopetusjärjestelmään.

Jotta ymmärtäisimme kielenopetusta ja -oppimista, meidän täytyy nähdä ne monimuotoisena, useiden toimijoiden järjestelmänä, olla tietoisia niiden rajoista, keskeisistä tavoitteista ja tasosta laajemmassa toimintakontekstissa. Meidän täytyy olla tietoisia kielenopetuksen ja -oppimisen eri alajärjestelmistä ja niiden välisistä suhteista. Kaikkeen tähän tarvitsemme malleja, jotka auttavat meitä kuvaamaan ja selvittämään eri lähestymistapojen käytännön seuraamuksia.

Eräs mahdollinen malli on tekijän malli (1979), joka on mukailtu vastaavista Mackeyn (1970), Sternin (1970), Strevensin (1977), Spolskyn (1978) ja muiden esittämistä malleista. Kaikissa näissä malleissa pyritään määrittelemään, mitkä tieteet vaikuttavat kielikoulutukseen; mitkä ovat teoreettikojen, soveltavien kielitieteilijöiden ja opettajien tehtävät kielikoulutuksessa; mitkä tekijät / päämuuttujat vaikuttavat kielikoulutuksen sijoittumiseen sen sosiopoliittiseen kontekstiinsa. Laaja yksimielisyys näyttäisi vallitsevan siitä, että toisen/vieraan kielen opettamisen teorian ja käytännön yleisen mallin tulee olla kattava (pätee kaikkiin mahdollisiin tilanteisiin), sen tulee korostaa vuorovaikutuksen periaatetta (komponenttien keskinäinen riippuvuus) ja näkemystä monista eri tekijöistä (mikään yksittäinen tekijä ei voi hallita) ja siinä tulee käydä ilmi, että kielenopetus perustuu monitieteiseen tietämykseen (Stern 1983, 35-50).

Tällaisten mallien mukaisesti muodollinen kielenopetus koulukontekstissa tapahtuu monimuotoisessa ympäristössä, joka muodostuu useista tasoista. Tasolla 1 eli yhteiskunnallisella tasolla kielitaidon tarve tuodaan ilmi enemmän tai vähemmän selvästi määriteltynä kielipolitiikkana ja sen merkitys tunnustetaan kielenopetuksen saaman yhteiskunnan tuen kautta. Tasolla 2 eli koulujärjestelmän tasolla olemme kiinnostuneita kielenopetuksen perusteista, sen infrastruktuurista – organisatorisesta ja hallinnollisesta kehiksestä ja kielenopetuksen perinteistä. Tasolla 3 on kyse kielenopetuksen yleisen lähestymistavan tai strategian määrittelystä, joka tavallisesti ilmaistaan opetussuunnitelmana. Opetussuunnitelman laatiminen on vaativa tehtävä, johon voidaan ja tulisikin sisällyttää useita tieteenaloja. Tätä kirjoitettua opetussuunnitelmaa (=aiottu opetussuunnitelma) viedään käytäntöön luokkahuoneessa (=toimeenpantu opetussuunnitelma) opetuksen tasolla (taso 4) vaihtelevassa määrin. Opetus tapahtuu monimuotoisessa ympäristössä, jossa opettajan täytyy tehdä monia taktisia päätöksiä joka

päivä. Tämä asettaa suuria vaatimuksia opettajien pedagogisille tiedoille. Opetussuunnitelmaa toteuttavat kuitenkin oppilaat oppimisen tasolla (=saavutettu opetussuunnitelma). Koko järjestelmän olennaisena osana ovat arviointi ja palaute. Arviointitietoa kerätään pääasiassa opetuksen ja oppimisen tasoilta ja tätä palautetietoa käytetään myös kaikilla muilla tasoilla. Tämä ei kuitenkaan tarkoita sitä, etteikö arviointia voitaisi kohdistaa myös muille tasoille.

Edellisissä kappaleissa on puolelta systemaattista lähestymistapaa kielipolitiikan suunnitteluun ja toteutukseen. Tätä sovelletaan nyt vieraskieliseen opetukseen eli CLIL:iin. Vaikka onkin totta, että innovaatioiden ei tarvitse tulla yksinomaan tai edes pääasiassa ylhäältä alaspäin (top-down) ja kielikylpyohjelmat ovat hyvä esimerkki alhaalta ylöspäin (bottom-up) tapahtuneista innovaatioista, täytyy kuitenkin korostaa sitä, että innovaatiot onnistuvat todennäköisesti parhaiten, kun ne tietoisesti ja viisaasti sovitetaan vallitsevaan järjestelmään. Innovaatiot ovat haavoittuvaisia ja on suositeltavaa varautua ongelmiin. Tämä edellyttää tietoisuutta kontekstuaalisista ongelmakohdista ja rajoituksista.

*Yhteiskunnallisella tasolla* CLIL tulisi tietoisesti yhdistää kansalliseen vieraiden kielten opetukseen. Ainakin yleisessä lainsäädännössä tulisi määritellä CLIL:in asema; koulujen, opettajien ja oppilaiden/opiskelijoiden oikeudet ja velvollisuudet; CLIL-opetussuunnitelman luonne; CLIL:in kautta saavutettujen tutkintojen ja todistusten luonne; CLIL:ille tarkoitettu taloudellinen tuki. Eräs CLIL:in tärkeä piirre tulisi myös ilmaista täysin selvästi – miten hyvää opetuskielen taito CLIL-opettajilla tulee olla ja miten tämä kielitaito voidaan luotettavasti tarkistaa.

*Opetusjärjestelmän tasolla* tulisi olla tarkemmat ohjeet sille, miten CLIL:in tueksi rakennetaan infrastruktuuri. Tarvitaan asiantuntijaryhmien laatimia tarkempia selvityksiä, joissa kuvataan CLIL:in kansallisia periaatteita ja tavoitteita. Kuten mikä tahansa muukin innovaatio CLIL täytyy liittää kansalliseen kontekstiin – muuten sen menestymisen mahdollisuudet heikkenevät ja ongelmien todennäköisyys kasvaa. Toisten ryhmien tulisi selvittää opettajakoulutusta, oppimateriaaleja, arviointia jne. CLIL:in kannalta.

*Strategian tasolla* tiedeyhteisö (soveltavat kielitieteilijät, kielikouluttajat, opettajankouluttajat jne.) tulisi saada mukaan CLIL:in toteuttamiseen. Tämä tapahtuu osallistamalla erillisen CLIL:in opetussuunnitelman kehittämiseen. Siinä määriteltäisiin erilaisia lähestymistapoja sille, miten vieraskielinen opetus voitaisiin integroida koulutusjärjestelmään tehokkaasti. Toisen ryhmän tehtävänä olisi CLIL-opettajien perus- ja täydennyskoulutuksen suunnittelu. Opetusmateriaalien valmistaminen ja muokkaaminen tulisi aloittaa tarpeeksi ajoissa ja sen menetelmistä tulisi keskustella (esim. yhteistyö kansallisten ja ulkomaalaisten kustantajien kanssa). Toisen asiantuntijaryhmän tulisi käsitellä testausta ja tutkintoja.

*Taktisella tasolla* koulujen tulee kehittää oma strateginen CLIL-suunnitelmansa, esim. sen tavoitteet, oppimäärä, organisaatio ja resurssit, materiaaleihin ja opettajien täydennyskoulukseen varatut resurssit sekä arviointi. Kouluilla pitäisi olla myös sisäinen seurantajärjestelmä, jonka avulla ne voisivat arvioida, miten tavoitteita on pystytty saavuttamaan (=miten opetussuunnitelma on toimeenpantu), ja joka helpottaisi kehitystyötä jatkossa.

CLIL on koulutuspalvelu oppilaille/opiskelijoille. He toteuttavat opetussuunnitelmaa oppimispyrkimystensä kautta. Tehokas oppiminen vaatii opettajan tukea, mutta myös ja vieläkin ratkaisevammin, oppijan aktiivista osallistumista. CLIL asettaa luultavasti vieläkin suurempia vaatimuksia oppijan itseohjautuvuudelle kuin perinteisemmät opiskelumuodot. Tästä syystä on suositeltavaa liittää myös oppijan näkökulma mukaan alusta lähtien ja rakentaa CLIL:iin oppijan kehitystä tukeva suunnitelma.

Kuten yllä on mainittu, järjestelmällinen *arviointi* on olennainen osa mitä tahansa systemaattista toimintaa. CLIL:n säännölliseen tutkimustoimintaan tulisi olla riittävä tuki, kuten myös tarkempiin tutkimuksiin siitä, mitä luokkahuoneessa tapahtuu ja millaista



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

39

oppimista CLIL:ssä tapahtuu. CLIL tarjoaa myös hedelmällisen alueen tieteelliseen tutkimukseen. Perinpohjainen tutkimus voi myös tuottaa hyödyllistä tietoa vieraan/toisen kielen oppimiseen teoriaan.

Yhteenvetona voidaan todeta, että CLIL täytyy räätälöidä kansallisiin/paikallisiin olosuhteisiin. Systemaattista lähestymistapaa tarvitaan varmistamaan, että CLIL:llä on tarvittava institutionaalinen ja pätevän opettajakunnan infrastruktuuri. Päätäjien, koulutusviranomaisten, tiedeyhteisön ja opettajakunnan yhteistyö on ratkaisevaa CLIL:n menestyksen kannalta. Oppijan osallistuminen on avainasemassa varsinaisessa opetus-oppimisvuorovaikutuksessa kouluissa ja luokkahuoneissa. Jotkut näistä vaatimuksista on Suomessa täytetty, mutta paljon on vielä tehtävääkin. Yleistä keskustelua tarvitaan (esim. Virtala 2002), toivottavasti systemaattisen tutkimuksen pohjalta.

### Lähteet

- Mackey, William F. 1970 Foreword to a book by Jakobovits, Leon A. *Foreign language learning: A psycholinguistic analysis of the issues*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, vii-xiii.
- Piri, Riitta 2001 Suomen kieliohjelmapolitiikka. Kansallinen ja kansainvälinen toimintaympäristö. (väitöskirja). Jyväskylä: Soveltavan kielentutkimuksen keskus. Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Spolsky, Bernard 1978 *Educational linguistics: An introduction*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Stern, H.H. 1970 Directions in language teaching theory and research, teoksessa: Qvistgaard, J., Schwartz, H. & Spand-Hansen, H. (toim.) *ALA Third Congress Proceedings, Vol. III, Applied Linguistics: Problems and solutions*. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag.
- Stern, H.H. 1983 *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stern, H.H. 1992 *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stevens, Peter 1977 *New orientations in the teaching of English*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Takala, Sauli 1979 Kielisuunnittelun kysymyksiä. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Takala, Sauli 1993a Language planning policy and development of FL proficiency in Finland, teoksessa: A. Huhta – K. Sajavaara – S. Takala (toim.) *Language testing: New openings*. Jyväskylän yliopisto, 46-54.
- Takala, Sauli 1993b Language policy and language teaching policy in Finland, teoksessa: K. Sajavaara – R.C.Lambert – S.Takala – C.A.Morfit (toim.) *National foreign language planning: practices and prospects*. Jyväskylän yliopisto, 54-71.
- Takala, Sauli & Sajavaara, Kari 2000 Language Policy and Planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 129-146.
- Virtala, Anna-Liisa 2002 Vieraskielisestä opetuksesta käyty julkinen keskustelu Suomessa. Argumentointi vieraskielisen opetuksen puolesta ja sitä vastaan. Julkaisematon lisensiaattitutkimus. Soveltavan kielentutkimuksen keskus. Jyväskylän yliopisto.

**Sauli Takala**

## Positioning CLIL in the Wider Context

The world-wide project of teaching and learning foreign languages has expanded to encompass larger sections of the population including both younger and adult learners. In some countries, including Finland, the whole age group - irrespective of language ability or other factors long believed to justify exclusion or exemption from FL study - has studied one or (as in the case of Finland) even more foreign languages for a few decades. It is not, however, only the scope of language teaching and learning that has changed dramatically. There has also been an obvious change in the role of foreign language proficiency: from being largely a part of general education, it has become to be seen a major part of many people's professional competence.

The scope and costs of the activity means that language planning and language-in-education planning have become important areas of human resources planning (eg. Kaplan & Baldauf 1997; Takala & Sajavaara 2000; Piri 2001). The development of the system of language teaching and learning requires systematic planning and evaluation. The advent of content-based language teaching (content and language integration/CLIL, bilingual education) brings in a new component, which needs to be fitted in the existing language teaching system.

In order to understand the project of language teaching and learning, we need to realize it as a complex system of activities by a number of agents, be aware of its boundaries, its central purposes and its level in a larger context. We must be aware of its various subsystems and of their interrelationships. For all this we need models to help us to describe and work out the practical consequences of different approaches.

One possible model (Takala 1979), is an adaptation of similar models proposed by Mackey (1970), Stern (1970) and Strevens (1977), Spolsky (1978) and others. All of these models seek to define what disciplines contribute to language education; what the tasks of theoreticians, applied linguists and practitioners are in language education; and what factors/major variables interact to place language learning into its sociopolitical context.

There seems to be a broad consensus that a general model for second/foreign language teaching theory and practice needs to be comprehensive (cover all possible situations), it needs to stress the principle of interaction (the interdependence of components) and the multifactor view (no single factor can predominate), and it needs to recognize that scholarship underlying language teaching is multidisciplinary (Stern, 1983, 35-50).

According to the model, formal language teaching in a school-type context takes place in a complex setting consisting of a number of levels. At level 1, the societal level, the need of language proficiency is manifested in a more or less clearly defined language teaching policy and it is recognized in the form of societal support for language teaching. At level 2, the school system level, we are concerned with the foundations of language teaching, its infrastructure: the organizational and administrative framework and the traditions of language teaching. At level 3, we are concerned with the definition of the general approach or strategy of language teaching. This is usually expressed in a curriculum (syllabus). Curriculum/syllabus construction is a demanding task in which a number of disciplines can and should be involved. This written curriculum (= the intended curriculum) is put into practice in classrooms (= the implemented curriculum), to a varying extent, at the level of teaching (Level 4). Teaching takes place in a complex setting, where many tactical decisions must be made by the teacher every day. This sets high demands on teachers'





## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

41

pedagogical subject knowledge. The curriculum/syllabus is, however, realized by the pupils at the level of learning (= the attained curriculum). An integral part of the whole system is evaluation and feedback. Evaluation data are mainly collected from the teaching and learning levels and this feedback information is used at all other levels as well. This does not mean, however, that evaluation cannot focus on other levels as well.

In the preceding sections, a systems approach to language policy planning and implementation has been advocated. This will now be related to CLIL. While it is true that innovations need not be exclusively or even mainly top-down, and immersion programmes are a good example of a bottom-up innovation, it needs to be emphasized that innovations are likely to succeed best if they are consciously and wisely adjusted to the current system. Innovations are vulnerable to many constraints and it is advisable to anticipate problems. This requires awareness of the contextual constraints.

At the *societal level*, CLIL should be properly incorporated into the national provision for foreign language teaching. There should be at least a broad legislative framework that defines the status of CLIL; the rights and obligations of the schools, teachers and pupils/students; the nature of the CLIL curriculum; the nature of examinations and certificates obtained from CLIL; the financial support available for CLIL. One crucial aspect of CLIL should also be clearly spelled out: how good should CLIL teachers' proficiency in the language of instruction be and how could that level be reliably checked?

At the *educational system level*, there should be more specific guidelines for how an infrastructure will be built to support CLIL. There should be more specific documents, prepared by groups of experts, to describe the rationale and the goals of CLIL in the country. Like any other innovation, CLIL must be related to the national context, otherwise the chances of success are diminished and the probability of problems increased. Other groups should look into the question of teacher training, teaching materials, assessment etc.

At the *strategic level*, the scientific community (applied linguists, language educators, teacher educators etc) should be involved in helping the implementation of CLIL by cooperating in the development of a specific curriculum. This would define various approaches to how content and language teaching/learning can be integrated in an efficient manner. Planning a system for CLIL teachers' basic education and in-service education would be the task of another group. Preparation and/adaptation of teaching materials should be started early enough and ways of doing this should be discussed (e.g. cooperation with domestic and foreign publishers). Testing and examinations should be dealt with by another group of specialists.

At the *tactical level*, the schools need to develop their own strategic plan for CLIL: e.g. its goals, its syllabus, its organisation and resources, resources for materials and teachers' in-service education, and assessment. The schools should also have an internal monitoring system to evaluate how the goals are fulfilled (=how the curriculum is implemented) and to facilitate further development work.

Finally, CLIL is an educational service for pupils/students. It is they who realise the curriculum through their learning endeavours. Effective learning requires teacher support but also, more fundamentally, active learner involvement. CLIL probably sets even more demands on learner self-directiveness than more traditional forms of study. For this reason, it is advisable to incorporate the learner perspective from the beginning and have a learner development component built into CLIL.

As mentioned above, *systematic evaluation* is an integral part of any organised activity. There should be adequate support for conducting periodical surveys, and more specific

studies of what goes on in classrooms, and the nature of learning in CLIL. CLIL provides a fruitful area for academic research as well. In-depth study may even provide useful input for the theory of foreign/second language learning.

In conclusion, CLIL needs to be tailor-made to fit the national/local circumstances. A systematic approach is needed to make sure that it has the requisite institutional and professional infrastructure. Cooperation between policy-makers, educational authorities, the academic community and the teaching profession is crucial for success. Learner involvement is a key element in the actual teaching-learning interaction in schools and classes. Some of these requirements are fulfilled in Finland, but a lot remains to be done. There is a need for public discussion (e.g. Virtala 2002), hopefully informed by systematic research.

### Lähteet

- Mackey, William F. 1970 Foreword to a book by Jakobovits, Leon A. Foreign language learning: A psycholinguistic analysis of the issues. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, vii-xiii.
- Piri, Riitta 2001 Suomen kieliohjelmapolitiikka. Kansallinen ja kansainvälinen toimintaympäristö. (väitöskirja). Jyväskylä: Soveltavan kielentutkimuksen keskus. Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Spolsky, Bernard 1978 Educational linguistics: An introduction. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Stern, H.H. 1970 Directions in language teaching theory and research, teoksessa: Qvistgaard, J., Schwartz, H. & Spand-Hansen, H. (toim.) AILA Third Congress Proceedings, Vol. III, Applied Linguistics: Problems and solutions. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag.
- Stern, H.H. 1983 Fundamental concepts of language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stern, H.H. 1992 Issues and options in language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Strevens, Peter 1977 New orientations in the teaching of English. London: Oxford University Press.
- Takala, Sauli 1979 Kielisuunnittelun kysymyksiä. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Takala, Sauli 1993a Language planning policy and development of FL proficiency in Finland, teoksessa: A. Huhta – K. Sajavaara – S. Takala (toim.) Language testing: New openings. Jyväskylän yliopisto, 46-54.
- Takala, Sauli 1993b Language policy and language teaching policy in Finland, teoksessa: K. Sajavaara – R.C.Lambert – S.Takala – C.A.Morfit (toim.) National foreign language planning: practices and prospects. Jyväskylän yliopisto, 54-71.
- Takala, Sauli & Sajavaara, Kari 2000 Language Policy and Planning. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 20, 129-146.
- Virtala, Anna-Liisa 2002 Vieraskielisestä opetuksesta käyty julkinen keskustelu Suomessa. Argumentointi vieraskielisen opetuksen puolesta ja sitä vastaan. Julkaisematon lisensiaattitutkimus. Soveltavan kielentutkimuksen keskus. Jyväskylän yliopisto.



CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

43



**Dieter Wolff**

## Zur Bedeutung des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts im Kontext des Mehrsprachigkeitskonzeptes der Europäischen Union

Bilingualer Sachfachunterricht existiert in verschiedenen europäischen Schulsystemen in unterschiedlichen Varianten schon seit mehr als dreißig Jahren. Das Konzept geht zurück auf ähnliche Ansätze der internationalen Schulen, der bilingualen Gymnasien und der Europaschulen. Allen diesen Ansätzen ist gemeinsam, dass eine andere als die jeweilige Landessprache benutzt wird, um ausgewählte Sachfächer (Geografie, Geschichte, Politik, Gemeinschaftskunde etc.) zu unterrichten.

Es ist wichtig festzuhalten, dass der bilinguale Sachfachunterricht in den meisten europäischen Ländern nicht als Fremdsprachenunterricht, sondern als integrierter Sachfach- und Fremdsprachenunterricht verstanden wird. Das Sachfach stellt nicht nur Inhalte für das fremdsprachliche Lernen bereit; der Unterricht erlangt vielmehr eine andere Qualität, weil die Inhalte aus unterschiedlichen kulturellen Perspektiven bearbeitet und damit Möglichkeiten für interkulturelles Lernen geschaffen werden. So zeigen auch die bisherigen Erfahrungen, dass sowohl die sprachliche als auch die Sachfachkompetenz im Rahmen dieses integrierten Konzeptes stärker gefördert wird als bei der isolierten Vermittlung von Sprachen und Sachfächern.

Die Europäische Union hat sich in ihrem Weißbuch von 1995 ein ehrgeiziges Ziel gesetzt: die Erhaltung und Förderung von Mehrsprachigkeit. Deshalb muss sie neue Wege beschreiten, um die Qualität des Fremdsprachenunterrichts in den Mitgliedsländern zu sichern und zu steigern. Die von der Kommission erhobene Forderung nach einer Verbesserung der individuellen Mehrsprachigkeit kann nicht mit einem systematischen Abbau der Angebote für das schulische Fremdsprachenlernen einhergehen, wie dies in einigen Ländern immer noch geschieht. Zwar hat das Europäische Jahr der Sprachen zu einer Sensibilisierung für sprachpolitische Fragen geführt, weder ist damit aber die Qualität des Fremdsprachenunterrichts in den Mitgliedsländern besser geworden, noch wurde die Zahl der an Schulen angebotenen Fremdsprachen im Sinne einer echten Mehrsprachigkeit vergrößert.

Das Konzept des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts ist aus einer Reihe von Gründen für die Förderung von Mehrsprachigkeit und damit auch für die Sprachenpolitik der Europäischen Union von großer Relevanz. Der wichtigste Grund ist zweifellos der, dass es sich um ein realistisches und ökonomisches Konzept handelt, das in vergleichsweise kurzer Zeit in allen Mitgliedsländern flächendeckend verwirklicht werden könnte. Natürlich benötigt ein Lehrer, der im Kontext des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts eingesetzt werden soll, eine besondere Ausbildung, die über die Ausbildung eines Sachfach- oder Fremdsprachenlehrers hinausgehen muss; solche Ausbildungskonzepte liegen jedoch bereits vor und könnten sehr schnell praktisch umgesetzt werden. Außerdem kann die Europäische Union im Rahmen ihrer Mobilitätsprogramme dafür Sorge tragen, dass Muttersprachler einer bestimmten Sprache, die ein Sachfach studiert haben, in einem anderen europäischen Land die Möglichkeit erhalten, dieses Sachfach in der Zielsprache zu unterrichten.

Das Konzept des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts ist darüber hinaus ein Konzept, das neue Chancen für die Umstrukturierung des fremdsprachlichen Angebotes an den Schulen eröffnet: Denn dadurch, dass Sachfächer in einer anderen Sprache unterrichtet werden, werden Stunden aus dem Gesamtstundenvolumen frei und können für die Vermittlung weiterer Sprachen genutzt werden. Die Tatsache, dass ein Sachfach gemeinhin nicht über die ganze Schulzeit hin unterrichtet wird, trägt dazu bei, dass mehr darüber nachgedacht wird, auch das Lernen von Fremdsprachen auf kürzere Zeiträume zu begrenzen. Besser als



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

45

traditionelle Fremdsprachenangebote trägt also der bilinguale Sachfachunterricht dazu bei, eine breitere Palette von Sprachen an den Schulen anbieten zu können und damit zu einer umfassenderen Mehrsprachigkeit zu gelangen.

Noch ein dritter politischer Grund muss hier genannt werden, der auf die europäische Dimension des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts abhebt. Anders als der traditionelle Sachfachunterricht trägt das bilinguale Lernen gerade in den gesellschaftswissenschaftlichen Fächern dazu bei, dass die Lernenden dem Sachfach aus unterschiedlichen Perspektiven begegnen. So erfolgt z. B. die Auseinandersetzung mit der Geschichte Deutschlands und Frankreichs mehrdimensional, d. h. die Geschichtsbilder beider Länder werden vermittelt. Und auch die Beschäftigung mit den politischen Systemen innerhalb der Europäischen Union wird sich nicht auf einen Blickwinkel beschränken und deshalb aus der kontrastiven Betrachtung neue Einsichten in ihre Funktionsweise gewinnen. So erbringt der bilinguale Sachfachunterricht eine Leistung, die weit über die bloße Förderung sprachlicher Fähigkeiten hinausgehend genuin auf die Entwicklung des Verständnisses für eine gemeinsame europäische Kultur hinwirkt.

Hier stellt sich nun die Frage, wo das eigentliche pädagogische Potenzial des Konzeptes zur Förderung der Qualität des Fremdsprachenunterrichts liegt. Die bisherigen empirischen Untersuchungen haben gezeigt, dass es dem traditionellen Fremdsprachenunterricht überlegen ist und dass diese Überlegenheit nicht mit irgendwelchen Selektionskriterien zusammenhängt. Der bilinguale Sachfachunterricht hat keinen elitären Charakter; er scheint in allen Lernkontexten zu funktionieren.

In den meisten empirischen Untersuchungen wird die Überlegenheit des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts darauf zurückgeführt, dass die Lerner über längere Zeit Kontakt zur Zielsprache haben. Je mehr und je länger die Schüler die fremde Sprache benutzen, desto besser lernen sie diese. Zweifellos spielt der Faktor Zeit beim Lernen einer Fremdsprache eine wichtige Rolle, jedoch ist er nicht der einzige Grund für den Lernerfolg. Das eigentliche Potenzial des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts für das Fremdsprachenlernen beschränkt sich nicht auf den Zeifaktor, sondern schließt andere ebenso wichtige Faktoren mit ein.

Am wichtigsten ist, dass der bilinguale Sachfachunterricht eine Lernumgebung bereitstellt, die es ermöglicht, moderne lerntheoretische und fremdsprachendidaktische Konzepte optimal umzusetzen:

- (1) So verbindet sich das Konzept der Authentizität sowohl mit den Inhalten des Unterrichts als auch mit der im Unterricht stattfindenden fremdsprachlichen Interaktion. Anders als im herkömmlichen Fremdsprachenunterricht wird im bilingualen Unterricht mit den authentischen Inhalten des Sachfachs gearbeitet; anders als im traditionellen Unterricht interagieren die Schüler in der Fremdsprache miteinander über reale Inhalte der Wirklichkeit. Dieser authentische Gebrauch der Fremdsprache fördert den Lernprozess in höherem Maße als im herkömmlichen Klassenzimmer, wo vorwiegend über pseudoreale oder fiktive Inhalte kommuniziert wird.
- (2) Von seiner Ausrichtung her ist der bilinguale Sachfachunterricht in hohem Maße an Lern- und Arbeitstechniken orientiert: Im Geschichts-, aber auch im Geografieunterricht werden Techniken gelernt und angewandt - z. B. das Analysieren von Grafiken, das Beschreiben von Karten oder Diagrammen, das Lesen von historischen Quellen -, die auch für das fremdsprachliche Lernen von großer Bedeutung sind und die Selbstständigkeit des Lernenden fördern. Lernerautonomie als oberstes Erziehungsziel baut in hohem Maße auf der Beherrschung von Lern- und Arbeitstechniken auf.
- (3) Die für den Sachfachunterricht relevanten Themen laden darüber hinaus zu Sozialformen des Arbeitens und Lernens ein, die unter den Begriffen Projekt- und Gruppenarbeit zusammengefasst werden und auch für das Sprachenlernen als sehr erfolgreich gelten.

Insgesamt ermöglicht der bilinguale Sachfachunterricht eine Form der gemeinsamen Arbeit



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

im Klassenzimmer, die modernen pädagogischen Prinzipien in höherem Maße entspricht als der traditionelle Unterricht. Das Klassenzimmer als Lernwerkstatt, in der Lernende und Lehrende in Projekten gemeinsam an den Lerninhalten arbeiten, das Klassenzimmer als Ort des ganzheitlichen Lernens, in dem die einzelnen Fächer nicht mehr arbiträr voneinander getrennt werden, das Klassenzimmer als Ort des autonomen Lernens, in dem die Lernenden selbstständig mit den Lerninhalten arbeiten - dieses Klassenzimmer, von dem die moderne Pädagogik bisher nur zu träumen wagte, kann im Rahmen des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts wenigstens in Ansätzen realisiert werden. Das eigentliche pädagogische Potenzial des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts liegt deshalb nicht nur in der Förderung des fremdsprachlichen Lernens, sondern vor allem auch in der Veränderung unserer verkrusteten schulischen Strukturen.

Im Rahmen eines so ausgerichteten Unterrichts wird es auch möglich sein, das manchem noch utopisch erscheinende Ziel einer Dreisprachigkeit für alle Bürger der Europäischen Union zu erreichen und damit dem derzeit noch über Sprachen abgedeckten Elitismus ein Ende zu bereiten. Denn das Klassenzimmer als Lernwerkstatt, das sich aus dem Konzept des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts ableiten lässt, wird in höherem Maße den unterschiedlichen Begabungen der einzelnen Lerner gerecht, die in den derzeitigen „mainstream“-Konzepten nicht berücksichtigt werden.

46



**Dieter Wolff**

## On the importance of CLIL in the context of the debate on plurilingual education in the European Union

Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) has existed as a pedagogical concept in European school systems for more than thirty years now. It can be traced back to similar approaches in international and European schools. Common to all approaches is the fact that a language other than the one most widely spoken is used to teach a fairly restricted number of content subjects (geography, history, politics, social sciences etc.).

It should be noted that in almost all the countries in which CLIL exists it is seen not simply as an approach to foreign language teaching but as an integrated form of teaching content and language. Not only does the content subject provide content for the language learning process; moreover, the fact that content is analysed from different cultural perspectives offers opportunities for intercultural learning and thus gives a new quality to classroom work. The experience available shows that both linguistic and content subject competence can be promoted within this integrated concept more effectively than when content and language are taught in isolation.

In the White Paper of 1995 the European Union has set itself an ambitious political goal, i.e. to maintain and to promote plurilingualism among the citizens of its member states. In order to reach this goal, the education systems in Europe have to look for new and better ways to secure and to improve the quality of foreign language teaching and learning. The political goal of promoting plurilingualism cannot be attained if member states still reduce language programmes in their school systems, for example with respect to the number of languages or lessons per week. Although the European year of languages has led to a new interest of the general public in questions of language policy, it has neither changed the quality of foreign language teaching in the member states nor the number of languages on offer.

The concept of CLIL is highly relevant for the promotion of plurilingualism and thus also for European language policy. The most important reason is that it is a realistic and economic concept which could be implemented fairly quickly in all member states. There can be no doubt that a teacher who is expected to teach in a CLIL class needs a specific kind of training which goes beyond the training of a foreign language or content subject teacher. Training programmes adapted to the needs of such teachers have already been developed, however, and could quickly be implemented. And the European Union could, in the context of the European mobility programmes, ensure that native speakers of a specific language who have studied a content subject could teach this content subject in another country in their own language.

Moreover, CLIL is a concept which opens new opportunities to restructure foreign language programmes in school: the fact that content subjects are taught in a foreign language would reduce the number of weekly hours necessary for the teaching of the language used in a content subject. These hours can be used to introduce more languages in the curriculum. Most content subjects are not taught over the whole school cycle, which contributes to reflecting more on the possibilities of reducing the teaching of a foreign language to a smaller number of years. Better than traditional foreign language teaching programmes, CLIL can contribute to offering a larger choice of languages in our schools and thus enhance plurilingualism on a broader scale.

Another political reason for introducing CLIL in the mainstream school system should be mentioned here. It is related to the European dimension in education. Working with content in another language necessarily leads to considering this content from different perspectives. The history of Germany and France, for example, will be presented in a CLIL class-

room both from a German and a French angle, and this contributes to the development of at least a bidimensional perspective. In dealing with the political systems of the European Union in politics a multiperspectival approach will be chosen, and through contrastive analysis new insights will be gained in how these systems function. Thus through CLIL learning results are obtained which go far beyond the mere promotion of linguistic abilities and have a genuine effect on the development of understanding for our joint European culture.

At this point the question arises how we can define the pedagogical potential of CLIL with respect to improving the quality of foreign language learning. Empirical research has shown that it is superior to traditional foreign language teaching and learning, but also that this superiority has nothing to do with criteria of selection. CLIL is not an elitist approach to language learning; it functions in all learning contexts and with all learners.

In most empirical research the superiority of CLIL is attributed to the greater length of exposure to the foreign language. The more and the longer students use the foreign language, the better they learn it. Undoubtedly the time factor plays an important role in learning a foreign language; it is, however, not the only reason for the CLIL learners' greater success. The pedagogical potential of CLIL is not restricted to the time factor, but includes other factors which are equally important.

The predominant among these factors is that CLIL provides a learning environment which makes it possible to realise modern learning theoretical and methodological concepts in an optimal way:

- (1) The concept of authenticity relates both to content and interaction. In contrast to traditional language teaching, learners in a CLIL classroom work with the authentic contents of the content subject; in contrast to the traditional classroom, learners interact in the foreign language about the real world around them. This authentic use of the foreign language promotes the language learning process much more than talking about the pseudoreal and fictitious contents of the traditional language classroom.
- (2) Methodologically, CLIL is strongly geared towards learning strategies and techniques: in the history or geography classroom, for example, techniques like analysing tables, maps or diagrams, or reading historical sources are applied and thus learned. These strategies are highly important for language learning as well and can lead the learner to a certain degree of independence. Learner autonomy as the highest goal in all education is based to a large extent on the mastery of learning strategies and study skills.
- (3) The topics relevant in the content and language classroom help learners understand the relevance of forms of collaboration which are unknown in the traditional classroom, for example group work or project work. These forms of social learning are regarded as being highly successful in language learning as well.

On the whole, then, CLIL creates a learning environment which corresponds much better to modern pedagogical principles than do traditional learning environments. The classroom is seen as a learning laboratory, a place in which learners and teachers jointly work in projects, a place in which the different subjects are not divided arbitrarily and taught in isolation, but are seen as a complex whole, a place of autonomous learning in which the learners deal independently with the learning content. This classroom, about which modern pedagogues only dream at present, becomes more realistic within a CLIL environment. The true pedagogical potential of CLIL does not lie in the promotion of foreign language learning alone but in the power it exerts to change our encrusted educational structures. Within such a learning environment it will also be possible to reach the goal which is defined in the 1995 White Paper and which many people still regard as utopian: trilingualism for all citizens of the European Union. The classroom as a learning laboratory – a pedagogical concept incorporated in the CLIL approach – is far better suited than mainstream pedagogical concepts to provide for the learners' different aptitudes. If CLIL were implemented in our educational systems, the idea of languages and language learning as something reserved only for an elite could quickly be abandoned.





## CHAPTER 1

### CLIL/EMILE IN EUROPE: Emergence 1958 – 2002

#### Synopsis

By tracking the development of language teaching and learning over the last five decades alongside the socio-political developments leading to European Integration, it is possible to determine the origins of what has come to be termed Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL/EMILE). In order for the member states of the European Union to adhere to its language objectives, particularly the goal for each school leaver to have competence in the mother tongue plus two community languages (MT+2) the breadth, scope and nature of existing platforms for language teaching and learning have required re-examination and adaptation. CLIL/EMILE can be considered a pedagogy which focuses on 'meaning' which contrasts to those which focus on 'form'.

Commitment to maintaining and enhancing Europe's linguistic and cultural diversity can be seen in EU treaties, European Parliament resolutions and other supra-national rhetoric stretching over the last fifty years. But language policies, rhetoric or good intent do not sustain and enrich language because the core conditions for any language to thrive and grow are need and use. The shift within the language teaching profession in this period towards exploring different ways of learning languages 'by doing' may have been in response to those linguistic realities outside the school which have a major impact on what can be achieved inside the classroom. Put bluntly, more students need more language competence. This is to be achieved without the opportunity for increased resources, either in time or personnel, which can be devoted to language teaching itself. Over the last decade in particular, the external pressure to find a solution appears to have led to the adoption of forms of CLIL/EMILE. Through appropriate delivery learners are able to have dual-focussed teaching which enhances learning of both subject content and the language itself. It is viewed as a pragmatic solution which could help reach the European Council's target of *making education and training systems a world reference by 2010 on the basis of improving quality, providing universal access and opening up to world dimensions.*

## Supra-national European Initiatives & Evolution of Language Teaching

Teaching and learning through a foreign language has a long tradition in Europe particularly in border regions and certain types of selective school or college. Exposure to this form of education has historically been linked to very specific geographical or social factors. It has generally involved a small fraction of any given school population. Integrating language and non-language content has been referred to as the *hallmark* of all forms of bilingual education.<sup>1</sup>

### 1950s

In the 1950s, dialogue in the early stages of what became the European Union focussed on not only language policies, national and supra-national, but also language teaching and learning. At the same time that there was socio-political dialogue, and statements issued on how policies should be implemented and realised, there was increasing pressure within education to re-evaluate how languages were taught, and perhaps more crucially, how languages were learnt.

In June 1958, an EEC Council Regulation<sup>2</sup> determined which languages were to be used within the European Economic Community. From this point on a clear message was sent out to the education profession, and other stakeholders, that an increasingly integrated Europe would continue to be a plurilingual entity. Integration, and the ensuing human mobility, would require that increasing numbers of ordinary people should be able to learn and use other European languages to a greater or lesser extent.

In the 1950s, the learning of foreign languages, in some educational systems, was characterised by what has been termed the 'hard option'.<sup>3</sup> This view, perpetuated a vision of how languages should be taught, and by whom they should be learnt. A predominant pedagogical focus was on mastery of linguistic structures.

Long-term commitment, rigorous learning of rules, mental discipline, memorizing word lists, grammatical rules and prose, academic, intellectual training, serious schooling, are a few of the terms used to describe the challenge of learning a foreign language. The prevailing view of this era often considered the learning of the 'classical languages' in similar terms to the learning of modern European languages.

'Since languages were deemed hard, hard in some extra-curricular way, that is, hard in their nature, then there is little incentive, and little benefit, in teachers and curriculum writers trying to make languages easier on the learner. This would defeat the purpose'.<sup>4</sup> This was an attitude that had permeated language teaching for nearly half a century and now, on reflection, is referred to as the *grammar/translation approach*. It had carried over from the teaching of classical languages into the teaching of modern languages. The key concept enabling language teaching to shift away from this approach was that of *relevance*.

Exercises such as the following, is taken from a widely-used 1950s textbook in the United Kingdom<sup>5</sup>, became increasingly challenged within education because they lacked relevance, to the lives, aspirations and often interests of the learners:

*Put into the Possessive:*  
 She's done the work of a whole day  
 The new tie of my friend Cyril  
 The army of Cyrus

For those learners able to succeed whilst studying under such 'hard option' curricula, prestige was bestowed. Both classical and foreign language curricula were almost auto-



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

51

matically assumed to be only for the 'brighter' students. Such 'high achieving students' could not only learn foreign languages, but also go on to use them in specific professions by being able to access the literature and cultural wealth of other cultures. A common dictum was 'languages for brighter students which make students brighter'.<sup>6</sup>

### 1960s

After 1958, a long period elapsed before issues pertaining to foreign language teaching and learning were given official recognition at the supra-national level. In February 1976, the Education Council<sup>7</sup> listed objectives concerning the teaching and learning of foreign languages and more specifically, promotion of language teaching outside the traditional school system.

Meanwhile, the 1960s and 1970s had witnessed a significant shift in terms of both attitudes towards languages and perceptions of how to enhance language learning. In the 1960s there was increasing acceptance that languages were important for spoken communication, and not just for reading and accessing knowledge. The prevailing view of the era was that a language could be mastered through grasping certain linguistic routines. The prevailing pedagogy was increasingly served by the new technologies of the era, notably the tape recorder and language laboratory. These were used to develop 'habit formation resulting from repeating certain patterned language drills'. This was termed the *behaviourist* or *structural approach*.

However over the decade a debate took place over the argument that *skill and knowledge of a language* might not always go smoothly with *skill and knowledge for using a language* in real-time encounters.

### 1970s

This and other similar debates led to the evolution of the *communicative approach*, a pedagogical outcome stemming from speech act theory.<sup>8</sup> The new focus on *communicative competence* had a major impact on how certain foreign languages were taught in the 1970s. It gave rise to the closely linked *situational approach*,<sup>9</sup> and then the development of what was called the *notional/functional approach*.<sup>10</sup>

One major characteristic of this decade was the sharp move away from viewing foreign languages as a 'hard option beyond the reach of most young people on the grounds that they just wouldn't have the stamina or capacity to succeed'. Now languages had become a *softer option* in which 'getting things done with words' replaced the earlier primary focus on learning linguistic structures. This shift led to two key developments. Firstly, it opened up language learning to broader sections of the school-age population. Secondly, it resulted in application of an educational approach which combined focus on learning about a foreign language with *learning by doing*, namely *learning through the use of a foreign language*. However, within the constraints of formal language teaching it was later argued that much communicative language teaching actually failed to be communicative.<sup>11</sup> The major reason was that what was deemed communicative actually often lacked authenticity, and thus relevance.

It is perhaps coincidental, but the 1970s and 1980s showed not only increasing attention being given within language teaching circles on *how we teach what we teach* but also at the supra-national level. In other words, in this period both the language teaching profession, and political interest groups, were active in examining language policies and practice within the member states.

In June 1978, the European Commission made a proposal<sup>12</sup> that sought 'to encourage teaching in schools through the medium of more than one language'. The same proposal also included comment on early language learning, mobility of pupils, and the teaching of foreign languages to less able students in addition to adults in vocational education. Most

of these issues would have run directly counter to the orientation of 'hard option' practitioners of two decades earlier. In February 1983, the European Parliament tabled a Resolution<sup>13</sup> which called for the European Commission to 'forward a new programme to improve foreign language teaching', which was followed by the European Council (Stuttgart) referring to the 'need to promote, encourage and facilitate the teaching of the languages of the Member States of the Community'.<sup>14</sup>

#### 1980s

In April 1984, the European Parliament issued a Resolution<sup>15</sup> asking for 'measures promoting the use of Community languages to be encouraged', and in June of that year the Education Council concluded that there was a need to 'give fresh impetus to the teaching and learning of foreign languages'.

Meanwhile, the foreign language teaching profession, now fully engaged in trying to achieve communicative language teaching outcomes, where possible, was beginning to talk of different types of *competence* in language learning. In other words, successful foreign language learning was not just being viewed in terms of achieving a high level of fluency, but also in relation to learning some partial competence linked to active use of the language. This revised perspective on the core value of language learning could be viewed as culminating in the 2001 production of the Common European Framework of Reference<sup>16</sup> and the European Language Portfolio.<sup>17</sup>

In April 1985 the European Council<sup>18</sup> noted the importance of 'acquisition by its citizens of a practical knowledge of other Community languages' and argued that this should be 'encouraged from an early age'. At the same time it recommended that a maximum number of pupils should learn 'two foreign languages and should have the opportunity to take part in exchanges'. In September 1985, the Education Council<sup>19</sup> again reported the need to 'take measures to promote the teaching of foreign languages'.

To teach more foreign languages to more young people, and to take into account the importance of giving these learners some skill in being able to use these languages, brings us back to the issue of implementation, *how can this be done in practice?* Although it was possible to promote and provide support for the upgrading of the foreign language teaching profession such as through specific supra-national European declarations dated 1976, 1978, 1983, 1984, 1985 and beyond, problems of practical implementation continued to exist. For example, the limited number of hours available for foreign language teaching in any national educational system or level, the costs involved in upgrading of teachers, or sophisticated curriculum development, could only have a limited impact in terms of achieving the goals and visions inherent in the supra-national discourse of the time.

Put simply, to convert the vision and rhetoric on linguistic and cultural diversity into practical action, an extra means of delivery would need to be found which would complement existing language teaching, yet enhance the scope and breadth of language learning.<sup>20</sup>

#### 1990s to the present day

One could argue that the immediacy and relevance of identifying and implementing such *extra means of delivery* can be seen in European Union documentation from 1988-2002. In 1988, The Education Council<sup>21</sup> and European Parliament<sup>22</sup> produced several statements on languages, specifically with regard to the teaching of foreign languages from an early age, and student/teacher exchanges. By definition, much introduction of foreign languages to early learners would require *combining the teaching of non-language content and language* because of the structure and nature of pre-school and primary level schooling.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

53

Programmes like Lingua,<sup>23</sup> Leonardo da Vinci<sup>24</sup> and Socrates<sup>25</sup>, amongst others, were instrumental in offering possibilities in the development of innovative language teaching. The Council of Education Ministers Resolution of 1995<sup>26</sup> states the need for citizens to 'acquire and keep up their ability to communicate in at least two community languages in addition to their mother tongue'. In so doing it follows an earlier draft resolution<sup>27</sup> mentioning, in the context of promoting innovative methods in schools and universities, *the teaching of subjects other than languages in foreign languages*. It also explicitly refers to *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)*, and links to the Maastricht Treaty of 1992, which includes comment on the significance of enhancing linguistic diversity and languages education.

The 1995 White Paper (Teaching and Learning – Towards the Learning Society) notes the significance of greater flexibility in 'the development and purposes of education and the consequent transformation of methods and tools'<sup>28</sup> and observes that it 'is desirable for foreign language learning to start at pre-school level. It seems essential for such teaching to be placed on a systematic footing in primary education, with the learning of a second community foreign language starting in secondary school. It could even be argued that secondary school pupils should study certain subjects in the first foreign language learned, as is the case in the European schools'.<sup>29</sup>

The 1996 Green Paper on mobility,<sup>30</sup> the 1997 Council of Education Ministers Resolution<sup>31</sup> on early learning and diversification of supply of languages, the European Council Presidency statement of 2000<sup>32</sup> on lifelong learning, and Council Resolution of December 2000<sup>33</sup> on the development of multilingualism, all indicate that this decade was characterized by discussion on how to harness education, and specifically the learning of languages, so as to support socio-economic goals and visions.

This 1990s also revealed increasing interest and attention being given to initiatives involving *teaching and learning through a foreign language* by professional groups in foreign languages education. Significantly this was also found amongst stakeholder groups such as parent-teacher associations, administrative bodies, non-language teaching groups, researchers and others. Within education and the teaching profession, it could be seen in increasingly *inter-disciplinary cooperation* between differing professional interest groups.

The European Commission was linked to many of these such as the first European Networks in Bilingual Education symposium in 1996,<sup>34</sup> closely followed by the founding of the EuroCLIC European Network in 1996,<sup>35</sup> the CeiLINK think tank of 1998,<sup>36</sup> a range of development project outcomes (Lingua Socrates) from 1997-2001,<sup>37</sup> including the launching of the CLIL Compendium in 2001.<sup>38</sup>

At the same time the Council of Europe was holding workshops both with and through the European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML, Graz) to examine the implications of the approach which it has referred to as 'bilingual education' and 'teaching non-language subjects through a foreign language'. This interest, corresponding closely in time to European Commission co-funded initiatives, although often differing in scope, resulted in the publication of a number of documents from 1995-1998. Some of these were published by the Council for Cultural Cooperation (CDCC)<sup>39</sup> and others by the affiliated ECML.

These reports show a trend towards replacing the long-standing term bilingual education with other alternatives such as 'learning and teaching non-language subjects through a foreign language', and the increasingly adopted 'Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)'.<sup>40</sup>



In essence, the 1990s witnessed considerable discussion, innovation and experimentation on finding *an extra means of language teaching and learning delivery* at both socio-political and educational levels.

It could be argued, and has been in some publications, that if the prevailing educational philosophy of language teaching and learning in the 1950s was one of grammar-translation, then the 1960s could be classified as behaviourism<sup>41</sup>, and the 1970s as the decade of communication. In the 1980s we witnessed an extension of our understanding of the word 'communication' particularly through the research field of what came to be termed *pragmatics*,<sup>42</sup> and more specifically through discourse analysis. Pragmatics examines the *study of the choices language users make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication*.<sup>43</sup> Both of these have helped achieve greater understanding of cognition and language use that has further developed through the 1990s. The impact of pragmatics on offering even higher quality language teaching environments, both actual and potential, is considerable. One key reason relates to learner relevance because pragmatics casts light on how people use language in practice and gives insight into social and cultural aspects of discourse.<sup>44</sup> In terms of education and pedagogy, it can be argued that the 1990s was the decade in which *teaching and learning through a foreign language* was increasingly adopted as a platform for providing the sought for *extra means of language teaching and learning delivery*.<sup>45</sup>

### Teaching Non-language Subjects Through a Foreign Language: introduction and application of diverse terms

A key issue when looking at the period 1950-2000 is to determine if 'teaching and learning through a foreign language' would entrench itself beyond a decade of increasing attention during the 1990s into a serious proposition for improving delivery of opportunities for language learning in the following years.<sup>46</sup>

Thus, if the decades of the last fifty years can be labelled according to 10 year cycles, and if the 1990s was the decade of teaching and learning through a foreign language, then is this particular approach sustainable, or is it merely another developmental post which is shortly to be superseded by an alternative?

In order to start addressing this question, it is important to examine the terms used in the field for situations in which 'a modern foreign language is used as the language of instruction in a subject other than language teaching itself'.<sup>47</sup>

In education, especially when examining trans-national trends, it can be difficult to link any specific term with any specific movement, group, or locality. Regardless, for the purposes here this is neither appropriate nor relevant. However, it is interesting to examine how the terms introduced and used have surfaced and evolved over recent decades. This is because by doing so, it is possible to exemplify how the approach itself has evolved and been adapted to the needs of the societies involved.

#### Mainstreaming

A single key issue relates to *mainstreaming* of the approach. From the 1980s onwards, the idea of teaching through a foreign language had been increasingly considered in terms of mainstream, ordinary government-supported schools, which may or may not be located in environments which have special linguistic features (such as border regions, bi- or trilingual areas). Europe has had special schools in various capital cities for many years which immersed learners so heavily into the target foreign language that most could be expected to reach high levels of bilingual fluency either during or at the end of their studies. These



schools (usually teaching through English, French, or German language) have been in existence long before the advent of what is termed the European Schools.

Both types have existed to serve very specific target groups for equally specific reasons. The idea of seeking out and defining the added value resulting from exposure to this experience of learning through a foreign language led interest groups to see if this exclusive experience could be implemented in 'ordinary' schools.

This resulted in a problem arising with terminology. The standard established term bilingual education was largely appropriate for certain rather special types of school. But its usefulness became questionable when applied to mainstream environments.

#### **Bilingual Education**

The term 'bilingual education' presupposes that the learners are, or will become, bilingual. Bilingualism is often associated with children who are brought up in bilingual families, and its use is often linked to speakers of languages belonging to linguistic minority groups who are in the process of being integrated into a wider linguistic environment.

Perhaps the easiest and least controversial way to define bilingual is to explain it in terms of equilingualism. An equilingual is a person who is equally competent in two languages. This is a popular understanding of the word bilingual and is a key issue if one is to use a term like bilingual education with the parents, young people and other stakeholders who represent the public at large.

Essentially, if the term is used in education it raises expectations that the outcome of this educational experience will be that students will attain 'balanced' or near-equal capabilities in two languages.

However, in academic and scientific circles, the word bilingual is viewed as a much more complex phenomenon, and in addition, it should be noted that there are rather polarized views on what does or does not constitute bilingualism. It is worth noting these because if a term is contentious and controversial, then its use in different contexts can lead to even greater acrimony and fractionalism. However, it should be stressed that controversy, and the debate which arises over a term as important and misunderstood as this one, is an essential part of leading towards greater understanding of the phenomenon in question. This, in turn, can ultimately benefit those involved, and the specific society at large.

Baker & Prys Jones<sup>48</sup> discuss some of the questions which have to be addressed when using the term bilingual. These are as follows; *'Is bilingualism measured by how fluent people are in two languages? Do bilinguals have to be as competent in each of their two languages as monolingual speakers? If someone is considerably less fluent in one language than the other, should that person be classed as bilingual? Are bilinguals only those persons who have more or less equal competence in both languages? Is ability in the two languages the only criterion for assessing bilingualism, or should the use of two languages also be considered? For instance, a person who speaks a second language fluently but rarely uses it may be classed as bilingual. What about the person who does not speak a second language fluently but makes regular use of it? What about a person who can understand a second language perfectly but cannot speak it? What about a person who can speak a second language but is not literate in it? Is bilingual a label people give themselves? Is bilingualism a state that changes or varies over time and according to circumstances? Can a person be more or less bilingual?'*

One single, major problem with this term has been that mainstream education could very rarely achieve high levels of bilingualism through application of the approach. Firstly, it would have been out of scope in terms of resources and other aspects of implementation. Secondly, although there is considerable methodological overlap, teaching children whose

linguistic background is in a minority non-European language was considered different to teaching 'majority linguistic children in a modern foreign language, in a situation in which they also usually receive formal teaching of the language in question and in which the pupil's mother tongue is the dominant language of the country or community in which s/he lives'.<sup>49</sup>

#### **Immersion Bilingual Education**

In the 1970s and 1980s the term immersion was increasingly adopted and used parallel with, or instead of, bilingual education. Consisting of three types, namely early total immersion, early partial immersion and late immersion, immersion bilingual education was started in Canada in 1965. This happened largely because of the emergence of a parental grassroots movement focussed on providing English-speaking children new ways to learn French.

The term immersion soon evolved into a generic 'umbrella' term covering key characteristics of the school population such as early, middle or late in terms of age, in addition to total and partial with regard to exposure to the target language.

What is important about the influence of Canadian immersion on Europe was that since the 1960s huge numbers of young people have passed through the immersion experience with a correspondingly large amount of research<sup>50</sup> carried out to validate good practice and identify malfunction. As of 1998, some 300 000 children per year were reportedly undergoing some form of immersion in the country.<sup>51</sup>

During the 1970s and 1980s as news spread of this apparently successful and rather remarkable large-scale and highly innovative language learning project from Canada to Europe, interest groups started to search for ways of replicating what was happening in Canada into schools in Europe.

What has clearly been hugely successful and popular in Canada however does not necessarily transpose easily into European contexts. For instance, there is evidence that immersion bilingual education is successful for majority language speakers much more than for those with a minority language background.<sup>52</sup> This alone would make the approach problematic as regards introduction in certain European contexts.

Briefly, the Canadian context, unique as most contexts are, allowed immersion to flourish in an environment in which certain situational and operational variables<sup>53</sup> were fairly constant. This was particularly the case in terms of pedagogical doctrine, supply of bilingual teachers, homogeneity of language starting levels and socio-economic status of children. The fact that schools could offer it but always with the proviso that participation was optional, and that it was originally a grassroots movement led by parents and some teachers are also key developmental factors. The combination of these factors allowed it to become an educational movement in its own right which resulted in teachers, parents, and young people themselves becoming convinced of its merits and thus committed to seeking quality outcomes. Such specific and positive variables in Canada meant that any application of the approach in an alternative setting would require adaptation, which might at times have been quite considerable.<sup>54</sup> This issue of adapting what appeared to work in one setting to another invited the development of alternative terms for the approach.

What is of crucial significance is that immersion bilingual education in Canada helped develop awareness of the importance of a range of methodological factors that need to be cultivated in order to achieve overall operational success. Immersion bilingual education was thus an educational approach that embraced a methodological perspective.

In Europe, in the 1970s, as in the present day, there have been examples of the language of instruction being changed with little or no regard for corresponding methodological shift. In other words, the question arose whether or not it was possible to change the language





## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

57

of instruction without adapting *how you teach what you teach*. The recognition of this issue, led to import of the terminology from Canada and yet sometimes limited import of the core ideas which have led to it being so successful in that given country. In turn, this led to interest groups moving away from the term altogether or adapting it through introduction of variants such as *language bath* or *language shower*.

Essentially, within Europe, the terms immersion bilingual education and bilingual education lost their way in the 1980s in particular because they were used to label experiments, however good, which often bore little relationship to the Canadian pioneering work. There are exceptions but these are relatively limited in scope. And as we have noted the reason for this was often due to the situational and operational variables being so different or otherwise not considered.

Recognition that Europe is not Canada, not as a whole, or even in terms of most regions, led to a seeking out for alternative terms by which to continue dialogue and experimentation of this educational approach by which children, young people and adults would learn non-language subjects through a modern foreign language. This may have been one reason why we saw a plethora of terms being adopted, introduced and fielded during the 1980s and early 1990s.

### Inter-linked Terms

In the 1980s and 1990s, particularly where older learners (often secondary level) were being introduced to the teaching and learning through a second/foreign language, a host of terms appeared in usage. Some examples are as below:

- Bilingual education
- Bilingual nursery education
- Bilingual instruction
- Content-based language teaching
- Content-based second language instruction
- Developmental bilingual education
- Dual-focussed language education
- Dual language bilingual education
- Dual majority language bilingual education
- Language maintenance bilingual education
- Extended Language Instruction
- Immersion
- Languages across the curriculum
- Language-based content teaching
- Language bath
- Language-enhanced content teaching
- Language-enriched education
- Language-enriched content instruction
- Language maintenance bilingual education
- Language shower
- Late partial bilingual programme
- Learning through an additional language
- Learning with languages

- Mainstream bilingual education
- Modern Languages Across the Curriculum
- Multilingual education
- Plurilingual education
- Sheltered language learning
- Teaching through a foreign language
- Teaching non-language subjects through a foreign language
- Transitional Bilingual Education
- Two-way bilingual education
- (Spanish/English/Finnish) as a language of instruction

Some of these are clearly variations of each other and may have originated without either foreign or heritage languages as a focal point. One example is Language Across the Curriculum that originally related to improving the skills of English as a mother tongue or second language of British school children. Some were imported from abroad, particularly the USA, where they had been exclusively used for contexts in which minority language students acquire proficiency in a dominant target language.

They may have been introduced to represent two rather different types of learning goal, namely the learning of a foreign language, or the learning of what may be termed a heritage language (generally denoting minority indigenous languages or in-migrant languages). Even though there is considerable overlap in methodologies, the teaching of, for example, French language to 12 year olds in Spain differs in situational and operational variables to the teaching of Greek language to Greek immigrants in Denmark, Arabic in France or Urdu in the United Kingdom. This difference was recognisable at a supra-national level<sup>55</sup> with the setting up of the Bureau for Lesser Used Languages (EBLUL) as an independent non-governmental organisation financed by the European Community as an institution of European interest. In addition, these differing perspectives could also be found in educational circles and soon respective terms were adopted by those interested in second or minority language teaching, and others by those involved with modern foreign languages.

### Adoption of the term CLIL/EMILE

Following initiatives in the Netherlands, supported by the European Commission, the European Network of Administrators, Researchers, and Practitioners, EuroCLIC, opted to adopt the term Content and Language Integrated Learning<sup>56</sup> (CLIL) as a generic umbrella term which would encompass any activity in which a foreign language is used as a tool in the learning of a non-language subject in which both language and the subject have a joint curricular role. The rendition of this term into French is *Enseignement d'une Matière par l'Intégration d'une Langue Étrangère (EMILE)*.<sup>57</sup> The acronym is increasingly produced simultaneously in English and French as CLIL/EMILE or vice-versa.

A core reason why term CLIL/EMILE was increasingly adopted through the 1990s was that it placed both language and non-language content on a form of continuum, without implying preference for one or the other. It was thus inclusive in explaining how a variety of methods could be used to give language and non-language subject matter a joint curricular role in the domain of mainstream education, pre-schooling and adult lifelong education. In the late 1990s, usage of the term soared as can be seen from publication references and internet site usage.

In the fourth objective of the decision by the European Parliament and Council which lead to establishing the European Year of Languages 2001, the following was stated:



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

59

*'To encourage the lifelong learning of languages, where appropriate, starting at pre-school and primary school age and related skills involving the use of languages for specific purposes, particularly in a professional context by all persons residing in the member states, whatever their age, background, social situation and previous educational experience and achievements'. In March 2000, the Presidency conclusions of the Lisbon Council argued for the modernisation of educational systems to allow development in specific fields including 'foreign' language learning. In March 2001, this was reiterated by the European Council in Stockholm in terms principally of lifelong learning, in that foreign language learning must be improved for Europe to achieve its economic, cultural and social potential'.<sup>58</sup>*

In March 2002 The Barcelona European Council<sup>59</sup> made a declaration on languages which stated that efforts should be made to 'improve the mastery of basic skills, in particular by teaching at least two foreign languages from a very early age; and establishment of a linguistic indicator by 2003 alongside development of digital literacy'. This was also the point at which the European Commission's MT+2 formula was referred to<sup>60</sup> in addition to more specific information on the linguistic indicator in which it has been suggested that students should aim to reach at least B2 on the Council of Europe's Common Framework of Reference. In discussion on the Objectives Process Mackiewicz<sup>61</sup> comments 'In the Union of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, people who do not know languages are in danger of becoming regarded as illiterate'. He also points out that new methods and ways of organising the teaching of languages, early language learning and ways of promoting the learning of languages are all included in the 2002 Barcelona Council's conclusions. In 1996 Hugo Baetens Beardsmore observed that (CLIL/EMILE) is a 'growth industry in educational linguistics' and if we consider activities in Europe between 1996-2002, we see no sign of this growth slowing. On the contrary it appears to be accelerating, especially in certain types of environment. Early language learning, whether at kindergarten, pre-school or primary, inevitably involves forms of CLIL/EMILE. Recognition, possibly through the use of the envisaged linguistic indicator, of the importance and value of partial and specific types of competence (as in 'you don't have to be a diamond to shine')<sup>62</sup> and computer literacy leading to internet usage, both establish the use of a foreign language as a tool for achieving ends other than language learning itself. In other words now in 2002, the arguments for solutions such as those offered by CLIL/EMILE are stronger than ever before because, ultimately, there is little choice unless language teaching is massively reformed and expanded, or the role of ICT takes on extraordinary proportions in terms of language teaching across populations from pre-school<sup>63</sup> through to adulthood – neither of which are likely.

It is precisely because it continues to be a *growth industry* that CLIL faces both opportunities and threats. Without wishing to resort to undue use of clichés here, we live in a fast moving period of European history, a period in which opportunities, fashions and consensus views appear and disappear; a period in which it is often those who are at the cutting edge who have the opportunity to 'seize the moment'. Yet those at the cutting edge are not always those who are best placed, equipped or able to make the best decisions, especially when growth can be read as an opportunity for commercial gain or political advantage.

Although it is possible, as we have done here, to suggest that the development of European integration can be matched with the development of language teaching and learning, in the late 1990s we have also seen other influences affect how we 'deliver and evoke' education. One of these is the growing interest in the integration of subjects or themes around subjects. Another is use of the new technologies in providing platforms for learning. Yet another is renewed interest in interactional as opposed to transactional teaching methods.

Clearly there is a prevailing view that some subjects should not be compartmentalized within a curriculum. The interest in CLIL/EMILE can be viewed as one part of this movement

because integration is often connected to the notion of relevance. Without relevance it can be hard to achieve meaningful learning. This is particularly true with learners of languages who *'far too rarely experience their linguistic skills, however limited these may be, as something relevant'*<sup>64</sup> Now that the notion of curricular integration is being actively discussed and implemented, and that the new technologies are increasingly accessible to learners, younger and older alike, there are some who view CLIL/EMILE not so much as an option, but as a pragmatic necessity for the world in which we live.

Application of this approach could, it is argued, help move towards the European Council's target of *making European education and training systems a world reference in terms of quality by the year 2010, on the basis of three fundamental principles: improving quality, providing universal access and opening up to a world dimension.*<sup>65</sup> Experience of CLIL/EMILE in Europe supports the arguments put forward in the early 1990s<sup>66</sup> whereby the approach was theoretically justified because

- Traditional methods for teaching second languages often disassociate learning from cognitive or academic development
- Language is learned most effectively for communication in meaningful, purposeful, social and academic contexts
- Integration of language and content provides a substantive basis for language teaching and learning: content can provide a motivational and cognitive basis for language learning since it is interesting and of some value to the learner
- The language of different subject areas is characterized by specific genres or registers which may be a prerequisite of specific content or to academic development in general

1 Genesee, F. 1987. *Learning through Two Languages: Studies of Immersion and Bilingual Education*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. See also Met, M. 1998. Curriculum decision-making in content-based language teaching. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (eds.) *Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and Multilingual Education* (pp.35-63) Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

2 EEC Council regulation No.1, June 1958

3 Argued by Lo Bianco 1995 in *Hard Option, Soft Option, Co-option*, Education Australia Issue 31

4 *ibid*

5 W. Stannard Allen 1959. *Living English Structure* p.17

6 Lo Bianco 1995 as above

7 Education Council, 9 February 1976, Resolution

8 Speech act theory is a theory of language as action which focuses attention on doing things with words or otherwise using language to get things done. Speech acts are linguistic expressions through which you can (for example) commit yourself to doing something (by, for example, promising), get someone else to do something (by using directives such as requests, proposals, giving orders) or actually perform some act (e.g. christening a baby, or making a formal announcement).

9 Essentially the situational approach was based on the premise that the language and activities in the language learning classroom would mirror the real world as closely as possible. You could see it as a shift from repeated drilling of a phrase like 'During the holidays of two weeks of my friend Masie' to asking, in pairs, questions like 'Excuse me, could you tell me the time'?

10 Notional/functional syllabuses were described by Wilkins, D. in the article 'Grammatical, situational and notional syllabuses'. In Brumfit, C. & Johnson, K. 1979. *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

61

- 11 See, for example, Nunan 1987:144. Communicative Language Teaching: making it work. English Language Teaching Journal 41.
- 12 European Commission 14 June 1978 Proposal
- 13 European Parliament 11 February 1983 Resolution
- 14 European Council, Stuttgart 1983
- 15 European Parliament 13 April 1984 Resolution
- 16 (EN) Cambridge University Press 2001; (FR) Editions Didier: cadre européen commun de référence:apprendre, enseigner,évaluer; (DE) Langenscheidt: Gemeinsamer europäischer Referenzrahmen für Sprachen:lernen, lehren und beurteilen.
- 17 Piloted 1998-2000, publication in separate member states ongoing 2001-2002
- 18 European Council, Milan 1985
- 19 Education Council, 27 September 1985
- 20 Discussed in Marsh, D. 2000. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): Development Potential 2000-2010, Finnish EU Presidency Conference report, Language Learning and Cross-border Cooperation, Helsinki: National Board of Education.
- 21 Education Council 1988 on 'teaching of foreign languages'
- 22 European Parliament 1988 Resolution
- 23 European Council 28 July 1989
- 24 European Parliament 6 December 1994
- 25 European Parliament 14 March 1995
- 26 Council of Education Ministers Resolution 31 March 1995
- 27 Draft Resolution, Presidency to Education Committee 6 January 1995
- 28 Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society. 1996 White Paper. European Commission p. 43.
- 29 Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society. 1996 White Paper. European Commission p. 67.
- 30 Education, Training Research. The Obstacles to Transnational Mobility Green Paper. European Commission 1996.
- 31 Council of Education Ministers Resolution 16 December 1997
- 32 Lisbon European Council Presidency Conclusions, March 2000.
- 33 Council Resolution (representatives of the Governments of the member states) 14 December 2000
- 34 Reported in 1997, Buiteveld, A. Report on the Conference on European Networks in Bilingual Education, European Platform for Dutch Education, The Hague, The symposium involved participants from 30 countries, and resulted in the founding of a European Network, EuroCLIC, in 1997.
- 35 From 1996-2002 EuroCLIC has seen exponential growth in membership. In 2002 this comprised 2000 addresses in 44 countries. There is a discernible interest by membership individuals and organisations in CLIL target languages other than English.
- 36 Marsh, D. & Marsland, B. CLIL Initiatives for the Millennium. CEILINK: University of Jyväskylä, Finland. The CEILINK Think-Tank was held in Strasbourg, 9-10 October 1998 involving 54 key professionals from 17 European countries.
- 37 A range of trans-national development projects were implemented on this field during the 1990s. BILD, DieSeLL, EuroCLIC, InterTalk, Tel2L, TL2L, (Socrates/Lingua) and VocTalk (Leonardo da Vinci)
- 38 Published as Profiling European CLIL Classrooms, Marsh, D., Maljers, A. & Hartiala, A-K., for the European Year of Languages 2001. UniCOM: University of Jyväskylä, Finland.
- 39 CDCC documents on this area include Workshop 12A (1993) Bilingual Education in Secondary Schools: Learning and teaching non-language subjects through a foreign language and a follow-up report with the same title called Workshop 12B (1996); Workshop 6B (1994) Learning to Learn Languages in Vocationally-oriented Education.

40 ECML Workshops in 1995-1998 were Bilingual Schools in Europe, Bierbaumer et al (4/1995); The Implementation of Bilingual Streams in Ordinary Schools: Process and Procedures – Problems and Solutions, Fruhauf et al. (21/1996); Aspects of Teaching Methodology in Bilingual Classes at Secondary Levels, Camilleri et al (8/1997); Redefining Formal Foreign Language Instruction for a Bilingual Environment, Hellekjaer (8/1997); Teaching Methods for Foreign Languages in Border Areas, Raasch et al. (19/1997) and Content and Language Integration in Vocational and Professional Education, Marsh et al. (20/1997)

41 As from B.F. Skinner (1930-1993)

42 See, for example, Kasper, G & Blum-Kulka, S. 1993. *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

43 Quote from Kasper, G. 1996 *Can Pragmatic Competence be Taught?* Conference paper, AAAL, March 1996, which draws on earlier work by David Crystal 1985.

44 See, for example, Piirainen-Marsh, A. 1987. *Empirical Pragmatics and Foreign Language Use*. 17th Summer School of Applied Language Studies, SOLKI: University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

45 See, for example, Kolodziejska, E & Simpson, S. (2000) *Language Across the Curriculum*, ECML, Graz, Austria, or Marsh (1999) *CLIL: Development Potential 2000-2010*. *Language Learning & Cross-border Cooperation*, EU Presidency Seminar, National Board of Education, Helsinki, Finland.

46 In December 2000 a Council Resolution stressed that to be able to 'work in a multilingual environment (is) essential to the competitiveness of the European economy'. The Council of the European Union's Resolution on the promotion of linguistic diversity and language learning on the framework of the implementation of the objectives of the European Year of Languages 2001 (Brussels 10 January 2002) includes an invitation to member states to 'take measures they deem appropriate to offer pupils, as far as possible, the opportunity to learn two, or where appropriate, more languages in addition to their mother tongues, and to promote the learning of foreign languages by others in the context of lifelong learning, taking into account the diverse needs of the target public and the importance of providing equal access to learning opportunities'. This reiterates the socio-political goals for language teaching and learning increasingly seen through the 1990s. The Resolution also comments that member states should consider how 'to promote the application of innovative pedagogical methods, in particular also through teacher training'. Hugo Baetens Beardsmore notes 'The nineties have witnessed such a breakdown of resistance and prejudice towards bilingual education in Europe that the momentum of change in classroom language provision is likely to outstrip supply. It is as if the cumulative effect of long-term research on bilingual development through schooling, together with increased media access and human mobility, have combined to revitalize the faith in alternative paths to high levels of multilingual proficiency. This mushrooming towards fundamental changes in classroom-based multilingual development reflects both an emancipation from the exemplary Canadian pioneering work on immersion, and a sophisticated adaptation of educational policy and practice to existing challenges'. Source: *Bilingual Education in Secondary Schools: learning and teaching non-language subjects through a foreign language*. Workshop 12A: Council of Europe.

47 Fruhauf, G. et al. 1996. *Teaching Content in a Foreign Language, Practice and Perspectives in European Bilingual Education*, European Platform for Dutch Education, The Hague, p.7.

48 Baker, C. Prys Jones, S. 1998:2 *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. *Multilingual Matters*: Clevedon, UK

49 See, for example, Nikula, T. (1997) *Terminological Considerations in Teaching Content through a Foreign Language in Marsh et al. Aspects of Implementing Plurilingual Education*. University of Jyväskylä, Finland; and Fruhauf, G. (1997) *Implementation of Bilingual Streams in Ordinary Schools*, ECML: Council of Europe.

50 There have been some 1 000 key studies published to date. See, for example, Genesee, F. 1987 *Learning through Two Languages*. Cambridge MA: Newbury House; or Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. 1982 *Evaluating Bilingual Education: A Canadian Case Study*. Clevedon: *Multilingual Matters*, UK.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

63

51 See Cummins, J. 1991. The politics of paranoia: reflections on the bilingual education debate. In O. Garcíá (ed.) *Bilingual Education: Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua. A. Fishman*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins 183-199. Also more recently cited in Baker, C. & Prys Jones S. 1998:49, *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, UK.

52 One early reference here is Hernandez.Chavez, E. 1984. The Inadequacy of English Immersion Education as an Educational Approach for Language Minority Students in the United States. *Studies in Immersion Education – A Collection for United States Educators*, Los Angeles, Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, 144-183. This apparent weakness of immersion bilingual education has also been taken up by others such as Baetens Beardsmore (1997), *Manipulating the Variables in Bilingual Education*, European Networks in Bilingual Education Forum, European Platform for Dutch Education, The Netherlands. p. 8-16.

53 Originally discussed in Spolsky, Green & Read 1974. *A Model for the Description, Analysis and Evaluation of Bilingual Education*. Navajo Reading Study Progress Report 23, Albuquerque, University of New Mexico as situational, operational and outcomes.

54 See, for example, Hugo Baetens Beardsmore 1993. *Bilingual Learning: Institutional Frameworks and Whole School Policies*. Language Learning for European Citizenship. Workshop 12A, Council of Europe CC-LANG (93).

55 In the European Commission, The Bureau for Lesser Used Languages (EBLUL), which was set up in 1982, is an 'independent non-governmental organisation financed by the European Community as an institution of European interest'. <http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/langmin/ebul.html>. The Mercator Information Network also exists as a result of Article 22 of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights which states that 'The Union respects cultural, religious and linguistic diversity' which, in turn led to the European Parliament adopting a series of resolutions on this issue. Within the European Commission the Directorate-General for Education and Culture deals directly with regional and minority languages in Europe, but not minority immigrant languages.

56 The term CLIL was discussed in open forums by members of the EuroCLIC Network at the 1996 Forum for Mainstream Bilingual Education, Helsinki, Finland, and then adopted by a group of specialists representing administration, research and practice in this field. Variants of the term linking content and language together had appeared in certain international publications earlier, notably in Short, D., Crandell, J. & Christian, D. (1987) *How to Integrate language and Content Instruction*, which itself was the result of a symposium at the University of California, Los Angeles which had input from a range of international academic figures. Later in 1991, the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education published *Integrating Language and Content Instruction: Strategies and Techniques* by Short, D. The reason why the EuroCLIC network representatives opted to adopt the term CLIL was that it placed both language and non-language content on a form of continuum, without implying preference for one or the other. Thus it was considered suitable as a generic term to bring together parties which were interested in the method from the point of view of either language development, or non-language subject development, or both. This term has been translated into French as follows: Enseignement d'une Matière par l'Intégration d'une Langue Etrangère (EMILE)

57 For example, Enseignement d'une Matière par l'Intégration d'une Langue Etrangère (EMILE), Fremdsprache als Unterrichts- und Arbeitssprache (FAUA), Apprendimento Linguistico Integrato – Content and Language Integrated Learning (ALI-CLIL), Aprendizaje Integrado de Conocimientos Curriculares y Lengua Extranjera (AICLE), Språk- och innehållintegrerad inläring (SPRINT).

58 Quoted from secondary source: Mackiewicz, W. 2002. Lifelong Foreign Language Learning, speech at the Spanish Presidency Language Seminar, Foreign Language Learning Needs in Education Systems, Valencia 5-7 May 2002. The European Council in Stockholm 2001 produced a report on the Concrete Future Objectives of Education and Training Systems which was a follow-up document to the Lisbon Council of 2000.

59 Barcelona European Council No:100/02 15 & 16 March 2002

60 Mackiewicz, W. 2002. as above

61 Mackiewicz, W. 2002. as above



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

62 Quote from a CLIL teacher during a research interview. In Marsh, D., Marsland, B. Stenberg, K. 2001. *Integrating Competencies for Working Life*, UniCOM: University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

63 The arguments for early language learning – if understood to involve children up to about 11 years (about the limit of the Critical Hypothesis Period) – as documented in, for example, Eurydice, *Foreign Language Teaching in Schools in Europe*, would require forms of CLIL/EMILE. The idea of teaching these age groups through a more formalist structural method is highly questionable in terms of good teaching practice. It is also questionable in terms of impact as commented on by Munoz, C. and quoted in the media as “Un estudio revela que es mejor empezar a aprender idiomas a los 11 años que a los 8” *La Vanguardia*, Barcelona, May 11, 2002: 30 Aunque adelantar la edad de enseñanza no mejora los resultados académicos, ayuda a la predisposición del alumno con el idioma. - Los niños que se inician en el estudio de una lengua extranjera a los once años obtienen mejores resultados que quienes empiezan a estudiarla a los ocho, según una investigación llevada a cabo por especialistas de la Universitat de Barcelona (UB). El estudio sugiere que adelantar la enseñanza de un idioma en la escuela no es imprescindible para su mejor conocimiento. En la actualidad, los alumnos españoles empiezan a estudiar inglés a los ocho años, cuando cursan tercero de primaria, aunque la ley de Calidad rebaja esta edad a los seis. The research findings will be published at a later date.

64 Mackiewicz, W. 2002. as above

65 Taken from Base Document of Spanish presidency language seminar, *Foreign Language Learning Needs in Education Systems*, Valencia 5-7 May 2002, referring to Barcelona Council (March 2002) on Detailed Programme of Work until 2010.

66 Snow, Met & Genesee (1992) as above

64







## CHAPTER 2

### CLIL/EMILE IN EUROPE: Dimensions

#### Synopsis

European CLIL/EMILE is multi-faceted across the whole educational spectrum from pre-school through to adult education. It is a dual-focused methodological approach that embraces both language and non-language content, focusing mainly on 'meaning'. It differs from other approaches that predominantly focus on 'form'. Thus there are as many types, as reasons, for delivery. These hinge on cultural, environmental, linguistic, non-language content and learning objectives.

It is too early to show evidence that theoretical justification for many types of CLIL/EMILE is watertight. Some types have been more researched than others but findings that are available are generally positive. In addition to research from within Europe, there is much important evidence from countries elsewhere. The rather recent introduction of the approach into mainstream education means that it will take some years for a sufficient body of research to be established. The main research issues concern types of methods, types of learner, age, level of exposure, impact on first language, choice of target language and subjects, learner and teacher competencies, quality assurance and environments. Overall, there are convincing signs that CLIL/EMILE can be successful for a broad range of learners and that small-scale applications, appropriately delivered, can be successful in achieving specific outcomes. One of the key issues is the role of CLIL/EMILE as an *enabler* – as an educational experience *that enables learners to learn how to learn both languages and other subjects*. Other methods, especially those which are experiential, set out to develop learning skills. What is distinctive about CLIL/EMILE as an enabler is the added value of learning language and subject simultaneously.

#### Reasons for European CLIL/EMILE Delivery

There are a wide variety of reasons why CLIL/EMILE is introduced across Europe from kindergarten to adult education.<sup>1</sup> These have been described in terms of *dimensions* (the major reasons) and *focuses* (the sub-reasons). There is often considerable overlap between both dimensions and focuses within any given school or curriculum. This overlap directly reflects both the interdisciplinarity of CLIL/EMILE and the extent to which it is multi-faceted. Thus, for case x, the predominant reason for introduction may be linked to learning a language. In case y, the predominant reason will be on the non-language content. However, in case z, there may be one of a number of alternative reasons such as influencing

attitudes, increasing overall learner motivation, enhancing school profile, or even changing *how we teach what we teach* in a given school.

CLIL/EMILE can act as a platform by which to achieve a range of outcomes, but there is one core characteristic which is described as follows *'the most important point to be underlined in plurilingual programmes is that the major concern is about education, not about becoming bi- or multilingual, and that the multiple language proficiency is the added value which can be obtained, at no cost to other skills and knowledge, if properly designed'* (Hugo Baetens Beardsmore).<sup>2</sup> This follows the line adopted elsewhere that if bilingual education is to take root then it *'must justify itself philosophically as education'* (Fishman).<sup>3</sup>

These arguments can be substantiated when we examine the reasons why CLIL/EMILE is implemented across Europe because whereas enhanced language development is nearly always a key factor *it is only one* in this form of *dual-focused education*.

This is a major strength and yet it is a strength that exposes the vulnerability of this approach, particularly during any experimental or introductory phases. CLIL/EMILE opens up means by which to re-think how and when we teach certain types of subject matter, and language, and this requires adopting an inter-disciplinary mindset within the educational profession.

Some of the strongest critics of this type of approach can be seen anchoring their arguments in terms of professional and cultural territorialisation. Equally, some of the strongest advocates are those that specifically want to break down certain professional and educational barriers because of *the language-enriched educational gains* that they consider attainable.

CLIL/EMILE, in some of its best practice, invariably goes beyond language teaching and learning. It has become an innovative educational approach, which is increasingly taking on a distinct European characteristic, and which carries *methodology as its hallmark*. It's introduction is essentially a *socio-pedagogical issue* because unlike commonly found top-down developments within education, the driving force for CLIL/EMILE is often at the grassroots and with socio-economic stakeholders.

Since the 1990s, Europe amongst other continents, has witnessed a knowledge revolution in education resulting mainly from increasingly widespread access to the Internet and the new technologies.<sup>4</sup> Some would argue that one effect of this on young people concerns the purposiveness of education and an increasing reluctance to postpone gratification.<sup>5</sup> Teachers and others argue that some students are no longer willing to *learn now for use later*, which is a form of deferred purpose, but prefer to *learn as you use and use as you learn* which suits the immediacy of purpose common to the times. One of the success factors reported of CLIL/EMILE is the *immediacy of purpose* which is positively acknowledged by young people.

To show the breadth of European CLIL/EMILE delivery, five major reasons, and eighteen sub-reasons, have been identified<sup>6</sup> which are linked to learning and development outcomes relating to culture, environment, language, content and learning. These are now briefly summarized below:<sup>7</sup>

### 1. The Culture Dimension

#### **Building intercultural knowledge & understanding**

There are many ways in which 'intercultural knowledge and understanding' can be learnt in schools. One problem has been related to the impact of this type of education because transforming knowledge into understanding often needs to be realised through experiential methods.<sup>8</sup>



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

67

CLIL/EMILE has been identified as one way to achieve positive results in this respect because language can be used as a means for showing similarities and differences between people of different backgrounds.

### **Developing intercultural communication skills**

The development of intercultural knowledge and understanding is closely linked to the capacity for language and use of communication skills. These skills are about how we use language in intercultural situations. One reason why this is a popular focus in CLIL/EMILE relates to individual learning styles and strategies. Put simply, some people learn effectively, or otherwise *can develop an appetite for language learning*, if given broader opportunities to *learn by doing*.

### **Learning about specific neighbouring countries/regions and/or minority groups**

In Europe there are both macro and micro integration processes running simultaneously. One involves the integration of nation states within Europe. The other involves increased contact between regions and communities. For example in the last decade some borders have changed radically which has directly impacted on the lives and aspirations of citizens. This has led to a need, in some environments, to actively teach about neighbouring countries, or, in some cases, minority groups residing within the learner's own country. CLIL/EMILE is used as a tool to facilitate this type of learning.

### **Introducing the wider cultural context**

Terms such as enculturation, acculturation, cultural adaptation and others have been used over the years to refer to a situation in which trans-migrant individuals learn to live in a different society to that of their early years or their forebears. CLIL/EMILE can be used to facilitate such processes of cultural/linguistic adaptation.

## **2. The Environment Dimension**

### **Preparing for internationalisation, specifically EU integration**

European Integration and global internationalisation have had an impact on environments ranging from those of the nation, through to regions and schools. Just as local employers may be requiring different skills now from the past, so we find that opportunities for funding, particularly from EU sources, are now increasingly available for young people. CLIL/EMILE may be used for such preparation, particularly with older learners. Indeed, the trans-national dynamic of the non-language subject content can, in turn, be used as a reason for the introduction of this approach.

### **Accessing International Certification**

Different types of certification exist throughout Europe. Some of these relate to overall educational achievement such as the International Baccalaureate. Others are more specifically linked to language competence through national organizations but offered to individuals in different countries (e.g. University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate, Alliance Francais, Goethe-Institut). Some schools prepare learners for these types of certification through CLIL/EMILE so as to make them *linguistically prepared to take up their rights*.<sup>9</sup>

### **Enhancing school profile**

Some schools have come under great pressure to adapt to socio-economic forces, both positive and negative, in recent years. This situation is sometimes complicated further in the increasing use of criteria-based evaluation systems by which the performance of schools is judged. This affects some national educational systems much more than others, but it appears to be a truism that schools are increasingly being subjected to similar *market pressures* such as those typical to the private sector. This results in schools looking for new means such as CLIL/EMILE by which to enhance their profiles.

### 3. The Language Dimension

#### Improving overall target language competence

Historically this has been one of the most common reasons for the introduction of CLIL/EMILE. It stresses language competence in general and therefore includes reading, writing, speaking and listening skills.

#### Developing oral communication skills

This is a very common aim within CLIL/EMILE where one part of overall language competence is given special importance. It may arise from the notion of having knowledge of a language, but not being able to actually use the language in real-life situations. In Europe, communication channels, from face-to-face to e-mail, have become increasingly important as mobility, both virtual and physical, has increased. Much communication, even in written form through information and communication technology modes, requires the ability to use oral language effectively.

#### Deepening awareness of both mother tongue and target language

There is a difference of opinion within certain circles, both research and educational, concerning the best conditions for learners to acquire additional languages. Equally, there is some dispute over the development of the first language in certain types of high exposure CLIL/EMILE situations. Depending on the age-range of the learners, some schools have developed language-sensitive curricula that cultivate both first and additional languages simultaneously.

#### Developing plurilingual interests and attitudes

European countries differ considerably with respect to the ability of citizens to use languages other than the mother tongue. This is a reflection of not only language policy but also attitudes towards the relevance and importance of learning languages at the grassroots. Language policies and political rhetoric may influence attitudes towards language learning, but it is also increasingly grassroots opinion that is decisive. Such opinion is often based on peoples' perception of what is advantageous for young people and their future needs. A critical factor here relates to whether people believe that European working life communication will be increasingly dominated by one single language. There is opinion that a dominant 'lingua franca' type language such as English can be used, for example, to start CLIL/EMILE, but because the *youngsters will pick English up anyway*, other languages should be learnt using this approach. *(It) builds the ability to learn other languages and this capacity is more developed in the students who have studied in two languages* (Hans-Ludwig Krechel).<sup>10</sup>

#### Introducing a target language

This focus allows a school to introduce a language in a non-formal way that is often geared towards developing interest in further study. It can be found across the whole age range, and may even involve a language that is not usually taught in the school environment.

### 4. The Content Dimension

#### Providing opportunities to study content through different perspectives

Languages, and the cultures associated with them, sometimes reveal differing world-views that can be seen in the ways in which some content is taught. One obvious example lies with how educational curricula in different countries may describe shared historical events. However, traditions in the different disciplines can lead to significantly diverse ways of



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

69

approaching and understanding similar phenomena. CLIL/EMILE enables learners to study through these different perspectives, which can lead to achieving a deeper understanding of the subject matter.

### **Accessing subject-specific target language terminology**

Some fields of learning have high-frequency international terminology that is not in the learners' first language(s). Using the target language through CLIL/EMILE helps learners to understand the subject and its core terminology. In addition to content learning, it is also linked to preparing the learners for forms of mobility.

### **Preparing for future studies and/or working life**

There are many different situations in which learners need to develop their language capabilities for future studies and/or working life. Just as opportunities exist on a scale never seen before for young people to study in different countries within Europe, so we also see much workplace recruitment emphasising the need to be able to speak different languages. This focus is particularly important in activating interest in trans-national or cross-linguistic working life.

## **5. The Learning Dimension**

### **Complementing individual learning strategies**

Specifically geared to learner-based methodologies that attempt to improve learning by giving attention to individuals' needs in terms of social and thinking skills. One broad issue here relates to the performance of boys and girls in relation to successful language learning. It has been argued that there is a gender bias in some educational systems that might actually disadvantage certain groups of boys who may then become alienated within the foreign language learning process. Although this is a controversial issue, CLIL/EMILE does provide alternative ways of approaching language learning, and if this reduces exclusion or otherwise serves mainstream learners then it is clearly advantageous. *We have evidence that it develops their analytic, reflective and hypothesizing skills and all that encourages them to become much greater risk-takers in terms of their linguistic self-confidence* (Do Coyle).<sup>11</sup>

### **Diversifying methods & forms of classroom practice**

It is obviously not necessary to change the language of instruction in order to diversify learning methods and classroom practice. However, the introduction of CLIL/EMILE, which is itself a set of methodologies, can act as a catalyst for change. In other words, its delivery can encourage careful analysis of existing methods and appropriate adaptation. What is characteristic of many CLIL/EMILE methodologies is the synergy resulting from communication orientation on the language, the content, and the interaction as it takes place within the classroom. This is because in types of dual-focused education all three of these play a pivotal role at some point or another. Recognition of the value of this type of broadly interactive methodology is one reason why teachers may adapt their methods. *This approach is much more effective than traditional foreign language teaching* (Dieter Wolff).<sup>12</sup>

### **Increasing learner motivation**

The development and nurturing of learner motivation is at the heart of all education. If CLIL/EMILE is specifically used to increase motivation then it usually involves low exposure programmes that aim to positively influence learner attitudes and self-confidence. Such programmes are often focused on providing non-threatening and supportive contexts where most or all of the learners feel comfortable with the classroom objectives. *The whole process is relaxed and natural* (Hugo Baetens Beardsmore).<sup>13</sup>

## Theoretical Justification, Concerns & Debate

### Introduction

The available evidence on forms of CLIL/EMILE needs to be evaluated in light of the many variables that are at play according to a myriad of differing types. *The final verdict is not yet in* and it will clearly take some time before a satisfactory profile of research into European CLIL/EMILE is available. There is, however, a voluminous amount of research on a wide range of differing situations which focus on learning through the medium of a second/foreign language, and an attempt will be made here to summarize a few of the key issues, some of which draw on experiences outside Europe. Others draw on examples of teaching and learning through the medium of a second/foreign language which do not resemble many forms of European CLIL/EMILE such as Canadian immersion. Although there may be substantial differences in application, there are some core methodological and theoretical issues that are very similar. At the end of the day much educational research is multi-faceted, just like classrooms, and the children in them, but there are some generalities worthy of observation and comment which interlink across contexts.

There are indications that an increasing research interest in European CLIL/EMILE is presently underway. Much anecdotal reporting, often by practitioners, or small research networks, has not been widely published. This is not to suggest that such practitioner or school-based reporting is not relevant and valid. On the contrary, it may well be so. Indeed there appears to be a wealth of experimentation, and small-scale enquiry, often in the case of monitoring contexts, action research and forms of reflective enquiry, which offer a rich source of information and data.

In recent years much available research has been rather positive about the impact of 'teaching through a second/foreign language'. It could be argued that in times gone by (when most available evidence on bilingual education was overwhelmingly negative, suggesting infamously that it would stunt intellectual agility) research was conducted for a specific socio-political agenda – such as the protection of unilingual models of education in the 1930s. If so, some might say that certain types of current CLIL/EMILE research is self-fulfilling in terms of justifying an approach which has become increasingly under the spotlight even before Joshua Fishman's famous dictum '*bilingual education is good for education*'.<sup>14</sup>

If we examine some of the strongest criticism of CLIL/EMILE, then it can be argued that the grounds for critique are not directed at the methodological potential of this approach for enriching education. Rather they may be seen to serve other less obvious purposes. One of these is the sometimes voiced view that CLIL/EMILE serves solely as a platform for strengthening the English language within the European educational systems. For instance, it has been argued that this would be to the detriment of national languages.<sup>15</sup> Some others might argue that by strengthening the English language in the curriculum through CLIL/EMILE, interest in the learning of other foreign languages diminishes.

Two important issues are raised when examining this type of argument.

Firstly, the reason for the argument may stem from political rather than research-based interests. In other words, the argument may be made for reasons that go beyond education. It is important to remember the words of Hugo Baetens Beardsmore that 'research on bilingual development has frequently revealed counter-intuitive findings'.<sup>16</sup> There are clear indicators that CLIL/EMILE is increasingly being considered as a platform for introducing and enhancing languages other than English in Europe, alongside corresponding enrichment of education in a broader sense. For example if the threat of English is used as a sound-bite in certain circles, there are other potentially stronger forces, particularly at the



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

71

grassroots, which may be saying 'my child will pick up English anyway, but I want them to be one step ahead and have another language'. Clarity of vision on the potential of CLIL/EMILE as an educational approach in its own right may be lost if it is caught up in the ongoing European lingua franca language debate. As yet there is insufficient evidence to substantiate this type of argument either way, but the debate can be both strong and based on intuition and not necessarily supported with facts. There is no a priori reason why English should be the main target language as European CLIL/EMILE develops across sectors.

Secondly, when criticism of CLIL/EMILE surfaces, it may portray a single type and ignore the variants. This type is likely to be high exposure over an extended number of years in a single language, English. These types do exist, sometimes for good or not so convincing reasons. But there are many other types of CLIL/EMILE delivery in Europe that do not fit such a category. It is these types which tend to show the innovativeness of this approach, and which have not often been subject to intensive research in the past. It is some of these types that offer the most important potential for the future because in relation to some important targets which espouse plurilingualism, *less exposure to CLIL/EMILE may be better than more.*

Finally, a caveat needs to be introduced when we consider CLIL/EMILE and research. It relates to *why* we introduce this type of methodology in a given kindergarten, school, or through, for example, distance education for adults. Is it predominantly to introduce, teach, or otherwise develop the language? Is it to teach some non-language content with language as an added value? Is it to implement a set of educational methods that are considered successful in introducing, teaching and otherwise developing both? There is little doubt from what we know about European CLIL/EMILE that much delivery is focused on, in Fishman's terms, *education and not just language.* Yet much research, from Europe or abroad, mainly Canada, focuses solely on the language dimension.<sup>17</sup>

*...there currently exist a variety of L2 instructional approaches that integrate language and content instruction and these can be characterized as falling along a continuum from language-driven to content-driven. In language-driven approaches, content is used simply as a vehicle for teaching target language structures and skills. The primary goal of these programs is language learning.... At the other end of the continuum are approaches where the content and language are equally important so that mastery of academic objectives is considered as important as the development of proficiency in the target language. Bilingual/immersion education are examples of content-driven approaches.*  
(Fred Genesee)<sup>18</sup>

This quotation is particularly revealing because it shows the tendency towards language that much research espouses, particularly that from Northern America where many applications of 'teaching through a second/foreign language' differ considerably from the European experience of CLIL/EMILE.

The publication from which this quotation derives is predominantly about the 'language' aspect of what is termed bilingual education – indeed this is why it is to be produced (2003). Here and elsewhere language is widely viewed as the predominant *raison d'être* for teaching and learning through a foreign language. But in Europe we have seen that there are reasons other than language per se which predominate<sup>19</sup> and the term, enriched education, is clearly applicable to some contexts.

Note in the quotation above the following:

1. A variety of L2 instructional approaches  
In European CLIL/EMILE some would argue that delivery is not part of L2 instruction

2. *At the other end of the continuum are approaches where the content and language are equally important* In European CLIL/EMILE 'at the other end of the continuum' the non-language content is considerably more important than the language

3. *Bilingual/immersion education are examples of content-driven approaches* CLIL/EMILE is not bilingual/immersion education per se. It is a rapidly developing dual-focussed educational approach which goes beyond what we have so often referred to as bilingual education in the past (see Chapter 1)<sup>20</sup>

In any review of research it is essential that we do not lose sight of the fact that the degree to which we can generalize findings from one situation to another is severely limited. However, some research, whether conducted in Europe or beyond, does have bearing on the validity of CLIL/EMILE.<sup>21</sup>

What follows are two quotations on key aspects of research in this field:

*In his overview of bilingual schooling William Mackey claimed that up to 3 000 variables could potentially intervene to account for the nature of the bilingual classroom. If we can accept this estimate, then it is evident that unravelling those parameters that educators can operate is a gigantic (task). Much of the sociologically oriented research in bilingual education has concentrated on macro-variables to help outline policy, while the interdisciplinary aspects of the field are still awaiting an integrated assessment of the fragmented and isolated variables, which together explain successful programmes.* (Hugo Baetens Beardsmore)<sup>22</sup>

*Bilingual education for majority language students is varied and complex as each community adopts different programmatic models and pedagogical strategies to suit its unique needs, resources and goals.* (Fred Genesee)<sup>23</sup>

This next section breaks down some key aspects of research and discussion on this area according to certain aspects of implementation:

#### **Which Methods?**

In the field of second language acquisition there is a difference between *instructed* and *naturalistic* learning situations. In addition, there are two types of knowledge considered. One is *explicit* in which learning is usually *intentional*, and the other is *implicit* where it may be *incidental*.<sup>24</sup>

CLIL/EMILE is often delivered through a form of *naturalistic* situation that allows for largely *implicit* and *incidental* learning.<sup>25</sup> *Learning out of the corner of one's eye*<sup>26</sup> where the language itself is only one part of a form of dual-focused education which takes place through authentic, meaningful and significant communication with others, is widely cited as a success factor in forms of CLIL/EMILE.<sup>27</sup>

In terms of providing a wider range of learners with opportunities for foreign language acquisition, Reber (1993) hypothesizes that 'from an evolutionary perspective, unconscious, implicit functions must have developed in man well before conscious explicit functions'.<sup>28</sup> The following observations on implicit learning are of interest when considering the reported impact of some types of naturalistic CLIL/EMILE delivery<sup>29</sup> :

- Implicit learning and memory should not be altered by the disorders that affect explicit learning and memory
- Implicit learning should be independent of age and level of development and last through time





- Acquiring knowledge implicitly should not show significant individual variation. Implicit learning processes should be very similar across the population
- Different from explicit learning processes, implicit processes should show little agreement with the results of tests of 'intelligence', such as the commonly used IQ tests.

Successful language acquisition depends on the amount and quality of input. But not all input becomes intake. If there is limited intake then there will be equally limited opportunities for output. Output is the realization of productive language skills. Reber's hypothesis has bearing on why practitioners claim that CLIL/EMILE can work well with a broad range of learners. This is sometimes cited as one reason why this approach is egalitarian in *opening the doors on languages for a broader range of learners*.<sup>30</sup>

To achieve success, specific methodologies are developed, tested and implemented. Heinz Helfrich<sup>31</sup> observes that *using a foreign language as a vehicular language requires methods, teaching styles and strategies which are neither in the traditional repertoires of foreign language teachers and not in the repertoires of non-language subject teaching* which further emphasises the innovativeness and distinct methodological qualities of types of CLIL/EMILE.

**In brief:** If below average and above average learners both benefit from exposure to implicit learning environments then CLIL/EMILE can be viewed as inclusive. If the only means for either group to learn a foreign language is through explicit, instructed, intentional settings, then this may be considered exclusive.

#### Which Learners?

*'Among the factors that recent studies have emphasized (within second language acquisition), three are of motivational importance for the CLIL teacher. The first one, an integrative orientation towards the target language group, that is a desire to learn a language in order to communicate with people of another culture who speak it. Second, pedagogical factors, such as the effects of classroom environment, instructional techniques, and the attitudes towards the language teacher and course. And third, the students' linguistic self-confidence, that is their belief to have the ability to produce results, accomplish goals or perform tasks completely, and in the case of an L2 to do all this with low levels of anxiety as well'*

(Muñoz 2002)<sup>32</sup>

*'Research in diverse settings has consistently shown that students in bilingual programs who speak a dominant societal language acquire significantly more advanced levels of functional proficiency in the L2 than students who receive conventional L2 instruction'* (Genesee 2003)<sup>33</sup>

All European students require multilingual skills, and there are no explicit findings that suggest that CLIL/EMILE might be detrimental for below average or otherwise at-risk students.<sup>34</sup> There will always be exceptions but there is little evidence to argue that some types of learner should be excluded. Anecdotal and research-based studies have shown good results being found with mixed ability classes in Europe.<sup>35</sup> In one case, not researched but reported locally, a school catering for adolescents with severe behavioural problems has used CLIL/EMILE for some years because it reportedly enhances the learning environment.<sup>36</sup>

Sometimes there is confusion over the pedagogical problems of handling classes that are heterogeneous in terms of individual language competence, but this should not be confused with which student types are likely to be beneficiaries.

*'Overall, results indicate that low academic/intellectual ability is no more a handicap in*

*bilingual education than it is in (first language) programs and, to the contrary, low performing students can experience a net benefit...'*

*...as was found in the case of students with low levels of academic ability, students with low levels of (first language) ability demonstrated the same levels of (first language) literacy development and academic achievement in immersion as similarly impaired students in (first language) programs.*

*...socio-economically disadvantaged students usually demonstrate the same level of (first language) development in immersion programs as comparable to (first language) programs<sup>37</sup>*

*... With respect to (second language) development, it has been found that economically disadvantaged immersion students generally perform better than comparable students in conventional (second language) programs on all measures of (second language) proficiency. (Fred Genesee 2003)<sup>38</sup>*

**In brief:** Forms of CLIL/EMILE suit a broad range of learners.

#### **Which Age?**

It has been argued that there exists a *critical period* in which second language acquisition best occurs, but research on this issue is far from conclusive.<sup>39</sup> This critical period hypothesis is used to argue the case that *'the younger you start the better'*. Given a naturalistic approach and quality input, early introduction to CLIL/EMILE, particularly if at low exposure, may be advantageous. What is interesting is that early language learning through non-naturalistic learning environments may offer no recognizable advantage.<sup>40</sup> It is increasingly argued that advantages can be achieved through CLIL/EMILE delivery that is fairly continuous and small-scale.

There are some types of foreign language learning approaches that focus on children's ability to remember and reproduce 'chunks of pre-fabricated' language. On the surface these can appear to be highly successful. But if considered in terms of the child *internalising learning* and being able to use a language creatively, they are of questionable value.<sup>41</sup> These should not be confused with types of CLIL/EMILE.

The following quotes are central to discussion of age:

*'the effects of age on instructed foreign language acquisition may, however, not be the same as on naturalistic language acquisition...preliminary evaluations in Europe have concluded that 'an early start does not automatically confer major advantages', and that for advantages to accrue, 'the early start factor needs to be accompanied by other factors such as quality of teaching and time for learning'. In addition, there is evidence that even when starting later, such as at secondary level, older pupils can make good progress.<sup>42</sup> (Muñoz 2002, citing Blondin et al. 1998)<sup>43</sup>*

*Early language learning is like a tree with roots. There are different ways of working up through these roots that lead to the stem of the tree. One problem with formal language instruction is that it often requires approaching the tree through a single root and this particular root may simply not suit certain types of potentially successful language learners. There are multiple ways of celebrating the language learning achievements of young children.<sup>44</sup>*

*Age is never a factor that operates on its own. It is always linked to a cluster of other factors. There is for example a difference in the impact of the 'age factor' when this is linked to 'naturalistic' contexts out of school and to 'instructional' contexts at school. In one of these contexts, the 'naturalistic' one, an early start appears to bring quicker and*



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

75

*more immediate advantages than does the other.*<sup>45</sup> (Richard Johnstone)

The argument that the level of proficiency in the child's first language has a direct influence on development of proficiency in a second language may not be a key issue in the forms of naturalistic language acquisition common to CLIL/EMILE, but may be so in instructed second language acquisition.

In other words argument that various levels of exposure to a target language though CLIL/EMILE threaten development of the first language (if this is a dominant language in the society) remains problematic.

High exposure CLIL/EMILE introduced at secondary level in academic subjects where the target language competence is either heterogenous or not sufficiently advanced can reportedly have a negative impact on learning outcomes.<sup>46</sup> But research reporting negative outcomes has been conducted in contexts where voluntary participation may be limited, such as Hong Kong. In European contexts, secondary level students are unlikely to be found in high exposure CLIL/EMILE classes learning academically demanding subjects if they do not have the pre-requisite target language competence. Research on European higher education is fairly equivocal in terms of high exposure.<sup>47</sup>

To quote Richard Johnstone<sup>48</sup> Europe needs a 'new logic for early language learning' - not so much linguistic as intercultural'. CLIL/EMILE applications with early language learners appear to provide this which can result in *languages being valued as part of the process*. This new logic is also referred to by Georges Lüdi in his 1999 report on languages education in Switzerland which is reported as follows: *The rise of English has exposed a failure to teach national languages effectively in schools. This is the finding of the recently published Lüdi Report, which was commissioned to evaluate and coordinate the teaching of foreign languages in Switzerland. The report concludes that the best way to teach languages is to expose children to them early, not as the subject of lessons but as languages of instruction.*<sup>49</sup>

Finally, ongoing work within neuroscience seeks to examine the ability to acquire and use several languages from a neurological perspective. One key research report<sup>50</sup> investigated how multiple languages are represented in the human brain and reports that *'second languages acquired in adulthood (late bilingual subjects) are spatially separated from native languages. However, when acquired during the early language acquisition stage of development, native and second languages tend to be represented in common frontal cortical areas'*. Evidence on the cortical representation and functioning of languages according to when they are acquired or otherwise learnt may be critical in gaining deeper understanding of language learning and age.

**In brief:** There is no single optimal starting age for CLIL/EMILE – it depends on the situation. Early introduction to low exposure types is now increasingly under discussion as advantageous. What is important is that any experience of early language learning be largely 'naturalistic'.

### What Exposure?

High exposure does not necessarily correlate with higher competence. It is the form, intensity, and timing of exposure that may be more important factors.<sup>51</sup> There may be *diminishing returns of extended (second language) exposure in bilingual education.*<sup>52</sup> The notion that *CLIL/EMILE is a good thing and therefore more is better* cannot be fully substantiated by available research. There is widespread opinion, sometimes supported by research, that low exposure over a longer period of time may bring substantial benefits. Achieving results depends entirely on the goals of any specific CLIL/EMILE delivery. Exposure of some 20 mins per day, amounting to about 1.5 hrs per week is considered positively in certain contexts.

**In brief:** Intensity and timing of exposure (qualitative) may be more important than accumulated time (quantitative)

#### Threat to First language?

*Students in bilingual programs who speak a dominant societal language usually develop the same levels of proficiency in all aspects of the (first language) as comparable students in programs where the (first language) is the exclusive medium of instruction....instruction in academic subjects through the medium of a (second language) does not usually impede acquisition of new academic skills and knowledge in comparison to that acquired by students receiving the same academic instruction through the medium of the (first language)... Collectively these findings make a strong case for the integrated approach to language instruction that defines bilingual education'*  
Genesee (2003)<sup>53</sup>

**In brief:** There is no available evidence which supports the view that low to medium exposure through CLIL/EMILE threatens development of the first language. It should also be noted that CLIL/EMILE frequently involves trans-linguaging whereby both the target language and the first language (majority) are actively used in the classroom. Key longitudinal research has been supported by an overview analysis (The Netherlands) which reveals that after six years of CLIL/EMILE medium exposure there is improvement in the mother tongue, Dutch, and the target language English.<sup>54</sup>

#### Which Languages?

English language does not have a monopoly as the sole target language in European CLIL/EMILE. For various reasons, the teaching of English language has often led to major innovations being tested and introduced. Some of these have consequently and positively influenced the teaching of other languages. Early interest in English as the vehicular language for CLIL/EMILE can, to some extent, be viewed in similar terms. There is evidence that successful experimentation with English may lead to further development in other languages.

One key issue here relates to the type of language that is found in the CLIL/EMILE environment. If *language is used as a tool*<sup>54</sup>, or as a *means of mediation*, it often becomes like a *virtual language*. The term virtual language has been used to describe a form of interlanguage – basically it is what is produced by a person who attempts to communicate but who does so with limited resources, or according to the influence of some special localized conditions. When a virtual language is actualised it is *characterized by adaptation and nonconformity*. This is contrasted to an actual language that implies adoption and conformity.

Henry Widdowson exemplifies such a distinction by referring to English language and the types of language that can be found, for example, in poetry. He quotes lines by Gerard Manley Hopkins in this respect:

*When will you ever, Peace, wild woodove, shy wings shut  
Your round me roaming end, and under by my boughs  
alongside e.e. Cummings  
Pity this monster manunkind  
Not.*

He points out that 'nobody would suggest that Hopkins or Cummings need English lessons'.<sup>55</sup> For practitioners and others involved with CLIL/EMILE, this is a core issue when we consider the target language(s). CLIL/EMILE rarely feeds the language as a subject to the learners – it provides a platform for learning by doing which is why some have likened it to *learning a foreign language using a similar naturalistic path that had been used to learn the first language*.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

77

He adds that:

*'Learners of a language do it all the time, whether they are learning a first or second language. Children invent new grammatical rules, coin new words, much to the delight of their parents. Pupils in school do the same thing with a foreign language, much to the exasperation of their teachers'.<sup>56</sup>*

**In brief:** English language does not have a monopoly position in European CLIL/EMILE. In higher (university level) education it appears to have become widespread especially in fields such as business but in mainstream general education, Spanish, French, German, in particular, are gaining ground as target languages. A central issue in various CLIL/EMILE delivery is often a question of what type of competence in which language(s)?

### Which Subjects?

*Cross-curricular activities are a response to the recognition that traditional subject boundaries are in many ways artificial for the purposes of teaching and learning and of the numerous tasks in adult life for which a multi-disciplinary approach is essential. UK National Curriculum, Modern Foreign Languages, 1990<sup>57</sup>*

*With respect to achievement in academic domains, such as mathematics, science, and social studies, evaluations of the progress of majority language students in bilingual programs indicate that they generally achieve the same levels of competence as comparable students in (first language) programs. Genesee (2003)<sup>58</sup>*

School subjects have been compared to *open windows on the world*, ideal for observation, developing means of interpretation, and changing personal understanding.<sup>59</sup> The preferred subjects for CLIL/EMILE have traditionally been those regarded as 'less academic', but there is also a body of opinion which increasingly argues that whatever non-language subject matter is adopted it must be *relevant* in terms of the dual-plane learning common to CLIL/EMILE. This view argues that subjects, or themes within subjects, should link into *the true contexts of the world* in terms of language and non-language topics.

**In brief:** There is considerable interest in offering CLIL/EMILE through theme-designed, modular approaches, rather than just through subjects. The reason for this appears linked to the role that CLIL/EMILE has in initiating change to traditional ways of teaching and learning. The Council of Europe reports on this area have argued that most subject matter is appropriate for CLIL/EMILE<sup>60</sup>, but any discussion on the suitability of subjects needs to be taken in respect to any given situation and age-range. The core issue here relates to the specific subject matter being of relevance, rather than the specific subject itself. For example, law might be relevant in terms of a module on European law, and not so in relation to aspects of national law.

### What Learner Competencies?

CLIL/EMILE should be viewed in terms of giving credit towards the specificity of functional domain-specific language use. Even relatively small-scale utilitarian goals of types of CLIL/EMILE should not be underestimated because they can provide learners with a narrow but firm step towards better linguistic competence through development of partial competences.<sup>61</sup> Reading and listening skills are often more advanced than speaking and writing skills even in cases of high and long exposure immersion. High exposure at early primary level can slow down literacy skills in the first language but those students who start at late primary or secondary usually shows no such lags.<sup>62</sup>

There are indications that certain transversal competencies may be achieved through CLIL/EMILE because language is a principal means of forming and handling new concepts. There is considerable interest in the possible benefits of learners being able to handle concepts in both first language and target language simultaneously.<sup>63</sup>

**In brief:** Due to the methodologies involved, types of CLIL/EMILE clearly suit the differing abilities of learners. What is of particular interest is the added value of the approach for these learners in terms of enhancing knowledge and skill.

#### **What Teacher Competencies?**

It is essential to understand that CLIL/EMILE is a pedagogy, a methodological approach which requires specific professional skills, including a high level of fluency in the target language. The competencies required depend on the type implemented.

The skill-specific scales of the Common Framework of Reference have potential for the assessment of language proficiency levels as relating to the linguistic demands of specific CLIL/EMILE types (because some types demand considerably heavier linguistic skills than others – compare for example a 15 minute ‘language shower’ for 9 year olds involving singing and games, to a 45 minute lesson on philosophy for 17 year olds).

Studies on teacher competencies at primary and secondary levels<sup>64</sup>, vocational<sup>65</sup> and higher education<sup>66</sup> all reveal that a good teacher will constantly adjust his/her linguistic skills to the complexity of the topic at hand through application of didactic skills. Many CLIL/EMILE teachers who do not have native or near-native fluency in the target language will need to adjust how they teach according to linguistic limitations. But this should not be seen as a failing on the part of such people who teach through CLIL/EMILE. On the contrary it reflects real-world linguistic demands where interlocutors constantly adjust their speech and non-verbal communication, whether in the first or second language, and with certain groups of CLIL/EMILE learners this can be a positive ‘model’ to observe and otherwise experience. Any over-emphasis on ‘language skill’ can lead us to neglect the significance of methodological skill. In addition, as has been seen in various studies, the methodological skills for CLIL/EMILE can be successfully taught through in-service or pre-service professional programmes.<sup>68</sup>



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

79

The following list outlines the 'idealised competencies' required of a CLIL/EMILE teacher who would teach cognitively demanding subjects extensively through the target language.<sup>69</sup>

BASIS OF COMPETENCY	SPECIFIC COMPETENCY REQUIRED
Language/ communication	Sufficient target language knowledge and pragmatic skill for the CLIL/EMILE type followed, so as to be a producer of comprehensible input for learners
	Sufficient knowledge of the language used by the majority of learners
	Fluency in an additional language, which may be the CLIL/EMILE target language or some other (e.g. one of particular relevance to target language native-speaker teachers as regards their personal additional-language learning experience)
Theory	Comprehension of the differences and similarities between the concepts of <i>language learning</i> and <i>language acquisition</i>
Methodology	Ability to identify linguistic difficulties (e.g. with language construction rules) resulting from first/other languages interference, or subject conceptualisation
	Ability to exploit methodologies which enhance the use of socially - and message-oriented language, thus providing optimal opportunities for learner communication through employing enriched communication strategies
	Ability to use communication/interaction methods that facilitate the understanding of meaning

BASIS OF COMPETENCY	SPECIFIC COMPETENCY REQUIRED
Methodology	Ability to identify linguistic difficulties (e.g. with language construction rules) resulting from first/ other languages interference, or subject conceptualisation
	Ability to use strategies (e.g. echoing, modelling, extension, repetition) for correction and for modelling good language usage
	Ability to identify and use dual-focussed activities which simultaneously cater for language and subject aspects
The learning environment	Ability to use different classroom settings in order to provide acquisition-rich learning environments
	Ability to work with learners of diverse linguistic/ cultural backgrounds
	Ability to devise strategies, such as those for learning languages, where learning is enhanced by peer interaction and according to principles of learner autonomy
	Knowledge of the potential of information and communication technology on CLIL/ EMILE learning environments
Materials development	Ability to adapt and exploit materials in consideration of semantic (conceptual) features of structure, as well as textual, syntactic and vocabulary features
	Ability to select complementary materials on a given topic from different media and utilise these in an integrated framework
Interdisciplinary approaches	Ability to identify the conceptual relations between different subjects with a view to making learning interlinked, relevant, easier and effective
	Ability to identify conceptual/semantic relations between the different languages active in the environment
	Ability to realise a Socratic philosophy which encourages learners to develop self-confidence and a "thirst for learning"
Assessment	Ability to develop and implement evaluation and assessment tools which complement the CLIL/ EMILE type implemented





**In brief:** Language fluency alone is not sufficient for effective CLIL/EMILE teaching. It is not necessary to assume that teachers should have native speaker or near-native speaker competence for all forms of delivery - 'you don't have to be a diamond to shine'.<sup>70</sup> But it is necessary that teachers can handle CLIL/EMILE methodologically in terms of language and non-language content and application, through use of optimal linguistic target language skills.

**Which Environments?**

Success factors reported<sup>71</sup> in relation to 'early-entry bilingual/immersion programmes in Canada', can be equally attributed to various forms of European CLIL/EMILE:

- Tapping the learner's natural language learning ability through naturalistic incidental learning contexts and satisfying needs arising from diverse learning styles
- Utilizing the learner's positive attitude towards the language(s) and culture(s)
- Providing an opportunity for extended exposure (due to having started early)

But it as has been pointed out that an *important consideration in the conceptualisation of good practice is the tension created between generalisability and context-specificity; that is to say to what extent can aspects of good practice carry across a variety of contexts and how far is good practice context-specific.*<sup>72</sup>

**In brief:** There is evidence that CLIL/EMILE can be implemented in appropriate context-specific ways in widely differing situations if the situational variables<sup>73</sup> are understood, and taken into consideration, as indicated through the breadth of case studies included in this report.

**Which Variables?**

There is no specific agreement on which of the variables bridge the gap between generalisability and context-specificity. However clarity on the following could be viewed as essential for achieving good practice<sup>7</sup>:

**The Situational Parameter**

The Institutional Environment

I. Situational Clarification

- aim and selection of a CLIL/EMILE approach
- objectives set for CLIL/EMILE courses
- realization process of aims and objectives
- flexibility of the institutional infrastructure (structures, procedures, decision-making processes)
- professional roles and inter-staff relationships/interactions

II. Action Plan

- institutional capacity
- financial resources & investment required
- materials bank/library/self-study facilities

- support systems (e.g. computer, networks, training, etc.)
- classroom facilities
- human resources
- available teaching staff
- new teacher recruitment
- use of external staff
- teacher selection strategies
- teacher development programmes
- in-service/tutor systems
- student selection
- selection procedure of in-house students
- recruitment of new students and selection procedures
- the CLIL/EMILE programme
- curriculum integration
- time-tabling
- interculturalism in the classroom
- promotion of CLIL/EMILE
- briefing students
- briefing parents
- briefing the interest groups in the wider environment
- course descriptions
- institutional ethos

### **The Operational Parameter**

Putting the CLIL/EMILE programme into practice

#### III. The CLIL/EMILE Curriculum

- choice of subjects
- objectives/targets of course subject
- course syllabus and learner > < teacher negotiation
- course outcome predictions and learner > < teacher agreements
- course approach and methodological shift
- intercultural aspects of course design
- scheduling of CLIL/EMILE subject courses
- time allocation
- CLIL/EMILE subjects > < L2 teaching
- teacher interaction & teamwork
- course materials
- availability of materials
- national & international networking
- self-made materials
- materials for self-study purposes

IV. The CLIL/EMILE Team

- professional roles, relationships, interaction and support
- subject teacher > < subject teacher
- subject teacher > < L2 teacher
- subject teacher/L2 teacher > < administration
- subject teacher/L2 teacher > < student
- role of the L2 teacher in the CLIL/EMILE context
- in-house support systems and tutoring

V. The CLIL/EMILE Teacher

- L2 competence
- professional role

VI. The CLIL/EMILE Classroom

- learning in a L2
- student > < teacher relationship
- self-directed, co-operative, and experiential learning
- supporting the learning process
- tasks, assignments, self-study
- assessment
- L2 threshold
- self-confidence
- reduced personality syndrome
- emotions
- linguistic fatigue
- group dynamics in a learner-centred bilingual environment
- intercultural dynamics

**The Outcome Parameter**

Foresight & Future

VII. Institutional/workplace feeding systems

- regional, localized opportunities for continuity
- co-operation with the local, national, and international labour market
- co-operation with foreign institutions and EU support organizations
- certification

VIII. Networking: local, national, international

- forums for sharing experience and expertise
- Network systems

IX. CLIL/EMILE Programme Results

- students' L2 and content performance assessment
- choice of L2
- new perspectives re:
- curriculum planning
- classroom practice
- institutional organization

**Quality**

*If we cannot demonstrate that the quality of CLIL/EMILE is better than less innovative forms of education, then we legitimise criticism of what we are doing.<sup>75</sup>*

Any quality assessment process needs to be integrated into a process of quality assurance. This has to be done locally and preferably linked to research findings from within the country, and from others. Such a process presupposes not only an agreed series of objectives for CLIL/EMILE and the regular assessment of achievement, but also a system of review. In a process of quality assurance it is at the review stage that the results of the assessments are usually interpreted, with the review body having the authority to add to, adjust, or delete objectives and assessment processes as necessary. A few countries in Europe nationally, or regionally/federally, carry out this sort of 'quality assessment' because often experimentation of CLIL/EMILE is relatively new. Central bodies have not yet adjusted to providing this type of service which would not only provide localised research bases for decision-making, but also a support system for ensuring that quality is achieved and maintained.<sup>76</sup>

**In brief:** Over time, local quality assurance systems will provide sufficient evidence for the implementation or otherwise of CLIL/EMILE in schools. Trans-national systems could be designed for adoption and adaptation in local contexts.

**Postscript**

There are clearly stronger arguments surfacing for rather than against the implementation of CLIL/EMILE in mainstream education. The question may arise as to why more schools (in Chapter 3: Realization, it is estimated that some 3% of schools in Europe teach through CLIL methodologies) don't implement the approach.

It can be argued that it takes time to move from 'vision' to 'practice', particularly in mainstream educational systems. In addition, CLIL/EMILE requires people in the teaching profession, especially the non-language teachers who tend to make up the majority of those involved, to undergo significant professional change in teaching through what is often, for themselves, a foreign language.

Information on the feasibility of CLIL/EMILE is only now reaching major educational blocks within Europe. Yet if one considers that publicity of the approach as applicable to mainstream education only really commenced in the mid 1990s, then it could be argued that the concept has spread rather rapidly across Europe, alongside localized, independent discussion and interest. Given the investment and time-frame involved, it could be argued that what has stemmed largely from European Commission projects and Council of Europe workshops, has embedded itself into certain types of mainstream education rather swiftly. In order for the approach to take root it is essential that some forms of structure are put in place. Some examples are discussed in the Recommendations section of this report. Such steps would ensure that the proven success and potential of CLIL/EMILE are communicated directly to educational stakeholders and gatekeepers within the nation states with specific reference to tangible outcomes and gains.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

85

1 These have been outlined in Marsh, D., Maljers, A. & Hartiala, A-K, 2001, Profiling European CLIL Classrooms, UniCOM, University of Jyväskylä, Finland. This publication was produced as a result of the Lingua supported 2000-2001 CLIL COMPENDIUM project.

2 Hugo Baetens Beardsmore (1999) *La Consolidation des Expériences en Éducation Plurilingue / Consolidating Experience in Plurilingual Education*. In Marsh, D. & Marsland, B. 1999. *CLIL Initiatives for the Millennium*, UniCOM, University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

3 Fishman, J. 1989. *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective*. p. 447. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, UK.

4 In the Scandinavian case studies rates of access to the Internet at home are about 80% and forecast to increase.

5 A concept drawn from sociology which has been used to explain youth behaviour and attitudes.

6 [www.clilcompendium.com](http://www.clilcompendium.com)

7 Adapted from Marsh, D. 2002, *Facing Change – Language Teachers as Mediators: Curricular Integration of Foreign Language Teaching*, MillenniLang, University of Lisbon, Portugal.

8 Argued by Ann Carlsson (Ericsson) Skolverket SPRINT meeting, 1998. Discussion on deferred and immediate purposes can be found in Johns, T. & Davies, F. *Text as a Vehicle for Information: The classroom use of written texts in teaching reading in a foreign language*, *Reading in a Foreign language*, Vol. 1, March 1983, pp. 1-19.

9 Quotation from InterTalk 1997. (Willy Beck), University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

10 Quotation from Intertalk 1997 (Hans-Ludwig Krechel) University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

11 Quotation from InterTalk 1997 (Do Coyle), University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

12 Quotation from InterTalk 1997. (Dieter Wolff), University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

13 Quotation from InterTalk 1997 (Hugo Baetens Beardsmore), University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

14 Fishman, J. 1976:23 *Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective*. Rowley: Newbury House

15 A recent example is from Sweden where the report *Mål I mun – ett handlingsprogram för svenska språket* (April 2002) published by a parliamentary committee (Kommittén för svenska språket), calls for new laws to ensure the primacy of Swedish language in the country. One feature of the report is the criticism it directs at CLIL/EMILE which is known as SPRINT in Swedish. It expresses some fear at the possible effects of this methodology on Swedish language. Interestingly reference to CLIL/EMILE is only in terms of high exposure cases, and criticism is directed at the lack of independent empirical research on its implementation. Ironically, whereas the report suggests the impairment of the first language, Swedish, amongst learners involved with CLIL/EMILE, it ignores the existence of factual data such as national tests in Swedish and the target language in question, which are not cited as evidence of negative impact. The report implies that CLIL/EMILE is emerging as a force which replaces foreign language teaching. Yet this author knows of no serious cases where such a proposition would be given any credence, especially considering what is known, and well documented in Sweden about the importance of appropriate parallel language teaching for ensuring success. Finally, some of the severest criticism against SPRINT is based on evidence from North American immersion education which bears little reality to most CLIL/EMILE as implemented in the Swedish context. Such reporting is thus de-contextualised and does not do justice to the types of implementation which may well be bearing success and not posing any threat to the national language in question. One commentator notes that it is indicative of a protectionist political springboard against the interventions of the EU. It is worth considering the quote by T. McArthur in *Comment: Worried about Something Else* 'that unease about language is almost always symptomatic of a larger unease' (Marshall, D. (ed.) *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, vol. 60, 1986, p.7-75.

16 Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1993. *Report to the Ministry of Education of Brunei Darussalam on the Visits to Schools and Discussions with Ministry Officials*. Bander Seri Begawan, Brunei Darussalam.

17 During the questionnaire retrieval process leading to compilation of *The CLIL Compendium*, language was not as frequent a reason for implementing CLIL/EMILE as others such

as developing intercultural understanding, influencing learner attitudes, and learning of certain types of non-language subject matter.

18 Genesee, F. 2003 (forthcoming) What do we know about bilingual education for majority language students? In Bhatia, T.K. & Ritchie, W. (eds.) Handbook of Bilingualism and Multiculturalism. London: Blackwell.

19 Marsh, D., Maljers, A. & A. Hartiala (eds.) 2001. Profiling European CLIL Classrooms. UniCOM, University of Jyväskylä.

20 See, also, The Significance of CLIL/EMILE by Hugo Baetens Beardsmore – expert statement in this report.

21 The author is particularly grateful to Fred Genesee for providing a succinct description of research findings on bilingual education for majority language students which is to be published as in Endnote 18. Some secondary sources derive from this paper in this section. In addition thanks are extended to Hugo Baetens Beardsmore for assistance in identifying CLIL/EMILE research documentation and sources.

22 Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1997. Manipulating the Variables in Bilingual education. Report on the Conference on European Networks in Bilingual Education. The European Platform for Dutch Education: The Hague.

23 Genesee, F. 2003 *ibid*.

24 See, for example, Norris, J. & Ortega, L. 2000. Effectiveness of L2 Instruction: A Research Synthesis and Quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50, 417-528.

25 It relates to the Vygotsky school of thought on 'learning being strictly dependent on interaction between individuals', and Piaget who argued that 'everything which is in our mind has necessarily passed through our hands'.

26 See, for example, Ehrman, M.E. 1996:183. *Understanding Second Language Learning Difficulties*. California: Sage.

27 See, for example, Snow, A., Met, M., & Genesee, F. 1989. A Conceptual Framework for the Integration of Language and Content in Second/Foreign Language Instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 201-218.

28 Pavesi, M. 2002. Incidental vs. Intentional Learning, Unit 5, *Second Language Acquisition for CLIL, TIE-CLIL*, Milan, Italy, citing Reber, A. (1993) *Implicit Learning and Tacit Knowledge*. NY: Oxford University Press.

29 Reber, A. 1993:88 *Implicit Learning and Tacit Knowledge*. NY: Oxford University Press, cited by Pavesi, M. 2002. *Incidental vs. Intentional Learning, Unit 5, Second Language Acquisition for CLIL, TIE-CLIL*, Milan, Italy.

30 See, for example, Marsh, D. 1997. *Approaching Bilingual Education. Aspects of Implementing Plurilingual Education*. UniCOM, University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

31 Helfrich, H. 1993. *Bilingual Education in Secondary Schools: Learning and Teaching Non-Language Subjects through a Foreign language*. Report on Workshop 12A, Council of Europe: Strasbourg. CC-LANG.

32 Muñoz, C. 2002:36. *Individual Characteristics of the Learner, Unit 5, Second Language Acquisition for CLIL, TIE-CLIL*, Milan, Italy.

33 Genesee, F. 2003, *ibid*.

34 On the contrary, mainstream exposure to CLIL/EMILE might go some way towards reducing inequities such as that noted in the Green Paper on Education, Training & Research: *Obstacles to Transnational Mobility*, which argues that the *obstacles to mobility particularly affect young people from more deprived backgrounds and the unemployed*'.

35 See, Case 17, *Mixed Ability (Sweden)* for instance and the work by Sigrid Dentler of Gothenberg University, Sweden.

36 *ibid*.

37 See, Holobow, N. Genesee, F. & Lambert, W. The effectiveness of a foreign language immersion program for children from different ethnic and social class backgrounds. Report 2, *Psycholinguistics* 12, 179-198.

38 Genesee, F. 2003, *ibid*.

39 See, for example, Birdsong, D. 1999. *Second Language Acquisition and the Critical Period Hypothesis*. Mahwah: Erlbaum The Critical Period Hypothesis (CPH) is attributed to Lenneberg 1967. It argues that between the ages of 2 and 13 years there exists a period



within which potential functional and biological linguistic development needs to be activated for normal development to occur or else capacity for language learning is diminished. It is widely argued that children are better language learners than adults. See, for example, Bialystok 1997, Singleton 2001, Age and second language acquisition, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 21, 77-89; Singleton, D. & Lengyel, Z. (eds) 1995. *The Age Factor in Second Language Acquisition*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters; and Scovel, T. 2000. A critical review of the critical period research, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 213-223.

40 See new findings by Muñoz, C. (forthcoming) University of Barcelona, Spain.

41 This is linked to the old argument about the value of 'rote-learning', and is more easily understood when considering input and intake. If input alone were sufficient then we could look at placing children in front of TV sets and have them exposed to foreign language without any need for instruction.

42 See, for example, Krashen, S., Scarcella, R. & Long, M. 1979. Age, Rate and Eventual Attainment in Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 13, 573-582.

43 Muñoz, C. 2002:36. Individual Characteristics of the Learner, Unit 5, *Second Language Acquisition for CLIL*, TIE-CLIL, Milan Italy, citing Blondin, C., Candelier, M., Edelenbos, P., Johnstone, R., Kubanek-German, A. and Taeschner, T., 1998. *Foreign Languages in Primary and Pre-School Education. A Review of Recent Research within the European Union*. Report for DG 22, European Commission.

44 Derived from speech by Richard Johnstone, Spanish EU Presidency conference, Foreign Language Learning Needs in Education Systems, Valencia, Spain. 5-7 May 2002.

45 Johnstone, R. 2002. Addressing the age-factor in learning an additional language: some implications for languages policy. Address at the, Spanish EU Presidency conference, Foreign Language Learning Needs in Education Systems, Valencia, Spain 5-7 May 2002.

46 See, for example, Nikula, T. & Marsh, D. 1997. Vieraskielinen opetuksen Tavoitteet ja Toteuttaminen, National Board of Education, Finland; and Marsh, H. W., Hau, K.T., Kong, C.K., 2000. Late Immersion and Language of Instruction in Hong Kong High Schools: Achievement growth in language and non-language subjects. *Harvard Educational Review* 70, 302-345.

47 See, for example, Vinke 1995, *English as the Medium of Instruction in Dutch Engineering Education*, Delft University Press; and Jansen, E., Ruttele M. & Vugteveen 2001. *De relatie tussen onderwijsopet en studieresultaat*. Universiteit van Amsterdam SCO-Kohnstamm instituut/ILO p.263-265.

48 As in endnote 40.

49 *Guardian Weekly*, September 1999.

50 Kim et al. 1997. Distinct cortical areas associated with native and second languages. *Nature*, Vol.388, 10 July 1997, p.171-175.

51 Genesee, F. 1987. *Learning through two languages: Studies of Immersion and Bilingual Education*. Rowley MA: Newbury House.

52 Genesee, F. 2003, *ibid*; and Marsh, D., Oksman-Rinkinen, P. and Takala, S. 1996. *Mainstream Bilingual Education in the Finnish Vocational Sector*. National Board of Education: Helsinki.

53 Genesee, F. 2003, *ibid*.

54 This has been a common metaphor in discussion of CLIL/EMILE since the early 1990s. See, for example, Räsänen, A. & Marsh, D. *Content Instruction through a Foreign Language*, Research & Fieldwork reports No.18, Continuing Education Centre, University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

55 Widdowson, H. G. 1997. EIL, ESL, EFL: global issues and local interests. *World Englishes*, Vol. 16, No.1, p.137-138.

56 Widdowson, H. G. *ibid*.

57 This document goes on to state that 'The full potential of the National Curriculum subjects will only be realised if in curriculum planning, schools seek to identify the considerable overlaps which inevitably exist in both content skills...'

58 Genesee, F. 2003, *ibid*.

59 See, for example, Bruner, J. 1971. *The Relevance of Education*. New York: W.W.Norton.

60 *Bilingual Education in Secondary schools: Learning and Teaching Non-language*

Subjects through a Foreign Language, Workshop 12A. Council of Europe CC-LANG (95)  
61 See, for example, Swain, M. 1998. Focus on Form through Conscious Reflection. In Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (eds.) Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

62 Genesee, F. 1987. Learning through Two languages: Studies of Immersion and Bilingual Education. Rowley MA: Newbury House.

63 Henry Widdowson observes that ...learners do not simply learn the actual encoded forms they are exposed to, or instructed in, but learn from the language; they go beyond the actual input to the underlying virtual resource' when describing ways of teaching the English language which are highly similar to CLIL/EMILE. He notes that *when we talk about the spread of English, it is not conventionally coded forms and meanings which are transmitted into different environments and different surroundings, and taken up and used by different people. It is not a matter of the actual language being distributed but of the virtual language being spread and in the process being variously actualised. The distribution of the actual language implies adoption and conformity. The spread of the virtual language implies adaptation and nonconformity. The two processes are quite different*'. CLIL/EMILE represents the process by which the language is actualised in conjunction with content implying nonconformity and adaptation. This is perhaps one key success factor in relation to why young people respond so well to this type of methodology. Widdowson, H. G. 1997. EIL, ESL, EFL: global issues and local interests. World Englishes, Vol. 16, No. 1, p.140.

64 Nikula, T & Marsh, D. 1997. Vieraskielinen opetuksen Tavoitteet ja Toteuttaminen (Content and Language Integrated Learning in the Primary and Secondary Sectors), Working group report 21:98, National Board of Education, Helsinki.

65 Marsh, D., Oksman-Rinkinen, P. & Takala, S. 1996. Mainstream Bilingual Education in the Finnish Vocational sector. National Board of Education, Helsinki.

66 See, for example, Klaassen, R. 2001. The International University Curriculum – Challenges in English-medium Engineering Education. Technische Universiteit Delft. See also Vinke, A. 1995. English as the Medium of Instruction in Dutch Engineering Education. Delft University Press & Räsänen, A. 2000. Learning and Teaching through English at the University of Jyväskylä, University Language Centre: Jyväskylä University Printing House; Lehtonen, T., Lönnfors, P. & Virkkunen-Fullenwider, A. 1999. Teaching through English at the University of Helsinki. Helsingin yliopisto Opintoasiainosaston julkaisuja 18: Helsinki

67 Huijbregste, I. 2000. Effecten en Didactiek van Tweetalig Voortgezet onderwijs in Nederland. Utrecht: WCC.

68 Various pre- and in-service programmes have been produced in recent years through DG EAC (Lingua and Leonardo da Vinci) such as BILD, DIESeLL, Tel2L, VocTalk, Tie-CLIL.

69 This is from a working document at the University of Jyväskylä and has previously been published in Marsh, D., Maljers, A. Marsland, B. and Stenberg, K. 2001 Integrating Competencies for Working Life, UniCOM, University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

70 Teacher quotation from Nikula, T & Marsh, D. 1997. Vieraskielisen opetuksen Tavoitteet ja Toteuttaminen (Content and Language Integrated Learning in the Primary and Secondary Sectors), Working group report 21:98, National Board of Education, Helsinki.

71 Genesee, F. 2003, *ibid*.

72 Quotation from Brewster, J. 1998: 91. Teaching Content through English, Innovation and Best Practice, Kennedy, C. (ed.) Longman: UK.

73 See, for example, Hugo Baetens Beardsmore 1997. Manipulating the Variables in Bilingual Education, report on the Conference of European Networks in Bilingual Education, The European Platform for Dutch Education: Den Haag.

74 Marsh, D. 1996. Integrating Content and Language Instruction. 1996 Mainstream Bilingual Education Forum, Helsinki – later published in Marsh, D. & Marsland, B. (eds.) 1999. Distance In-service Education for Enhancing Second Language Learning, DIESeLL, UniCOM, University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

75 Nixon, J. 2001. Kvalitet I SPRINT, Skolverket, Stockholm, Sweden.

76 Both the Netherlands, Sweden and some federal states of Germany have such systems in operation. See, for example, SPRINT – Content and language Integrated Learning in Sweden, 2000, Quality in SPRINT and SPRINT – hot eller möjlighet, produced by Skolverket, Stockholm, Sweden.





## CHAPTER 3 :

### CLIL/EMILE in Europe: Realization

#### Synopsis

Teaching through a foreign language has a long tradition in various schools and school systems throughout Europe. These have generally served special societal needs (for instance, Luxembourg) or types of learner (for instance, international schools). Teaching through a second language is also extensive in certain regions, particularly bilingual environments (for instance, Wales and Catalonia).

These types are not the focus of this chapter. Here the realization of CLIL/EMILE in Europe is described in relation to foreign language usage. Focus is on scale of activity and development, in terms of quality and/or growth, with major emphasis on significant movements in mainstream environments.

Any discussion of scale of activity requires attention to be given to the essence of CLIL/EMILE methodology, namely, that it is dual-focused on both language and non-language content. A large amount of the type of language education provided to early language learners (up to about 12 years of age) in some educational systems involves integration of language and non-language content. If a child learns a foreign language through focus on function and content, more than on form, then it can be argued that this is likely to be a form of CLIL/EMILE. By definition therefore, such types of 'language teaching' involve use of CLIL/EMILE methodologies. The difficulty in generalization stems from perceived differences in the methodologies used to teach foreign languages to early language learners in different parts of Europe.

The percentage of schools in Europe that use CLIL/EMILE to some extent has been a key discussion point with experts, and others, during the report drafting process. There is no empirical evidence available to substantiate any quantitative claim one way or the other. Some countries have comprehensive, reliable and updated data available covering all CLIL/EMILE innovations. Others have partial data, and some little to no reliable data. This issue is addressed in the recommendations.

It is estimated that, overall, some 3 % of schools in Europe teach through CLIL/EMILE methodologies. It should be stressed that the scale of activity needs to be considered in terms of exposure which may range from 5 – 100%.

In the last ten years, there has been a rapid growth in some countries. Activity and development is often directly linked to the extent to which schools, or regions, are autonomous. However, both centralized (for instance, Austria and France), and more de-centralized

systems (for instance, Finland and the Netherlands) may enable CLIL/EMILE to be realized.

### Pre-school & Primary

Statistics are particularly hard to obtain on kindergarten and pre-schooling. There are cases where kindergartens prepare children for CLIL/EMILE at primary through various types of 'language encounter' in Finland. The percentage of such facilities is estimated at about 0.5%. Although there is much discussion about possible merits of the approach at this level, which suggests a possible increase in activity, substantiation remains problematic.

At primary level there are systemized approaches involving all schools in Luxembourg based on citizens becoming trilingual (Letzeburgesch, German and French). German is introduced as a foreign language in the first year. This swiftly replaces Letzeburgesch as medium of instruction until it becomes the major vehicular language at the end of primary schooling. German, then, is the exclusive language for content learning. French as a language is introduced in Grade 2 of primary school and used as a vehicular language in secondary education.

In Finland there has been interest shown in CLIL/EMILE at primary level. Recent figures are not available but in 1996 about 3.5% of all schools were reported as using the approach, and projectile figures indicated growth for 1996-1999.

In Germany there is one particular initiative which links minority and foreign languages in Berlin. This involves 3 500 learners which at both primary and secondary levels and 9 target languages of which 6 are community languages as described in Case Profile 4.

In Spain, as in other regions, there are various initiatives being conducted that are often project-based. In the Basque country up to 30 % of the public primary schools offer small-scale CLIL/EMILE in English within a framework of trilingual education. In Catalonia, project ORATOR 1999-2004 has developed CLIL/EMILE in 8 schools involving some 650 students. The LINGUAPAX project involves 5 schools and some 300 students. The total number of students experiencing trilingual education in Catalonia is about 5 500. Finally, there is the MECD/British Council project in Madrid which started in 1996 and now involves teaching through English in 42 mainstream schools and some 10 800 pupils.

In Italy a large-scale project, ALI CLIL (Lombardia), is currently active. Starting in 2001 this involves both primary and secondary sector schools (some 1 100 pupils in 30 schools). Receiving support from Socrates/Lingua and reported in Case Profile 5, the target languages are English, French, German and Spanish.

Trilingual education experiments in Catalonia (15-20 schools) and the Basque country (300 schools), involve Castilian and either Catalan or Basque, and a foreign language, which is usually English or French. One or two content subjects are usually offered through the foreign language. The Orator Project (1999-2004) initiated by the Catalan Department of Education offers schools the possibility of implementing CLIL/EMILE for two years. As of 2002, it is reported that there are 8 primary schools active involving some 650 pupils. The Linguapax project launched in 1991 involves 5 primary schools (around 300 pupils). English and French are the main target languages.

In Estonia about 330 pupils are currently undergoing an immersion pilot project which both aims at integrating minority language speakers and introducing a foreign language. This is described as Case Profile 11.

In Austria there is a move underway to introduce language learning in the whole primary sector. To allow this to happen, one option is to use forms of CLIL/EMILE. A localized example is in Salzburg where some 1 500 pupils in 15 schools experience the approach in 'language showers' through English and French. This is described in Case Profile 2.

In Belgium recent developments in Wallonia, following the educational modifications



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

91

introduced in 1998, are having an impact on general education. 28 schools have permission to use an alternative language for part of their education. 21 have opted for Dutch as a target language, 5 through English, and 2 through German.

In Hungary it was reported (2000) that there are 7 schools teaching through English and 9 schools teaching through German.

Denmark, Ireland, Greece, Portugal, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands are reported to have very little CLIL/EMILE at primary level. In Scotland, for example, there is one high-profile primary school (Aberdeen) that teaches through French.

The increasing number of schools which cooperate within, for instance, Comenius 1, are almost certainly experiencing some form of CLIL/EMILE. Little is known about the didactics and outcomes of these projects in terms of language development. But, it can be expected that languages development is an added value.

### Secondary

In 1992, following grassroots pressure, the Austrian Ministry of Education launched a 10 year national CLIL/EMILE project 'English as medium of instruction' for special topic related projects and cross curricular activities. Increased efforts were also made to integrate school visits and exchanges into the curriculum. The project successfully provided support and is being reduced in scale because the schools are increasingly considered able to continue with this approach after the initial start-up period. Before the 1990s there were about 8 bilingual schools in the country. In 1999, there were reportedly 54 Hauptschule (10-14 years, 4,1 % of total number of this type of school), 56 Allgemeinbildende Höhere Schule (10-18 years, 26,8 %), and 59 Berufsbildende höhere Schule (14-19 years, 31,9 %). In 2002 there are estimated to be about 200-250 secondary schools involved with exposure rates of between 10 – 100%. The target language is predominantly English with some 3% in French.

In Bulgaria there are about 100 special language schools that need to offer at least 3 subjects through English to gain specialized school recognition. Students follow a preparatory year in the target language before entering CLIL/EMILE streams. There is a broad network of schools that teach through a foreign language which may be English, French, German, Spanish, Russian, or Italian.

In 1996 it was reported that Estonia had some 30 'foreign language' schools with some subjects taught through a foreign language. English was the predominant language, followed by German and Swedish.

In France, bilingual sections were set up as a result of the 1963 agreement between France and Germany. More significant in terms of mainstreaming was the introduction of the sections européennes in 1992. There are some 2 508 sections européennes resulting from centralized action allowing for introduction of the approach in 1992. Target languages are German, English, Italian and Spanish (in addition to some provision in Dutch, Russian and Chinese). A rapid increase of about 50% was seen between 2000-2002. Due to the rapid extension, and political interest in mainstreaming, this is described in Case Profile 1.

In the Czech Republic, the Ministry of Education started a network of upper secondary schools with bilingual sections in 1990. This originally involved 4 schools, targeting French. It later expanded to 12 schools in total with 5 teaching through French, 3 through German, 2 through Spanish, 1 through Italian and English respectively. All of these schools cooperate with a foreign partner. Intensive teaching of the language in the first two years is followed by CLIL/EMILE in the third year, which may involve some 5 subjects.

In Finland, a 1989 initiative by a working party of the Ministry of Education recommended

that teaching through a foreign language be available in Finnish schools. In this decentralized environment, figures available from 1996 show that about 5 % of mainstream schools offer some sort of CLIL/EMILE. A figure of 14% of all lower secondary, and 24% of upper secondary show the extent to which the approach became increasingly popular at the higher level of education. Recent (1999) directives on teacher linguistic competences may have reduced the projectile figures from 1996 which estimated delivery peaking in this sector at about 20% overall.

In Germany data from 2000 reports that there are 307 CLIL/EMILE secondary schools of which 216 teach through English, and 77 through French.

In Italy the Liceo Linguistico Europeo, which started in 1992/1993 with some 9 schools had expanded to 95 schools by 1998. This complements the Liceo Classico Europeo that has been operational since 1992 in 17 institutions. There have been numerous small-scale activities and in addition to ALI-CLIL, reported above which also involves secondary level students, there is a large-scale CLIL Science (Piemont) project currently active. Involving about 1 200 pupils in 40 schools, the project received support from Socrates/Lingua and is reported as Case Profile 7. The target languages are English, French and German.

In Luxembourg, French is introduced as the language of instruction in secondary schools. Maths and French language are taught through French and the other subjects through German in the first 3 years. German is gradually replaced by French through the longer secondary school programme until it remains as a subject only.

In 2000, Hungary had 39 schools (secondary academic) of which 17 teach through English, 11 through German and 6 through French. Italian, Russian and Spanish are used in one school each.

CLIL/EMILE was introduced in the Netherlands in 1989. In 2002 there are 44 secondary schools using English and 1 through German. The scales are high throughout, at 50 % of the curriculum.

In Spain small-scale initiatives vary from region to region. Many of the privately-funded secondary schools offer CLIL/EMILE, mainly through English. For example, there are estimated to be some 15-20 schools offering trilingual education in Catalonia alone. Between 1998-1999 a large pilot experiment involving 260 Catalan schools (and some 52 000 students) was started whereby English was taught using an inter-disciplinary content-based approach.

In Sweden, grassroots interest in the early 1980s, followed by government support through change of educational directives in 1992, allowed the scale of CLIL/EMILE to increase. In 1999 2 % of lower secondary schools, 4 % of all 4 compulsory schools, and 20 % of upper secondary schools were reportedly using the approach.

In the United Kingdom, The Nuffield Enquiry of 2000 made a strong recommendation for provision of CLIL/EMILE. The number of recently developed Language Colleges is estimated to be about 350-400 (2000), and it is possible that these schools will be the location for greater delivery of CLIL/EMILE in the future. There is also a trend towards specialisation where all schools should adopt one of about five strands – of which languages is one. This may also have a knock-on effect on CLIL/EMILE development in the future. As of now, some 40 secondary schools are reported to have introduced CLIL/EMILE.

There is no information presently available to suggest that there is much significant activity in other countries.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

93

### Vocational

In Austria, which has 59 Berufsbildende höhere Schule (14-19 years, 31,9 % of total of this school type), there is speculation that CLIL/EMILE will increasingly develop in this sector.

In Finland, figures from 1996 found 45 % of colleges responding to a questionnaire survey (response rate 56.8 %) were actively involved with CLIL/EMILE delivery. As with Austria, existing levels are considered likely to continue if not increase. In Finland, the predominant target language is English.

In Hungary data (2000) show that there are 12 secondary vocational schools, 6 teaching through English, 5 through German, and 1 through French.

In the Netherlands a consortium of some 23 vocational colleges offer international business streams through English. This is likely to expand.

In Spain there are a few state initiatives that are small-scale in mainstream education. Some private schools offer CLIL/EMILE on courses such as accounting, computing, and commerce.

There is no information presently available to suggest that there is much significant activity in other countries.





CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION





## CHAPTER 4

### CASE 1

#### Experimental to Mainstream

##### Synopsis

It is argued that the type of CLIL/EMILE introduced over the last ten years through the sections européennes is considered both 'egalitarian' and worthwhile in terms of acting as a catalyst for introducing culture and inter-disciplinary teaching into French classrooms (see, for example, statement by Jack Lang, Minister of Education, *Les 10 ans des sections européennes*, 12 March 2002). It remains to be seen if the political will is available to take the experience of the sections européennes deeper into French mainstream education but it is very significant that CLIL/EMILE is seen as a means for introducing both educational change (as in greater inter-disciplinary teaching) and as a vector by which to steer more young people towards foreign language learning.

##### Background & Contact Details

Country	France
Case Name	From Experimental to Mainstream
Target Language(s)	Predominantly English, German, Spanish and Italian. Also Russian, Dutch and Chinese.
Sector	General Mainstream Education
Level	Upper Secondary and Vocational
Scale	2 508 sections européennes, including 134 in vocational training schools. (2001-2002) There has been an increase of 50% from 2000-2002.
Gender Ratio	Unknown, but should be no different from that of corresponding secondary classes
Contact Person	Patricia Bertaux
Address	IUFM de Lorraine 5 rue Paul Richard 54320 – Maxéville France
Phone	+33 (0) 3 83 17 68 68
Fax	+33 (0) 3 83 17 68 69
E-Mail	<a href="mailto:patricia.bertaux@lorraine.iufm.fr">patricia.bertaux@lorraine.iufm.fr</a>

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

In France, there are different types of CLIL/EMILE delivery in both public and private schools. The target language is used for up to 50% of the curriculum in *lycées internationaux*, and also in some primary schools where regional languages are maintained. CLIL/EMILE is also often offered in French schools abroad (*établissements français à l'étranger*), particularly in Germany. The most interesting adaptation of CLIL, however, takes place in *sections européennes* (SE).

The experiment began ten years ago, following an initiative by the Ministry of Education. The government decree implementing these classes, published in summer 1992, allowed schools a certain amount of independence: schools volunteered to open an SE in the language of their choice, corresponding to their school projects, resources and local considerations.

The SE operate with two main objectives:

- enhancing language teaching, often in response to parents' and learners' wishes
- building up international exchanges for these schools, to further European citizenship and enhance knowledge of other cultures while teaching according to the common curricular framework of upper secondary education.

(NB: The full official title is "Sections européennes et orientales", in order to accommodate similar experiments in other languages, such as Chinese, and other less widely used and less taught languages.

- School / Location Environment

Monolingual • Mostly  
 Bilingual •  
 Multilingual •

What should be noted is that SE are in ordinary mainstream schools. In these schools courses lead to the same baccalaureate as with other secondary classes, and are not necessarily linked with, for example, geographical proximity to another country, or local language particularities, even if these may of course play a role in the decision to offer a SE.

- Time-Frame

In operation since 1992, the SE have just celebrated their 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Most importantly, what started out as a limited experiment has constantly gathered momentum (50% increase in the last two years), and is now being extended to vocational training (started in 2000). This expansion is forecast to continue, for different reasons (see below), and what was sometimes criticised as an elitist tendency (the creation of such specialist classes led to suspicions of an opportunity for academic streaming) is in fact spreading to all types of schools, and is rapidly becoming even more egalitarian "...des voies d'excellence généralisables..." While some aspects of these classes will change at some point, they in fact prefigure many changes taking place, or soon to take place, in the French secondary educational system as a whole. Consequently, expansion should continue in coming years. CLIL/EMILE is thus viewed as one aspect of a large-scale education overhaul.

- Scale

The present scale in 2 508 schools is estimated to involve c. 8 000 learners, but present estimates of scale after expansion are not available.

- Target Language(s)

English, German, Spanish and Italian; and also others such as Russian, Dutch and Chinese.



- Target Age Range  
15-20 years

- Exposure
 

Low (5-15% of teaching time)	• Yes
Medium (15-50% of teaching time)	• Yes
High (over 50% of teaching time)	•

At first, enhanced preparatory language teaching is offered in the *Collège* (lower secondary school), with 2 added hours of language teaching (alongside introduction of interdisciplinary CLIL/EMILE work) per week. Once in *Lycée*, part of one or more subjects is taught through CLIL/EMILE every week during the three years leading up to the baccalaureate.

- Subject Field

Any subject other than French language and Philosophy (which is only taught in the final year before the baccalaureate) may be taught through CLIL/EMILE. History and Geography, linked into one subject in France, are the subjects most frequently taught, but many classes are taught (Sciences, Maths, Music, Fine Arts and Physical Education) through CLIL/EMILE. This list is not exhaustive.

Subjects chosen may be linked with a particular project, but in general, the choice is made, at least initially, according to personnel resources: *lycée* teachers are qualified to teach only one subject, so the choice of subject is often subsumed to the languages practised by the teachers volunteering for the SE.

- Inter-disciplinarity

At present, inter-disciplinarity mainly concerns co-operation between subject and language teachers. The latter helps the subject teacher in the field of language, and helps provide the necessary language acquisition in the language class.

Inter-disciplinarity is at the moment limited, because the curricular content of CLIL/EMILE in SE is identical to that in other classes leading up to the baccalaureate, which is subject-specific in its contents. However, with the recent introduction of various forms of interdisciplinary work in secondary education in France (for example, guided project work in *lycées*), and the reinforcement of language learning under way (see below), it is possible to predict a growing move towards greater inter-disciplinarity in coming years. Again this is linked to both good practice in CLIL/EMILE and modernisation of the educational system.

- Course or Modular

As French education (defined by the final assessment of the baccalaureate) still has a mainly course-based tilt – apart from recent implementation of interdisciplinary work – there is little thematic or modular teaching.

However, one very interesting aspect of CLIL/EMILE in SE is that, since only part of the curriculum of a particular subject is taught through the L2 (or L3), teachers are led to re-shape the traditional course content, in order to adapt knowledge areas or competences (whether subject-specific or transdisciplinary) specifically because of CLIL/EMILE. Thus, for example, the hours taught in the L1 will be devoted to knowledge-intensive teaching, whereas the CLIL/EMILE hours will focus on activities permitting the use of the L2/L3: consolidating knowledge, and using it in various communicative activities.

This fact is extremely important for future perspectives for CLIL/EMILE in SE and elsewhere in French secondary schools.

- Content–Language Ratio

As the language teacher takes on much of the language acquisition necessary for the CLIL/EMILE class, some of the language onus is taken off the shoulders of the subject teacher,

who while using the language as the vector of communication, is able to focus on predominantly on non-language content. This is important insofar as the curriculum is identical to that taught in non-CLIL classes, and so curricular demands remain extremely challenging.

- Discourse Type

CLIL/EMILE teachers in the SE choose activities that allow meaningful teacher-learner/ learner-teacher/learner-learner communication. Consequently, CLIL/EMILE has an important role to play in the modification of traditional teacher-centred practices, in a context where schooling is still heavily weighted towards the transmission of knowledge model.

- Trans-Languaging

Translanguaging is allowed when it can help avoid a break-down in communication, but does not normally need to be used more often because of the additional language training provided in the language classes, and the support provided by language teachers.

- Certification

Certification has been integrated into the SE CLIL/EMILE from the very beginning, at baccalaureate level, where a special certification – *mention "section européenne"* or *"section de langue orientale"* – is included in the baccalaureate certificate. To obtain this *mention*, students must qualify in two ways: first, the language mark in the baccalaureate exam must be at least 14/20; secondly, an oral exam is conducted on the subject in the CLIL language. This oral, although not included in the overall results allowing qualification for the baccalaureate, accounts for 80% (to which is added 20% from continuous assessment) in a total of 20 points, and the student must obtain an average of 10/20, in addition to the language mark, in order to qualify for the *mention*. In the 2001 session of the baccalaureate exam, including all specialities and types of baccalaureate, there were 7928 S.E. candidates, of whom 96.55% obtained the *mention*.

This *mention*, although it does not at present correspond to a sort of higher certification, is considered by potential employers as a plus in a curriculum vitae. Means to assert official recognition of this certification are underway.

When SE, often centred on specialist professional subjects, were extended to vocational training in 2000, the same system was retained for the *baccalaureat professionnel*. It is interesting to note that this has been an important step in the process of certification of vocational training on the European level. It has led to the introduction in France of a special certification at all levels of vocational training (including post-secondary), the *Europro* certificate, validating periods of work experience spent in other European countries.

This certificate is yet another step in the direction of transnational certification of competences, both at secondary level and in higher education, and can be linked to projects concerning the Europe-wide validation of professional qualifications.

- Teachers

As mentioned above, teachers in secondary education in France are qualified to teach only one subject. Consequently, SE CLIL/EMILE calls on subject teachers with sufficient mastery of the L2, but who are not qualified as language teachers. These teachers, however, are often recognised as proficient by the inspector specialised in the language concerned through the delivery of a *habilitation*. More and more teaching posts in SE are being set aside as requiring specialist competences.

One future prospect with respect to teacher qualification is the setting up of a master's level qualification for CLIL/EMILE teachers which will provide official recognition of their competences while respecting national teacher qualification requirements. Once again, the creation of such a diploma will be another step towards European qualification, with an

ECTS masters level in teaching.

- Linked to ICT

ICT is linked to SE CLIL/EMILE in several respects. Firstly it provides a primary source of teaching materials. ICT also comes into play as an important tool in the cultural exchanges that are a key aspect of SE. However the pedagogical use of ICT is much the same as in non-SE classes.

- Added Value

From an instrumental point of view, the added language certification at the baccalaureate has added value in the student's curriculum vitae. It is also closely linked to the notion of European citizenship in that students are considered better equipped for participation in intercultural and international arenas.

This European aspect also induces the educational system as a whole to make steps in the direction of integrating education in Europe. Hence the added values are for learners in terms of language and culture, but also for the country as a whole in the context of involvement in the construction of Europe.

Finally, pedagogical experimentation in SE CLIL/EMILE will gradually have a long-term knock-on effect across the secondary educational system.

- Transferability Potential

Transferability is high even if environments differ.

- Indicators for Future Potential

One future prospect with respect to teacher qualification is the setting up of a master's level qualification for CLIL/EMILE teachers which will provide official recognition of their competences while respecting national teacher qualification requirements.

The creation of such a diploma will be another step towards European qualification, with an ECTS masters level in teaching. The future potential for SE CLIL/EMILE looks very bright, and not only because of its perception by the public as educational added value. To see why, it is useful to set SE in the context of recent reforms in language teaching, thanks to extremely positive action taken by the French Ministry of Education before, during and after the European Year of Languages 2001. It should perhaps be pointed out that France, like other European countries, is actively promoting language learning to safeguard its own language from the perceived and real invasion of "global English".

Recent reforms are phasing in language learning at primary level, going well beyond the previous "initiation" experimented in the last two levels of primary school, to starting learning a first foreign language in the last year of nursery school. While, as in the past, the shortage of qualified language teachers may delay full implementation, measures have been taken to maintain language learning at university level, so that soon a university language certificate will be a prior requirement for entry into primary teacher training. (A second foreign language will be available at the beginning of secondary education.)

Whatever delays may slow down the generalisation of this process, we can foresee that children born in the year 2000 will pass their baccalaureate after starting an L2 at the age of 5-6. When this begins to become a reality, it will, of course, be impossible to continue to teach L2 as a subject in upper secondary school the way it is taught now. The proposed solution is the generalisation of CLIL/EMILE in L2 teaching at upper secondary level, along the lines of what is now being done in SE, allowing language teachers to offer learners contents which are more in line with their maturity and centres of interest. Consequently, we can say that SE may be seen as both a recognised stage in language learning, and one of the tools of change in language learning and its inevitable link with cultural knowledge, in

the framework of the construction of Europe.

- Broader Impact

As already stated, the benefits of SE are to be considered both on the level of the learner and on the broader social level of a country being pro-active in responding to the challenges of a European dimension.

- In Addition

In a speech on the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the SE (12 March 2002), Jack Lang emphasised their "pioneering role", both in the past, but also at present and in the future which is condensed and summarized here by Patricia Bertaux as :

*While continuing to promote a European vision both within schools and in society in a broader sense, the SE are called on to contribute to language learning as a tool for learner autonomy. CLIL/EMILE allows learners to familiarise themselves with communicative situations and build up their self confidence through a better mastery of language – be it a foreign language or the mother tongue – leading to the construction of a balanced personality, and a feeling of belonging to the world.*

*Another very important role of SE lies in their "potential for innovation": as mentioned earlier, the long-term trend in French education is to move away from subject-specific encyclopaedic knowledge towards integrating knowledge and transversal competences. This trend is very much still in its infancy, with the recent introduction at different levels of secondary education of pluri-disciplinary projects, recognised at the level of the baccalaureate, but still in the framework of a traditional curriculum.*

*Here the interest of SE CLIL/EMILE lies in the way they can help to spread new pedagogical practices and change teaching approaches and learning attitudes by bringing transversal competences into synergy.*

- Predominant Reasons for Implementation

The Culture Dimension

- Build intercultural knowledge & Understanding
- Develop intercultural communication skills
- Learn about specific neighbouring countries/regions and/or minority groups

The Environment Dimension

- Prepare for internationalisation, specifically EU integration
- Access International Certification

The Language Dimension

- Improve overall target language competence
- Develop oral communication skills

The Content Dimension

- Provide opportunities to study content through different perspectives
- Prepare for future studies and/or working life

The Learning Dimension

- Diversify methods & forms of classroom practice



## CASE 2

**Urban Primary Cluster****Synopsis**

This exemplifies relatively swift and widespread delivery of CLIL/EMILE as a form of 'language encounter'. Supported by parents and local authorities, the Salzburg Model has been launched through both in-service teacher education programmes and the production of materials to be used in all schools involved. The small geographical area covered, in this case a city and its surroundings, has meant that training and cooperation has been manageable. The primary target language at the outset is English, and attempts to introduce French have not been overly successful. However, if parents believe that these language encounters in the English language are worthwhile, then it is likely that in time there will be grassroots demand for extension of this practise at primary level into another foreign language. It is also interesting to note that authorities in neighbouring Bavaria (which has reportedly not recently performed well in terms of foreign language learning results), is building cooperation with the Salzburg training team to see if this type of CLIL/EMILE could also be introduced in that part of Germany.

**Background & Contact Details**

Country	Austria
Case Name	Salzburg Model
Target Language(s)	English (French)
Sector	General Education

Level	Age-range 6-10 years
Scale	c. 1 500 pupils
Gender Ratio	50% female; 50% male
Contact Person	Ione Steinhäusler
Address	VS Morzg, Gneiserstrasse 58, A 5020 Salzburg, Austria

Phone	+ 43 662 820194
Fax	+43 662 820194 75
E-Mail	ione@netway.at

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

Since 1989/1999 introduction of foreign language learning in the first grade of primary school (age 6 years) has been obligatory in Austria. This is taught in short daily sequences and integrated into all subjects except the mother tongue. Foreign language learning may be in English, French, Italian, Croatian, Czech, Slovakian, Slovenian or Hungarian. From September 2003 teachers of first and second classes have to have additional in-service training, on methodology and didactics of foreign language learning of the young learner.

The Salzburg Model started in 1993 and has continually developed since then, particularly with supporting in-service teacher development programmes organised locally. 4 grades in 14 schools teach through the medium of English for about 1 hour per day using 1 teacher per school, often but not always with native-speaker competence. Attempts to introduce

French language have not been largely successful due to parental 'grassroots' opinion on the desirability of English as the target language.

Other models exist in this sector in Austria, for example the Vienna Bilingual Schooling Model (VBS) which provides about 50% of teaching in the target language, English. Native English-speaking teachers have been employed for this task. In the Europa – Europe – L'Europe Model of Wiener Neustadt, 80 classes are taught through the medium of French and English for about 1 hour per week. As with the Salzburg Model this requires full integration with the existing curriculum, but there the pupils are immersed in two languages at an early age. This is usually handled by an Austrian class teacher.

The Salzburg Model is a form of 'language shower' in which pupils are exposed to continuous, non-threatening activities in the target language, which allows them to develop certain skills and knowledge which lays the basis for formal language instruction which usually commences at 10 years in secondary education.

- School / Location Environment

Monolingual • Yes

Bilingual •

Multilingual •

- Time-Frame

In operation since 1993

- Scale

Involving 1 500 learners

Involving 15 teachers

- Target Language(s)

English (French in one school out of 15). This is largely due to parental demand and not centralized planning.

- Target Age Range

6 – 10 years

- Exposure

Low (5-15% of teaching time)

Medium (15-50% of teaching time)

High (over 50% of teaching time)

• Low

•

•

- Subject Field

Mathematics, physical education, music, arts and crafts, and general studies

- Inter-disciplinarity

Inter-disciplinarity is high

- Course or Modular

Mainly by course

- Content–Language Ratio

The major emphasis is on language and communicative skills

- Discourse Type

Highly interactional

- Trans-Languaging

Both Austrian and the target languages are used



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

103

- Certification

Not applicable at this age although a tailored language learning portfolio is presently being developed.

- Teachers

Attempts to have teachers who have native or near-native language competence in the target language.

- Linked to ICT

ICT is not an important part of educational delivery of CLIL at the school. However, as is typical of Austria, ICT is prioritized in general education, and thus it is always regarded as an important element of school learning. It is estimated that about 50% of pupils have Internet access at home, and 75% have a computer.

- Added Value

It is viewed as preparing pupils for formal language instruction by building self-confidence in using the language, acquiring a solid command of the sound system of the language, and widening the horizons of them to other languages and cultures.

It is considered that learning through the target language enhances awareness of the mother tongue. That is, pupils learn to compare and conceptualize in both languages reinforcing the learning of each. Some people have observed that the spoken and communication skills in the mother tongue could be enhanced by this 'language shower' experience at this age.

- Transferability Potential

Transferability is high even if environments differ

- Indicators for Future Potential?

Highly positive

- In Addition

This is an example of small-scale CLIL/EMILE delivery which is relatively manageable in a curriculum because of the amount of exposure involved and the targets set. It involved a planning period of about 2 years at both local and national levels, negotiation and training in order for this model to be established and implemented. A key success factor lies with the in-service training offered locally in methodologies and language development. In addition, comprehensive sets of materials (theme-based including scripts, flash cards, posters, games and story books) have been locally produced for this purpose.

- Predominant Reasons for Implementation

The Culture Dimension

- Build intercultural knowledge & Understanding
- Develop intercultural communication skills
- Introduce the wider cultural context

The Language Dimension

- Develop oral communication skills
- Deepen awareness of both mother tongue and target language
- Develop plurilingual interests and attitudes
- Introduce a target language

The Learning Dimension

- Increase learner motivation



## CASE 3

**Urban Primary/Secondary Cluster****Synopsis**

This case describes a cluster of three kindergartens and four schools, all located within a short distance of each other in a small municipality (300 sq. km), which offer CLIL/EMILE through five languages whilst teaching to the national curriculum. Starting with English and Swedish as target languages in 1990, the municipality then moved into introduction of French and German. Russian was also introduced but for slightly different reasons, namely to accommodate Russian and bilingual Finnish-Russian children into the educational system. However the Russian stream is not entirely assimilative because it primarily functions to produce children with Russian language skills. A key success factor may be in the close proximity of the schools and the local availability of an integrated in-service development programme organised to support the teachers involved. This is a type of CLIL/EMILE implementation that could be replicated in other urban environments.

- Background & Contact Details

Country	Finland
Case Name	Turku Cluster
Target Language(s)	English, French, German, Russian, Swedish
Sector	General Education

Level	Pre-school, Primary, Secondary
-------	--------------------------------

Scale	1 000 pupils
Gender Ratio	50% female, 50% male
Contact Person	Maija Aalto
Address	Ilpoisten koulu Lauklähteenkatu 13 20740 Turku

Phone	+358 2 2629129
Fax	+358 2 2629135
E-Mail	mato@tkukoulu.fi

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

Turku is a Finnish metropolitan area of 200 000 inhabitants which has a group of three kindergartens and four schools specializing in CLIL/EMILE in English, French, German, Russian and Swedish. The Russian stream caters for in-migrant children and bilingual Russian-Finnish speakers. The children are taught through a Finnish curriculum, as used with non-CLIL/EMILE teaching with the addition of certain linguistic and cultural input. Exposure varies according to grade and language but the approach assumes that small-scale continuity is essential for success. At the end of secondary schooling (16 – 19 years) the language of instruction reverts to the first language in order to prepare for national matriculation examinations. Target language instruction continues during this period however.

- School / Location Environment

Monolingual • Mainly but with the official status of bilingual (6% Swedish-speaking)  
 Bilingual •  
 Multilingual •





## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

105

- Time-Frame

English & Swedish since 1990  
French since 1993  
German since 1994  
Russian since 1995

- Scale

Involving 1 000 learners  
Involving 85-90 teachers

- Target Language(s)

English, French, German, Russian, Swedish

- Target Age Range

3-6 years • 50  
5-15 years • 730  
15-20 years • 220

- Exposure

(Language by grades)

English	1-2. 0-25 %; 3-6.80 %; 7-9. 40 %
German	1,10 & 2. 10-20%; 3. 20-30 %; 2-6 30-40 %; 7-9. 10%
French	1-6- 50-80 %; 7-9. 25-30 %
Russian	1-2. 0-25 %; 3-6. 50 %; 7-9. 10 %
Swedish	1-2. 100%; 3-6. 60 %; 7-9. 50 %

- Subject Field

All subjects have elements or themes in the target language except mother tongue teaching. But not each subject needs to be taught through the target language in any given year.

- Inter-disciplinarity

There is a high level of inter-disciplinarity especially at primary level.

- Course or Modular

Theme-based within and across subject areas

- Content–Language Ratio

Content has primary place other than in language lessons, and language-sensitive methodologies are used throughout all CLIL/EMILE teaching. Teachers have engaged in in-service education to further their understanding of optimal methods.

- Discourse Type

Mainly interactional through meaningful teacher-learner, learner-teacher, learner-learner communication.

- Trans-Languaging

At lower levels the teacher uses the target language mostly, and the pupils reply in the mother tongue. But as they progress to higher levels pupils increasingly use the target language

- Certification

Participation in CLIL/EMILE is cited in school reports. Grades 2, 4 and 6 receive extra reports on target language linguistic abilities. English & German streams receive special external language certification, not yet available for the other languages.

- Teachers

Teachers are a mixture of subject and language teachers, and mostly non-native speakers who have a good to excellent command of the target language.

- Linked to ICT

Use of computers is of increasing importance as availability and understanding of hardware and software improves.

- Added Value

The children are exposed to the language at a very young age and then over the school career allowed to further develop the language slowly and continuously. It is possible that early exposure to the first foreign language facilitates the learning of other languages. It has also been noted that rather than threatening use of the first language, the children become communicatively advanced in both languages. There has also been anecdotal observation and comment on development of analytic skills, and research is currently underway to research this aspect. The hope is that by exposing the child to a foreign language at a young age, with continuous support, less time and effort will be required at later stages of development and higher results attained.

- Transferability Potential

Very high due to the close proximity of schools and school catchment area (approx 300 sq km).

- Indicators for future potential

Very positive

- Broader Impact

This type of CLIL/EMILE is of direct benefit to the municipality in terms of attractiveness of local educational provision and capacity for attracting workers into local industry from other countries who have families unable to use the national languages. It is also regarded as strengthening the broader society by giving Finnish nationals high level target language skills as an added bonus to an education which broadly follows the Finnish curriculum.

- Predominant Reasons for Implementation

The Culture Dimension

- Build intercultural knowledge & Understanding
- Develop intercultural communication skills
- Learn about specific neighbouring countries/regions and/or minority groups
- Introduce the wider cultural context (particularly Russian)

The Environment Dimension

- Prepare for internationalisation, specifically EU integration
- Enhance school profile

The Language Dimension

- Improve overall target language competence
- Develop oral communication skills
- Deepen awareness of both mother tongue and target language
- Develop plurilingual interests and attitudes



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

107

- Introduce a target language (particularly German and Russian)

### The Content Dimension

- Provide opportunities to study content through different perspectives
- Access subject-specific target language terminology
- Prepare for future studies and/or working life

### The Learning Dimension

- Complement individual learning strategies
- Diversify methods & forms of classroom practice
- Increase learner motivation



## CASE 4

**Urban Multicultural Cluster****Synopsis**

This is an example of an urban environment in which the school populations include significant numbers of in-migrant children. In order to capitalize on heritage languages as a strength, and introduce European Community languages such as English, French, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese and Greek, in addition Russian, Polish and Turkish, the schools have adopted CLIL/EMILE in order to pursue a plurilingual/ pluricultural educational approach. Publications and forms of research are not definitive yet on the outcomes. However the Parent Teacher Associations involved are currently engaged in trying to have the availability of this type of CLIL/EMILE education expanded. It is a very interesting example whereby both community languages and others are given equal footing in terms of the value of linguistic enrichment, where the host country language, German language is not seen as suffering as a result of exposure up to 50%-50%.

- Background & Contact Details

Country	Germany
Case Name	Urban Multicultural Cluster
Target Language(s)	Started in 1992-1993 with English, French and Russian, now expanded to Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Polish, Turkish and Greek.
Sector	General Mainstream Education
Level	Primary & Secondary
Scale	c.3 500 pupils
Gender Ratio	Balanced, possibly greater ratio of females in upper secondary
Contact Person	Wolfgang Zydatis
Address	Freie Universitaet Berlin Institut fuer Englische Philologie Habelschwerdter Allee 45
D-14195 Berlin	
Phone	+49 30 8385 5961
Fax	+ 49 30 8385 5993
E-Mail	WBKZydatis@t-online.de

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

This is a two-way immersion approach focussing on both intensive second language/ bilingual education and intercultural contact (*Begegnungsschule*). A 50-50 principle is used in terms of the curriculum being taught in both languages (i.e. mother tongue and partner tongue are used for different areas of the primary curriculum) but also as regards the set-up of pupils and teachers/staff (both groups come from both language and cultural backgrounds). Teachers teach their subjects(s) in their mother tongue: one teacher – one subject-one language. Pupils learn to read and write in their strong language first, the second language follows - usually – in the second year of primary school. All pupils are expected to be "equally" literate in both languages by the end of year 8, after that the two language groups are merged. Up to then pupils are taught in separate language groups: strong mother tongue and generally weaker partner tongue. Contrary to the original model (of two monolingual groups encountering and learning from each other), about a third of these students are relatively bilingual in the first place, although this is not always evenly balanced. This does create some problems in terms of insufficient differentiation, .e.g. groups are highly heterogeneous in terms of language proficiency. Some target languages/



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

109

partner tongues have two schools in Berlin, some only one. The usual regulation as regards restricted catchment area does not apply to these streams. Pupils can attend from all over Berlin. All are state schools.

- School / Location Environment

- Monolingual •
- Bilingual •
- Multilingual • Yes

- Time-Frame

In operation since 1992/93

- Scale

Involving c. 3 500 learners

Half the teaching staff are native speakers of the respective partner tongue. (Quote: "The big problem is teachers' pay because they get paid on the basis of their native country teacher training which tends to be shorter than the one in Germany, they usually have "only" one subject instead of two (as in Germany), thus their salary is about a third less than that of their German colleagues creating a lot of unrest and frustration. Some very good teachers have left the project".)

- Target Language(s)

English, French and Russian, now expanded to Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Polish, Turkish and Greek.

- Target Age Range

Pre-school year, around 5-6 years

Primary school, 6-12 years

Secondary 15-20 years

The project continues up to classes 10 (for those who leave school) or class 13, i.e.

"Abitur". All school leaving certificates are possible: comprehensive school (levels class 10 or 13) and grammar school (class 13/Abitur).

- Exposure

Low (5-15% of teaching time) •

Medium (15-50% of teaching time) •

High (over 50% of teaching time) • 50%-50% principle

- Subject Field

At primary level maths is always taught in German, whereas "topic work" ("Sachkunde" such as "environmental studies") is always taught in the partner tongue. Fine arts, music and/or P.E. are taught on the basis of availability of teachers, i.e. either in the mother or in the partner tongue.

The two languages are taught in separate groups and with reduced numbers (half the group). Classes have up to 24 pupils (half for the two languages). The same principle holds from class 5 onwards when subject teaching proper begins: maths in German, languages separate, biology/history-social sciences/geography in the partner tongue. A second foreign language (English for the majority of 8 partner tongues and French for the English partner tongue school) starts in class 5, grammar schools must offer a third foreign language as from class 9 onwards.

- Inter-disciplinarity

Some degree of inter-disciplinarity in project work

- Course or Modular  
Both course and modular
- Content–Language Ratio  
Focus mostly on content but teaching handled in language-sensitive way.
- Discourse Type  
Fairly transactional but in grades 5 & 6 an increasing amount of collaborative project work is done (biology, geography and history).
- Trans-Languaging  
This depends on the language stream and teachers. Some adhere to one-language policies, others allow for trans-languaging, especially to reinforce learning.
- Certification  
An extra ‘statement’ is included in school-leaving certificates
- Teachers  
50% native speakers of the language, and 50% German language native speakers. Most teachers are primary or subject teachers without qualifications or specific training in languages.
- Linked to ICT  
No, predominantly due to lack of resources and investment
- Added Value  
Quote: *“There is hardly any discussion in the German literature as regards the long-term objectives or the justification of bilingual projects in terms of educational value. The roots of these projects in Germany were, of course, the “Waves” of the German-French Treaty of 1963 which led to the set-up of bilingual German-French streams. But now things have changed, more languages have come to the fore (esp. English) but also – at least in the Berlin Europe School idea – the “small” languages, esp. the languages of our migrant minorities. We don’t know for sure what the advantages are - I would argue it is the openness for other languages and cultures, an increased ability to handle a second language more “naturally” and to use it more authentically (use of media, internet, academic literacy) and – I suppose – a certain readiness to go abroad (as a pupil or student later on).*
- Transferability Potential for other environments  
Transferability is high if environments are similar particularly in urban areas with a high density of migrant minorities.
- Future Potential  
Positive
- Broader impact  
The Parent Teacher Associations are presently engaged in trying to get pressure and lobby groups to negotiate with the Ministry of Education on the possibility of expansion especially at secondary level because of its considered successes.
- Predominant Reasons for Implementation  
The Culture Dimension  
- Build intercultural knowledge & Understanding (strong)



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

111

### The Environment Dimension

- Access International Certification
- Enhance school profile (strong)

### The Language Dimension

- Improve overall target language competence
- Develop oral communication skills

### The Content Dimension

- Provide opportunities to study content through different perspectives
- Prepare for future studies and/or working life (strong)



## CASE 5

**Regional Primary / Secondary Network****Synopsis**

This exemplifies how a mandate from a regional authority responsible for education to experiment with CLIL/EMILE, and some supplementary resources, can allow rapid and widespread plurilingual implementation. The actual exposure to CLIL/EMILE here is very small indeed, some 20 student hours, but this does not detract from its importance in terms of two key aspects. Firstly, that within a short period of time some 1 000 pupils will have been able to experience this method. Secondly, that it involves delivery in English, French, German and Spanish. Thirdly, that it spans all educational levels handling learners from 6 – 19 years. It shows that it is possible to embark on developing a large-scale platform for 'language encounters' through CLIL/EMILE, experiment during an initial pilot stage, and have this done in four language simultaneously. The involvement of teachers of foreign languages, and in this case a high number of in-service teacher trainers, and non-language teachers, working as pairs in the 30 schools involved is regarded as a basic success factor. Finally, this case derived partly from a national Italian language learning initiative, but also as a direct result of a 3 year Lingua A project.

## • Background &amp; Contact Details

Country	Italy
Case Name	ALI-CLIL
Target Language(s)	English, French, German, Spanish
Sector	General Mainstream Education (primary & secondary)

Level	Primary	6-11 years
	Lower Secondary	11-14 years
	Upper Secondary 1:	14-16 years
	Upper Secondary 2:	16-19 years
	Scale c.	1 000 pupils
Gender Ratio	50% female; 50% male	
Contact Person	Gisella Langé	
Address	IRRE Via Leone XIII 10 20145 Milano, Italy	
Phone	+ 00 39 335 844 8449	
Fax	+ 00 39 02 551 7936	
E-Mail	tieclil@tin.it	

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

The ALI-CLIL project is experimental 2001-2002 over the Lombardia region, involving about 30 schools, and 3 to 4 teachers in each school. A key reason for its launch was to broaden access to forms of CLIL/EMILE from those already seen in certain specialized Italian schools (e.g. licei linguistici europei, licei classici europei, classi internazionali nei licei scientifici).

It is a spin-off project resulting from a national initiative on improving language learning which started in 1998 focusing on incorporating the new technologies, theme-based modular teaching, the European framework and CLIL/EMILE into the delivery of language teaching (Progetto Lingue 2000). In addition, ALI-CLIL is the result of a Lingua A project





## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

113

(TIE-CLIL) which resulted in great interest in CLIL from 50 or more 'language trainers' in Lombardia who had actively been involved in assessing and evaluating the TIE-CLIL modules.

A key characteristic is in teamwork between language and non-language teachers. This is the professional core of ALI-CLIL where pairs of teachers work together to deliver CLIL/EMILE. This has led to considerable re-thinking on how to teach the language and the subject matter respectively which, in turn, leads to a form of teaching and learning which is distinctive to CLIL/EMILE. The lower language competence of the non-language teacher at the outset generally means that the language teacher has greater responsibility for classroom teaching.

Teachers have been given a professional support structure through FAD ALI-CLIL. This has provided training in the new technologies for production of theme-oriented materials and create an on-line environment for dialogue and information flow.

The approach is fundamentally plurilingual in that the use of CLIL/EMILE is being actively explored in relation to a variety of different languages. This has resulted in an experimental period of implementation in which languages other than English have been successfully promoted as CLIL/EMILE target languages.

- School / Location Environment

Monolingual • Yes

But, some areas are rapidly becoming increasingly multilingual in certain respects. Primary Level Grade 1 classes in Milano are estimated to have about 25% of intake who have a language other than Italian.

Bilingual •  
Multilingual •

- Time-Frame

In operation since 2001

- Scale

Involving 1 000 learners

Involving 120 teachers (in c.30 schools)

- Target Language(s)

English, French, German, Spanish

- Target Age Range

3-6 years • About to start through bilingual kindergartens

5-15 years • Yes

15-20 years • Yes

- Exposure

Low (5-15% of teaching time) • Yes

Medium (15-50% of teaching time) •

High (over 50% of teaching time) •

- Subject Field

Subject choice is largely due to availability of teaching personnel at this stage.

Primary	English & German	Geography
	English & Spanish	Science



Lower Secondary	French English & French English	Maths Music Art, science, history, geography
Secondary	French English	Maths, history, geography Art, science
Upper Secondary	German English	Geography Geography, chemistry, science, biology, history

- **Inter-disciplinarity**  
Interdisciplinarity is very high and considered crucial for success.
- **Course or Modular**  
In modules of about 15-20 hours which are locally-produced by groups of language and non-language teachers and teacher trainers
- **Content–Language Ratio**  
Primary – 50% language, 50% non-language subject  
Lower Secondary – 75% language, 25% non-language subject  
Upper secondary – 25% non-language subject, 25% language

There are three main teaching procedures which may be adopted by the language and non-language teachers:

1. The language teacher carries out the CLIL/EMILE activities in class after planning them with the support of the non-language teacher
2. The language teacher and the non-language teacher plan and carry out the CLIL/EMILE activities in class together
3. The non-language teacher carries out the CLIL/EMILE activities in class with the external support of the language teacher

- **Discourse Type**  
Interactional
- **Trans-Languaging**  
Yes
- **Certification**  
No special certification
- **Teachers**  
Target language and non-language teachers, predominantly non-native speakers of the target language. In the future it is anticipated that the bulk of CLIL/EMILE will be handled by non-language teachers.
- **Linked to ICT**  
Yes, but more in terms of preparing the schools for CLIL/EMILE, than delivery of CLIL/EMILE in the classrooms. An online platform (first class) was established to enable teachers to build up CLIL/EMILE modules which could be shared throughout the ALI-CLIL network (cost about € 24 000). This has been particularly important in raising the quality of CLIL materials, and by consequence, methodologies, and in ensuring that support for target languages other than English is forthcoming.
- **Added Value**  
Lowering the threshold of starting formal language instruction. Building learner self-confidence and interest in languages, particularly in terms of 'fun'. Positively influencing attitudes towards both languages and language learning.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

115

Teachers involved have been impressed by the speed of language learning, even after some 15 hours of for example science in a foreign language. There appears to be anecdotal evidence that increased exposure, even on a small scale such as this, can bolster levels of learner self-confidence. At primary level it has been observed that through CLIL/EMILE the language becomes 'real' in the learning environment and that the children respond very favourably to this.

Throughout ALI-CLIL focus is made on the following principles which may provide added value:

1. Intercultural comparison between differing perspectives and expressions, especially in relation to historical or cultural events and icons.
2. Development of methodologies specific to CLIL/EMILE at any level, and in a given subject, which influences skills and knowledge development.
3. Identifying similarities and differences between the target language and majority language from a semantic and pragmatic point of view.

- Transferability potential

Transferability potential is considered very high even in differing environments.

- Indicators for future potential

These are strongly positive.

There has reportedly been a significant shift of attitude towards language learning in Italy over the last 10 years. Due to both internationalisation and immigration, the importance of language learning appears to be increasing amongst the general public. CLIL/EMILE may be one means by which to match the new expectations.

- Predominant Reasons for Implementation

The Culture Dimension

- Build intercultural knowledge & Understanding
- Develop intercultural communication skills
- Learn about specific neighbouring countries/regions and/or minority groups
- Introduce the wider cultural context

The Language Dimension

- Deepen awareness of both mother tongue and target language
- Develop plurilingual interests and attitudes
- Introduce a target language

The Content Dimension

- Provide opportunities to study content through different perspectives

The Learning Dimension

- Diversify methods & forms of classroom practice
- Increase learner motivation

## CASE 6

**Regional Trilingual Cluster****Synopsis**

This case involves a special context that also exists, in differing ways, in other parts of Europe such as the Ladin valleys of South Tyrol in Italy, Frisia and in the Netherlands. Its significance, in this report, lies not so much in the socio-linguistic features of the environment, but in how methods have been developed which allow for early language learning.

- Background & Contact Details

Country	Spain (Basque Country)
Case Name	Regional Trilingual Cluster
Target Language(s)	Basque, Spanish, English
Sector	General Education
Level	Primary (& Secondary)
Scale	300 schools
Gender Ratio	
Contact Person	Rosa Aliaga (Primary)
Address	Basque Government Villa Fatima Ataritzar bidea 16 20013 Donostia, Basque Country, Spain
Tel.	+ 34 629469348
E-Mail	ghizkuntza@donosgune.net

## For information on Eleanitz:

Contact Person	Itziar Elorza (secondary subjects project)
Address	Pedagogical Coordinator of the Ikastolas Ikastolen Elkartea Anoeta 22 20014 Donostia-San Sebastian Basque Country, Spain
Tel.	+ 34 943 445108
Fax.	+ 34 943 465294
E-Mail	ielorza@gie.ikastola.net

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

During 1996-1999 a pilot scheme was implemented in 13 schools in the Basque Autonomous Community. The results were considered favourable although there were some concerns voiced over the early introduction of the third language and the step from bilingualism to trilingualism. The pilot has resulted in a decision being reached to introduce a foreign language, English, in some 300 primary state schools during 1999-2000. A team of 16 advisors has served as a problem-solving development group, providing professional development and various forms of consultancy. This is part of the DCB (National Curriculum Reform Blueprint) that includes the 'scheme for the early introduction of English'. The methods used are CLIL/EMILE, integrating content and language through major emphasis on interaction. A core issue here relates not only to the trilingual context, but to the methods used which are largely as relevant to tri- bi- and monolingual contexts, because of the shared goal of introducing a foreign language to early language learners.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

117

The main impetus for the project was grassroots demand for English to be introduced in the region as early as possible. The earlier Eleanitz project, which started in 1991, is now in secondary level and involves about 64 schools. Most schools start English as a third language in infant education (4 year olds).

There is a high percentage of private schools in the Basque Country (reportedly about 50%) and initiatives will also be taking place in this sector.

- School / Location Environment  
Bilingual environment
- Time-Frame  
In operation since 1999 following pilot of 1996-1999
- Scale  
Some 300 primary schools in the public sector (private sector not known) and about 70 schools in the public sector (but this figure is not fully substantiated by available data)
- Target Language(s)  
Basque, Spanish & English
- Target Age Range  
This project is starting at primary but is also to extend into secondary through, for example, CLIL/EMILE in the Subject Projects Materials project with 12-16 year olds.
- Exposure  
Exposure to the foreign language is low at 90 minutes per week in 3 sessions of 30 minutes in the DCB project. In Eleanitz, exposure is pre-school (2.5 hrs); 6-12 years (3 hrs); lower secondary (4 hrs); upper secondary (5 hrs) – the secondary level exposure includes complementary English language support.
- Subject Field  
Generally highly integrated
- Inter-disciplinarity  
Very high
- Course or Modular  
Task-based through different didactic units such as story-based units. At secondary level units are used in different subjects, partly cross-curricula, and at upper secondary there is greater movement towards subjects (Eleanitz).
- Content–Language Ratio  
Mainly on language (primary) and content (secondary)
- Discourse Type  
Highly interactional
- Trans-Languaging  
At primary, the English specialist teachers follow the one language one person principal. The classroom teachers cooperate as the aim is to have the foreign language integrated into the curriculum for nursery education at each centre. Trans-languaging would be according to appropriacy.

- Certification

Not applicable at this stage at primary

- Teachers

Mainly provided by language specialists (DBC) at primary

- Linked to ICT

Not significantly at primary

- Added Value

It is reported that there is a 'positive transfer that takes place between the languages that the children already know and the new language. Our aim is to obtain the best possible level of proficiency in English by the end of compulsory secondary schooling. However it is also our aim to optimise the home language and school language. (Ikastetxe Prestakuntza Proiektua 1999-2000 ikasturtea. Eusko Jaurlaritzako Hezkuntza Saila.)

In addition, the introduction of the methodologies may enhance advances towards the type of plurilingual education being implemented in relation to Basque language and Spanish.

- Transferability Potential

Transferability of the methods developed is rated as very high even in environments which are not similar.

- Indicators for future potential

Highly positive

- Broader Impact

The special linguistic circumstances in the Basque country, with its dominant (Spanish) language, and minoritized (Basque) language, have been tackled through various measures. The introduction of English into the Basque educational system has been subject to some criticism in terms of impact, especially on Basque language, but also Spanish. However, analysis of this criticism suggests not so much that significant negative outcomes have been found, but that the possibility of positive outcomes has not been substantiated. In pioneering work of this type, it is thus perhaps worthwhile to wait for the evaluation results that will be steadily forthcoming according to reports in associated literature. The scale at 1.5 –3 hrs per week reported in primary is not considered high enough to result in negative impact on the first or second languages.

- Additional Observation & Comment

When considering early language learning of a foreign language, it is necessary to examine good practice at kindergarten, pre-school or early primary level. 'Since children work as an integrated and unified whole, the Nursery school will create an educational framework in which their experiences take place in a way which includes and integrates all the dimensions of their development, without ignoring any or dealing with them separately. This means that school activities and experiences should allow the children to put into practice and develop their different personal resources and whole selves'... For this reason, the introduction of English should not be an element that is additional to, or independent of the normal educational framework of the school.... This does not mean the accumulation and juxtaposition of learning experiences but rather establishing meaningful connections between what has already been learnt in previous situations and experiences, and the forthcoming information of new experiences' (Ikastetxe Prestakuntza Proiektua 1999-2000 ikasturtea. Eusko Jaurlaritzako Hezkuntza Saila.)

In the Eleanitz plurilingual project, all the languages in the curriculum are taught through an integrated approach. A central support structure has produced sets of progressive materials for 4 year olds through to 16 year olds. Starting with a task-based approach at primary, it ends with a full CLIL/EMILE subject approach at secondary.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

119

- Predominant Reasons for Implementation
  - The Culture Dimension
    - Learn about specific neighbouring countries/regions and/or minority groups
  - The Language Dimension
    - Develop oral communication skills
    - Deepen awareness of both mother tongue and target language
    - Develop plurilingual interests and attitudes
    - Introduce a target language
  - The Learning Dimension
    - Complement individual learning strategies
    - Diversify methods & forms of classroom practice



## CASE 7

**Regional Gender/Discipline Bias****Synopsis**

The project design which led to this form of CLIL/EMILE delivery focussed initially on a variety of different issues, including gender. In some schools, in certain regions, certain disciplines tend to attract males rather than females, and others vice-versa. Foreign language learning, for instance, may be a rather more attractive option for females in some places, and science for males in others. This is a generalization, but a truism in certain locations, which reportedly applies to in this case to Northern Italy, but also in educational systems of other countries.

This type of CLIL/EMILE was implemented in two rather distinct types of Italian school. One of these (science-focused) reportedly tend to attract more males than females, and the other (humanities-focused) more females than males. The project offers an opportunity to see if CLIL/EMILE can attract greater numbers of females to the study of sciences, and likewise males to the study of languages.

Gender is an issue which surfaces rather frequently in anecdotal reporting on CLIL/EMILE implementation in other countries. The argument is that the approach can act as a catalyst which challenges certain socio-cultural attitudes which work against freedom of choice on the basis of gender.

- Background & Contact Details

Country	Italy
Case Name	CLIL Science
Target Language(s)	English, French & German
Sector	General Mainstream Education

Level	Lower & Upper Secondary (13-18 years)
Scale	c. 1 200 pupils
Gender Ratio	Overall balanced, but not within specific schools
Contact Person	Ms Teresina Barbero
Address	IRRSAE Piedmont Corso Vittorio Emanuele II, 70 10121 Torino, Italy

Phone	+ 00 39 011 560 6403
Fax	+ 00 39 011 540 271
E-Mail	tebarbero.irrsae@tin.it

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

This experimental CLIL/EMILE Science project involves teaching through French, English and German in one class in each of 40 schools in the Piemonte region (7 provinces, Alessandria, Asti, Biella, Cuneo, Novara, Torino, Verbania) for one term only. In each school a language and non-language teacher work together to deliver one or a variety of CLIL/EMILE forms. The implementation is highly diverse and eclectic because during this experimental period, different types of approach are being tested. Internal and external evaluation will lead to assessment reporting in late 2002. As with TIE-CLIL in Lombardia, this project is linked to a national science and language initiative (lingue e scienze), but the geographical region differs slightly in that this can be considered a border region in which some of the schools involved are between 50 to 150 km from the Italian-French border. It is not a bilingual region yet there is clear influence from the border that relates to





## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

121

this type of CLIL/EMILE introduction. Although it is too early to report on outcomes, this case is interesting in terms of scale and objectives, particularly with regard to gender and language learning. In the case of continuation and possible expansion, it is also particularly interesting in terms of future decisions on target languages.

- School / Location Environment

Monolingual • Yes  
Bilingual •  
Multilingual •

- Time-Frame

Initial time-frame is 2001-2002

- Scale

Involving c. 1 200 learners  
Involving c. 80 teachers

- Target Language(s)

English (27 schools)  
French (15 schools)  
German (2 schools)

- Target Age Range

13-20 years

- Exposure

Low (5-15% of teaching time)	• Under 5%
Medium (15-50% of teaching time)	•
High (over 50% of teaching time)	•

- Subject Field

Science, earth sciences, applied ecology, microbiology, biology and applied biology, chemistry and physical chemistry, geography, and physics.

- Inter-disciplinarity

Interdisciplinarity is very high and considered crucial for success.

- Course or Modular

Project-based themes within courses (up to 20 hours per course.)

- Content–Language Ratio

Balanced and variable focus according to type of implementation.

- Discourse Type

Heavily interactional where some language communicative language teaching methodology used for languages are shifted into the teaching and learning of science.

- Trans-Languaging

Much content matter is taught in Italian, often by a science teacher. This is then handled in one way or another by the language teacher who may work separately or alongside the science teacher. There are capacity factors here that influence which teacher has a specific role because of the shortage of non-language teachers who have fluency in the target language.

There are various ways in which Italian and the target language are combined:

- Science teacher and language teacher teach separate lessons. The science teacher teaches in Italian, the language teacher in the target language but orientates the lesson towards the science subject.
- Science teacher and language teacher teach separate lessons. The science teacher and language teacher teach in the target language and the language teacher orientates the lesson towards the science subject.
- Science teacher and language teacher teach together in the same lesson. The science teacher teaches in Italian, and the language teacher in the target language.
- Science teacher and language teacher teach together in the same lesson. The science teacher and language teacher both teach through the target language.
- The science teacher teaches in Italian, but with materials in the target language.
- The science teacher teaches alone in the target language

- Certification  
Not applicable.

- Teachers  
Teachers of sciences and teachers of foreign languages

- Linked to ICT  
Only with respect to upper secondary where use of the Internet is common for project work

- Added value  
The major objectives of this experimental period concern motivating students to learn both subject and the target language, consolidate existing first and target language knowledge or preparing students for study in that language. Other objectives relate to information technology skills, oral presentations, teambuilding, and with older students workplace-linked skills.

The discernible added value of such small exposure to CLIL/EMILE will be reported in late 2002.

- Transferability Potential  
Transferability potential is rated as very high.

- Indicators for future potential  
It is not yet possible to determine. If it is found after experimentation that this type of approach suits the present Italian context in terms of introducing CLIL/EMILE then the future potential may be considerable. The impetus here comes primarily from language teaching. If this is to continue to develop then the sciences content will have to be fully integrated with the language, as is the present aim.

- Broader Impact  
In Italy there has been great interest recently in integration of themes into 'modules'. This example, linked to this broader educational development trend, simply links languages to non-language subjects. In this case CLIL/EMILE helps the implementation of other objectives because it requires methodological development that introduces focus on non-core skills such as those which are Internet-based or linked to other forms and systems of communication.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

123

- Predominant Reasons for Implementation

The Environment Dimension

- Prepare for internationalisation, specifically EU integration
- Enhance school profile

The Language Dimension

- Improve overall target language competence
- Develop oral communication skills
- Deepen awareness of both mother tongue and target language
- Develop plurilingual interests and attitudes

The Content Dimension

- Provide opportunities to study content through different perspectives
- Access subject-specific target language terminology
- Prepare for future studies and/or working life

The Learning Dimension

- Diversify methods & forms of classroom practice
- Increase learner motivation



## CASE 8

**Networked National Secondary****Synopsis**

This is an example that shows the importance of having a stakeholder network (national or otherwise regional) which offers support and guidance to schools, engages in joint development tasks, especially over the first 5-10 years. Another successful example is the Austrian-based Centre for School Development that started operating in 1992.

124

- Background & Contact Details

Country	The Netherlands
Case Name	Networked National Secondary
Target Language(s)	English, German
Sector	General Education
Level	Secondary
Scale	4 400 students
Gender Ratio	50% -50 %
Contact Person	Anne Maljers
Address	European Platform for Dutch Education Bezuidenhoutseweg 253 NL - 2594 AM The Hague
Phone	31 70 3814448
Fax	31 70 3831958
E-Mail	amaljers@europeesplatform.nl

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

Grassroots pressure from parents in the late 1980s for access to 'international schools' led to the delivery of a single CLIL/EMILE stream in 1989. Success within the international schools has led to the setting up of CLIL/EMILE streams for mainstream Dutch-speaking students in 7 of the 8 international schools in the country that are sponsored by the Dutch Ministry of Education. Major growth, however, took place in mainstream Dutch schools.

In 1993, there was a total of 5 schools. At this point the first national inventory was made by the European Platform for Dutch Education which reported to the Ministry of Education on development stages and issues necessary for the future. A few years later, in its official policy report for internationalisation, the Ministry of Education gave the European Platform the task to support and develop CLIL further and offer support to schools in areas defined in the survey done in 1993.

In 2002 there are 34 schools offering CLIL/EMILE through English at secondary level. There is 1 school working through the medium of German. There are 10 schools starting in 2002 that will result in a total of 45 schools by the end of the year. All schools teach 50% of the curriculum in English, the target language. This 50 % is based on one of the very few state regulations for CLIL/EMILE which states that 50% of all teaching has to be in Dutch. Final examinations are also taken in Dutch which has an effect on the subjects taught through English especially in the last two years of secondary school.

The CLIL/EMILE schools cooperate in a network that is coordinated by the European Platform for Dutch Education. The main fields of cooperation are:



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

125

1. Coordination of information flow
2. Materials inventory and development, cooperation with publishers
3. Teacher training: identifying needs and development of courses
4. Quality assurance

A steering committee representing the participating schools sets annual aims and goals. The network schools meet five times per year to jointly discuss ongoing development but also issues such as pupil selection.

The network has been especially important in achieving clarity of CLIL/EMILE delivery in the Netherlands – thus a Dutch ‘model’ has been created (2001 CLIL/EMILE Standard based on the CLIL/EMILE standard of 1997) which contains 4 elements.

1. Results (proficiency English, proficiency Dutch, mastery of content matter similar to non CLIL/EMILE students and development of international orientation
2. Educational learning process a. quantitative: 50 % of lessons taught through English, at least one subject out of three differing clusters of subjects, b. qualitative: at least one native speaker in the CLIL/EMILE stream, use of authentic teaching materials, the English language teachers playing a key role, use of target languages in other language lessons, c. internationalisation; CLIL/EMILE is supported by international activities including exchanges, portfolio development for students which demonstrates international activities, a varied extracurricular programme. d. That the CLIL/EMILE teachers meet the requirements identified in 2000 and laid down in a nationally-produced CLIL/EMILE teacher profile.
3. Conditions for maintaining CLIL/EMILE streams, including teacher development compensation, teamwork and coordination of the streams
4. Quality assurance

Schools interested in setting up CLIL/EMILE streams need to adhere to the requirements laid down in the standard which is functioning as an instrument for regulation as well as a quality.

Following the 2001 standard, a quality assurance instrument was developed by the European Platform, teacher-training and research institutes, and the network schools. This is to be used for certification of CLIL/EMILE schools from 2002 onwards. The instrument is based on the standard and is meant to provide a state-of-the-art quality assurance statement for CLIL/EMILE practice within a given school. The results will be used for quality development as well for identifying examples of good practice in certain aspects of the standard.

While the number of CLIL/EMILE schools is growing, the structure of the network will undoubtedly be adapted. Meetings with 25 schools still allow for an open exchange of information and ideas but when the number of schools continues to rise, this will be difficult to maintain. Some schools have already taken the initiative to start smaller, regional networks which allow for more face-to-face communication and cooperation.

- School / Location Environment

- Monolingual • mainly
- Bilingual •
- Multilingual •

- Time-Frame

CLIL/EMILE schools in operation since 1989. The network has functioned since 1993.

- Scale

Involving 34 schools in 2001-2002, 45 schools in 2002-2003  
Involving 250 teachers

- Target Language(s)  
English

- Target Age Range
  - 3-6 years
  - 5-15 years
  - 12 – 18 years
  - 15-20 years

- Exposure
  - Low (5-15% of teaching time)
  - Medium (15-50% of teaching time)
  - High (over 50% of teaching time)
  - Yes – exactly 50%

- Subject Field  
In order to allow the acquisition of as broad a language register as possible, schools are required to offer at least one subject out of the following field/clusters of subjects
  1. Sciences (maths, biology, physics, chemistry)
  2. Social sciences /studies (geography, history, social and political sciences, philosophy etc)
  3. Creative and sports (drama, physical education, music, arts, crafts etc.)

- Inter-disciplinarity  
Especially in the extra-curricular activities and through international projects.

- Course or Modular  
Mainly course-based

- Content–Language Ratio  
Estimated at 80% content, 20% language

- Discourse Type  
More interactional than transactional.

- Trans-Languaging  
Dutch is used if optimal for understanding specific issues. Dutch-English glossaries are frequently used.

- Certification  
Students in the CLIL/EMILE streams need to follow the official Dutch curriculum which also means they need to take final exams in Dutch. There is no additional officially recognized certificate that students receive (sometimes they get school certificates, and the network has developed its own certificates which are given to students after years 3 and 6, but these do not have official status).

An agreement has been made with the International Baccalaureate Organisation to allow students to take an additional exam for English (Language A2 exam, which the IBO developed for bilingual students. This is rather unique because normally students need to follow an IBO diploma programme and cannot opt for one certificate only). This certificate gives additional proof of the extra efforts and results the students have reached in English.

- Teachers  
Teachers are normally Dutch subject teachers who teach through English. There are a few native speakers (most schools have one and in many cases the native speaker is the teacher of English who ideally offers support to the subject teachers). Team cooperation between subject and language teachers is not as developed as it could be.  
The network has defined teacher competencies in 2000, requiring language proficiency of at least B2 of the Common European Framework of Reference.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

127

- **Linked to ICT**

ICT is important in the schools as it:

1. provides authentic material and resources
2. provides students with a natural environment to use the target language

- **Added Value**

Students reach a higher competence in English after completing their upper secondary education through CLIL/EMILE. These positive results have been reported in a landmark longitudinal research study (Huibregtse, I. 2001 – Effecten en didactiek van tweetalig voortgezet onderwijs in Nederland), which has also shown that there is no negative effect on the development of the mother tongue nor on quality of learning content matter.

The link to internationalisation enhances the attractiveness of the streams, and thus school profiles. The programme that students follow contains many international and extracurricular activities such as English drama, exchanges and cooperation projects and provides students with a broader, international perspective on the content matter through the use of authentic teaching materials.

The methodologies used allow students to develop additional practical skills such as searching for materials, using the Internet, presentations, and other features of improved learner autonomy.

Teachers generally report that teaching through another language provides an enrichment of their own professional life.

- **Transferability Potential**

Very high even if environments differ

- **Indicators for Future Potential**

Development is rapid and positive. In the last three years the number of schools offering CLIL/EMILE has doubled. The real challenges lies in adoption of other target languages and other educational sectors, particularly vocational. Some schools are now examining these possibilities.

- **Broader Impact**

The methodological innovations found in the CLIL/EMILE streams could, in various ways, be relevant to improving quality of learning in non-CLIL/EMILE teaching.

- **Additional Observation & Comment**

Networking only works if all parties are equivalent stakeholders and in a relatively similar stage of development. For this reason, a separate network for schools which have little experience of CLIL/EMILE was set up in 2000 allowing schools with more experience to network separately.

More information:

[www.netwerktto.europesplatform.nl](http://www.netwerktto.europesplatform.nl)

- **Predominant Reasons for Implementation**

The Culture Dimension

- Develop intercultural communication skills

The Environment Dimension

- Prepare for internationalisation, specifically EU integration
- Access International Certification
- Enhance school profile



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

### The Language Dimension

- Improve overall target language competence
- Introduce a target language

### The Content Dimension

- Provide opportunities to study content through different perspectives
- Prepare for future studies and/or working life

### The Learning Dimension

- Complement individual learning strategies

**128**







## CASE 9

**Internal EU Border- 3 Examples****Synopsis**

These three examples represent a new type of border school in which mainstream schools explore forms of cross-border cooperation through implementation of CLIL/EMILE. The Finland-Sweden border has been open for a considerable period of time, and both culturally and linguistically, communities straddle the border region. Yet there are also communities that are in close proximity to the neighbouring country but not used to learning and speaking its respective language to a high degree. Thus the area is not fully bilingual.

The region, Lapland, faces high rates of population depletion and to some extent exclusion rates are affected by high unemployment. This is one major problem as it moves towards preparing young people through education for their respective futures in a multilingual Europe. In all three cases, CLIL/EMILE allows the schools to be pro-active in responding to the socio-economic challenges they face by becoming ever stronger in terms of the quality of education they aspire to offer. The outcomes are particularly encouraging particularly considering the low investment costs used to start CLIL/EMILE.

## • Background &amp; Contact Details

Countries	Sweden-Finland
Case Name	Swedish-Finnish Border
Target Languages	Finnish, Swedish, English
Sector	General Mainstream Education

Example A	
Level	Age-range 6-16 years
Scale	c. 305 pupils
Gender Ratio	50% female, 50% male
Contact Person	Ms Hjördis Lagneback
Address	Språkskolan Haparanda kommun S-953 85 Haparanda, Sweden
Phone	+ 46 922 148 08
Fax	+ 46 922 107 37
E-Mail	spraskolan@haparanda.se

Example B	
Level	Age-range 5-13 years
Scale	c. 200 pupils
Gender Ratio	50% female, 50% male
Contact Person	Ms Tuula Asikainen
Address	Pellon koulu Opintie 7 FIN-95700 Pello, Finland
Phone	+ 358 16 518 446
Fax	+ 358 16 512 627
E-Mail	pellon-koulu.kanslia@pello.inet.fi

Example C	
Level	Age-range 16-19 years
Scale	c. 70 pupils
Gender Ratio	90% female; 10% male
Contact Person	Ms Maire Pelttari
Address	EuroLukio Tornion yhteislyseon lukio Hallituskatu 7 FIN-95400 Tornio, Finland
Phone	+ 358 16 432 575
Fax	+ 358 16 432 336
E-Mail	maire.pelttari@suensaari.tornio.fi

#### Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics

Border schools have been a traditional environment for schools to teach in each of the neighbouring languages. In recent years such activity may have increased, particularly because of the *opening up of borders* in certain areas. Here are three examples of schools recently established which have introduced CLIL/EMILE as a pragmatic solution to the needs and expectations of the surrounding environment in an area where the borders have been *'fluid and open'* for some years and which now are internal to the European Union.

#### Example A

The Språkskolan-Kielikoulu of Haparanda (SE) and Tornio (FI), established in 1989, is located in the border town of Haparanda (population 10 000 inhabitants) which lies across a river from the Finnish town of Tornio (population 23 000). The area has a long history of cross-border contact and can be considered bilingual, Finnish-Swedish. The school started as a spin-off from a Swedish national development project (PuFF) which sought to identify means for improving the situation concerning the minority Finnish-speaking community of Sweden. The running costs of the school are considered similar to conventional Swedish monolingual schools.

The school provides pre-schooling (kindergarten) which employs 4 staff and presently only caters for Swedish-speaking children; primary for Finnish and Swedish-speaking pupils (and an after-school club for both) in addition to lower secondary. The first graduation of the 'CLIL/EMILE stream' was in 2001. Pupils leaving the school may select vocational education (in Lulea, some distance from Haparanda); upper secondary in Swedish locally, or through CLIL in neighbouring Tornio (through Finnish-Swedish and English). The grading system is Swedish but the curriculum has been partially adapted for CLIL/EMILE.

Intake is based on 50% Finnish-speaking and 50% Swedish-speaking pupils. In Grade 1 18 pupils are selected from each language group, and are then taught either as a group of 36, or separately. Many of these children come from bilingual families and so on starting in Grade 1, they may already have some language competence in the target language. But this is not always the case. The languages are taught as 'foreign languages' or home languages respectively, and some non-language content is taught through CLIL/EMILE. Use of computers is a high priority, and the school is well-equipped. Home access to the Internet is rated at around 75%.

The philosophy of the school is changing from mixing two separate cultural-linguistic groups, as in sometimes teaching separately and sometimes together, towards greater integration. For this to happen, staff consider themselves not to be either language teachers or other subject teachers, but rather 'language developers'. In other words, the staff, all of whom are proficient in both languages, all have responsibility for language development. Finnish staff rarely teach through Swedish, and Swedish staff rarely through Finnish.

One problem affecting this type of school in relation to further integration is in compatibil-



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

131

ity of the two educational systems. The Swedish and Finnish systems are not fully compatible, particularly in post-primary education. This means that teachers from the respective countries may also differ in approach and ethos. This is not to suggest that positive outcomes cannot be gained from this type of dual-language school, but simply that there may be serious limitations to the degree of integration possible. This may be seen in the student intake levels of Example C which is the Finnish recipient upper secondary school serving pupils leaving the Språkskolan. However, the school can be considered a successful compromise in the manner by which it integrates both the pupils and the languages of instruction.

### *Example B*

Pellon koulu is located in a small Lapland area (population 5 000 inhabitants, with some 2 000 living in the town of Pello itself). The area is subject to increasing population decline common to Northern Finland, and neighbouring Sweden (-9.4% in 1996-2000, -3.7% in 2001). The figures for the whole of Finnish Lapland are -4.4% in 1996-2000, and -1.3% in 2001). The school is therefore coming under increasing pressure to re-examine ways of ensuring that it maintains its position as a quality education provider in a situation of diminishing resources, and as a consequence of population decline, pupil intake. The communities of Pello are separated by a river. The socio-economic situation in neighbouring Sweden is similar.

Pello school started to experiment with CLIL/EMILE through English in 1992. It has a steady history of developing theme-based curricula that integrates learning of target languages and content. This experience (involving small exposure to learning through English and Swedish) has laid a platform for examining how to protect the viability of this and other schools in this type of region. In 2001, the school adopted a new policy of moving one class of children across to the neighbouring Swedish school and teaching through CLIL/EMILE for one day per week. This has started with an experimental phase in which the Grade 1 class (c.20 pupils aged 7-8 years) mix with the Swedish pupils (c.10 pupils of same age) learning subject matter in both Swedish and Finnish. It is intended that this experience will continue through to Grade 4 (10-11 years), and that it could provide a blueprint for similar schools in the future.

This is planned as follows: Teachers employed by either Swedish or Finnish authorities teach linguistically-mixed classes in one location. The groups are separated for some subjects such as teaching of the mother tongue as a language, teaching of the target language as a second/foreign language, mathematics and some 'more-demanding' themes. Much art, music, religion, biology, geography, physical education is taught through two languages in combined classes. All extra-curricular activities would be handled likewise. The philosophy of this approach is largely pragmatic and pro-active in terms of the successes evident through earlier experience of CLIL/EMILE through the medium of English. It is not a reactive response to reducing expenditure on, for example, maintaining schools in low population areas, but pro-active in providing a rich learning environment for children even when located in an increasingly pressurized socio-economic environment. Finnish Lapland itself is a vast region of 94 000 sq. km covering 30% of the country with a population of 194 000 inhabitants (Swedish Lapland is 99 000 sq. km with a population of 260 000. Such land mass is greater than Austria or Portugal) and the closure of schools will only result in increased transportation of pupils, which may involve considerable distances.

The school can be considered 'trilingual' because learning through the third language, English, allows for networking and exchange with schools outside Scandinavia which is increasingly facilitated through the use of computers.

### *Example C*

The EuroLukio, established in 1998, is located within a conventional Finnish-language upper secondary school, Tornion yhteislyseon lukio, in the town of Tornio (23 000 inhabitants). Tornio town can be considered as having a stable local economy although the

surrounding area, on the Finnish side of the border, is subject to a high rate of population decline (-8.0% in 1996-2000, and -3.0% in 2001). The town lies directly across the river from the Swedish town of Haparanda and its counterpart lower secondary school Spåraksolan (Example A above). It is an upper secondary school, based on the Finnish side of the border that accepts pupils from either Finland or Sweden. It regards itself as an international upper secondary school which has certain special curricula subjects (some of about 30 hrs tuition are provided by the local university and arranged over weekends) and teaching of and through Swedish, Finnish and English, and teaching in other languages. Student mobility is a high priority as is the use of ICT. The cost of the school is comparable to that of corresponding Finnish upper secondary schools, although mobility does involve extra costs.

The target CLIL/EMILE languages are Swedish, Finnish and English, but the usage and rate of exposure is highly variable, depending on subject matter, group type and other factors. Basically, different themes or modules within courses are taught in one of the target languages. But because the school does not attract as many students from Sweden (estimated at about 10% of school population) as from Finland, the amount of Finnish as a CLIL/EMILE target language is presently low. This may be a temporary phenomenon. However, it appears to be linked to compatibility of educational systems and will be discussed below. The main foreign languages taught are English, French, German and Spanish. Active links, often involving exchange with schools in Belgium, France, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Spain, Portugal and the United Kingdom, further allow them to experience international environments.

Final certification is according to conventional Finnish upper secondary schools in which all students are expected to sit a national matriculation examination which they can take either in Swedish or Finnish languages. The teaching through CLIL/EMILE is reduced in the final, third year, of study so as to further prepare the pupils for sitting examinations in either Finnish or Swedish.

- School / Location Environment

- Bilingual
- Example A, small communities closely located across internal border
  - Example B, very small communities closely located across internal border
  - Example C, small communities closely located across internal border

- Time-Frame

Example A

In operation since 1989

Example B

In operation since 1992, new system introduced 2001

Example C

In operation since 1998

- Scale

Example A

Involving 300 learners

Involving 30 teachers

Example B

Involving 200 learners

Involving 9 teachers



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

133

Example C  
Involving 70 learners  
Involving 18 teachers

- Target Language(s)  
Example A Swedish, Finnish, (English)  
Example B Swedish, Finnish (English)  
Example C Swedish, Finnish, English

- Target Age Range  
3-6 years • Example A  
5-15 years • Example A Example B  
15-20 years • Example C

- Exposure  
Examples A, B, & C all involve 15-50% of teaching time.

- Subject Field  
Example A  
CLIL/EMILE is increasingly implemented through modular 'theme-oriented' courses that may be inter-disciplinary (combining elements from more than one traditional subject area such as physics and biology). More demanding subject matter is taught separately through the mother tongue. Drawing, gymnastics, music, handicrafts and other such subjects are taught in a mixed class of about 36 pupils, with two teachers, one speaking in Swedish and one in Finnish, following locally-developed language strategies. Repetition of what is said in one language, in another, is specifically avoided.

Example B  
CLIL/EMILE is implemented through 'theme-oriented' courses in one of three languages (Swedish, Finnish, English) on mathematics, biology, geography, religion and ethics, history, music and physical education.

Example C  
CLIL/EMILE is implemented through 'theme-oriented' courses which are embedded into different subjects, namely mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology. Special courses, provided by the departments of history and languages at a nearby university provide teaching through English on courses relating to Europe, internationalisation and intercultural communication.

- Inter-disciplinarity

Example A  
High

Example B  
High

Example C  
High

- Course or Modular  
Example A: Modular theme-oriented  
Example B: Modular theme-oriented  
Example C: Modular theme-oriented

- Content–Language Focus/Ratio

Example A

The major focus is usually on the non-language subject matter, but attention is increasingly given to the language itself in the non-language subjects and in the 'extra hours' devoted to learning the target language as a foreign/second' language.

Example B

The major focus is usually on the non-language subject matter, but attention is given to the language itself through use of 'language-sensitive' methodologies.

Example C

The major focus is on the non-language subject matter.

- Discourse Type

Example A – highly interactional

Example B – highly interactional

Example C – a combination of interactional and transactional discourse

- Trans-Languaging

Example A

Trans-languaging is viewed as a positive and constructive part of the educational experience, and not a weakness, unless it involves simple interpretation. Teachers pay special attention to trans-languaging and thus it could be considered as part of educational methodology in the school.

Example B

Trans-languaging is viewed as a positive and constructive part of the educational experience, and not a weakness, unless it involves simple interpretation. Teachers pay special attention to trans-languaging and thus it could be considered as part of educational methodology in the school.

Example C

Trans-languaging is viewed as a positive and constructive part of the educational experience, and not a weakness, unless it involves simple interpretation. Teachers pay special attention to trans-languaging and thus it could be considered as part of educational methodology in the school.

- Certification

Example A

Final school-leaving diploma is normal as for Swedish pupils in conventional monolingual schools. No special allowance or dispensation is given according to the experience of CLIL/EMILE.

Example B

Final school-leaving diploma is normal as for Finnish pupils in conventional monolingual schools. No special allowance or dispensation is given according to the experience of CLIL/EMILE.

Example C

Final school-leaving diploma is normal as for Finnish pupils in conventional monolingual schools. A special extra diploma is provided which gives credit for the experience of CLIL/EMILE that is issued locally stating national Ministry rules which allow the school to operate.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

135

- Teachers

Example A

Teachers are recruited from Sweden and Finland and they teach in their own languages to the groups when separated, and also in their own languages in the mixed CLIL/EMILE classes where both groups of c. 18 pupils is mixed into a single class.

Example B

Teachers are a combination of native speakers of the target language, non-native speakers, language teachers and teachers of other subjects.

Example C

Teachers are recruited from Sweden and Finland, and brought in from other countries on a part-time basis to teach through their own respective mother tongues.

- Linked to ICT

Example A

ICT is not an important part of the educational delivery of CLIL/EMILE at the school. However, as is typical of Sweden, ICT is prioritized in general education, and thus it is always regarded as an important element of school learning. It is estimated that about 75% of pupils have Internet access at home. Pupils can be generally regarded as computer-literate.

Example B

ICT is not an important part of the educational delivery of CLIL/EMILE at the school. However, as is typical of Sweden, ICT is prioritised in general education, and thus it is always regarded as an important element of school learning. It is estimated that about 75% of pupils have Internet access at home. Pupils can be generally regarded as computer-literate

Example C

ICT is not an important part of the educational delivery of CLIL/EMILE at the school. However, as is typical of Finland, ICT is prioritised in general education, and thus it is always regarded as an important element of school learning. It is estimated that about 75% of pupils have Internet access at home. Pupils can be generally regarded as highly computer-literate.

- Added Value

Example A

(Swedish mother tongue speakers) to communicate in Finnish language; (Finnish mother tongue speakers) to communicate in Swedish language. Linguistic self-confidence and development (learning in two languages also seen to be advantageous in learning of a 3<sup>rd</sup> foreign language), considerable interpersonal communication self-confidence and development, good non-language subject learning skills (higher ranking according to conventional monolingual schools in terms of exam results) and possibly development of mindset which is receptive to cultural diversity.

Teachers perceive that, overall, the communication skills of the pupils are enhanced (if compared to conventional monolingual schools on either side of the border, but particularly in respect to Finnish-speaking pupils), and that there is some evidence that the respective mother tongue skills may also be enhanced (on the basis that the children learn to analyse both the mother tongue and target language when problem-solving through CLIL/EMILE). Pupils leave general education (lower secondary) linguistically-equipped to study in either the Swedish or Finnish systems of education.

Example B

This is too early to determine due to the recent start-up of the new experimental phase but it is anticipated that a higher level of competence in more than two languages will be

achieved. Achieving the types of linguistic self-confidence and development, and interpersonal communication self-confidence and development cited above, even though located in a physically remote region with a small population base.

#### Example C

Students leaving this upper secondary school generally achieve high grades in their final examinations (higher overall than national average in 2001) and a correspondingly high level of education. They are able to consider further or higher education in either Swedish or Finnish, or probably indeed through English due to their high overall competence in this language. They are considered internationally-oriented, highly confident in using different languages to a high level of skill. Achieving the types of linguistic self-confidence and development, and interpersonal communication self-confidence and development cited above, even though located in a physically peripheral region with a small population base at no extra cost to conventional schooling, with no sign 2001, of any loss in terms of the learning of non-language subject matter.

- Transferability Potential

Transferability is considered very high if environments are similar (Examples A, B). Example C can be applicable to diverse environments.

#### Example A

Potential for transferability is considered high if the border communities are located very close to each other, and if the border is easy to cross as is the case with this EU internal border.

#### Example B

Potential for transferability is considered high if the border communities are located very close to each other, and if the border is easy to cross as is the case with this EU internal border.

#### Example C

Potential for transferability is considered high even if this type of school was not located on a border.

- Indicators for future potential

Positive in all cases.

#### Example A

The school originally started as a 'language school' in which Swedish and Finnish were the primary target languages alongside other foreign languages. Having two separate linguistic streams within the school has enabled certain goals to be reached (but it is important to remember that this border is open and the towns are very closely located, and inter-marriage rates high) such as improved language and cultural skills. There may be a slight difference between the attitudes of parents who send their children to these schools. Swedish parents may be opting for the 'quality image' of the school, and Finnish parents for the language skills that their children will attain. Put simply, the motivation for sending pupils to this specific school may differ but what these parents have in common is high motivation towards education in general. By having good grade averages the school will likely continue to be attractive for parents on both sides of the border. In time, it is possible that applications will exceed places as profile and reputation develops. The major developmental step facing the school is considered methodological. Even if good results have been increasingly achieved over the past 5 years in particular, then more could probably be gained by examining the strategies used for both the teaching of the target language as a foreign/second language (as opposed to teaching of the language as a mother tongue) and the teaching of non-language subject matter through a target language.





## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

137

### Example B

Even before starting the new Swedish-Finnish experiment in 2001, the school has achieved a considerable international profile from 1992 onwards, achieved in part, from interest in CLIL/EMILE through English. This has allowed methodological development to be achieved through experimentation and reflection, and a set of principles followed which suit the very specific surrounding social environment. The population decline and ensuing financial pressures on the region means that schools closure and a gradual run-down of educational facilities including loss of suitable staff is a very real possibility. By acting in this way, Pello school is not only in the position of possibly upgrading the value of the educational experience it offers pupils and their families, but also managing to do this in a cost-effective manner. There is thus a possibility that this type of primary school could become a blueprint for this type of situation.

### Example C

This school has rapidly developed as an 'international environment' and not a 'language school'. Learning languages is an important focus but is considered an added value in addition to quality learning of subject matter and final examination grades.

One question arises on gender ratio. Why is it the case that this school appears not to attract male students (presently 10%)? One answer lies in the perception that this is a language school and that this could serve as a handicap reducing final examination performance. It can be considered a temporary problem and not the result of how the school operates. Another issue relates to the number of students it attracts from the Swedish side of the border (presently about 10%). It has been noticeable that there has been a rather swift drop-out rate of Swedish students during the very first few weeks of the school year. This is considered due to the incompatibility of the Swedish and Finnish educational systems. The Swedish system does not involve a matriculation examination which, in Finland, is highly regarded and held in esteem. There may be a perception, rightly or wrongly, amongst Swedish students that the Finnish upper secondary school is harder than their own for whatever reasons. Certainly it is different, and in the case of this reporting it has not been possible to probe the reasons further than this.

- Broader Impact

Example A Regional cohesion and integration, establishing respect for the joint cultures of the area, and rather more separate national cultures, and preparing school-leavers with linguistic skills which suit socio-economic demands which is advantageous both regionally and nationally.

Example B Ensuring availability of quality primary education in a low-finance region

Example C Ensuring availability of quality internationally-oriented education without extra cost in a peripheral region.

- In Addition

### Example A

Much can be achieved even if educational systems are not fully compatible, if there is some degree of flexibility in allowing schools in 'special circumstances' like this to operate. When this school started as a 'language school' there may have been a high degree of consecutive repetition in each language (as in saying something to the class in Swedish, and then repeating this in Finnish). This was found to be disadvantageous, and a steady move towards 'language-sensitive' methodologies has ensued.

Both sides of this border area, which may be considered peripheral in geographical terms, is suffering from population depletion (-3.7% 1996-2000; -1.0% in 2001) and this type of school could be further developed as a quality model which could serve both linguistic communities during a period of declining school population and resources.

## Example B

The location of this school is in a remote Lapland area (population 5 000, with some 2 000 living in the town of Pello itself) subject to increasing population decline common to this part of Northern Finland (-9.4% in 1996-2000, -3.7% in 2001). The figures for the whole of Finnish Lapland are -4.4% in 1996-2000, and -1.3% in 2001). Neighbouring Sweden faces similar problems. The implementation of trilingual CLIL/EMILE can be considered a pragmatic response to a very serious socio-economic set of problems.

## Example C

This type of school could be a model for schools which teach partially through CLIL/EMILE in other parts of the EU, whether located by a border or not. The principle is to have language and communication as an added-value alongside the delivery of a high quality curriculum which is focussed on internationalisation and contemporary life.

- Predominant Reasons for Implementation

## The Culture Dimension

- Build intercultural knowledge & Understanding A B D
- Develop intercultural communication skills B C D
- Learn about specific neighbouring countries/regions and/or minority groups A B D
- Introduce the wider cultural context A B C D

## The Environment Dimension

- Prepare for internationalisation, specifically EU integration A C D
- Enhance school profile C

## The Language Dimension

- Improve overall target language competence A B C D
- Develop oral communication skills A B C
- Deepen awareness of both mother tongue and target language A B C
- Develop plurilingual interests and attitudes A B C D
- Introduce a target language A C

## The Content Dimension

- Provide opportunities to study content through different perspectives B D
- Access subject-specific target language terminology B D
- Prepare for future studies and/or working life A B C D

## The Learning Dimension

- Complement individual learning strategies A



## CASE 10

**External EU Border****Synopsis**

This example concerns a single school located in three separate locations along a border, traditionally referred to as a frontier, that has traditionally been 'highly restricted' in terms of cultural exchange and mobility. It is a socio-linguistic border that has long been associated with hostility and other forms of negative prejudice for socio-historical reasons.

The school was set up (in the form of a three location cluster) along the Finnish side of the border to both provide enhanced instruction in the Russian language (for national socio-economic reasons) and cater for in-migrant Russian-speakers (often of Finnish descent who had been re-located out of present Finnish borders due to historical political contexts). It attracts pupils who are Finnish-speaking, Russian-speaking, and bilingual, and teaches through not only Finnish and Russian, but also English and Swedish. It considers itself to be a plurilingual school that uses CLIL/EMILE methodologies whilst teaching to the Finnish national curriculum. To succeed it has been developing its own educational methodologies to suit the objectives and local context. It acts as a model for border regions in which there is animosity, if not even hostility, between linguistic groups. Thus it may be relevant to other borders within or external to the European Union members, and the pre-accession states.

## • Background &amp; Contact Details

Country	Finland-Russia
Case Name	Finnish-Russian School of Eastern Finland
Target Language(s)	Swedish, English, Finnish & Russian
Sector	General Mainstream Education
Level	Age-range 11-19 years
Scale	c. 330 pupils
Gender Ratio	60% female; 40% male
Contact Person	Ms Leena Luostarinen
Address	Finnish-Russian School of Eastern Finland Ratakatu 20 FIN-53100, Lappeenranta, Finland
Phone	+ 358 40 594 5336
Fax	+ 358 5 616 2779
E-Mail	leena.luostarinen@edu.itasuomenkoulu.net

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

The Finnish-Russian School of Eastern Finland, established in 1997, is located in three separate cities, Imatra (31 000), Joensuu (52 000) and Lappeenranta (58 000) which are spread out over a rural area (about 12 000 sq.km) on the border with Russia.

Pupils from homes in which Russian is a first language comprise about 30%, which leaves about 70% have Finnish as the home language. However, the school was not established to accommodate the needs of incoming Russian-speaking migrants. On the contrary, a major incentive was to tackle the problem of too few Finnish pupils studying Russian language.

This region, even though the border can still be viewed as relatively 'non-fluid' for socio-political reasons, was regarded as suitable for experimenting with language through CLIL/

EMILE so as to enhance access to the Russian language for Finnish speakers. The size of the Russian-speaking minority was increasing, number of Russian-speaking visitors increasing, alongside trade relations, thus the Finnish and Russian language demands of the community were also steadily increasing. The introduction of CLIL/EMILE can thus be viewed as a pragmatic response to identifiable social-economic needs.

The philosophy of this approach (termed dual-language education and possibly to be re-termed plurilingual education) is to give both Finnish and Russian mother tongue speakers the respective target languages, and to show that the language of the minority Russian speakers is a valuable asset thus triggering a positive bicultural learning environment, and giving all pupils the added value of a high level of fluency in two languages by the time they leave school.

The obligatory languages of the school are Finnish, Russian and English. All CLIL/EMILE education is based on theme-based modules that are often inter-disciplinary. The school is shifting away from selection of themes/topics/subjects according to availability of teaching staff, towards a module-driven curriculum in which certain identifiable themes are selected as most suitable for CLIL/EMILE. The main idea is to teach the national curriculum but with the added value of extra development of at least two foreign languages (one European community, one non-EU neighbouring country) and develop interpersonal communication skills. The 'bicultural' aspect is an important part of the school's ethos. The school has consciously developed a micro-culture through observing and recognizing habits or cultural events representing the Finnish and Russian languages, and special attention is given to the communication codes particular to each language.

Expansion is not a priority because as the school develops it wants to continue to develop good practice in first instance, and it could be argued that one such 'plurilingual school' is sufficient for this particular region, its population and needs. The potential for transferability is, however, considered high.

This type of education costs some 20% more than conventional monolingual schools. Much of this finance is absorbed by extra teaching hours which are provided due to the use of two vehicular languages.

It would have benefited from increased research-support, from the local university for instance, and better human resource management at the beginning of the experiment. In addition, there is a noticeable difference of educational and pedagogic orientation between the Finnish and Russian teaching staff. This could be considered advantageous in some ways, but it is an issue that needs to be addressed due to divergent approaches used. They have experienced problems with both models and materials. Having examined various well-known models, particularly from immersion, they found that they needed to develop a CLIL/EMILE model that was unique to the special characteristics of the environment. They have needed to address problems resulting from low exposure to Russian language in the environment (and Internet). This would not have been a problem had a major target language been, for example, English. However, they have steadily worked at developing strategies to overcome this weakness.

The relationship with Russia has been problematic for centuries and consequently a negative attitude towards this language has been rather commonplace in Finland. Thus, this school has been set up in a particularly challenging linguistic environment. Given such circumstances its achievements to date are considerable.

- School / Location Environment
- Monolingual • Yes, sparsely populated rural area with external EU border
- Bilingual •
- Multilingual •



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

141

- Time-Frame

In operation since 1997

- Scale

At present the school involves 350 learners, and about 30 teachers plus part-time assistance.

- Target Language(s)

Finnish, Russian, English

- Target Age Range

3-6 years •  
5-15 years • Yes  
15-20 years • Yes

- Exposure (proportion of CLIL teaching experienced by a learner in a school year)

Low (5-15% of teaching time) •  
Medium (15-50% of teaching time) • Yes  
High (over 50% of teaching time) •

- Subject Field

CLIL/EMILE is implemented through modular 'theme-oriented' courses that may be interdisciplinary (combining elements from more than one traditional subject area such as physics and biology). These have tended to depend on availability of capable teaching personnel and there is now a move to establish certain courses and recruit staff accordingly. Thus, the school appears to be moving from subjects selected according to availability of staff towards selection on the basis of appropriate learning topics.

- Inter-disciplinarity

High

- Course or Modular

Modular theme-oriented

- Content–Language Ratio

The major focus is usually on the non-language subject matter, but attention is given to the language itself through use of 'language-sensitive' methodologies.

- Discourse Type

Highly interactional although teachers of one of the target languages, Russian, appear to prefer non-interactive methods. This may be linked to Russian teacher-training, and thus culture, and efforts are made to find compromise positions for all teachers so that a pre-requisite degree of interactivity is found in all classrooms

- Trans-Languaging

Trans-languaging is viewed as a positive and constructive part of the educational experience, and not a weakness, unless it involves simple interpretation. Teachers pay special attention to trans-languaging and thus it could be considered as part of educational methodology in the school.

- Certification

Final 'matriculation' certification is normal as for Finnish pupils in conventional monolingual schools. No special allowance or dispensation is given according to the experience of CLIL/EMILE.



- Teachers

Teachers are a combination of native speakers of the target language, non-native speakers, language teachers and teachers of other subjects.

- Linked to ICT

ICT is not an important part of the educational delivery of CLIL/EMILE at the school. However, as is typical of Finland, ICT is prioritized in general education, and thus it is always regarded as an important element of school learning. It is estimated that about 75% of pupils have Internet access at home. There appears to have been some recent decline in out-of-school hours Internet usage at school, which might be linked to increased home usage. It is assumed that most of this Internet usage is through the medium of English, not one of the other target languages. Pupils can be generally regarded as computer-literate.

- Added Value

(Finnish mother tongue speakers) To communicate in an increasingly important less widely-used language; (Russian mother tongue speakers) to communicate in the widely used language of the environment.

Linguistic self-confidence and development (learning in two languages also seen to be advantageous in learning of a 3<sup>rd</sup> foreign language), interpersonal communication self-confidence and development, good non-language subject learning skills (higher ranking according to conventional monolingual schools in terms of exam results) and possibly development of mindset which is receptive to cultural diversity.

- Transferability Potential

Transferability is high even if (border) environments differ

- Indicators for Future Potential

This particular school is unlikely to expand because it appears to be of an appropriate size to suit localized needs. The potential for transferability is considered high for this type of border region (Relatively closed EU-external with history of hostile and otherwise negative attitudes)

Having encountered difficult development periods in its 5 year history, the school is now entering a new development phase in which it is stronger due to clarity and commitment to the CLIL/EMILE approach it has implemented. Although lack of resources and other forms of external research-based support have meant that it is not in a position to analytically prove outcomes, on an anecdotal level the success and validity of the approach appear to be validated. The present wish is to re-organise the curriculum (particularly towards theme-based learning which remains uncommon in conventional monolingual education) and consolidate experience so as to further strengthen the school. A key issue relates to the essence of CLIL/EMILE. In this school, the teachers have found that alongside changing the language of instruction, changing the delivery of education is also a pre-requisite for success.

Transferability to other environments, particularly those similar on the eastern boundaries of the European Union might be possible.

- Broader Impact

Establishing respect for the linguistic and cultural heritage of an immigrant community, and preparing school-leavers with foreign language skills that suit socio-economic demands which are advantageous both regionally and nationally.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

143

- In Addition

When you change the language of instruction it is also necessary and advantageous to change the delivery of instruction, and learning approach. This is a major issue in the development curve of this type of school.

- Predominant Reasons for Implementation

The Culture Dimension

- Build intercultural knowledge & Understanding
- Learn about specific neighbouring countries/regions and/or minority groups
- Introduce the wider cultural context

The Environment Dimension

- Prepare for internationalisation, specifically EU integration

The Language Dimension

- Improve overall target language competence
- Develop oral communication skills
- Deepen awareness of both mother tongue and target language
- Develop plurilingual interests and attitudes
- Introduce a target language

The Content Dimension

- Prepare for future studies and/or working life

The Learning Dimension

- Complement individual learning strategies



## CASE 11

**EU Pre-Accession Minority / Foreign Language****Synopsis**

This case exemplifies how the introduction of CLIL/EMILE can be used for dual purposes. Firstly, to address a minority language problem within a country, Secondly, to use similar methodologies to introduce a third language, in this case a foreign language.

- Background & Contact Details

Country	Estonia
Case Name	EU Pre-Accession Minority / Foreign Language
Target Language(s)	Estonian & English or other European language
Sector	General Education

Level	Primary
Scale	c.330 pupils
Gender Ratio	51.5% female; 48.5% male
Contact Person	Peeter Mehisto
Address	Kihnu 1 13913 Tallinn Estonia

Phone	+ 372 605 72 50
Fax	+ 372 605 72 51
E-Mail	peeter.mehisto@keel.uninet.ee

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

As a pre-accession country, Estonia faces two challenges. Firstly to improve skills in the national language, Estonian, amongst the Russian-speaking community. Secondly, to prepare the population as a whole for European integration through providing opportunities for enhanced language learning. The methodology used here, essentially an example of Canadian immersion, primarily seeks to solve a problem relating to minority language issues. In Grade 1, 100% of teaching is through the target language, Estonian. This gradually declines through to Grade 6 where 44% is in Estonian and 44% in Russian. However, from Grade 3 onwards 12% of the curriculum is taught in a foreign language. The dual-focus involved in implementation is of particular significance because there are other countries which face similar language problems within their communities which are linked to past historical circumstances. It is assumed that by successfully introducing forms of CLIL/EMILE to solve one problem, the groundwork is laid for tackling another, namely increasing the number of foreign language speakers within the society. There have been CLIL/EMILE initiatives within the country since 1992, mostly due to grassroots pressure, but this is a major government supported initiative that is likely to result in expansion.

- School / Location Environment

Monolingual	•
Bilingual	• Yes
Multilingual	•





## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

145

- Time-Frame

In operation since 2000 for trial period of 4 years in the first instance.

- Scale

Involving 330 learners in (2000-2001) 5 classes of 4 schools in Kohtla-Järve, Narva and Tallinn.

- Target Language(s)

Estonian & English or other European language

- Target Age Range

3-6 years • Yes  
5-15 years • Yes  
15-20 years •

- Exposure

Low (5-15% of teaching time) •  
Medium (15-50% of teaching time) •  
High (over 50% of teaching time) • Yes

- Subject Field

Depending on the grade the target language is used for a majority of subjects/themes

- Inter-disciplinarity

According to immersion methodological principles.

- Course or Modular

Through the same curricula as in mainstream primary schools.

- Content–Language Ratio

The goals of immersion aim to provide advanced levels of proficiency in reading, writing, speaking and listening comprehension in Estonian, age-appropriate levels of Russian language competence, grade-appropriate levels of academic achievement in non-language subjects, such as mathematics, an understanding and appreciation of the Estonian and Russian culture, and strong skills in a third language (Keelkumbluskeskus: esimene aasta 2001). Thus language and content ratio are variable within the topics and subjects within curriculum.

- Discourse Type

Likely to be highly interactional

- Trans-Languaging

Not known

- Certification

.Not applicable

- Teachers

Estonian and Russian-speaking teachers from Estonia.

- Linked to ICT

The project uses ICT as a support in setting up implementation and has an electronic immersion chat room for pupils.

- Added Value

Integration into Estonian-speaking society for minority language speakers and strong skills in a third language, alongside grade-appropriate levels of academic competence in non-language subjects.

- Transferability Potential

High if environments are similar.

- Indicators for future potential

The introduction of immersion for the purposes stated might provide a platform for additional types of CLIL/EMILE to be introduced at other levels of education in the country. As of 1998, there was little reported CLIL/EMILE activity in Estonia. This high-level and thoroughly planned project (also involving local and foreign expertise in Finland and Canada) is likely to play a prominent role in terms of teaching through a second/foreign language for diverse purposes within the country.

- Broader Impact

This project is rather new and it is too early to describe impact. However, outcome indicators exist which suggest that by 2007 participation of non-Estonian-speakers in Estonian social, political and social life will have increased; that the quality of education overall would have increased and have a knock-on effect in guaranteeing the stability and development of Estonian language schools where Estonian-speakers are in a minority.

- Additional Observation & Comment

One of the various success factors linked to this project is the production of teaching and learning materials. Over 450 worksheets were produced for teachers to be used in Grade 1 and to some extent in Grade 2.

- Predominant Reasons for Implementation

The Culture Dimension

- Build intercultural knowledge & understanding
- Develop intercultural communication skills
- Introduce the wider cultural context

The Environment Dimension

- Prepare for internationalisation, specifically EU integration

The Language Dimension

- Improve overall target language competence
- Develop oral communication skills

Deepen awareness of both mother tongue and target language

- Develop plurilingual interests and attitudes
- Introduce a target language

The Learning Dimension - Learntix

- Diversify methods & forms of classroom practice



## CASE 12

**EU Pre-Accession Foreign Language****Synopsis**

This is an example of a school in an accession country, Bulgaria, which has participated in a national educational initiative, Education for European Union Integration, and adopted CLIL/EMILE as a means of achieving the desired plurilingual outcomes for students. Although both Spanish and English are target CLIL/EMILE languages, each student is to be offered 3 foreign languages (starting in 2003) as subjects in their own right.

- Background & Contact Details

Country	Bulgaria
Case Name	EU Pre-Accession Foreign
Target Language(s)	Spanish, English
Sector	Secondary
Level	14-19 years
Scale	5 classes x 125
Gender Ratio	50% female, 50% male
Contact Person	Stefka Kitanova
Address	164 <sup>th</sup> Spanish Language School Sultan Tepe 1, Sofia, 1505 Bulgaria
Phone	home 00359 2 710741 (GSM 098 489699)
E-Mail	butsa13@hotmail.com

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

This is one example of a member of a cluster of schools (Sofia, Bulgaria) that specifically aim to enhance learner's foreign language skills alongside provision of mainstream education. There is some tradition of this type of schooling in this area (over about 50 years) but in recent years there has been a resurgence of interest that may be attributed to the impact of internationalisation and specifically the accession processes. The vehicular languages are English, French, German, Spanish, Russian and Italian. The teachers involved are networked and have undergone various forms of professional development in CLIL/EMILE. Student linguistic competencies tend to be very high and grassroots support equally strong. Students in these 'specialized schools' tend to stay on an extra year.

- School / Location Environment

Monolingual • Yes  
Bilingual •  
Multilingual •

- Time-Frame

In operation since 1988

- Scale

Involving 650 learners  
Involving 40 teachers

- Target Language(s)  
Spanish, English, French, Portuguese
- Target Age Range  
Throughout schooling from 5 – 20 years.
- Exposure
  - Low (5-15% of teaching time) •
  - Medium (15-50% of teaching time) •
  - High (over 50% of teaching time) • Yes
- Subject Field  
Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Geography, History, Philosophy (ethics, law, civics)
- Inter-disciplinarity  
Low
- Course or Modular  
Course-based
- Content–Language Ratio  
90% content - 10% language
- Discourse Type  
90% transactional – interactional 10%
- Trans-Languaging  
Trans-languaging is viewed as a positive and constructive part of the educational experience, and not a weakness, unless it involves simple interpretation.
- Certification  
National diploma for Spanish language students (recognized by Spanish government)
- Teachers  
Most teachers are Bulgarian with a Master’s level degree in a subject and the target language recognized by Ministry of Education. A few target language native speakers are employed according to availability and resources.
- Linked to ICT  
Not directly linked to CLIL/EMILE delivery although good facilities exist.
- Added value  
The major outcomes relate to preparing students for further study abroad, or foreign language studies in Bulgaria. Linguistic and subject competencies are high. There is a strong sense that the school uses CLIL/EMILE in order to prepare for membership of the European Union in the broadest sense.
- Transferability Potential  
Transferability potential is high if contexts are fairly similar.
- Indicators for Future Potential  
Lack of resources and reported low cooperation between universities and government within this country hinder progress of this type. The motor for development has been parents and schools, and thus this is a largely grassroots movement which has received tacit support from the authorities. Learning through a foreign language is a long-standing feature of what are locally viewed as ‘quality schools’. To further penetrate other mainstream schools in the locality, teachers believe that greater interest and support needs to



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

149

come from research and administrative bodies – but these in turn are restrained by lack of resources.

- Broader Impact

This prepares students to be able to use 1 + 2 languages which is viewed as a European language objective, and also be able to serve local foreign language linguistic needs.

- In Addition

The school is moving towards moving on from offering one foreign language in the first year and a second foreign language from the second year, both of which are learnt through to graduation, to also offering a third foreign language for the final two years of schooling. In other words, parallel to the use of CLIL/EMILE, 3 foreign languages are specifically studied.

The school is involved with a national project termed 'Education for European Union Integration' which offers aspects of European citizenship in the school curriculum. This initiative is directly linked to aspirations towards membership of the European Union.

- Predominant Reasons for Implementation

The Culture Dimension

- Develop intercultural communication skills

The Environment Dimension

- Prepare for internationalisation, specifically EU integration
- Access International Certification
- Enhance school profile

The Language Dimension

- Improve overall target language competence
- Develop plurilingual interests and attitudes

The Content Dimension

- Prepare for future studies and/or working life

The Learning Dimension

- Diversify methods & forms of classroom practice

## CASE 13

**Vocational Secondary****Synopsis**

This exemplifies a vocational sector college that provides extensive CLIL/EMILE to separate streams in 3 languages. The location of the college, close to major private sector enterprises, allows it to work closely with industry in producing graduates who have the prerequisite skills as set by potential future employers. This then allows the college itself to benefit directly in various ways, not least financial in this case. It is an example of successful plurilingual CLIL/EMILE delivery that appears highly advantageous for the principal stakeholders, students, employers and the college itself.

- Background & Contact Details

Country	Hungary
Case Name	Hunfalvy János Fővárosi Gyakorló, Kéttannyelvű Külkereskedelmi, Közgazdasági Szakközépiskola
Target Languages	English, French, German,
Sector	Vocational Secondary
Level	15-19 years
Scale	Check
Gender Ratio	70% female, 30% male
Contact Person	Mr Istvan Baranyai
Address	Hunfalvy János Fővárosi Gyakorló, Kéttannyelvű Külkereskedelmi, Közgazdasági Szakközépiskola H-1011, Budapest, Ponty utca 3, Hungary
Phone	+ 361 201 01 22
Fax	+ 361 2010122
E-Mail	baranyai@hunfalvy.hu

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

Hunfalvy János is a secondary vocational level college specialising in economics and foreign trade, located in Budapest. It works closely with local employers and its CLIL/EMILE programmes are directly linked to workplace requirements of these employers which recruit graduates from the school. Hungarian educational guidelines on CLIL/EMILE are specific and always require a balance of teaching through the target language and through the national language. The school could be considered well-funded due to its relationship with some 100 commercial enterprises (2002), and laws that allow these organisations to donate funding directly to the school. It is particularly significant that the school offers three foreign languages simultaneously.

- School / Location Environment

- Monolingual • Yes
- Bilingual •
- Multilingual •



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

151

- Time-Frame

Teaching through German since 1987

Teaching through English since 1990

Teaching through French since 1998

- Scale

Involving : 4 streams of 40 students in French = 160 students

4 streams of 40 students in German = 160 students

4 streams of 40 students in English = 160 students

Involving 24 teachers (French 9; German 7; English 8)

(The whole school has about 800 pupils and 90 teachers)

- Target Language(s)

French, German, English

- Target Age Range

3-6 years •

5-15 years •

15-20 years • Yes 14-18 years plus

- Exposure

Low (5-15% of teaching time) •

Medium (15-50% of teaching time) • Yes

High (over 50% of teaching time) •

(NB: Hungarian law decrees that bilingual-type schools should have a minimum of 35% of the curriculum taught either of the language or through the language, and a maximum of 50%, with the remaining taught in the Hungarian language.)

- Subject Field

General economics, international economics, foreign trade, computer sciences, general law, cultural/civilization studies (of target language).

- Inter-disciplinarity

Low

- Course or Modular

Course not modular

- Content–Language Ratio

The non-language content has priority in the learning context, but language is also ranked highly, thus the ratio is estimated at 80% content, 20% language. Linguistic accuracy is usually the task of the language teacher but all teachers give specific attention to language when teaching non-language content.

- Discourse Type

Highly interactional

- Trans-Languaging

It is used for pragmatic purposes, that is when it is most sensible to switch from the target language to Hungarian, but is fairly minimal.

- Certification

According to conventional Hungarian certification procedures with a special dispensation acknowledging CLIL/EMILE.

- Teachers

By Hungarian law at least one native speaker of the target language should be employed in this type of school. The other teachers are target language teachers, other subject teachers, and most of the CLIL is done by Hungarian mother tongue speakers.

- Linked to ICT

Very highly. The school is very well-equipped with computers (7 computer laboratories with about 20 computers in each). It is estimated that about 40% of students have access to the Internet at home.

- Added Value

Hunfalvy Janos, located in a capital city, is able to prepare those students on its CLIL/EMILE programmes for the linguistic demands of certain types of employment in the surrounding area. Because it is so closely linked to major employers (over 100 contracts in 2002), and because it gears its education according to general wishes of those employees, these students can feel confident that by the time they graduate they will have a stronger than weaker position in the job market.

It thus provides the students with linguistic and communication skills in the target language. Special emphasis is also given to the types of field-specific terminology they will need in working life. They are also considered to be self-confident and better skilled in relation to the international demands of work whether based in Budapest or elsewhere.

The school attracts the attention of companies that need, or possibly increasingly need, multilingual staff at a greater range of personnel levels than earlier. Under Hungarian law companies have to donate some 1.5% of total annual labour costs to vocational education. This can be done by paying directly to the state or to colleges to a maximum ratio of 75% to a college and 25% to the state. By being so directly linked to corporations and other organizations, and by being actively seen to provide professional and also linguistic/communication skills to the students, Hunfalvy János attracts direct corporate investment which enables it to be very well-equipped and endowed. This might well be the case, or have been the case in the past, when it was a monolingual school. However, the needs of Hungarian corporate life in terms of internationalisation, particularly in terms of plurilingualism, have meant that this particular vocational sector school has adopted CLIL/EMILE and continued to benefit directly as a result.

- Transferability Potential

Transferability is high if environments are fairly similar

- Indicators for Future Potential

Very positive

- Broader Impact

The most obvious is employability of the graduates. This is linked to broader economic performance of the employing companies which require employees to have some degree of fluency in foreign languages.

- Predominant Reasons for Implementation

The Culture Dimension

- Build intercultural knowledge & Understanding
- Develop intercultural communication skills
- Introduce the wider cultural context

The Environment Dimension

- Prepare for internationalisation, specifically EU integration
- Enhance school profile





## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

### The Language Dimension

- Improve overall target language competence
- Develop oral communication skills
- Develop plurilingual interests and attitudes

### The Content Dimension

- Access subject-specific target language terminology
- Prepare for future studies and/or working life

**153**



## CASE 14

**Vocational Tertiary****Synopsis**

In tertiary education, both vocational and higher, there has been a strong tendency to teach certain parts of programmes through the English language. For various reasons this has often not gone alongside discussion into 'how to teach through English as a foreign or second language'. One of the most reported views is that you just teach as you normally teach but through a different language. Such forms of implementation would not qualify as CLIL/EMILE because it implies an absence of any inherent methodological qualities is implied. This example is exceptional because when the college embarked on the idea of teaching through English (alongside Dutch to some extent) the staff examined methodological issues and then introduced features common to CLIL/EMILE. It therefore stands as an example of how colleges of this type and in this sector could review how, why and what they are teaching through a foreign language, and, in particular, the choice of vehicular language(s). Put simply, if, as estimated here, there are so many vocational colleges of this type teaching through English now, then it is probably only a matter of time before the market shows interest in having similar graduates with European languages other than English.

## • Background &amp; Contact Details

Country	Netherlands
Case Name	Vocational Tertiary
Target Language(s)	English Sector

Level	Vocational Tertiary
Scale	100 (2003)
Gender Ratio	60% male, 40% female
Contact Person	Hariett Dekkers
Address	Deltion College
Dr. Hengeveldweg 2	
8025 AK Zwolle	
Phone	+ 31 38 850 3224
Fax	+ 31 38 850 3201
E-Mail	hdekkers@deltion.nl

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

Students work through English language for vocational qualifications that are either issued nationally or from abroad (UK). In essence they receive dual qualifications. This is an example, found increasingly across Europe, in which English is the predominant target language for the teaching of business and commerce. What differs is that the college has not simply opted to 'teach in English to be international' which is a common refrain, but rather sought to 'teach partly through English' using suitable language-sensitive methodologies. The college is a founding member of the The International Business Studies Alliance which is a strategic association of seven cooperating Regional Education Centres throughout the Netherlands, and currently involves ten separate vocational colleges (Naamschool, Plaats; Albeda College, Rotterdam; Deltion College, Zwolle; Dudok College, Hilversum; Noorderpoort College, Groningen; Rijn IJssel College, Arnhem; ROC Eindhoven, Eindhoven; ROC Nijmegen, Nijmegen; ROC Zadkine, Rotterdam and Zeelandia Opleidingen, Curacao). Plans are also underway to merge with the IBMS (International Business and Management Studies Network comprising 13 higher vocational education Colleges which provide teaching through English).



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

155

The educational programmes provided cater for young people entering low to middle management and qualifications are based on the official European system which classifies the various occupations (assistant, junior official, senior official, middle management employee) according to different qualification levels. Each of which correspond to one or more qualifications. Throughout, the need to use English in the workplace is considered an essential skill. Students do 'on-the-job' training work placements at various internationally-oriented companies. And to guarantee the international nature of the courses, several parts of the programme may be completed abroad. The student can obtain a Europass if s/he achieves one or more attainment targets in one of the other member states of the European Union outside the Netherlands. The evaluation of a study period abroad is similar to that of a study period in the Netherlands. The Europass complements this certification.

In operation since 2000, this particular college is working its way towards identifying means by which to ensure that CLIL/EMILE methodologies are used. A key question is whether or not colleges in this sector will introduce CLIL/EMILE languages other than English.

- School / Location Environment

Monolingual • Yes  
 Bilingual •  
 Multilingual •

- Time-Frame  
 In operation since 2000

- Scale  
 Involving 100 learners (2002-2003)  
 Involving 10 teachers

In the IBS network there are about 1 000 students being taught through the medium of English.

- Target Language(s)  
 English  
 (Spanish & German taught as languages. There is a possibility that experience of CLIL/EMILE through English could lead to greater interest in languages other than English)

- Target Age Range  
 16 years upwards

- Exposure (proportion of CLIL teaching experienced by a learner in a school year)  
 Low (5-15% of teaching time) •  
 Medium (15-50% of teaching time) • Yes  
 High (over 50% of teaching time) •

- Subject Field  
 No specific subjects, but rather through themes as relating to the EDEXCEL programme (UK-based) covering areas such as human resources, marketing, logistics, finance, business plan, international trade, the competitive business. A student would expect to have about 12 hrs per week in CLIL/EMILEW + target language lessons + projects (often 50-50% English-Dutch)

- Inter-disciplinarity  
 Programmes are highly inter-disciplinary

- Course or Modular  
 Modular

- Content–Language Ratio

The non-language content has priority in the learning context, but language is also ranked highly, thus the ratio is estimated at 80% content, 20% language. Linguistic accuracy is usually the task of the language teacher but all teachers give specific attention to language when teaching non-language content.

- Discourse Type

Predominantly Interactional

- Trans-Languaging

It is used for pragmatic purposes, that is when it is most sensible to switch from the target language to Dutch, or for other reasons, thus the learning environments are often bilingual.

- Certification

Dutch qualification: Wholesaler and Assistant Export manager, level 4.

UK qualification: AVCE Business, Double Award.

This means that a given student has studied 12 business units; 8 portfolio assignments (reports and presentations) and 4 external exams from Edexcel (UK)

- Teachers

All Dutch, both language and non-language specialists.

- Linked to ICT

Yes, heavily interlinked particularly through autonomous learning, use of the Internet for research, simulations, and other forms of desktop work.

- Added value

More, and better opportunities, for students to enter the labour market. Greater self-confidence from having worked in international company's abroad, or in international environments in the Netherlands because of the wider cultural diversity encountered. In some respects, the CLIL/EMILE is seen as more demanding than a corresponding Dutch language programme. For example, students have to develop autonomous learning skills, which are then useful in working life.

The school attracts the attention of companies that need, or possibly increasingly need, foreign language-speaking staff over a greater range of personnel levels than earlier. By being even more directly linked to corporations and other organizations, and by being actively seen in providing professional and also linguistic/communication skills to the students, the college enhances its profile and benefits as a result in various ways.

- Transferability Potential

Highly transferable if the situations are similar.

- Indicators for future potential

Very positive and likely to expand. The experience of learning through English may act as a catalyst for learning other languages with interest being presently shown in Spanish and German.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

157

- Predominant reasons for Implementation

The Culture Dimension

- Build intercultural knowledge & Understanding
- Develop intercultural communication skills

The Environment Dimension

- Prepare for internationalisation, specifically EU integration
- Enhance school profile

The Language Dimension

- Deepen awareness of both mother tongue and target language
- Develop plurilingual interests and attitudes

The Content Dimension

- Access subject-specific target language terminology
- Prepare for future studies and/or working life

The Learning Dimension

- Diversify methods & forms of classroom practice
- Increase learner motivation



## CASE 15

**Mixed Media Higher / Adult Education****Synopsis**

This exemplifies the delivery of language-focussed materials which, in order to be attractive, relevant and of interest to the target group (adults), is heavily integrated with non-language content. The materials and course delivery appear to be highly sophisticated, and there is evidence that the student assessment of the programmes is high. This successful application could be seen as a model for transfer into other countries, because even if the UK market is considered large, and thus the investment for these materials may have been greater than smaller, with eLearning platforms increasingly available, it should be possible to produce such high quality programmes for delivery across Europe.

On first impression it may appear as a set of language courses, which indeed is the primary purpose for initial production. But if both adults of this age range (30-60 years) and young children (kindergarten – early primary) are to successfully learn foreign languages, then the language content has to be fully integrated with some non-language content and activities. Hence this is included here as a form of CLIL/EMILE.

- Background & Contact Details

Country	United Kingdom (8% of students living outside the UK)
Case Name	Mixed Media Higher & Adult Education
Target Language(s)	French, German, Spanish
Sector	Higher Education (courses accredited to Open University) and Adult Education (non-accredited options)

Level	Post-school (continuing and life-long learning)
Scale	Total number of students (2002) 4 425
Gender Ratio	60% female; 40% male
Contact Person	Hugh Starkey
Address	Faculty of Education and Language Studies The Open University P.O.Box 625 Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA, United Kingdom

Phone	+ 44 121 426 1661
Fax	+ 44 121 427 9848
E-Mail	H.W.Starkey@open.ac.uk

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

The Faculty of Education and Languages was established at the Open University in 2000 with the merger of the School of Education and the Faculty of Languages. Multimedia programmes in French have been offered since 1995 (c. 13 000 students), in German since 1997 (c. 6 000 students) and Spanish since 1999 (the first graduates completing a Diploma in Spanish in 2001). These have been essentially language courses but in recent years they have integrated non-language content with language content on a considerable scale. As of now, they can be viewed as a form of CLIL/EMILE.

- The courses are offered at 3 levels

Spanish	En rumbo (1999), Viento en popa (2000) and A buen Puerto (2001)
French	Ouverture (1995, revised 2002), Envol (1996), & Mises au point (1998)
German	Auftakt (1997), Motive (1998), & Variationen (1999)



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

159

Approximate number of students and language choice per year (2001 figures)

French	2 603
German	1 032
Spanish	1 550

These are delivered according to open university-type distance education platforms allowing for flexible learning time-frames and tutor guidance which may be face-to-face, by telephone or on-line.

Core contents include themes on economics, leisure, health, performing and visual arts, marketing & sales, media and communications, hopes and expectations, history, housing and re-location, society and exclusion, politics, traditional and modern technology and science, the world of work, urbanism and architecture, multiculturalism and identity, art, society, science, global markets and ecology and the environment.

These are delivered in a fully integrated way not only designed according to learner language competence level but also in a manner that nurtures language development alongside content learning.

Development is presently underway for 'beginner' courses and these are expected to be launched as follows German & Spanish (2003); French (2004).

Although aimed at the UK market, some 8% of all students have residence outside the UK.

- School / Location Environment  
These courses target learners in all types of environment

- Time-Frame  
In operation since 1995

- Scale  
(2001 figures)  
Involving 5 185 learners  
Involving 260 tutors

- Target Language(s)  
French, German and Spanish

- Target Age Range  
3-6 years •  
5-15 years •  
15-20 years • 20 years plus

(Median age of a UK OU Languages student is 48 years)

- Exposure  
Not applicable. An open university student may or may not be doing this type of course alongside others.

- Subject Field  
Themes from various subjects likely to be of interest to adult students include economics, leisure, health, performing and visual arts, marketing & sales, media and communications, hopes and expectations, history, housing and re-location, society and exclusion, politics, traditional and modern technology and science, the world of work, urbanism and architecture, multiculturalism and identity, art, society, science, global markets and ecology and the environment.

- Inter-disciplinarity  
Very high
  - Course or Modular  
Modular
  - Content–Language Ratio  
Focus is primarily on language development achieved through theme-oriented content learning.
  - Discourse Type  
Highly interactional
  - Trans-Languaging  
At Level 1, both English and the target languages are used, but by Level 2 all written materials are in the target language except grammatical explanations. Communication, peer-to-peer, tutor-student, aims to maximize target language usage where possible.
  - Certification  
The course materials may be used as part of a course leading to certification, or selectively according to development aims. One course (one level) amounts to either 30 or 60 OU credits, and a diploma is awarded on completion of 120 credits. The diploma is awarded by the Open University and can be part of a degree programme (requiring 360 credits).
  - Teachers  
Teachers, referred to as ‘tutors’, may be native-speakers or non-native speakers of the target language. All are language specialists.
- The materials are produced by a combination of academics, including native and non-native speakers of the target language, with each team comprising about 6 experts.
- Linked to ICT  
The course contents are mixed media comprising commissioned video and audio packages devised by the course team and filmed/recorded by the BBC. In addition there are non-commissioned, selected materials drawn from various sources according to theme.
- On-line real-time voice tutoring and consultation over the Internet is currently being developed using an internal OU platform (lyceum) that offers a range of interactive facilities which can be exploited in various ways (tutor-student; student-student, group). Launching of this platform is expected for German in 2002.
- What does it enable people to do?  
To advance language and communication skills in the target language alongside selected content areas according to language and options selected.
  - Added value  
Provision of opportunities for lifelong learning of both languages, and non-language content, for adults of all ages. It allows students to study without having to give up work or personal commitments through offering flexible study time-frames (e.g. 8 hrs or 16 hrs per week).





## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

161

- Transferability Potential

Transferability potential is very high for diverse contexts.

- Indicators for future potential

Very positive

- Broader Impact

This type of course is marketed according to various goals, one of which is employability and career development. The provision of language-support materials which can be used prior to starting one of these courses, allows a motivated adult who may have little to no proficiency in the target language, an opportunity to 'take up' language learning at a later stage in life. One key goal here links to career development and possibility mobility.

Both the credits and the structure of these courses encourage students to continue studies either in languages, or in other content areas, and thus they are prime examples of continuing higher education resources.

- In Addition

The size of the market in the UK probably allows for large investment in this type of product which is of high quality in terms of content and design. In the annual report for the Institute of Educational Technology (April 2002) the executive summary cites that 96% of students were 'fairly' or 'very satisfied' with the quality of their courses (these are the two highest accolades in the questionnaire used). There is high praise for almost every aspect of the teaching (print and audio-visual materials, tutorials, clarity of learning outcomes, ease of attaining these outcomes and so forth.

- Predominant Reasons for Implementation

The Culture Dimension

- Build intercultural knowledge & Understanding
- Develop intercultural communication skills
- Learn about specific neighbouring countries/regions and/or minority groups

The Environment Dimension

- Prepare for internationalisation, specifically EU integration

The Language Dimension

- Improve overall target language competence
- Develop oral communication skills
- Develop plurilingual interests and attitudes

The Content Dimension

- Provide opportunities to study content through different perspectives
- Access subject-specific target language terminology
- Prepare for future studies and/or working life

The Learning Dimension

- Increase learner motivation

## CASE 16

**Multimedia Interactive Technologies****Synopsis**

Applied to the training of CLIL/EMILE, and its delivery in the classroom, this example is highly promising in terms of enabling schools to share resources through use of interactive technologies. It could have far-reaching consequences, particularly in terms of staffing vis-à-vis native and/or non-native speakers, but also in relation to the development of CLIL/EMILE methodologies. In addition, considering the potential for teaching across school sites, be they in the United Kingdom or abroad, return on initial investment for set-up seems promising. A major advantage of this particular case is that a research team is able to work alongside practitioners in establishing best practice.

- Background & Contact Details

Country	United Kingdom
Case Name	Teaching Observatory
Target Language(s)	French, (German & Spanish)
Sector	General Education
Level	
Scale	c. 120 pupils per school
Gender Ratio	50% female; 50% male
Contact Person	Do Coyle
Address	University of Nottingham Dearing Building Jubilee campus Wollaton Road Nottingham NG8 1BB, United Kingdom
Phone	+ 44 115 951 4543
Fax	+ 44 115 846 6600
E-Mail	Do.Coyle@nottingham.ac.uk

**Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics**

The School of Education at the University of Nottingham developed a 'Teaching Observatory' in 2000 which was to provide a means by which to have interactive links between a higher education institution and schools located elsewhere. It was originally based on two sites, the University of Nottingham and Hockerill Anglo-European College in Bishop's Stortford and has now been extended to six sites through membership of Dartford College (11-18 years Language College), Charles Darwin (Biggin Hill), Dartford Boys School (Dartford), Southwolds (Keyworth), and King Edward VII (Melton Mowbray). Four other schools are currently negotiating membership. Each site has a 6 ISDN line large screen video facility with pan tilt/zoom cameras (remote controllable) and interactive whiteboards equipped to Promethian specifications. Essentially, it is possible to be located at one site and yet immersed in the other through the technologies, whether in the role of teacher, tutor, researcher or learner through use of large screens, interactive whiteboards and audio equipment.

When first designed (as a DfES Training School Initiative) the Teaching Observatory was envisaged to be a multi-purpose and multi-modal interactive training medium for pre-service teacher trainees who would be able to observe lessons given by expert teachers in a non-intrusive way. The target group were teacher trainees specialising in CLIL/EMILE



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

163

(geography, science and history through French and German) and those of modern languages. Correspondingly it allows participants to use and develop use of the new technologies in their respective fields.

The Teaching Observatory has also been used specifically for developing ways in which to enhance delivery of CLIL/EMILE through this type of interactive technology. In the initial stage it has been used for real-time non-intrusive lesson observation, individual remote support by tutors for trainees who are observed during teaching practice, shared interactive whiteboard applications between the two sites and various other specific tasks such as observation, analysis, and materials development.

The Teaching Observatory is like a large window in the wall of the classroom that allows people on either side of the wall to see and communicate with each other. This has 3 strands: a Virtual Training Centre (for training teachers); an Extended Training Centre (continuing professional development) and a Teaching and Learning Resource Centre (research-driven).

Use of the Teaching Observatory with trainees and learners based in two locations is likely to be extended where several school clusters set up equipment in order that teaching and learning can be achieved in many different ways, not only involving the physical location of a given person or group, but also the use of such technology to enrich the learning processes. It is likely that the University of Nottingham will be a 'hub' for the schools or clusters of schools. A three year ongoing project (CLIP run by CILT, London) focuses on developing CLIL/EMILE skills in between 6-8 schools, all of which could benefit from linking to the Teaching Observatory. It is also possible that other institutes of higher education may become involved in one capacity or another.

The Teaching Observatory is as applicable to monolingual teaching as to CLIL/EMILE. The University of Nottingham is the major UK centre of interest and expertise in CLIL/EMILE (School of Education) and therefore its use for this type of methodology remains a priority interest. Although a provider of teacher training the University is also viewing the Teaching Observatory as a means for teaching and learning in a foreign language. This is where its potential for enhancing quality CLIL/EMILE is considerable.

Initial cost is considered to be in the region of 20 000 euro per site, but there are certain cost benefits which could be gained through inter-linking of resources. Further extension and development relies partly on research both ongoing and planned.

- School / Location Environment

Monolingual • yes  
Bilingual •  
Multilingual •

- Time-Frame

In operation since 2000

- Scale

At present involving 100+ learners per school, presently 2 schools = c.200 learners  
And some 70 modern foreign language teacher trainees at the University of Nottingham.  
Each school would involve about 4 tutors, 1 researcher and 3 teachers in the school itself.

- Target Language(s)

French, followed by some German and Spanish

- Target Age Range

- 3-6 years •
- 5-15 years • Yes
- 15-20 years • Yes

- Exposure

- Low (5-15% of teaching time) •
- Medium (15-50% of teaching time) • Yes
- High (over 50% of teaching time) •

- Subject Field

History and geography at present

- Inter-disciplinarity

Low

- Course or Modular

Course and Modular

- Content–Language Ratio

The major focus is on the subject

- Discourse Type

Highly interactional

- Trans-Languaging

Teachers use only the target language, pupils respond in target language to teacher but may use mother tongue in group work

- Certification

Standard UK certification (GCSE) which is usually taken one year earlier

- Teachers

Native and non-native speakers of the target languages

- Linked to ICT

Highly dependent on the new technologies

- Added Value

Trainees/Trainers can observe lessons, create lesson plans and materials looking at effectiveness of lesson observation at a distance including pre and post lesson discussion/analysis, and creation and evaluation of electronic resources

Trainees/Teachers can observe lessons, engage in post-lesson discussion and have trainees taught at a distance so as to develop observation, analytical and reflective skills, and raise awareness of skills needed to be an effective distance teacher.

Teachers/Trainers can observe lessons systematically and investigate teaching strategies allowing them to engage in non-intrusive observation, create protocols for this type of interactive media, identify effective teacher strategies and give feedback to teachers

Learners can be taught in various multi-modal and situational ways that enhances the real-time and real-life qualities of language learning. Put simply, regardless of school location,



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

165

learners can see themselves and the context of their lesson as linked to the wider world to a greater extent than previously.

There are several innovatory elements being considered in ongoing research, namely:

- Use of whiteboards at a distance to enhance learning
- Use of whiteboards to support literacy and modern foreign language learning
- Use of whiteboards to encourage speaking and reading in a shared learning environment (between sites, collaborative use of materials, simultaneous use of powerpoint type programmes)
- Use of the Teaching Observatory as a classroom inquiry tool to develop innovatory teaching such as CLIL/EMILE.
- Use of 'activote' system to encourage the development of higher order thinking skills
- Creation of effective collaborative learning environments

Essentially, use of the Teaching Observatory platform invites use of innovative teaching and learning strategies. In practical terms it could allow more than one class in more than one location to be taught by a single teacher, classes in different countries to be taught together, real-time interaction between pupils in different locations or even countries to work together towards common goals and so forth. Certainly, it appears very promising for the delivery of high quality CLIL/EMILE courses. In terms of cost, initial investment of some 20 000 euro per site could be offset in time by sharing resources through use of this type of interactive teaching tool.

### • Transferability Potential

Transferability is very high to very different contexts if ICT equipment is available

### • Indicators for future potential

- Positive      • very positive
- Negative     •
- Comment    •

### • Broader Impact

Forging a closer link between the school classroom and the wider world, which, in turn, unlocks various types of potential, is a likely consequence of use of this type of equipment.

### • In Addition

Use of this type of equipment could help schools overcome some of the major difficulties in implementation of CLIL/EMILE. Theme-based modules, taught partly at distance through such media with learning reinforced locally, using high quality materials (cost-effective due to scale of use) and proven methods, could allow a cross-border and cross-linguistic application of CLIL/EMILE not seen earlier.

### • Predominant Reasons for Implementation

The Culture Dimension

- Build intercultural knowledge & Understanding
- Develop intercultural communication skills

The Environment Dimension

- Prepare for internationalisation, specifically EU integration
- Enhance school profile

The Language Dimension

- Improve overall target language competence
- Develop oral communication skills



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

### The Content Dimension

- Provide opportunities to study content through different perspectives
- Access subject-specific target language terminology

### The Learning Dimension

- Complement individual learning strategies
- Diversify methods & forms of classroom practice

166



## CASE 17

**Mixed Ability - Secondary****Synopsis**

This exemplifies introduction of German as a target language in a mixed ability school, which has students from Swedish and immigrant backgrounds. The school had faced resistance by students towards taking a second foreign language after English in Grade 7 and a corresponding high drop-out rate of 35%. CLIL/EMILE was successfully used as a means to encourage students to study this second foreign language. Students attained a considerably better command of all four skills in German language than is usually the case after a standard 3 year programme. Good practice was attained through informed planning and the support of a research team at the local university that carefully monitored initial implementation and reported accordingly.

- Background & Contact Details

Country	Sweden
Case Name	Kyrkbyskolan Nödinge
Target Language(s)	German
Sector	General Education
Level	Lower Secondary
Scale	Pilot Group 33
Gender Ratio	55% female, 45% male
Contact Person	Dr. Sigrid Dentler
Address	Dept. of German and Dutch Gothenburg University Box 200, 405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden
Phone	+ 46 31 773 44 77
Fax	+ 46 31 773 47 62
E-Mail	sigrid.dentler@tyska.gu.se

- Summary Description of Key Case Characteristics

The introduction of CLIL/EMILE at Kyrkbyskolan Nödinge was according to two interlinked projects, one of which was pedagogical, the other research-based. The pedagogical focus was on setting a means by which to enhance the learning of German and to prevent pupils from dropping out of learning a third language in Grades 8 and 9 (which had been commonplace and often on the grounds that 'languages are too difficult'). Emphasis was placed on the cultural dimension in the delivery of CLIL/EMILE. For instance, this was done through providing opportunities to become acquainted with German life and culture through two school visits to Germany and by receiving German visitors each year (groups of students and their teachers). Evaluation findings confirm the original goals: the pilot group outperformed the two control groups as to language skills. As to broadening of cultural understanding, a pilot study of cultural stereotypes about Germans and the German language found no differences between pilot and control groups.

What is special about this particular case is that the original goals were highly ambitious but because of dedicated research support, it has been possible to prove to a reasonable extent, the outcomes reported. The school set out to make a previously low priority foreign language, widely perceived as 'difficult' by the students who are of mixed ability and in a non-privileged mainstream school environment, an attractive study option at a point in the student's schooling when learning a 3<sup>rd</sup> language is generally considered a poor if not unwise choice. Through the introduction of CLIL/EMILE, it appears that this situation was considerably altered with the drop-out rate standing at 0% in the pilot groups and 35% in the control groups.

- School / Location Environment

Monolingual • Yes (However the classes include bilingual immigrant children)  
 Bilingual •  
 Multilingual •

- Time-Frame

In operation from 1998 – 2001 as first pilot  
 Due to be repeated starting autumn 2002

- Scale

Involving 33 learners  
 Involving 1 teacher (native speaker of German) and three German-speaking assistants (Lingua) for approximately 6 months each

- Target Language(s)

German

- Target Age Range

13-15 years

- Exposure

Low

- Subject Field

Geography, history, religion, social sciences

- Course or Modular

Up to about 80% of whole courses with the remaining 20% taught through Swedish.

- Content–Language Ratio

Focus is almost wholly on teaching content in a language-sensitive way. For instance, written assignments are corrected according to grammatical correctness and mistakes/errors in speech production are sometimes given attention.

- Discourse Type

There is a gradual transition from transactional to interactional as follows: at the beginning learning is mostly transactional (traditional teaching methods with little student interaction) probably due to the pupils' faulty knowledge of the target language. However in the second term of the 7<sup>th</sup> grade interactional learning becomes more commonplace (role plays as part of history teaching, group work in geography and civilisation, and so forth), alongside fostering of learner autonomy.

- Trans-Languaging

There is extensive use of trans-languaging. For instance, students will often ask questions or answer questions from the teacher in Swedish, but then repeat them in German after getting clues or help from the teacher. One teacher observes that 'the dreary business of having to repeat questions and answers made many students refrain from using Swedish just out of laziness'.

Some 20% of the teaching is through the medium of Swedish (Swedish talk and texts). The main reason for the teacher using Swedish was either because the subject matter was specifically Swedish (e.g. Swedish law) or of some form of interpersonal intensity (e.g. pupils





## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

169

asking questions about ethics or morality during religious lessons).

The teachers, however, always try to avoid mixing German or Swedish. Thus use of Swedish or German is according to certain situational requirements and routines.

- Certification

Students receive special certificates at the end of Grades 7 and 8, followed by a European Language Portfolio-linked certificate at the end of Grade 9 stating written and oral competencies.

- Teachers

One experienced and CLIL-trained native-speaker of German, fluent in Swedish, and relatively inexperienced Lingua assistants on short-term assignments.

- Linked to ICT

In the 8<sup>th</sup> grade e-mail is used between Germany and Sweden (German students writing in Swedish, and Swedish students writing in German). The Internet is also increasingly used for information retrieval and exchange (through, for instance, video clips). All students have a computer at home to facilitate this, and in case of financial constraints at home then grants were made available for purchase. Thus ICT can be considered a high priority in this type of CLIL/EMILE delivery.

- Added Value

These are considered as follows:

- greater willingness to communicate in the target language
- willingness to go on learning more about the target language
- enhanced sense of pride, self-reliance, in being able to do something considered special by following the German pilot programme. As an aside here, according to some of the parents of the academically less-gifted pupils involved, the project positively changed the students' attitude to school and learning
- enhanced sense of language creativity, using different cognitive faculties (communicative strategies) to search for solutions when the target language knowledge seems incomplete
- willingness to consider mobility and use the target language through, for instance, visiting German speakers in Germany, and possibly beyond in the future.

- Transferability Potential

Transferability is very high for diverse contexts

- Indicators for future potential

Very positive, particularly as research evidence validates the approach used.

The future potential seems high if the Swedish teacher training education can start to offer special CLIL/EMILE training programmes for teachers, stressing the need for better command of target language, methodologies and cross-disciplinary skills and knowledge.

- Broader Impact

It is not usual for young people from non-academic backgrounds, who are sometimes considered to be 'less academically gifted' to study a second foreign language at school unless obligatory. This type of CLIL/EMILE delivery has succeeded in raising the numbers of a broad range of young people wishing to actively study a second foreign language. It is also suggested that the students who have gone through this type of education have a higher communicative competence in the target language than those who have studied it for some five years through traditional language teaching.

- In Addition

One key feature of this case is the research that was been designed from the outset and ongoing. A summary of the findings is as follows:

The evaluation project was set up according to a holistic approach, testing the four language skills through different kinds of tests at certain intervals, thereby paying special attention to vocabulary and grammar. The results from 5 listening and 5 reading comprehension tests point to a significant lead for the pilot group. Their lead is remarkably high when listening skills during colloquial speech at high speech rate were tested and when answering reading comprehension questions that call for top down reading (up to 35% better). In accordance with other test results their listening and reading results showed a much lower standard deviation when compared to the control groups, i.e. the non-analytic approach of bilingual learning seems to promote homogeneous learning

*The results just discussed look somewhat different from those reported by Washburn (1997) and Knight (1988) on English immersion in Swedish upper secondary schools (the so called gymnasium). To sum up briefly, Washburn and Knight report slightly better, although statistically not significantly better results as to grammar and listening and reading skills. There seem to be three main reasons for the evaluation results diverging from those in Washburn and Knight, i.e. the evaluation of learning L3 German in lower secondary school versus that of learning L2 English in upper secondary school. First, the opportunities for implicit learning outside school are abundant for English but almost non-existent for German - the former probably helps students with just traditional language art studies to diminish the lead that bilingual teaching usually promotes. Second, if an evaluation in accordance with Washburn and Knight uses traditional holistic language tests (so called national tests set up by the Swedish school board) as its starting point many results will tend to converge due to the so called ceiling effect of the test design (i.e. their small CLIL lead as to reading and listening skills). And furthermore, taking test results like those concerning grammatical structure at a very general level and in the form of written cloze tests as a basis of comparison, will bring about a somewhat distorted picture since it leaves out the question, if there might be a difference in performance when grammatical acquisition is at stake (cf. our divergent test results as to test types).*

*As to the evaluation of writing and speaking skills the tests comprised tasks like describing the family, writing and telling a picture story, oral reconstruction of picture story and role play. The ongoing analyses of these tests point to a bigger active vocabulary as to verbs and adjectives (types) and a striking willingness to produce longer texts/more discourse in German. In terms of German syntax the acquisition of German S V O order was studied in accordance with Pienemanns Processability Theory (1998). The results confirm the implicational developmental stages, whereby showing a remarkable lead for the pilot group, at group level as well as individual level.*

*As for morphology, i.e. case marking of noun phrases, there are no group differences – probably because hardly any acquisition seems to have taken place during the three years looked at (due, of course, to the ambiguous case marking system in German). Subject -verb agreement was also looked into, showing a different tendency. In the first free written productions in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade there was no lead for the pilot group as to marking the present. By the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> grade this has changed. Many students in the control groups, but hardly anyone in the pilot group, uses the infinitival form as a kind of temporal default form, combining with any subject. And contrary to the control groups, a majority of the pilot students tell their picture story in the past, thereby showing very good command of both the preterite and the present perfect forms.*

*The groups studied also took 1 vocabulary test (passive word knowledge) at the end of grade 9 and 5 traditional grammar tests a regular intervals. The lead of the pilot group as to passive word knowledge turned out to be huge.*



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

171

*The analyses of the formal grammar tests and their comparison with free production tests show a decreasing syntactical and morphological lead for the pilot group when taking tests that put a strong demand on conscious rote and rule learning and, conversely, hardly any demand on automatic retrieval procedures of grammatical knowledge. Taking also the opposite situation into account, i.e. the fact that the pilot group always outperforms the control groups when producing language on line (i.e. taking tests were a high degree of automaticity of retrieval is necessary and where implicit learning seems useful) seems to confirm the idea that bilingual methodology promotes language acquisition.*

Further reporting is due for 2003 – ‘How little do they need and how much do we get?’  
Dentler, S. Stauffenburg/Tübingen.

- Predominant Reasons for Implementation

The Culture Dimension

- Develop intercultural communication skills

The Environment Dimension

- Prepare for internationalisation, specifically EU integration
- Access International Certification
- Enhance school profile

The Language Dimension

- Improve overall target language competence
- Develop oral communication skills
- Introduce a target language

The Content Dimension

- Provide opportunities to study content through different perspectives

The Learning Dimension

- Diversify methods & forms of classroom practice
- Increase learner motivation



CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

172





## CHAPTER 5

### CLIL/EMILE in Europe: Added value

#### Synopsis

Language teaching and learning, as delivered through the widely differing educational systems of the European Union member states, clearly needs additional support in one form or another. Some would argue that contemporary languages education has often failed to provide platforms for learning which suit a broad range of people, young and older. To learn a language and subject simultaneously, as found in forms of CLIL/EMILE, provides an extra means of educational delivery which offers a range of benefits relating to both learning of the language, and also learning of the non-language subject matter. In addition there are social, psychological and economic benefits. In order for these benefits to be realized there is a need to consider CLIL/EMILE in terms of both educational and socio-political goals such as MT+2.

In political terms it is noteworthy that some of the current pre-accession countries (for example, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia and Romania) are actively exploring use of CLIL/EMILE in order to prepare for EU membership. The same thing appears to have happened with the last major intake of new members in the mid-1990s (Austria, Finland, Sweden) which all saw a major increase in delivery of CLIL/EMILE prior to and following membership.<sup>1</sup>

To successfully reach goals stated in various formal declarations (white papers, green papers, resolutions etc.) and in particular those of Objective Four<sup>2</sup> *proficiency for all in three community languages*, CLIL/EMILE can be utilized as a platform for achieving various forms of added value, each dependent on context and application.

These are briefly described according to specific types of individual and social interests in terms of the economics of language, social inclusion & egalitarianism, gender equality, relevance and value of limited competencies, early language learning, certification, and school development.

#### The Economics of Language

Although there is continuous widespread discussion on the value of linguistic diversity in Europe, relatively little empirical work has been done, econometric or other, on the economic yield which may be had from increasing efforts within education to enhance levels

and types of language learning. Grassroots stakeholders, a social force that is very often instrumental in exploring how CLIL/EMILE could be introduced in schools and colleges, appear to view this approach as offering young people an additional bonus that could enhance future personal and professional prospects. When you examine why parents and others want their children to experience CLIL/EMILE the view that it may ultimately lead to *greater individual economic opportunities and benefits* is evident.

Whereas the focus of those stakeholders who are parents, or young people themselves, may be on the individual benefits of being able to use, to some extent, one or more other languages, other stakeholders may have other differing focuses which share a common interest in securing economic benefits. These may be localized or broadly social. In the case profiles included in this report, a localized example is included of a college which introduces CLIL/EMILE in three community languages at vocational level so as to prepare young people for identifiable and localized work opportunities in organizations which explicitly state that they need multilingual personnel.<sup>3</sup>

But societies are also stakeholders, and in terms of providing impetus for action, if not financial resources for implementation, the economic yield of an approach like CLIL/EMILE is often cited, even if it cannot be substantiated. There is a need for a form of econometric analysis, or some alternative description, which convincingly shows that language knowledge is human capital for a society at large.<sup>4</sup> One strategy is to examine the unit costs of learning a language in terms of learning languages from the same and differing linguistic families and describe these in relation to appreciating and depreciating assets.<sup>5</sup> Investment-return oriented information could convert what is believed to be the case into empirical arguments for investment in educational innovations such as CLIL/EMILE.

### Social Inclusion & Egalitarianism

CLIL/EMILE in mainstream education provides a greater range of young people than earlier with opportunities for linguistic development that would previously have been either denied, or unavailable for lack of resources. In Europe, the argument that CLIL/EMILE is egalitarian by nature is strongly voiced in some regions. Providing the opportunity for *learning languages* was a major shift of policy in some educational systems over the last fifty years. To provide opportunities to actively *use these languages* at school or college, is an experience which CLIL/EMILE is seen to provide.<sup>6</sup>

The most commonly cited reasons for social exclusion are:

- socio-economic barriers
- negative attitudes to difference
- inflexible curricula
- processes and forms of language and communication
- poor learning environments
- inappropriate and inadequate support infrastructures
- inadequate policy and legislation
- lack of family/parental involvement and support
- lack of clarity and learner support for learning objectives
- availability of appropriate human resources

It has been argued that forms of CLIL/EMILE can act as a potential tool for reducing the effects of social exclusion on additional language learning<sup>7</sup> because it impacts on some of these factors. The inclusion arguments also relate to the breadth of educational sectors



where CLIL/EMILE is appearing.<sup>8</sup> The successes at the vocational level are slowly beginning to filter through to those regions that may not even have bothered to teach foreign languages on courses because *'they failed at languages at school and they will fail here'*. This is clearly not the case with some examples of CLIL/EMILE delivery which have provided young people in, for example, the vocational sector, a *second chance* to learn foreign languages through an alternative approach, namely learning by doing, rather than learning by studying.

The most extensive available research shows no evidence that there are specific 'at risk' learner types that would be disadvantaged by CLIL/EMILE. On the contrary there is evidence that so-called low ability learners can achieve specific advantages.<sup>9</sup> One case cited in the case profiles even suggests that it is a positive educational experience for certain types of young people who are regarded as having 'behavioural difficulties'.<sup>10</sup>

However, it is necessary to show evidence that mixed ability learners can benefit from this approach which stems from European educational environments. The most effective way to achieve this would be for a substantial case study to be carried out which is then reported as a form of applied research within vocational education and training (VET) networks.

### Gender Mainstreaming

There is a widespread anecdotal view that 'girls are better at foreign languages than boys'. Some CLIL/EMILE practitioners argue that this may not be so much a matter of innate gender-linked ability as preferred ways of learning which complement diverse language learning styles. Forms of CLIL/EMILE provide alternative platforms for language learning that could help close the perceived, and to some extent reported, differences in language learning performance between girls and boys in school.<sup>11</sup>

### The Relevance and Value of Limited Competencies

CLIL/EMILE can undermine and challenge some of the negative consequences of the *all or nothing* attitudes that can influence people's perceptions of themselves as language learners.<sup>12</sup> By showing value towards both partial competencies and domain-specific limited competencies, the approach can challenge this particular attitudinal obstacle towards language learning.<sup>13</sup> It can also go beyond linguistic and communicative skills by reinforcing personal self-respect.<sup>14</sup>

A key aspect here is showing the value of a learner's *interlanguage*. This is the type of language produced by learners who are in the process of learning a second language.<sup>15</sup> In language learning which is focused on getting declarative knowledge (knowing that) about the specific language, such language production is inevitably the focus of error correction. In CLIL/EMILE where the focus is more likely to be on getting procedural knowledge (knowing how), the significance of achievement through *doing things with words* is likely to be greater.<sup>16</sup> This can be a crucial factor in building self-confidence and encouraging learners to continue being productive in terms of language use, literally in producing *comprehensible output*.

It has been argued that CLIL/EMILE may not provide the house of an additional language, and not even necessarily a room in that house, but it can give the key to the door, and provide individuals with the major first step towards cultivating a *can-do attitude* towards language learning, *a key to the door if not the house itself*.<sup>17</sup>

### Early language Learning

In their early years people are said to acquire the basic attitudes about foreign language learning and cultures that may stay with them for the rest of their lives. Late introduction to

language learning (after 11-12 years) may mean that we lose the window of opportunity, known widely as the Critical Period, which serves to support the argument that when learning additional languages *the younger the better*. The naturalistic approach, characteristic of much CLIL/EMILE, offers the possibility of enhancing learning and performance through appropriately timed education.<sup>18</sup>

*Language is an instinct. It's not a cultural invention like the wheel or agriculture, and its not passed down the way we pass down other bits of a culture like how the government works or how to tie your shoes. Children are designed to pick up a language just as birds are designed to learn how to fly, to migrate or sing, and spiders designed to spin webs. Natural selection shaped the human brain for children to pick up the grammatical structures of speech around them. The environment of a young child is full of things he or she learns to use as tools. Language is one of these, and the natural way a child learns its first language can also be used by that child to learn other languages.<sup>19</sup>*

176

### Certification

Through CLIL/EMILE, particularly at medium to high exposure, students are linguistically prepared to take up their right to study abroad, and often better prepared for the opportunities in Europe for future studies and working life. Putting aside certification of overall educational achievement such as the International Baccalaureate, schools and colleges often link CLIL/EMILE programmes to measurements of language competence through organizations based in other countries such as the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate, Alliance Francaise or the Goethe-institut. Such Certification can be regarded as enhancing learner's curriculum vitae. But in addition, there are other options which become increasingly attractive if students experience forms of CLIL/EMILE and the linked activities which may ensue such as increased contact with people in other countries through project work or travel. The most obvious is the European Language Portfolio.

### Catalyst for School Development

Some schools have come under great pressure to adapt to socio-economic forces, both positive and negative, in recent years. This situation is sometimes complicated by the apparently increasing use of criteria-based evaluation systems by which the performance of schools is judged. It affects some national educational systems more than others but does result in schools looking for new means by which to enhance their profiles in the most cost-effective way available. CLIL/EMILE may be adopted to fulfil such ambitions.<sup>20</sup> However, there is a risk that successful CLIL/EMILE delivery in a given school can lead to demand outstripping supply as parents perceive the gains that could be gained.<sup>21</sup> This, in turn, could lead to poor practice through hasty and ill-considered implementation, but generally the impact on the school environment as a whole is reported as positive.

One of the more surprising outcomes found in the work (2000-2001) leading to development of the CLIL Compendium was the argument put forward by teachers in various countries that CLIL/EMILE leads to 'diversification of methods and forms of classroom practice'.<sup>22</sup> During compilation of some of the case profiles in this report it is particularly noticeable that the introduction of CLIL/EMILE is the platform by which desired change in schools is achieved, which might not have been feasible otherwise. Shifting towards learner-centred methods is common in some cases, and towards modularity or theme-based learning typical of others.<sup>23</sup>

In addition, the trans-cultural dynamic of the content of some curricula topics can lead to introduction of CLIL/EMILE (for example where schools are linked trans-nationally in project work). Alternatively, it may be CLIL/EMILE which can lead to introduction of such content (for example, there is argument now for development of a European core educational module, available in different languages and exploited through CLIL/EMILE, which covers





issues relating to geography, history, and social studies).

Finally, it is worth noting that much language learning, if not most in many cases, will actually take place outside the classroom. In the language learning lesson, or through CLIL/EMILE, there is always a predominant objective of giving the student a *hunger to learn* the language in question. Once the self-confidence is established, and the basics of the language learnt, it is possible for the student to voluntarily engage in learning and development activities outside the classroom in fully naturalistic environments. By establishing a positive outlook towards additional language learning, CLIL/EMILE can also promote pluricultural (intercultural) awareness, tolerance and understanding.

### Conclusion

*Not trilingualism for the sake of its self but multilingualism for some other goal which is education. (Hugo Baetens Beardsmore)*

It could be possible that greater allocation of resources into additional language teaching could enable European Union member states to reach the primary language learning objective for each school leaver to have competence in three languages (MT+2). However, we would still face the question of whether largely instructional contexts where language learning is intentional and focused on developing explicit declarative knowledge will serve the interests of a broad range of learners in developing differing types and levels of competence. In addition, allocation of resources into one educational field inevitably means withdrawing similar resources from another. This can make the processes of change complex, slow, and ripe for intransigence.

To provide a dual-focused learning environment whereby the student *learns a subject and language simultaneously*, is in itself an added value resulting from CLIL/EMILE simply because of the efficiency offered in terms of time investment and educational outcomes.

*The kinds of activities they were involved in with history and geography meant that they had to develop their analytical skills, their reflective skills, their hypothesizing skills, and they learned to be much greater risk takers in terms of their own linguistic confidence.<sup>25</sup>*

Depending on type and context, CLIL/EMILE may benefit the individual on a personal and professional basis. It can also be viewed in terms of societal and cultural benefits, particularly with regard to mobility, and overall improvement of communication between various language users.

## Endnotes:

1 The Without Borders network which is spearheading a campaign to build closer ties with states outside the European Community will probably link CLIL/EMILE schools through different target languages.

2 1995 White Paper Teaching and Learning: Towards a Learning Society, European Commission

3 Please refer to Case Profile 13.

4 Not only for member state societies but also the European Union as a whole. One early reference to the cost of admitting Eastern European accession states without changing either policy or levels of multilingualism so as to reduce reliance on over-extensive translation and interpretation stems from an article in *Libération* (June 1992) 'with 9 languages, there are 72 possible translation permutations for meetings. With 12 languages, there are 132 permutations, with 16 languages, there would be 240. For each meeting using 9 languages, there are 27 interpreters...for 13 languages, you would need 42 interpreters and for 16 languages, you would need 54 interpreters. It compared cost to the Common Agricultural Policy arguing that ongoing language policy and levels of multilingualism would dwarf the budget of the CAP.

5 An attempt to do this was done in Canada (1998) which produced a set of hard arguments as to why investment in learning languages was beneficial for regions and the country as a whole. In Breton, A., *Economic Approaches to Language and Bilingualism*, Department of Public Works and Government services, Canadian Government. Some local attempts have also been made in Europe, and more widely in 1994 by The European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages. Please refer to Price, A. (ed.) Casson, M, Cooke, P. & Williams, C. 1994. *Quiet Revolution: Language, Culture and Economy in the Nineties*, translated into French and published by the Bureau Européen pour les Langues Moins Répandues in 1997 under the title; *Les dividendes de la diversité - Langue, culture et économie dans une Europe intégrée*.

6 This is argued on the grounds that it was only parents with both interest and financial resources who would send their children abroad for 'language courses' or other forms of foreign experience in earlier days.

7 Source: Marsland, B. & Marsh, D. 1999. *Progress*: Bristol Local Education Authority.

8 In this report, Case Profile 17 is particularly interesting in terms of 'mixed ability' classes and the way in which one form of CLIL/EMILE appeared to be successful with students who might otherwise have not opted to learn additional languages.

9 Genesee, F. 2003 (forthcoming). What do we know about bilingual education for majority language students? In Bhatia, T.K. & Ritchie, W. (eds.) *Handbook of Bilingualism and Multiculturalism*. London: Blackwell.

10 This school was not examined in depth because of the low scale of CLIL/EMILE but there is some brief description included in Case Profile 17.

11 In Finland, at the advanced level of learning English as a foreign language at secondary level, boys perform better in the final matriculation examination, but less well in terms of corresponding school grades. One informant, Anne Ontero (Board Member, Finnish National Association of Teachers of English) argues that even though the textbooks and allied materials are very good in terms of language learning, certain types of student need more substance in terms of non-language content. Students have voiced criticism of not being suitably challenged, in both English and other languages, and that 'they could learn more things at the same time' – in other words learn content alongside the various forms of often highly sophisticated exercises, communicative and form-based, used in the courses.

12 Hugo Baetens Beardsmore 1993. *Bilingual Learning: Institutional Frameworks – Whole School Policies*. Workshop 12A. *Language Learning for European Citizenship*. Council of Europe CC-LANG (93).

13 The Council of Europe's Common Framework of Reference, and more specifically practical applications such as the Portfolio enable individuals to see that credit can be given for even partial limited competencies. Even very limited exposure to CLIL/EMILE can help facilitate such attitudinal change.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

179

14 This is a difficult assertion to prove on the basis of existing European empirical research, but is widely reported by practitioners.

15 From Navés, T. 2002. *Interlanguage: Learner's Language in Second Language Acquisition for CLIL*. TIE:CLIL -Milan: Sovrintendenza Scolastica Regionale della Lombardia

16 From Pavesi, M. 2002. *Incidental vs. Intentional Learning in Second Language Acquisition for CLIL*. TIE:CLIL - Milan: Sovrintendenza Scolastica Regionale della Lombardia.

17 Marsh, D. 1997. *Approaching plurilingual education*, in Marsh, D., Marsland, B. & Nikula, T. (eds.) *Aspects of Implementing Plurilingual Education*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

18 It is hard to imagine how young learners are taught languages without it being mainly content-based, but during the course of this study it has been suggested that some types of formal language learning are indeed heavily form-based even with young learners.

19 InterTalk. Jyväskylä:University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

20 To introduce CLIL/EMILE so as to enhance a school profile may be a temporary goal, as for example, in rejuvenating a school which has problems with attracting students. It may also lead to negative outcomes if the decision to teach through CLIL/EMILE is top-down and not supported by both staff and availability of extra resources, particularly during start-up. There are some reports received during compilation of this report that schools which teach through a foreign language towards international certification such as the International Baccalaureate may be attractive to parents because of a lack of confidence in the national school system in question. Informal assessment from one European IB regional office suggests that strong growth is anticipated in parts the EU zone.

21 In some studies parental expectations have been noted as unrealistic particularly when terms equivalent to bilingual education or immersion are used to promote programmes because they imply 'full' competencies.

22 Marsh, D., Maljers, A. & Hartiala, A-K. 2001. *Profiling European CLIL Classrooms*. Jyväskylä:University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

23 See, for example, Kohonen, V. 1994. *Teaching Content through a Foreign Language is a Matter of School Development*. In Räsänen, A. & Marsh, D. (eds.) *Content Instruction through a Foreign Language*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

24 Hugo Baetens Beardsmore in InterTalk. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä

25 Do Coyle in InterTalk. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, Finland.



CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

180





## CHAPTER 6

### CLIL/EMILE IN EUROPE: Future Prospects

#### Synopsis

During 1996, a small group of experts from different backgrounds across Europe were asked to give their views on the future of CLIL/EMILE up to the year 2005.<sup>1</sup> In 1998, 54 key professionals from 17 European countries gathered in Strasbourg for a think-tank on the future of CLIL/EMILE.<sup>2</sup> Statements from both sources contain a rich source of insight that are reviewed issue-by-issue, through quotation, summary, and comment, in terms of what we know now about the present, some seven years later. These cover problems & solutions; establishing European types; reliability & confidence; mainstreaming; learning strategies; modular & theme-based curricula; new technologies; teacher professional development and stake-holding.

#### Framing the Future

*We tend to forget that our (westernised) educational systems...transmit a largely national culture and are primarily vernacular systems with much emphasis on national traditions, national values and a national language... just as we take it for granted that the ordinary man or woman in all westernised countries is literate and numerate in terms of his/own society, in about fifty or hundred years' time it might perhaps be regarded as a matter of course that s/he has command of at least one other language.*  
(E. Hawkins)<sup>3</sup>

The need to establish the *normalcy of plurilingualism* remains a challenge for many national educational policies on foreign language teaching.

*The fact that the teaching of foreign languages has expanded to encompass larger sections of the population, including both younger and adult learners, means that language teaching has become increasingly more institutionalised. Like any system, it requires systematic planning and evaluation. The advent of content-based language teaching (content and language integration/CLIL, bilingual education) brings in a new component which needs to be fitted in the existing language teaching system. Systematic attempts to define a national policy of foreign language teaching are, however, of relatively recent origin.<sup>4</sup>*

*It seems that a major development in education in general, and in language education as a specific instance, is a growing realization of itself as a social institution, as a social system that serves some fundamental social desires, needs and functions. Language teaching serves basic communication needs, and as its importance tends to increase all the time, it is more and more acquiring the characteristics of any institutionalised process... Language teaching is not only the activity of individual teachers – it is a system of activities. In order to understand it as a system, we need to realize its boundaries, its central purposes and its position in a larger context. We must be aware of its various sub-systems and of their inter-relationships.*  
(S.Takala)<sup>5</sup>

This author then discusses a systems approach to language policy planning and implementation in relation to CLIL/EMILE. He argues that there are several levels on which CLIL/EMILE should be handled to ensure that it is properly incorporated into the national provision for foreign language teaching. These are societal, educational system, strategic, tactical, and finally as a service for pupils/students. He argues his case for the future as follows:

#### **Societal**

CLIL should be properly incorporated into the national provision for foreign language teaching. There should be at least a broad legislative framework which defines the status of CLIL; the rights and obligations of the schools, teachers and pupils/students; the nature of examinations and certificates obtained from CLIL; the financial support available for CLIL. One crucial aspect of CLIL should be clearly spelled out: how good should CLIL teachers' proficiency in the language of instruction be, and how could that level be reliably checked?

#### **Educational Systems**

*There should be more specific guidelines for how an infrastructure will be built to support CLIL. There should be more specific documents, prepared by groups of experts, to describe the rationale and the goals of CLIL in (a) country. Like any other innovation, CLIL must be related to the national context, otherwise the chances of success are diminished and the probability of problems increased. Other groups should look into the question of teacher training, teaching materials, assessment and so on.*

#### **Strategic**

*The scientific community (applied linguists, language educators, teacher educators, etc.) should be involved in helping the implementation of CLIL by cooperating in the development of a specific curriculum for CLIL. This would define various approaches to how content and language teaching/learning can be integrated in an efficient manner. Planning a system for CLIL teachers' basic education and in-service education would be the task of another group. Preparation and adaptation of teaching materials should be started early enough, and ways of doing this should be discussed (e.g. cooperation with domestic and foreign publishers). Testing and examinations should be dealt with by another group of specialists.*

#### **Tactical**

*Schools need to develop their own strategic plan for CLIL: e.g. its goals, its syllabus, its organisation and resources, resources for materials and teachers' in-service education, and assessment. The schools should also have an internal monitoring system to evaluate how the goals are fulfilled (= how the curriculum is implemented) and to facilitate further development work.*

**Educational Service**

*CLIL is an educational service for pupils/students. It is they who realise the curriculum through their learning endeavours. Effective learning requires teacher support but also, more fundamentally, active learner involvement. CLIL probably sets even more demands on learner self-directiveness than more traditional forms of study. For this reason, it is advisable to incorporate the learner perspective from the beginning and have a learner development component built into CLIL.*

(S. Takala)<sup>6</sup>

These issues, outlined in 1996, will now be examined in terms of other commentary and what we can see happening in the present. In preface, it is worth noting the point that national policies of foreign language teaching are of relatively recent origin. Recommendations and objectives on community language learning made at the European level will inevitably be received across the breadth of the member states' education systems according to how prioritised additional language learning is in any given context. If the learning of languages is emphasized as a national need, but not as a national priority, then innovations such as CLIL/EMILE will have considerable difficulty in making advances.<sup>7</sup>

There are now signs, even in the larger countries, that there is political recognition, and possibly will, at a societal level, to upgrade and diversity levels of foreign language competence across a broad spectrum of a given population. There are also indications that the current interest shown towards integration of curricula content in education<sup>8</sup>, which became particularly strong in some countries in the 1990s, will continue to grow. There is a view that some subjects at certain levels should not be compartmentalized within a curriculum. Integration is often connected to the notion of relevance because as teachers and students know, without relevance it can be hard to achieve meaningful learning.<sup>9</sup> The impact of the new technologies and its increasing availability, particularly in homes across Europe, means that young people's attitudes towards accessing real-life in education, as opposed to simulation, will increase rapidly. One could argue that one of the major influences on educational change that we can see now in some countries is partly a response to the 'mindset' change of the younger generations through access to the Internet.

Interest in CLIL/EMILE is linked to this movement. Experimenting with vehicular languages in the curriculum does not stand alone as a solution to achieve higher levels of plurilingualism. Rather, it is part of a slow but steady overhaul of education that looks likely to gather pace. The evidence for this is in activities now being seen across Europe at the systems, strategic, and tactical levels.

Some of these will now be commented on issue-by-issue.

**Problems & Solutions**

*Europe has a long tradition in the teaching of foreign languages in secondary education and even, in some countries, in primary schooling. But the tradition flatters to deceive, as often there is little relation between the time and the effort dedicated to these teachings and the results obtained. Such deception has led to constant changes in the teaching methods... in the seventies a change was initiated in the methodology of second language teaching (communicative language teaching) which was to have lasting effects... However, while the introduction of the second language through (communicatively-oriented) activities, as is attempted at the pre-school stage, might be very simple, the repetition of these activities in later years makes them somewhat artificial and students soon lose interest in them... the next step was 'task-based approach', using the foreign language for some kinds of school activity, and from here to using the foreign language as the vehicle for teaching certain subjects in the school's curriculum... teaching in a foreign language will continue to grow as (it) represents the most effective means of acquiring a thorough knowledge of a foreign language... (and can serve as a stimulus for certain aspects of intellectual development). M. Siguán.<sup>10</sup>*

Unfortunately, especially in larger European countries language teaching has degraded in recent years. This is, of course, partly due to financial restrictions... and partly to the belief that knowing English as a foreign language is enough for the average school leaver. The lack of interest in learning languages and in promoting language learning has also very much to do with the lamentable state of language teaching itself, however. It is clear that with our present approach to the teaching and learning of foreign languages which Baker<sup>11</sup> ironically but appropriately characterises as drip-feed education, we will never achieve multilingualism in Europe. It is absolutely necessary to reform language teaching... What is new is the way in which different language learning approaches which have developed in isolation, are brought together in order to promote more efficient language teaching and multilingualism... 'learning by construction' (is) entirely different from 'learning by instruction', which is still the most characteristic feature of the mainstream classroom.<sup>12</sup> There can be no doubt that the constructivist paradigm will replace instructivism in the near future.

(D. Wolff)<sup>13</sup>

As outlined in Chapter 1 of this report, the types of dual-focused learning typical of CLIL/EMILE is seen as a pragmatic and worthwhile response to the educational demands of the present day. To teach more young people, more languages, with more skills-based competencies, requires turning aspirations into concrete can-do realities. The reported successes increasingly voiced during the last five years, even if unsubstantiated by empirical research in most cases, are likely to become increasingly of interest to stake-holders as they search for ways that can turn the language problem endemic in some parts of Europe, into language potential.

*(We need to) develop the increasing CLIL momentum by harnessing the creative force of confident and experienced practitioners with a united strategy for involving, at all levels, more professionals new to CLIL. For me this constitutes a pragmatic way forwards.*

(Do Coyle)<sup>14</sup>

It has been said that a common time-frame for introducing changes in education can be viewed as a 10-15 year cycle. The fusion of interest in CLIL/EMILE whereby differing stakeholders started taking interest in its potential could be regarded as having gained pace around the mid 1990s. From then through to the present, particularly in the last 3 years, it is believed that there has been a marked increase of interest in localized applications.<sup>15</sup> It is assumed that this interest will continue to gather momentum, particularly if it supported by national authorities in educational systems that offer some degree of curricular flexibility and school autonomy.<sup>16</sup> Assuming the applicability of 10-15 year project cycles in education, it would be possible to suggest that European CLIL/EMILE might reach its watershed around 2010 because the problems will not abate without solutions. The European languages dilemma allows adaptation of an adage 'necessity is the mother of CLIL/EMILE'.<sup>17</sup> Apart from assuming that the new technologies will radically re-define language learning, there is little chance of finding solutions without introduction of these types of methodologies.

### **Towards Establishing European Types**

*Given that there is a great diversity of language contexts, educational provision and perceived scholastic needs amongst the diverse communities of Europe, it is impossible to provide a blueprint for language education that could serve as a single model.*

(Hugo Baetens Beardsmore)<sup>18</sup>

*The popularity of such teaching (CLIL/EMILE) has led to the tendency that what has worked well in one setting can be proposed as a working model in all other settings. The reality is quite the reverse – in each setting it is necessary to begin by defining the aims and by drawing up a list of available resources, and with this information to plan the teaching method used. (M.Siguán)<sup>19</sup>*





## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

185

*What is new is that it (CLIL/EMILE) brings together concepts which have been developed in different parts of the European Union.*  
(D. Wolff)<sup>20</sup>

Teaching in a foreign language has existed for many decades in Europe. There are infamous examples of excellence in most capital cities, and certain other localities. Names such as the Lycée International de Saint-Germain-en-Laye, Lycée ferney-Voltaire Ecole Active Bilingue Jeanine Manuel, Geneva Anglo-French School, Kennedy School Berlin, international schools, the Franco-German schools, and the European schools, regularly surface in this regard. More recently the spread of International Baccalaureate schools (c.300 in Europe) have also raised the profile of schools that teach through a second/foreign language to some if not most of their pupils.

But teaching *in* a foreign language may differ enormously from teaching *through* a foreign language. One thing particularly positive about the European experience of CLIL/EMILE is that at the early experimental stage the locus of control tends to be in the hands of practitioners.

*The fulfilment of this dream (exchanges, integration, immersion) is possible only on condition that the teacher, the main agent of innovation in our stable educational world, possesses necessary inclination, willpower, capacity and resources. As theoretical research in linguistics, psychology, pedagogy and language teaching is undergoing increasingly rapid development, the teacher must of necessity be the mediator between theory and practice – otherwise the gulf separating the two will become ever wider and deeper.* (J.van Ek & R. Richterich)<sup>21</sup>

CLIL/EMILE denotes the methodologies that are used to teach both subjects and languages in a situationally-specific integrated framework. What has been happening over the past decade is that situational frameworks have been introduced and increasingly tailored for European contexts. As practitioners and researchers increasingly articulate the methods used we can see CLIL/EMILE coming of age as a distinctly European socio-pedagogic approach tailored for European contexts.

### Reliability & Confidence

As seen in Chapter 2 of this report, there remains insufficient empirical evidence of the impact of differing types of CLIL/EMILE across Europe. However, there are signs that research communities in different countries are beginning to take a more active interest. The very fact that CLIL/EMILE is trans-disciplinary has itself been a key reason why researchers have not taken as much interest as might have been supposed. CLIL/EMILE does not fit into 'compartmentalized' institutional frameworks which, at university level at least in some parts of Europe, are not renowned for responding swiftly to change. Is it languages? Is it education? Is it sociology, education, psychology? As inter-disciplinarity permeates thinking in research organisations, so we can expect the spotlight to fall on forms of European CLIL/EMILE.

Some exemplary work has been done,<sup>22</sup> and very promising studies on important facets of CLIL/EMILE impact are now ongoing, but *the final verdict is not in yet*. A single major trans-national study on primary and secondary level, medium and low exposure – with key

variables controlled – could be of fundamental importance in terms of showing evidence to satisfy the question *does it work?* An unsuccessful attempt to secure funding for such a project was made by a consortium of universities in 2000 but it is likely that further applications will be submitted. If successful, then perhaps the first hard findings on European CLIL/EMILE strands, implemented across borders, might be available by 2006.

There are other issues here relating to the notion of confidence. At the grassroots there is often confidence, if not outright enthusiasm, for CLIL/EMILE. If educational authorities are responsive to 'education as a service' then such interest should be responded to through permission to experiment and implement, and so forth. We are not going to discover if CLIL/EMILE works in specific localities unless opportunities for implementation are forthcoming. The popularity of the approach amongst parents, learners and other stake-holders should be utilized to improve not just language learning, but education. A general trend towards client-based cultures in education, as in other public services, suggests that the voices of the grassroots may become increasingly listened to in the future.

Confidence can also be nurtured through 'speaking in different tongues' – namely communicating the validity of CLIL/EMILE in terms understood by diverse stake-holders. One most obvious factor is economic. It is necessary to articulate that there is a capital gain to be found by facilitating and investing in this type of educational methodology. There have been some small-scale attempts at this in the past but an empirically-based analysis, perhaps put into the context of accession countries and the impending increase in the number of official EU languages, could be most beneficial. It is possible that such analysis will be forthcoming because so many issues of urgency need to be addressed in the near future on linguistic diversity, multilingualism and plurilingualism in Europe.

Once described as a *growth area in educational linguistics*,<sup>23</sup> there is a very pressing need for communication with educational authorities, particularly those divisions responsible for examination systems. *It would seem that unless one can have dialogue between, for example, the examining boards and the practitioners in bilingual education, it will still be a long time before content and language integrated learning can really take off as a more generally widespread phenomenon.*<sup>24</sup> As of now it is difficult to know if and when such dialogue will take place. It is crucially important for medium to high exposure types, but not so much in terms of smaller-scale theme-based strands and modules.

Reliability and confidence can be established through research, communication and evidence of quality assessment leading to validation and recognition. These have been developing steadily in, and across, some countries over the last decade and it is anticipated that the pace will quicken because of the breadth of experimentation increasingly reported in some countries.

### Mainstreaming

*Schools, like learners, are infinitely variable.*<sup>25</sup> The mainstreaming of CLIL/EMILE is probably a direct result of the grassroots movement that is typically the main driving force for its implementation.

*We should strive at all costs to ensure that the benefits.... and the mastery of foreign languages do not become the social preserve of the privileged few. I believe there are two ways in which this might be avoided. The first recognises that in order to be able to offer teaching in which the foreign language is the vehicle, it is not necessary that the majority of teachers be capable of undertaking the task... the second suggestion takes into consideration the intensive use of current means of communication.*  
(M.Siguán)<sup>26</sup>

The perceived and reported value of small-scale exposure and the increasing availability of the new technologies can help ease introduction of this approach into mainstream education.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

187

In some countries, education expanded in mainstream education during the 1960s-1970s. This meant that a significant cohort of people who entered the profession at that time is now in the process of retirement. It has been argued<sup>27</sup> that this may result in increasingly large-scale recruitment of younger teachers who, in turn, may be more receptive to experimenting with new methods such as CLIL/EMILE, and have higher levels of foreign language competence.

Mainstreaming CLIL/EMILE will probably be a slow and possibly arduous process in some countries, but in others much easier. Learner entitlement is a key issue here because in the past the approach has only been available to privileged, or more able learners, and as we are seeing through the examples of European CLIL/EMILE, it appears to serve the interests of the whole ability range.

If it had not mushroomed in mainstream education, CLIL/EMILE would have remained a sidelined experience for the privileged, gifted, or for those in exceptional circumstances. Now that it is being experimented with in mainstream education, it is anticipated that it will continue to grow. This could be slow, as schools assess strategies, resources and merits of the approach, or rapid if sanctioned at a high level and otherwise given impetus by regional or national authorities.

*If CLIL is to have a future in mainstream education, then it is essential that all interest groups see that they are stakeholders in the provision of linguistically-enhanced education for the benefit of the wider society*  
(Marsh.D., Marsland. B., Nikula, T)<sup>28</sup>

A fundamental impetus for CLIL/EMILE may not lie within the school, or educational authority. There is clear evidence that learners in mainstream education are more exposed to foreign languages and mobility than before. The ability to communicate to some extent in another language appears to be establishing itself as 'normal'. As it becomes normal for people to want to be able to use more than their mother tongue, so the desire for educational provision to nurture and facilitate this will become stronger.

### Learning Strategies

*On the whole, mainstream language teaching is fairly traditional in Europe even when it is based on communicative principles. It does not promote the language competence necessary in a multilingual Europe, and it does not take into account the knowledge available on language learning in psychology and learning theory... Both theoreticians and experienced language teachers have known this for a long time.*  
(D. Wolff)<sup>29</sup>

*In order to maintain their current standards of living, it is generally agreed that the rising generation will need to exhibit qualities which have, perhaps, not previously been valued so highly. Among these qualities are independence of thought, an openness to new ideas, a willingness to try new ways, to experiment, to think laterally and make connections across many disciplines, to be prepared to take the responsibility for their own lives and futures*  
(J. Nixon)<sup>30</sup>

As societies and cultures evolve so must educational provision. This era shows widespread attention being paid to helping learners develop means to problem-solve and master learning items independently. The types of integration seen in education often work towards contemporary understanding of learning<sup>31</sup>:

- *Human comprehension and human learning are seen as active processes of construction in which both perceptual stimuli and the learner's prior knowledge are involved*
- *Learning is an autonomous process which the learner carries out to a large extent by him/herself*
- *Learning is a process for which the learner must assume responsibility. Responsibility develops only if the learner understands the importance of the learning item for his/her learning process*
- *Learning is an explorative process which the learner carries out within a framework of hypothesis building and hypothesis testing*
- *Learning is a process which is particularly successful when it takes place in groups*
- *The result of a learning process is different for each learner, because the learner's prior knowledge is always subjective knowledge and is different in each learner*

CLIL/EMILE impacts on these indicators of best practice in teaching and learning. As such, it could be viewed as an appropriate response to what we now know about how to learn both in terms of language and other content. Therefore increased interest in its implementation is anticipated.

In terms of young learners, CLIL/EMILE also serves as an enabler<sup>32</sup> to

- *Help children overcome fear, ethnocentrism and prejudices with respect to other cultures*
- *Help develop more possibilities for linguistic and intercultural communication*
- *Raise interest in languages and make children conscious of the equality of languages*
- *Contribute to the understanding of the children's own mother tongue and its specific features*
- *Encourage children to experiment with language and to systematise their observations*

Types of approach which aim to promote language and cultural awareness<sup>33</sup> and others such as in Case Profile 2 of this report involving 'language encounters', probably represent an area of considerable growth for CLIL/EMILE in Europe. But 'discovery learning', 'problem-base learning', or, for example, 'explorative learning', will also possibly become increasingly commonplace. These are likely to be realized as a form of cross-curricular project or theme-based modular CLIL/EMILE with older learners. Another sector, vocational education, as shown in Cases 13 and 14, is also likely to become increasingly active.<sup>34</sup>

### **Modular & Theme-based Curricula**

*If CLIL is seen as a pedagogical goal, i.e. to teach both languages and subjects within an integrated framework, it may be that due to the specificities of our national context (UK) several stages along the continuum need to be developed initially – ranging from a wide*



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

189

*spectrum of short-term modules and cross-curricular projects to intercultural programmes and medium term courses...*  
(Do Coyle)<sup>35</sup>

At a tactical level, kindergartens, schools and colleges could explore delivery of CLIL/EMILE through low exposure modules, or forms of inter-disciplinary theme-based courses. From language showers and language encounters at kindergarten, pre-school or early primary, through to modules at secondary, these would be practical and theoretically sound platforms for the introduction of the approach. There are an increasing number of examples being produced and introduced across Europe.

*More children or even all children could be offered the experience of using the foreign language as the working language by offering modules in the foreign language on a more flexible basis in as many subjects as possible.*  
(Ingeborg Christ)<sup>36</sup>

Delivery of CLIL/EMILE has tended to be according to availability of target language-speaking teachers, rather than according to subject or theme first and foremost. There are signs that this situation will change as experimentation continues and any initial but not sustainable interest by staff declines (following a sort of 'honeymoon period'). In addition, as we learn more about the theoretical underpinnings of successful practice it is more obvious that certain subjects, and themes within subjects, are more conducive to successful impact than others.

*It is important to consider CLIL as one part of a general trend affecting the teaching methodologies found across the curriculum. The key terms here are integration and inter-disciplinarity.* (Marsh, D., Marsland, B. & Nikula, T)<sup>37</sup>

Because CLIL/EMILE invariably involves dual aims, and is an educational approach in its own right, the development of purpose-designed modules will probably overtake the idea of simply adopting a single subject for the purpose in cases of low exposure. In higher exposure we may see increasing development of themes within subjects, or across subject fields, but not whole subjects themselves. High exposure delivery is likely to continue to be subject-based but perhaps with more recognition of the value of trans-linguaging and code-switching than might presently be the case.

### New Technologies

*Every assessment of the achievements... must be mindful that it is not only a 'foreign language component' which is added to a mainstream subject, but that new cultural, transcultural and non-cultural dimensions, mediated through the foreign language, gain access to the concepts and the teaching of these subjects.*  
(Wolfgang Hallet)<sup>38</sup>

Access to the Internet at home is estimated at about 60-80% in certain countries<sup>39</sup>. In addition, availability of equipment at school appears to be increasing. In terms of both language learning and attitudes towards the immediacy and relevance of education, young people are currently immersed in a form of ITC generational leap from their forebears. The impact of the new technologies is certain to increase in breadth and scope. This suggests a corresponding interest in both CLIL/EMILE, and greater self-learning of languages and content outside the school classroom.

In addition, as seen in Case Profile 16, the availability of ever-more advanced hard and software, and the inevitable reduction of costs, will increasingly offer radical solutions for not only overcoming resource problems for schools, but also enhancing trans-national, and thus trans-linguistic educational platforms.

The future of CLIL/EMILE in Europe is inextricably linked to the new technologies. The argument that the Internet would strengthen English to the detriment of other languages, understandable in earlier days, can now be questioned. It has recently been estimated (March 2002) that there is now more Internet traffic in languages other than English.<sup>40</sup> This is probably linked to the expansion of e-commerce. Figures available argue that there are some 228 million users of English, and 339 million users of other languages. Of the latter figure some 192 million people are estimated to be using European languages other than English. Thus it is argued that the potential of the Internet as a plurilingual resource is steadily becoming a reality. Projection estimates for 2003 show English (270 million), Non-English (510 million), of which 259 million would be using other European languages.

*A revolution in electronic communications has also created a need for proficiency in multiple languages. The Internet makes global communication available and easy, whether it be for personal, professional, commercial, or other reasons. On the one hand, this has created a particular need for proficiency in English as a lingua franca on the internet. On the other hand, as with economic globalization, global communication via the internet has also created the possibility of much greater communication in regional languages. Indeed, domination of the internet by English is giving way to a much stronger presence of regional and local languages as e-commerce takes hold and begins to commit resources to communicating with local and regional markets. In fact, there are presently more internet sites in languages other than English than English.*  
(Fred Genesse)<sup>41</sup>

Thus we can assert that the advent of the 'knowledge society' could, itself, have influence on the demand and success of this type of approach in education and beyond.

### Teacher Professional Development

*The universities and/or training institutes should develop pre- and in-service programmes for future teachers. Such programmes need to strike a balance between scientifically grounded research and expertise with respect to practical concerns.*  
(Henning Wode & Petra Burmeister)<sup>42</sup>

*Partnership networks linking schools with universities and other interested agencies are likely to expand and evaluate effective bilingual teaching programmes. Electronic communications will enable national school-university networks to work more efficiently.*  
(Do Coyle)<sup>43</sup>

There has been very little provision of initial or in-service professional development programmes in CLIL/EMILE for teachers, either subject or content. Thus there is clearly a lack of suitably qualified teachers who have *certified competence* in both a subject and a foreign language. But, there is an increasingly identifiable pool of teachers who consider that they possess, or could possess, *professional competence* to teach through CLIL/EMILE.

Initial teacher education in CLIL/EMILE is a pre-requisite for consolidating this approach in mainstream education. As of now there are very few European institutions offering such training programmes, but there are parallel types of education in existence whereby future teachers can learn a language and subject simultaneously. These could be developed further as insight into good practice increases.

A range of in-service teacher development programme prototypes have been developed over the past few years, some which have received the support of the European Commission's SOCRATES/Lingua funding. At the same time there have been localized attempts at providing this type of professional development. Information on the breadth and impact of these is not currently available but research is now beginning to be conducted and pub-



lished. At the same time there is at least one initiative underway which would offer a transnational higher education qualification for experienced teachers<sup>44</sup> and other mainly national examples that have been operational for a few years.<sup>45</sup> It is possible that further networking will lead to consolidation of experience on what types of input are required for success after the design and testing of prototypes that we have seen accruing over the last ten years.<sup>46</sup>

Teacher development is directly tied to qualifications and the bench-marking of teacher competencies. It will allow central decision-making bodies to ensure that attempts at implementation, however successful, do not carry the potential for built-in failure.

### Stake-holding

*...lack of coordination between partners which include trainers, inspectors, materials producers and examining boards  
(Hugo Baetens Beardsmore)<sup>47</sup>*

*The time is now right to move into the next stage of development, which is probably the most challenging in the life of CLIL to date. The metamorphosis of CLIL from 'special' to commonplace, from pioneer teachers to competent professions, from polyglot ministeries to predominantly monolingual education systems, has widespread implications.  
(Do Coyle)<sup>48</sup>*

In terms of outreach it is essential that stakeholders are brought together with a common frame of reference which is communicated clearly and supported by theoretically sound arguments for the benefits of CLIL/EMILE. Considering the 'market economy' culture that is increasingly affecting how schools operate in different parts of Europe, the reasons for CLIL/EMILE would need to be in terms not only of education but also cost-ratio benefits. This is because the major 'gatekeepers' are more likely to be senior administrators, possibly responsible for budgets alongside curricula issues, rather than school administrators. If deliverable outcomes can be shown as feasible for a wide range of learners, and types of CLIL/EMILE delivery can be introduced as small-scale endeavours in the first instance, then the grounds for success are laid. There are examples of successful stake-holding liaison in some countries, sometimes to the highest levels,<sup>49</sup> and if circumstances prevail such dialogue and focus is likely to continue.

A key factor here concerns two specific types of stake-holder, namely parents and older students:

The motor is driven by parents, always bottom-up not top-down, innovations in this area have usually come from parental pressure when the system does not meet the educational needs. (Hugo Baetens Beardsmore)<sup>50</sup>

The influence of parents in increasingly 'client-based' educational provision is a force that is likely to snowball in some countries as 'word-of-mouth' spreads, even if it is in unrealistic terms about what a school might achieve in terms of providing foreign language competence to pupils and students.

There are clearly examples where, once introduced, demand exceeds supply, and in those countries where parents and pupils are empowered, particularly those in which decision-making can be made also at school or regional level, it is likely that the 'grassroots' will continue to expand in significance in this respect. In a country where curricula are heavily centralized and autonomy is low, it will be very difficult to see how CLIL/EMILE could be introduced as a bottom-up movement. However, it might be possible to bring understanding of the benefits of this approach to the highest of levels in those countries if circumstances allow, and if it is possible to communicate directly with key interlocutors.

On the basis of information presently available, expansion is viewed as steadily increasing. If this momentum continues then it will need monitoring and support from stake-holders, including national and trans-national bodies striving for ever better provision of education and in that, higher levels of plurilingualism. CLIL/EMILE may not yet be at the starting point as a mass education innovation but if developments continue at the current pace, this point will likely be reached sooner than later, even if in terms of preference rather than immediate implementation due to resources.

1 Marsh, D., Marsland, B., Maljers, A. 1998. Future Scenarios in Content and Language Integrated Learning. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä & The Hague: European Platform for Dutch Education.

2 The think-tank report was published as Marsh, D. & Marsland, B. (eds.) 1999. CLIL Initiatives for the Millennium. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

3 Hawkins, E. 1996. 30 Years of language Teaching. London: CILT quoted in Coyle, D. Content and Language Integrated Learning; A Developing British Perspective. As in Endnote 2.

4 Cf. Takala, S. 1993 Language planning policy and development of FL proficiency in Finland. In Huhta, A., Sajavaara, K., & Takala, S. (eds.) Language Testing: New Openings. p.46-54, Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. See also Takala, S. 1993. Language policy and language teaching policy in Finland. In Sajavaara, K., Lambert, R.C., Takala, S., & Morfit, C.A (eds.) National Foreign Language Planning: Practices and Prospects. pp. 54-71. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

5 Takala, S. 1998. Preface. As in Endnote 1.

6 Takala, S. 1998. Preface. As in Endnote 1.

7 CLIL/EMILE has been identified as being particularly active in certain member states. These tend to be small and in the case of Austria, Finland and Sweden, relatively new members. These are also societies that have prioritised the importance of learning languages across the population. Larger countries, notably Germany, France and Italy are also now showing signs of interest through political discourse and actions, in ways of addressing problems of monolingualism, and exploring means by which to implement CLIL/EMILE in mainstream education.

8 For example, the movement towards 'modularity' in Italy.

9 Marsh, D. Inter-linking Initiatives. As in Endnote 2.

10 Siguán, M. 1998. The use of second languages in teaching: a review of past and present attitudes and future prospects. As in Endnote 1.

11 Reference to Colin Baker, School of Education, University of Wales, Bangor, UK.

12 The author refers to the work of Mercer, N. 1995. The Guided Construction of Knowledge, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters just before this extract.

13 Wolff, D. 1998. Languages across the curriculum: A way to promote multilingualism in Europe. As in Endnote 1.

14 Coyle, D. 1998. Looking forwards: moving on. As in Endnote 1.

15 This is a personal deduction, based on increase of information flow, publications, research and other activities.

16 Heavily centralized educational systems such as in present-day England are very difficult environments for introducing innovations such as CLIL/EMILE into mainstream education. Coyle (1998) argues that *'current provision in the UK is limited... linguistic competence in a foreign language whilst perceived as a national need is not an education priority... Britain's inheritance of the Anglophone tradition, and the desire to suppress the heritage and commonwealth 'minority' languages such as Urdu and Punjabi, weigh heavily upon innovative and radical reform... an unsympathetic national examination system refuses to recognise subject competence in any language other than English... the statutory 5-16 (years) national curriculum in English schools is becoming increasingly prescriptive, centralised and evidence-based.*

17 Quoted earlier as 'necessity is the mother of bilingual education' by Haugen (1972) The stigmata of bilingualism in The Ecology of Language. Stanford: Stanford University Press.





## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

193

- 18 Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1993. Bilingual Learning: institutional frameworks – whole school policies. Workshop 12A, Bilingual Learning in Secondary Schools: Learning and Teaching Non-language Subjects through a Foreign Language. P.39. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- 19 Siguán, M. 1998. The use of second languages in teaching: a review of past and present attitudes and future prospects. As in Endnote 1.
- 20 Wolff, D. 1998. Languages across the curriculum: A way to promote multilingualism in Europe. As in Endnote 1.
- 21 Van Ek, J. & Richterich, R. 1989. Research and development in the perspective of educational change. Language Learning in Europe: the challenge of diversity. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- 22 E.G. There are numerous studies published which are significant in, for example, Luxembourg, Finland, the Netherlands, Germany, Sweden, UK amongst others
- 23 Baetens Beardsmore, H. Manipulating the variables in bilingual education. In Buiteveld, A. 1997. Report on the Conference on European Networks in Bilingual Education. The Hague: European Platform for Dutch Education.
- 24 Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1999. La Consolidation des Expériences en Education Plurilingue / Consolidating Experience in Plurilingual Education. As in Endnote 2.
- 25 Adapted from Clegg, J (ed.) 1996. Mainstreaming ESL. p. 237. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- 26 Siguán, M. 1998. The use of second languages in teaching: a review of past and present attitudes and future prospects. As in Endnote 1.
- 27 Nixon, J. communication on national surveys in Sweden.
- 28 Marsh, D., Marsland, B. & Nikula, T. 1999. CLIL: a review of current thinking. As in Endnote 2.
- 29 Wolff, D. 1998. Languages across the curriculum: A way to promote multilingualism in Europe. As in Endnote 1.
- 30 Nixon, J. & Kibe, J. 1998. Visions from Sweden – towards competence in international communication. As in Endnote 1.
- 31 Wolff, D. 1998. Languages across the curriculum: A way to promote multilingualism in Europe. As in Endnote 1.
- 32 Thürmann, E. 1991. Begegnung mit Sprachen in der Grundschule. Schulverwaltung 8, 182-187, cited in Wolff, D. 1998. Languages across the curriculum: A way to promote multilingualism in Europe. As in Endnote 1.
- 33 One example is Eulang (Lingua Socrates 1998-2001) M.Candelier, Université René Descartes Paris 5, France.
- 34 Both primary and vocational were viewed as growth areas in the CEILINK Thinktank on CLIL/EMILE, Strasbourg, October 1998, reported in Marsh, D. & Marsland, B. (eds.) CLIL Initiatives for the Millennium. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, Finland.
- 35 Coyle, D. 1998. Looking forwards: moving on. As in Endnote 1.
- 36 Bilingual teaching in Germany in Fruhauf, G., Coyle, D. & Christ, D. (eds.) Teaching Content in a Foreign Language: Practice, Perspectives in European Bilingual Education. The Hague: European Platform for Dutch Education.
- 37 Marsh, D., Marsland, B. & Nikula, T. 1999. CLIL: a review of current thinking. As in Endnote 2.
- 38 Hallet, the bilingual triangle. A tool for curriculum development, and for materials and lessons design. As in Endnote 2.
- 39 From Scandinavian case profile notes for Finland and Sweden.
- 40 See [www.gleach.com/globstats/refs.php3](http://www.gleach.com/globstats/refs.php3).
- 41 Genesee, F. 2003 (forthcoming). What do we know about bilingual education for majority language students? In Bhatia, T.K. & Ritchie, W. (eds.) Handbook of Bilingualism and Multiculturalism. London: Blackwell
- 42 Wode, H. & Burmeister, P. 1998. Priorities for CLIL investment in the forthcoming period. As in Endnote 2.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

- 43 Coyle, D. 1998. Content and language integrated learning: A developing British perspective. As in Endnote 2.
- 44 ALPME, coordinated through ERASMUS by the University of Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona.
- 45 Universities of Wuppertal (Germany) and Nottingham (UK).
- 46 For example, BILD, DieSeLL, VocTalk, TIE-CLIL, Tel2L amongst others
- 47 Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1999. La Consolidation des Expériences en Education Plurilingue / Consolidating Experience in Plurilingual Education. As in Endnote 2.
- 48 Coyle, D. 1999. Looking forwards: moving on. As in Endnote 2.
- 49 In large countries such as France & Italy, and smaller ones such as Austria, Finland, Sweden and The Netherlands.
- 50 In interview March, 2002

194





## CHAPTER 7:

### CLIL/EMILE in Europe: Recommendations for extending good practice

Sets of recommendations on the development of CLIL/EMILE can be found in various sources including the 1995 Conference on European Networks in Bilingual Education (The Hague: European Platform for Dutch Education), the 1998 CEILINK Think-tank (Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä), and various Council of Europe reports. These tend to focus on localized aspects of successful implementation. An increasing number of references to forms of CLIL/EMILE have also been found in reports and statements linked to recent specialist European languages meetings that tend to be fairly general in terms of examining the potential of CLIL/EMILE. These have all been taken into consideration in this chapter.

The recommendations included here have been drawn up on two levels. Firstly, with respect to harnessing and developing the potential of CLIL/EMILE in terms of outreach and extension of good practice in relation to the European dimension. These are largely based on data analyses and information received during the course of preparing the report. Secondly, according to the national contexts, drawing mainly on existing recommendations made by the CEILINK Think-tank, and partly replicated elsewhere.

In the first set of recommendations concerning the European dimension, each has been considered in terms of feasibility, impact and potential multiplier effects. These are broken down according to a general model of education (introduced in Chapter 6: Future Prospects) which includes the societal level (societies, and the social collective of the European Union); the systems level (member state educational systems); the strategic level (where professional research and practice-based expertise is used to provide specialist insight and development); and practice (the schools, colleges or other learning environments where implementation occurs).

#### The European Dimension

##### Societal

- That a group of experts, representing economics, social policy, statistics and languages, be commissioned to produce an *econometric analysis* report on the potential of CLIL/EMILE as a socio-economic driver which explicates languages knowledge as human capital within national economies. Comparison of unit costs of language learning as presently conducted, and those inclusive of CLIL/EMILE according to research evidence of achievable outcomes, would provide investment-oriented analysis. This could be used to build empirical arguments on deliverable outcomes that could influence top-down decision-making on prioritising this type of educational innovation within national contexts, leading to European Community benefits.

Financed as a Public Services Contract, reporting to the Commission, the group would produce an analysis showing the relationship between additional language skills across populations and economic performance, and link this to localised investment in specific types of language education. Synchrony could thus be made linking grassroots pressure and top-down decision-making through provision of data that is likely to further establish a direct link between skills in languages and economic performance. Major objective: provision of evidence to justify investment and establish socio-economic gain.

- That a *fusion group* be formed, comprising key experts within appropriate national policy decision-making bodies that have a mandate to handle initiatives related to CLIL/EMILE. Working within organisations such as Ministries of Education, this group would be asked to report on the viability of introducing or expanding CLIL/EMILE in respective national educational sectors. Having been suitably briefed, preferably in a face-to-face meeting focussed on the potential of the approach for enabling member states to achieve the MT+2 formula, experts would submit evaluations to a central body that would then report back to the member states. In such a process specific attention should be given to the significance of limited or domain-specific competencies. Economic arguments, if and when available, would also support this type of new and combined thrust into national political and administrative constellations. Major objective: establishing a policy level network for dissemination of information on implementation and potential to national 'gate keepers'.
- That a member state represented inter-disciplinary *think-tank* be created (50-60 people) during the Action Report drafting stage (2003) comprising policy-makers, examination board representatives, publishers, research implementation experts and other gatekeepers, to evaluate the feasibility of pre-determined low exposure forms of CLIL/EMILE at primary, lower secondary, upper secondary and vocational education. Reporting directly to the European Commission, this would complement the 1998 researcher-practitioner CEILINK think tank (Strasbourg) and act as a catalyst for strategic development within the respective educational fields of responsibility. Major objective: supporting the continuation of networking between researchers and practitioners in addition to establishing new links with private sector and other interest groups.
- That an *exchange funding system* be specially geared (for example, through Comenius) towards supporting teachers (content and language) to visit, teach and job-shadow in CLIL/EMILE schools in other countries.
- That European expert bases on CLIL/EMILE combine to form a *consortium* with which to apply for trans-national research funding through the Sixth Framework 2002-2006 programme in order to identify, examine, and establish solutions for achieving the MT+2 formula. Plurilingualism does not carry specific reference, and there appears to be preference for large-scale consortia and projects, not common place within the culture of languages-oriented education, in relation to the founding of the European Research Area. But an attempt should be made to access research funding and establish a basis by which to test the impact of CLIL/EMILE at different levels in member states. This could be done through Theme 7: Citizens and governance in the European knowledge-based society.
- That *coordination* of communication flow, and strategic implementation, to and between national contexts, be conducted through the European Commission, or a body seen to be operating with its mandate, and operationalized for a trial period of 3 years, estimated as 1 person at 50% of work load in the first instance. In so



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

197

doing the European Commission should also continue to make explicit reference to CLIL/EMILE, as has been seen in the past, because of the influence this can have in terms of national initiatives.

- That *Europe-wide documentation* on language learning such as produced by Eurydice, is broadened in the future to quantify schools which systematically teach through a foreign language, and that international comparative evaluations of education such as PISA, include foreign language learning. This would provide comparative data to complement, for example, the widely-cited Eurobarometer, and help support the need for broadening languages education.

### Systems

- That member state policy bodies responsible for language education be invited to identify *local examples of good practice*, possibly in conjunction with European Quality Label awards past and present, which can be used as localized 'landmark' examples. If possible, certain performance indicators, common to different environments based on existing situational and operational and outcome variables, could be monitored either by the schools, or a national agency, over a 3-5 year period on the impact and outcomes of CLIL/EMILE in these environments.
- That it is necessary to find a 'common language' which *articulates the methods* and communicates the purposes and goals of CLIL/EMILE to policy-makers. Due to the trans-disciplinarity involved, key gatekeepers may be working in compartmentalized and separated fields of responsibility and operation. A short authoritative text could be produced as a 'reflection document', in conjunction with a range of European experts, designed specifically for local ministry of education policy-makers and other gate-keepers, which succinctly articulates the potential of CLIL/EMILE according to a range of implementation types as a trans-disciplinary endeavour.
- That CLIL/EMILE be used as an instrument for promoting *teacher mobility*. This would be facilitated if national agencies could provide special dispensations on harmonization and recognition of teacher qualifications, even if temporary, for CLIL/EMILE schools. Lack of recognition of qualifications from another member state has been seen to adversely affect salary scales thus resulting in incoming teachers from other countries being disadvantaged. In certain types of CLIL/EMILE attracting and drawing some target language-speaking staff to complement existing non-native speaker staff is recognized as a success factor.

### Strategic

- That recommendations be drawn up which indicate the *required linguistic fluency of teachers* according to the Common European Framework of Reference scales in relation to the linguistic load of specified types. DIALANG, which is a measurement of general target language proficiency, is a suitable diagnostic testing system for informing teachers about individual proficiency levels in relation to specific target language skills, and providing feedback and advice for further development. If some clarification were available on the linguistic load required for specific types of delivery, a system would be operational and accessible which would help surmount a major obstacle in CLIL/EMILE development. This stems from individuals being uncertain about their own target language skills which is often due to attitudes towards fluency and native-speaker competencies, and lack of information available for guidance. Promotion of DIALANG alongside a brief explanation for those intending to teach through different types of CLIL/EMILE could have con-

siderable impact, particularly with regard to promoting delivery of CLIL/EMILE in different languages. There is, as yet, no widely applicable test of subject-specific target language competence available. There do exist, often in higher education institutions, numerous examples of language tests which are subject-specific but these are not generally widely available. The development of such tests, which take into account both general language and subject-specific proficiency, could be made by those teacher education institutions which offer CLIL/EMILE through initial teacher education programmes.

- That *thematic CLIL/EMILE units* (25+ hours) be constructed to unify content areas in the form of modules, preferably drawing on topics which contextualise the European experience. Such modules which could eventually be considered in terms of an informal form of 'European core curriculum', should be produced by an inter-disciplinary team. These should be flexible enough to accommodate local-specific input and analysis, and which, once piloted and tested, should be rendered into all community languages for the 3 levels of compulsory education. Produced in close conjunction with certain learner age cohorts, these should include both content and insight into the teaching strategies that could be used in the respective classroom. Thus the modules would act not only as material, but also as a means for developing teacher competence in CLIL/EMILE. In addition, they would act to enhance diversification of languages of instruction. Such modules should draw on topics principally located within the humanities, from subjects such as history, geography, psychology and social studies. Distribution should be facilitated through early partnership with localized publishing companies. Should commercial viability not be forthcoming in the early stages in certain countries due to perceived initial scale, then an Internet Materials Bank, linked to a significant Internet site, could be used in the interim.

- That a *resonance group* be formed comprising key experts previously involved with both Council of Europe and European Commission supported assignments and projects relating to forms of CLIL/EMILE (1990-2002). This group would be invited to review the output and implications of workshops, projects, and other forms of research, analysis and development, particularly on professional development programmes and teacher competencies. This could lead to development of a strategy by which to achieve greater understanding of overlapping interest and availability of resources. It could enable bridges to be built between what appear to be, at times, fragmented interest groups operating in different capacities and circles but sharing common interests and aspirations. This could not only help unite European expertise, but also lead to greater development momentum and the establishment of a focussed institutional research expert network. Major objective: to greater unite expertise in a field that is currently viewed as fragmented, and provide a means by which to review previous experience and establish the premises for future experimentation and implementation.

- That a *European student research network* be established for universities and higher education colleges by which, often working virtually, students could carry out studies on CLIL/EMILE for graduation or post-graduate thesis work. Communication with tutors would be as standard practice, but an Internet-based network could both trans-nationalize student research through provision of a special interest group, and start providing studies, however modest, on the validity of this approach in local contexts. This could be operationalized at minimal cost through an existing higher education network such as the European Language Council if interest and capacity exists. We are now approaching a period when ever-more student interest is being shown in CLIL/EMILE as a research topic within higher education, and to consolidate this interest through forming an ad hoc Internet-based network would be clearly advantageous.



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

199

- That inter-disciplinary research on existing and the future generation of multi-media interactive technologies for trans-national CLIL/EMILE delivery be conducted by a consortium of universities and the private sector working towards provision of quality cost-effective hard and software for interactive multi-location CLIL/EMILE delivery.
- That existing initial teacher training systems which enable a trainee to specialise in both a content subject and a foreign language (For example, at primary level in Finland & Norway; and at Secondary level in Austria & Germany) be examined and reported on with a view to pan-European extension. In addition, both initial and in-service development courses specific to CLIL/EMILE could be included in such analysis.
- That efforts be made to support *bridging the disciplinary gap* between language and subject teachers through existing professional networks, indicating the mutual benefits which can result from 'team-building' and 'pairing' in assessing the advantages of CLIL/EMILE.
- That the base-line data requirements for implementing *quality assurance* be designed and made available for local adaptation. This could be built on existing frameworks.
- That an attempt be made to *clarify* the often location-specific difference of understanding between '*formal language instruction*' and *CLIL/EMILE* in early language learning. This could improve understanding of similarities and differences between these in discussion on early language learning and describe each in terms of specific labels such as Language Encounter, Language Awareness, Language Teaching, Language Shower, etc. A great deal of quality language teaching with early learners already involves integrating content and language and is called 'language teaching' and not CLIL/EMILE. It would be useful to look at this 'best practice' in language teaching, reportedly common to some environments more than others, and show that far from being a new and possibly intrusive innovation, at primary level CLIL/EMILE may already exist but under another name. This could have a positive impact on attitudes towards CLIL/EMILE, and 'language teaching proper', because if language teaching to this age group is more form-based than functional, then it may be failing to reach optimal outcomes.
- That any efforts to produce a *higher education degree system* in CLIL/EMILE be given support as and when applicable. A trans-national higher degree programme, designed and implemented by key European centres of expertise in this field could act as a catalyst in establishing a flagship academic programme for European CLIL/EMILE, which could then have a multiplier effect on trans-national initial and in-service education, and on research initiatives.

### Practice

- That kindergarten, pre-school and primary schools be given special focus with regard to low exposure of CLIL/EMILE which combines the principles of 'language awareness' and 'language encounter' initiatives.
- That vocational sector colleges, not only business-oriented, be given special focus with regard to low to medium exposure through CLIL/EMILE which combines sector-specific target language(s) knowledge with job-specific communication competencies. Existing languages delivery, even through newly formulated approaches such as VoLL (vocationally-oriented language learning), is considered

frequently insufficient. This is due to resource allocation and time available for 'language teaching'. CLIL/EMILE would allow for greater exposure to 'language learning' without reduction of resources from other parts of the curriculum.

- That adult education providers should be given special focus with regard to mixed media distance education in CLIL/EMILE which is generational or sector-specific, but not bound to student places of domicile.
- That copyright-free prototypes of short introductory texts on CLIL/EMILE be made available through the Internet. These could be adapted from existing examples, such as Opening Doors (EYL) or Using languages to Learn and Learning to Use Languages (Lingua A), rendered into other languages, reproduced and used by schools to clearly formulate and communicate their reasons for CLIL/EMILE delivery and intended outcomes.
- That the value of the inter-relationship between experience of CLIL/EMILE and the European Language Portfolio and, in particular, the European Language Passport, be articulated to schools and learners.
- That local and possibly long-standing expertise in CLIL/EMILE in, for example the private sector, be invited to *feed advice through to public education* through ad hoc forms of exchange and dialogue.
- That schools are encouraged to estimate *how little CLIL/EMILE is needed to achieve desired results*. It is important that schools examine delivery of CLIL/EMILE in terms of 'how little do they need, how much do we get'.

The second set of recommendations focuses more on national contexts. These are broken down, as in the original CEILINK format, according to focus on learners, practitioners and other stakeholders.

### The National Dimension: Learners

#### Target Language Selection

Although CLIL/EMILE can operate successfully bilingually, it can also be introduced as a tool for promoting plurilingualism in education and beyond. Thus it should not be associated with any one particular language, but viewed as an educational approach to support linguistic diversity. Initial CLIL/EMILE exposure in a widely-taught language can be used as a springboard for later expansion into another widely-taught or less widely-taught language.

#### Learner Selection

Criteria selection for CLIL/EMILE streams should not necessarily be based on first or target language competence, because of the significance of learner motivation in achieving successful outcomes with mixed ability groups. Guidelines should be drawn up to facilitate the inclusion of a broad range of learners in a framework that encompasses diverse models. This would help to unlock the potential of CLIL/EMILE and facilitate mainstreaming.





### Study Skills

One commonly-cited additional value of CLIL/EMILE is the enhanced development of learning strategies and skills, which are related to broader cognitive applications. Exposure to trans-disciplinary training in language-specific study skills could enhance the development of specifically subject-related productive skills. This can be achieved through closer integration of first, target and non-language specialists in the curriculum.

### Assessment

Performance assessment of CLIL/EMILE learner performance has to be sensitive to the subject-language duality inherent within many models. Integrated pedagogical classroom learning needs to be assessed using similarly integrated assessment tools. Viewing an examination text from a solely language or subject point of view negates the trans-disciplinary characteristics of CLIL/EMILE. Testing and assessment apparatus need to be introduced which allow learners to show the breadth of their knowledge and skills in relation to both content and language.

### Learner Certification

Formal recognition of learner achievement in certain types of high-activity CLIL/EMILE should be made at national level. Efforts to have such documentation recognised by authorities and institutions trans-nationally should follow.

## The National Dimension: Practitioners

### Initial Teacher Education

Initial teacher education in CLIL/EMILE is a pre-requisite for consolidating this approach in mainstream education. Specialised programmes need to be developed which would encourage inter-disciplinarity by providing subject and language specialisation and certification. Such programmes need to be more than add-on modules, and might involve a longer time-frame of study than conventional programmes. They might also require a closer working relationship between training institutions and schools, maximising the development of practitioners' skills in the learning of the linguistic, scientific and pedagogical aspects of the approach. Some existing programmes could be used for reference purposes.

### In-Service Teacher Education

Experienced teachers of subjects and languages should be provided with the opportunity to move into CLIL/EMILE through the provision of in-service development programmes. The outcomes from these programmes could then also inform the development of curricula for initial teacher education in CLIL/EMILE. A continuing programme of in-service development is necessary for all practitioners, thereby providing up-to-date information concerning advances in the field, and maintaining both subject and language proficiencies. In-service packages should also be seen as a necessary part of context-specific development regionally and institutionally. Some existing programmes could be used for reference purposes.

### Practitioner Skills Assessment

External systems of quality assurance should be made available regionally and nationally for teachers and schools that wish to have a professional profile or review of competencies and performance. Assessment teams would ideally comprise expertise in both research and

practice. Recommendations arising from such assessment would focus on the range of knowledge and skills required for good practice in CLIL/EMILE, which includes factors such as language proficiency, methodological competence and socio-cultural awareness. In addition, part of such assessment would require some focus on institutional capacity and implementation. Practitioners should also be encouraged to engage in continuous self-assessment, using tools such as the DIALANG diagnostic language test and classroom practice review tools, in order to identify successes, weaknesses and developmental areas.

#### Internet Materials Bank

To assist in the provision of quality materials, which could be integrated into a range of national curricula, national Internet Materials Banks could be developed and piloted, preferably in conjunction with the private sector. The Banks should only focus on a small range of modular or topic-based learning materials, specified according to level and language which fit into national curricula. The materials bank should ideally comprise downloadable resources, which would be designed with a view to flexibility and ease of adaptation, and links to other similar sites. Reviews of other suitable materials in published sources should also be included, alongside guidelines for practitioners to create their own materials.

### The National Dimension: other stakeholders

#### Description of CLIL/EMILE Models

It is necessary to define, concretise, and exemplify how CLIL/EMILE can be implemented in different contexts, and have this information produced in a style which is accessible to a non-specialist audience. Brief descriptions of variables and options should be supported by case-study exemplification, with an overview of the range of models implemented. By examining facts drawn from existing experiences, interest groups would be able to select features of established practice which might be suitable for their local situations.

#### Curricular Development

Insight into those topics and modules, within subjects, which are reported as being particularly suitable for CLIL/EMILE, should be considered in terms of the development of elements of a curriculum relevant to national contexts.

#### Breadth of Potential

Local case studies of successful implementation of CLIL/EMILE, ranging from pre-school to higher education, should be carried out to examine the full range of potential of this approach for all age groups.

#### Utilising Existing Expertise

Pilot projects should be used to bring together existing expertise and established infrastructures in, for example, specialist schools such as International Baccalaureate, International schools and others. This would establish dialogue and complementarity between these schools and mainstream educational institutions.

#### Testing and Evaluating Innovation

Initiatives should be made to include a wider range of expertise in CLIL/EMILE than has previously been the case. Such expertise, generally research-driven, is needed to explore



## CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

203

the multi-disciplinary and holistic features of the approach. Objective empirical data is increasingly required to substantiate claims and analysis of such data is instrumental in allowing informed decision-making on future development.

Key issues requiring attention include:

- Linguistic multiplier effects of CLIL/EMILE
- Concept formation in different languages
- Cognition and code-switching
- Development of pragmatic and metalinguistic skills
- Attitudinal change
- Comparative approaches to subjects
- Impact on first (and home/heritage) language and cultural identity
- Professional and societal long-term impact of CLIL/EMILE
- Second language learning/acquisition vis-à-vis CLIL/EMILE
- Early learning in a CLIL/EMILE environment
- Partial and domain-specific competencies
- Methodological integration of languages and non-language subjects

Previous relevant research findings should be brought together with the results from these areas of enquiry, and made accessible to a wider audience. A research inventory collating the national and European experience of CLIL/EMILE would complement existing data from other continents. It is desirable that some future research initiatives be carried out by teams comprising both researchers and practitioners. These issues are unlikely to be addressed in a meaningful way unless official recognition of the need leads to the injection of targeted national funding.





CLIL/EMILE - THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

