Title

CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning): the bigger picture

A response to: A. Bruton. 2013. CLIL: Some of the reasons why ... and why not. System 41
(2013): 587-597

Authors

Dr Julia Hüttner, University of Southampton (corresponding author)

Department of Modern Languages

Avenue Campus

University of Southampton

Highfield Road

Southampton

SO171BF

UK

Tel: 02380599423

Email: J.Huettner@soton.ac.uk

Prof Ute Smit, University of Vienna

Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik

Universität Wien

Campus AAKH/Hof 8

Spitalgasse 2-4

A-1090 Vienna

Austria

Email: ute.smit@univie.ac.at

1 Introduction

In his paper published earlier this year in this journal, Anthony Bruton (henceforth AB) outlines his arguments against "a wholesale adoption of CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning)"and argues that CLIL acts as a discriminator of socio-economically and educationally disadvantaged learner groups. He bases his argumentation on readings of extant research on CLIL and immersion education. The editor of *System* approached the present authors to impart our understanding of and reaction to this CLIL critique. Given the importance, in our view, of clarifying positions in order to engage in fruitful academic debate, we have accepted this invitation.

CLIL (Content-and-Language-Integrated-Learning) has enjoyed massive uptake in continental Europe over the last twenty years in very diverse educational settings and has given rise to a vibrant research scene. With this "coming of age", both the CLIL educational practice(s) and the attendant research should withstand critical review and work towards a more stringent positioning (cf. e.g. Dalton-Puffer, Nikula & Smit 2010; Cenoz, Genesee & Gorter 2013), and it is worth noting that there are several CLIL endeavours under way that do just that.[1]

In this sense Bruton's (2013) contribution is a laudable endeavour to re-position and critique CLIL, especially by asking the question of suitability for all learners. The thrust and tone of this article is also a clear indication of the controversies surrounding CLIL and the strong feelings it seems to give rise to. In this paper, we aim to show in which ways we disagree with AB's argument of what CLIL is and does. What we do not wish to do in this short contribution is to either provide a full review of CLIL research, as this has been done very successfully in recent publications, such as Dalton-Puffer (2011), or to provide a response to all the individual points made in Bruton (2013) as this would take too much attention away from responding to his main arguments. Nonetheless, we would like to point out that we have the impression that at times CLIL research findings are quoted mainly to support AB's arguments, but not necessarily in a way that corresponds to the original research focus

---

[1] For instance, the AILA Research Network on "Content and Language Integrated Learning and Immersion Education: Applied Linguistic Perspectives" (http://clil-ren.org/) or the international project on "Language and Content Integration: towards a conceptual framework" (2011-2014) (http://conclil.jyu.fi/)

or, indeed, their findings. For instance, AB turns Smit's (2010) fundamentally *qualitative* finding of tertiary-level students and their lecturers engaging in different patterns of explaining subject-specific and non-specific terms in classroom discourse into a purely *quantitative* one. So, instead of reporting on the different participatory roles teachers and students enacted in their explanatory exchanges depending on, firstly, the moment in time – given the longitudinal nature of the study – and, secondly, the technical status of the term being explained, AB offers an idiosyncratic reading of the finding by claiming "that the more technical the topic, the less interaction, and vice versa" (p. 592). A similar tendency to overly free interpretation of sources is noticeable even when it comes to central conceptual stances. A case in point is AB's claim that "one premise of CLIL is that it is an improvement on current foreign language teaching practice in formal education [...] and that it is preferable to other alternative options for improvement on an existing deficit situation in FL development (Dalton-Puffer 2011)". After a careful re-read of Dalton-Puffer (2011), however, all we could find was the following passage:

> As noted earlier, public expectations regarding CLIL centre on its being efficient and effective for foreign language learning, expectations that are fuelled by dissatisfaction with the outcomes of school-based foreign language learning and a somewhat stereotypical view of foreign language lessons as a series of mechanistic grammar drills. (p. 193)

In how far Dalton-Puffer's (2011: 193) hedged proposition as to "stereotypical views on foreign language lessons" allows for the essentialist claim that CLIL is supposedly seen as "preferable to other alternative options" eludes us.

While such inaccurate and possibly even distorting rendering of sources is a point of contention in itself, what we rather wish to focus on in the following are the major differences in AB's and our understanding of CLIL, its characteristics, its limitations and its embeddedness in (local) educational practice(s). In what follows, we will outline why we consider the representation of CLIL given by AB to over-simplify the differences between the realisations of what is labelled CLIL across Europe, and the

reasons why this diversity will invariably continue to exist. Importantly, we consider the characteristics suggested as typical of CLIL as, in fact, constituting an extremely atypical case of CLIL, reducing the validity of many of the arguments brought forth as critique of all other forms of CLIL. We will also aim to show how CLIL as a language policy issue in the wider sense (see e.g., Spolsky 2004, Shohamy 2006) can be considered an umbrella term for various local responses to the global phenomenon of an increased use of English in professional, international (and mostly entirely non-native) contexts.

2. Challenging some assumptions

AB builds his argument against CLIL as a teaching approach on certain assumptions regarding its nature and consequences that we take issue with. Firstly, CLIL is described as aiming at "student selection" (p. 587), thus functioning as a social discriminator. Secondly, CLIL is positioned as replacing modern foreign language (MFL) instruction (see Table 1, p. 589). Finally, as regards its defining characteristics, CLIL is constructed as a uniform pedagogy that can be evaluated and compared context independently.

2.1. Assumption 1: "CLIL is discriminatory"

Undoubtedly, educational discrimination is an important and serious matter, especially so as educational systems in many, not to say most, countries have functioned centrally in implementing and/or entrenching social divides, advantaging some social groups, but disadvantaging many others. However, we would argue that CLIL in itself is a negligible factor compared to other, system-inherent sources of privileging some on socio-economic grounds. Arguably, the most obvious factor are school fees, which act as gatekeepers of educational opportunities, for instance, in countries with a highly developed private school sector such as the UK, but also in countries like Greece or Korea in which private afternoon schools focussing on particular subjects, such as English or Mathematics, have developed complementarily to the public sector as a presumably more effective, but definitely more cost intensive route to educational success (Mitsikopoulou 2007, Park 2009). Besides financial

disadvantaging, educational discrimination is unfortunately also integral to many national school systems. For instance, in Austria and Germany students are divided into more or less academic school types at the end of primary school, age 10, while e.g. Finland and the UK have a comprehensive school system until age 16. One of the consequences is the comparatively high degree of social determinism when it comes to the constellation of Austrian university students: the percentage of students whose parents have academic degrees is 2.5 times higher than the percentage of students whose parents do not (OECD 2012).

It is furthermore far from difficult to come up with 'bad-practice' examples of language functioning as one of the power-wielding mechanisms to exclude large groups of learners. Going back into history, the century-long use of Latin as prime European medium of instruction for advanced education obviously excluded all those not competent in it. While the later move to the national language as educational language was originally empowering in Europe, our present-day mobility or 'super-diversity' (Blommaert & Rampton 2012) has made it clear this has by now changed quite dramatically: the still mainstream policy to undertake education in the national language has well documented disadvantaging effects on speakers of other languages, be they autochthonous or recent immigrant groups (e.g., Brizić 2006, Leung & Street 2012). It is against this rising relevance and struggles of multilingual learner groups within the traditionally 'monolingual habitus' of European schools (Gogolin 1994, Siemund et al 2013) that we find it particularly surprising that AB claims that education in the national language must of necessity be less discriminatory than CLIL. This, he argues, is a result of the latter involving a foreign language, while the former supposedly draws on the students' L1. In view of the diversity in 21st century European classrooms, however, the assumption that the national language equals the students' L1 has definitely outlived itself. One of the consequences of the diversity of students' proficiency levels in the national language has been for present-day content subject pedagogy to foreground discourse-oriented teaching (e.g., Schmölzer-Eibinger 2011). Not dissimilar from CLIL, such an approach recognises that the learners are engaged

in content *and* language learning at the same time, thus attempting to counteract the discriminatory potential inherent in national-language teaching for L2 speakers of that language.

Foreign languages can also result in discrimination when featuring as subjects. In the UK, for instance, private schools provide a disproportionate amount of foreign language teaching, given that they only make up 19% of all schools. Thus, in 2011, foreign languages were compulsory at 82% of all private schools, compared with only 23% of all state-run schools (Tinsley & Han 2011: 12). When it comes to English, on the other hand, most European educational policies feature it as an obligatory subject for all students, thus acknowledging its unparalleled utilitarian value and its status as one of the essential educational goals of the 21st century. That English has gained a status similar to literacy and numeracy is underlined in bilingual initiatives catering for mainstream learners.

Generally, we fully agree with AB that educational discrimination is an important topic that would require a lot more focused attention, political as well as academic. Given its pedagogical, societal and economic relevance, however, applied linguistic and, for that matter, any other research needs to engage in focused investigations that recognise educational discrimination as complex, dynamic and context-specific. General accusations laboured against a highly diversified teaching approach such as CLIL, lack the investigative rigour and applicability that a matter as serious as educational discrimination actually requires.

2.2. Assumption 2: "CLIL replaces foreign language teaching"

AB claims – and we will argue below that this is a mistaken assumption – that CLIL acts as a replacement for foreign language teaching in dedicated lessons in a two-fold manner; firstly, in timetabling, where CLIL lessons are seen as taking the place of EFL/MFL lessons, and secondly, CLIL is supposedly seen as replacing EFL/MFL teaching in terms of changing the overall aims of foreign language teaching in Europe.

This assumption relates to a large extent to the definition of CLIL implied by AB, for instance, in Table 1 (p. 589), which outlines the following four-way distinction of CLIL practice:

1) L1 content classes and no MFL classes

2) L1 content classes and MFL classes

3) L2 content classes and MFL classes

4) L2 content classes and no MFL classes

This table is misleading, as – in our view – only option 3) represents actual CLIL practice. Option 1) is the case of no MFL teaching at all, which is a sad reality in many UK schools (Coleman et al. 2007, Coleman 2009), but uncommon in the rest of Europe; option 2) is, in fact, the default setting for most continental European schools, and option 4) is the reality for increasing numbers of migrant students whose L1 is not the medium of instruction at school, or can be seen to present an English-Medium-Instruction context, which is rare at secondary level, but increasingly common at tertiary level (e.g. Doiz, Sierra & Lasagabaster 2013; Smit & Dafouz 2012). In compulsory education, where CLIL in Europe mostly takes place, there would be an uproar if students in state schools were supposed to learn content through a foreign language without any specific provision in that language. This has led to a general acceptance of 3) as the default European CLIL scenario. Overall, the purpose of this table eludes us – it certainly does not show "basic CLIL option for combining content and FL focus" (p. 589), but rather, at best, a rough outline of the language provisions offered at school in Europe.

Confusingly, the variations of CLIL that AB identifies later on in this section are the following

1) Learn the FL separately, in order to learn the content through the FL;

2) Learn the FL through the content, which has already been learnt in the L1;

3) Learn the FL and the content together. (ibid, p. 589)

AB suggests that options 1 and 2 prevail in CLIL practice whereas most studies claiming benefits of CLIL would imply option 3 to be taking place. Underlying these suggested paths is a rather simplified view of learning "the" language and "the" content. Both of these are complex endeavours and most school students will learn in cycles, with repetitions, by building on existing knowledge, by making

links to previous (school and world) knowledge, and in CLIL settings, by learning in TWO languages. In a diversity of ways, nearly all CLIL practice aims to ensure that students have the required specific language skills reflecting disciplinary language use in their L1 (or, more accurately, the national language of education[2]) and the CLIL language. This can take the form of both languages being used in the same CLIL lesson or of CLIL subjects being taught throughout phases in either the national language or the target language. This clear role for the national educational language is arguably one of the big differences to immersion programmes, especially when, like in the US, these are often transitional, i.e. aiming at monolingualism in the national language.

What AB seems to suggest is that having content taught only through the L2 in the absence of MFL provision is the most wide-spread CLIL scenario. In fact, this is not at all a typical CLIL practice, and we are not aware of any such programmes taking place anywhere in compulsory primary or secondary education in Europe. Indeed, CLIL is typically an additional element of FL instruction, and does *not* replace dedicated language classes. This is apparent in curricula, in practices and in the beliefs and attitudes of CLIL students and teachers, who quite clearly position CLIL as *complementary* to MFL classes and *not* as redundant. (see e.g. Coyle, Hood & Marsh 2010, Hüttner et al. 2013) This position is outlined in the following pupil quote "the technical stuff is one thing, where you do technology in English, and the other thing is the English lessons where you talk about your hobbies" from a project investigating CLIL at Austrian technical colleges (Dalton-Puffer et al. 2008). While this boy did not evaluate one over the other, it is clear that for him, CLIL and English are not redundant but clearly complementary.

AB further argues that for "some quarters [CLIL is] THE so-called solution to FL teaching and learning in the EU" (p. 587), and in line with this statement suggests that "CLIL is supposed to improve existing deficiencies in the formal learning of foreign languages (FL) in state schools of the EU" (ibid). AB does

---

[2] As stated earlier, the equation of national language (of instruction) and pupils' L1 is inaccurate. While exact numbers across the EU are hard to come by, some country statistics suggest around 20% of pupils to have a different L1 than the national language, with a tendency towards considerably higher percentages in urban clusters. (see, e.g., Statistik Austria (2013) reporting 19.8% for Austria; Centraal Bureau voor de Statstiek (2013) reporting 22.3% for the Netherlands)

not provide any evidence for this suggestion, and while this might well be the reason for adopting CLIL in some European regions (e.g. Andalucia), it is difficult to follow AB's argumentation of it as a generally valid defining feature of CLIL. What seems to be the case is rather that the demands on professional and advanced foreign (usually English) language ability have increased in Europe. This might well take place also where there are generally "satisfactory" (rather than 'deficient') English achievements among school leavers, as in Finland (Nikula 2007: 207), and conversely CLIL might not be taken up to a large extent, even if MFL provision is in decline and there is an on-going debate about the state of foreign language teaching, such as in the UK. Moreover, the focus on "the deficiencies […] in state schools of the EU" is a moot point in many contexts as private schools do not enjoy the same privileged status throughout Europe. In Germany, Austria and Finland, all countries with solid CLIL uptake, private schools play a rather negligible role and do not show a systematic difference in uptake (or not) of CLIL in their programmes.

Importantly, we find it very problematic to suggest that CLIL or any other approach can or should provide "THE" answer to language teaching in the 21st century. In line with Kumaravadivelu (2001, 2006), we would argue that we are in fact, in a post-method era, where we can no longer assume that 'one size – or teaching method – fit all'. Rather, issues of *particularity*, i.e. being "sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching a particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals within a particular institutional context embedded in a particular sociocultural milieu" (Kumaravadivelu 2001, 538) gain tantamount importance. This applies to language teaching in general, as well as to CLIL provisions.

2.3. Assumption 3: CLIL constitutes a uniform pedagogy

In line with AB's argument that CLIL replaces MFL teaching, he postulates CLIL as encompassing "a pedagogy" (p. 590). To our mind, however, this is one of the most fundamental misunderstandings; there is no unified CLIL pedagogy and even less a CLIL method. CLIL practice is informed by local

realisations of language teaching methodologies (often with at least a nod to communicative language teaching, itself an approach that encompasses a range of practices) and, most importantly of all, a host of content subjects. CLIL lessons appear as content in pupils' timetables and are taught by content specialist (who might *also* be language specialists, but generally not by language specialists who are themselves not content specialists). The result of this is that CLIL physics in Spain will – of necessity – look different from CLIL sports in Austria or CLIL geography in Finland. CLIL comes in such diverse national, but also local realisations that cross-study evaluations need to remain particularly careful not to disregard the different educational specificities the respective CLIL studies are taken from. While there are surely more criteria to be kept in mind, we will illustrate their relevance for CLIL policies and practices by focussing on national differences in relation to (a) duration of comprehensive education, (b) foreign language proficiency levels, and (c) standardisation in testing.

While Finland has nine years of comprehensive education, Austria and Germany have only four, splitting learners into 'academic' vs. 'vocational' at the age of 10. This means that Finnish and Austrian learner groups between grades 5 to 9 are *a priori* different in student composition. Concerning the second factor, the widely cited Eurobarometer (European Commission 2012) has revealed an often quoted cline in self-reported foreign language proficiency levels ranging from relatively high in the North to considerably lower in the South of Europe. Less well known is a cross-national study on attested FL proficiency levels in 13 European countries that provides further evidence for the partially huge differences in foreign language proficiency across nations (European Commission 2013). For instance, in France and Sweden the first foreign language tested was English, but while only approx. 15 % of the French test group achieved skills in the broad CEFR level of B, this level of proficiency was attested for approx. 80% of the Swedish testees (ibid.: 92). It goes without saying that the overall language proficiency in the language of teaching and learning will have an important impact on the respective CLIL practices. The third criterion mentioned here are the different testing practices we find in educational systems. Given that the washback effect is generally

to be reckoned with in education, the kind of standardised tests and the language they are set in will have direct consequences for CLIL. In Finland, for example, the end-of-grade 12 standardised test in Finnish goes hand-in-hand with very little CLIL during grades 10-12, while CLIL is practised in Austria until grade 12, most likely also because of the more flexible school-leaving oral examinations.

In sum, these admittedly sketchy descriptions of different educational specificities point to the context-specific constellations of factors that co-construct what CLIL looks like in a particular case. Across different contexts, overlaps and certain similarities can be expected, but where they are and what they look like cannot simply be assumed at the outset. Rather, they need to be aimed for as outcome of situation-sensitive CLIL research (cf. also Sylvén 2013).

3. Conceptualising CLIL

3.1. The common denominator

A logical consequence of this context-sensitive stance on CLIL is, it seems to us to recognise that CLIL comes in highly diverse realisations and that there is no 'one size fits all' conceptualisation. So, instead of attempting to postulate a detailed, theoretically 'tight' definition of what is (not) CLIL and of entering into heated discussions into where to draw the borders and what (not) to include (e.g. Lasagabaster & Sierra 2010; Somers & Surmont 2012), we argue for a more genuinely constructivist approach that acknowledges the diversity and dynamics integral to CLIL practices. By drawing on Wittgenstein's (1953) notion of 'family resemblance', we see CLIL practices as displaying some of a bundle of possible characteristics, without wanting to claim that any of them are 'necessary and sufficient'. Similar to AB, we use Dalton-Puffer's (2011, 183) description as basis for our own, but – unlike AB – we attempt to clarify its constructivist stance, acknowledging the dynamics and diversity of CLIL practices as they are found in Europe and further afield.

As we see it, CLIL can be described as an "educational approach where [some] curricular content is [additionally] taught through the medium of a foreign language [which is often also taught as a subject itself], typically to students participating in some form of mainstream education at the

primary, secondary, or tertiary level" (Dalton-Puffer 2011, 183, our additions). Our three additions given in square brackets are intended not to improve on the content of the original description, but rather to clarify what CLIL practices tend to entail. Firstly, schools take quite different routes as regards the percentage or number of content subjects in which English or a foreign language is used. This can range from parts of one single subject, e.g. the history lessons covering the Third Reich (Wiesemes 2007), to a full-year programme of various subjects, such as History, Geography or Biology (e.g. Lasagabaster 2008). The second and third additions relate to what we argued for above, namely, to the use of the foreign language as *additional* medium and to the wide-spread practice of teaching the CLIL language also as subject. The former underlines the fact that the use of the foreign language does not require a complete change in medium; rather, teachers and students will use the CLIL language *together with* the established language of education, either in structured ways – such as the CLIL language for new content and the national language for revision or vice versa – or in spontaneous 'languaging' (e.g. Moore & Nikula 2013), resulting in bi- or maybe even multilingual classroom practices. As regards the final specification, we wish to stress again that the claim that CLIL replaces MFL provisions needs to be restricted to the tertiary level. Primary and secondary education typically pursues a complementary policy of MFL classes and CLIL in the target language. . In other words, the '2-for-1' motto that AB warns us so fiercely of, should not be taken as a descriptor of educational policies, but rather for what it is – a catchy political slogan.

3.2. The bigger picture

This distinction between EU guidelines and school policies leads our discussion to an issue that we consider highly relevant, but which is side-lined in AB's paper, namely language policy (for overviews cf. e.g. Ricento 2006, Spolsky 2012). As argued convincingly in Spolsky (2004) and Shohamy (2006), language policy or the 'language choices made by individual speakers on the basis of rule-governed patterns recognized by the speech community (or communities) of which they are members' (Spolsky

2009, 1), form complex, multi-componential social activities that entail 'language management' (viz. language policy documents), 'language ideology' (viz. stakeholder beliefs) and 'language practices' (viz. language use in the community). Each of these three components is complex and multi-layered in itself and, additionally, interplays with the other two in diverse and partially also contradictory ways. When analysing a particular language policy, it is thus important to keep this dynamic complexity in mind. As regards our present discussion, this means that a particular national, regional or institutional CLIL policy draws on various managerial documents, of which the EU recommendation for language learning is only one), is supported (or not) by the teachers, parents and learners involved and is enacted, and thereby presumably changed, in the actual discursive practices (cf. also Dalton-Puffer 2011).

While, clearly, not every paper on CLIL policies can investigate all three components in detail, a theoretically naive stance that equals 'language policy' with a few policy documents cannot but remain theoretically and analytically underspecified and thus superficial. It will not allow for explanations of mismatches or synergies between policy documents, practices and beliefs; neither can it point out the developments and mutual influences or lack thereof between various policy documents. If we aim to provide a bigger, more comprehensive picture of CLIL, we will thus need to pay heed to language beliefs and practices, in addition to policy documents (e.g. Hüttner et al 2013).

Apart from allowing for more detailed discussions of particular CLIL policies, such a comprehensive view on CLIL policy also provides us with more of a basis to understand the CLIL phenomenon over the last years. To begin with, the extended view of CLIL policy, drawing on language management documents at all levels from pan-European to local, actual language practices, and the beliefs of stakeholders underlines the diversity of CLIL, and that it is not a monolithic endeavour throughout Europe, but in fact a range of quite diverse local realisations, whose 'family resemblance' we have sketched above.

Such a broader view also foregrounds the relevance of English in the spread of CLIL as an educational approach. From its beginnings CLIL has come with a limited range of languages, with English far outnumbering all the other languages taken together, which has motivated Dalton-Puffer, Nikula and Smit (2010: 286-288) and later Dalton-Puffer (2011) to argue for Content-and English-Integrated-Learning (CEIL) as the most widely spread version of CLIL. This preponderance of English as driving force behind CLIL is also reflected in its uptake outside Europe (e.g., *Latin American Journal of CLIL*) and negatively in the minority status CLIL (in languages other than English) has played in the UK or other countries (see, e.g. , Spain, where only 70 schools have CLIL in German or French compared to 625 in English[3]). While the reasons for this overwhelming preference for English are widely known and need no further elaboration a language policy view underlines that the pro-English managerial decisions often go hand-in-hand with supportive teacher, parent and student beliefs and practices in- but also outside of school.

In contrast to most other foreign languages, English is no longer seen as an additional bonus, but as relevant for advanced literacy and gaining higher professional status (Grin 2001); a development that has led scholars like Seidlhofer (2003) to argue for English to be viewed as separate in the canon of foreign languages at school. Increasingly, it seems, English proficiency has a similar status to computing skills (Graddol 2006). The non-experts need to have sound knowledge of both, and English language learning is not anymore only for those motivated by foreign languages, but a necessity for all. This is specifically so in a professional context, which is why in many countries CEIL enjoys a specially privileged position in vocational subjects and professionally oriented schools, or at least towards the higher years of schooling where the professional needs of students become more prominent. A study amongst 48 students and teachers in Austrian technical colleges revealed the general support for CEIL in view of later professional needs (Dalton-Puffer et al 2008). The generally positive uptake of using English in some of their subjects, even if unsystematic and sometimes even

---

[3] Los Programas de Enseñanza Bilingüe de la Comunidad de Madrid. Un estudio comparado. 2010. http://www.madrid.org/cs/Satellite?c=CM_InfPractica_FA&cid=1142623372595&idTema=1109265604897&language=es&pagename=ComunidadMadrid%2FEstructura&perfil=1273044216036&pid=1273078188154

unannounced, is noteworthy because it underscores the enacted reality of English as professional language and (future) lingua franca. Perhaps especially because many of these students do not consider themselves good language learners, they tend to appreciate the repeated use of English as medium of instruction. In combination with compulsory EFL classes, these CEIL practices are experienced as supporting the language learning process, possibly revealing the dynamically inter-related nature of using and learning English that Widdowson (2013) argues for in explaining the learning capacity inherent in English as a lingua franca discourse (see also Seidlhofer 2011). Similar to ELF users "mak[ing] strategic use of the linguistic resources at their disposal [...] to serve their communicative purposes" the CEIL phases "provide [the students] with the motivation and capability for further learning". (p. 192) In other words, CEIL functions as practice ground, which in combination with EFL classes enhances the learning possibilities for English as classroom language, but also as future professional language.

3.3. The potential of CLIL: What can CLIL offer language learning?

Reflecting our position on CLIL, we wish to outline in this final section not what CLIL does better than MFL, but rather what it adds to the learning experience. As two such areas we identify firstly, developing discipline- or subject-specific language and genre proficiency and secondly, changes in the affective dimensions of language learning.

As regards the first point, we would argue that one of the 'family resemblances' of CLIL, and indeed one of its natural consequences, is a focus on more subject and discipline-specific uses of the foreign language. This has been observed to a very great extent in lexical knowledge of both technical and semi-technical terms, related to specific subjects. CLIL gives occasion and communicative need to students to learn these terms, which are otherwise difficult to integrate into regular MFL lessons. In addition, the learning of such (semi-) technical vocabulary is often linked to learning the concepts they encapsulate; usually in both the national and the CLIL language. This can lead to a deeper

engagement with said concepts, encouraging content learning, but also stretches students towards an extension of their L2 lexicon beyond the primarily personal and familiar (Llinares, Morton & Whittaker 2012: ch. 5).

This subject-specificity of language use is beneficial also in terms of broadening students' experience of genres and of discourse functions related to the subjects taught through CLIL. The use of discipline-specific micro-genres has been studied quite extensively in CLIL research, frequently within a Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) framework. Specific work includes *explaining* or *defining* (Dalton-Puffer 2007, Gablasova 2012, Llinares & Morton 2010, Llinares et al. 2012, Smit 2010) and explicitly links these micro-genres to their disciplinary specificities. Whittaker et al. (2011) have focused on the development of history-specific English through CLIL and further work is under way. Learning these areas of the target language is possible in CLIL, but unlikely in traditional MFL classes, which – as AB's examples of song lyrics by Lady Gaga and The Beatles illustrate – focus on journalistic and personal text types, rather than disciplinary ones.

The second area where CLIL seems to show benefits is students' positive affect towards the foreign languages. AB seems to suggest that a more traditional EFL provision is – by its very nature – more motivating to students, but he does not seem to offer more than his own experience to support this. We are certain that there are many students who feel motivated by the artistic works of Lady Gaga, or indeed William Shakespeare, Charles Dickens, Hilary Mantel, or Hanif Kureishi. Equally, however, there are students who are not at all motivated by this and might feel more inclined to engage with English if it is related to their professional or other disciplinary interests.

Hüttner et al.'s (2013) study targeted a group of learners who are often seen as hard to motivate for studying foreign languages, namely male teenagers with a clearly expressed interest for technology and science. This study shows in the Austrian context and for learners in technical colleges that CLIL encouraged positive feelings towards the L2 English in terms of learners losing their fear of using English and making mistakes. The reason given for this is largely that English in CLIL is more clearly

seen as a communicative tool rather than as an expertise in itself. This links to the point made earlier that CLIL does not replace MFL, but rather complements it. A CLIL student in computer engineering highlighted his motivation for English through CLIL by saying that "if there is a [computer] program, then it's nearly always available first in English" and another technical student said on CLIL that "the interest and engagement have increased because we now know that we have more chances to work abroad and be successful". We would argue, too, that the reality of using English professionally is one of necessity in our globalised world, and has little to do with the traditional conceptualising of learning language to engage with the target language culture and a lot with using English as a lingua franca for primarily professional and academic purposes. Students in engineering colleges in Austria might or might not be interested in typically British or American lingua-cultural artefacts; however, none of them is fool enough to believe that they will be successful engineers without the ability to communicate professionally in English. This is expressed quite typically by one CLIL teacher (who had no English teaching specialism) in this project, who stated that "a vocational school trains for the job and with all this globalisation it is actually unthinkable to manage without English".

To conclude, CLIL will motivate some students to learn English and not others, just like EFL classes will motivate some students and not others. The advantage, to our mind, lies in the complementary nature of CLIL and in its diversity. AB appears to lament this diversity as it makes pinning down CLIL and doing experimental research with CLIL and non-CLIL students harder. We, however, feel that this very diversity of practices is an inevitable consequence of CLIL being a set of localised responses to the rise of English as a global lingua franca.

References

Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2012). Language and superdiversity. *MMG Working papers, 12*(9), 1-36.

Brizić, K. (2006): The secret life of languages. Origin-specific differences in L1/L2 acquisition by immigrant children. In *Int J Applied Linguistics* 16 (3), 339–362.

Bruton, A. (2013): CLIL. Some of the reasons why … and why not. In *System* 41, 587–597.

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2013) Online statistic database http://www.cbs.nl/nl-NL/menu/home/default.htm (accessed 2 December 2013)

Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2013). Critical Analysis of CLIL: taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*. doi: 10.1093/applin/amt011

Coleman, J. (2009) Why the British don't like languages. Myths and motivations in the UK. Language Learning Journal 37 (1), 111-127.

Coleman, J. A., Galaczi, A. & Astruc, L. (2007) Motivation of UK school pupils towards foreign languages: a large-scale survey at Key Stage 3. *Language Learning Journal* 35 (2), 245-280

Coyle, D., Hood, P., Marsh, D. (2010). CLIL. Content and Language Integrated Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: from practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 182-204.

Dalton-Puffer, C., Hüttner, J., Jexenflicker, S., Schindelegger, V., & Smit, U. (2008). *Content and language integrated learning an Österreichs Höheren Technischen Lehranstalten*. Vienna: Bundesministerium für Unterricht, Kultur und Kunst, Abt. II/2 (Austrian Ministery of Education, Culture and Art, Section II/2).

Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T., & Smit, U. (2010) Language use and language learning in CLIL: Current findings and contentious issues. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.). *Language use and language learning in CLIL*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 279-291.

Doiz, A.; Lasagabaster, D.; Sierra, Juan M. (Eds.) (2013): English Medium Instruction at Universities. Global Challenges. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

European Commission (2012*): Special Eurobarometer 386. Europeans and their Languages*. Available online at http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm. (accessed 23 Sept. 2013)

European Commission (2013): First European Survey on Language Competences. Final report: European Commission: Education and Training. Available online at *ec.europa.eu/languages/eslc/docs/en/final-report-escl_en.pdf* (accessed 23 Sept. 2013)

Gablasova, D. (2012). *Learning and expressing technical vocabulary through the medium of L1 and L2 by Slovak-English bilingual high-school students.* (PhD), University of Auckland.

Gogolin, I. (1994). *Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule*. Münster & New York: Waxmann Verlag.

Graddol, D. 2006*. English Next. Why Global English Might Mean the End of 'English as a Foreign Language'*. British Council: The English Company (UK) Ltd. (accessed November 13, 2009)

Grin, F. (2001): English as economic value: facts and fallacies. In World Englishes 20 (1), pp. 65–78.

Hüttner, J., Dalton-Puffer, C, & Smit, U. (2013). The power of beliefs: lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*(3), 267-284. (doi: 10.1080/13670050.2013.777385)

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001) Towards a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly* 35, 537-560.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding Language Teaching: From Method to Postmethod*. London: Routledge.

Lasagabaster, D. 2008. Foreign Language Competence in Content and Language Integrated Courses. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal* (1): 31–42.

Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. (2010). Immersion and CLIL in English: more differences than similarities. *ELT Journal, 64*(4), 367-375. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccp082

Leung, C.; Street, Brian V. (2012): English in the Curriculum. Norms and practices. In C. Leung & B. Street (Eds.) English. *A changing medium of instruction* (pp. 1–21). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Latin American Journal of CLIL: http://laclil.unisabana.edu.co/index.php/LACLIL

Llinares, A, & Morton, T. (2010). Historical explanations as situated practice in content and language integrated learning. *Classroom Discourse, 1*(1), 46-65.

Llinares, A., Morton, T. & Whittaker, R. (2012). *The roles of language in CLIL*: Cambridge University Press.

Mitsikopoulou, B. (2007). The Interplay of the Global and the Local in English Language Learning and Electronic Communication Discourses and Practices in Greece, *Language and Education* 21, 232-246, DOI: 10.2167/le749.0

Moore, P. and Tarja, N. (2013). Translanguaging in CLIL. Paper given at the BAAL conference, September 2013

Nikula, T. (2007). Speaking English in Finnish content-based classrooms. *World Englishes* 26 (2): 206‑23.

OECD (2012) *Education at a Glance 2012*: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing, http://www.oecd.org/edu/EAG%202012_e-book_EN_200912.pdf [accessed 23 Sept. 2013]

Park, Jin-Kyu. 2009. 'English fever' in South Korea: its history and symptoms, English Today 97, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 50-57. doi:10.1017/S026607840900008X

Ricento, T. (2006). Language policy: Theory and practice: An introduction. (pp. 10-23) In T. Ricento (Ed.) *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. London: Wiley.

Schmölzer-Eibinger, S. (2011) *Lernen in der Zweitsprache: Grundlagen und Verfahren der Förderung von Textkompetenz in mehrsprachigen Klassen.* Tübingen: Narr.

Seidlhofer, B. (2003). A concept of 'international English' and related issues: from 'real English' to 'realistic English'? http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/SeidlhoferEN.pdf. Accessed October 21, 2013.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*: Oxford University Press.

Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy. Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London: Routledge.

Siemund, P., Gogolin, I., Schulz, M., & Davydova, J. (2013). *Multilingualism and Language Diversity in Urban Areas: Acquisition, identities, space, education* (Vol. 1). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Smit, U. (2010). CLIL in an English as a lingua franca classroom: on explaining terms and expressions interactively. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 259-278). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Smit, U.; Dafouz, E. (Eds.) (2012). Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education. Gaining Insights into English-Medium Instruction at European Universities. (AILA Review 25.) Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Somers, T., & Surmont, J. (2012). CLIL and immersion: how clear-cut are they? ELT Journal, 66(1), 113-116. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccr079

Shohamy, E. (2006): Language policy. hidden agendas and new approaches. London: Routledge.

Spolsky, B. (2004). Language Policy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language Management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2012). *The Cambridge handbook of language policy*: Cambridge University Press Cambridge.

Statistik Austria (2013) *Online database*

 http://www.statistik.at/web_en/publications_services/superstar_database/index.html (accessed 25 September 2013)

Sylvén, L. K. 2013. CLIL in Sweden - why does it not work? A metaperspective on CLIL across contexts in Europe. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16 (3): 301–20.

Tinsley, T., & Han, Y. (2012). *Findings from the 2011 Language Trends survey*. CfBT Education Trust.

Widdowson, H. G. (2013): ELF and EFL: what's the difference? Comments on Michael Swan. In *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca 2 (1). 187-193*

Wiesemes, R. (2007). Developing a methodology for CLI classroom research: a case study of a CLIL classroom where the Holocaust is taught (pp .275-289). In C. Dalton-Puffer & U. Smit (Eds.) *Empirical Perspectives on CLIL Classroom Discourse.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Whittaker, R., Llinares, A. & McCabe, A. (2011) Written discourse development in CLIL at secondary school. *Language Teaching Research* 15 (3), 343-362.

Wittgenstein, L. 1953. *Philosophische Untersuchungen. Philosophical Investigations* [Translated by Gertrude E.M. Anscombe]. Oxford. Blackwell*.*