

EFFECTIVE CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED

LEARNING (CLIL) PROGRAMMES

Teresa Navés tnaves@ub.edu

www.ub.edu/filoan/naves.html

www.ub.edu/GRAL/Naves

To appear as Navés, T. (In press). Effective Content and Language Integrated Programmes. Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe. Y. Ruiz de Zarobe. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

International surveys indicate that the majority of people in the world are bilingual or multilingual rather than monolingual (See for example, World Bank, 1995). In fact, many more children throughout the world are educated in a second or foreign language, for at least part of their formal education, than exclusively in their mother tongue (Tucker, 1999).

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is not new. In recent years, however, integrating the teaching of languages with the teaching of academic subject matter has become more and more popular all over the world. The programme goals vary a great deal as does the degree of success achieved. In Canada, English and French have been the target languages of French and English speaking communities respectively. In Quebec for example, English speakers in some schools have been taught almost the entire curriculum in French. In the US, with a multilingual population, the main concern has been to guarantee that all school children can fully function in English, specially, in academic contexts. Because of the increase of students from abroad in North-American universities, content-based programmes have been more and more widely used to help

these students cope with the demands of academic objectives. In Europe and Asia, most of the programmes are designed to improve the learning of foreign languages.

INTRODUCTION: CLIL IN EUROPE & ASIA, CANADA AND USA.

Canadian Immersion Programmes are by far the most highly acclaimed language learning programmes. SLA researchers, teachers and parents fully agree that the immersion programmes in Canada have been extremely efficient and successful. Instruction is given in the target language from kindergarten on or starting at some time during elementary school. (Swain & Lapkin, 1982; Swain, 2000).

Early immersion begins right at the start of schooling in kindergarten or grade 1, while delayed immersion does not begin until the middle years of elementary school (ages 9-10), and late immersion after that (ages 11-14). An important difference between early and delayed or late-immersion programs is that training in second-language literacy precedes training in first-language literacy in early immersion. In total French immersion, all classes are taught in French, usually for the first three years of the program. English-language arts classes are introduced in the fourth grade, followed by a gradual increase in English instruction for other subjects. In partial French-immersion programs, a varying proportion of classes (usually 50%) are taught in French. This proportion typically remains stable throughout the program. (Canadian Council on Learning, 2007)

When the first immersion programmes were set up in the mid-1960s, school boards, parents and administrators insisted they be evaluated. Because all content was

being taught using the students' second language, parents and educators were concerned about how much content would be learnt, about the development of first language skills, and about how well the second language would be learnt. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, performance in these three areas was monitored. Four generalisations can be drawn from the immersion data. First, in order to obtain expected levels of achievement in the subjects taught via the second language, 'threshold levels' of L2 skills need to be reached. Second, while early total immersion students consistently performed as well as their unilingual, English-instructed peers on content-subject tests, early partial immersion students did not. Third, although the early total immersion programme was considered to be the one which would most threaten the development of first language skills, results of empirical research show that this is not the case. In the short run, after just two or three years, immersion students lag behind their non-immersion peers in some aspects of English. After that, however, immersion children perform as well as, or better than, their English-educated peers in all aspects of English language skills. Fourth, in general, early and late French immersion students have similar levels of writing skills in French, with both groups performing less well than their francophone peers. Immersion weaknesses clearly relate to deficits in their grammatical competence and vocabulary knowledge, rather than to discourse aspects of performance. Speaking is the weakest of the four skill areas for immersion students. (Swain, 2002)

In the US, the integration of content and language has a long tradition both in what is usually known as Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and in Bilingual Education Programmes (BE). Although Bilingual Education programmes are still controversial for politicians and the media, when properly implemented, research has clearly shown that they are at least as efficient as non-bilingual programmes, if not more so.

Content-based Instruction is “...the integration of particular content with language teaching aims...the concurrent teaching of academic subject matter and second language skills” (Brinton, Snow et al., 1989, p. 2). CBI approaches “view the target language largely as the vehicle through which subject matter content is learned rather than as the immediate object of study” (Brinton, Snow et al., 1989, p. 5).

Bilingual education has been defined as “schooling provided fully or partly in a second language with the object in view of making students proficient in the second language while, at the same time, maintaining and developing their proficiency in the first language and fully guaranteeing their educational development” (Stern 1972 cited in Swain 200:1999). For the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE) Bilingual education has been practiced in many forms, in many countries, for thousands of years. “Defined broadly, it can mean any use of two languages in school – by teachers or students or both – for a variety of social and pedagogical purposes. In today’s context, a period of demographic transformation in United States, bilingual education means something more specific. It refers to approaches in the classroom that use the native languages of English language learners (ELLs) for instruction” (NABE, 2004). Bilingual education remains controversial, in spite of a substantial number of studies demonstrating that students in bilingual programs learn and succeed academically in English at least as well as, or better than in programmes conducted only in English.

Schools in which the teaching of certain subjects in the curriculum may be offered in a foreign language have existed in Europe for several decades. The 1995 Resolution of the Council of Europe refers to the promotion of innovative methods and, in particular, to “the teaching of classes in a foreign language for disciplines other than

languages, providing bilingual teaching”. It also proposes improving the quality of training for language teachers by ‘encouraging the exchange with Member States of higher education students working as language assistants in schools, endeavouring to give priority to prospective language teachers or those called upon to teach their subject in a language other than their own’.

The European Commission’s (1995) *White Paper. Teaching and learning. Towards the Learning Society* declares that proficiency in three community languages is a priority, and suggests lowering the starting age and teaching content in a foreign language as ways to contribute to the achievement of this objective.

The European Commission’s (2005) report on foreign language teaching and learning claims that an excellent way of making progress in a foreign language is “to use it for a purpose, so that the language becomes a tool rather than an end in itself.” (p. 9). The European Commission, has funded research projects across Europe investigating the use of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) since the early-90s, pulling together the threads of existing approaches such as 'content-based instruction', 'immersion', and 'bilingual education'. All the aforementioned terms were replaced by CLIL, which was launched by UNICOM in 1996. Content and Language Integrated Learning refers to situations where subjects are taught in a foreign language with two aims: learning content, and, at the same time learning a foreign language (Marsh & Langé (Ed.), 1999). CLIL programmes involve learning subjects such as history, geography and others in a language that is not one’s own (Marsh & Langé (Ed.), 2000). According to the European Commission’s (2005) report, CLIL helps to

ensure the attainment of EU objectives in the area of language learning and enables pupils to study a non-language related subject in a foreign language.

CLIL and other forms of bilingual or immersion teaching share certain common features. CLIL will be used as an umbrella term to refer to the aforementioned programmes in this article. Bilingual Education (BE) will also be used to talk about specific programmes in the US and elsewhere.

CLIL RATIONALE

For Littlewood (2007), there is no discontinuity between Content-Language Instruction (CLI) and Task-Based Learning and Teaching (TBLT). Richards (2005: 29) includes both task-based and content-based instruction as ‘extensions of the CLI movement but which take different routes to achieve the goals of communicative language teaching – to develop learners’ communicative competence’. Nunan (2004: 10) sees communicative language teaching as an overarching concept (‘a broad, philosophical approach to the language curriculum’) of which ‘task-based language teaching represents a realization . . . at the levels of syllabus design and methodology’. Littlewood (2004: 324) also regards TBLT as ‘a development within the communicative approach’, in which the crucial feature is that communicative ‘tasks’ serve not only as major components of the methodology but also as units around which a course may be organized.

Most of the arguments in favour of CLIL come from SLA research and show that CLIL (a) creates conditions for naturalistic language learning, (b) provides a purpose for language use in the classroom, (c) has a positive effect on language learning by putting the emphasis on meaning rather than form and (d) drastically increases the amount of exposure to the target language (Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2007).

We can briefly review the rationale for integrating content and language. Krashen, 1982; Lightbown & Spada, 2006; Long, 1990, and Swain 2000, among others, suggest that a second language is most successfully acquired when the conditions are similar to those present in first language acquisition: that is, when the focus of instruction is on meaning rather than on form, when the language input is at or just above the proficiency of the learner, and when there is sufficient opportunity to engage in meaningful use of that language in a relatively anxiety-free environment. The researchers take the position that students will learn more when the focus of language instruction is shifted away from teaching the language directly to a situation in which students acquire language naturally, through lively exchanges with other students. The key to these exchanges is content area instruction in English.

Cummins (1981) argues that individuals develop two types of language proficiency: basic interpersonal language skills (BISC) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP). While interpersonal language skills can be acquired in 1 to 2 years, the level of proficiency needed to cope with academic contexts takes 5 to 7 years to develop. CLIL offers a means by which learners can continue their academic or cognitive development while they are also acquiring academic language proficiency. Cummins

(1984) also suggest that successful learning takes place when the task is cognitively demanding yet heavily contextualised. The integration of language and subject matter content offers the possibility of meeting the two conditions.

Research on second language acquisition has shown that considerable exposure to naturally-occurring language is necessary to ensure the achievement of a good level of competence in the L2. Learners need to have access to spontaneous speech, preferably in an interactive context where they can obtain plenty of information on the structure and the functioning of the foreign language. Acquiring an L2 is a long, natural process (Lightbown & Spada, 2006).

In Europe and Asia, when CLIL programmes guarantee a considerable increase in amount of exposure to the L2, they may prove a unique opportunity to improve levels of performance in the learning of foreign languages.

SUPERIORITY OF BE OVER OTHER PROGRAMMES

In the survey of successful programmes in California Krashen & Biber (1988) found that students in well-designed bilingual programmes consistently outperformed their peers. Three major meta-studies, Willig (1985), Greene (1997) and Wong-Fillmore & Valadez (1986), addressed the extensive comparative literature on instructional practices that improve the development of literacy in bilingual populations. Willig analysed 23 studies and compared the results from various types of programmes. Willig's (1985) meta-analysis indicated that bilingual education programmes

significantly enhanced academic achievement in comparison with English instructional programmes. In general, research in the US shows that bilingual education, when well implemented, is the most effective way to enable speakers of languages other than English to learn both English and academic-subjects (Cummins, 1984; García, forthcoming; Krashen, 1991, 1997, 2007; Swain & Lapkin, 1982).

Thomas & Collier (1997) conclude that at the elementary level two-way bilingual education is the best programme because students develop academic and second language proficiency as well as cognitive understanding through their first language. These advantages are not evident until the sixth grade. Students who are in educational programmes that provide extended instruction in their native language outperform students who only receive short-term instruction in their native language (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, and Christian, 2006).

HOW CAN WE DESCRIBE SUCCESSFUL CLIL PROGRAMMES IF THEY ARE SO DIFFERENT FROM ONE ANOTHER?

The majority of Content and Language Integrated programmes, whether we are talking about bilingual education (BE), or immersion, share basic characteristics, but they display two major differences. Firstly, BE programmes and partial immersion programmes provide instruction in the learners' mother tongue while most, if not all, initial instruction in total early immersion programmes is in the second language. A second major difference is that in immersion programmes all learners are initially unilingual, i.e., they all have a similar, very limited command of the second language and share the same mother tongue, whereas in BE there is not necessarily any common first language and the command of English as a second language among the learners varies a great deal.

SUCCESS DEFINITION

In 1999, the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) funded the Intercultural Development Research Association (IDRA) to identify 10 exemplary bilingual education programmes in schools in the US. After examining the programmes, IDRA identified the 25 common characteristics and criteria that were responsible for the success of the programmes. "Success" was operationally defined as evidence of academic achievement (compared to district and/or state standards) for LEP students in bilingual education programmes (IDRA, 2002). For IDRA Newsletter (2002) see also Robledo Montecel et al. (2002a, 2002b and 2004)

CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE CLIL PROGRAMMES

Navés (2002) grouped the characteristics of successful CLIL programmes under 10 headings. What follows is a revised and updated version, in the light of the existing literature evaluating content-based, bilingual, immersion and CLIL programmes.

1. RESPECT AND SUPPORT FOR LEARNERS' L1 AND HOME CULTURE

What is the rationale for providing some instruction in the learner's native language? Second language acquisition research has shown that the level of proficiency in the first language has a direct influence on the development of proficiency in the second language. The lack of continuing first language development has been found, in some cases, to inhibit the levels of second language proficiency and cognitive academic growth. The underlying assumptions based on empirical and theoretical research of these CLIL programmes are: on the one hand, the knowledge learners acquire through their first language helps make the English they hear and read more comprehensible. On the other hand, literacy developed in the primary language transfers to the second.

For Krashen (1997), when schools provide children quality education in their primary language, they give them two things: knowledge and literacy. Literacy developed in the primary language transfers to the second language. Once we can read in one language, we can read in general. There are solid theoretical and empirical grounds for favouring programmes for Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students that promote the development of their home language before and along with development of English (Cummins, 1981).

García (forthcoming) points out that it might seem counterintuitive to support the use of the child's first language in education in order to help the child do better in English. But this is explained by the concept of *linguistic interdependence*, which means that knowledge of one language bolsters knowledge of the other. Cummins (2000) argues that, "the first language must not be abandoned before it is fully developed, whether the second language is introduced simultaneously or successively, early or late, in that process" (Cummins, 2000, p. 25).

Around the world there is near consensus among researchers that "greater support for L1 development, and academic development in L1, is positively related to higher long-term academic attainment by LEP pupils" (Ferguson, 2006, p. 48).

Effective CLIL programmes acknowledge and support learners' home language and culture by allowing learners to use their L1 at early stages and also providing some academic instruction in learners' L1. Language arts (reading, writing...) are introduced in L1 and at different stages content subject matter is taught in L1 as well.

Collier, 1995, Crawford & Krashen (2007), Thomas and Collier (1997), Tikunoff (1982, 1983), among others, have shown that the development of first-language skills provides a sound foundation for subsequent academic success in and through English as a second language. For Collier (1995) the following four requisites need to be met: 1) a socioculturally supportive environment, 2) the development of the students' first language to a high cognitive level, 3) continuous cognitive development through education in the first language, and 4) teaching the target language with highly cognitively demanding but heavily contextualised tasks.

Cummins (1989) and Tikunoff (1982, 1983) argued that second language learners feel empowered by knowing that their native culture and language matter. Several large-scale evaluation programmes (Ramírez, 1992; Thomas & Collier, 1997) demonstrate that using the home language in instruction benefits language minority students.

2. MULTILINGUAL AND BILINGUAL TEACHERS

Most teachers are bilingual, although in most programmes they only use the target language for instruction. They do, however, show their understanding of learners' L1 by responding appropriately and rephrasing learners' remarks made in their L1.

IDRA (2002) found that in successful BE programmes teachers responsible for BE were bilingual and that all teachers in the school regularly received information about bilingual education, ESL strategies, and students' cultural and linguistic characteristics.

“When bilingual teachers have a conscious, shared ethnic identity, they are likely to intuitively recognize the needs of their bilingual learners. This finding also speaks to the importance of having bilingual teachers, especially those with a conscious, shared ethnic identity, as role models for language minority children.”
(Bustos Flores, 2001)

3. INTEGRATED DUAL LANGUAGE OPTIONAL PROGRAMMES

Historically the most effective BE and immersion programmes seem to share three characteristics. First their optionality. Second they aim for additive bilingualism and thus are sometimes also known as dual language or two-way bilingual programmes i.e., they aim at making learners fully competent in at least two languages: the mother tongue and the second language. Third, they are not pull-out programmes, i.e. they do not segregate LEP students from mainstream classes. It goes without saying that there

are other programmes which are effective and successful which do not aim for additive bilingualism.

The five most commonly implemented bilingual programme designs are pull-out, structured immersion, transitional, maintenance, and dual language (Crawford, 1999). The first three do not aim at facilitating bilingualism. The remaining two are often recommended because of their proven success in fostering bilingualism, academic achievement, and cultural pluralism (Krashen, 1998). In successful CLIL programmes, target language instruction is not structured or of a pull-out nature but rather contextualised and integrated.

Effective CLIL programmes are optional, not imposed (Swain & Lapkin, 1982). Parents in Canada thought of immersion as a right, not as an imposition. Parents felt they were entitled to ask that their children attend an immersion programme and that it was the responsibility of the Council to provide such education.

4. LONG-TERM STABLE TEACHING STAFF

One of the key factors to the success of these programmes is that they must be long-term, which implies not only the continuity of the programme but also the stability of teaching teams (Navés & Muñoz, 1999).

Lindholm-Leary's (2001) evaluation of BE programmes in California examined 1) English only programmes, 2) transitional bilingual education, and 3) two-way dual language programmes. They concluded that students who were in instructional programmes where English was used for only 10% to 20% of the time did as well on English proficiency tests as students in programmes in which English was used approximately 50%. It is worth noting that by grade 6 Latino students in dual language education (two-way bilingual education) outperformed transitional bilingual education students. In Mathematics students in dual language education scored ten points higher on average than those educated only in English.

It takes at least seven years for a second language learner to function with an adequate level of English proficiency in academic contexts, "a critical time period not allowed by the current education policies in this country. Learners in BE programmes may acquire playground English quickly but true bilingualism can take up to seven years to develop." (Quezada, 2000, p. 25 in García, forthcoming).

5. PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IS PIVOTAL

Parents play a critical role in both establishing and maintaining CLIL programmes. Some of the most effective immersion and BE programmes were initially established because of strong parental interest in giving their children enriched language and culture education. The most well-documented case of this is the Canadian French immersion programmes.

A growing number of parents' associations in the North America and elsewhere view bilingualism as a laudable personal and family goal and strive to provide their children with the opportunity to learn a second language at a young age. One clear measure of this parental desire to promote child bilingualism is the explosive demand for and development of two-way bilingual education programmes, in which both majority-language and minority-language children learn two languages (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2007). Cummins' (1996) observed that "Culturally diverse parents' strong desire to contribute to their child's education . . . care passionately" (p. 8).

“Family participation is twice as predictive of academic learning as is the family's socioeconomic status. Parents who feel welcome in schools are a powerful resource that can better their children's education. When schools and families work together, students succeed and communities are stronger.”

Montemayor, 2004

Parental involvement is crucial to the success of bilingual programmes because parents are resources, both to their children and to school personnel. They act as communicators, translators, cultural specialists, etc. Administrators must involve parents in the decision-making process and encourage them to participate in literacy rich activities, in any language, with their children. Research indicates that parents can best promote literacy in English by developing early literacy in their children's native language (Cloud, Genesee & Hamayan, 2000).

IDRA (2002) found that in the successful BE schools, all parents knew the rationale and the critical components of bilingual and ESL programmes and were strong advocates of the BE programmes. “Parents felt they belonged at their children's school and were very positive about the administration, faculty, and staff, saying they believed them to be truly concerned for and committed to their children's success” (Robledo, 2002, 2004). A meta-analysis conducted by Jeynes (2005) of 41 studies involving urban elementary schools demonstrates a significant relationship between parental involvement and academic achievement.

6. JOINT EFFORT OF ALL PARTIES INVOLVED

Effective CLIL programmes require the joint effort of all parties involved: educational authorities, parents and teachers at both district and school level are actively involved in planning the policy to implement such programmes and the means by which they are sustained. (Navés & Muñoz, 1999)

Designing and implementing a CLIL project is not an easy task. It requires the joint effort of Educational Authorities, school board coordinators, and CLIL teachers. We have already mentioned the lack of specific training for CLIL teachers, how different the ideal profile of a CLIL teacher seems to be from that of ordinary Primary and Secondary school teachers, and how unstable school staff is due to teachers' high mobility. In addition to this, we saw the need of long-lasting CLIL projects, in which to plan coherently which content subjects will be taught in which languages. Therefore, for successful and long-lasting

CLIL projects to occur, the Educational Authorities must provide the necessary teaching conditions under which school teachers can work. (Navés & Muñoz, 1999)

Leadership is one of the 25 features IDRA (2002) found in successful BE programmes in the US. In successful BE programmes, leaders are well informed of the rationale for bilingual education and share an active commitment to bilingualism. They pro-actively involve teachers, the community, and the private sector in the design and development of the bilingual programme and are open to innovation. All the parties involved feel responsible for maintaining a safe and orderly school climate. Moreover, “clearly articulated roles and responsibilities, dynamic two-way communication, and focused and sustained supports between central office and school level staff provide strong leadership, credibility, and respect for the bilingual programme” (Robledo, 2002)

García (forthcoming) claims that in spite of the substantial research evidence that it takes between 5 to 7 years to develop proficiency in academic English, many States insist on keeping emergent bilinguals stay in special programmes for only one year (California, Arizona and Massachusetts) or for a maximum of three years (New York State and Washington, for example). Zehler et al. (2003) report that according to their national survey, emergent bilinguals are receiving educational support for about half the time that they will most likely need it, according to the research.

7. TEACHERS' PROFILE AND TRAINING

Teacher quality, along with Principal quality, are two of the most important factors in determining school effectiveness and, ultimately, student achievement (Clewell & Campbell, 2004).

IDRA (2002) found that in successful BE programmes fully credentialed bilingual and ESL teachers did continuous training in best practices in bilingual education and ESL. Moreover, staff was selected based on their academic background, experience in bilingual education, and language proficiency. They were also selected for their enthusiasm, commitment and openness to change, and innovation. Teachers were strongly supported, often recognized for their students' successes, and were part of a team that was characterized as loyal and committed. Many of the staff stayed in their schools. (Robledo, 2002, 2004)

Montague (1997) noted that the most important aspect of any multilingual education programme is teacher training in pedagogical and theoretical aspects of language acquisition. Additional research on teacher training in multilingual education suggests that teachers should have many attributes in order to work in a multilingual education setting: proficiency in the target language, knowledge of the principles of language acquisition, and pedagogical skills specifically adapted for teaching foreign languages to young children (Van de Craen & Perez-Vidal, 2003).

8. HIGH EXPECTATIONS & ASSESSMENT

In their list of 25 features of effective BE programmes IDRA(2002) found that the schools that were successful published and disseminated statements of expectations to the school community that created a vision and set of goals that defined the achievement levels of all students. “Staff, parents, and students, including language-minority parents and students, can state the purpose of the school in their own words” (Robledo, 2002). Staff in the 10 successful BE programmes surveyed hold themselves accountable for the academic success of all students, including LEP students. As for evaluation, multiple assessment measures both in learners’ first language and in the language of instruction are used. Rigorous academic standards apply to all students, including LEP students.

Collier (1992), Walqui (2006) and many others have called attention to the importance of building high expectations for all learners irregardless of their individual differences and language and cultural background in particular. Research has shown that teachers and school leaders make a difference in students' education (Robledo & Cortez, 2002). For example, value-added assessment studies in Tennessee have shown that students who have high-quality teachers over a period of three years achieve, on average, 50 percentile points more on standardized tests than those who have low-quality teachers (Sanders & Rivers, 1996)

9. MATERIALS

Oakes (2002) argues that there is a clear link between appropriate materials and curriculum and student academic outcome. CLIL learners need appropriate materials to learn English and content. Mahone (1984) conducted a need analysis in the US to look

at the appropriacy of existing materials used in BE. The picture which he described unfortunately still applies to many CLIL contexts in which there are not enough teaching materials available and most of those that we have have been created by the teachers themselves. Navés & Muñoz (1999) pointed out how important appropriate materials were for CLIL programmes to be successful. Unfortunately, in many different contexts, there are not enough materials available to teachers to meet the needs of teaching content in the target language.

10. CLIL METHODOLOGY

Numrich (1989) focuses on five strategies to improve the comprehension of content in CLIL.

- (1) predicting on the basis of prior knowledge,
- (2) anticipating what will be read next,
- (3) using statements to check comprehension of a text during reading,
- (4) analysing text organization by looking for specific patterns, and
- (5) classifying to facilitate comprehension of similarities and differences.

In Navés (2002) some of the most characteristics of successful CLIL programmes were summarised as follows:

- (a) Teachers exhibit active teaching behaviours such as giving instructions clearly, accurately describing tasks, maintaining learners' engagement in instructional tasks by maintaining task focus, pacing instruction appropriately, and communicating their expectations for students' success.

- (b) In presenting new information teachers use appropriate strategies such as demonstrating, outlining, using visuals, building redundancy, rephrasing, scaffolding, linking new information to learners' previous knowledge, etc. to make input comprehensible and context-embedded.

- (c) Teachers monitor students' progress and provide immediate feedback whenever required. They check comprehension constantly, achieving high levels of communication between teachers and learners and among learners themselves.

- (d) Effective instruction is aided by allowing learners to respond in a wide variety of ways: from verbal responses both in L1 and L2 to non-verbal responses (responding by doing) in early stages, but they are gradually expected to respond only in the TL once they show enough command of the TL. At the early stages, emphasis is on the development of receptive skills.

- (e) Consistent integration of cognitively demanding academic content and the TL. Cognitive abilities and processes such as identifying, comparing, drawing conclusions, finding similarities and differences, etc. are integrated in the design of the programme.

- (f) Teachers respond to and use information from their students' home cultures, using cultural references, organising instruction to build upon participant structures from students' home culture and observing the values and norms of students' home culture.

- (g) Task work includes: hands-on tasks, experiential learning tasks, problem solving tasks, etc.

- (h) Collaborative learning, autonomous learning and self-directed learning are also suggested by some CLIL specialists.

More recently de Graaff et al. (2007: 20) identified 5 main indicators for effective CLIL language teaching performance, as in:

- (1) Teachers facilitate exposure to input at a (minimally) challenging level by selecting attractive authentic materials, adapting texts up to the level of the learners and scaffolding on the content and language level by active use of body language and visual aids.
- (2) Teachers facilitate meaning-focussed processing by stimulating the learners to request new vocabulary items, check their meaning, use explicit and implicit types of corrective feedback on incorrect meaning identification, and practice through relevant speaking and writing assignments.
- (3) Teachers facilitate form-focussed processing by giving examples, using recasts and confirmation checks, clarification requests and giving feedback (sometimes including peer feedback). No evidence was found of CLIL teachers providing explicit form-focused instruction, e.g. by explaining rules.
- (4) Teachers facilitate output production by encouraging learners' reactions, working in different interactive formats and practising creative forms of oral (presentations, round tables, debates) and written (letters, surveys, articles, manuals) output production, suggesting communicatively feasible tasks, giving the learners enough time for task completion, encouraging learners to speak only in English, providing feedback on students' incorrect language use and stimulating peer feedback.
- (5) Teachers facilitate the use of compensation strategies by stimulating students to overcome problems in language comprehension and language production,

reflecting on use of compensation strategies, and scaffolding on-the-spot strategy use.

Cummins (2000) has called for a "transformative/intercultural pedagogy" for language minority students where students' language and cognitive abilities are engaged in the learning process and where students' identities are affirmed

CONCLUSION

Integrating content and language is not new. It has been used for decades under different labels. Most of the early research on content and language intergrated programmes -- immersion programmes in Canada, bilingual education programmes in the USA -- was concerned with proving that integrating content and language was not harmful, that it would not damage or slow down the acquisition of the learner's first language, second language or academic content. Now, almost fifty years after Canadian Immersion programmes were first thoroughly evaluated and then unanimously acclaimed, researchers still seem to feel the need to reaffirm that these programmes are not in fact harmful before daring to describe how successful they have been. Likewise, in the United States, in spite of the wealth of empirical research that confirms the success of properly implemented bilingual education programmes, researchers still feel required to present their rationale and to prove their success, time and time again, before proceeding to describe the characteristics of effective bilingual education programmes.

Nonetheless, in the last two decades, while in Europe and Asia the main emphasis is still on describing the rationale and benefits of implementing content and language integrated (CLIL) *approaches and methodologies*, in North America the emphasis has shifted to further investigating the characteristics of efficient immersion and bilingual education *programmes*.

As important as CLIL teaching methodology may be, it is just one among many other features efficient CLIL programmes have in common. The one feature which all efficient CLIL programmes share is that they are PROGRAMMES of varying length which provide, nevertheless, a substantially greater and better exposure to the target language.

Efficient CLIL programmes –an umbrella term for immersion, content-based, and bilingual education programmes in America, Europe and Asia—share the following ten common characteristics: (1) respect and support for the learner’s first language and culture; (2) competent bilingual teachers i.e. teachers fully proficient in the language of instruction and familiar with one of the learners’ home languages; (3) mainstream (not pull-out) optional courses; (4) long-term, stable programmes and teaching staff; (5) parents’ support for the programme; (6) cooperation and leadership of educational authorities, administrators and teachers; (7) dually qualified teachers (in content and language); (8) high teaching expectations and standards; (9) availability of quality CLIL teaching materials; (10) properly implemented CLIL methodology.

The defensive attitude that can be inferred from researchers’ need to justify, time and time again, the rationale and benefits of integrating language and subject content rather than further investigating the commonalities of efficient CLIL programmes may have to do with pressure from (a) folk beliefs and prejudices against bilingualism and

multilingualism and (b) political interests. As Cummins (1995) put it more than a decade ago:

“I argue (...) that the debate on bilingual education must be considered in the political contexts for two reasons: first, the research findings on the effects of bilingual education are both abundant and clear; the common perception that research is either largely unavailable and/or inadequate is a myth generated by strong vested interests. The second reason for examining closely the political context of the issue is that the educational changes required to reverse the pattern of language minority group school failure are essentially *political* changes because they involve changes in the power relations between dominant and dominated groups”. (p. 63)

I wish to express my thanks to the Catalan Department of Education for the pilot Barcelona content-based programme I co-ordinated with Margarita Ravera and Cristina Riera for four years (1994-1998). I am also deeply in debt with Professor Ofelia García and James Purpura from Columbia University for having invited me to observe inspiring BE classes in NYC in fall 2007.

REFERENCES

- Brinton, D. Snow. M. A. Wesche, M. B. 1990. *Content-based Language Instruction*. New York: Newbury House.
- Brisk, M. E. (1999). Quality Bilingual Education: Defining Success. *LAB Working Papers, 1*,
- Bustos Flores, B. (2001). Bilingual Education Teachers' Beliefs and Their Relation to Self-Reported Practices *Bilingual Research Journal, 25*(3),
- Canadian Council on Learning. (2007). French-Immersion Education in Canada. *Lessons in Learning*.
- Center for Applied Linguistics. (2007). Directory of Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Programs in the U.S. from
- Clewell, B., & Campbell, P. (2004). *Highly effective USI schools: An outlier study*. Washington: The Urban Institute / Campbell-Kibler.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. V. (2000). Critical Features of Enriched Education. In N. Cloud, F. Genesee & E. V. Hamayan (Eds.), *Dual Language Instruction. A Handbook for Enriched Education* (pp. 9-24). U.S.: Heinle & Heinle.

- Council Resolution of 31 March 1995 on improving and diversifying language learning and teaching within the education systems of the European Union, Official Journal C 207 of 12.08.1995
- Collier, V. P. (1992). A Synthesis of studies examining long-term language minority student data on academic achievement. "Bilingual Research Journal," 16, p. 187-212.
- Collier, V. P. (1995). Acquiring a Second Language for School. Directions in Language and Education. *National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education*, 1(4), 1-12.
- Crawford, J. (1997). *Best Evidence: Research Foundations of the Bilingual Education Act NCBE Report* National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education
- Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual Education. History, Politics Theory and Practice. Fourth edition revised and expanded.*
- Crawford, J. and D. Krashen Stephen (2007). "English Learners 101." Language Magazine 7(2): 20-21
- Crawford, J., & Krashen Stephen, D. (2007). *English Learners in American Classrooms: 101 Questions, 101 Answers*: Scholastic.
- Cummins, J. (1981). *Bilingualism and minority language children*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (1987). Immersion programs: Current issues and future directions. In L.L. Stewin & S.J. McCann (Eds.) *Contemporary educational issues: The Canadian mosaic*.
- Cummins, J. (1995). Bilingual Education and Anti-Racist Education. In O. García & C. Baker (Eds.), *Policy and Practice in Bilingual Education. Extending the Foundations. Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 2* (pp. 280). Clevedon, Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, & pedagogy: Bilingual children caught in the cross-fire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism in Education: Aspects of Theory, Research and Practice*. London: Longman.
- Dalton, Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Classrooms*. Benjamins.
- Dalton, Puffer, C. & Smit, U. (2007). *Critical Perspectives in CLIL Classroom Discourse*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- De Graaff, R., Koopman, G. J., Anikina, Y., & Westhoff, G. (2007). An Observation Tool for Effective L2 Pedagogy in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 603-624

- European Commission (1995). *White Paper on Education and Training. Teaching and Learning. Towards the Learning Society*
- European Commission & Wastiau-Schlüter, P. (Ed.) (2005). Key Data on Teaching Languages at School in Europe.
- Ferguson, G. (2006). *Language planning and education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Press.
- García, O. (forthcoming) Reconstituting Bilingual Education in a Globalized World. Multilingual Matters
- Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning Through Two Languages: Studies of Immersion and Bilingual Education*. Cambridge: Newbury House.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W. M., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Intercultural Development Research Association IDRA Newsletter (2002)
- Jeynes, W.H. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relation of parental involvement to urban elementary school student academic achievement. *Urban Education*, (40)3, 237-269.
- Krashen S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. D. (1991). Bilingual Education: A Focus on Current Research. Focus, Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education, Number 3 (pp. r).
- Krashen, S. (1997). Why Bilingual Education? ERIC Digest (pp. 4): ERIC/CRESS, P.O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325-1348.
- Krashen, S. (1998). Bilingual Education and the Dropout Argument (pp. 8): For full text:
- Krashen, S. 1998. "Heritage language development: Some practical arguments." In S. Krashen, L. Tse, and J. McQuillan (Eds.), *Heritage Language Development*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates. pp. 3-13.
- Krashen, S. 1999. *Condemned without a Trial: Bogus Arguments Against Bilingual Education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Publishing Company.
- Krashen, S., & Biber, D. (1988). *On course: Bilingual education's success in California*. Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Krashen, S., Tse, L., and McQuillan, J. 1999. *Heritage Language Development*. Century City, CA: Language Education Associates.

- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How Languages are Learned. Second revised edition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lindholm-Leary, K.J. (2001). *Dual language education.* Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: Some questions and suggestions. *ELT Journal* 58.4, 319–326.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. This is a revised version of a plenary paper presented at the International Conference of the Korean Association for Teachers of English, held in Seoul, Korea, in June 2006. *Language Teaching*, 40(3), 243-249
- Long, M. H. (1990). Maturation Constraints on Language Development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 251-285.
- Mahone, A. (1984). Training Manual for the Implementation of a Bilingual Education Instructional and Training Materials Development Process/Model.
- Marsh, D., & Langé, G. (Eds.). (1999). *Implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning. A Research-driven TIE_CLIL Foundation Course Reader.* Jyväskylä, Finland: Continuing Education Centre, University of Jyväskylä on behalf of TIE-CLIL (European Lingua Project).
- Marsh, D., & Langé, G. (Eds.). (2000). *Using Languages to Learn and Learning to Use Languages.* Jyväskylä, Finland: UniCOM, University of Jyväskylä on behalf of TIE-CLIL.
- Montague, N. S. (2000). Critical components for dual language programs. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 21(4),
- Montemayor. (2004). Excellent Bilingual Early Childhood Programs ? A Parent Guide. *IDRA Newsletter*, May,
- Navés, Navés, T., & Muñoz, C. (1999). Implementation of CLIL in Spain. In D. Marsh & G. Langé (Eds.), *Implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning. A Research-driven TIE_CLIL Foundation Course Reader* (pp. 145-158). Jyväskylä, Finland: Continuing Education Centre, University of Jyväskylä on behalf of TIE-CLIL (European Lingua Project).
<http://www.ub.es/filoan/addendumen.html>
- Navés, T. (2002). Successful CLIL Programmes in Navés, T. Muñoz, and C. Pavesi, M. Module 2: Second Language Acquisition for CLIL. In G. Langé & P. Bertaux (Eds.), *The CLIL Professional Development Course* (pp. 93-102). Milan: Ministero della Istruzione della Università e della Ricerca. Direzione Regionale per la Lombardia.
- New Jersey State Dept. of Education, T. D. o. C. B. E. (1984). *Effective Practices for Successful Bilingual Parent Involvement Programs: An Administrator's Handbook.* P.T.M. No. 400.20.

- Numrich, C. (1989). Cognitive strategies for integrating ESL and content area instruction. In Macero, J. D., et al. (Eds.), *Realizing the dream. Selected conference proceedings.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 314 959).
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Oakes, J. (2002). *Access to Textbooks, Instructional Materials, Equipment, and Technology: Inadequacy and Inequality in California's Public Schools (October 1, 2002).* UCLA's Institute for Democracy, Education, & Access. Williams Watch Series: Investigating the Claims of Williams v. State of California. Paper wws-rr001-1002.
- Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs OBEMLA
- Richards, J. C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today.* Singapore: RELC
- Robledo Montecel, M., & Cortez, J. D. (2002). Successful Bilingual Education Programs: Development and the Dissemination of Criteria To Identify Promising and Exemplary Practices in Bilingual Education at the National Level. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(1), 1.
- Robledo Montecel, M. Cortez, J., & Intercultural Development Research Association, S. A. T. X. (2004). *Successful Bilingual Education Programs. IDRA Newsletter: Intercultural Development Research Association.* Document Number)
- Robledo Montecel, M., & Goodman, C. (Eds.) (2002). *IDRA Newsletter.*
- Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center. Knoxville: University of Tennessee. Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.
- Sullivan, J. H. (2004). "Identifying the Best Foreign Language Teachers: Teacher Standards and Professional Portfolios." *Modern Language Journal* 88(3): 390-402.
- Swain, M. (2000). French Immersion Research in Canada: Recent Contributions to SLA and Applied Linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 199-212.
- Swain, M., & Johnson, R. K. (1996). Discovering Successful Second Language Teaching Strategies and Practices: From Programme Evaluation to Classroom Experimentation and A Response. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 17(2-4), 89.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1982). *Evaluating Bilingual Education: A Canadian Case Study.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Stern. H. H. 1972. Introduction. In M. Swain (ed.) *Bilingual schooling: Some experiences in Canada and the United States.* Toronto: OISE Press. 1-6.

- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. (1997). School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students. NCBE Resource Collection Series, No. 9. *National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education*, BBB27896,
- Tikunoff, W. J. (1983). *An emerging description of successful instruction: Executive summary of part 1 of the SBIF study*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 297 561)
- Tikunoff, WJ. (1983). *Significant bilingual instructional features study*. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory.
- Tikunoff, W. J., & Vazquez-Faria, J. A. (1982). Successful Instruction for Bilingual Schooling. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 59(4), 234-271.
- Tikunoff, W., Ward, B., van Broekhuizen, D., Romero, M., Castaneda, L.V., Lucas, T., & Katz, A. (1991). "A Descriptive study of significant features of exemplary special alternative instructional programs." Washington: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs.
- Tucker, G. R. (1999). A Global Perspective on Bilingualism and Bilingual Education. *ERIC Digest. ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics Washington DC, ERIC 1-800-LET-ERIC(ED435168)*,
- Van de Craen, P.& Pérez-Vidal, C. (eds.) *The Multilingual Challenge/Le défi Multilingue..* Barcelona: Printulibro.
- Walqui, A. (2006). Scaffolding instruction for English learners. A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(2), 159-180.
- Willig, A.C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research*, 55(3), 269-317.
- Wong-Fillmore, L., & Valadez, C. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook on research on teaching* (pp. 648-685). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- World Bank. (1995). "Priorities and strategies for education." Washington, DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
- Zehler, A., H., F., Hopstock, P., Stephenson, T., Pendizick, M., & Sapru, S. (2003). *Descriptive study of services to LEP students and LEP students with disabilities. Research Report.*