**TEACHING CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

CLIL is currently achieving great attention across the world with different forms. However, the research relating to its practical teaching is still a limitation. Focusing on cross-curricular programmes, this article analyses critically four of CLIL’s central claims against the evidence of the latest research. The claims analysed are: CLIL leads to greater linguistic proficiency, it boosts motivation, it is suitable for learners of all abilities and it leads to greater intercultural awareness. The article concludes that while all four claims are, to a large degree, substantiated by the evidence, there are also clear limitations, stemming from theoretical and methodological shortcomings of the CLIL model, as well as from its interaction with contextual factors. The article suggests a number of ways in which these limitations can be addressed and concludes that, unless remedied, they could lead to an understandable yet regrettable disappointment with a model that is genuinely promising.

**II. LITERATURE REVIEW**

To begin with, CLIL’s effectiveness in both language and content achievement has been well documented (Baker, 2011; Cenoz, Genesee, & Gorter, 2014; Dalton-Puffer, Llinares, Lorenzo, & Nikula, 2014; Yang, 2015). The successful stories of CLIL in Europe have inspired the application of this approach in different contexts including Vietnam. From a theoretical perspective, the twofold benefits of CLIL can be explained using a sociocultural framework of learning (Pinner, 2013). Accordingly, a second language (L2) is most successfully acquired in conditions similar to those present in first language (L1) acquisition (Krashen, 1982). Such conditions are created in CLIL classrooms through instructions that focus on meaning (content) rather than on form (language), scaffolds needed for learners to progress in their Zone of Proximal Development, and a relaxing environment where students lively exchange content knowledge with their peers. (Naves, 2009). In terms of content acquisition, once receiving the content input in L2, the students’ ‘private speech’ takes place in which students decode and analyse the information using L1, and later, if required, the students will have to encode the knowledge and represent it using L2. This issue of language use and code switching will be further discussed in this paper; the main argument, to this point, is that this process requires students to deal with the content more than once, thus allowing students to achieve a deeper understanding of the subject matter (Hall & Cook, 2012). Next, CLIL is a pedagogically appropriate approach to teach literature in EFL context, for it takes into account fundamental elements of literature teaching. Currently, there are two major trends in teaching literature for English majors in H. university, both of which fail to gain much success. The first trend, which has enjoyed its popularity for long, features traditional literature classrooms with translation-based and teacher-centred methods. In such classrooms, the main focus is on the subject matters: the authors’ autobiographies, the analysis in terms of both content and linguistic features of poems, short stories, novel extracts. Such an approach is ascribed to students’ misleading perception about and negative attitudes towards learning literature (Kellem, 2009). On the contrary, the second trend, which resonates the in-vogue CLT pedagogy in Vietnam, witnesses an overemphasis on the teaching of linguistic elements from literary works as well as the practice of language skills rather than on the subject matter. Enthusiasts of this trend might reason that literature is all about language; therefore, teaching literature for EFL learners should take language as the focal point (Kellem, 2009). This approach is problematic as it risks ignoring the needs and interests of learners and the real purpose of the course - literature as a subject per se rather than a means for practicing language skills. Besides, it fails to recognise the potential of employing literature to solve the classic dilemma of EFL classroom, which is the content being taught is also the medium of instruction, or teaching language using language (Pinner, 2013). As literature and language are inextricably related, the teaching of literature will not be fulfilled without taking into account language elements, not only the language of learning literature but also the languages for and through learning the discipline. For this reason, an dual-focused approach should be employed in literature teaching (Pinner, 2012). CLIL, which is a dual-focused approach employing an additional language as the means of teaching and learning subject matters to facilitate both language and content acquisition (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010), is perfect for dealing with literature without ignoring its interrelation with language. Pinner (2012) argues that an understanding of and engagement with the difficult and culturally rich content of literary works will provide learners with meaningful and authentic language to improve their language skills. Under this light, CLIL helps solve the conflict of language-content in EFL context by making the focus on content also conducive to language acquisition. Finally, other benefits of CLIL literature programs are enhancing students’ motivation and reducing teachers’ content-language competence burden. Regarding the learners’ motivation, the study conducted by Lasagabster (2011), which compares one CLIL class with a ‘traditional’ EFL class, shows that the learners’ motivation is higher and retains longer in CLIL class. Pinner (2013) argues that these motivational effects are resulted from the high level of authenticity of CLIL texts, language and tasks. In CLIL classes, attention is paid to both what is written in the text and how it is written. That students use the target language for interpreting, negotiating, exchanging and representing content knowledge makes their use of L1 meaningful and authentic (Pinner, 2012). Given EFL practice in Vietnam remains a weak form of bilingual education, maximising students’ use of English in an authentic environment is of paramount importance. Then, the argument that CLIL helps reduce teachers’ content-language competence does not imply that EFL teachers are more suitable for CLIL. In fact, it suggests that EFL teachers can take the main role in CLIL program instead of the role of advising and supporting content teacher as recommended by a number of research (Arnó-Macià & Mancho-Barés, 2015; Georgiou, 2012; Lo & Macaro, 2015). EFL teachers, who have background knowledge of literature, or ideally, who once took CLIL literature courses, can teach the course. In this case, the problem of content - knowledge competence can be solved. This has merits especially in contexts where there is a lack of mechanism and policy for cross departmental collaboration of EFL and content teachers. In conclusion, CLIL is a potential alternative to teaching literature in EFL context thanks to its dual-focused nature and its catering to fundamental elements of literature teaching as well as learners and teachers’ motivation, needs and concerns. However, it should be noted that successful CLIL programs require appropriate methodologies, assessments and pedagogies (Georgiou, 2012) which will be presented and discussed hereafter.

**III. APPROACHES FOR TEACHING – AN EXAMPLE**

**Teaching literature unit**

Prior knowledge of content and language:

- Students have general understanding of the history of English literature and social, cultural and political features of British and American societies;

- Students have general knowledge about literature genres, their structures and literary elements such as figures of speech, rhyme scheme;

- Students are able to engage in discussion, reading and writing using their English language skills. Content goals for unit:

Students will:

- understand the authors’ autobiographies and how the authors’ life and career affect their works; - understand different social, cultural and political influences in different times and how they affect ones’ writings;

- understand and develop a critical insight into a variety of themes such as love, family relationship, time, nature …;

- develop a critical understanding of the literary, aesthetic and meaning of the works and cultural values through evaluating literary works in both target language and source language;

- develop creativity and critical thinking through visual, oral and written expression;

**Language goals for unit:**

Student will:

- revise and learn grammar elements that characterize different genres; - understand and be able to use literary elements such as stylistic devices, plot, setting, climax, character … to develop their own literary writing;

- engage in critical reading of a text and develop writing, speaking and listening skills; - learn and extend their vocabulary on a variety of themes.

**1. Content focus**

Summarising and explaining information about the authors’ life and careers; - Understanding genres of poems and their characteristics; - Relating to background information about the authors’ autobiographies to explain and interpret the meanings of the texts; - Relating to prior knowledge about social, cultural and political factors affecting major trends in English literature to explain the meanings of the texts; - Interpreting, predicting, arguing and reflecting on the main themes: the ravage of time, the comfort that lies bring to ones’ insecure mind; the uplifting power of nature; the inner eye concept; the concepts of love, loss and regret; - Identifying, predicting, and justifying the uses of stylistic devices; - Comparing, contrasting, describing, and justifying the similarities and differences between the original works (in English) and the translations (in Vietnamese); - Applying the new knowledge (genres of poems, stylistic devices) and relating to their own knowledge, interests to write poems and reflection.

**2. Language focus**

- Vocabulary; old English words/ phrases;

- Grammar: prepositions of place; inversion structures; comparative: as … as;

- Figure of speech/ stylistic devices: simile; personification; hyperbole; metaphor;

- Dictionary skills

**3. Activities**

Jigsaw reading activity (group work): readings about the authors’ autobiographies (L1/L2 used to facilitate understanding of the text);

- Term matching exercises on figures of speech (Teacher/ students name L1 equivalents of figures of speech);

- Students find examples of figures of speech from the texts and discuss such uses, their intention and effects (pair work);

- Class discussion on the main themes of the texts; - Discussion on Vietnamese translations of the poems;

- Creative writing: students write their own poem; (Teacher scaffolds in L1/ L2 - suggesting vocabulary, phrases, resources)

**4. Written reflections on one of the works**

One of the key aspects of the CLIL classroom that the Scope and Sequence chart pays attention to is the issue of classroom languages use, or the use of L2 and L1. The proposed program advocates the use of L1, or “own language” use, a term coined by Hall and Cook (2012), besides L2. The importance of languages use and suggestions for effective use of languages in CLIL literature classroom will be discussed in this writing. To begin with, the issue of languages use in CLIL classroom should be examined to develop a proper understanding not only about the use of L1, L2 but also about CLIL. Furthermore, given the debate over distinguishing CLIL, immersion and content-based approaches (Cenoz, Genesee, & Gorter, 2014; Dalton-Puffer, Llinares, Lorenzo, & Nikula, 2014) and the argument that languages use is crucial to distinguish CLIL from other approaches (Lin, 2015), it is important to highlight this issue. By its nature, CLIL is about teaching through a language, not teaching a language (Baker, 2011; Georgiou, 2012). In Vietnam, however, this principle is often mis-interpreted, with the focus inclining toward the language end of the language - content continuum (Lee, 2008; Normand-Marconnet, 2013). This mis-interpretation are resulted from the exclusive use of L1 in CLIL classrooms. Yet Lin (2015) argues that other factors contributing to the popularity of monolingual teaching model in CLIL context include the stereotyping of L1 use which attaches L1 use to the much criticised Grammar-Translation method, mis-interpretation of maximum input hypothesis and early research finding about the effectiveness of monolingual teaching. As a result, code-switching, a natural phenomenon in language classroom (Baker, 2011) is often claimed as unwanted or as a guilt by teachers, and students are often prohibited from using their own language (Baker, 2011; Blyth, 2009; Hall & Cook, 2012). However, regardless of their stands, teachers, linguists and experts must agree that L1 plays a role in SLA (Second Language Acquisition). An awareness of the use of own language, thus, is conducive to CLIL curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. Then, own language use is an important aspect of CLIL classroom, for effective employment of L1 is conducive to both language and content acquisitions, which are the dual aims of CLIL. This can be rationalised employing psycholinguistic and sociocultural theories of learning. From psycholinguistic perspectives, according to Cummins’ Common Underlying Proficiency model and Threshold theory, insufficient L2 proficiency can negatively affect the students’ ability to deal with curriculum materials; thus, programs that allow the use of L1 or more developed languages yield better result than those restricting own language use (Baker, 2011). In terms of L2 acquisition, Cummins (2000) developed the Developmental Interdependence Hypothesis, arguing that L2 competency partly depends on learners’ L1 proficiency. Accordingly, the transfer of learning abilities and learning processes from first language literacy eases the learning of and in L2 (Baker, 2011). From sociocultural perspectives, L1 is considered the best pedagogical resource (Hall & Cook, 2012) for students to cope with a classroom task. Grounding on SLA input theory, L1 can help make L2 input comprehensible (Lin, 2015). Another way to look at the benefits of own language use is through its functions, the typology of which varies among authors. For example, they can be categorised into pedagogic (communication of meaning, emphasis …), assessment (reflecting students’ proficiency) and social functions (classroom management, face-saving, reducing distances, …) (Baker, 2011) or into ideational, textual and interpersonal functions (Lin, 2015). Another rationale for the emphasis on this issue is that it positively influences the formation of learners’ identities as non-native speakers of English language. Cook and Hall (2012) argue that languages use policies in both language and CLIL classrooms are informed by the history and power relationship between these languages. The politics of languages use is, thus, to strengthen the hegemony of English language. By allowing first language use, the learners’ cultural and linguistic identities are preserved. Furthermore, the advocacy of own language use reflects that English is increasingly used as a Lingua Franca in non-native environments which challenges the ownership of English (Jenkins, 2006). Finally, the unit of work in the scope and sequence chart suggests some implications for own language use in CLIL classroom. Given the aforementioned benefits of own language use, there should be a clear policy on languages use which acknowledges the constructive role of students’ first language. Such policy should take into account contextual factors as well as learners’ needs and interests (Baker, 2011). Despite the lack of evidence on the most effective pattern of L1-L2 use in CLIL classroom, the amount of time for L1 use should decrease as learners’ level of L2 proficiency increases (Hall & Cook, 2012). To effectively employ L1 as a pedagogical resource, Lin (2015) suggests that L1 should be used in both oral and written forms, and in a planned manner rather than spontaneously. The activities in the scope and sequence chart resonate the Multimodalities/ Extextualization Cycle proposed by Lin (2015), which combines vernacular L1 and L2 to scaffold students’ learning of academic L1 and L2. The lessons start with activities creating rich experiential contexts to evoke students’ interest and background information for the content to be learnt using multi-modalities such as videos, information gap activities. In this stage, students’ own language can be used to help learners tackle with new and technical information. Similarly, in the second stage when students engage with the content knowledge, the use of L1 in activities like note-taking, translations comparison and diagram making facilitates deeper understanding of the content or “unpack the L2 academic text” (p. 86). In the last stage, students engage in entextualising the content through L1/L2 academic genres (poem writing, translating, story writing). Also, as the students have reach upper intermediate level of English, students should be encouraged to use more L2 and use L1 in case the insufficient L2 proficiency might hinder communication and the acquisition of technical content.
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