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This article looks at the characteristics of Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in order to examine their similarities and differences. The analysis shows that CBI/CLIL programmes share the same essential properties and are not pedagogically different from each other. In fact, the use of an L2 as the medium of instruction, the language, societal and educational aims and the typical type of child are the same in CBI and CLIL programmes. The use of both CBI and CLIL refers to programmes where academic content is taught through a second or additional language and the preference for one term over the other is associated with contextual and accidental characteristics. In this article, there are examples from Basque education where academic content is often taught through the medium of Basque and English to students with Spanish as a first language. The examples show that even if there are more subjects taught through the medium of Basque than through the medium of English, there are no essential differences between CBI (partial immersion in the Basque example) and CLIL (English-medium instruction in the Basque example). The need to share the research findings of CBI/CLIL programmes is highlighted.
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A school in the Basque Country

We visit a class in a school located in the Basque Country where Basque is spoken by approximately 30% of the population. The use of Basque is not the same in different areas and our school is located in a Spanish-speaking area, Bilbo Handia-Gran Bilbao, in the Basque Autonomous Community (BAC) where only 23.1% of the population can speak Basque and Spanish is the majority language spoken by the whole population. There are 22 students in this class. The students are in the third year of secondary school (14–15 years old). All the students have Spanish as a first language except for two immigrant children who speak Romanian at home. These immigrant children also have Spanish as their dominant language because they have lived in the Basque Country for more than 10 years, and they speak Spanish to their classmates. They can understand Romanian very well but they often answer their parents in Spanish and they always speak Spanish with their
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friends. The class we visit is what is known in the Basque Country as the B model which has Basque and Spanish as the languages of instruction (see Cenoz, 2009). This means that approximately half of the subjects are taught through the medium of Basque and the other half through the medium of Spanish.

The bilingual models were established in the BAC more than 30 years ago and the B model is aimed at Spanish-speaking children who do not speak Basque at home. Nowadays, 25% of the students in primary education and 27% of the students in secondary education are enrolled in this model. Parents decide the bilingual education model for their children and the most popular is the D model with Basque as the main language of instruction both for Basque L1 speakers and for Spanish L1 speakers.

Going back to our school we can see that in the third year of secondary, Mathematics and Science are taught through the medium of Spanish and Physical education, Cultural and social values and Technology through the medium of Basque. All the teachers who teach through the medium of Basque are bilingual in Basque and Spanish and most teachers who teach through the medium of Spanish are also bilingual. Spanish is the first language for half of the teachers who teach through the medium of Basque. Some learned Basque at school and others as adults. Basque L1 teachers are fluent in Spanish, the majority language.

The teaching of English as a third language starts in preschool. Two years ago and with the idea of improving English language skills, English became an additional language of instruction for Social science. So nowadays all students have English as a subject but English is also used in the Social science class. English language teachers and Social science teachers who teach through the medium of English are local teachers with Basque and/or Spanish as their first language. All students also have Basque and Spanish as school subjects. There is also an optional subject for students to choose between French (in French), Computer science (in Spanish) or Laboratory (in Spanish). The distribution of the languages can be seen in Table 1.

The school is an example of an increasing trend to use a second or foreign language as the language of instruction to teach content. All students in this class have two content subjects in Spanish, three content subjects in Basque (a second or third language) and one content subject in English (a third or fourth language). In addition, some students have one optional subject in Spanish and others study French as an optional subject.

Basque is an official language in the BAC but in this particular urban area, students have limited exposure to Basque outside school. They use only Spanish because they live in a

Table 1. Distribution of the languages in a B model Basque school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Basque</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and social values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque language and literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish language and literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French language (optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer science (optional)</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory (optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spanish-speaking area. They have the possibility of watching television in Basque but it is just an option among many other Spanish and international channels. Basque is a second language for 20 of the 22 students and a third language for the other 2 students who have Romanian as their first language. Basque can be considered as a second language and not a foreign language because it is an official language in the BAC but this does not imply contact with Basque outside school.

English is not an official language and exposure to English outside school is limited to some music or computer games but in most cases these are also in Spanish. According to the Eurobarometer (2012), 22% of the population in Spain can speak English, which is one of the lowest percentages of speakers in the European Union (EU). Therefore, no big differences can be expected regarding exposure to Basque and English outside the class, which is limited in both cases.

The B model has been considered as a typical case of Content-Based Instruction (CBI) which is called partial immersion. The D model, with Basque as the language of instruction, is at the same time a CBI model of total immersion for Spanish L1 speakers and a maintenance type of bilingual education for students with Basque as L1. There is also the A model, with Spanish as the medium of instruction, and Basque as a school subject, which cannot be considered as a model of immersion. Although Basque-medium education is older, the three models were established in 1983 and they are often referred to as bilingual education or immersion. The teaching of content through the medium of English is often referred to as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and has developed in recent years.

Are CBI and CLIL the same or different? In order to answer this question, we first have to look at CBI and CLIL in more detail.

What is CBI?

Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989, p. vii) define CBI as, ‘the concurrent study of language and subject matter, with the form and sequence of language presentation dictated by content material’. Even though there are older examples of CBI, its origins are usually associated with Canadian immersion programmes, which is the best-known example of CBI. CBI includes different types of immersion but also other programmes. Stoller (2008, p. 59) considers that CBI is ‘an umbrella term’ for approaches that combine language and content-learning aims even if there are differences in the emphasis placed on language and content.

As Genesee and Lindholm-Leary (2013) point out, there are alternative forms of CBI depending on the educational level, the organisation of the curriculum and the relative emphasis on language or content. CBI can take place at all educational levels: preschool, primary, secondary or higher education levels. Regarding its role in the curriculum, it can refer to total immersion (approximately 90% of the school time in the second language) or it can just refer to content-based themes in language classes. Met (1998) provided ‘a continuum of content and language integration’ that ranges from the most content-driven end, which is total immersion followed by partial immersion to the most language-driven end, which are language classes with frequent use of content and theme-based courses. In all cases, the aims of the programme combine the learning of curricular content and language learning.

The Basque school we have visited is a special case of CBI because there are two languages other than the first language that are used as languages of instruction apart from being taught in second/third language classes. In the third year of secondary, three content subjects are taught through the medium of Basque and one through the medium of English. Most CBI programmes only have one second or additional language as the language of instruction but teaching through the medium of two additional languages that are not the
students’ L1 is common in the Basque Country and also in double immersion programmes in Canada (Genesee, 1998) and in European schools (Baetens Beardsmore, 1993).

According to Tedick, Christian, and Fortune’s criteria (2011, p. 2), the programme in the school we visited would be immersion in the case of Basque because at least 50% of the subject matter instruction was taught in Basque in primary education and now there are more than two subjects taught through the medium of Basque. It would be an example of early partial immersion. It would not be immersion in the case of English because English is used as the medium of instruction for only one subject. Both Basque-medium instruction and English-medium instruction can be considered examples of CBI. If we take Met’s continuum, the Basque-medium subjects in the school we visited would be placed towards the ‘content-driven’ end of the continuum but not at the end because it is partial immersion and not total immersion in Basque. The English-medium subject would be placed also towards the content-driven end but more towards the middle of the continuum because only one subject is taught through the medium of English (see Figure 1).

What is CLIL?

One of the best-known definitions of CLIL is that provided by Coyle, Hood, and Marsh (2010, p. 1): ‘... a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language’. The term CLIL was launched in Europe in the 1990s and is often associated with teaching through the medium of English (Dalton-Puffer, Nikula, & Smit, 2010). However, the definition of CLIL refers to ‘an additional’ language and not only to English and this could be any language other than the first language, including foreign, second or minority languages (see Eurydice, 2006; Marsh, 2002).

CLIL can take place at different educational levels in preschool, primary school, secondary school and higher education. Regarding its role in the curriculum, it can refer to teaching one or more subjects through the medium of the L2 and it can also refer to just content-based themes in language programmes. Massler, Stotz, and Queisser (2014) differentiate two types of CLIL: type A CLIL in subject lessons and type B CLIL language lessons. These types seem to be very close to what Met (1998) calls ‘content-driven’ and ‘language-driven’ ends of the continuum. Massler et al. (2014) consider that type A, which also includes immersion, takes place when learning aims are based on the content of the academic subject taught through the medium of a foreign language and assessment is mainly based on content. In our examples this is the case of teaching Social science through the medium of English or Physical education, Cultural and social values or Technology through the medium of Basque. Type B refers to programmes in which foreign language instruction is thematically based and content from other school subjects is used in the language class. In this case the aims and assessment focus on the foreign language. This could be the case of some programmes where CLIL is only limited to the foreign

Figure 1. Basque and English-medium education and content and language integration. Source: Based on Met (1998).
language class and curricular topics and projects, such as studying the human body or the solar system in the English language class. Massler et al. (2014) also refer to a C type as a full integration of content and language ‘shown in the pupils’ timetable as a subject of its own’ but consider that this is a ‘rare phenomenon’. When compared to Met’s (1998) continuum, this seems to be the middle point between the two ends.

The Basque school we visited could be considered as type A of CLIL in the case of both Basque and English because content subjects such as Physical education, Cultural and social values and Technology are taught through the medium of a second or foreign language. These subjects are content-oriented and the main aim will be for students to learn content and assessment is based on content. It is expected for students to improve their skills in Basque and English at the same time. However, language classes in this school can also have some academic content and they could be regarded as type B (see Table 2).

So far, we have identified the Basque school we have visited as both CBI and CLIL. There is a difference in the intensity of the content-based approach used for the teaching of Basque (three subjects) and English (one subject). The teaching of only one subject in English would not qualify as the specific type of CBI called immersion according to the criteria given by Tedick et al. (2011, p. 2).

CLIL and CBI are often considered as two labels for the same reality (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 9; Dalton-Puffer, 2007, p. 6; Van de Craen, Ceuleers, & Mondt, 2007, p. 186). For example, Ruiz de Zarobe (2008, p. 61, footnote) considers them synonymous, CLIL being the most popular term in Europe and CBI in the USA and Canada. However, some scholars consider that CLIL is quite different from other types of CBI such as immersion (see, e.g. Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2010; Pérez-Cañado, 2012). Cenoz, Genesee, and Gorter (2014) analysed the relationship between a specific type of CBI, immersion and CLIL regarding the goals of each approach, students’ and teachers’ profiles, the target languages, the balance between content and language instruction, and other pedagogical issues such as material development or instructional methods. They conclude that categorical distinctions between CLIL and immersion are unsupported. In the next section, we will look at the extent of the differences between CBI and CLIL.

**Essential and accidental properties of CBI and CLIL**

Aristotle (384–322 BC) in his work *Metaphysics* made a distinction between the essential and the accidental properties of an individual or an object. Essential properties are defining properties for the existence of the individual or object while accidental properties are not necessarily connected to the existence of the individual or object. Paran (2013) refers to this distinction using the terms defining vs. incidental when examining the relationship between CLIL and immersion.

In this section, the relationship between CBI and CLIL will be discussed, paying attention to their essential and accidental properties. Before doing that we are going to refer to something that CBI and CLIL have in common: their diversity and dynamic nature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A subject lessons</th>
<th>Type B language lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basque-medium subjects</td>
<td>Basque language class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-medium subjects</td>
<td>English language class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on Massler et al. (2014).
The diversity and dynamics of CBI/CLIL

CBI/CLIL refers to a variety of pedagogical programmes and their study has been approached from different theoretical and methodological perspectives. Both CBI and CLIL have been referred to as umbrella terms:

Content-based instruction (CBI) is an umbrella term referring to instructional approaches that make a dual, though not necessarily equal, commitment to language and content-learning objectives. (Stoller, 2008, p. 59)

CLIL is an umbrella term covering a dozen or more educational approaches (e.g. immersion, bilingual education, multilingual education, language showers and enriched language programmes). (Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols, 2008, p. 12)

The implementation of CBI and CLIL takes different forms. The educational aims of specific schools and societies and the sociolinguistic situation can affect the implementation of different forms. As we have already seen, some programmes, such as the Basque programme described in this article, have two or three additional languages. We have also seen that some programmes are more content-oriented than others and use an additional language as the language of instruction for other subjects. Even in the case of content-oriented programmes, there can be diversity. In some cases, only one subject is taught through the medium of an additional language and in others most subjects in the curriculum are taught through the medium of an additional language. There are also differences regarding the grade in which the CBI/CLIL programme starts and the teaching methodology and materials used.

One of the most widespread CBI/CLIL programmes is immersion, which has been referred to as ‘the quintessential model of content-based L2 instruction’ (Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013, p. 3). Canadian immersion education has received a lot of attention and it has spread to different parts of the world. Immersion requires the use of the additional language for at least 50% of academic instruction in primary school (Tedick et al., 2011) or at least for several years in the curriculum (Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013). Other core features of immersion were identified by Swain and Johnson some years ago (1997, pp. 6–8):

1. The L2 is the medium of instruction.
2. The curriculum is the same as for L1.
3. Overt support exists for the L1.
4. The programme aims for additive bilingualism.
5. Exposure to the L2 mainly in the classroom.
6. Students enter with similar levels of L2.
7. The teachers are bilingual.
8. The classroom culture is that of the L1.

These core features characterise most types of immersion (early, middle, late, total and partial), which are placed towards the content-driven end of Met’s (1998) continuum. These core features also correspond to the characteristics of Massler et al.’s (2014) type A subject lessons but it would be called immersion only when 50% of the curriculum is taught through the medium of a second or additional language. These features are not shared by all forms of CBI/CLIL because the L2 does not have to be the language of instruction in what Met (1998) calls language-driven forms or Massler et al.’s (2014) type B language lessons.

However, society has changed and an important point that needs attention in the twenty-first century is related to the dynamic nature of CBI/CLIL. This point was raised by Swain and Lapkin (2005), who argue that, at least in Canada, the core features need to be adapted
because of the sociopolitical situation and the fact that many students in immersion programmes speak other home languages. This is an important issue in the characterisation of CBI/CLIL programmes elsewhere as well because it is quite often taken for granted that all students speak the same L1 and share the same culture and very often this is not the case. Swain and Lapkin (2005) propose to make changes to five of the eight features. They propose to replace the L2 by ‘the immersion language’ because in the case of immigrant students, this could be an L3 or L4 (features 1, 5 and 6). They also consider that it cannot be said that overt support exists for the L1 (feature 3) or that the classroom culture is that of the L1 (feature 8) in the case of immigrant students even if this would be desirable.

CBI/CLIL in the Basque Country also shows great diversity. The Basque- and English-medium classes in the school we have visited share the core features of immersion given by Swain and Johnson (1997) with the necessary changes suggested by Swain and Lapkin (2005) to accommodate the two students in the class who do not have Spanish as the L1. Even if the core features of immersion apply to the English-medium subjects as well, this situation is CBI/CLIL but not immersion because English-medium instruction is limited to only one subject.

When the educational models were implemented in the BAC in 1983, the main aim was to maintain and develop the use of Basque in education. At the time, English and, in many cases, French were taught as school subjects. The models were aimed at Basque L1 and Spanish L1 students in a society with very few speakers of other languages (see Table 3). The neat separation of these three models has been challenged over the years mainly due to the following factors:

(1) The D model, with Basque as the main language of instruction, has attracted a large number of Spanish L1 students because it is seen as an opportunity to acquire communicative skills in Basque. Nowadays, 69% of the students in primary education and 61% in secondary education are in the D model. With a few exceptions, students with Basque as the L1 are in the D model but considering that the percentage of speakers of Basque is about 30% of the population, it can be estimated that half of the students (or even more) in the D model do not have Basque as a first language. The D model has between 70% and 80% of the time through the medium of Basque and it is a form of CBI/CLIL (early total immersion) for those students who do not have Basque as the home language. At the same time, the D model is not CBI/CLIL for the students who have Basque as the L1. The distribution of Basque and Spanish L1 students depends on the sociolinguistic area so

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Educational models in the BAC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D model</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that in some Basque-speaking areas, Basque is the L1 for most of the students but in most areas Spanish is the main L1. This programme is not dual immersion because there are no Spanish-medium subjects except for the Spanish language classes.

(2) The increasing use of English as an additional language of instruction which follows the international trend to acquire communicative competence in English as a global language. The role of English in Basque education has increased over the years and nowadays it is often used as an additional language of instruction as it is the case in the school we visited. English-medium instruction is an example of content-driven CBI or type A content subjects CLIL. Some schools also use a theme-based approach in the Basque, English and French classes and in this case we would have language-driven CBI or type B language lessons CLIL. This trend towards CBI/CLIL takes place in the three original models of bilingual education, A, B and D, and results in more complex models of CBI/CLIL that involve at least two additional languages, as we have seen in the school we have visited. It is certainly a move from bilingual to multilingual education (see also Cenoz, 2009).

(3) An additional factor that adds diversity is the relatively recent arrival of students with home languages other than Basque and Spanish. As Swain and Lapkin (2005) point out in the case of Canadian immersion, in the BAC we also have to refer to the students’ home language even if it is not used at school. There are immigrant students in the three linguistic models but they tend to choose the A and B models more frequently than local students. When discussing the scope of CLIL, Paran (2013, p. 322) makes an interesting point that is related to students who are schooled in a colonial language or in the language of the host country. He says that strong forms of CLIL are not new because these students learn content through the medium of an additional language and adds, ‘What is new is the emergence of CLIL in countries where education has traditionally been in the L1’.

The complexity of Basque multilingual education shows that education is linked to the sociopolitical context and cannot be separated from the trends to promote Basque in society, the increasing use of English as a global language or the mobility of the population. The original bilingual models designed more than 30 years ago have changed over time and nowadays their boundaries are blurred. From a CBI/CLIL perspective and taking into consideration the student’s first language, there are between four and eight possible situations in the Basque Country as can be seen in Table 4.

Basque L1 speakers are usually enrolled in the D model with Basque as the language of instruction which is their L1 but they can be in CBI/CLIL in English, their third language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Basque L1</th>
<th>Spanish L1</th>
<th>Other L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No CBI/CLIL</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI/CLIL in Basque</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI/CLIL in English</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI/CLIL in Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI/CLIL in Basque and English</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI/CLIL in Spanish and English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI/CLIL in Basque and Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI/CLIL in Basque, Spanish and English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore, there are two possibilities for these students regarding CBI/CLIL, either no CBI/CLIL or CBI/CLIL in English. No CBI/CLIL refers to programmes taught in Basque with Spanish and English as school subjects. CBI/CLIL in English refers to programmes that include English-medium instruction for at least one subject.

Spanish L1 speakers can also have no CBI/CLIL and CBI/CLIL in English only but also CBI/CLIL in Basque only and CBI/CLIL in both Basque and English. When CBI/CLIL in Basque is involved it is for 40% to 90% of the school time.

Students with other L1s have the same four options as Spanish L1 students plus four more (in brackets) if it is considered that CBI/CLIL also applies to refer to the school languages of the host country. Although this point needs further development, in this article, we focus on CBI/CLIL for speakers of the majority language without discussing in detail the situations involving the learning of Spanish and other majority languages by speakers of Basque or other home languages. Another possibility that could be discussed is that of students with two or more home languages.

These possibilities show the diversity of CBI/CLIL in just one context where CBI/CLIL programmes do not generally change between primary and secondary schools and the school languages are the same, Basque, Spanish, English and French. The diversity of CBI/CLIL can certainly be enormous if these and other factors are taken into account in different contexts around the world. The diversity of CBI/CLIL is also reflected in the various approaches used in research. In fact, CBI/CLIL is a complex phenomenon that involves language and content-learning, affects the whole curriculum and takes place in different parts of the world. Research on CBI/CLIL is multidisciplinary and scholars working on education, applied linguistics, psychology and other disciplines use different theories and methodologies when analysing different aspects of this approach. Some research, which is product-oriented and has as its focus the results of the CBI/CLIL approach as a whole, evaluates its effect on competence in the L1, competence in the additional language and academic achievement in subjects taught through the medium of an additional language. This has been done extensively in immersion programmes and to a lesser extent in other types of CBI/CLIL programmes (see Cenoz, 2009; Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013; Tedick & Wesely, 2015). Other researchers have focused on interaction and discourse in the classroom. This process-oriented research has been influenced by Sociocultural Theory, Cognitive Psychology, Discourse Analysis and Systemic Functional Linguistics, among others (see, e.g. Llinares, Morton, & Whittaker, 2012; Mohan & Slater, 2005; Nikula, Dalton-Puffer, & Llinares, 2013; Stoller, 2008; Swain & Lapkin, 2013). Some areas that have received particular attention are the analysis of the way language and content are integrated and teacher–student interaction in the classroom (see Stoller, 2008; Lyster, 2007).

Differences in essential and accidental properties

The diversity of CBI/CLIL programmes and approaches in its research, the dynamics of these programmes and the preference for one or the other label in different contexts have motivated some scholars to insist on the uniqueness of CLIL (see, e.g. Coyle, 2008; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2010). Cenoz et al. (2014) analysed the claims about the uniqueness of CLIL and its differences as compared to CBI (in particular to immersion as a specific type of CBI) and their conclusion was that, ‘although CLIL’s origins in Europe might make it historically unique, this does not necessarily make it pedagogically unique’ (Cenoz et al., 2014, p. 244). In a similar vein, Paran (2013) states that the differences between the two are contextual rather than defining differences. The identification of essential or defining properties of CBI/CLIL is crucial because if CBI and CLIL share the same essential features
and are considered by some scholars as different, educators and researchers are deprived of valuable information that they could potentially share (Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013; Cenoz et al., 2014). In this section the properties of CBI/CLIL will be analysed.

**Essential properties**

The most essential property of CBI/CLIL is the integration of language and content and this is recognised as such by scholars working in both the CBI and the CLIL traditions. For example, we can consider Stoller’s (2002, p. 109) view of language and content in CBI: ‘language as a medium for learning content and content as a resource for learning and improving language’. This view seems to be the same as the one given in the definition of CLIL: ‘an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language’ (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 1). The basic idea behind the integration of content and language is that languages are not learned first and then used but that they are learned by being used (see Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013).

Taking into account the enormous diversity of CBI/CLIL programmes, their essential properties have to be general so as to be identified at a curricular level and not at a micro level of specific practices inside the classroom. Typologies of bilingual and multilingual education have identified indicators to distinguish and compare different models. One of the best-known typologies is Baker’s (2011), which distinguished strong and weak forms of bilingual education. This typology uses four indicators to classify 10 types of bilingual education. The four indicators are the following: the language background of the child, the language of the classroom, the linguistic aims and the societal and educational aims. A similar typology of CBI/CLIL programmes would be desirable as well but a preliminary step is to analyse if there are essential or just accidental differences between CBI and CLIL. In order to do so the four indicators used by Baker are taken as the basis of the comparison.

The diversity of CBI/CLIL is such that the comparison between the two can be best represented by using continua rather than dichotomies. The use of continua not only follows Met’s continuum on the different types of CBI (see Figure 1) but also provides the possibility of selecting different points to allow for the diversity of CBI/CLIL (see also Cenoz, 2009; Hornberger, 2007).

The four continua of CBI/CLIL can be found in Figure 2. In this figure, we can see the four indicators used by Baker (2011) to establish a typology of bilingual education. We take these indicators as the essential properties that can define a programme as CBI or CLIL. Different types of programmes could be placed along the continua. If there are essential differences between CBI and CLIL these programmes would be placed at different points on the continua of the essential properties. If CBI and CLIL share the same essential properties they could be placed at the same point along the continua.

Here we look at each of the properties in more detail so as to see how CBI and CLIL can be placed.

**Medium of instruction**

The first continuum looks at the medium of instruction for the whole curriculum. As we have already seen it is possible to have CBI/CLIL as part of language lessons (language-driven types or type B language classes). This continuum not only looks at CBI/CLIL as the continuum proposed by Met (1998) or the dichotomy proposed by Massler et al. (2014) but ranges from strong forms of CBI/CLIL to no CBI/CLIL. No CBI/CLIL refers to programmes in which the majority language, which is the L1 of most students, is used.
as the medium of instruction and additional languages (second, foreign) are taught as school subjects without any special attention to the integration of language and content. Most CBI/CLIL programmes are characterised by being towards the left end of the continuum because both the majority language and an additional language are used as languages of instruction and as subjects. This is the case of most CBI/CLIL programmes including immersion (see also Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2013, p. 546). As we have already seen, the multilingual programme at the Basque school we have visited is an example of CBI/CLIL in two languages, Basque and English. This continuum allows for diversity regarding the number of subjects that are taught through the additional language. This number could range from only one subject, which is very common for English in European contexts often referred to as CLIL, to several subjects in the curriculum.

**Language aims**

Another essential feature of CBI/CLIL programmes is that they aim at multilingualism. This is in contrast with transitional programmes that aim at replacing one language by another and result in monolingualism. CBI/CLIL aims at developing both the majority language and additional language(s). The specific aims regarding additional languages will be linked to the elements identified in the Continua of Multilingual Education, that is, the characteristics of the languages learned, the educational and sociolinguistic contexts (see Cenoz, 2009, chapter 2). The linguistic goals to be reached can be more ambitious if the majority language and the target language are closely related to each other, as in the case of Luxemburgish and German or Spanish and Catalan, than if they are more distant as in the case of Cantonese and English or Finnish and English.
The extent to which CBI/CLIL is present in the curriculum is an important factor when defining the aims of the programme. For example, different aims are to be expected in the school we have visited for Basque and English. The aims for Basque are higher than for English taking into account that CBI/CLIL for Basque started in preschool and that there are three content subjects through the medium of Basque in the third year of secondary. English-medium instruction has just started in the third year of secondary although English is studied as a subject from preschool. The use of the target language in the sociolinguistic context can also have an important influence on the progress made in the additional language. Even if the results of CBI/CLIL can be very positive, research has indicated that students develop very high levels of reading and listening proficiency but do not do as well in productive skills. In fact, even in very intensive CBI/CLIL programmes such as full immersion, students use restricted vocabulary and non-idiomatic language and they have some problems with grammatical accuracy and sociolinguistic competence (see Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013; Tedick & Wesely, 2015).

**Societal and educational aims**

CBI/CLIL aims at pluralism and enrichment and not at assimilation. The idea is that by becoming multilingual students will be able to communicate with other people, to get a better understanding of other cultures, to be better prepared for the job market and, in some cases, to contribute to the development of minority languages. The other end of the continuum, assimilation, is more common in the case of immigrant students who are expected to be assimilated to the culture of the majority.

**Typical type of child**

Most CBI/CLIL programmes are aimed at children who have the majority language as L1 rather than minority L1 children. This is the case of the Basque school we visited where 20 of the 22 students have Spanish, the majority language, as their L1. However, we cannot forget that modern society in the twenty-first century is dynamic and characterised by its mobility. Nowadays, CBI/CLIL programmes cannot be expected to have homogeneous classes with only speakers of the majority language. Although CBI/CLIL programmes can be placed at the majority L1 end of the continuum, there are some exceptions such as dual immersion, which is addressed at majority L1 and minority L1 children and has had an important development in the USA (Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013; Lee & Jeong, 2013).

The analysis indicates that CBI/CLIL programmes share the same essential properties and are not pedagogically different from each other. The prototypical CBI/CLIL programme is taught by content teachers of different content subjects with an L2 or additional language as the language of instruction. Both CBI and CLIL have multilingualism as a language aim, enrichment as a societal and educational aim and the typical type of child is a speaker of the majority language. The analysis of the essential properties of CBI/CLIL indicates that the unique character of CLIL proposed by Dalton-Puffer, Llinares, Lorenzo, and Nikula (2014, p. 215) cannot be sustained because CBI/CLIL programmes (and not CLIL programmes only) are timetabled as content lessons and taught by content teachers. Scholars, practitioners and educators may have their preferences for one label over the other but CBI and CLIL are essentially the same thing.
**Accidental properties**

The spread of CBI/CLIL programmes, the diversity of contexts in which these programmes are implemented all over the world and the labels used to refer to them create the need to distinguish between those properties essential or defining of CBI/CLIL and those that are contextual, accidental or incidental. Here we look at properties of CBI/CLIL that can vary in different contexts but do not define these programmes.

**Target language**

Scholars associated with CBI do not seem to have problems applying the term CBI to programmes with content taught through minority, second and foreign languages (Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013; Swain & Johnson, 1997). This is also the case of many scholars associated with CLIL (Eurydice, 2006; Marsh, 2002; Smala, 2014). However, other scholars consider that CLIL can only be used for languages such as English, French or German or for foreign but not second languages (Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2013; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2010). To exclude some languages because they are not as ‘important’ as English, French or German is a clear case of language discrimination. To exclude languages that are not ‘foreign’ in terms of their use outside the classroom is not justified, at least in the European context. According to this view and going back to our school in the Basque Country, Basque-medium instruction would be CBI because Basque is co-official in the BAC and English-medium instruction would be CLIL because English is a foreign language. However, children do not necessarily have more exposure to Basque than to English outside school because there are areas where the number of speakers of Basque is as limited as the number of speakers of English. As Paran (2013, p. 320) points out, the problem is to pay attention to the nomenclature rather than to the programme itself. It is a problem to pay attention to the label ‘second’ or ‘co-official’ vs. ‘foreign’ instead of looking at the real possibilities of using the target language outside the class. A comparison of language use across languages and countries is difficult but it can be useful to look at surveys that focus on knowledge of the language as an indirect measure which can also be an indicator of the availability of the target language outside school. According to the 5th Sociolinguistic Map of the Basque Country (Basque Government, 2011), the knowledge of Basque in the 20 counties into which the region is divided ranges from 16.2% to 81.2% of the population. According to the Eurobarometer (2012), the knowledge of English in the EU states ranges from 20% to 90%. It is obvious that a student in the Netherlands where 90% of the population speak English has more possibilities to use the ‘foreign’ language outside school than a Basque student has to use the ‘second-co-official’ language in the school we visited, which is in an area where Basque is spoken by only 23.1% of the population. The classroom is the only context for learners to use the target languages, in some CBI/CLIL contexts but not in others. The use of the target language in the social context is an important predictor of language acquisition but it is obvious that learning one language or another cannot be considered an essential characteristic of a programme.

**Native vs. non-native teachers**

CBI/CLIL has as its main essential property to integrate language and curricular content and this is done in most cases by using an additional language as the language of instruction. Teachers in CBI/CLIL tend to be the school teachers in the schools where the programmes are implemented. CBI/CLIL teachers are content teachers except in the cases of weak CBI/CLIL programmes in which the language teacher follows a content-oriented language
syllabus. In most cases, teachers are multilingual and are proficient in both the majority language and the additional language(s). It has been argued that CLIL is different from CBI because CLIL teachers are usually non-native (Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2013; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2010). This reasoning is quite problematic for several reasons. First, having native or non-native teachers can certainly be the object of a specific research study but second/foreign language lessons are never considered different types of programmes on the basis of being taught by native or non-native teachers. There is no justification to do it in the case of CBI/CLIL. Second, at least in some contexts such as the Basque Country, there are as many non-native teachers as native teachers in CBI/CLIL programmes for Basque. The percentage of native teachers is not as high in the case of English although there are programmes in Spain where most teachers in CBI/CLIL programmes are native speakers of English. Third, the dichotomy native speaker vs. non-native speaker implies a separation of communicative competence that is often not applicable to multilingual speakers who have a multilingual repertoire (see Cenoz & Gorter, 2011; Lin, 2015).

**Starting age**

Another feature associated with CLIL by some scholars is that the implementation of CLIL usually takes place in secondary education after learners have already acquired literacy skills in their first language (Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2013; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2010). The level at which CBI/CLIL is introduced cannot possibly be an essential or defining feature of CLIL because there are CBI/CLIL programmes starting in preschool, primary school, secondary school and even higher education.

**Origin**

Although learning through the medium of a second or additional language has existed for many centuries, the origin of CBI is often associated with the first French-medium immersion programmes in Canada in the 1960s and the origin of CLIL is linked to the use of English-medium instruction in Europe in the 1990s. Over the years, CBI has attracted scholars from different disciplines, while CLIL is more closely linked to scholars working on English language teaching and second language acquisition. However, both CBI and CLIL research can generally be placed within the field of applied linguistics and some theoretical frameworks, which are influenced by the research traditions of specific contexts, may be used more often in some countries than in others. The theoretical approach taken by the researchers and the methodology used do not define the type of programme analysed and cannot be considered essential characteristics of CBI/CLIL.

**Conclusion**

There is great diversity in the implementation of CBI/CLIL programmes and these programmes are dynamic and change because they have to keep up with new challenges in society. CBI/CLIL programmes have attracted scholars from different research traditions and some traditions are more important in some contexts than in others. Practitioners may also use some materials and teaching strategies in some specific contexts. The specific classroom practices and the specific research studies can be innovative and even unique but this does not imply that CBI is different from CLIL. As we have seen, there are no differences between CBI and CLIL regarding their essential properties. There are accidental
differences between programmes that are linked to the specific educational contexts where the programmes take place but they are not unique for CBI or CLIL.

The common characteristic of CBI/CLIL is that they ‘use non-language content as a vehicle for promoting L2 proficiency’ (Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013, p. 5). In this article, we have looked at essential and accidental properties of CBI/CLIL and concluded that they are not essentially different from each other. This conclusion is very important for both researchers and practitioners because they can share research findings and practices from different parts of the world instead of limiting themselves to the programmes that are specific to their own context (see also Cenoz et al., 2014).

CBI/CLIL are typically aimed at speakers of majority languages but there are some programmes such as dual language education that are aimed at both speakers of majority and minority languages. As we have seen, an important step is to share CBI/CLIL ideas, findings and practices from different parts of the world when these programmes are aimed at majority L1 children. An additional step could be to share the challenges of CBI/CLIL with those of programmes aimed at language minority children (see Tedick et al., 2011). Programmes to promote the use of the L1 when it is a minority language share some characteristics with CBI/CLIL programmes aimed at speakers of majority languages because of the challenges minority language speakers face due to the limited use of their language in some domains (see Gorter, Zenotz, & Cenoz, 2014). Gallagher and Leahy (2014) argue for another step and urge for transfer across models including ‘immersion by default’, that is, the case of migrant children who have the language(s) of the host country as the medium of instruction.

An important issue is that we can no longer think of homogeneous classes of students who have the majority language as their L1 and teachers who are the ideal native speakers of the target language as a model. In the twenty-first century, CBI/CLIL programmes will increasingly have students of majority, minority and immigrant languages in the same class. These students are very often multilingual speakers with different languages in their linguistic repertoire. The need to develop metalinguistic and language awareness taking the students’ own repertoire as the point of departure creates the need for CBI/CLIL to adopt a multilingual focus so as ‘to integrate not only language and content but also all the languages in the students’ multilingual repertoires’ (Cenoz, 2013, p. 393). Developing integration in CBI/CLIL programmes is certainly needed at different levels in order to share good practices in educational research.
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