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Should CLIL be inclusive?
The target groups approach

- 'Language profile' of education remains linked to that of the target population ...
- in terms of language abilities and use ...
- defined in terms of homogeneous characteristics.
The target groups approach
BE types by language orientation

- **Submersion** monolingual education
  ... for majority-language children (bilingualism = ignored)

- **Transitional** 'bilingual' education
  ... for powerless language-minority children (bilingualism = problem)

- **Maintenance & revitalization** bilingual education
  ... for empowered language-minority children (bilingualism = right)

- **One-way immersion** enrichment bilingual education
  ... for homogeneous monolingual elite (bilingualism = privilege)

- **Two-way immersion** enrichment bilingual education
  ... for two homogeneous language groups (bilingualism = resource)
The target groups approach

Limitations and problems

- **International migratory patterns** (e.g. Lambert 1999, Vila 2001)
  - diversity of IM languages
  - number of IM speakers in total
  - number of speakers per IM language
  - interspersed settlement pattern
  - qualified teachers
  - Instructional materials
  - language codification & elaboration
  - dialect & standard varieties
The target groups approach
Limitations and problems

• Dominant-language-only pedagogy
  – disempowering (Kubota 2003)
  – ignores learners’ cultural identity (Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004)
  – economically limiting (Banks 2004)
  – pedagogical success? (Cummins 2009)

• Two-way immersion (Valdés 1997, 1998; Palmer 2009)
  – Power distribution
  – Relative language status (need versus option)
  – Political/economic language status (EU versus immigrant)
• A target groups approach to education
  – may cause subtractive bilingualism
  – may lead to segregation

• Organizational formulas based on the homogeneity of students clearly no longer work

• A different perspective on diversity is needed!
• Influx of IM students in majority bilingual education (CLIL/immersion)

• CLIL may provide a more suitable alternative to effective language learning for IM students (Van de Craen et al. 2007, Sierra & Lasagabaster 2008)
• L1 support... ? (Cummins e.g. 1981)

• “language disadvantage” doesn't disappear with removal (Genesee 2007)

• L2+L3 = greater difficulties? (Wolff 2005)

• Concern that they will not have adequate opportunities to develop L2 (e.g. Dagenais & Berron 1999)
• Paucity of research and lack of agreement (Gunderson 2007, Auerbach 1993)

• Studies from Canada (e.g. Dagenais et al.), BAC (e.g. Sierra & Lasagabaster 2008), Catalonia (e.g. Vila 2001, 2009; Nussbaum & Unamuno 2006)

• Looking at
  – Beliefs and attitudes: more positive (e.g. Makropoulos 2005; Dagenais 2003, Dagenais & Day 1998, 1999; Manzanos & Ruiz Pinedo 2005)
  – Motivation: “investment” (e.g. Pierce 1995, Makropoulos 2009, Ibarran, Lasagabaster & Sierra 2008)
  – Achievement: equal or even better (overview by Roy & Galiev 2009)
Two strands of explanations can be discerned:

1. Explanations from a pedagogical perspective

2. Explanations from a learning theoretical perspective
Pedagogical perspective

CLIL is the ultimate **communicative language teaching**

- CLT should be **communicative**
- CLT should be **inherently repetitive**
- CLT should be **functional/pragmatic**

CLIL cannot be but **inherently communicative, repetitive, and functional/pragmatic.**
Pedagogical perspective

- **L1 support through flexible language arrangements**
  - code-switching (Gajo 2007, Ferguson 2003)
  - translation (Manyak 2004)
  - Translanguaging (Garcia 2009)
  - transfer (Cummins 2007)
  - collaborative dialogue (Swain 2001)

- **Language as a cognitive tool for learning** (Swain & Lapkin 2005)

- **Visual aids, gestures, ...**

- **Language awareness**
Theory of learning perspective

- CLIL is a form of **implicit learning** ...
- Implicit learning is **not associated** with 'academic' learning ...
- It refers to a **non-structured, non-guided, scaffolded, holistic, unconscious mode** of learning ...
- Content is learnt through language, but no **explicit language teaching** takes place, at least not initially ...
- The status of this way of learning is **different** from explicit learning
Theory of learning perspective

What is implicit learning... ?

• Implicit learning is such a form of learning in which “[complex information] is [learned] without complete verbalisable knowledge of what is learned” (Seger 1994: 164).

• The difference with explicit learning processes is that implicit learning is:
  • more robust
  • independent of age
  • less prone to give rise to variation
  • independent of IQ
  • more suited to shared learning
  (cf. Reber 1993)
Theory of learning perspective

- Implicit knowledge is later engaged to acquire explicit knowledge, e.g. grammatical knowledge

- The movement from implicit to explicit learning is recognized as one of the most powerful learning mechanisms (Reber 1993, Cleeremans 1997, Shanks 2005)

- The learning outcomes are stronger, and thus creates stronger learners.
• In CLIL schools when children learn how to read a difficult language such as French and English, pupils have better results when they start reading in an easy language also when that language is not their mother tongue...

• Wallonian children have better reading results in their mother tongue if they have started reading in Dutch (Vandersmissen 2010, Veron 2012)…
Conclusion

• CLIL as a highly stimulating learning environment...

• In which implicit learning processes are central...

• That goes beyond the distinction between additive and subtractive language learning...

• As learning is language-driven, but not language-specific.
Thank you for your attention

Merci de votre attention

Vielen Dank für Ihre Aufmerksamkeit

Thomas.Somers@vub.ac.be


