Something to talk about:
Integrating content and language study in higher education

Part 1: What is CLIL?
Concepts, methods and research

Elisabeth Wielander
11 June, 2013, Aston University
Session 1: Outline

- What is CLIL?
- Research into CLIL across Europe
- Conceptual frameworks and methodologies
The Road to CLIL

Education in a language other than L1 is not new - dates back to Antiquity

20\textsuperscript{th} century: growing focus on cognition, interaction and meaningful communication (Piaget, Vygotsky)

Today: new driving forces for language learning require new approaches

Precursor: Canadian Immersion
Canadian Immersion

‘early’ – ‘late’, ‘total’ – ‘partial’

- native-like receptive skills
- oral and written production somewhat less developed
- overall higher levels of proficiency
- performance in the subject matter taught through L2 comparable to non-lingual peer groups
- decidedly positive attitude towards L2 and its speakers

Pérez-Cañado (2012: 317)
Driving forces behind CLIL

- **reactive reasons:** responding to situations where multiple L1s lead to the adoption of an L2 as language of instruction e.g. sub-Saharan Africa, South Africa - “convert a language problem into language potential”
  - Coyle / Hood / Marsh (2010: 7)

- **proactive reasons:** creating situations which would reinforce multilingualism e.g. French immersion in Canada, European integration
The Road to CLIL

European integration: need for greater levels of multilingualism

from 1990s: CLIL considered effective way to
- achieve high degree of language awareness
- accommodate diverse learning styles
- provide greater exposure to L2
- improve linguistic and communicative competence
- increase learner motivation through greater authenticity

European Council (2005)
Defining CLIL

‘bilingual’ education / schools in Europe

Within CLIL, language is used as a medium for learning content, and the content is used in turn as a resource for learning languages. European Commission (2005: 2)

CLIL: umbrella term for context-bound varieties like

- immersion (Språkbad, Sweden)
- bilingual education (Hungary)
- multilingual education (Latvia)
- integrated curriculum (Spain)
- Languages across the curriculum (Fremdsprache als Arbeitssprache, Austria)
- language-enriched instruction (Finland)

Eurydice (2006: 64-67)

There is no single blueprint that can be applied in the same way in different countries.” Coyle (2007: 5)
Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is a dual-focused educational approach in which an *additional language* is used for the learning and teaching of both content *and* language. That is, in the teaching and learning process, there is a focus not only on content, and not only on language. Each is interwoven, even if the emphasis is greater on one or the other at a given time.

Coyle / Hood / Marsh (2010: 1)

[A]chieving this two-fold aim calls for the development of a special approach to teaching in that the non-language subject is not taught *in* a foreign language but *with* and *through* a foreign language.

Eurydice (2006: 8)
Lessons from immersion

- clearly defined role of **focus on form:**
  - metalinguistic awareness
  - opportunities for production practice

- sociolinguistic and sociocultural context different
  - L and C **integrated flexibly along a continuum**
  - no stated preference for either

- aim: functional rather than (near) native-like competence

Pérez-Cañado (2012)
Does CLIL work?

very heterogeneous – context is king
but: common characteristics

- content knowledge not threatened – positive effects on subject acquisition

- L2 development evidenced
  - more complex, accurate L2 use
  - reading proficiency
  - incidental vocabulary acquisition
  - pragmatic and discursive competence

- levelling of gender differences in attitude, achievement

Pérez-Cañado (2012: 317)
Successful employability of today’s higher education (HE) graduates in Europe is more and more dependent on how well they are prepared linguistically and interculturally to enter the internationalised labour market.

Greere / Räsänen (2008: 3)
Bologna Declaration 1999 – European Higher Education Area
key issue: Internationalisation

“W]e try to avoid speaking about English-language education; we always say foreign-language education and everybody knows that in practice it means English, only English.” Lehikoinen (2004: 44)

most CLIL research is carried out in non-Anglophone European countries

- number of English-medium BA and MA programmes more than tripled: from 700 in 2002 to 2400 in 2007
- leading the field: Netherlands, Finland, Cyprus, Sweden, Switzerland and Denmark
- disciplines: Economics/Business, Engineering, Science

Wächter / Maiworm (2008: 12)
Findings from Europe: perceived gains

- similar to findings from other bilingual settings
- L2 competence (particularly improvement in receptive skills)
  - Gains in the discipline-specific terminology and grammatical aspects common in discipline-specific genres and discourses
- gains in self-confidence
- multicultural competence
- greater methodological innovation and level of reflection

Aguilar/Rodriguez (2012), Pérez-Cañado (2012)
Findings from Europe: perceived losses

Lecturers:

• affects “ability to communicate knowledge in an effective and student-friendly manner”

• uncomfortable expressing themselves in everyday language

• limit to the depth of material and quality of class discussion

• poorer coverage of subject matter, slower delivery rate

• increased workload and lack of materials

Tange (2010)
Respondent #4
Aguilar/Rodríguez (2012)
Findings from Europe: perceived losses

Students:
Spanish study: students report
  • frequent use of avoidance strategies [due to language deficits]
  • inability to exhibit best performance
  • decrease in the quality of teaching
  • decrease in students’ overall learning results
  • increase in study load

Aguilar / Rodríguez (2012)

Sweden, Norway: problems with lecture comprehension:
  • difficulties in note-taking
  • reluctant to ask and answer questions
  • experienced lectures as more challenging

Pérez-Cañado (2012)
If lecturers cannot provide *appropriate language input*, if students are not provided with adequate *opportunities for interaction* in the foreign language, if students do not already possess a *command of the language* that allows them to benefit from English-medium instruction, the hoped for enhancement of students’ language skills may remain forthcoming.

Sercu (2004: 548, my emphasis)
Findings from Europe: Teacher training

In some countries, higher education teaching and research staff have not been explicitly trained in educational methodologies. In these cases, higher education has been viewed as characterized by *transactional modes of educational delivery* (largely imparting information), rather than the *interactional modes* (largely process-oriented) characteristic of CLIL.

Coyle / Hood / Marsh (2010: 24, my emphasis)
Findings from Europe: CLIL training

It seems that CLIL at the tertiary level is often performed in a rather casual manner because university professors are not inclined to receive training on how to teach in a foreign language.

Costa / Coleman (2010: 26)

CLIL training specially adapted to university teachers is necessary so that lecturers can overcome their reluctance to a methodological training and thereby the potential of CLIL is realised.

Aguilar / Rodriguez (2012: 183)
A three-year project to ‘map the current landscape for languages in higher education’ based at the LLAS Subject Centre, University of Southampton in cooperation with the Lifelong Learning Erasmus Network and partly funded by the European Commission.

CLIL = ‘umbrella term for all those HE approaches in which *some form of specific and academic language support* is offered to students in order to facilitate their learning of the content through that language’

LanQua (2010a, my emphasis)
LanQua

**STEPS FROM NON-CLIL TO CLIL**
(in L2 & FL mediated higher education)

- pre-sessional teaching of language, discourse, academic practices etc. to support students' learning in the content course/programme that follows
- possible collaboration btw teachers
- language learning outcomes specified according to content learning needs

**PRE-CLIL (language)**
- courses/programmes provided systematically by subject specialists to mixed, multicultural and multilingual groups (>25% exposure)
- language learning expected due to exposure, but outcomes not specified; implicit aims and criteria
- collaboration possible, but rare

**PRE-CLIL (content)**
- language support coordinated with/integrated in subject studies and takes place simultaneously
- joint planning btw teachers and specified outcomes and criteria for both content and language

**NON-CLIL**
- no concern for language learning, other agendas
- no (pedagogical) collaboration
- e.g. visiting experts, individual lectures
  - incidental, unsystematic, limited exposure (<25%)

**LSP / Discipline-Based Language Teaching**
- language specialists providing discipline-specific LT to support learning
- no (systematic) collaboration
- with subject specialists, FL teacher chooses materials
- possible power plays, role formation

**ADJUNCT-CLIL**
- fully dual approach and full integration of language across subject teaching by subject specialist or via team teaching
- specified outcomes and criteria for both content and language

(source: Greere / Räsänen 2008: 6)
Group discussion

Look at the LanQua model:

☑️ Where would you place your institution’s approach to L2 content teaching?

or

☑️ Which approach would be feasible / most appropriate for your context?
Conceptual frameworks

Young field:

- mostly descriptive, qualitative research, increasingly empirical/quantitative studies
- distinct lack of theoretical conceptual groundwork

- most widely-used and discussed: 
  Do Coyle’s 4Cs Framework
Coyle’s 4Cs Framework

Coyle / Hood / Marsh (2010: 41)
Language Triptych

Language of learning

Foreign Language Learning

Language for learning

Language through learning

Coyle / Hood / Marsh (2010: 36)
Language in CLIL

language used for academic and specific purposes puts different demands on linguistic processing and production - needs instruction and training

Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) = “conversational fluency in a language”

Cognitive Academic Language proficiency (CALP) = “access to and command of the oral and written academic registers of schooling”

Cummins (2008: 71-72)

aim: develop critical literacy and critical language awareness
Scaffolding is a temporary structure used to help learners act more skilled than they really are.

Linguistic scaffolding includes:

- specialized vocabulary
- key L2 language structures and grammatical features
- information on subject-specific text type conventions and structural features

aim: make input comprehensible so that it can be processed and internalised
modified L2 speech in ‘teacher talk’ similar to child-directed speech (interactionist theory)

- slower rate of delivery
- higher pitch
- more varied intonation
- shorter, simpler sentence patterns
- stress on key words
- frequent repetition
- paraphrase

Lightbown / Spada (2006: 21)
Minimum proficiency level?

Hughes / Madrid (2011): minimum of B1 (Threshold) in CEFR

-> no problem: A-level = B2 (Vantage)
  • Milton 2007: vocabulary size
  • Klapper / Rees (2004): A-level entrants to UG German
    • “doubt predictive validity of A-level grades”
  • Worton report (2009): need for remedial L2 support in Y1

Simplifying linguistic ‘packaging’ of content requires careful calibration

[If] the simplification leads to the trivialization of the content and does not favor the proper cognitive growth of the students, then the CLIL approach is not being implemented.

Costa / D’Angelo (2011: 9)
Types of scaffolding

- Linguistic scaffolding: provision of language-related support such as structural, lexical, and pragmatic.
- Cognitive/conceptual scaffolding: provision of support focusing on cognitive strategies and metacognitive skills.
- Cultural scaffolding: supports understandings of and connections between different, “other” culture(s).
- Affective scaffolding: supports the emotional / psychological needs of the learners (e.g., anxiety, self-efficacy, and self-esteem).
Pair task

Find a partner who teaches similar content (e.g. history, film, economics)

☑ Discuss the cognitive and linguistic demands of your content area in general.
☑ Choose one example of a topic / unit you teach and think about the types and forms of scaffolding you could provide to support your students’ learning.
Please discuss these two questions in your group:

- What is good CLIL?
- What are some prerequisites for CLIL implementation?
Good CLIL…

- is context-embedded
- is content-driven (rather than content-based)
- has clearly defined learning outcomes for BOTH content and language
- makes creative use of language as learning tool (linguistic scaffolding)
- connects learners to language use for different purposes at different times
- develops linguistic confidence and competence and promotes spontaneity
- is localised and carefully adapted to fit specific context
- is motivating for both teachers and learners
Prerequisites for CLIL

- Open eyes: be aware of what is and isn’t possible
- Institutional commitment – CLIL requires resources!
  - CPD, methodology training, reduced workloads
- Instructors convinced of value and willing to invest time and effort
- Cooperation between language and subject experts
- Clearly formulated, explicit learning objectives
- Time to redesign curriculum, modules, assessment
- Don’t re-invent the wheel!
  - Use lessons from CLIL in secondary education, EAP, etc.
The position of CLIL is clearly at an exploratory stage in higher education in many countries and although there are situational and structural variables which work against its introduction, there are also forces which give it considerable potential (cultural and linguistic diversity, and competence-based learning).

Coyle / Hood / Marsh 2010: 18
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- Background: MFL in UK Higher Education
- L2 content in German UG programmes
- CLIL at Aston University
Changing focus of UG provision

- shift in conceptual focus initially in the 1960s
  - technical colleges re-designated and new universities founded
- move away from the traditional model of a literature-heavy syllabus towards more contemporary, vocational models and broader socio-cultural curricula, influenced by Area Studies, Cultural Studies and Media Studies
- changing status of language proficiency as an objective in and of itself - strong utilitarian focus on applied linguistics, communicative competence

Kolinsky 1993, Coleman 2004
cross-language and cross-discipline teaching provision
‘[T]raditional language department divisions have disappeared and colleagues have found themselves working more closely with other modern linguists and non-linguists in developing cross-departmental and interdisciplinary courses.’
Klapper (2006: 3)

move away from SH and JH towards CH

increase of institution-wide language programmes (IWLP)
‘In a major power shift, language centres are increasingly supplying all the language classes for the institution – even where there are specialist degrees in Modern Languages”
Coleman (2004: 150)

MFL department closures
‘[...] their academics absorbed into Cultural Studies, European Studies or Politics while the language centre delivers foreign language skills to the whole institution [...]’
Coleman (2004: 150)
Virtually non-existent!

Isolated UK HE case studies:
Tamponi (2005)
Macías (2006)

Relationship between L & C more generally:
Gieve / Cunico (2012)
German: Macro context

proliferation of CLIL in German UG programmes in UK
- extent to which L2-content teaching is practiced
- motives for implementing CLIL
- institutional parameters which influence CLIL implementation

- online survey of Heads of German
- 51 German departments at UK universities
- response rate of 55%
### General institutional profiles

#### Type of university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of University</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancient university (before 1800)</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Brick university (before WW1)</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate Glass university (1960s-1992)</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New university (post-1992)</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently created university (since 2005)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mandatory Year Abroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandatory Year Abroad</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Position within the university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position within the University</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German group within MFL combined w Politics, Social Sciences, etc.</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German group within MFL Department</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual School / Department of German Studies</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any content modules taught in German?

McBride (2003):
Incidental CLIL?

apparent proliferation of L2 content teaching not reflected in research
-> CLIL practice in these universities sometimes incidental?

Comment #12: “We leave it up to individual staff to decide.”

Danger: impossible to know whether any reflection on the specific requirements of effective CLIL implementation is taking place -> little more than

simply teaching a content through a foreign language, while not taking into account that both content and language goals should be considered.

Costa (2009: 84)
Correlation minimal:
Mandatory YA (82%): 70% have L2-taught content modules
No obligatory YA: 60%

Slight difference in timing:
Mandatory YA: 63% start L2 content in Year 1, 81% in Year 2 and Final Year
No obligatory YA: no L2 subject instruction in Year 1
Plans to introduce content modules taught in the L2?

- Respondent #7: 
  teaching content in German **discontinued** in order to “allow students from other Schools (mainly Politics and History) to choose [sic] German content units”

- Respondent #15: 
  “In the current climate there is more emphasis on making content units available to students without German (eg German film, Holocaust Studies, Diaspora Studies). Teaching in the target language would **militate against interdisciplinarity.**”
Respondent #20:

“[T]he European culture lectures are at the moment shared with students of French, Spanish and European Studies and therefore, taught in English. However, from next year they will be taught separately in the specific target languages, e.g. also German.”

Respondent #4:

“Current discussions are taking place over the introduction of some content teaching in the target language (traditionally this has not been the case) - partly due to student demand, and partly due to a need to expose students to more language across the curriculum.”
Programme level

Ancient: only Y2+F
Red Brick: Y1 (50%), Y2 (60%), YF (90%)
Plate glass: Y1 (60%), Y2 (100%), YF (60%)
In order to **prepare their students for the immersive experience of the Year Abroad**, German departments increase exposure to the L2 in Year 2.

Once students return from their Year Abroad, they are keen to **maintain and further enhance** their improved language skills through continuing exposure to German.

Students are expected to **develop more advanced language skills during their first year** of study before they are expected to follow a more L2-heavy study programme in Years 2 and F.
Types of modules taught in L2

Politics and society
- Older unis: 83.3%
- Younger unis: 83.3%

Literature
- Older unis: 83.3%
- Younger unis: 83.3%

Area studies
- Older unis: 66.7%
- Younger unis: 61.1%

History
- Older unis: 55.6%
- Younger unis: 44.4%

Film
- Older unis: 38.9%
- Younger unis: 33.3%

Economics
- Older unis: 33.3%
- Younger unis: 27.8%

Linguistics
- Older unis: 100%
- Younger unis: 100%
CLIL at Aston University
School of Languages and Social Sciences
School of Languages and Social Sciences
CLIL at Aston

- all language and content modules taught in the L2
  40-80 out of 120 credits taught AND assessed through MFL
  integrated Year Abroad
- focus on contemporary society, politics and culture
  study skills development through portfolio tasks
  clear content AND language objectives
- language modules interlink with content modules to
  support linguistic and academic requirements of the CLIL classroom
Example: German SH

Year 1
German Language Skills
German History and Society
German Current Affairs
German Language Past and Present
Introduction to Translation
Introduction to Film Studies

Year 2
German Language Skills II
Translation and Textual Skills
Post-war Germany
Politics & Society in Contemporary G
Current Trends in German Cinema
Austrian Cultural History

Final Year
German Language Skills III
German Research Dissertation
German History and Society Reflected in German Film
German Popular Culture
German Contemporary Culture
German-Jewish Biographies
Module descriptions

Outline learning outcomes

- content knowledge and understanding
- language-related skills
- cognitive skills
- subject-specific skills
- transferable skills
1. Module Learning Outcomes:

I. Knowledge and Understanding
a) Language-related skills
Develop a sound, concise academic writing style in French. Using debate and discussion informally to self-appraise and appraise as a group, with seminar leaders in French. Develop the ability to express views on political topics and engage in debate in French.

b) Subject-related skills
Students will gain an appreciation of the broad and complex structure of contemporary French Politics. Students will learn the narrative political history of the French Fifth Republic, from the perspective of its organising framework, that of presidentialism. Students will gather a basic understanding of the key contents and problems of French politics, and will have an introduction to its comparative framework.

II. Cognitive and Analytical skills
a) Language-related skills
Students will learn about leadership politics in the context of the French party system, and the wider political culture, and the main theoretical approaches to these. In the seminars, they will discuss these issues. Students will be able to understand key political concepts, and to use them in political debates, and through seminar work particularly will learn critically to analyse information.

b) Subject-related skills
Interpretation of graphic information, e.g. graphs, tables, political advertising, speeches, documentaries, etc. Understanding the complexity of French politics.
Assessment and marking

- wide range of different assessment types are used to test content and 4 language skills, e.g.
  - exams (oral and written)
  - individual and group presentations
  - essays (1000-3000 words)
  - debates
  - portfolio
  - projects
  - video production

- marking criteria and feedback procedures are
  - structured according to language level
  - harmonised across the languages
## 2. Content Modules in the TL

Productive writing in the Target Language

Applicable to the following tasks: academic essay, YA project, final year dissertation.

Based on 'LTS Guidelines for Essay Writing'.

NB: TL = Target language

### Year 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Percentage range</th>
<th>Breadth of understanding</th>
<th>Linguistic accuracy</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Structure and academic writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>There is broad and sophisticated understanding of primary material under consideration. A series of relevant secondary sources are engaged with, and there is clear critical distance from these sources. Discussion is firmly situated within the broader socio-historical or cultural context.</td>
<td>There are very few errors, if any.</td>
<td>Mobilises a series of well argued points in support of a clear position. Focus is retained throughout, even where the argument is complex. Analysis successfully moves beyond a received argument to develop and support a personal position.</td>
<td>Writing is very well structured, with clear introduction, body, and conclusion, strong developmental links, and hierarchisation of arguments. References are appropriate in terms of number and relevance, there is clear evidence of sustained, pertinent research. Sources are differentiated, clearly presented and integrated into the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>Excellent understanding of the primary material under consideration. Relevant secondary sources have been understood and are mobilised productively. Coherent and detailed links are made to a relevant broader socio-historical or cultural context.</td>
<td>Errors are rare, though there may be some minor mistakes. There are no major errors.</td>
<td>Mobilises a series of coherent points in support of a clear and developing personal position, going beyond a clear understanding of what the question requires and developing and supporting a nuanced answer.</td>
<td>Writing is generally well structured, with clear logical progression and integration of supporting material. References are appropriate in terms of number and relevance, there is clear evidence of sustained, pertinent research. Sources are differentiated, clearly presented and integrated into the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>Demonstrates clear understanding of the primary material and independent thought. Secondary reading judiciously supports a detailed argument. Links are consistently made to a relevant broader socio-historical or cultural context.</td>
<td>There are a number of minor errors, often caused when attempting ambitious or complex sentence structures. Lexis, punctuation, mood, voice, syntax are convincing and consistent.</td>
<td>Coherent and clear, consistently organised around ideas or themes. Information and examples supplied are subordinated to the development of the argument. Analytical in tone and purpose.</td>
<td>Clear developmental structure with identification and separation and hierarchisation of arguments. Clear and logical overall shape. References are appropriate in terms of number and relevance, there is clear evidence of pertinent research. Sources are differentiated, clearly presented and integrated into the text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LSS LTS Marking criteria

**Oral Production in the TL**

Applicable to the following tasks: Presentation, viva, discussion, role play etc.

*NB: TL = Target language*

#### Year One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Percentage range</th>
<th>Content and comprehension</th>
<th>Accuracy, range and idiom</th>
<th>Pronunciation and fluency</th>
<th>Communication and structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>Exceptional work in all respects. There is convincing control of subject matter, breadth and depth, and wide understanding of the complexity of the issues. Is able to react and interact convincingly. Reformulates, summarises, expands.</td>
<td>There are very few errors, if any. TL is idiomatic and consistently uses complex sentence structures. Exceeds expectations for this level.</td>
<td>Pronunciation is consistent and impressive, with little interference from other languages. Excellent fluency.</td>
<td>Excellent body language. Energetic, clear, convincing delivery. The structure is clear and logical, with arguments and information integrated into a coherent and persuasive argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>Sustained and convincing work with excellent control of subject matter, and wide understanding of the issues. Interacts and reacts easily.</td>
<td>Excellent use of the TL. Errors are rare, though there may be a number of minor mistakes, and perhaps a very limited number of more serious ones. Good command of lexis and syntax.</td>
<td>Pronunciation and fluency are excellent, with good rhythm and little interference from other languages.</td>
<td>Excellent body language. Energetic, clear delivery. The structure is clear and logical, with arguments and information integrated into a coherent and persuasive argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>Shows sustained competence and fluency, with a wide understanding of the issues. Questions are answered with</td>
<td>A wide variety of structures and lexis is used. There can be numerous minor errors, often caused when</td>
<td>Very good intonation, rhythm and fluency, though there is some interference</td>
<td>Very good body language and convincing delivery. Good audience awareness. The structure is logical and coherent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
language modules interlink with content modules to support linguistic and academic requirements of the CLIL classroom

Example: Independent Listening Task (ILT)

integrated in core language modules for Y1+2

• weekly videos (15-25 min)
• tasks (listening compr, fill-the-gap, vocab quizzes, etc.)
• self-check answers
• additional online resources
• assessment: online portfolio (pass/fail), oral exam

topics aligned with core content modules

create synergies between language and content modules
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deutschlandlied</td>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Task Das Deutschlandlied.docx</td>
<td>Exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Übungen</td>
<td>Self-check answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kontrollblätter</td>
<td>Other resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zusätzlicher Lesestoff :</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges: Heterogeneous learner groups

1. primary language spoken at home:
   - 62% English, 10% German
   - 35% multilingual

2. classroom interaction in MFL in Sec:
   - 60%: no more than half
   - 12%: at least three quarters

3. varying degrees of exposure to L2 outside the classroom
   - 32%
   - 28%
   - 12%
   - 23%
   - 5%
   - n/a

The actual language proficiency (and confidence!) among Year 1 students varies considerably!
We want students to actively explore, research and solve complex problems to develop a deep understanding of core academic concepts.

- adapt language use to proficiency level without compromising complex and intellectually demanding content.
- focus and depth - compromise on the goal of covering as much content as possible.
- increased awareness of language.
- explore ideas from multiple perspectives and build an understanding of their interconnectedness.
Challenges: Appropriate teaching materials

difficult to find adequate teaching materials

- increasing lack of text comprehension skills: students less able to process complex academic texts, even in English
  - e.g. German: no textbook culture
  - experience at gauging level of complexity / difficulty of language: adapt when and how?
Challenges:
Teacher training

Subject specialists happy to teach in L2, but

- often no language-pedagogical background
  
  [T]here are very few full-time staff researching into language and language pedagogy – and, indeed, very few languages academics have undergone professional training in the teaching of a foreign language.
  
  Worton (2009: 30)

Yet:

The vast majority of staff in all [MFL] Departments are involved in language teaching; 36% reported that all of their staff are involved in the language elements of their programmes; 68% reported between 80% and 100% involvement.

  Worton (2009: 30)

- reluctant to receive training in CLIL methodology
Student survey

- questionnaire distributed to all on-campus German students
  - five modules
  - two rounds: beginning and end of TP

- 4 sections:
  - A for General Background, including age, gender and year of study
  - B for Language Background
  - C for University Background
  - D for language use (incl. L1) in the classroom
Question C3/1:
Did you come across the Integrated Approach when you investigated Aston?

- Yes: 39%
- No: 58%
- N/A: 3%

n=60
Question C4/1:
Did the Integrated Approach used at Aston play a part in your decision to study here?

- Yes: 37%
- No: 18%
- N/A: 45%

n=60
Question B3/2: Do you believe that the IA should be advertised more strongly to promote Aston?

- Yes: 55%
- No: 33%
- N/A: 12%

n=58
Question B3a/2: Why is it important that Aston advertise the IA more strongly?

Answer category 1: pedagogical advantage

- “because it improves the teaching and involves the student more immersing him/her in the foreign language”
- “because it makes learning more effective”
- “because you learn two skills at the same time”
- “because it benefits the students in their language skills”
- “Because it is so, so much better – better grasp of the language and everyone assumes this will happen, but there are only two unis that do it.”
Question B3a: Why is it important that Aston advertise the IA more strongly?

Answer category 2: unique selling point

- “Because it is a USP of Aston which other unis don’t offer.”
- “Because it is a great asset and attraction for students that are interested in learning languages at Uni.”
- “Because it is an approach that could be seen to give language students here an advantage over students at other universities.”
- “It is a real strong point of the degree programme and I think it would interest a lot of people.”
- “Because not many universities offer it and students are searching for opportunities to learn in this manner.”
- “It may later help to influence students to come to the university.”
- “It’s the reason why I’m here.”
Question B3a:
Why is it important that Aston advertise the IA more strongly?

Answer category 3: transparency

▶ “because it is unclear what it is!”
▶ “I am not aware of it – therefore if it is a positive thing it is important to know about it”
▶ “important part of course delivery”
▶ “to let students know how involved they’ll be with the course”
▶ “so that people know they are expected to speak in the target language”
Question D20:
I consider using German to communicate in class a beneficial and rewarding challenge.

Round 1:
- 53% strongly agree
- 42% agree
- 7% disagree
- 0% strongly disagree

Round 2:
- 45% strongly agree
- 45% agree
- 7% disagree
- 1% strongly disagree

n=60
n=58
Question D 26:
I believe that, without the Integrated Approach, my language skills would not have improved as significantly as they have.
Y2: Question D 30

I feel more comfortable about going abroad next year because I have got used to using German to communicate in and out of class.

Round 1:

- Strongly agree: 30%
- Agree: 50%
- Disagree: 5%
- Strongly disagree: 5%
- N/A: 10%

n=20

Round 2:

- Strongly agree: 53%
- Agree: 29%
- Disagree: 18%
- N/A: 0%

n=17
YF: Question D 30
I believe that my YA was more beneficial and successful because I had been taught exclusively in German in Y1 and 2.
Question D28:
I believe that my exam results in Y1 (and 2) would have been better if more E had been used in class.

Round 1:
- 5% strongly agree
- 5% agree
- 18% disagree
- 41% strongly disagree

n=37

Round 2:
- 6% strongly agree
- 14% agree
- 37% disagree
- 20% strongly disagree

n=35
German students in all year groups perceive clear advantages in the university’s approach to CLIL.
- German students generally consider L2-taught content classes both challenging and beneficial for their language development.
- Year 2 students feel better prepared for their YA because of their prolonged exposure to the target language.
- Year F students returned from placements feel that their YA was more successful.
- Many students are unaware of the Integrated Approach when they join Aston University.
  - It may be useful to communicate information about the CLIL approach more clearly to prospective students.
“Target-language content teaching has proven to be an enriching experience for both my students and myself. As an instructor, I become the medium through which the students learn and experience not only language skills or subject specific contents but the culture I bring into the classroom.”

Dr Raquel Medina, Senior Lecturer in Spanish

“Teaching first year content modules in the TL allows you to be part of an impressive development process and is as rewarding as it is challenging.”

Dr Claudia Gremler, Lecturer in German
I WANT YOU TO FEEDBACK!

Questions?