

CLIL With Languages Other Than English

BOWER, Kim <<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7259-8118>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/31702/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

BOWER, Kim (2023). CLIL With Languages Other Than English. In: BANEGAS, Dario Luis and ZAPPA-HOLLMAN, Sandra, (eds.) The Routledge Handbook of Content and Language Integrated Learning. Routledge Handbooks in Applied Linguistics . London, Routledge, 210-224.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Chapter 18 CLIL with languages other than English

Kim Bower, ID 0000-0001-7259-8118

Professor Kim Bower holds a chair in Innovation in Languages Education at Sheffield Hallam University and is President of the Association for Language Learning. She is a principal fellow of the Higher Education Academy and received a National Teaching Fellowship for her leadership of curriculum innovation in language and teacher education in England. An experienced researcher in these fields, Kim leads an international network for content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in Anglophone countries. Her research focuses on CLIL and motivation.

The recent rapid expansion of Global English as a lingua franca has seen its predominance as the language of choice for foreign language study increase at the expense of Languages Other Than English (LOTE) such as French or Spanish. The development of bilingual and multilingual education is, however, dependent on many variables and the picture is complex. Although LOTE languages are facing a resulting crisis across sectors in many European and Asian countries as preference to learn English above other languages increases, Anglophone countries provide the majority of contexts in which LOTEs are learned. Here, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has been found to have the potential to counter the prevailing trend of demotivation for language learning through age-relevant, content-based, meaningful use of the foreign language for learning subject disciplines *and* language. CLIL practice in these contexts is limited – and as a result, so is research. This chapter provides an overview of CLIL in the Anglophone contexts of Australia and the UK, considers CLIL’s potential for addressing demotivation in learning LOTEs, optimal conditions for implementation and direction of travel.

Key words

CLIL, languages other than English (LOTE), motivation, bilingual education

INTRODUCTION

The term Languages Other Than English (LOTE) first introduced in Australia (Clyne, 1991) in the context of community languages, now termed ‘additional languages’, (Clyne, 1991) is now more widely used across linguistic contexts. The rapid expansion of Global English has seen its predominance as the language of choice for foreign language study increase at the expense of LOTEs such as French or Spanish. LOTEs are therefore facing a crisis in many European and Asian educational sectors. Where there are contextual reasons for learning another foreign language (e.g., bilingual countries or regions), or contexts in which there are heritage languages, motivation and take up of LOTES may be higher, but less so where the language is a distinct foreign language. Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) literature in such contexts often refers to English but may refer to a LOTE or may compare CLIL in English and a LOTE.

Examples of LOTE research in European countries include bilingual Belgium (see e.g., Baten et al., 2020, De Smet et al., 2018, De Smet et al., 2019, Surmont et al., 2016) and Switzerland, where different Cantons have different policies regarding bilingual education, with some of the German cantons leading the way in LOTE CLIL (Bartholemy, 2021). The European Centre for Modern Languages has some LOTE-specific projects such as ‘CLIL LOTE Start’ (Haataja et al., 2011) aimed particularly at German, with project members from

Finland, Hungary and Portugal. And CLIL LOTE transitions (2020-2023) aims to develop a wide network for CLIL LOTE to address transition and is led by team members from Denmark, Finland, Norway and Greece.

Predominantly Anglophone countries such as Australia and the UK, however, represent the majority of contexts in which LOTEs are the only foreign languages learned. Here languages taught tend to be distinct foreign languages. Learning foreign languages in an Anglophone country combines with the context of learning CLIL through the medium of a foreign language, rather than through the medium of English, to create particular conditions for CLIL LOTE. In common with some European contexts such as trilingual Spain where many CLIL learners do not encounter the target language (TL) outside the classroom (Lasagabaster, 2010), learners in Anglophone contexts rarely do so.

In England and Australia, a broader prevailing demotivation for language learning among school-aged learners is well documented for England, see Bower, 2019b; Lanvers, 2017; Mills & Tinsley, 2020; Collen, 2021a). The rise of Global English however threatens take-up further (Lanvers & Chambers, 2019; Lanvers et al., 2021). Issues of social justice have also been shown to disadvantage language learners in particular (NALA, 2020). Whilst policy-makers aim to close the attainment gap between disadvantaged students and their peers, Hutchinson et al. (2020) report that in England this gap had ceased closing for the first time in a decade. As a result, prior to Covid 19, disadvantaged students were 18.1 months of learning behind their peers by the time they finished their exams at age 16. The gap in the primary sector has increased for the first time since 2007. Persistent poverty was found to be a factor. Disadvantaged learners and boys are least likely to study a language (Tinsley & Doležal, 2018) or attain higher grades (Mills & Tinsley, 2020). Issues of social justice are also present in the inequality of provision in disadvantaged schools, where choice of language is limited, and where community and lesser taught languages lack the opportunities and prestige of the most common languages (Collen, 2021a) and where the linguistic skills of these often bilingual and plurilingual learners tend to be overlooked. This is also true in Australia, where education in other languages is perceived to attract children from middle-class households (Wright et al., 2018). Turner and Cross (2016) argue for making space for multilingualism in Australia, noting that whilst the concept is gaining ground elsewhere, it is losing ground in there. There is a clear need for what Gale et al. (2017) term an advancement of conceptual understanding of socially inclusive pedagogies, and for all within education to think differently about diversity and learning.

CLIL has been found to have the potential to counter the prevailing trend of demotivation for language learning through age-relevant, content-based, meaningful use of the foreign language for learning subject disciplines and language. In some contexts, such as the UK, it has also been found to support learners of all abilities and socio-economic status (e.g., Bower, 2019b; Coyle 2011). However, CLIL practice in these settings is limited, and therefore so is research on it. In the light of this, this chapter explores CLIL and its applications in these predominantly English contexts. Given the importance of context in CLIL (Dobson, 2020), after defining key terms, the Anglophone contexts of Australia and the UK are detailed. CLIL's potential for addressing demotivation in learning LOTEs is examined and optimal conditions for implementation are then explored. Finally, the direction of travel for CLIL LOTE and languages education is considered.

LOTE CLIL IN AUSTRALIA and ENGLAND

An Overview of CLIL in the Anglophone contexts of Australia and the UK

Languages in the UK

Teaching in minority and heritage languages in Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland has developed since 1944 (Bower, 2021b; Eurydice 2006:16). Devolution provides for different education systems in Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and England. Scotland has adopted an ambitious 1+2 policy whereby two additional languages are learned in addition to English. Here, L1 Gaelic medium schools, account for less than five percent of primary provision (Collen, 2021b). In Wales, language provision is also distinct: around 16% of pupils attend Welsh-medium schools, with a further ten percent attending schools that are bilingual, dual-medium, or in English with significant Welsh provision. From a population of c. 3.2 million, the Welsh government aims to increase the number of people speaking the Welsh language from 570,000 in 2017 to one million by 2050. (TheEducationDirectorate, 2017). All pupils learn English and Welsh age 5-16 and although there is a commitment for a further foreign language from age nine, in practice system-wide take up is limited (Tinsley & Board, 2017). Northern Ireland’s shorter 3-year compulsory language learning period (age 11-14) requires one European language including Irish (Gaelic), which 5.59% of the population can speak to some degree (UK Census 2011) and 5,256 children attend an Irish-medium school in Northern Ireland (NI Government, 2015). A further 1.98% of the population speak Ulster Scots to some degree (UK Census 2011). Irish and Ulster Scots speakers therefore make up a small minority of the population. In Ireland, where the uptake of Irish is higher, but also in decline, Mac Gearailt et al. (2021) call for the use of CLIL to reverse the trend. Despite its multilingual population, unlike her sister UK countries, England has no official heritage or border languages. English is the predominant L1 and in this sense, motivation for language learning has no inherent inducements.

Languages in Australia and England

Australia shares a similar context to that of England. Lo Bianco and Slaughter (2009) note that across Australia only 17.6% of students aged 14-15 and 10.9% aged 15-16 study a language with New South Wales (NSW) lagging behind its fellow states. Here, students aged 11-12 or 12-13 study a second language for only 100 hours and only 20% continue learning a language for the higher certificate. Despite being one of the most multilingual countries in the world, “Kids come to school bilingual, and end up monolingual in English.” (Baker, 2021).

In these two LOTE contexts, which share other similarities as Table 1 illustrates, CLIL, albeit through different approaches, has found fertile ground.

Table 1. Summary of Developing Strands in bilingual education in Australia and the UK, (Cross & Bower, 2018)

Developing Strands in bilingual education in Australia and the UK	
Bilingual education	
England	Australia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pioneers 1970s/80s • based on Canadian model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pioneers 1970s/80s • based on Canadian model

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g., Goff's, Mill Hill schools • curriculum taught in a foreign language (10-50%) • language colleges 1995-2010 (promote language learning in school and community) • ML association support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g., Mansfield Secondary, Bayswater South Primary schools • curriculum taught in a foreign language (33-50%) • school type varies between states • government support • Modern Languages association support
CLIL	
England	Australia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1990s • led by language teachers • promote and preserve modern language learning dual focus on content and language • range of models - modules in language lessons to subject and curriculum strands • language colleges 1995-2010 • ML association support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2010s • led by language teachers • promote high quality language learning • dual focus on content and language • range of models - modules in language lessons to subject and curriculum strands • government support • ML association support

Bilingual education based on the Canadian model was successfully introduced by pioneers in the 1970s/80s in a few schools in both Australia and England, and was supported by Modern Language (ML) associations. In both cases, initiatives were language teacher led. Up to 50% of the curriculum was taught in a foreign language. In 2002 immersion programmes were identified in 49 primary and 14 secondary schools across Australia (De Courcy), whilst in England, where no statistics are available, there were fewer. In England, some language colleges (1995-2010) - specialist schools which aimed to promote language learning in schools and the community - supported bilingual initiatives. Crucially in Australia, unlike England, bilingual education had government policy support (Cross & Bower, 2018).

The ways in which CLIL was introduced in England and Australia differ. In England, CLIL evolved from the ground up, led by language teachers seeking to promote and preserve language learning in the UK and received governmental support which stopped short of national policy. For example, Bower (2013) notes a recommendation of the Nuffield Inquiry (Nuffield Foundation, 2000) for a nationally co-ordinated programme of CLIL in the UK. Consequently, the DfES (2002) funded a 3-year national CLIL pilot study involving fifteen schools, of which eight were secondary (Eurydice at NFER, 2005; Wiesemes, 2005). By 2011 over 50 schools had implemented CLIL to some degree (Coyle, 2011). Subsequent support came through Language Colleges until their abolition under the Coalition government in 2010, and through government-initiated projects, notably the Anglo-French Bilateral Exchange Project (2007–2011) for teacher education, in which both subject and language specialist trainee teachers spent four weeks teaching a curriculum subject in a foreign language in the reciprocal country. The government's current strategy for foreign languages in England is to increase take-up for languages in secondary schools by a focus on linguistic form centred around grammar, vocabulary, and phonics, spearheaded by a national

centre for teaching excellence (Bower, 2021). Despite the success of bilingual programmes and the growing number of plurilingual migrants, many of whom arrive with little or no English, bilingual education does not yet form part of the strategy.

By contrast, in Australia CLIL's systemic introduction from the top down began in 2010 in a selection of schools in Victoria, supported from the outset by governmental policy allowed CLIL to thrive. Here the objective was to promote high quality language learning (Cross & Bower, 2018). Languages education approaches and policies vary across states and territories, but a National Languages Plan is planned (AFMLTA, 2021). As CLIL was being introduced in Australia, literature and smaller research studies focussed on issues pertaining to how CLIL might be used to expand bilingual education into more schools (Turner, 2013a), consideration of whether CLIL might be used to invigorate Japanese (Turner, 2013b), the design and implementation of a unit of work (Turner, 2015), integration in the context of local curricula (Cross, 2016), and on defining CLIL for Australia (Cross, 2015). More recent studies consider whether Japanese CLIL might be a driver for innovation in the teaching of content (Turner, 2019), pedagogy in Japanese CLIL contexts (Ohki, 2022), and the need for teacher training and research of the appropriate use of L1 (Turner & Fielding, 2020).

CLIL's potential for addressing demotivation in learning LOTES

In both English and Australian contexts CLIL's potential to motivate learners has been reported. For example, three larger scale studies (Bower, 2013; Coyle, 2011; Cross & Gearon, 2013) found that learners were positive about the importance of learning a language. They also reported increased confidence and attainment for the majority of learners. These gains were found in learning across the curriculum, not just in the CLIL subjects, in contrast to some settings where underachievement has been found (e.g., Sylvé, 2013). This may relate to the nation-specific CLIL profile of England— in these schools, learners of all abilities enter their language national exams at least one year earlier than their peers and revert to English for the curriculum subject in their final year.

Cross and Gearon's (2013) report and evaluation of pre- and post-trial stakeholder surveys of a semester-long trial of CLIL in six Victorian schools involved parents, students, principals and teachers all of whom favoured this pedagogical approach. The study contributed to government vision and policy for languages education (VictorianDfE, 2011, 2013), which focussed on high quality provision informed by international best practice. Overall findings revealed consistent parental support for CLIL. Student data interestingly revealed a minimal (0.1%) decrease in their enjoyment of studying languages, yet conversely a slight increase in the data revealed that students felt languages education supported both their learning in English and their overall work in school. Confidence in self-reported perceptions of languages skills and oral skills had also increased. Data from school leaders demonstrated high levels of support and positive perceptions of CLIL and languages education, irrespective of any previous experience of bilingual education. Teachers consistently favoured the CLIL content approach to language teaching over traditional language programmes, building on pilot work that also identified positive gains in creativity (Cross, 2012). CLIL was introduced systematically year by year starting with foundation year in primary schools. The state of Victoria introduced the initiative more widely supported by a CLIL training course for CLIL teachers at the University of Melbourne, professional development for principals in both government and non-government schools, and a resources website, which by 2018 had published accessible resources for half the first year of the

secondary science curriculum in a range of languages. The project and associated resources from one of the trial primary schools demonstrated sustained benefits when it was shared after seven years (Peterson, 2021). Following the teacher professional development course in 2014 at the University of Melbourne, Peterson began small, establishing one Geography unit for children aged seven and shared the value of CLIL with both leadership and generalist teachers from the outset. Aims of learner engagement and motivation, enhanced outcomes and making language learning relevant and meaningful to learners were met. By 2021 all children in the school were learning part of their science curriculum in either Italian or Greek throughout their primary school education (Peterson, 2021).

Two larger studies in the UK focussing predominantly on well-established projects found similar learner benefits. The Interacting for Teaching and Learning in CLIL (ITALIC) study (Coyle, 2011) reported that 85% of the participating learners were motivated to continue CLIL. Students cited benefits such as engagement, developing speaking skills, confidence, greater use of study skills, preferring CLIL to traditional language lessons, genuine communication, and a sense of achievement. In contrast to the prevailing monolingual mentality of predominantly Anglophone contexts, 70% of learners saw themselves as future users of a foreign language for work and leisure.

Bower's (2013) study which researched stakeholder perspectives of learners, teachers and school leaders in three contrasting CLIL settings, focussed specifically on the effects of the CLIL pedagogical approach on learner motivation. Here, a similar proportion of learners found CLIL lessons motivating. Challenge, linguistic competence and confidence were also raised as positives. Students were engaged and viewed the higher expectations as positive. As in the ITALIC project, learners enjoyed developing a wider range of skills including independent research skills rarely found in a traditional language classroom. They also demonstrated a shared appreciation of intercultural awareness resulting from CLIL lessons such as 'learning French is like stepping into a whole other world' and 'because you understand people better' (Bower, 2019b).

These two studies in the UK along with other limited research available (e.g., Hunt, 2011; Zindler, 2013) demonstrate the potential of CLIL to generate similar significant learner motivation gains to those in other countries, for example: Finland (Seikkula-Leino, 2007), France and Germany ((Dooly, 2008) Spain (Lasagabaster, 2011; Lorenzo & Moore, 2010). See also Lasagabaster (2019) for a broader review of motivation literature in CLIL in the European context. It will be interesting to see whether in Australia, after a longer period of implementation and as CLIL becomes more embedded within the curriculum, there is any positive impact on learner motivation. In England and Australia CLIL classrooms, where the majority of CLIL groups tend to be mixed ability, any higher learner gains cannot be attributed to selection, motivation or the ability of the learners in a similar way to studies undertaken elsewhere (e.g., Rumlich, 2017) or indeed in some Australian immersion programs (Smala et al., 2013).

Optimal conditions for implementation

Key conditions that favour and support bilingual education in schools which emerge from the literature include governmental policy for languages that is systematically implemented, school-based factors, resources, and professional learning for teachers.

Government languages policy

Where a coherent governmental policy for languages including bilingual education has been implemented, such as in Australia, CLIL has been able to thrive. In European contexts such as Spain for example, language policy has enabled CLIL to become embedded in the curriculum in the six tri-lingual autonomous communities in Spain, in which Basque, Catalan and Galician share co-official status with Spanish. Here, different languages are used as the means of instruction in multilingual school programmes to enable students to learn English as a further additional language (Lasagabaster 2017; San Isidro & Lasagabaster 2020). In Italy, final year students in secondary schools learn a curriculum subject through a foreign language (European Commission/EACEA/ Eurydice 2017). In England, by contrast, the lack of a coherent national languages policy has hindered the development of foreign languages over time (e.g., Coleman et al., 2007) - including in bilingual education (e.g., Bower, 2019a) - despite government support for languages in the form of reviews, projects, and funding, for example. When priorities or governments change, so can the policies that affect language projects and approaches. In England, the absence of a national languages policy is not the only barrier to innovation. In a climate where schools compete against each other for success in examination outcomes age 16, school leaders find themselves under constant accountability pressure in the form of a narrow and relentless focus on attainment. Schools are required to become at least 'good' under the current national inspection regime, which may deter them from curriculum innovations such as CLIL (e.g., Waldegrave & Simons, 2014). This kind of educational policy which focusses on economic competitiveness to the detriment of the broader social purposes of education, as Ball (2017) suggests, is a retrograde step (see Bower, 2019a). Given this context it is perhaps not surprising that only a few, confident school leaders have chosen to innovate the curriculum through CLIL.

There are a number of factors, however, that are significant to successful implementation and take up of CLIL in schools. The first is support from school leaders. Bower (2019a) explores the key role a school leader's commitment plays in establishing and sustaining CLIL programmes. Leaders in the three diverse contexts studied attribute 'a depth of engagement that has the potential to stretch, challenge and inspire all learners' to CLIL (Bower, 2019a: 362). In the Australian context Turner (2013) suggests the importance for schools to committing long term to one or more specific CLIL languages, despite any changes in governmental policy about which language should be taught in schools. The second is how CLIL is organised. A number of studies (e.g., Bower, 2019a; Peterson, 2021) suggest starting small and developing strategically and highlight the benefits of CLIL's flexibility to adapt to a wide range of contexts (Bower, 2020; Bower, Coyle, & Cross, 2020) and therefore be adopted by a larger number and range of schools. Others (e.g., Turner, 2013) call for whole school approaches rather than stand-alone subjects. However, a wide range of models have been found to be successful in the UK, from language-based projects based on a link with a school in a target language speaking country (e.g., language-based field studies and language exchange school-based CLIL) to language-based projects based on links with other curriculum areas (e.g., a series of lessons on an aspect of the science curriculum in a language lesson) or school-based projects such as whole school subject and curriculum strands. This would seem to confirm the scalability found in the Victorian evaluation (Cross & Gearon, 2013). Given this flexibility and track record in the range of schools that have adopted the approach, it is interesting that anecdotal CLIL seems to have been considered insufficiently scalable to become a viable part of the current governmental focus for learning

languages in England i.e. achieving linguistic excellence through grammar, vocabulary and phonics.

A third factor is that of resources and materials. Developing resources to support learning of any new courses requires significant time, effort, and expertise. This is particularly true of CLIL because planning and teaching needs to take account of both language and discipline content. Teachers invariably mention heavy workloads ((Bower, 2013).

Collaboration and the sharing of resources can support teachers by providing a starting point from which to adapt materials to meet the needs of their own learners. Resources to support bilingual learning in LOTE are now available on a wide range of websites, summarised here. From the outset, the Victorian government working in conjunction with schools, teachers, academics, the Modern Language Teacher Association Victoria (MLTAV) and the MLTAV CLIL Language Teachers' Professional Network (2013) set up a resources website *Fuse* providing half a year of CLIL secondary Science curriculum units in seven LOTE languages (Bower, 2021b). In the UK, the Embedding Languages Across Primary and Secondary Education (ELAPSE) KA2 project provided individual units of work in four disciplines for learners aged 8-12 in French, German and Spanish. Although delayed due to the pandemic, the subsequent ELAPSE + project will provide an intensive week of CLIL training for teachers from 29 schools in the appropriate TL country. The Addressing Diversity in bilingual Education (ADiBE) European project 2018-2021 (Pérez Cañado, 2018) provided research projects in the six participating countries for a special issue in the International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, CLIL teaching units including some for LOTE, and video guides on a wide range of aspects of CLIL teaching. Websites such as the 'Association for language Learning CLIL Zone' and 'Learning through languages UK' provide access to some of these and to other resources. The European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML) website provides resources to projects including the CLIL LOTE Start project (Haataja et al., 2011) and CLIL LOTE transitions project (2020-2023).

Teacher training

The need for more teacher professional development in CLIL is well documented (see e.g., British Council, 2014) and is similar to other bilingual education contexts (e.g., Tedick, Christian, & Fortune, 2011). Whilst teacher education in the UK for primary schools has minimal training in modern languages, post-graduate secondary teacher education programmes for LOTE languages, via numerous initial teacher education routes, are well-established and rigorous. Although not a requirement, some providers may include one or more sessions about bilingual education and/or CLIL within the training. Potentially then, despite an overcrowded curriculum, a vehicle exists for the provision of CLIL training for all trainee teachers. This is also true of Australia where pre-service teacher education in languages exists in most States and Territories on secondary programmes, but it is much less common in primary programmes. Here any CLIL training contributes to the professional development programmes that all in-service teachers are required to select and to undertake.

Professional development that goes beyond the basics of CLIL to supporting teachers in their ongoing development is needed to enable the embedding and growth of this kind of bilingual learning. Understanding the nature of CLIL is quite different from developing curricula and to implementing teaching approaches on the ground. As Pavón and Rubio (2010) suggest, the demands of curriculum planning in CLIL can be a stumbling block. In addition to specific teaching strategies, teachers need to be conversant in both theoretical and

practical understandings of CLIL to integrate linguistic and non-linguist goals, content and assessment criteria into the curriculum - CLIL is no easy option. The Victorian model for professional development includes a 2-day in-service training course leading to the planning of lessons with a further follow-up day after teachers have taught the lessons with a teacher educator from the University of Melbourne. Subsequent lesson observation and feedback visits have provided further support in some schools. San Isidro and Lasagabaster (2020:100) suggest four aspects of training that are key in integrating CLIL curriculum planning with teaching: firstly, that professional learning is undertaken prior to curriculum planning and teaching; secondly, that a pluriliteracies approach is adopted in which subject and language teachers understand both content and language objectives and the pivotal role of meaning-making when developing subject and linguistic knowledge (Meyer & Coyle, 2017); thirdly, that teacher collaboration allows co-construction and implementation of the CLIL curriculum; and finally that teachers are empowered to 'own' CLIL pedagogies through training in integrated curriculum planning and design aligned with task-based learning, project-based learning and integrated assessment. A professional development course aimed at addressing diversity in bilingual education was developed by the UK team for the ADIBE project for participating partners to adapt and disseminate for specific contexts. In this programme learning and assessment are underpinned by six principles: teachers as designers; dialogic classrooms for deeper learning; transparency/explicitness; learner-centredness; multimodality and pluriliteracies; and scaffolding (Bower, 2021a).

Direction of travel

Over 1,620,000 students in schools in England speak, or engage with a LOTE at home (DfE, 2020). In these bilingual, predominantly Anglophone contexts, where English is the language of schooling, EAL is considered akin to LOTE CLIL languages (in the broader sense of languages education). Yet rather than being viewed as a resource, these bilingual and plurilingual learners who speak a different language from the language of schooling, have tended to be viewed from a deficit perspective. Hence EAL support tends to define students by their lack of English, and heritage language education defines learners by their lack of native speaker fluency. Minority language students are then generally placed without support in classes with native speakers of English. EAL and heritage/community languages have separate research journals, separate teacher associations and separate conferences; in schools EAL and heritage/community languages teachers generally work and teach in separate spaces. And yet the goal of support and intervention programs for these multilingual student groups is learning that draws on a single coherent set of linguistic practices and resources. A holistic reconceptualisation of languages education is needed if we are to address the issue raised by Cruickshank in the introduction of this chapter, about bilingual learners leaving schooling monolingual. We need to do more to address social injustice in languages education.

In England, although there are examples of good practice (see e.g. Anderson et al., 2016; Foley, 2018), EAL learners tend to be integrated in mainstream classes, often without specialist support. Headline data masks the differentials of attainment: for example, attainment is often noticeably much lower in locations with a higher percentage of EAL pupils (Choudry, 2018). Uptake for modern languages is also reduced in areas of social deprivation. In England, the combining of EAL and CLIL pedagogies is beginning to be researched as part of addressing the pressing need for effective approaches and professional

development for learners in all multilingual settings (Coyle et al., 2021). Coyle et al.'s (2021) study in England for example, reports the combining of EAL and CLIL pedagogies in a multilingual school in an area of deprivation, where 42 languages are spoken, and newly arrived migrants follow a values-driven parallel curriculum. Here diversity is embraced. All learners are considered different from one other, and each student is understood to bring unique experiences, strengths, and ideas to the learning environment- and these enrich the environment to the benefit of all

Australia's successful 'rich task' EAL programme has enabled it to become the only OECD country where first- and second- generation migrant and refugee students score at or above the national average on international tests (Thomson et al., 2017). Cruickshank et al.'s (2018) study with eight low socio-economic secondary schools with high populations (80%+) of bilingual students focused on improving student engagement and teacher professional knowledge in science, language and literacy. Findings indicate substantial gains in working, thinking, and writing scientifically as a result of teacher sustained, onsite teacher professional learning and enquiry. However, the situation for heritage languages differs. Australia has one of the lowest rates of provision of languages of all OECD countries and NSW, despite the wealth of linguistic resources students bring to school, has the lowest rate of provision in Australia. In Victoria, on the other hand, the number of Community Languages schools is quite high and the number of students who attend these is also significant. Between 28% and 32% of households in Victoria are bilingual. Collaboration in the combining of EAL 'rich task' and CLIL pedagogies between the UK and Australia has begun and a larger scale research project is on hold due to the pandemic.

CONCLUSION

Exploration of the contexts of the UK and Australia has provided an overview of the CLIL pedagogical approach, potential learner gains and its current trajectory in both Anglophone contexts. Online resources for commonly taught LOTEs are becoming available. However, it will be important to further advance professional learning for teachers and leaders – not only to seek to increase the numbers of teachers, and thereby learners, confident in these pedagogical approaches, but also to develop capacity beyond the basics so that teachers' understanding of diversity, learner-driven pedagogies, collaborative learning environment and multilingual classrooms continues to be deepened. Given the rapidly increasing multicultural and multilingual nature of our classrooms, this is particularly pressing if we are to implement this kind of alternative thinking about, and approaches to, diversity and inclusion in all classrooms and thereby contribute to increasing equity and closing the education gap.

Further research, especially longitudinal studies, are needed in LOTE contexts to investigate the impact that CLIL approaches may have on learning over time and the effectiveness of pedagogical approaches as they emerge and develop to meet the needs of all learners. As practice that combines CLIL and EAL approaches develops, it will be important to explore if and how this might enable access to multilingual, multicultural learning for all rather than the few. Theoretical and practical consideration of how CLIL approaches might contribute to the field of literacies in L1 as well as other languages offers further fertile ground for investigation (Bower, Coyle, Cross, et al., 2020).

The incorporation of socially inclusive pedagogies such as those advocated by Gale et al. (2017) are needed by teachers across our education systems - the pedagogical principles and cooperative nature of the CLIL learning environment have the potential to become part of the way forward. The combining of pedagogies in a reconceptualisation of languages education from a holistic perspective thus offers potential progress in meeting the learning needs of *all* learners.

Further reading

Paniagua and Istance (2018). Teachers as Designers of Learning Environments. The Importance of Innovative Pedagogies). OECD Paris

Paniagua and Istance explore how focusing on pedagogies, (as we do in CLIL), shifts the perception of teachers from technicians who strive to attain the education goals set by the curriculum to experts in the art and science of teaching. Seen through this lens, innovation in teaching becomes a problem-solving process rooted in teachers' professionalism, rather than an add-on applied by only some teachers in some schools.

Bower, Coyle, Cross, et al. (2020). Curriculum Integrated Language Teaching: CLIL in Practice. Cambridge University Press

This book addresses the issues of developing CLIL in Anglophone and similar LOTE contexts and shows how to implement this method of language learning successfully in the classroom. Through three key themes, sustainability, pedagogy and social justice, each author explores CLIL as a means of addressing cultural diversity and socio-economic disparity. It offers a set of flexible teaching tools for all contexts, which serve to combine language and content, ultimately enhancing the learning experience of students.

Coyle and Meyer (2021). Beyond CLIL: Pluriliteracies Teaching for Deeper Learning. Cambridge University Press

Coyle and Meyer propose a pluriliteracies approach to move beyond CLIL, providing strong theoretical grounding and explaining how to put this understanding into practice. Pluriliteracies aims to facilitate deeper learning through an explicit focus on disciplinary literacies, guiding learners towards textual fluency, encouraging successful communication across cultures, and providing a key stepping-stone towards becoming responsible global citizens.

References

- ALL. (2021). *Association for Language Learning CLIL Zone* <https://www.all-languages.org.uk/research-practice/clil-zone/>
- AFMLTA, (2021) Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations. National Languages Plan and Strategy. Retrieved from: <https://nlps.afmlta.asn.au/>
- Anderson, C., Foley, Y., Sangster, P., Edwards, V., & Rassool, N. (2016). Policy, pedagogy and pupil perceptions: EAL in Scotland and England. *CERES, University of Edinburgh*. From, <http://www.ceres.education.ed.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Policy-Pedagogy-and-Pupil-Perceptions-Final-full-report.pdf> (Accessed 16th April 2017).
- Baker, J. (2021, 8 May). NSW students lag Australia and world in learning second language: teachers. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. <https://www.smh.com.au/national/nsw/nsw-students-lag-australia-and-world-in-learning-second-language-teachers-20210506-p57pm6.html>
- Ball, S. J. (2017). *The education debate*. Policy Press.
- Bartholemy, C. (2021). *CLIL in Languages Other Than English – Successful Transitions across Educational Stages. Curriculum and teacher training in Switzerland CLIL LOTE Transitions Project*, Online.
- Baten, K., Van Hiel, S., & De Cuypere, L. (2020). Vocabulary Development in a CLIL Context: A Comparison between French and English L2. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(2), 307-336.
- Bower, K. (2013). *To what extent does content and language integrated learning (CLIL) as a language-based project approach promote pupil motivation in the teaching of MFL in three secondary schools in England?* University of Hull.
- Bower, K. (2019a). School leaders' perspectives on content and language integrated learning in England. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2019.1667367>
- Bower, K. (2019b). 'Speaking French alive': learner perspectives on their motivation in Content and Language Integrated Learning in England. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 13(1), 45-60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2017.1314483>
- Bower, K. (2020). Three schools, three models: senior leaders' views about the value of CLIL in their school. In K. Bower, D. Coyle, R. Cross, & G. N. Chambers (Eds.),

Curriculum integrated language teaching: CLIL in practice. Cambridge University Press.

Bower, K. (2021a). *ADiBE Professional Development Course Part1: Content and Language Integrated Learning for ALL* CLIL 2021, Online. <https://adibeproject.com/>

Bower, K. (2021b). Content and language integrated learning in England: Missed opportunities and ways forward. In *Language learning in Anglophone countries* (pp. 267-287). Springer.

Bower, K., Coyle, D., & Cross, R. (2020). CLIL in multilingual and English-background contexts: expanding the potential of content and language integrated pedagogies for mainstream learning. In K. Bower, D. Coyle, R. Cross, & G. N. Chambers (Eds.), *Curriculum integrated language teaching: CLIL in practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Bower, K., Coyle, D., Cross, R., Chambers, G. N., Gieron, M., Lasagabaster, D., Meiers, G., Smala, S., & San Isidro, X. (2020). *Curriculum integrated language teaching: CLIL in practice* (K. Bower, D. Coyle, R. Cross, & G. N. Chambers, Eds.). Cambridge University Press.

BritishCouncil. (2014). *Drafting a New Strategy for CLIL in Europe. Recommendations from the policy workshop in Como 10-12 March 2014* https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/clil_recommendations_august_14_pdf.pdf

Choudry, S. (2018). The attainment of EAL pupils in England – What the headlines don't tell us. <https://naldic.org.uk/https-ealjournal-org-2018-02-01-the-attainment-of-eal-pupils-in-england-what-the-headlines-dont-tell-us/>

Clyne, M. G. (1991). *Community languages: the Australian experience*. Cambridge University Press.

Coleman, J. A., Galaczi, A., & Astruc, L. (2007). Motivation of UK school pupils towards foreign languages: a large-scale survey at Key Stage 3. *The Language Learning Journal*, 35(2), 245-281. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730701599252>

Collen, I. (2020). *Language Trends 2020. Language teaching in primary and secondary schools in England*. BritishCouncil. <https://www.britishcouncil.org/research-policy-insight/research-reports/language-trends-2020>

Collen, I. (2021a). *Language Trends 2021. Language teaching in primary and secondary schools in England*. Retrieved 14.7.21, from <https://www.britishcouncil.org/research-policy-insight/research-reports/language-trends-2021>

- Collen, I. (2021b). A Review from Northern Ireland of the Linguistic Devolution of Primary School Languages. In *Language Learning in Anglophone Countries* (pp. 117-133). Springer.
- Coyle, D. (2011). *ITALIC Research Report Investigating Student Gains: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. University of Aberdeen, Esmée Fairbairn Foundation. www.abdn.ac.uk/italic
- Coyle, D., Bower, K., Foley, Y., & Hancock, J. (2021). Teachers as Designers of Learning in Diverse Bilingual Classrooms: A UK Case Study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1989373>
- Coyle, D., Hood, H., & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cross, R. (2012). Creative in finding creativity in the curriculum: The CLIL second language classroom. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 39(4), 431-445.
- Cross, R. (2015). Defining Content and Language Integrated Learning for Languages Education in Australia. *Babel*, 49(2), 4-15.
- Cross, R. (2016). Language and content 'integration': The affordances of additional languages as a tool within a single curriculum space. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 48(3), 388-408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2015.1125528>
- Cross, R., & Bower, K. (2018). CLIL in Australia and the UK: Similar or different? AARE, Sydney.
- Cross, R., & Gearon, M. (2013). *Research and Evaluation of the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Approach to Teaching and Learning in Victorian Schools*.
- Cruickshank, K., Ellsmore, M., & Brownlee, P. (2018). *The Skills in Question. Report on the Professional Learning Strengths and Needs of Teachers in the NSW Community Languages Schools to the NSW Community Languages Schools Advisory Board*.
- Cruickshank, K., Sutherland, L., & Markauskaite, L. (2020). *Investigating EALD Education in Secondary Science: Project Report*.
- Daryai-Hansen, P. (2020-2023). *CLIL LOTE transitions project*. European Centre for Modern Languages. www.ecml.at/CLILLOTEtransitions
- De Courcy, M. (2002). *Learners' Experiences of Immersion Education. Case studies of French and Chinese*. Multilingual Matters.

- De Smet, A., Mettwie, L., Galand, B., Hiligsmann, P., & Van Mensel, L. (2018). Classroom anxiety and enjoyment in CLIL and non-CLIL: Does the target language matter? *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(1), 47-71.
- De Smet, A., Mettwie, L., Hiligsmann, P., Galand, B., & Van Mensel, L. (2019). Does CLIL shape language attitudes and motivation? Interactions with target languages and instruction levels. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1671308>
- DfE. (2020). *Schools, pupils and their characteristics*
- DfES. (2002). *Languages for All: Languages for Life- a strategy for England*.
- Dobson, A. (2020). Context is everything: reflections on CLIL in the UK. *The Language Learning Journal*, 48(5), 508-518.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2020.1804104>
- Dooly, M. (2008). Content and language integrated learning: Introduction. In D. E. M. Dooly (Ed.), *"How we're going about it." Teachers' voices on innovative approaches to teaching and learning languages* (pp. 104-108). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- EuropeanCommission/EACEA/Eurydice. (2017). *Key data on teaching languages at school in Europe – 2017 Edition*. . European Commission.
- Eurydice. (2006). *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe* (E. U. o. t. E. Commission, Ed.). European Commission.
- Eurydice at NFER. (2005). *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at schools in Europe, England, Wales and Northern Ireland, National Description 2004/2005*. European Commission.
- Foley, Y., Anderson, C., Conteh, J., & Hancock, J. (2018). Initial teacher education and English as an additional language. *CERES. The University of Edinburgh*.
- Gale, T., Mills, C., & Cross, R. (2017). Socially inclusive teaching: Belief, design, action as pedagogic work. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 68(3), 345-356.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487116685754>
- Government, N. I. (2015). Irish-medium Schools. <https://www.education-ni.gov.uk/articles/irish-medium-schools>

- Haataja, K., Kruczinna, R., Àrkossy, K., & Costa Afonso, C. (2011). *CLIL-LOTE-START - European Centre for Modern Languages* (E. C. f. M. Languages, Ed.)
<https://www.ecml.at/Portals/1/documents/ECML-resources/CLIL-LOTE-START-EN.pdf>
- Hunt, M. (2011). Learners' perceptions of their experiences of learning subject content through a foreign language [Article]. *Educational Review*, 63(3), 365-378.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2011.571765>
- Hutchinson, J., Reader, M., & Akhal, A. (2020). *Education in England: Annual Report*
<https://epi.org.uk/publications-and-research/education-in-england-annual-report-2020/>
- Lanvers, U. (2017). Contradictory others and the habitus of languages: Surveying the L2 motivation landscape in the United Kingdom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(3), 517-532.
- Lanvers, U., & Chambers, G. (2019). In the Shadow of Global English? Comparing Language Learner Motivation in Germany and the United Kingdom. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Motivation for Language Learning* (pp. 429-448). Springer.
- Lanvers, U., Thompson, A. S., & East, M. (2021). Introduction: Is Language Learning in Anglophone Countries in Crisis? In *Language Learning in Anglophone Countries* (pp. 1-15). Springer.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2011). English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), 3-18.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2010.519030>
- Lasagabaster, D. (2017). Language Learning Motivation and Language Attitudes in Multilingual Spain from an International Perspective. *Modern Language Journal*, 101(3), 583–596. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12414>
- Lasagabaster, D. (2019). Motivation in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Research. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Motivation for Language Learning* (pp. 347-366). Springer.
- Lasagabaster, D., Sierra, J. (2010). Immersion and CLIL in English: more differences than similarities. *ELT*, 64(4), 367-375. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccpo82>
- Lo Bianco, J., & Slaughter, Y. (2009). *Second languages and Australian schooling*. . ACER Press Australian Council for Educational Research.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285580967_Second_languages_and_Australian_schooling

- Lorenzo, F., & Moore, P. (2010). On the natural emergence of language structures in CLIL. *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*, 7, 23.
- Mac Gearailt, B., Mac Ruairc, G., & Murray, C. (2021). Actualising Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in Irish-medium education; why, how and why now? *Irish Educational Studies*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2021.1910971>
- Meyer, O., & Coyle, D. (2017). Pluriliteracies Teaching for Learning: conceptualizing progression for deeper learning in literacies development. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 199-222. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2017-0006>
- Mills, B., & Tinsley, T. (2020). *Boys studying modern foreign languages at GCSE in schools in England*. British Council. <https://epi.org.uk/publications-and-research/boys-studying-foreign-languages/> www.britishcouncil.org
- NALA. (2020). *National Association of Language Advisors (NALA) survey: The languages curriculum and disadvantaged students*. <https://www.nala.org.uk/2020/05/languages-curriculum-vulnerable-and-disadvantaged-students/>
- Nuffield Foundation. (2000). *Languages: the next generation: the final report and recommendations of the Nuffield Languages Inquiry*.
- Ohki, S. (2022). A sociocultural perspective of risk: *An activity theoretical investigation into the influence of risk on teachers' pedagogical knowledge and practice in a content and language integrated learning (CLIL) context* [PhD thesis, The University of Melbourne]. Melbourne, Australia.
- ONS. (2011). *2011 Census* <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>
- Pavón, V. V., & Rubio, A. F. D. (2010). Teachers' concerns and uncertainties about the introduction of CLIL programmes. *Porta Linguarum: Revista Internacional de Didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras*(14), 45-58.
- Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2018). *Attention to Diversity in Bilingual Education (ADiBE)* <https://adibeproject.com>
- Peterson, M. (2021). *The Challenges and Rewards of the CLIL Unit Design Process. Sharing our story of how we introduced CLIL to increase the engagement of students' learning of Italian*. Language World, Online.
- Rumlich, D. (2017). CLIL theory and empirical reality—Two sides of the same coin?: A quantitative-longitudinal evaluation of general EFL proficiency and affective-motivational dispositions in CLIL students at German secondary schools. *Journal of*

Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 5(1), 110-134.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.5.1.05rum>

San Isidro, X., & Lasagabaster, D. (2020). Lessons to be learned: a professional development approach to curriculum planning in a multilingual school in Galicia. In K. Bower, C. Coyle, R. Cross, & G. Chambers (Eds.), *Curriculum Integrated Language Teaching: CLIL in Practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Seikkula-Leino, J. (2007). CLIL Learning: Achievement Levels and Affective Factors. *Language and Education*, 21 (4), 328-341. <https://doi.org/10.2167/le635.0>

Smala, S., Paz, J. B., & Lingard, B. (2013). Languages, cultural capital and school choice: Distinction and second-language immersion programmes. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 34(3), 373-391.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2012.722278>

Surmont, J., Struys, E., Van Den Noort, M., & Van De Craen, P. (2016). The effects of CLIL on mathematical content learning: A longitudinal study. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), 319-337.

Sylvén, L. K. (2013). CLIL in Sweden—Why does it not work? A metaperspective on CLIL across contexts in Europe. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 301-320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.777387>

Tedick, D. J., Christian, D., & Fortune, T. W. (2011). *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities* (Vol. 83). Multilingual Matters.

TheEducationDirectorate. (2017). Welsh in education Action plan 2017–21.
<https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2018-02/welsh-in-education-action-plan-2017%E2%80%9321.pdf>

Thomson, S., De Bortoli, L., & Underwood, C. (2017). *PISA 2015: Reporting Australia's results*.

Tinsley, T., & Board, K. (2017). Language Trends 2016/7. Language teaching in primary and secondary schools in England survey report.
https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/language_trends_survey_2017_0.pdf

Tinsley, T., & Doležal, N. (2018). *Language Trends 2018: Language teaching in primary and secondary schools in England survey report*.
<https://www.britishcouncil.org/research-policy-insight/research-reports/language-trends-2018>

- Turner, M. (2013a). CLIL in Australia: The importance of context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(4), 395-410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.691086>
- Turner, M. (2013b). Content-based Japanese language teaching in Australian schools: Is CLIL a good fit? *Japanese Studies*, 33(3), 315-330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10371397.2013.846211>
- Turner, M. (2015). The significance of affordances on teachers' choices: Embedding Japanese across the curriculum in Australian secondary schools. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(3), 276-290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2015.1085063>
- Turner, M. (2019). The positioning of Japanese in a secondary CLIL science classroom in Australia: Language use and the learning of content. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 7(2), 192-211. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.18021.tur>
- Turner, M., & Cross, R. (2016). Making space for multilingualism in Australian schooling. *Language and Education*, 30(4), 289-297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2015.1114627>
- Turner, M., & Fielding, R. (2020). CLIL Teacher training and teachers' choices: exploring planned language use in the Australian context. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2020.1792920>
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and racial studies*, 30(6), 1024-1054. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465>
- VictorianDfE. (2011). *Victorian Department of Education and Early Childhood Development. The Victorian Government's vision for languages education.* .
- VictorianDfE. (2013). *Languages—Expanding your world: Plan for implementing the Victorian Government's vision for languages education.* V. Department for Education.
- VictorianGovernment. (2018). *Fuse* <https://fuse.education.vic.gov.au/pages/clil>
- Waldegrave, H., & Simons, J. (2014). Watching the watchmen. *Policy Exchange, London*, at: www.policyexchange.org.uk/images/publications/watching%20the%20watchmen.pdf.
- Wiesemes, R. (2005). *The Final Report for the Content and Language Integrated Project.*

Wright, J., Cruickshank, K., & Black, S. (2018). Languages discourses in Australian middle-class schools: parent and student perspectives. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 39(1), 98-112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2016.1232536>

Zindler, K. (2013). Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and PE in England. *An Exploratory Study. Ph Thesis. University of Sheffield: Sheffield.*