38
ELF and Content and Language Integrated Learning

Julia Hüttner

Introduction

This handbook is devoted to English as a lingua franca (ELF) and hence "any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option" (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 7), and the chapters presented give evidence of the unprecedented use of ELF in all manner of settings, both geographical and contextual. This chapter, however, addresses Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and so an "educational approach where subjects such as geography or biology are taught through the medium of a foreign language, typically to students participating in some form of mainstream education at primary, secondary but also tertiary level" (Dalton-Puffer *et al.*, 2010, p. 1) and so its inclusion here might seem incongruous at first sight. After all, even though CLIL participants choose to use English for their education, they do clearly have another option, namely the main educational language of their context, which is typically the first language (L1) of the majority of CLIL participants. So CLIL English language practices in the classroom are typically *not* lingua franca uses.

Nevertheless, I would argue that there are crucial points of contact (and some of clear contrast) between CLIL and ELF, which have so far been little explored (but see Dalton-Puffer and Smit, 2016) and where a greater understanding might be of mutual benefit to researchers of CLIL and ELF, and to educational practitioners. This contribution will start by providing an overview of CLIL and its main research findings, followed by a section aiming to highlight areas where ELF impinges on CLIL in the areas of language policy, beliefs and practices. For reasons of space and focus, I do not address CLIL at the tertiary level (but see Smit 2010 and Chapter 31 this volume) or non-mainstream English-medium programmes, such as international or European schools.

CLIL: definition and overview of research

CLIL is a cover term for a variety of educational practices where non-language subjects are taught through a foreign language, typically to school-age students. It has been defined as "a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the

learning and teaching of both content and language" (Coyle *et al.*, 2010), but research into the varied CLIL practices shows clearly that despite this dual-focus aim, pedagogic reality varies. Frequently, this integration is not encapsulated in the individual CLIL classroom, but at best in the overall educational experience of students, who usually enjoy focused foreign language teaching in addition to the CLIL classes, which are in most cases staffed, scheduled and assessed in terms of their subject content. There have been attempts at capturing the potentials of introducing CLIL to the curriculum by reference to the conceptual framework of the "4Cs" (Coyle, 2007), i.e. content (subject matter), cognition, (thinking processes), communication (language) and cultural (intercultural awareness), but the extent to which these dimensions have become part of CLIL curricula varies tremendously.

These initial remarks already point to the fact that CLIL cannot be described as one uniform pedagogical practice, but that it is rather an umbrella for a variety of practices, which share some 'family resemblance' and are heavily influenced by contextual factors. For the sake of clarity, it is also necessary to be explicit about the fact that CLIL shares aspects of other types of bilingual education (see Cenoz *et al.*, 2014; Dalton-Puffer *et al.*, 2014). Like in many educational areas, fuzzy boundaries between practices exist, and it seems most helpful to consider various types of bilingual education along continua addressing the other languages involved in teaching, the focus of teaching (language and/or content), the qualifications of teachers in terms of language and/or content, the situation of the language used and the learners in terms of minority, majority or foreign language and the intensity of the teaching programme. This contribution will focus only on CLIL at secondary and primary levels of education.

Even though the term CLIL has gained currency in Asia, Latin America and Australia, it remains most closely associated with the European educational landscape. Its coinage in the 1990s aimed to encompass a programmatic, language political standpoint towards fostering European multilingualism through providing innovative educational alternatives by moving bilingual education into European educational practice, without the connotations of elite bilingualism (and elite schools) or of the discourse of "problems" associated with bilingual education for migrant children. Very quickly, the acronym CLIL "acquired some characteristics of a brand name, complete with the symbolic capital of positive description: innovative, modern, effective, efficient and forward-looking" (Dalton-Puffer *et al.*, 2010, p. 3) and has enjoyed tremendous uptake across Europe at all educational levels. CLIL practices found their way into schools both on the basis of bottom-up initiatives of teachers and parents, for instance in Austria, and as a result of explicit educational policies, as in the Netherlands (www.europeesplatform.nl) and in several Spanish regions (Dalton-Puffer and Smit, 2013). With a slight time-delay to the booming of CLIL practices, CLIL research began to flourish and is now represented in several groups and initiatives, such as the CLIL research network of AILA (http://clil-ren.org/).

Arguably the main strand of CLIL research is in studying the outcomes of CLIL on student achievements, primarily in the foreign language, reflecting the positioning of CLIL as a language learning and teaching endeavour. Many of these studies take the form of comparisons between students attending CLIL classes and those in regular education, and this set-up merits a few critical remarks. Especially in the beginning, but still continuing in many contexts, CLIL was an option for students, so there is an expectation that students in CLIL classes are more motivated and better foreign language users than their non-CLIL counterparts to start with. An additional difficulty lies in the fact that CLIL is complementary to regular EFL classes, so it is not possible to say what CLIL on its own would achieve in terms of student language learning, but only what it achieves in addition to regular EFL.

The expectation based on this situation is that CLIL learners outperform their non-CLIL peers, and this is largely borne out in research (see e.g., Admiraal *et al.*, 2006). A closer look at which language areas most benefit from CLIL instruction is arguably more interesting, and seems to highlight that oral proficiency and vocabulary benefit the most (see e.g. Agustín-Llach and Canga Alonso, 2016; Heras and Lasagabaster, 2014; Jexenflicker and Dalton-Puffer, 2010). Despite the generally positive view of the effects of CLIL on vocabulary, Tragant *et al.* (2016) suggest that although CLIL science materials provide more challenging vocabulary input, the learning of productive vocabulary is more successful in the ELT context for their primary school participants.

Later research aimed at addressing the content learning of CLIL students; a challenging endeavour given the fact that there are many contexts where there are no standardised tests at schools in content subjects and even more contextual variation in terms of which content is taught. Findings in this area are overall rather mixed, with research citing improved content learning through CLIL (e.g. van de Craen *et al.*, 2007), studies that indicate less content learning through CLIL (e.g. Lim Falk, 2008) and a cluster of research suggesting an overall zero effect of CLIL on content learning (e.g.; Admiraal *et al.*, 2006; Jäppinen, 2005). Clearly more structured and large-scale studies are needed in this area, with key involvement of content specialists.

A growing cluster of CLIL research addresses classroom discourse in CLIL (e.g. Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Jakonen and Morton, 2013; Llinares *et al.*, 2012; Nikula, 2010) and highlights the diversity of roles that English and other languages take in CLIL learning and teaching. It shows the range of interactions and genres that students and teachers engage in, as well as the adaptions to pedagogy which result from an increased language awareness. Finally, there is increased research into teacher and learner beliefs in CLIL (e.g. Hüttner *et al.*, 2013; Skinnari and Bovellan, 2016), which establishes the perception on this pedagogic innovation, including motivations for engaging in it, and investigates the effects on (content) teacher identity of engaging in CLIL. Some of the findings of these research areas will be discussed below.

In the following section, I will address areas of CLIL where ELF can be seen to be influential; an area hardly addressed in CLIL research so far. CLIL can be regarded as one of the biggest innovations in European language education and so in many ways as an instance of educational language policy. As mentioned above, however, this is only at some levels related to overt language policies, i.e. in terms of European Commission guidelines. Thus, I argue for viewing CLIL as an exemplar of extended language policy and will structure the discussion roughly by addressing the three elements identified by Spolsky (2004) as constituting language policy, i.e. language management, language beliefs and language practices.

CLIL and ELF: points of contact at policy level

Language management

CLIL has from its beginning been linked with explicit European language policy, which aims at fostering the ideal of a multilingual European citizen. The European Commission's 1995 White Paper sets out that the widely quoted "mother tongue plus 2" policy, or to be precise the aim that "upon completing initial training every [European] should be able to communicate in two Community foreign languages" (European Commission, 1995, p. 47). Furthermore, this White Paper states that the way towards achieving this aim is for school students to "study certain subjects in the first foreign language learned" (ibid.), i.e. through CLIL.

One of the most notable facts about the EU official policy documents lies in their complete negation of any difference between English as a CLIL language, or German, French, Estonian or Bulgarian. This is in line with other European initiatives, like the Common European Framework for Languages (CFR), which does not distinguish between target languages and so ignores Graddol's (2006) view that English proficiency is gaining a similar status to computing skills, i.e. a requirement for all professionals, similarly to advanced literacy and numeracy). That an attitude of 'all school languages are equal' might be unhelpful to all has been argued by Seidlhofer (2003), who proposes viewing English as separate in the canon of foreign languages at schools, and so ensuring safe ecological space for other languages.

However, despite such an ELF-ignoring attitude of pan-EU policies on CLIL, the interim official levels of the individual EU members states or specific regional educational authorities has largely been void of any substantial provision of CLIL policies (with the exception of Italy, Spain and the Netherlands), and so the interpretation of this EU guideline favouring CLIL as part of multilingualism strategy is very open. In fact, bottom-up CLIL movements have – without sanctions from European policy-makers – moved towards re-branding the official EU aim as learning to use the "L1 plus *the* language of wider communication = English" (Dalton-Puffer and Smit, 2016), and so taking a much more ELF-aware position.[1]

Language beliefs

This somewhat diverse interpretation of CLIL policy in the local context points towards the importance of understanding Spolsky's second area of extended language policy, i.e. language beliefs, in the uncovering of the links between ELF and CLIL. Language beliefs cover the complex cluster of intuitive, subjective knowledge about the nature of language, language use and language learning, taking into account both cognitive and social dimensions, as well as cultural assumptions (cf. Barcelos, 2003, p. 8ff). The importance of considering beliefs in language teaching enterprises has been highlighted with regards to several aspects; these include decision-making in the classroom (Borg, 2006; Graus and Coppen, 2015), uptake and evaluation of new pedagogical approaches (Hüttner *et al.*, 2013; Tan, 2011) and the success or failure of teacher education programmes and activities (Borg, 2011; Freeman and Richards, 1996). The importance of understanding CLIL teachers' beliefs has been acknowledged (Dalton-Puffer and Nikula, 2014, p. 118), but is not (yet) one of the major research foci.

As is to be expected in research on a pedagogical innovation, the questions of more general language beliefs have rarely featured in CLIL research. This relates importantly to the issue of what language stakeholders envisage to be the "L" in CLIL and here findings suggest that the views expressed in the European policy papers of CLIL as a tool fostering multilingualism or of the more general cognitive and cultural benefits as expressed in the CLIL compendium find little reflection in practice. By contrast, English is considered the main and in some sense 'most obvious' CLIL language, and participants frequently link the benefits of CLIL to the (perceived) benefits of learning to use English in a manner that relates to its position in the world, i.e. to its use as a lingua franca with a preponderance of use in work-related positions.

On a very general level, this specific position given to English is shown in the responses to the Eurobarometer in 2012 on attitudes to languages, where 79 per cent of Europeans responded that English is the most useful foreign language to learn, with the next positions at 20 per cent held equally by German and French (European Commission, 2012).

Support for this is found in Otwinowska and Forys' (2015) study on 10- and 11-year-old Polish CLIL learners, who responded positively to the statement that "English is an important language and I want to learn it well", i.e. at point 4.9 and 5.7 on a 6-point Likert scale, with 6 constituting the 'strongly agree' option. A question remains, however, whether this acknowledgement of the importance of English has results on the conceptualisation of English as native language, lingua franca or something else.

One way into a better understanding of the views on what kind of English is used in CLIL can be sought by delving into studies of CLIL teachers' and students' views of their English proficiency and targets in CLIL. More specifically, this focuses on their views towards the need of using or targeting native-like English, which is partly reflected in beliefs surrounding correction practices. As is to be expected in an educational approach that is far from uniform, diverse responses emerge in this respect, with some differences apparently related to the age of the CLIL learners involved.

Thus, at primary level, Bovellan (2014) found that CLIL teachers in Finland embraced a native-speaker ideology and described their own English proficiency with "insecure and dismissive terms" (p. 174). Such a clear rejection of any non-native language use is not replicated at secondary levels of education, where Moate (2011), again in Finland, offers a more differentiated picture of upper-secondary CLIL teacher beliefs on their English. In the initial phases of their CLIL practice, some participants reported fear and insecurity about their use of English, going so far as to talk of parts of their brain being "paralysed" (Moate, 2011, p. 337). With more experience of CLIL, however, the same participants reported a change in their relationship to English and towards themselves as L2 English users, now reporting a high level of acceptance of 'mistakes' and other features of 'Finnish English', indications of a weakening of a native speaker ideology. In the words of one participants: "I do speak [English] now. I commit mistakes all the time, but so it goes" (Moate, 2011, p. 341) leading to the conclusion that "native language skills cannot be demanded of teachers or students" (ibid.).

Dalton-Puffer in her study of Austrian secondary CLIL classes found teachers to agree on the notion that "the great advantage of CLIL is that students do not need to fear being sanctioned for language errors" (2007, p. 227), unlike in ELT classes. That language mistakes are not much of an issue was also expressed by the Dutch CLIL teachers in Denman *et al.*'s (2013) study, who all concurred in adopting the teaching strategy of "encouraging students to carry on if they make mistakes" (p. 296) and finding it to be working well. However, such a rejection of native-speaker targets is not ubiquitous and not necessarily mirrored in teaching practices; Dalton-Puffer (2007, p. 229) reports on teachers systematically correcting EFL-type mistakes, such as third-person -s and adverb/adjective, even though the same teachers were keen to point out that "it was the content that was important".

In upper level secondary education, a link to ELF is made in stakeholders' perception of the (professionally oriented) English learnt through CLIL and an increase the in the employability of students. This use of English is sometimes linked to envisaged professional interactions with other non-native speakers of English . In Hüttner *et al.*'s (2013) study on the beliefs of Austrian CLIL teachers and students in professional colleges, the international aspect of future professional lives of the students, enacted with English (as a lingua franca), became a major justification for CLIL. In the words of a content teacher: "a vocational school trains for the job and with all this globalisation it is actually unthinkable to manage without English" (Hüttner *et al.*, 2013, p. 279). This connection between CLIL, English (as a lingua franca) and employability is made also in the context of Hong Kong (Li, 2002). The fact that this professional practice is not linked to native-speaker norms is apparent in the critical view of many content teachers on the potential of native-speaker assistants

or ELT teachers as "being out of [their] depth" when teaching students, e.g., how to write chemistry reports. Nevertheless, there is a clear realm for native-speaker ideology in these CLIL participants' minds and that is the ELT classroom, which is constructed largely as complementary to CLIL. While participants positioned the language learning and use in CLIL as relevant to professional futures (at times enacted through ELF), ELT was seen as addressing more personal language needs, but also the place where you "actually learn the language". One student participant summarise this view as: "the technical stuff is one thing, where you do technology in English, and the other thing is the English lessons where you talk about your hobbies" (Hüttner *et al.* 2013, p. 279)

The current research base on CLIL stakeholder beliefs is still somewhat thin, but a type of continuum seems to emerge, where ELT is positioned as encompassing clear native-speaker orientation, in terms of language use, role differential between teachers and students, and correction practices, followed by primary school CLIL, where CLIL teachers feel the pressure of conforming to native-speaker standards and the more different secondary level CLIL, where teachers become more relaxed in their position as content experts first and foremost, with room for language practices more akin to ELF. However, the presence of disciplinary norms in language use continues in these settings.

CLIL and ELF: the practice level

The position of other languages

While it is an 'obvious truth' that most ELF speakers have multilingual repertoires, it is only very recently that Jenkins (2015) argued for a reconceptualization of ELF as "English as a multilingual franca" by pointing out that "the relationship between English and other languages in respect of the multilingualism of most ELF users and the 'multicompetence of the community'" (p. 59) has so far not received due focus in ELF research (but see Cogo, 2012; Kalocsai, 2014). While I agree with Jenkins that a "more multilingual turn" in ELF conceptualisation is beneficial to our understanding of the complexity of ELF, there remain distinct differences with the bilingual practices present in CLIL. One of the main differences between ELF and CLIL interactions lies not in the fact that in both cases speakers have multilingual repertoires, but in the known shared linguistic repertoires. Thus, in typical ELF situations, English is the one language participants know they share from the outset of an interaction, whereas in CLIL from the outset participants know that the shared repertoire is the local educational language *plus* English. Given that the majority of CLIL programmes involve a maximum of 50 per cent of instruction taught through the foreign language, and the strong tendency for CLIL to start at secondary school level, high levels of competence of all participants in the local educational language exist and so all CLIL participants can and do resort to this language. Thus, from the outset, CLIL constitutes an (acknowledged) bilingual situation. Moore and Nikula (2016) even suggest that CLIL should stand for content and language*s* integrated learning, to acknowledge the position of the L1 in this learning endeavour.

As a way of conceptualising this bilingual practice I will here adopt the notion of translanguaging (García and Li, 2014), which "posits that bilinguals have *one linguistic repertoire* from which they select features *strategically* to communicate effectively" (García, 2012, p. 1, emphasis in original). In line with ELT classrooms, an area of a considerable amount of L1 use in CLIL concerns interactions in the regulative register, which often relate to issues of classroom management. Given the presence of such regulative register only in

educational contexts, similar practices are not observed in typical ELF interactions. Dalton-Puffer (2007, p. 102) in her study of Austrian secondary classrooms found that student questions relating to the location and use of materials or to aspects of organising tasks and activities were by default in the L1. Similarly, teachers reported using the L1 for a number of regulative functions, but also to intensify content learning, check understanding and make cross-linguistic comparisons (Gierlinger, 2015; Lasagabaster, 2013). In contrast to many ELT classrooms, Moore and Nikula (2016) found in a study that brought together extant data from secondary CLIL classrooms in Austria, Finland and Spain that the use of the L1 by students was rarely criticised or forbidden by CLIL teachers as long as it displayed a clear orientation to the ongoing interaction, reflecting patterns of behaviour typical in bilingual communities, and arguably also some ELF interactions.

An area of some overlap with ELF interactions lies in the apparently greater acceptance of bilingual word-play and innovation. Kontio and Sylvén's (2015) study on CLIL in vocational schools in Sweden shows the boys' use of bilingual language play, as in the following exchange, where the students try to figure out how to use hydraulic power and levers to get a flywheel to move.

Extract 1 (Engineering workshop)

1 Rob Men ((Sw: But)
2 Ken Men ((Sw: But)
3 Ben Ja (.) men (Sw: Yeah, but)
4 Rob Men vad (Sw: But, what)
5 Ken Men in blue ((smiley voice))

The humour in this interaction relies on the bilingual homonymy of 'men', but line 5 also shows how the students appear to create an identity – as working men in their blue boiler suits? – for themselves through English. Moore and Nikula (2016) report on neologisms, based on mergers of resources of both languages, produced by teachers and students in CLIL, including "protestantist", and "patented agency" (for patent office). In the example given below, the Spanish student creates a neologism for the English 'mop' from the Spanish 'fregona'.

Extract 2 (Geography)

1 S: that instead of the (.) eh men that have to sweep with
2 water all the city (.) we have not to (.) eh (.) make dirty
3 the city
4 T: aha () very good (.) so taking care about that (.) very
5 good M (.) something else
6 S: no cleaning the city with fregons ((children laugh))
7 no (.) no
8 T: ok ok [our … our language inventor]
9 S: [with with with water]
10 SS: Fregons fregons @@

(Moore and Nikula, 2016, p. 226)

One major use of translanguaging in CLIL relates to subject-specific terminology, where frequently translations of terms are sought and offered, sometimes in lieu of and sometimes in addition to paraphrases or explanations in English. To some degree, this is a time-efficient

practice to ensure that key concepts are clear to the students, and often used as a short-cut by students (Dalton-Puffer, 2007, p. 150). The following example illustrates the use of translation within definitions.

Extract 3 (History)

1 T: what is a peace treaty
2 S1: ein Friedensvertrag (G: a peace treaty)
3 S2: Friedensvertrag
4 T: Friedensvertrag

(Dalton-Puffer, 2007, p. 137)

In contrast to typical ELT classrooms, there are instances of such translanguaging surrounding technical terms initiated by teacher uncertainty with regard to the English term. Such insecurity and also the pattern of students providing the required English terms seems, however, not to be considered a threat to teacher's professional self-image, something that was also borne out in Hüttner *et al.* (2013). The example below from a Finnish classroom shows the teacher using a genuine question in line 5 and accepting the student's contribution and corrections in this instance of a joint construction of (language) knowledge.

Extract 4 (Biology)

1 T: what's [left] from the gills is called um the finnish
2 S3: [oh]
3 T: word is nielurisat (F: tonsils) [or] kitarisat (F: adenoids)
4 S1: [tonsils]
5 T: what are [they in en-]
6 S1: [the tonsils] tonsils
7 T: tadgies ((misheard))
8 S1: tonsils
9 T: tosins
10 S1: tonsils
11 T: tonsils

(Moore Nikula, 2016, p. 224)

Finally, the use of translanguaging reflects an educational aim, acknowledged by many CLIL teachers, of ensuring that students are bilingual in terms of their competence in subject-specific language. In the example below from a history lesson for 13–14-year-olds in Spain, we can see how technical Spanish terms are made a legitimate teaching object in a CLIL class.

Extract 5 (History)

1 T: Why can't you use the same land without leaving it to rest?
2 S: Because you plant different things.
3 T: Good. By planting different things which need different
4 substances from the earth. Do you know in Spanish?
5 Does anybody know the Spanish word for when the land rests?
6 S: erm
7 T: La tierra esta en … (Sp: The land is in …)

8 S: ba-
9 T: en?
10 S: barbecho (Sp: fallow)
11 T: Barbecho good good
12 Esta es la palabra espanola (Sp: This is the Spanish word)
13 that many of you don't know but you have to learn it too.
14 Spanish words OK?

(Llinares et al., *2012, p. 35)*

To summarise, we see that while both CLIL and ELF are potentially bilingual practices, CLIL is so in an acknowledged fashion with clear roles for 'the other' language, both interactionally and pedagogically.

A different set of norms? Focus on disciplinary language in CLIL

The final point above links to another area of both contrast and contact to ELF, namely the focus on subject-specific language in CLIL. As CLIL has, by definition, an agenda of fostering the learning of disciplinary content, it is hardly surprising that the concurrent vocabulary, genres and quite generally, "particular ways of thinking about and doing" (Leung and Street, 2012, p. 9) of a subject loom large (see e.g. Llinares *et al.*, 2012; Llinares and Morton, 2010; Nikula, 2012, 2015) Thus, while we have seen that many CLIL teachers, especially at secondary levels, are wary of positioning their own or their students' target as native-speaker English, another norm, namely that of the discipline, seems to be strongly present in CLIL classrooms, even if some of the linguistic or generic features related to this might not be openly in teachers' or students' awareness. Hüttner and Smit (2014) argue that the increased exposure and the provision of learning possibilities of subject- or discipline-specific language is one of the main potentials that CLIL can offer. By its very nature, (semi)-technical vocabulary and disciplinary genres are naturally integrated into CLIL, a task much harder to achieve in general ELT.

The one area where currently much of the work on disciplinary language in CLIL is located relates to vocabulary learning, where some studies suggest a success of CLIL in this regard (see e.g. Agustín-Llach and Canga Alonso, 2016; Gablasova, 2014) In the area of genre competence, research has addressed CLIL learners' productions from a perspective of systemic functional linguistics (e.g. Whittaker *et al.*, 2011; Llinares *et al.*, 2012), with findings here suggesting developmental patterns of CLIL students towards, for instance, more appropriate uses of nominalisation patterns in history genres. Dalton-Puffer has recently (2013) suggested the concept of 'cognitive discourse functions' to describe the academic language use in CLIL classrooms, and empirical work using these is under way. Suggestions for using genre as a guiding principle for CLIL curricula and a means of integrating language and content have also been made (e.g. Lorenzo, 2013), but awareness and adoption of genres in CLIL curricula is still sketchy. While research into this area is still in its infancy, initial findings suggest that CLIL provides improved learning affordances for disciplinary language use.

Conclusion

This contribution set out to highlight the nexus between CLIL and ELF and, ideally, to spark more mutual interest into the respective research fields. In many ways, CLIL can be seen as a

set of localised educational responses to the rise of English as a global lingua franca, acknowledged in stakeholder beliefs, even if official EU policies continue to negate any unique status of English. On a level of interactional practice, a key difference between CLIL and ELF lies in CLIL being clearly educational, where the use of English is not a necessity, but a choice made to foster language learning. However, in elements such as the acceptance of language innovation, a partial rejection of native-speaker English as the only valid educational target, CLIL resemble practices found in ELF. In addition, the focus on content and the change in the teacher and student role relationship with regard to language expertise help enrich the educational uses of English at school. In terms of norm-orientation, while native-like English is questioned to some extent in CLIL, another set of norms, related to the discipline, emerge. While not focused on in ELF research so far, the position of professional or disciplinary discourse norms and conventions might be worth a closer look from the ELF perspective.

Practices in CLIL vary enormously, so any conclusions to be drawn from the studies reported here are tentative, but CLIL does seem to have the potential of being the 'missing link' in English language provision at school between the purely educational, and still largely native-speaker oriented ELT classroom, and the reality of a professional, globalised world, where English is of paramount importance – and where in many cases this English is English as a lingua franca.

Note

1 In most cases, this unfortunately does not lead to an awareness of a need for other or additional policies to foster multilingualism in other languages than English or to maintain heritage languages.

Related chapters in this handbook

31 Smit, Beyond monolingualism in higher education: a language policy account

32 Murata and Iino, EMI in higher education: an ELF perspective

Further reading

Coyle, D. Hood, P. and Marsh, D., (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dalton-Puffer, C., (2011). Content and language integrated learning: from practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, pp. 182–204.

Llinares, A., Morton, T. and Whittaker, R., (2012). *The roles of language in CLIL*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nikula, T., Dafouz, E., Moore, P. and Smit, U., eds (2016). *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and multilingual education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism

References

Admiraal, W., Westhoff, G. and de Bot, K., (2006). Evaluation of bilingual secondary education in the Netherlands: students' language proficiency in English. *Educational Research and Evaluation* 12, pp. 75–93.

Agustin-Llach, M.P. and Canga Alonso, A., (2016). Vocabulary growth in young CLIL and traditional EFL learners: evidence from research and implications for education. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 26(2), pp. 211–227.

Barcelos, A.M.F., (2003). Researching beliefs about SLA: a critical review. In P. Kalaja and Barcelos, A.M.F., eds, *Beliefs about SLA: new approaches.* New York: Springer. pp. 7–33.
Borg, S., (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education*. London: Continuum.
Borg, S., (2011). The impact of in-service education on language teachers' beliefs. *System*, 39, pp. 370–380.
Bovellan, E., (2014). Teachers' beliefs about learning and language as reflected in their views of teaching materials for content and language integrated learning (CLIL). PhD. University of Jyvaskyla.
Cenoz, J., Genesee, F. and Gorter, D., (2014). Critical analysis of CLIL: taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 35, pp. 243–262.
Cogo, A., (2012). ELF and super-diversity: a case study of ELF multilingual practices from a business context. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2, pp. 287–313.
Coyle, D., (2007). Content and language integrated learning: towards a connected agenda for CLIL pedagogies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10, pp. 625–646.
Coyle, D., Hood, P. and Marsh, D., (2010). *CLIL: content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dalton-Puffer, C., (2007). *Discourse in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
Dalton-Puffer, C. (2013). A construct of cognitive discourse functions for conceptualising content-language integration in CLIL and multilingual education. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), pp. 216–253.
Dalton-Puffer, C., Llinares, A., Lorenzo, F. and Nikula, T., (2014). "You can stand under my umbrella": immersion, CLIL and bilingual education: a response to Cenoz, Genesee and Gorter (2013). *Applied Linguistics*, 35, pp. 213–218
Dalton-Puffer, C. and Nikula, T., (2014). Guest editorial content and language integrated learning. *The Language Learning Journal*, 42(2), pp. 117–122.
Dalton-Puffer, C. Nikula, T. and Smit, U., eds, (2010). *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
Dalton-Puffer, C. and Smit, U., (2013). Content and language integrated learning: a research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 46(4), pp. 545–559.
Dalton-Puffer, C. and Smit, U., (2016). Content and language integrated learning and ELF. In Pitzl, M. and Osimk-Teasdale, R., eds, *English as a lingua franca: perspectives and prospects.* Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 235–244.
Denman, J., Tanner, R. and de Graaff, R., (2013). CLIL in junior vocational secondary education: challenges and opportunities for teaching and learning. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16, pp. 285–300.
European Commission, (1995). *White paper on education and training: teaching and learning: towards the learning society*. Brussels: European Commission.
European Commission, (2012). *Europeans and their languages* (Eurobarometer). Brussels: European Commission.
Freeman, D. and Richards, J.C., (1996). *Teacher learning in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gablasova, D., (2014). Issues in the assessment of bilingually educated students: expressing subject knowledge through L1 and L2. *The Language Learning Journal,* 42, pp. 151–164.
Gablasova, D., (2015). Learning and retaining specialized vocabulary from textbook reading: comparison of learning outcomes through L1 and L2. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98, pp. 976–991.
García, O., (2012). Theorizing translanguaging for educators. In C. Celic and K. Seltzer, eds, *Translanguaging: a CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators*. New York: CUNY-NYSIEB, pp. 1–6.
García, O. and Li Wei, (2014). *Translanguaging: language, bilingualism and education.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Gierlinger, E., (2015). "You can speak German, Sir": on the complexity of teachers' L1 use in CLIL. *Language and Education*, 29(4), pp. 347–368.
Graddol, D., (2006). *English next*. London: British Council.
Graus, J. and Copppen, P.A., (2015). Student teacher beliefs on grammar instruction. *Language Teaching Research*, 20, pp. 571–559.
Heras, A. and Lasagabaster, D., (2014). The impact of CLIL on affective factors and vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 19, pp. 70–88.

Hüttner, J., Dalton-Puffer, C. and Smit, U., (2013). The power of beliefs: lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16, pp. 267–284.

Hüttner, J. and Smit, U., (2014). CLIL (content and language integrated learning): the bigger picture. A response to: A. Bruton. 2013. CLIL: some of the reasons why … and why not. *System*, 41, pp. 587–597.

Jakonen, T. and Morton, T., (2013). Epistemic search sequences in peer interaction in a content-based language classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 36(1), pp. 73–94.

Jäppinen, A.K., (2005). Thinking and content learning of mathematics and science as cognitional development in CLIL: teaching through a foreign language in Finland. *Language and Education*, 19, pp.147–168.

Jenkins, J. (2015) Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a lingua franca. *Englishes in Practice* 2, pp. 49–85.

Jexenflicker, S. and Dalton-Puffer, C., (2010) The CLIL differential: comparing the writing of CLIL and non-CLIL students in higher colleges of technology. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula and U. Smit, eds, *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 169–190.

Kalocsai, K., (2014). *Communities of practice and English as a lingua franca*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kontio, J. and Sylvén, L.K., (2015). Language alternation and language norm in vocational content and language integrated learning. *Language Learning Journal*, 43, pp. 271–285.

Lasagabaster, D., (2013). The use of the L1 in CLIL classes: the teachers' perspective. [e-journal] *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 6(2). Available through: http://laclil.unisabana.edu.co/index.php/LACLIL/article/view/3148 [last accessed: 2 November 2016].

Lasagabaster, D. and Sierra, J.M., (2009). Language attitudes in CLIL and traditional EFL classes. [e-journal] *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1. Available through: www.icrj.eu/12/article1.html [last accessed: 2 November 2016].

Li, D.C.S., (2002). Hong Kong parents' preference for English-medium education: passive victims of imperialism or active agents of pragmatism? In A. Kirkpatrick, ed, *Englishes in Asia: communication, identity power and education*. Melbourne: Language Australia, pp. 29–62.

Lim Falk, M., (2008). *Svenska i engelskspråkig skolmiljö. Ämnesrelaterat språkbruk i två gymnasieklasser*. Stockholm: Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Stockholm Studies in Scandinavian Philology.

Leung, C. and Street, B.V., (2012). English in the curriculum: norms and practices. In C. Leung and B.V. Street, eds, *English: a changing medium of instruction*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 1–21.

Llinares, A. and Morton, T., (2010). Historical explanations as situated practice in content and language integrated learning. *Classroom Discourse*, 1, pp. 46–65.

Llinares, A, Morton, T. and Whittaker, R., (2012). *The roles of language in CLIL*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lorenzo, F. (2013). Genre-based curricula: multilingual academic literacy in content and language integrated learning. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), pp. 375–388.

Moate, J.M., (2011). The impact of foreign language mediated teaching on teachers' sense of professional integrity in the CLIL classroom. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(3), pp. 333–346.

Moore, P. and Nikula, T., (2016). Translanguaging in CLIL classrooms. In T. Nikula, E. Dafouz, P. Moore and U. Smit, eds, *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and multilingual education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 211–234.

Nikula, T. (2010). Effects of CLIL on a teacher's classroom language use. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula and U. Smit, eds, *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 105–123.

Nikula, T., (2012). On the role of peer discussions in the learning of subject-specific language use in CLIL. In E. Alcon and M.P. Safont, eds, *Discourse and language learning across L2 instructional contexts*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 133–153.

Nikula, T., (2015). Hands-on tasks in CLIL science classrooms as sites for subject-specific language use and learning. *System*, 54, pp. 14–27.

Otwinowska, A. and Forys, M., (2015). They learn the CLIL way, but do they like it? Affectivity and cognition in upper-primary CLIL classes. [e-access] *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Available through: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/ 13670050.2015.1051944 [last accessed: 2 November 2016].
Seidlhofer, B., (2003). A concept of 'international English' and related issues: from 'real' English to 'realistic' English. [online]. Available from: www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/source/SeidlhoferEN.pdf [last accessed 15 May 2016].
Seidlhofer, B., (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Skinnari, K. and Bovellan, E., 2016. CLIL teachers' beliefs about integration and their professional roles: perspectives from a European context. In T. Nikula, E. Dafouz, P. Moore and U. Smit, eds, *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and multilingual education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 145–170.
Smit, U., (2010). *English as a lingua franca in higher education.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Spolsky, B., (2004). *Language policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tan, M., (2011). Mathematics and science teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the teaching of language in content learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 15 (3), pp. 325–342.
Tragant, E., Marsol, A., Serrano, R. and Llanes, À., (2016). Vocabulary learning at primary school: a comparison of EFL and CLIL. [e-access] *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 19(5), pp. 579–59.
Van de Craen, P., Ceuleers, E. and Mondt, K., (2007). Cognitive development and bilingualism in primary schools: teaching maths in a CLIL environment. In D. Marsh and D. Wolff, eds, *Diverse contexts – converging goals: CLIL in Europe*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 186–200.
Whittaker, R., Llinares, A. and McCabe, A., (2011). Written discourse development in CLIL at secondary school. *Language Teaching Research*, 15, pp. 343–362.