



Elders learning English for Europe

2021-1-PL01-KA220-ADU-000033465

CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING

Elders Learning English for Europe



Co-funded by
the European Union

Project information

Project: Erasmus+

Project title: Elders learning English for Europe

Acronym: ELENE

Project No.: 2021-1-PL01-KA220-ADU-000033465

Project coordinator: Instytut Badan i Innowacji w Edukacji, [INBIE], Poland

Project partners:



LJUDSKA
UNIVERZA
ROGAŠKA
SLATINA



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Authors:

Nataša JAKOB - Ljudska univerza Rogaška Slatina – LURS - Slovenia
Renata OCHOA-DADERSKA – Instytut Badań i Innowacji w Edukacji – Poland
Mojca VUKOVIC – Ljudska univerza Rogaška Slatina – LURS - Slovenia
Yeliz NUR AKARÇAY - Sarıçam Halk Eğitimi Merkezi - Türkiye
Gabriela OCHOA-DADERSKA – Instytut Badań i Innowacji w Edukacji – Poland
Agnieszka CHEĆCIŃSKA-KOPIEC Kukuczka Academy of Physical Education in Katowice – Poland
Alpaslan AKILLI - Sarıçam Halk Eğitimi Merkezi - Türkiye
Emine ANLAR - Sarıçam Halk Eğitimi Merkezi - Türkiye
Luis OCHOA SIGUENCIA – Kukuczka Academy of Physical Education in Katowice – Poland

Editorial preparation: Fundacja Instytut Badań i Innowacji w Edukacji

Cover graphic design: Renata Ochoa-Daderska

Printing and binding:

Online © Fundacja Instytut Badań i Innowacji w Edukacji, Częstochowa, 2022

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7918282

Free publication

Programme: Erasmus+ Key Action: Partnerships for cooperation and exchanges of practices; Cooperation partnerships in adult education; Project Reference: 2021-1-PL01-KA220-ADU-000033465

Topics: CLIL, Teaching and learning of foreign languages; Active ageing; Development of training courses

More publications: Publishing INBIE: <https://publisher.inbie.pl>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| INTRODUCTION | 5 |
| CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING..... | 7 |
| CLIL Methodology and English language learning | 8 |
| When to apply CLIL..... | 9 |
| Benefits of CLIL..... | 11 |
| LSP & CLIL: differences and similarities | 11 |
| The relationship between LSP and CLIL in the tertiary education..... | 12 |
| INTERACTION IN THE CLIL CLASSROOM | 14 |
| Posing questions in the classroom | 14 |
| Active learning..... | 16 |
| The possibilities of using CLIL for teaching English to seniors | 17 |
| DEVELOPMENT OF CLIL CLASSROOMS IN CHOSEN COUNTRIES | 19 |
| Development of CLIL in Slovenia | 19 |
| Development of CLIL in Poland..... | 21 |
| Development of CLIL in Turkey | 22 |
| Development of CLIL in Portugal..... | 23 |
| Development of CLIL in Spain..... | 24 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 26 |
| REFERENCES | 28 |

INTRODUCTION

CLIL – Content and Language Integrated Learning concerns integrated subject and language education based on the simultaneous transmission of content in the field to subjects and elements of a foreign language.

The CLIL method is recommended by the European Commission to promote language learning and linguistic diversity. The essential features of this method are:

- systematic group work,
- selection of exercises that take into account different types of learners' intelligence,
- learning through various sensory channels,
- the use of sources and materials appropriate for integrated teaching,
- vocabulary useful in CLIL lessons,
- the use of a foreign and native language in integrated teaching.

During the classes, various forms can be used:

- group teaching,
- work in working groups,
- workshops and presentations of video, music and images.

Classes primarily include exercise and workshop, which allows for the practical use of theoretical knowledge. In this method, the learner is focused on obtaining substantive information using their language skills.

The methods of LSP and CLIL differ significantly in their point of view. While standard LSP teaching focuses primarily on foreign language competences, CLIL methodology always implies teaching contents as well as language. Therefore, they stimulate varying approaches to foreign language teaching, as well as learning objectives and outcomes and teachers' roles. However, these two linguistic approaches seem also to share some basic features: use of needs analysis, context-based and task-based instruction, subject-specific orientation, fostering of both communicative and academic competence, etc.

Regarding higher education, CLIL teaching in Slovenia, Poland, Spain, Portugal and Turkey is still scarce, with the exception of some colleges and faculties, like the College of Logistics and Management – AREMA in Slovenia and Academy of Physical Education in

Katowice, in Poland – AWF Katowice. A good example of CLIL methodology used in the classroom are lectures in “Communication Management”, “Mobile Marketing” and “Gestion de proyectos con fondos de la Union Europea”. These courses are provided by Luis Ochoa Siguencia PhD to Polish students of Sport and Tourism Managements in the bachelors and masters’ degree (AWF, 2023).

Surprisingly, several studies usually conclude that older starters show a faster rate of language acquisition. Therefore, implementing CLIL classroom into higher education programmes is a good idea. The main idea of CLIL is to guide learners towards a functional integration of language mastery, subject field knowledge and cognitive and metacognitive skills, all of which require systematic monitoring and planning. The CLIL methodology under our scrutiny represents a possible model of teaching economic and logistics subjects in English through a gradual and mutual collaboration of CLIL and LSP approaches, which are considered to have a great amount of features in common.

Questions should promote discussion in the classroom while learning. Learners are not supposed to be afraid of making mistakes. This means that the teacher should plan the lesson in a different way, giving more space to learners, asking questions which require them to extend their thinking and which encourage them to increase their contributions. The more learners are involved with the content, the more they will understand and the longer they will retain their understanding. The kind of input for interaction would be: question → answer + question → answer + question → etc.

CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING

In spite of the coexistence of Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in the European tertiary education settings, in recent years there has been an increasing interest in the implementation of CLIL programs at higher school level, in preference to LSP courses (Costa & Coleman, 2010; Gonzalez Ardeo, 2013; Räisänen & Fortanet-Gómez, 2008; Vázquez & Gaustad, 2013). This hardly comes as a surprise because CLIL is undoubtedly an innovative approach with its dual focus that combines language learning and subject learning. Although it has been more widely studied within primary and secondary education, there are also some studies on CLIL at university level (Fernández, 2009; Gustafsson, 2011; Leonardi, 2015; Smit & Dafouz, 2012; Wilkinson & Zegers, 2007, 2008). It was not until the early 90's that CLIL began to take shape in Europe. After the White Paper entitled Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society was issued in 1995 (Commission of the European Communities, 1995) promoting multilingualism has become one of the relevant objectives of the European education system. The concept of multilingualism, expressed by the formula 2+1, implies that all the citizens of Europe should be able to use not only their mother tongue but also two other foreign languages. Consequently, the implementation of CLIL started spreading rapidly (Pérez-Vidal, 2009), particularly within the primary and the secondary education framework where bilingual education was usually the term used to refer to teaching content subjects (especially Humanities or Natural sciences) through the medium of foreign and native language.

Regarding higher education, CLIL teaching in Slovenia, Poland, Spain, Portugal and Turkey is still scarce now. However, the majority of language programs intended for non-philological learners remain devised as LSP courses. The main issue involving the tertiary level of education and foreign languages teaching is what methodological bases, approaches and strategies, techniques and materials to apply within the broad term of LSP teaching, especially since there is no common or standardized curriculum framework for LSP teaching or within ERASMUS+ exchange programs, where some courses are specially designed for the foreign students. The student participating in the exchange

learning experience will have lectures in English or they will have the lessons of the chosen subject Individually.

This matter, however, is becoming more and more a pressing issue as the internationalization of university studies and learner mobility in Europe has become a reality in the country. Surprisingly enough, it is generally the foreign language teacher who decides whether to implement CLIL or teach a course as LSP in order to meet the needs of standardization and internationalization of university studies in Slovenia.

CLIL Methodology and English language learning

When it comes to the choice of language, as expected, English is the most extensively implemented target language for CLIL in Europe (Dalton-Puffer, 2011). Generally, any other foreign language could be exercised as a medium of instruction in CLIL programmes, but English continues to be the most popular vehicular language in all the non-Anglophone areas (Graddol, 2006, as cited in Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010). Despite official policies of the European Union promoting multilingualism and linguistic diversity, implementing such policies, however, proves more difficult than anticipated, due to “an inexorable increase in the use of English” (Coleman, 2006, p. 1). No other language can challenge its position as international lingua franca or as ‘killer language’, as Coleman (2006) refers to it. This is also true for higher education globally. Even before the Bologna Process, English was irreplaceable as the language of science, technology and academia, so it is no surprise that most courses at tertiary level at many European universities determine for English as the main instruction language (Gonzalez Ardeo, 2013; Leonardi, 2015).

In addition, according to the main principles of the Bologna Declaration, international co-operation among universities implies the mobility of learners and teaching staff. It reflects on the curricula and the dominant presence of English as the main language of instruction (Leonardi, 2015). To put it as Philipson (2009, p. 37) does, internationalization of education has come to mean English-medium higher education. Regardless of sporadic frequencies of other languages as instruction languages (French, German, Spanish), a number of degree courses in Europe have already introduced English as mandatory in their study programs. A quick look at the literature on LSP and CLIL courses, it is often assumed that the language of instruction is English. There are some initiatives, both in Europe, United

States and Australia, to include Asian, European and heritage languages among CLIL vehicular languages (Coyle et al., 2010) which is in line with the promotion of LOTE (Languages Other than English) programmes (de Riva O'Phelan, 2006; Haataja, Kruszinna, Àrkossy, & Costa Alfonso, 2011).

It is important to stress that in this paper CLIL methodology will be considered as a fusion of two parallel courses: a language course and a content teaching course with a focus on developing different language skills in order to achieve higher-order thinking.

This model is known as *Adjunct CLIL*: "Language teaching is field specific, [...] language courses complement stage-by-stage higher education programmes, learners successfully learn content and gain the ability to use the CLIL language for specific purposes" (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 25).

For the purpose of this study, some CLIL features were:

- selected, defined and explained.
- identified and analysed in the specific settings of the subject Professional Terminology in a Foreign Language (originally: Stokovna terminologija v tujem jeziku).
- analysed through learners' answers on the use of the particular feature, and
- discussed in the light of possible future use in the classroom.

Learners' views on different approaches, strategies and techniques used in college language teaching shed a fresh light on the LSP teaching experience, allowing the authors to examine critically the teaching paradigm in use and hopefully identify certain aspects of teaching that may contribute to a better and more successful acquisition of foreign language in the given situation.

When to apply CLIL

One of the most topical issues in many European education systems is whether it is better to start foreign language teaching at an early age, or whether it is better to include CLIL courses at a later stage – without establishing an early first contact with the foreign language. Although research undertaken in naturalistic settings confirms that young starters ultimately achieve higher competence in the L2, studies carried out in school

settings are not so definitive and, in fact, they usually conclude that older starters show a faster rate of acquisition [Lasagabaster, 2008]. In the same vein, studies completed in the Canadian context demonstrate that late immersion learners perform as well as early immersion learners in some language assessments, despite the latter having accumulated two to three times more instruction learning the L2 (Turnbull M, Lapkin S, Hart D, Swain M. 31-53). Studies completed in formal learning contexts have thus recurrently shown that older learners are faster and better learners than younger ones in most aspects of acquisition, even in the case of pronunciation, the skill that –at least from a theoretical point of view– may benefit most from this early start (García Mayo MP, García Lecumberri ML, 2003) .

However, folk beliefs are playing a paramount role in this respect, as it is widely held that the younger, the better in foreign language learning, despite the previously mentioned empirical evidence, which demonstrates that this is not always the case in formal language learning contexts such as, school. One of the main reasons lies in the idea that children are supposed to be better at acquiring languages implicitly (whereas older learners and adults benefit more from explicit teaching), and for this implicit learning to take place, massive amounts of input are needed. Therefore it is similarly believed that this implicit learning can only be provided in second language naturalistic contexts or in immersion programmes (Dekeyser RM, 499-534).

This belief is shared not only by parents, but also by teachers and language planners, which is why most European governments have decided to lower the starting age of learning a foreign language (Eurydice, 2005). Nevertheless, this is an issue which is becoming controversial in some contexts.

In fact, Egiguren observed that the early teaching of English may not be the only course of action. This author compared two groups of learners, the first one made up of learners who started to learn English at the age of 4, and the second one at 8, but the latter also had two hours per week of Arts taught in English. In this case, no differences were found when the participants' proficiency in English was compared at the age of 10. This leads Egiguren to conclude that the early teaching is not the only possibility when it comes to improving our learners' command of English. In just a year and a half, the late starters had already caught up with the early starters thanks to the CLIL approach.

The findings obtained by Egiguren seem to support the implementation of CLIL programmes since the particular features of formal settings such as school appear to benefit older learners in the short term due to their being at a more developed cognitive stage. This gives them an advantage when it comes to test-taking. However, young learners cannot take advantage of the necessary exposure and contact with the L2 (Munoz, 2006a). Similarly, the implementation of a CLIL approach augments the presence of the foreign language in the curriculum without increasing learners' time commitment. This creates a context in which the foreign language is used to transmit information in real communicative situations and therefore language learning takes place in a more meaningful and efficient way.

Benefits of CLIL

The CLIL approach has been praised on many different grounds (Coyle, 2008). It is believed to help prepare learners for internationalization, a key word for all education systems due to the aforementioned globalization process. It is also believed to boost the affective dimension because learners will feel more motivated to learn foreign languages. It is thought to help improve specific language terminology. It is believed to enhance learners' intercultural communicative competence and to foster implicit and incidental learning by centring on meaning and communication. In addition, it is thought to trigger high levels of communication among teachers and learners, and among learners themselves. As a result of all the reasons mentioned above, it is also believed to improve overall language competence in the target language, in particular oral skills. CLIL is logically being more beneficial for their development than traditional foreign language teaching approaches, for instance LSP.

LSP & CLIL: differences and similarities

LSP refers to language research and instruction that focuses on the specific communicative needs and practices of particular social groups (Hyland, 2007). It has evolved quickly over the past four decades, drawing its strength from an eclectic theoretical foundation, a distinctive interdisciplinary and a vivid interest in research-based language

education. Dating back to the sixties, LSP has reached its maturity and proved its value when it comes to learning foreign languages for a variety of specific purposes.

CLIL, on the other hand, is “a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language” (Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols, 2008, p. 9) which implies “using a language that is not learners’ native language as a medium of instruction” (Mehisto et al., 2008, p. 11). Moreover, CLIL is not considered an absolutely new form of language or subject education, but rather an innovative fusion of both. It is defined as an umbrella term which includes LSP, language and subject education, while sharing some elements of education practices such as Bilingual education and immersion (Coyle et al., 2010), Content-Based Instruction (CBI), Dual Language Programmes, English-Across-the-Curriculum among others (Dalton-Puffer, 2007).

The relationship between LSP and CLIL in the tertiary education

If one is to attempt to explore the relationship between LSP and CLIL in the tertiary education, it is important to stress that these teaching approaches have been at the core of heated controversies as to whether they are different methodologies or two different terms used for the same approach. Apparently, LSP is usually considered as focusing on specific language, whereas CLIL is seen as concentrating on both language and subject-specific content at the same time (Gonzalez Ardeo, 2013). Nevertheless, both approaches share an interest in subject-specific context. If we look at things from LSP perspective, it is certain that if authentic texts are used by language teachers, the prevalent reason for choosing such materials remains language learning, albeit within a specific, disciplinary area as LSP teachers are language specialists. Diversely, CLIL falls into the category of content-driven approaches in which a foreign language is used for learning and teaching both content and language (Coyle et al., 2010). Furthermore, CLIL normally allows for mother tongue (L1) use and code-switching, while LSP traditionally does not focus on L1.

The main idea of CLIL is to guide learners towards a functional integration of language mastery, subject field knowledge and cognitive and metacognitive skills, all of which require systematic monitoring and planning (Swain, 1988). Consequently, it seems that when embracing the CLIL approach it is not a question of whether to focus on meaning or form

but rather that it is crucial to address both (Coyle et al., 2010). To put it clearly, the emphasis on form or meaning is subject to specific learning situations and determined by a wide range of variables in the particular CLIL settings.

As stated by Leonardi (2015) and by Martín del Pozo (2017), there are more areas of convergence than divergence between these two approaches. The attempt at collaborative work inspired by these approaches would be certainly beneficial for foreign language learning for university learners. What is more, both CLIL and LSP should foster intercultural understanding.

The review of relevant literature shows that, generally speaking, LSP and CLIL share several key features, the three most frequently mentioned being:

- the use of context from different non-linguistic subjects,
- the use of communicative language teaching methodology and
- the development of academic and communication skills (Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2007; Greere & Räsänen, 2008).

It is a well-established fact nowadays that learning languages out of context came to be regarded as an outdated methodology. The rationale behind both LSP and CLIL is that the use of language becomes more authentic and more functional if it allows learners to understand and express thoughts in a specific discipline. The subject-specific contents seem to provide learners with a more appropriate and more natural environment for language learning and practice leading to a more successful and meaningful communication in real life situations (Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2007).

Because each approach is subject to the specific learning situation and unique educational and teaching settings, the features of Professional Terminology in a Foreign Language taught at Arema, the College of Logistics Management, as a form of both, CLIL and LSP, indicate that the primary goal refers to developing learners' functional language competences regarding specific topics about specific disciplinary contents, in this case: the professional terminology in logistics management. The secondary goal is learning the language. However, both of the goals are being performed interchangeably. Thus, the CLIL methodology under our scrutiny represents a possible model of teaching economic and logistic subjects in English through a gradual and mutual collaboration of CLIL and LSP approaches, which, as we discovered, have a great amount of features in common.

INTERACTION IN THE CLIL CLASSROOM

Bilingual programmes under the umbrella of CLIL began their implementation in the Spanish region of Murcia in 2009 and since then they have gained a foothold, not only in this area, but also in the whole country (Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010).

A few years later, CLIL teachers were asked in this region to participate in a survey to learn about which CLIL approach they were implementing, their satisfaction with the programme, and the difficulties they were experiencing. One recurring feeling that the vast majority of the 99 teachers who took part in the survey shared was that learner learning rates seemed to slow down after the first two years of the programme (first and second year of primary education). From the extensive reading of research concerning the role of teachers in the classroom, especially in CLIL contexts, it was discovered that excessive levels of teacher discourse appeared to be the cause of the slowdown (Mercer, 1995; Dalton-Puffer, 2007).

Additionally, the relatively few opportunities that learners did have to interact consisted of initiation–response–feedback sequences that only involved pedagogic feedback. Thus, the goal of the exchanges was simply to check their understanding of the content explained and whether they followed the teacher’s discourse or not (Lorenzo, Trujillo, and Vez, 2011). As a result, they came to realisation that if learning contexts were based on the transmission of content alone and checking what learners remembered or understood learners would not learn to think for themselves and there would be few opportunities for language development (Hunkins, 1989; Llinares, Morton, and Whittaker, 2012). In order to provide such learning opportunities, classroom interaction should be more dialogic; and effective questioning can be one of the ways of providing the catalyst (Wells and Mejía-Arauz, 2005).

Posing questions in the classroom

There are some guidance directions, which should be followed by teachers in CLIL classrooms.

Firstly, when using questions in the classroom, teachers should be mindful of the true pedagogical objectives. Hence, we as teachers should not lose sight of the fact that this type of questioning requires a certain conscious preparation, because not every question raises a stimulating response, fosters critical thinking, or enlivens knowledge processing (Fisher, 2013). Thus, for example, the questions formulated during content explanations should be especially meaningful. In this way, if they draw learners' attention to recall mere facts, they will focus on listening for and finding just this type of information. However, questions that involve linking the content with learners' prior knowledge will imply higher-order thinking. Remarkably, different studies have indicated that teachers merely use questions that develop low cognitive levels such as 'remembering' or 'understanding' (Acree and Dankert, 2005; Dean, Ross, Pitler, and Stone, 2012).

The process of interaction between the teacher and the learner, as stated before, is based on the use of initiation–response–feedback exchanges in which the teacher poses a question, the learner answers it, and the teacher says if the response is right or wrong—limiting the exchange of communication (Coyle, Hood, and Marsh, 2010). As such, the outcomes of the teaching and learning process, including CLIL classrooms, are lacking.

Questions should promote discussion. Learners are not supposed to be afraid of making a mistake. This means that the teacher should plan the lesson in a different way, giving more space to learners, asking questions which require them to extend their thinking and which encourage them to increase their contributions, as the more learners are involved with the content, the more they will understand and the longer they will retain their understanding. The kind of input for interaction would be: question → answer + question → answer + question → etc.

Secondly, as also Zydatið (2012) pointed out, it is paramount for the teachers to improve the CLIL training, as well as to provide further empirical research on the 'merged learning' of subject matter and language. In addition, the research has demonstrated that engaging learners cognitively in an interactive way leads to an increase in the quality of their learning (Freire and Faundez, 2010; Llinares). When it comes to CLIL classrooms, teachers' questions that intent to develop learners' thinking contribute to high-quality interaction and provide exceptional opportunities for both content and language learning, and therefore represent an improvement of the teaching process (Llinares, 2017). In light of the above, they decided to conduct research that addressed the types of questions teachers asked

their learners in CLIL classrooms and how they could be sure the questions they posed covered a complete set of knowledge and cognitive dimensions. The results pointed to the great significance and promise of optimizing the use of questions in CLIL classrooms.

Thirdly, it is of great importance, how a question is formulated. Depending on how a question is formulated, it can address a lower dimension such as 'remembering' or a higher one such as 'creating'. Additionally, learners should not limit their answers just to one single word, but they should use whole, grammatically correct sentences, which differ in their answers. With this in mind, our goal is to develop cognitive levels different from 'remembering', the answer to the question must be new. That is to say, teachers should not ask questions with already given answers, or it becomes impossible to discern if learners reached the solution by using higher cognitive processes such as 'analysing', 'evaluating', and 'creating', or if they just remembered a previously learned fact (Caravaca, 2019).

To summarize, as teachers we sometimes pose a question in order to draw learners' attention or to check if they understand the content correctly. Unfortunately, it occurs very often that we get the same answer from several learners. With this in mind, we could conclude that different types or even more preparations are needed to teach in CLIL classrooms. That includes also posing questions whose importance is to be emphasized in order to reach learners' higher cognitive processes such as:

- analysing
- evaluating
- creating.

Active learning

One of the core features of CLIL we consider of great importance is also active learning (Coyle et al., 2010). The traditional classroom and the roles once played by the participants of the learning process have given way to a different atmosphere and a more active role of learners who become more autonomous and responsible for their learning. Additionally, for learning to be defined as active, learners need not only to do something, but also to reflect on that. As a learner-centered concept, active learning involves learners "doing things and thinking about what they are doing" (Bonwell & Elison, 1991, p. 2). This is to

say that active learning means shifting the focus from the teacher to the learners, but also at promoting cognitive tasks of higher order through active engagement with the subject-specific content (Prince, 2004).

The concept of active learning implies, for example, that learners should be communicating more; especially when it comes to verbalizing different procedures connected to the non-linguistic content they are learning. In doing so, learners should co-operate with their peers through various social forms such as pair work, group work, debates, plenum etc. while teachers are expected to act more and more as mediators or “facilitators” as mentioned by Dalton Puffer, ready to negotiate the meaning of language and content with their learners when necessary. As active learners, learners become involved in tasks that stimulate decision-making and critical thinking, such as:

- setting contents of the course,
- choosing materials and learning techniques, as well as most useful language and learning competences,
- and enabling most adequate learning outcomes for their particular needs.

In addition, active learning also means the maturity and responsibility for self-evaluation practices and self-monitoring in achieving the learning outcomes (Dalton Puffer, 2007). This is vital for learners and teachers to be satisfied with the outcome, especially, when reflected back on learners’ knowledge before lectures. Of course, the learners’ prior knowledge differs, but the fact is that all learners including teachers notice the difference, upgrade, and progress, which makes the evaluation much easier.

The possibilities of using CLIL for teaching English to seniors

Despite the fact that there is basically no scientific researches or literature on using CLIL for teaching English to seniors, practical experience shows that it is as much possible as it is useful.

Organizations, such as universities for third age, can use CLIL for teaching English to seniors during various activities, lecture or study circles for seniors. For example, mentors and English teachers can join forces and collaborate in creating bilingual cooking courses

for elderly, where seniors learn expressions in connection to food, local and international dishes, beverages and also polite phrases used at restaurants and bars.

In addition, learning English can be introduced into Nordic walking sessions, where seniors can role play giving and receiving directions in a certain city, learning not only phrases for giving directions, but also English words for buildings in cities and villages, all of which are very important while travelling abroad, as well as the use of the Imperative.

Yoga or any other kind of physical exercises can be a good tool for learning English expressions for body parts and also health conditions, which can be very useful when one gets ill during travelling abroad and needs to visit a doctor.

Computer classes or classes on how to use smart phones can again be used as a means of learning English expressions needed while using different applications and machines while travelling, such as ticket machines, ATMs and similar. Using the word such as 'send', 'confirm', 'delete' and similar that can be found on computers and phones can also be found while using different machines while travelling.

Dancing classes can also be a good opportunity for counting steps in English and learning English numbers while doing something good for your health.

To sum up, CLIL for seniors, although not pointed out by experts in the field, is very much possible, all that is needed is a bit of imagination, good will and enthusiasm of the mentor of individual activity for seniors.

DEVELOPMENT OF CLIL CLASSROOMS IN CHOSEN COUNTRIES

Development of CLIL in Slovenia

The fact that content plays a vital role in teaching and learning a foreign language has not been a secret. Already Mohan (1986) pointed out that in the teaching of content the role of language as a medium is often ignored and forgotten. Experts in foreign language didactics have developed a range of approaches and methods that address foreign language learning in relation to non-language subjects or focus on a greater role for content. They go by different names with some differences, but the important role of linking content and learning a language through it are what they all have in common:

- language across the curriculum,
- content-based instruction/content-based language learning,
- content and integrated language learning,
- cognitive academic language learning approach,
- English for specific purposes,
- immersion etc.

In a content-oriented approach - CLIL, the foreign language becomes both a medium of communication and a language of learning, It is an approach to learning and teaching that combines two goals at the same time - focusing on the foreign language and content interchangeably (Mehisto, Marsh, Frigols 2008).

This type of approach offers not only an increase in linguistic abilities in a foreign language, but also intervenes in the area of the learner's cognitive development. Of course, the development of metacognitive abilities developed by the learner with this approach, also plays an important role in this. A foreign language is thus learned through content that is suitable for the learner's age and cognitive abilities. The purpose and main goal is to learn the basic vocabulary in spoken and written situations and grammatical structures.

The content represents an enriched language input for the learner, as the teacher has to use various teaching aids, such as additional explanation, visualization, movements and

gestures, manipulate the language and provide the learner with support throughout the process. The didactic and methodical skills of the teacher are of central importance here, according to the fact that the learner is dealing with two unknowns at the same time. On the one hand, he/she gets to know the demanding content of a particular field, on the other however, he/she is constantly exposed to the requirements and laws of the target language. Therefore, it can be concluded that the learner is continually in a language situation that is just above his/her current level of understanding and succeeds to take it to the next level (Krashen 1985).

During the entire process, the learner has to participate extremely actively mentally and physically, focusing on the content and the language at the same time. As a result, he/she is forced to pay attention. There are also many opportunities to actually use the target language, which accelerates both understanding and acquisition and stimulates the output (Swain 1985).

Content-based approaches in Slovenia

The CLIL approach, which has spread across Europe and become part of the national curriculum has not yet been officially implemented in Slovenia or is only widespread in certain environments (Pižorn and Pevec Semec 2010). It has been tested by teachers in national and school projects, but it has not been able to spread as an equivalent foreign language approach (except in the UTJ-JIMU project; *ibid.*). One obstacle may be the Constitution of the Republic of Slovenia, which states that the only official language of instruction in the Republic of Slovenia is Slovene. Nevertheless, the CLIL approach should not be refused because it does not change the official language of instruction in any way; furthermore, it is only its extension (Dalton Puffer 2007, Coyle et al. 2010).

There are numerous advantages of CLIL in the classroom, which have also been discovered:

- learners enhance their sense of citizenship,
- they increase their awareness of the value of transferable skills and knowledge,
- they improve their confidence and ability to use the target language,
- CLIL may enormously increase the learners' thinking ability (Sabet, 2012).

Development of CLIL in Poland

CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) means learning the language through specific topics and issues from different disciplines, and using one's knowledge and interests in the process of learning the language. INBIE uses this method when providing programming, ce Information and communication technology applied to business and workplace, and during Spanish culture lessons.

Senior learners receive a text that covers the topics. The topics are discussed in small groups using English or Spanish language as a medium. This activity promotes the self – stimulation of imagination and creativity in adult learners.

What can be noticed is that the classes with CLIL elements increase motivation to learn both the language and the subject / topic discussed. The learners acquire a better ability to learn and to search, select, analyse and synthesize the information obtained. One important element during the learning activity is the use of Information and Communication Technology. Seniors use smartphones to search for information and / or meaning of sentences / words they cannot understand. Taking into account this fact, we can assure that participants of the lessons learn not only the foreign language, but also how to use more effective forms of communication.

Content and Language Integrated Learning fosters the development of key competencies and social behaviour (working in teams) and awakens curiosity and independent thinking skills.

The starting point is the text given to senior learners and later on the question or problem to be solved is added to the activity. Among others, the classes consist of team projects and individual project tasks. In this way, practical skills and competencies are acquired.

Senior learners who join different courses conducted in a foreign language are motivated not only on the subject but also on the possibility to improve reading and listening comprehension. In this situation, we found that Content and Language Integrated Learning is one of the best methods for elders willing to improve their foreign language skills.

Development of CLIL in Turkey

CLIL is a type of bilingual education and successfully applied in many European countries. However, CLIL-based activities in English as a foreign language teaching received less attention in Turkey when compared to other European contexts. In the 1950s, Anatolian High Schools provided education for selected high-achieving students and included intensive English courses in their education programs. In these schools, every subject was taught through English.

There were also some schools that offered courses in German and French instead of English. However, such programs failed to be successful because teachers lacked the necessary proficiency to teach the subject matters through a second language. Although the CLIL method was set aside in primary and secondary education in the 1990s, up-to-date many private primary and secondary schools have adopted CLIL in several subjects. CLIL is also successfully on the rise in higher education; it continued at highly prestigious Turkish universities.

CLIL-supported education system in Turkey was carried out in Anatolian high schools and Science high schools until 1997 in order to teach science and math lessons in English. Today, this system is used in some private schools. In the globalized world linguistic effects are gaining importance. For this reason, Turkey, like many countries, is doing its best to reach this competition because almost many institutions “are in competition with each other to add new English-medium programs to their bodies, making English Medium Instruction (EMI) a common phenomenon” (Atlı, 2016: 1). These kinds of schools utilize CLIL, one of the most chosen approaches as internalization of higher education gets much more competitive.

Between 2006 and 2009, the ProCLIL project financed by the EU involved four countries (Germany, Spain, England, and Turkey). The project aimed to explore how primary school teachers, learners, and parents perceived CLIL in the beginning and at the end of the implementation process. The findings indicated that primary school teachers focused more on the content while teaching English. The teachers, students and their parents also perceived CLIL as a positive instructional tool to help students with their language development.

Development of CLIL in Portugal

The first appearance of CLIL method in Portugal is not connected to learning English, but to learning French language. It began in 2006 with one of the earliest projects 'Secções Europeias de Língua Francesa' (SELF) in which French was used for teaching subjects in more than twenty lower and upper secondary schools across Portugal. It was started by Portuguese Ministry of Education and the French Embassy.

CLIL in connection to English language was started by various projects. Although none of these projects lasted very long, they all left an important mark in this area. One example of these successful projects is the STEPS – UP Project (Support for Teaching English in Primary Schools – University of Porto) which was presented by FLUP and Porto City Council. In this project English language teachers were encouraged to take part in small CLIL projects at schools where they were teaching.

A significant importance for CLIL in Portugal was the piloting of the Early Bilingual Education Project, presented by the Portuguese Ministry of Education and the British Council in the period between 2011-2015 in primary schools across Portugal. Primary teachers taught Social Studies and 'Expressions' for 5-10 hours per week in four levels of primary education. Teachers received training in bilingual teaching practices. After 2015 the project started gradually extending to other schools.

So what can be said about the situation with CLIL in English in Portugal today? Statistics show that most teachers involved in teaching CLIL are part of an ageing population and therefore CLIL should be addressed in pre-service teacher education or foreign language and teachers who do not teach languages to achieve a greater presence of CLIL in Portugal (Ellison, 2018).

According to Lasagabaster and Doiz (2016), CLIL has exponentially grown in popularity over the past 20 years in Europe, becoming "widespread across the continent and its reach, under its many guises, is felt around the world" (Ellison, 2018). In primary and secondary education, particularly, content and language integrated learning (CLIL) has a long history in European nations. However, not all nations have adopted the same implementation models for CLIL, nor have they all been on the same page with regard to the dissemination of CLIL (Hüttner & Smit, 2014; Ellison, 2018).

There is not much evidence of CLIL in Portugal's public or private schools, and the strategy is still an evolving phenomenon (Ellison, 2018). Hence, not all Portugal's mainstream education incorporates CLIL at all levels. Although the scope of CLIL practice or teacher preparation for CLIL has not been systematically chartered, CLIL is primarily known through the "top-down" PEBI program policy of the Ministry of Education and by a number of "bottom-up" grassroots initiatives of CLIL implementation in schools. A number of Erasmus+ projects seem to enable students and teachers to explore CLIL and gain access to training.

In Portugal the adoption of CLIL in schools has been slower than in the majority of other European nations. Nevertheless, the phenomenon exists, and even though it is not required, more schools are beginning to use CLIL in recent years under various names, such as "bilingual education." No studies are available about CLIL across all school levels in this country up to this point, but scholarly interest in the phenomenon is growing concurrently.

When compared to neighboring European nations, the number of schools and teachers participating in CLIL projects is still small, and the geographic distribution of CLIL implementation is uneven. A priority of centralized educational policy is needed to involve more students, teachers, and schools in high-quality CLIL education while also addressing the geographical imbalance in distribution across Portuguese state schools.

Development of CLIL in Spain

Although numerous researches have shown the benefits of CLIL, the General Organic Law of the Educational System (LOGSE) accepted in 1990 did not mention it at all. Nevertheless, teachers often used topics and contents during their classes, not only focusing on grammar, but also on content, using authentic language, important topics and problem solving tasks, which later on served as a base of CLIL training.

A good example of fostering CLIL is Andalusia, one of the pioneering regions in the creation of bilingual schools. In this region, CLIL programmes started with the Plan for the Promotion of Multilingualism in 2005, which included important information on bilingual schools, bilingual coordination, the roles of language and non-language teachers and assistants, students and similar.

In the last two decades Spain has taken over a leading position in the European context in connection to the implementation of CLIL programmes, mostly due to its cultural and linguistic diversity which contribute to the development of various CLIL policies and practices (Madrid, Ortega Martin and Pearse Hughes, 2019).

CONCLUSION

With all the evidence in favour of a content-based approach, it would be a real pity if we did not allow the possibility in our school system to find a solution for its implementation. Consequently, learners (and teachers too) could see the relevance of foreign language learning in connection with non-language subjects, and the need to systematically integrate foreign language teaching with non-language subjects in a way that gives both subjects equal status. The starting point should be the content of non-language subjects, as this would not burden pupils with additional content, but deepen and build on existing ones. We have to make sure that the learning objectives of both the language and the non-language subject are met, which is possible only with careful lesson planning in various forms of quality teamwork teaching.

CLIL and non-CLIL learners have different attitudes toward L1 and L2, which may cause differences in their learning motivation (Sylvén, 2015). In CLIL, the use of foreign language learning strategies as well as subject-related content were facilitated and improved; at the same time, reading skills, lexicon, satisfaction, and collaboration were enhanced.

However, CLIL has some limitations. CLIL research thus far has focused on English as a Foreign Language (EFL); in the future, research on CLIL should pay more attention to the effect of CLIL in other linguistic environments and the effectiveness of language and content integration [3]. Although CLIL has made great progress in the last 20 years, it is also necessary to determine how to innovate CLIL on an ongoing basis. Therefore, new tools are needed to improve the quality of CLIL.

In sum, although CLIL has the advantage of teaching both content and language, it still has many issues. For example, it is common for the target language to be limited to English. The issue of the balance of content and language in the classroom needs to be resolved, and research is required to make CLIL more efficient. Moreover, CLIL design has been based only on CLIL characteristics. To develop its potential, it should perhaps be discussed from the viewpoint of a more professional curriculum design model.

Consequently, senior students' success in foreign language study depends not only on how old they are, but on their choice of study objectives and learning strategies. If learning objectives and strategies of the offered courses comes from the learners, they will be happy and motivated to be involved in the foreign languages experience.

REFERENCES

Acomi, Nicoleta & Carabias, Manuel & Ochoa Siguencia, Luis & Dragan, Any & PORCELLI, Fabiola & Ochoa-Daderska, Renata & DRAGAN, Daniel & Ricchiuto, Savino & SUDANO, Damiana & CHIRIS, Bogdan & Amoruso, Laura & Kopiec, Agnieszka & Vega, Jonas & Tudorache, Stefania & Acomi, Ovidiu. (2021). Wspieranie osób starszych. Przewodnik dla praktyka. 10.5281/zenodo.5767086.

Acomi, Nicoleta & Carabias, Manuel & Ochoa Siguencia, Luis & Dragan, Any & Porcelli, Fabiola & Ochoa-Daderska, Renata & Dragan, Daniel & Ricchiuto, Savino & Sudano, Damiana & Chiris, Bogdan & Amoruso, Laura & Kopiec, Agnieszka & Vega, Jonas & Tudorache, Stefania & Acomi, Ovidiu. (2021). Supporting Elderly: A Practitioner's Guide. 10.5281/zenodo.5594887.

Acree, J. and B. Dankert (2005). Quality Questioning. Research-Based Practice to Engage Every Learner. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Anderson, L., D. Krathwohl, P. Airasian, K. Cruikshank, R. Mayer, P. Pintrich, J. Raths, and M. Wittrock (eds.) (2001). A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing. A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. New York: Pearson Education.

Atli, I. (2016). A Suggested Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Model for the Faculty of Medicine at Ondokuz Mayıs University: Exploring Perceptions and Practices (1-254). Samsun: Ondokuz Mayıs University. Retrieved November 10, 2018, from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.

AWF (2023). Rozkłady zajęć - semestr letni. (n.d.). Retrieved April 6, 2023, from <https://awf.katowice.pl/rozklady-zajec/rozklady-zajec---semestr-letni>

Bonwell, C. C., & Eison, J. A. (1991). Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 1. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Caravaca R.V. *ELT Journal*, Volume 73, Issue 4, October 2019, Pages 367–376, <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccz030>

Coyle D. (2008) CLIL—A pedagogical approach from the European perspective. In: Van Deusen-Sholl N, Hornberger NH, Eds. Encyclopedia language and education. Second and foreign language education, 2nd edition, Volume 4, New York: Springer Science+Business Media LLC 2008; pp. 97-111.

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & 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: John Benjamins.

Dekeyser RM (2000). The robustness of the critical period effect in second language acquisition. *Stud Second Lang Acquis* 2000; 22: 499-534.

Eiguren I.(2006). Atzerriko hizkuntza goiztiarraren eragina gaitasun eleaniztunean. Ph.D.[Dissertation]. Vitoria-Gasteiz, Spain: University of the Basque Country.

Ellison, M. (2018). (Net)Working CLIL in Portugal. *e-TEALS* 9(s1):4-22. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333722289_NetWorking_CLIL_in_Portugal

Ellison, M., Morgado, M., & Coelho, M. (2022). CLIL across schools in Portugal. *Contexts and conditions for successful CLIL in Portugal*.

Eurydice (2005). Key data on teaching languages at school in Europe. Brussels: European Commission.

Fisher, R. (2013). Teaching Thinking: Philosophical Enquiry in the Classroom (4th ed.). London: Bloomsbury.

Freire, P. and A. Faundez (2010). Por una pedagogía de la pregunta. Xátiva: Edicions del Crec.

García Mayo MP, García Lecumberri ML (2003). Age and the acquisition of English as a foreign language. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gonzalez Ardeo, J. M. (2013). (In)compatibility of CLIL and ESP courses at 29 university. *Language Value*, 5(1), 24-47.

Greere, A., & Räsänen, A. (2008). Redefining CLIL – Towards multilingual competence. Report on the LANQUA subproject on content and language integrated learning. Retrieved from http://www.lanqua.eu/files/Year1Report_CLIL_ForUpload_WithoutAppendices_0.pdf

Hunkins, F.P. (1989). Teaching Thinking through Effective Questioning. Boston, MA: ChristopherGordon Publishers.

Hüttner, J., & 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 (2013): 587–597. *System*, 44, 160-167

Hyland, K. (2007). English for Specific Purposes. Some influences and impacts. In J. Cummins, & C. Davison (Eds.) *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 391-402). New York: Springer.

KRASHEN, Stephen (1985). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. New York: Pergamon.

Kurmash, N. (2019). *Clil technology for the formation of intercultural communicative competency on senior stages of profile school* (Master's thesis, Namik Kemal Üniversitesi).

Lasagabaster David (2008). *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*. 21: 30-41. ISSN: 1874-9135 — Volume 4, 2011.

Lasagabaster, D. & Doiz, A. 2016. CLIL students' perceptions of their language learning process: delving into self-perceived improvement and instructional preferences. *Language Awareness*, 25, (1-2), 110-126.

Lasagabaster, D. and Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (eds.) (2010). *CLIL in Spain Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Leonardi, V. (2015). Bridging the gap between ESP and CLIL in the university context. *Iperstoria – Testi Letterature Linguaggi*, 5, 18-26. Retrieved from http://www.iperstoria.it/joomla/images/PDF/Numero%205%20giusto/saggi_monografica/Leonardi_ESPCLIL.pdf

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

Lorenzo, F., F. Trujillo, and J.M. Vez. (2011). *Educación Bilingüe. Integración de contenidos y segundas lenguas*. Madrid: Editorial Síntesis.

Madrid, D. Ortega Martin, H. L. Pearse Hughes, S. (2019). *CLIL and Language Education in Spain*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Martín del Pozo, M. A. (2017). CLIL and ESP: Synergies and mutual inspiration. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 11(4), 49-68.

Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL. Content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Mercer, N. (1995). *The Guided Construction of Knowledge. Talk Amongst Teachers and Learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mohan, B. A. (1986). *Language and Content*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Muñoz C, Ed. (2006b). Age and the rate of foreign language learning. Clevedon. Multilingual Matters.

Muñoz C. (2006a). The effects of age on foreign language learning: the BAF project. In: Muñoz C, Ed. Age and the rate of foreign language learning, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters 2006a; pp. 1-40.

Muñoz C. Age-related differences in foreign language learning. Revisiting the empirical evidence. *Int Rev Appl Linguist* (in press).

Ochoa-Daderska, Renata & Kopiec, Agnieszka & Gródek-Szostak, Zofia & Akarcay, Yeliz & Ochoa Siguencia, Luis. (2022). Elders learning English for Europe: The Polish case. 10.5281/zenodo.6394513.

Ochoa-Daderska, Renata & Ochoa-Daderska, Gabriela & García, Javier & Callarisa Fiol, Luis & Navikiene, Zivile & Navikaite, Justina & Demirci, Metin & Gródek-Szostak, Zofia & Niemczyk, Agata & Szelağ-Sikora, Anna & Kopiec, Agnieszka & Ochoa Siguencia, Luis. (2023). Professional use of ICT -based solutions for social Integration: DigIN report I. 10.5281/zenodo.7662148.

Pižorn K., PEVEC SEMEC K. (2010) Izhodišča za uvajanje dodatnih jezikov v 1. VIO. V: Lipavc Oštir, Alja (ur.), Jazbec, Saša (ur.). Pot v večjezičnost - zgodnje učenje tujih jezikov v 1. VIO osnovne šole. Ljubljana: Zavod RS za šolstvo, 106 – 168. <http://www.zrss.si/pdf/vecjezicnost.pdf>.

Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93(3), 223- 231.

Sabet M.K. and Sadeh N.(2012). "CLIL European-led projects and their implications for Iranian EFL context," *Engl. Lang. Teach.*, vol. 5, no. 9, pp. 88–94.

Swain, M. (1988). Manipulating and complementing content teaching to maximize second language learning. *TESL Canada Journal*, 6(1), 68-83.

Sylvén L.K. (2015). "CLIL and non-CLIL learners' beliefs about language," *Stud. Second Lang. Learn. Teach.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 251–272, 2015.

Turnbull M, Lapkin S, Hart D, Swain M. (1998). Time on task and immersion graduates' French proficiency. In: Lapkin S. Ed. *French second language education in Canada: empirical studies*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1998; pp. 31-55.

Wells, G. and Mejía-Arauz R.(2005). 'Toward dialogue in the classroom: learning and teaching through inquiry'. *Working Papers on Culture, Education and Human Development* 1/4: 1–45.

Yavuz, A. C., Öztüfekçi, A., Ören, A. D., Kaplan, A., & Uzunkaya, Ç. Y. (2020). Teachers' Perceptions and Needs of CLIL: A Collective Case Study from Turkey. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 9(1), 92-103.

Zydatið, W. (2012). 'Linguistic thresholds in the CLIL classroom: the threshold hypothesis revisited'. *International CLIL Research Journal* 1/4. Available at <http://www.icrj.eu/14/article2.html> (accessed on 31 August 2018).