

Focusing on the "I" in CLIL. A review of Nikula, T., Dafouz, E., Moore, P. & Smit, U. (eds.) (2016). *Conceptualising Integration in CLIL and Multilingual Education. Bristol (UK): Multilingual Matters.*

Bristol (UK): Multilingual Matters.
276 pp., ISBN: 978-1-78309-613-8

Hanne Roothoof
Universidad Pública de Navarra



Even though it is common knowledge that the “I” in CLIL stands for integration, it appears that this concept has not been sufficiently addressed in previous research on CLIL and multilingual education. Rather, as also stated in the introduction of “Conceptualising Integration in CLIL and Multilingual Education”, a lot of research on CLIL has focused on learning outcomes, showing that it is possible to acquire a foreign language while at the same time achieving the same content goals as in first language content classes.

Hence the editors of this book decided to bring together a number of studies in which integration is central. However, the idea of integrating content and language, which lies at the heart of CLIL pedagogy, is not as straightforward as it would

appear. This book therefore sets out to better define what integration means, and to study how it can be achieved on three important levels: that of curriculum planning, of teachers’ beliefs and of classroom practice. These three levels also constitute the three main parts of the book.

It is important to note that all contributions draw on data from the ConCLIL project, which brings together researchers from different disciplines (e.g. socio-constructivist theories, systemic functional linguistics, conversation analysis) and countries, in particular Finland, Spain and Austria. This way the book sets an example of how integration can be achieved on the level of research, since the authors stress the need for integration on all levels, also that of research and teaching, for instance through tandem teaching of content and

language teachers. However, the main concern of the authors in the present volume is still the integration of language and content, which they claim is not just relevant for CLIL contexts, but for all education, since language is intrinsically linked to content.

Even if curricula have incorporated the idea of language into content subjects, this has not often been done based on theory, but rather in an instinctive way. This results in classrooms in which teachers only focus on language when they are faced with specific students' needs. The first part of the book therefore contains specific proposals for integrating language and content in the curriculum. First of all, Dalton-Puffer presents an inventory of cognitive discourse functions which can be included in the curricula of different subjects, for instance "classify, describe, evaluate". As in the second chapter, which focuses on historical literacy, the idea is to formulate "can do statements", in a similar way as in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. This is important, since it has been shown that CLIL teachers tend to think they should focus on content specific vocabulary, but they do not seem to be aware that students need to be able to perform certain actions in their foreign language, such as explaining causes in history or classifying features in a biology lesson. While examples from classroom data show that to a certain extent teachers and students already use these discourse functions, it is thought to be beneficial to focus on them in a more explicit way.

Chapters three and four focus on CLIL in mathematics classrooms. Through a think-aloud study, Berger shows that students solving mathematical word problems in their L2 spend considerably more time decoding the message before they move on to mathematical calculations, while students working in their L1 often assume they understand and jump to conclusions. The author claims that her study shows that learning mathematics bilingually can have advantages, rather than the L2 being an added difficulty.

Barwell then presents a Bakhtinian perspective on language and content integration, which he applies to examples from an ethnographic study of the learning of mathematics in second language classrooms in Canada. According to the author, rather than students having to replace their informal concepts in the L2 by more appropriate subject specific language, they need to learn to use both informal and formal registers alongside of each other.

The second part of the book deals with teachers' views on integration and on their role in this process. Both studies in this part focus on teachers from different countries, by means of interviews, even though the first study by Dafouz et al. looks at university lecturers and the second study by Skinnari and Bovellan deals with secondary CLIL teachers. Despite differences in educational level, cultural background etc., several similarities emerged in how these teachers see themselves. For instance, while many of them acknowledge the importance of language in CLIL, they primarily see themselves as content teachers and are often unsure of their dual role as language and content experts. They moreover seem to believe that language in CLIL is learned in a naturalistic way, and thus they do not often focus systematically or explicitly on language.

The third and final part explores integration of content and language in classroom observational data, in interaction between teachers and students or peer interaction. The study by Morton and Jakonen combines a conversation analysis perspective with the notion of “*linguaging*”. As can be expected, the authors state that most *linguaging* in CLIL classrooms focuses on vocabulary. The authors analysed students’ incidental focus on a vocabulary item while working on a history essay in small groups. They do not mention how common such episodes were in their data, since they decided to focus on two related interactions in detail to show how words, gestures and gaze are intrinsically linked when students interact about language. In any case, the authors suggest it may be useful for teachers to pre-plan the language they want their students to focus on in specific content-based tasks. If *linguaging* is shown to be beneficial for students’ development, it might indeed be a good idea to make sure it occurs more frequently and in a more systematic way.

The next chapter in this part compares the use of evaluative language in teacher and student talk in different disciplines and countries. Llinares and Nikula justify the need to promote evaluative language use in CLIL because students do not just need to learn facts, but they need to be able to take a stance towards the content they are learning, and thus use higher-order thinking skills. Their data showed that, even though there are differences in the types and frequency of evaluative language used in the different contexts, students’ use of evaluative language is often rather limited. A reason for this seems to be that teacher fronted CLIL classes are often characterized by IRF interactional patterns, in which students’ contributions are limited to one word and the focus is on facts. This was especially the case in the social science classes under observation. The authors’ advice is for teachers to ask more questions inviting reasons and explanations, since these were found to be more conducive to the use of evaluative language.

The final chapter in part three studies the integration of content and various languages, by investigating *translanguaging* in classroom interaction. As Moore and Nikula state, one of the ideas behind CLIL was originally to foster multilingualism. However, in practice “*bilingual*” is often understood as knowing two separate languages (“*L2 monolingualism*”). Teachers often think they should stick to one language and should not allow code-switching. However, some CLIL teachers do think that the L1 can be used in certain cases. Unfortunately teachers are not normally taught about how to exploit the L1 in a more systematic way. Data from the ConCLIL project show that both teachers and students in the different contexts and subjects “*translanguage*”. Teachers can switch to the L1 to make sure content is understood by everyone, or to give students the opportunity to learn key terminology in both languages. *Translanguaging* was also found to occur naturally in interaction, to keep the conversation going, in a similar way as this happens with multilinguals outside the classroom. The authors conclude that awareness about *translanguaging* and its uses needs to be raised. Apart from being a communicative strategy, it could even be seen as a learning goal, if we consider CLIL as a way to promote true multilingualism.

The book ends with a concluding chapter, in which an overview is given of all different approaches to integration and they are classified according to how visible the language pedagogy of the approach is and how language is viewed. The advantage of this chapter is that it gives the reader an overview of the different ideas expressed in the volume.

While there are many ideas which are undoubtedly of use to teachers, such as the many examples of classroom interaction and the chapters about beliefs, I think the book is first and foremost a theoretical volume, intended for researchers. Its promise to provide a sound basis for investigating integration in CLIL at the three levels has definitely been fulfilled. However, throughout the book, examples from practice and participants' views show that there is still a long way to go for true integration to take place. For instance, in curricula references to language are scarce and unsystematic, teachers struggle with their role as content versus language teacher, and examples from classroom discourse show that focus on language usually happens in an incidental and unplanned way. Clearly, there is not only a need for more research on the topic, but it is also imperative to provide more training to teachers on how content and language integration can be achieved. This book thus provides us with useful insights into what still remains to be done if we want to put the "I" truly at the centre of CLIL.