

Content and Language Integrated Learning: An Evaluation of the German Approach

Dieter Wolff
University of Wuppertal

1. Introduction

Multilingualism has become a political goal but also a political necessity in Europe. In the Maastricht treaty the member states of the European Union have opted for the preservation of linguistic and cultural diversity in Europe. This decision was taken in the firm belief that European union can only be achieved if this diversity is maintained. Apart from this fairly idealistic approach to achieving unity via diversity there is also a clear political and economic necessity to increase multilingualism in Europe. Trade between the member states of the EU is growing every year, so-called Euregios are being developed across the borders of the member states, exchanges between the inhabitants of the Union are becoming more and more frequent. Although in intercultural communication English is used as a *lingua franca*, it has become clear that the use of English as the only means of interaction has more negative than positive effects in such highly diversified linguistic contexts.

Multilingualism has been identified as a political necessity in Europe, but this has not yet led member states to make the educational efforts necessary to attain this goal. Although educationalists and language teaching specialists have understood that our present approach to learning and teaching foreign languages - which Baker ironically but appropriately characterises as “drip-feed education” - will never lead to multilingualism in Europe, there is disagreement about the best way to develop adequate linguistic proficiency in several languages, a competence which is higher than what we attain nowadays in traditional language teaching and learning. A number of so-called post-communicative approaches are under discussion: task-based and process-oriented language teaching and learner autonomy are among the most frequently discussed models.

One model which is becoming very popular all over Europe is Content and Language Integrated Learning or CLIL. This approach has also been called Bilingual Content Teaching, Bilingual Subject Teaching or Content-Based Language Teaching. The term CLIL is now the most commonly used, however, especially since a definition has been found which is acceptable to all dealing with this new approach (**Folie**):

Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) is a generic term and refers to any educational situation in which an additional language and therefore not the most widely used language of the environment is used for the teaching and learning of subjects other than the language itself.

This definition of CLIL was developed by a group of language and content teaching specialists for a research project in which different models of content and language integrated

teaching and learning in Europe are being analysed. In the context of this project, which was financed by the EU, questionnaires were sent to more than 1800 CLIL schools all over Europe in order to find out more about their specific approach to CLIL. During the analysis of the data – the final results will be published in the so-called CLIL compendium in the middle of February – it became clear that CLIL approaches vary considerably in different European countries and that this variation is due, among other things, to the educational and linguistic background of each specific country. The definition of CLIL which was developed on the basis on these questionnaires is, admittedly, very general; but it can integrate all CLIL approaches practiced in Europe, it cannot, however, specify the individual features of each single approach developed in one particular country.

In my paper I will describe and evaluate one approach to CLIL which was developed in Germany. **(Folie)** I will first draw a picture of the German approach, its linguistic and educational background and the way CLIL is integrated in the German school system. In the next part I will talk about CLIL pedagogy in Germany. I will look at CLIL curricula, selection of students, language and content teaching methodology, materials for CLIL, students' assessment, teacher training and research on CLIL. Part four of my paper is devoted to new methodological issues related to CLIL. Two questions will be focused upon: the pedagogical potential of CLIL and the necessity for a CLIL methodology. I will argue that it is the learning environment created by the integration of content and language in such classrooms which is highly beneficial both for the language learning process and the understanding of the content subject. I will also argue that teachers have not succeeded in using the full learning potential contained in this complex new learning environment and that therefore a CLIL methodology will have to be developed. In my concluding remarks I will argue that CLIL as practiced in Germany but also in a number of other countries would benefit enormously if it was integrated methodologically into an approach defined by the principles of learner autonomy and if it made more use of the resources and the tool functions of the New Technologies.

1. The German approach to Content and Language Integrated Learning

In this part of my paper I will draw a picture of the German approach and its main characteristics. I will begin by giving a short overview of the linguistic and the educational background and will then show in which way CLIL is integrated into the German school system.

2.1 Linguistic and educational background

Officially, the Federal Republic of Germany is a monolingual country. The official majority language is German, a language which is also spoken in Austria, and parts of Switzerland, making German the most widely used native language in the European Union. The linguistic situation in Germany is, however, more complex than this. Besides German there are two minority languages officially recognised in the constitution, Danish and Sorbic, the first spoken in the Danish-German border region in the North of Schleswig-Holstein, and the second - a Slavic language – spoken by a small group of people in a rural area in the East of Berlin. Apart from these two minority languages, which do not really play a role in the country's linguistic profile, there are the languages spoken by large groups of migrants and immigrants: Turkish, Serbo-Croatian, Greek and Italian are among the most widely spoken languages. Although these languages are tolerated in Germany they have no official status, but they influence political

decisions with respect to language policy and thus also with respect to the development of multilingualism.

It is important to note also that Germany is a federal republic which means, in terms of educational policy, that the fifteen states of the confederation each have their own educational system which can differ considerably from the system of other states, sometimes even to such an extent that children have difficulties in moving from one system to another. But it should also be pointed out that the educational decisions of the larger states (Northrhine-Westphalia, Bavaria, Hessen and Baden-Württemberg) are often taken without discussion by the smaller states. This is also true for the German variant of CLIL for which only minor differences can be found in the different states.

From the point of view of language teaching the structure of the German system is rather traditional. Until now foreign language teaching starts at the age of ten when children move from primary to secondary school. The first language is usually English; some more traditional Gymnasien might still offer Latin as a first language, and in the regions bordering France or Belgium French can be the first language. In grade seven, when children are twelve years old, a second foreign language is introduced, either French or English (depending on the first language the child has chosen). In grade ten a third language is introduced: this can be Spanish or Russian or even Latin. Languages are taught three to four periods a week. It is important to mention at this stage that most German states have decided recently to introduce a first foreign language already in primary school. From 2003 onwards children in Germany will begin learning English in third grade at the age of eight. This decision will have consequences for CLIL as well.

One last point is important in the context of this paper. In Germany, secondary school teachers do not teach only one subject: to become a state school teacher you have to have studied two subjects. Many students combine two languages (English and French), others will study English and German. But quite a number of students study a language and a content subject, for example English and Geography or French and History. These are the teachers that we have recruited for our CLIL classes.

2.2 CLIL in the German school system

History of CLIL in Germany: In Germany Content and Language Integrated Learning has a fairly long tradition. As an approach to promoting foreign language competence it partly grew out of the European school model, its success is to a large extent also due to the development of the so-called Franco-German schools in the late sixties and early seventies. These schools were founded after the French-German friendship treaty had been signed in the early sixties. The number of secondary schools practicing CLIL was very small in the beginning. In most of them French was used as the language of instruction. In the beginning of the seventies a few schools began to introduce English, but, on the whole, this approach was regarded as fairly idiosyncratic, at least up to the middle of the eighties. At that time, when the number of children dramatically decreased and schools had to fight for students, more and more schools offered CLIL as an option. To date, more than 300 schools in Germany offer a CLIL option, among them there are almost eighty which use French as the language of instruction. (Folie)

Organisation of CLIL in the German school system: CLIL in Germany is usually organised

according to the following pattern. When children begin their secondary education at the age of ten they have the choice to opt for a CLIL education. They do not enter a CLIL class right away, however, but take part in a preparatory language course in the school's CLIL language which continues for two school years. Normally this preparatory course consists of two to three additional language lessons per week in which the students are expected to develop a higher degree of general language competence, but also some basic ESP proficiency in the content subjects.

In grade seven at the age of twelve content education in a foreign language begins (**Folie**). The most favoured content subjects are History and Geography; Politics is also a favourite, but even content subjects like Biology, Sports or Religious Instruction are taught in a foreign language. As in normal classes content subjects are taught two hours a week; as foreign language lessons continue as well, learners are exposed to the foreign language six to seven hours a week. At grade nine a second content subject is introduced, it is taught in the same foreign language. At grade eleven in some schools a third content subject is introduced for students who continue their schooling to obtain their final degree, the Abitur (**Folie**).

The languages of instruction are, in general, English and French. Other languages used, often only in one school, are Italian, Spanish, Russian or Polish. It is important to underline that when a school in Germany has opted for CLIL, content teaching, unlike in other European countries, usually takes place in only one foreign language. This does not exclude other foreign languages being taught in this school as well.

The overhead slide also shows that at least the most widely used CLIL languages have their favourite content subjects. For example, History is proportionately taught more often through French, Geography more often through English. This has something to do with the choices students make when they acquire their teaching diploma. French and History is a more common combination than English and History, English and Geography is more common than French and Geography. The schools are free to choose the language of instruction; in general, they can choose their content subjects from a set of six to eight. Their choice depends, of course, both with respect to the language and the content subjects, on the teachers available at the school.

At the end of their schooling students who have successfully gone through a CLIL branch obtain the same degree as students who were taught in their mother tongue. Students whose language of instruction is French are given an additional diploma which allows them to register at any university in France. Whereas these students still have to pass a French language exam before being able to study in France, students who have passed the so-called Abi-Bac (i.e. a joint Franco-German examination) at the end of their schooling can study in France without any additional exams. The Abi-Bac can be taken only by students who have gone through a CLIL branch.

Motives for introducing CLIL: I mentioned already that until now schools in Germany have been free to open a CLIL branch. Ministerial permission was given when the school could prove that a sufficient number of qualified language and content subject teachers were available and that there were enough students interested in taking a CLIL course. Ministries usually gave financial support to such schools or provided them with an additional teaching post. As I will explain in a moment this situation has changed now but it is still interesting to look at the motives

a school has in opening a CLIL branch (**Folie**). On the overhead I show you a list of reasons schools gave when they were asked why they introduced CLIL. The data is from a questionnaire which was sent to all CLIL schools in Germany by one of the ministries of education.

Three reasons given for the introduction of CLIL at a specific school are equally important when looking at the data statistically. Most schools believe that CLIL branches develop what is called in Germany “European competence”, they also believe that students having studied within a CLIL branch have better chances at university and in professional life. Teachers and school administrators are of the opinion that it is possible more easily within a CLIL branch to develop general language competence, communicative competence and intercultural competence. When analysing these motives for the introduction of CLIL it can be seen that they are either pragmatic or language-focussed. According to what schools believe it is the foreign language which is promoted through CLIL, and a good knowledge of the foreign language will help students to get better jobs both in Germany and in Europe. The fact that specific content subjects are taught through a foreign language and the consequences of this for content subject learning do not seem to play a role (neither negatively nor positively) when the decision to introduce a CLIL branch is taken.

Slightly disappointing is the fact that not many schools believe that CLIL promotes pedagogical innovation. Most schools seem to be of the opinion that simply the choice of CLIL is innovative enough, and that it is not necessary to expect any further pedagogical innovation through the implementation of CLIL. I will take up this observation in the next part of my paper where I will show that CLIL teaching in general is very conventional in Germany both with respect to content and language.

I would like to make one last comment with respect to the motives for introducing CLIL. Although only four schools mention “better understanding of the partner country” as a reason, it is interesting to note that all of them use French as the CLIL language, the partner country thus being France. The answers make clear that France is still seen as a partner country which can be understood as a cultural unit, whereas English is related to so many different countries with so many different cultures that understanding these cultures does not seem possible. It might be the case that teachers and school administrators relate English to some kind of multinationalism which cannot be identified culturally any more, i.e. students learn French as a language related to the French culture, but they do learn international English, a language not related to any culture any more. This certainly is a problem which has something to do with the hegemonial position of the English language around the world.

Future plans: I mentioned a moment ago that until now it was quite easily possible to open a CLIL branch in a German secondary school. This situation has changed recently due to lack of state funding. Instead, ministries of education all over Germany propose a new model for CLIL which is based on a so-called modular principle. The modular approach is expected to introduce elements of content and language integrated learning into all secondary schools. Teachers who are both language and content teachers are expected to do part of their content teaching in the foreign language. They should develop specific teaching sequences (projects) dealing with a topic which lends itself to be taught in a foreign language, for example a project on the French revolution in French, or on early industrialisation in England in English. Ideally, in content teaching teachers would switch between the mother tongue and the foreign language several

times during a school year. The modular approach can, of course, not be compared with “traditional” CLIL. Neither is there any linguistic preparation for the CLIL course nor do learners build up a specific register for the content subject in the foreign language. The results of modular CLIL with respect to language proficiency will not be as good as the results of traditional CLIL. On the other hand, modular CLIL is probably more efficient than traditional language teaching as it bridges the gap between language learning on the one hand and content learning on the other. Modular CLIL is a particularly interesting model for the sector of vocational training.

3. CLIL pedagogy in Germany

During the last ten minutes or so I have tried to draw a general picture of the German CLIL model. In what follows I would like to discuss in more detail some pedagogical aspects of this model, beginning with more administrative aspects and ending with some remarks on teacher training and research on CLIL (**Folie**).

3.1 Curricula

The state of the art with respect to curricular development can be characterised as different in the fifteen states of the Federal Republic. In many states no specific curricula for CLIL exist, teachers do what they think is best within the general CLIL framework. On the other hand, in Northrhine-Westphalia, the largest state, specific curricula have been devised for all subjects which can be chosen as content subjects for CLIL. Although these curricula are similar to the corresponding mother tongue curricula they are different in that they put topics into another order, for example in focussing more on contents which are important for the target language culture. Curricula also contain examples which are meant to show how certain content topics can be dealt with in a foreign language. One principle is inherent in all content subject curricula: students having gone through a CLIL branch must have the same knowledge of the content subject at the end of their school career as students who have studied the content subjects through their mother tongue.

3.2 Selection of students

I mentioned some minutes ago that students have to choose at the age of ten whether they want to enter a CLIL class at the beginning of grade seven. This choice depends, of course, on a number of factors: there must be a CLIL school located near their home; their primary school teachers are expected to give a positive assessment with respect to the child’s succeeding in the CLIL class; secondary school teachers are expected to discuss possible problems with the child’s parents. But, in general, any child can enter a CLIL branch without having to pass an exam or go through an interview. Although this seems a very democratic procedure with respect to the selection of students it must be admitted that secondary schools try to form CLIL classes with only the most gifted children or at least what they believe to be the most gifted. Demographic analyses of CLIL classes also show that the number of migrant children is fairly low and that children of well-to-do parents are in the majority. In a way CLIL classes seem to replace classes which started with Latin as a first language and are thus the prestige classes in a school.

3.3 Language teaching and learning methodology

Mainstream foreign language teaching in Germany like in the rest of Europe is based on the

so-called communicative approach, a language teaching model which was introduced in the beginning of the seventies in the context of new developments in linguistics, sociolinguistics and philosophy (i.e. speech act theory and pragmatics). Communicative language teaching is also the approach which characterises the methodology prevalent in the CLIL classroom. Neither from a theoretical nor from a practical perspective does communicative language teaching present itself, however, as one homogeneous approach. There are many different varieties, radical theoretical approaches representing the “pure doctrine” and more traditional approaches which try to maintain older concepts and to relate them to fundamental principles of the communicative approach. In German schools a fairly conventional type of communicative language teaching prevails; it is still highly dependent on audiolingual and cognitive principles but also includes elements of communication. Most teachers have developed their own eclectic approach which includes both interaction between teachers and students – but not so much between students – , but also heavily relies on grammar teaching, rule learning and conventional ways of vocabulary work. On the whole, foreign language teaching in Germany is fairly traditional, even when it is based on communicative principles. Unfortunately, this traditional way of dealing with language is also typical of the German CLIL classroom.

3.4 Content teaching and learning methodology

The way content subjects are taught in German classrooms is not less traditional. In general, all teaching and learning is textbook-centred, i.e. textbook materials are the only materials used in the classroom, with the exception of the occasional video film. It can be observed, however, that content teaching in CLIL classes is beginning to undergo major changes which have something to do with the different learning environment. There are no content subject textbooks in the foreign language, so teachers have to find other materials, there are no ready-made dictionaries available which contain the technical vocabulary of the content subjects, so teachers and pupils have to put together their own vocabulary lists. This necessitates working together in groups, an approach which was more or less unthinkable until recently in the German content classroom. In a way, the CLIL learning environment seems to enforce a new methodological approach in the content classroom, and this pressure on methodology seems to be higher on the content than on the language side.

3.5 Materials

As I mentioned already, materials are a delicate issue in the German CLIL approach. It is therefore being discussed quite controversially. Many CLIL teachers complain that there are no materials available; for time reasons they feel unable to collect materials, so they ask German textbook editors to develop materials for them. Although some materials have been developed by schoolbook editors - mainly small collections of texts focussing on one specific topic (for example on deserts or the rain forest in Geography, **Folie**) , most editors do not really intend to produce materials on a large-scale basis, the main reason for this being that the market is too small and too diversified. Other teachers adapt materials from the target language country, using for example French history or English geography books. Problems arise because the target language text books do not reflect the German curriculum, and because, at least in the beginning, the texts are too difficult for German learners. A third group of teachers is looking for their own materials making use of all kinds of sources: the internet, television, radio, print media etc. They take specialised journals like the National Geographic in order to find texts on geography, or

historical journals for their history courses. In general, materials development is an issue which is being taken care of by the pedagogical institutes of the different states. The data bases prepared by some of them show that in the near future sufficient materials will be available on the internet for most content subjects and the major languages.

3.6 Students' assessment

Within the general framework of the German educational system in which frequent learner assessment plays a great role the evaluation of the students progress both in the content subject and in the foreign language is quite problematic. The question arises whether students should be assessed according to their linguistic abilities or by their results in the content subject. There can be no doubt that this question is important also in conventional language teaching: many teachers are confronted almost daily with the problem in which way an essay should be assessed which is brilliant from a language point of view but poor content-wise. But in CLIL the consequences are more far-reaching because they touch upon two different subjects. Should a student whose English or French is brilliant but whose knowledge in the content-subject is less than average get a better mark in the content subject because he or she can express herself more fluently than another student whose content knowledge is better than that of the first student but whose linguistic competence is less developed? In general, within the German CLIL framework content knowledge should decide on the assessment in the content subject, and linguistic proficiency in the language subject. But very often it is difficult to separate the two competences. The assessment issue has definitely not been solved in the present context, it can only be solved if the approach to assessment in general is changed.

3.7 Teacher training

CLIL as an innovative educational concept can only be put into practice on a larger scale if there is a sufficient number of teachers who can teach content subjects through a foreign language, i.e. who are not only qualified subject and foreign language teachers but who are also familiar with CLIL as a content and language integrated approach to learning. In Germany we have not gone very far yet in CLIL teacher training although the number of teachers we need in our CLIL branches is fairly high. Until recently there has neither been any pre-service nor any in-service training. Most CLIL teachers learn the CLIL-specific aspects of their profession in the field, i.e. while they are teaching in CLIL classes. Now some German universities (including Wuppertal) offer an additional pre-service teacher training programme for students who want to qualify as CLIL teachers. Our programme consists of a module in bilingualism and bilingual education, a course on English or French for specific purposes, a course on learning strategies and a course on materials development. It also includes a stage lasting six weeks in a CLIL school and a three months' stay at a school in the target language country. Some in-service teacher training centres now also offer specific training seminars for future CLIL teachers.

3.8 Research on CLIL

The existing research on CLIL in Germany is mainly classroom or action research. Although this research is important as it sheds light on the difficulties teachers have, a more complex research programme will have to be developed to find out more about CLIL and the way it works in the German context. From a language teaching perspective one important question should be what

distinguishes the linguistic development of a student learning a foreign language in a CLIL context from a student in a traditional classroom. Although a number of researchers (for example Wode) are dealing with this question already, they focus mainly on structural and lexical aspects of language: learners are compared as to lexical richness and structural complexity. What we would need, however, is research on the overall language proficiency of both learner types. This can not be analysed on the basis of lexis and grammar, but necessitates a much more complex research programme. A research project which we have started to work on in Wuppertal is concerned with the question, in what way the representation of content changes in an individual's mind if content is learned through another language.

4. New methodological issues

As I have tried to show in describing the German approach to CLIL, mainstream methodology is fairly traditional both with respect to the content and the language teaching component. Some CLIL specialists – most of them language teaching specialists – have, however, raised a number of methodological issues in recent years trying to overcome the shortcomings inherent in the German model. These issues center around two points, the critical reflection of the pedagogical potential of CLIL and the development of a CLIL methodology. I would like to deal with these two issues in more detail now.

4.1 Reflecting on the pedagogical potential of CLIL

Adherents of CLIL have always been convinced that learners develop a higher competence in the foreign language because they are exposed to it for longer periods of time than in conventional language teaching. They also believe that using the foreign language as a working language for the content subject is more authentic than using it to talk about the traditional topics of a foreign language classroom, i.e. Peter and Betty, their pets, their father's job, their free-time activities, going to a cinema or to the disco etc. According to CLIL specialists, it is not only the interaction which becomes authentic in the CLIL classroom, however; subject-specific materials (maps, graphs, pictures etc.) which are used in the classroom are more authentic than foreign language textbooks which usually deal with their topics in a rather naive and superficial way. So, according to adherents of CLIL this approach is superior to conventional language teaching because of its higher degree of authenticity and its higher frequency of exposure.

These advantages, which are purely language-oriented, should not be underestimated, but there are a number of additional features in CLIL which, if integrated more consistently into the classroom, will make this approach a more powerful instrument not only for the promotion of language competence. It is important to see that through CLIL a learning environment is created which makes it possible much more easily to put into effect modern pedagogical theories. I can discuss here only a few aspects.

The learning environment created through CLIL lends itself much better to the introduction and use of learning techniques and strategies. The learner will get to know the necessity of using strategies of hypothesis building and hypothesis testing in the content subject and will transfer them to his language learning. Learners will, for example, be introduced to analytic strategies in the interpretation of maps and will also use them in language learning. They will work with subject-specific vocabulary and thus increase their vocabulary learning potential. Subject learning

is highly strategic, especially in subjects like History and Geography, and learners will much more easily transfer their strategic knowledge to their language learning. Learning techniques and strategies are the most important tools for the autonomous learner. Although their potential in the CLIL classroom is beginning to be recognised, they have not yet found their adequate position.

Another pedagogical principle which can be integrated much better into the learning environment of the CLIL classroom is the necessity to make the acquisition of skills and knowledge which can be used in real life central in all classroom activities. Knowledge transmitted in schools should not be different from real life or action knowledge. What must be avoided in CLIL classes is to teach factual historical or geographical knowledge: this knowledge which is usually prepared and ready-made for learners to consume is not the knowledge which will really involve them and will make them do processing efforts both language- and content-wise.

This principle leads to another, equally important one. A CLIL classroom offers an environment for explorative learning which cannot be found in a conventional classroom. Exploring the content subject, experimenting with specific aspects are natural activities in a CLIL classroom. Discovery learning and project work are much easier to embed into such a learning environment than into a conventional classroom.

4.2 Developing a CLIL methodology

As I mentioned earlier when discussing content methodology, CLIL seems to make teachers and language teaching theoreticians more sensitive to issues of methodology. The question is asked whether CLIL needs a methodology of its own. Although many teachers and teacher trainers do not believe in a specific CLIL methodology a number of more progressive adherents of CLIL (cf. Otten, Thürmann) defend the necessity for such a methodology. The methodological discussion turns around three general issues: receptive processing, language production and autonomy.

It has become clear that reading and thus reading skills are of great importance in the CLIL classroom. Most of the acquisitional processes are related to language comprehension: learners work with documents and other sources in order to acquire content subject knowledge and have to develop the strategies necessary to process information. Although reading strategies play an important role in other foreign language learning contexts as well, in CLIL they decide on the student's success or failure. We know from reading research that reading skills are related to text formats and thus indirectly also to subject matter. Readers develop specific reading styles for specific texts: they process newspaper texts in a way different from literary or scientific texts. And they process texts in another way when these are written in the learner's first or second language. A specific CLIL methodology must take this issue into account, reading strategies must play an important part both in the preparatory classes but also during the learning process in the CLIL classroom. But within CLIL receptive processing does not only mean reading texts; content subject work also includes working with graphs, tables, maps, charts etc. Here specific processing strategies are necessary as well which will help learners to process the information contained in these materials. So developing the ability for receptive processing in the CLIL classroom is an issue which entails both language and other kinds of visual processing.

Although language production is a less neglected issue in the traditional language classroom,

it has to be looked upon in a new way in the context of CLIL. Classroom discourse, for example, plays a much more important role in the CLIL classroom. As researchers in Germany and in Austria (Thürmann, Abuja) have found out, the discourse necessary for the CLIL classroom can be analysed as consisting of two sets of skills (**Folie**), one more general functional set valid for all content subjects and consisting of the following speech acts or text formats, identify – classify/define – describe – explain – conclude/argue – evaluate, and one more specific set which is different for different content subjects or groups of subjects (my example is from Physics), defining – classifying – making inductions/stating laws – describing states and processes – working with graphs, diagrams, tables, etc. – interpreting – writing reports.

In order to develop these skills students need language support; words, phrases for classroom discourse etc.

In this context it should also be mentioned that terminological aspects have lost their overwhelming importance in the discussion of CLIL methodology. Especially in the early CLIL years teachers believed that content teaching could only work if students had the precise terminology in the foreign language at their disposal; nowadays it has become clear that the terminological inventory of a content subject can be differentiated into more general and into more specific terms. As Krechel (1996) put it, in CLIL one should begin by providing more general content-subject-oriented vocabulary and should then slowly move towards more and more specific vocabulary (the French term *l'inondation* belongs to the more general technical vocabulary of Geography and can also be found in general French, the term *le surpaturage* is a very specific term used only when discussing questions of agriculture in Geography).

Not much needs to be said here about the third issue, autonomy. CLIL methodologists in Germany have recognised the importance of autonomy in all learning and thus also in language and content learning. They suggest making learners more conscious of their learning and language learning processes; to develop autonomy they propose to promote general study and learning skills so that learners can work independently in the classroom.

5. Concluding remarks

Like all approaches to CLIL, the German model, although it fits into the general definition which I discussed at the beginning of my talk, shows specific features, which make it different from all the other models. As I indicated earlier these features have something to do with the German linguistic and educational context. In a country in which learners normally have very little contact with the target languages outside school it is understandable that immersion-type approaches to CLIL – as found in bilingual or multilingual countries – were not introduced. Although a number of researchers – among others Henning Wode (1995) – have pleaded for immersion CLIL in the German context it has become clear that Canadian, Australian or American immersion programmes – even if they work in these countries – cannot simply be transferred into the European context, especially in a monolingual country. German CLIL, which like immersion relies on exposure but also on a systematic methodological approach to language and content, seems to be the best solution to develop multilingualism in the linguistic context in which Germany is located.

The fact that the underlying methodological approach is still very traditional might also have

something to do with the monolingual status of the country. The idea that languages must be taught not only systematically but also in a form-focussed way is more common in a country where other languages are not used officially. It is more difficult to convince teachers in such countries that languages must be used in order to be learned than in countries in which other languages are in daily use like, for example, in the smaller European countries such as Holland, Denmark or Sweden. And the fairly rigid German education system must not be forgotten either in this context, a system which normally takes only teachers who were trained in Germany. This contributes to the fact that most foreign language teaching in German schools is done by native speakers of German who have, in general, a different attitude to language teaching and learning than native speakers of the target language. A CLIL approach relying only on immersion would not be possible without making use of native speakers as teachers.

Like a number of other approaches, CLIL in Germany aims at additive bilingualism. In this it is different from CLIL programmes which are maintenance or transitional programmes. But it should not be forgotten that in German CLIL programmes integration of language and content is taken very seriously. CLIL is not simply a means to an end, in that CLIL students are exposed to the foreign language more frequently than others and that like this develop a higher competence in this language. The new perspective on content, which students develop when they learn content through another language, is equally important. In our research project in Wuppertal, where we compare students of History who study this content subject in their native language, German, with students who study History in French, we are able to show that the way the latter group looks at historical problems is much wider, more far-reaching and multi-perspectival. The perspective they develop is more neutral, more contrastive, it is intercultural.

Let me say in the end that CLIL as practiced in Germany but also in a number of other countries seems to be a very convincing approach to promote higher language proficiency and a better understanding of content. But it would benefit enormously if it was integrated methodologically into an approach defined by the principles of learner autonomy and if it did make better use of the resources and the tool functions of the New Technologies. But this is another topic.

Powerpoint Folien für Hong Kong

1. Folie: Name und Titel des Vortrags

Dieter Wolff

Bergische Universität

Gesamthochschule Wuppertal

Fachbereich 4

E-mail wolff2@uni-wuppertal.de

Content and Language Integrated Learning: An Evaluation of the German Approach

2. Folie: Definition von CLIL

Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) is a generic term and refers to any educational situation in which an additional language and therefore not the most widely used

language of the environment is used for the teaching and learning of subjects other than the language itself.

3. Folie: Gliederung (die Gliederung ist neu, sie sollte sich Punkt für Punkt von oben nach unten aufbauen)

1. Introduction
2. The German approach to CLIL
 - 2.1 Linguistic and educational background
 - 2.2 CLIL in the German school system
3. CLIL pedagogy in Germany
 - 3.1 Curricula
 - 3.2 Selection of students
 - 3.3 Language teaching and learning methodology
 - 3.4 Content teaching and learning methodology
 - 3.5 Materials
 - 3.6 Students' assessment
 - 3.7. Teacher training
 - 3.8 Research
4. New methodological issues
 - 4.1 Reflecting on the teaching and learning potential of CLIL
 - 4.2 Developing CLIL methodology
- 5 Concluding remarks

4. Folie: Anzahl der CLIL Schulen in Deutschland (bereits vorhanden)

5. Folie: Content subjects and languages (bereits vorhanden)

Dazwischen eine Folie Integrating content subjects (vgl. Skizze)

6. Folie: Motives for introducing CLIL (bereits vorhanden)

Können wir hier dazwischen die Gliederung von Abschnitt 3 noch einmal aufbauen. Das sollte an dieser Stelle bis 3.5. Materials gehen.

7. Folie: Eine Seite aus einem CLIL Material

An dieser Stelle muß die Gliederung von Abschnitt 3 fortgesetzt werden, also 3.6, 3.7 und 3.8.

8. Folie: Discourse skills in the CLIL classroom

General skills:

identify – classify/define – describe – explain – conclude/argue – evaluate,

Specific skills:

defining – classifying – making inductions/stating laws – describing states and processes – working with graphs, diagrams, tables, etc. – interpreting – writing reports.