Chapter II

Review of Literature

Content and Language Integration and Learning is seen primarily, as an alternative method of teaching a foreign or second language while teaching a specific subject matter. The alternative approach is significant, as the emphasis is laid equally on the learning of the subject matter and the learning of the foreign or second language by the learners, irrespective of whether the method is subject-led or language-led. The CLIL method of teaching has thrown into perspective, certain issues, other than learning of the subject matter (content) while the language proficiency of the learner is raised.

The discussions in the first chapter revolves primarily on the possibilities of teaching English as a second language for purpose of promoting language learning within a tribal and an indigenous set up for the promotion of an oral tradition which is assumed to have an impact on many other issues concerning the way of living of the tribal and indigenous people. An example that may be taken here is raising the awareness on the value of the indigenous land, and how the teaching of English language can be instrumental is creating such awareness. Thus, the teaching and learning of English within this context occurs within a regional context, whereby the linguistic needs of the learners’ second language and their social and environmental needs of the communities are addressed. The basis on which the linguistic, social and environmental needs are addressed has found room within the alternative method found in the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). Understanding CLIL from its inception to its features will throw light on how this research work fits in with this methodology.
If the British Empire were to rule entire Europe, it may be assumed that the European Language Policy would have delved only on language immersion programmes. However, with every State bearing its own cultural identity, their linguistic identity is also acknowledged. The acknowledgement of each linguistic identity is important for trade within the European Union. Coyle (2008) is of the opinion that there has been umpteen number of bilingual education models before the emergence of CLIL. Coyle quotes a few from Baetens-Beardsmore (1993), as she refers to the bilingual educational programmes prevalent in Europe before the dawn of CLIL as:

- the maintenance and expansion of a threatened linguistic patrimony as in Wales…
- the promotion of neighbouring languages across national frontiers as in the German model, the provision of high-level multilingual proficiency as in Luxemburg and the European schools, and the integration of immigrant populations into mainstream society.

(Baetens-Beardsmore, 1993 as quoted in Coyle, 2008 p. 98)

Coyle, goes on further to state that “the ideologies” (Coyle 2008, p.98) were “spawning … in attempts to build on, rationalise or dominate linguistic and cultural diversity” (Coyle 2008, p. 98) but there was “little emphasis … on collaboration to develop CLIL pedagogies” (Coyle 2008, p. 98) which called for the “re-visioning of bilingual education according to national and regional contexts” (Coyle 2008, p. 98) within Europe “to create a channel for shared understandings” (Coyle 2008, p 98). The Commission of the European Communities (1995) argued strongly that all European citizens should be able to communicate in three languages—the local and / or national language and
two other European Languages (Commission of European Communities, p. 47). CLIL thus came into being to indicate:

a generic umbrella term encompassing a wide range of initiatives, in which learning of second/foreign languages and other subjects has a joint curricular role in education.


The “joint curricular role in education” (Marsh (2002) as quoted in Coyle (2008), p. 99) as stated above may be broaden into two broad categories: the learning of an additional language or languages to the native language and the gathering of content and knowledge as prescribed by the curriculum of the educational board or institution. In other words, the joint curricular role in education in CLIL terms may be spelt out as learning having a ‘dual focus’. The dual focus of the CLIL is stated as:

CLIL refers to situations where subjects, or parts of subjects, are taught through a foreign language with dual focused aims, namely the learning of content and the simultaneous learning of foreign language.

(Marsh, 1994 quoted in Coyle 2008 p. 99)

Coyle brings clarity to the concept of content and language integration by quoting Marsh (2002) on what the focus of CLIL is:

it does not give emphasis to either language teaching or learning, or to content teaching and learning, but sees both as integral parts of the whole.

(Marsh 2002 as quoted in Coyle 2008 p. 99)
Though emphasis was not given specifically either to language or content teaching and learning, Coyle states that “the principles underpinning CLIL classroom practice tended to rely heavily on second language acquisition theory” (Coyle, 2005 as quoted in Coyle 2008 p.98). The researcher is of the opinion that CLIL is a method where its principles are the outcome of the several Second Language Acquisition Theories particularly, the Social Interactionists and Social Theories, the Natural Approach, and the Communicative Approach. A similar characteristic found in all the three theories mentioned, in relation to CLIL, is that society plays a significant role in the learners’ acquisition of a second language.

The Social Interactionist and Social Theories argue that the “linguistic environment” (Gass (2002) as quoted in Malone (2012), p. 3), the “social environment” (Vygotsky (n.d). as quoted in Malone (2012), p. 3) and “comprehensible output in meaningful conversations is necessary for successful second language acquisition” (Swain (1990) as quoted in Malone (2012), p. 3).

Krashen’s Affective Filter Hypothesis (1995) states another factor that determines the learners’ ability in acquiring a second language; he states that the learners’ level of comfort (the emotions and feelings) in the process of learning, determines learners’ ability; the equation being: high affective filter amounts to low level of learning and vice versa.

The Communicative Approach has its prime focus in the conveying of meaning, irrespective of the accuracy of form, while communicating. The meaning which has its basis on the learners’ experience is conveyed in interaction using the target language.
It is also found that the three second language theories mentioned, also reflect the relationship the learners have with their social environment. The researcher terms this as the ‘learner-socio-lingual environment relationship’. Prior knowledge of a learner begins with what the learner gathers through his/her sense during his/her infant stage. The bond between him/her and his/her environment shapes the beliefs and perception of the learner. Prior to learning the second language, the avenue for his expression lies in the native language. Malone thus, quoting Butzkamm (2007) re-affirms that:

the mother tongue is therefore the greatest asset people bring to the task of foreign language learning and provides an indispensable Language Acquisition Support System.


On further analysis, the ‘learner-socio-lingual environment relationship’ has five dimensions, each of which may be considered a factor in the learners’ attempt at learning a second language. The learner, at the helm of the relationship, depends (an unconscious effort) on the social environment for content for learning and understanding, and uses the same environment when applying the content and language learned. In this sense, the cognitive ability of the learner determines their use of a second language.

If the surrounding or the environment plays such a vital role in the learning of a language, then it is only logical that every learner has his unique surrounding or environment that influences his learning of a second language. In this sense, the re-visioning of bilingual education, mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, calls for emphasis on the learning of a second language along the regional context. The CLIL models for each region, each
surrounding, and each environment is specific to the learners’ needs and ability to learn a second language.

Irrespective of the uniqueness of each of the learners’ surrounding, environment, and culture, the ‘awareness of self and others’ (Gierlinger, E. (2012)), ‘the thinking process’ (Gierlinger, E. (2012)), ‘the language use for communication’ along a specific ‘subject matter’, are aspects which are touched upon by all models of CLIL. Coyle has summed up this process in 4Cs Framework for CLIL (Coyle (1999) as quoted in Coyle (2008), p. 103). The framework touches on four areas in the learning of a second language: Content, Communication, Cognition and Culture. This work of Coyle was conceptualized by Mohan in his Knowledge Framework (1986). Coyle explains that this framework thus, it:

starts with content (such as subject matter, themes, cross-curricular approaches) and focuses on the interrelationship between content (subject matter), communication (language), cognition (thinking) and culture (awareness of self and ‘otherness’) to build on the synergies of integrating learning (content and cognition) and language learning (communication and cultures).

(Coyle 2008 p. 103)

Knowledge and understanding of the subject matter requiring thinking, critical and creative; using a learnt or acquired language skills in the first and second language for interaction as a result of the cognitive process; and gathering knowledge of the society, environment and culture where the learning takes place is indicative that CLIL occurs as per the 4Cs Framework. Coyle’s 4Cs
Framework, no doubt, simultaneously brings into focus learning of a language and learning of content, thus fulfilling the aim of dual focus of which CLIL speaks of.

CLIL models may vary in context, content and the target language that is needed to be acquired. This depends entirely on the community in which the learner is placed, and on the purpose of learning which may be for academic purposes, vocational purposes and professional purposes. Having stated this, it is apt to state here, that though CLIL models may differ in context, content and the target language needed to be acquired, the features however, of all CLIL models, are synthesized under common headings. Mehisto, Marsh, and Frigols (2008) reflected a synthesis of the features of CLIL and categorized them under the following headings: Multiple Focus, Safe and Enriching Environment, Authenticity, Active Learning and Scaffolding. The highlights of each of these features indicate the uniqueness of this methodology.

The “Multiple Focus” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29) is a feature that reflects language learning and content learning being supported in both the language and content classroom. Other than the language-content learning support that this feature states, it is the integration of several subjects and the “organization learning through cross-curricular themes and projects” (Mehisto et al 2008, p.29) that has also been the prime focus.

Motivation is another important factor that has enabled CLIL to be successful as an innovative methodology. This psychological aspect, that enhances learning, is attributed to the “safe and enriching learning environment” (Mehisto et al (2008), p.29) that is created in the CLIL classroom. The “safe and enriching environment” (Mehisto et al (2008), p.29)
is due to the ability of the students to “experiment with language” (Mehisto et al. (2008), p. 105) in the classroom. There is enough activity in the classroom that raises the level of awareness of how and what language is used in the course of study and the use of “authentic learning materials” (Mehisto (2012), p.22) and the use of “authentic language” (Mehisto (2012), p.22) raises the motivation of the learners.

Achieving authenticity in the use of materials and in the use of language has been discussed by Pinner (2013) in *Authenticity and CLIL: Examining Authenticity from an International CLIL Perspective*. In this paper he discusses the nature and the development of the term ‘authenticity’ in relation to CLIL methodology. The reference is made to the target community from which the content is received and the language used and learnt is a “by-product of meaningful interactions” (Pinner (2003), p. 46):

The nature of CLIL classroom puts the emphasis not on a specific target community where the language is spoken, but on the content being learned using the target language as a tool. CLIL achieves authenticity through ‘authenticity of purpose’ (Coyle et al., 2010: 5). So, in the Vygotskyian sense, language is a psychological tool through which other forms of learning are mediated, language in CLIL is a tool through which other learning is achieved. Thus the authentic purpose and the learning of meaningful content lend their authenticity to the language.

(Pinner (2013) p.46)
In addition to the Pinner’s (2013) statement on authenticity, Mehisto et al (2008) included this as one of the six features of CLIL. Mehisto et al (2008) puts the learners’ needs at the heart of learning in a CLIL classroom. Here the students are allowed to “ask for language help” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29), the interests of the students are accommodated, and “a regular connection between learning and the student’s lives” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29) is made and also allows them to be connected “with speakers of other CLIL language” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29).

From the learners’ point of view, it seems apparent that “peer co-operative work” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29) exists where a certain degree of autonomy is given to the students in the classroom. The autonomy given to the students is the classroom enables what Mehisto et al (2008) refers to as “Active Learning” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29). The learners are given the opportunity to “help set content, language and learning skills outcomes” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29), the learners are given an opportunity to “evaluate progress in achieving learning outcomes” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29) and there is “negotiating of meaning of language and content” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29) among the learners. In all this, the “teachers act as facilitators” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29).

As facilitators, teachers assist learners in the classroom CLIL activities. The process of assisting learners in reaching autonomy is known as “Scaffolding” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29). As a CLIL feature identified by Mehisto et al (2008), scaffolding is seen as “building on a student’s existing knowledge, skills, attitudes, interests and experience” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29); “repackaging information in user-friendly ways” (Mehisto et al (2008), p.
responding to different learning styles” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29); “fostering creative and critical thinking” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29); and “challenging students to take another step forward and not just in comfort co-operation” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 29). Mehisto et al. (2010) interestingly links this process of assisting learners not only by the teachers teaching language or content, but speaks of an assistance that comes from the “parents” (Mehisto et al. (2008), p. 30), “local community, authorities and employers” (Mehisto et al (2008), p. 30) of the learners. Other than Mehisto et al, Banegas (2012) in Integration Content and Language in English Language Teaching in Secondary Education: Models, Benefits and Challenges quote Gibbons (2002) to reflect scaffolding as:

a special kind of help by which the teacher temporarily assists learners while they perform a task so that, in the future, they can become autonomous and work on their own.

(Gibbons (2002) as quoted by Banegas (2012), p. 112)

According to Mehisto, et al (2008), the core features of all CLIL models, brings into light the role of the content teachers in teaching a second language in the content classrooms. Mehisto, et al. (2008) states:

However, CLIL also calls on content teachers to teach some language. In particular, content teachers need to support the learning of those parts of language knowledge that students are missing and that may be preventing them mastering the content.

(Mehisto et al. (2008), p. 11)

The integration of Content and language is thus understood that, the ground work for this integration begins not on top-down hierarchical strata.
Negotiation and planning of CLIL work begins as a basic communication exercise that begins with negotiation between teachers and students on the content to be learnt followed by further classroom discussions among the learners.

In formal classroom learning, ‘content’ and ‘language’ are two independent variables. The relationship between the two in learning is now self-explanatory; yet, the question is what takes precedence? This may vary from class to class and what really takes priority in the list of learner needs. From a CLIL perspective, it is understood that either content or language may take precedence in a classroom, but what takes precedence may never dominate the other. It is only appropriate then to take this discussion further into what exactly does content entail and what does language entail.

The issue of social context, prior to content and language learning, requires a glance so as to put into perspective the ‘what’ and the ‘why’ of content and language learning. Candlin and Mercer (2001) states that:

“The wider social context of life outside the classroom has an important effect on what takes place in these interactions between learners and teachers and among learners.”

(Candlin and Mercer (2001), p. 2)

It is from this point of view that objective of learning language and content in a CLIL classroom go beyond the classroom context. The source of learning of both content and language is the society from which the learners come from, and the application of what has been learnt is carried forward in the society to which the learners go back to.
The issue of relevance of content to the learners’ life, learners’ studies, and learners’ needs is supposedly realized in the class, if and when a teacher attempts at connecting the prescribed content with the learners’ prior knowledge, learners’ situation and learners’ needs. As a matter of using this principle of taking the learners from the ‘known to the unknown’, CLIL methodology indicates the relevance of what is taught to the learners from another perspective.

The relevance of the content used in the CLIL classroom is determined by both the teacher and the students. Content may be situational, thematic or need based. Situations are based on needs, desire, perception and a certain level of curiosity. The theme however, is decided upon after discussions and negotiations have taken place with the teacher concern.

Subjects such as Mathematics, Science, History, Geography and other subjects are the prescribed syllabus for Content learning in school or higher education. In a conventional classroom, the aim and objective of the teacher is to enable the students to retain the knowledge offered in these subjects, connect it with real issues and apply this knowledge in real world situations when needed. In other words, the knowledge gathered here is stored for use when needed. In CLIL methodology, critical and creative thinking among the students is activated, in the sense that there is enough deliberation on the subject matter between teachers and students or among the students themselves. This is where the role of the target language comes into play.

Banegas (2010) highlights the Language Triptych’s concept of Coyle et al. (2010), emphasizing on the need to analyse the role of language in learning, by classifying language into: “language of learning”, “language for
learning” and “language through learning” (Coyle et al. 2010 (36-48) quoted in Banegas (2010) p. (n.p.). Coyle understands that looking at language from this perspective will ensure a successful CLIL plan. The classification of language into three categories states a definite purpose for learning language at various levels. In brief, the Language Triptych suggests the learning of a language that is used currently in a subject matter, learning a language to be able to proceed with a given classroom task, and learning a language to link prior knowledge with new knowledge, using new language that may occur in the course of study.

Form and meaning are the focus of language learning. The learning and usage of vocabulary and sentence structure occurs in the discussions and deliberations that take place when CLIL activities are conducted. The language skills are developed in the process of integrating the learning of language and content in the CLIL classroom.

CLIL has spread across the globe. With its early beginnings in Europe, it spread to South America and to East Asia. The focus and the features of CLIL made this methodology relevant to all CLIL classrooms whether the purpose of it is academic, professional or vocational. The extent to which CLIL has branched out into various fields of study assures the researcher that there are greater heights and wider expanses to which this methodology could be taken to. The CLIL focus and features are apt, if and when used, in exploring the significance of learning of English as a second language in tribal and indigenous communities.

What CLIL methodology could further explore, is the significance in the perception that (English) language learning lies along a continuum, where
the oral tradition may be promoted, and the pressing issues of land (as used only as example in the need based choice of content) in the tribal and indigenous areas may be addressed as an assessment of the impact on the promotion of the oral tradition in the CLIL classrooms. The purpose then of CLIL would extend to sustaining the distinctive indigenous oral tradition of the tribal and indigenous communities while spreading the traditional knowledge that has sustained indigenous communities for decades.

The democratic approach to teaching and learning requires that content is developed and written by the teachers teaching in a CLIL classroom. The CLIL method encourages that teachers teaching a second language and teachers teaching the subject develop and write materials as per the requirements of knowledge to be gathered, understood, analysed and interpreted.

Discussions and deliberations have been made by proponents relating to authenticity of materials, students’ autonomy, democracy in classroom learning, the possibility of content teachers contributing to the language learning of the students in the content classroom. In the event of such deliberations and discussions across the globe, several references have been made more so to CLIL models within this approach to learning content and language.

CLIL proponents such as Do Coyle, David Marsh have developed models within the CLIL approach; Dario L Banegas and Sandra Lucietto have been prompt at analysing some existing models within the CLIL approach, throwing light on the benefits and challenges of models pointing the way forward towards more advanced models for better integration and learning of
content and language. From the components found in these models, such as 4C Model and the Language Triptych of Do Coyle, the most striking of them is the focus given to content, communication and culture.

Lucietto (2008) speaks of “a new quality CLIL model” (Lucietto (2008), p. 85) where the “dual nature of CLIL …is a new learning environment where content and language interact and inextricably contribute to learning” (Lucietto (2008), p. 87). It is apparent, therefore, that all three (content, communication and culture) interact with each other, creating an environment that enables the advancement of knowledge progression and yet, simultaneously, raises the level of linguistic proficiency among the learners. The interaction of the three aspects, content, communication and culture, integrates the learning of content and language. It is thus understood that the learning environment created by these models is relevant and authentic, is motivating for both students and teachers, and provides ample opportunities for the linguistic objectives and knowledge objectives to be met.


These models indicate that the role of the subject teachers and the language teachers are integrated yet distinct. However, Lucietto (2008) states:

```
insists on Teaching Teams (T-Teams), i.e. content and language teachers working together in all phases: module planning, materials’ production, implementation (when possible), assessment, and module evaluation.”
```

(Lucietto (2008), p.87).

When CLIL lessons take place during the content lessons, there are two different stands taken with regards to the use of a foreign or second
language when teaching content. Lucietto (2008) is of the opinion that a CLIL lesson is taught in a content classroom whereby “content lesson is taught in a foreign language” (Lucietto (2008), p. 87). Harrop (2012) on the other hand is of the opinion that content is taught “with and through the foreign language” (Harrop (2012), p. 57). In the opinion of the researcher, the dual nature of CLIL is addressed. The difference in the use of the three different prepositions reflects the approach in integrating content and language.

Do Coyle in her Language Triptych indicate that the preposition through in “language through learning” is “incidental language that results from active involvement with the tasks” (Coyle 1999, Gajo 2007 as quoted in Harrop (2012), p. 59). The term ‘involvement’ in the opinion of the researcher, is synonymous with ‘task’, ‘action’, and ‘integration’. This is not to demean the preposition in when speaking of “teaching content in a foreign language” however, it is only positioning a present approach of language teaching with reference to how language was taught in the past.

Models within the CLIL approach may well be viewed as ‘methodological operations’ in a content classroom, which explores the maximum potential in knowledge processing and linguistic processing and progression made among learners. The processing of knowledge can be effective, if and when, the lexical items are processed and internalized to a stage where learners are able to utter it in various complex and accurate form, within a given context. Thus, the integration of the acquisition of knowledge (content) and the acquisition of a second language (lexical and syntactic) is integral within these ‘methodological operations’. These ‘methodological operations’ can be made relevant to various settings. In the line of CLIL,
therefore, the ‘methodological operations’ may be customized to meet the needs of the learners, focusing minutely, on localized settings.

The localized setting as, in the context of this work, is proposed to be within a society where “the cutting edge of knowledge lies in the spoken value of the word” (Syiem (2011), p. 11). The “words” (Syiem (2011), p. 8) are viewed as the “vehicles of transmission” (Syiem (2011), p. 8) of all knowledge and wisdom. In *Navigating the Written: The Challenge to the Oral (The Origin Myth and Lost Script of the Khasis)*, Syiem states that “The written is…viewed as an incursion into the value system that depended solely upon the importance of the spoken word.” (Syiem (2011), p. 2). With this in mind, one argues that focusing on the language skill of speaking in the English classrooms, calling to mind the oral culture of a people, is an avenue to rejuvenate dying traditions. Rivers (1968) is of the opinion that the written code is too “elaborate and cumbersome” (Rivers (1968), p. 159) to be of use for oral communication; it is also “too intellectually demanding for informal communication” (Rivers (1968), p. 159). It is thus understood that the oral characteristic of a community, passes information along the use lexical items, the use of different sentence types and syntactic arrangements, using content that pertains to the lives of the people. Thus, as Rivers (1968) put it that the spoken word also involves the following features that “convey the full import of the spoken message” (Rivers (1968), p. 160):

Aspects of the spoken code which are not noted in the written code have frequently not been taught beyond a superficial level. Such features as pitch, intonation, stress and duration, assimilation, juncture, elisions, liaisons at word boundaries, and
expressive features like tone of voice and gestures are often all but ignored.

(Rivers (1968), p. 159)

The advent of the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) brought to the forefront an approach which focuses on "integrating foreign language and subject/thematic content in a wide range of learning and teaching context" (Coyle (2008), p.97). Coyle (2008) plays on the word 'integration' and 'language', keeping in mind the socio-cultural settings of a community.

A play on the word ‘integration in CLIL is twofold: “safeguard the subject being taught whilst promoting the language as a medium for learning as well as an objective of the learning process itself” (Coyle (2002a, p. 27 as quoted in Coyle (2008), p.100) thus enabling the conceptualization of both language and content along a continuum, this responding to the ‘local conditions and desires of a community’.

It is within the ‘local conditions and desires of a community’ that one is of the opinion that CLIL models are ‘methodological operations’ that may be customized as per the conditions, desires and need of a community. This forms the basis of an attempt of a CLIL model the researcher proposes to integrate culture (the oral culture), content (affinity to the land), and communication (spoken form/discourse, vocabulary and accuracy of form). The objective of this integration of these three aspects is to raise the level of proficiency in spoken English as a second language, using the characteristics of an age-old practice found in the oral tradition while appreciating the affinity the oral cultures have with their land.
The model is an incorporation of components of the CLIL approach particularly the aspects of cultural awareness and content from cultural set up that may be used in the development of communication in a foreign/second language. The model also considers key features from Interlanguage (IL), the Learning Process Approaches namely the Information Processing Approach (IP), the Connectionist Approach and a Social Approach. Below is a diagram that reflects a conceptual framework for content and language learning within the CLIL approach.

Diagram 1: The Conceptual Framework for Content and Language Learning

One assumes that the basis on which all interaction and communication takes place is the socio-cultural setting of the individual. Communication in the first as well as the second language begins with and awareness and the awakening of the senses of the learner. Likewise, it is one’s assumption that the second language learner, within a tribal and indigenous set up, has the potential to raise his/her second language linguistic proficiency by being
gradually guided into an interactive and communicative mode, simply by being taught the lexis of what he/she is aware of around his/her surrounding, and the feeling words that are associated with what he is aware of. The significance of the feeling words would indicate, affirm and acknowledging his / her emotional response to his/her surrounding. Acknowledgement and affirmation motivates learning. The motivation of the learners is assumed to be raised if content for learning is closer to home. Thus this model identifies culture at the heart of learning within the CLIL set up.

When one views culture as a lifestyle then cultural awareness begins with an awareness of the surrounding: the natural surroundings, people and their behaviour, beliefs and lifestyles of individual families and the community as a whole. Awareness is a level of input that enables learners to absorb what catches their eye amidst their natural surroundings, families and community. Being aware of what is around and absorbing it, is Input. Saville-Troike (2006) states the following:

Input for SLA is whatever sample of L2 that learners are exposed to, but it is not available for processing unless learners actually notice it: i.e. pay attention to it. Then it can become intake. It is at this point of perception of input where priorities are largely determined and where attentional resources are channelled.

(Saville-Troike (2006), p.74)

The input, the perception or the awareness for learning of the natural surroundings of the learners, the beliefs, and life lifestyle of the people
provides enough content for learning. It is the role and tasks of the language teachers to organize the materials into authentic materials for learning of content and language.

It is assumed that the awareness that is brought by the various ways of input can motivate learners to widen the scope of knowledge of their cultural set up within the formal classroom. The language lesson that occurs in the content classroom is a mediation of the learners between the real world outside the classroom and how that is expressed in the classroom. The learners’ initial process to develop linguistic proficiency is initiating the process of expressing meaning through interaction using the vocabulary learnt in the second language. Using the cultural content in expression of meaning in the classroom by the learners is another level where students are guided into. A reference to Selinker’s Interlanguage (1972) may be referred to here, where this approach may be considered as a “creative process” (Saville-Troike (2006), p. 41) of development and this is “driven by inner forces in interaction with environmental factors, and influenced by both L1 and by input from the target language” (Saville-Troike (2006), p. 41). Selinker (1972) was referring to the development of the Interlanguage. Selinker is of the opinion that the forces of influences of the L1 and the L2 in “interaction with environmental factors” (Saville-Troike (2006), p. 41) do not erase the system of rules that is present in the learners’ mind which governs the Interlanguage. However, he goes on to state that the system of rules that govern the Interlanguage, is subject to change. The change in patterns is determined by context and this context could well be attributed to society.
The researcher assumes, that cognitive development in the learner in learning a second language takes place when learners conceptualise, brainstorm, organize thought patterns on the linguistic arrangement using the content presented to them. One assumes that both content and language is integrated and learnt simultaneously. Over the course of duration given to learn the given content, the learning objectives of the language teacher may determine to sync in with the learning objectives of the content teacher. Content will be learnt as well as linguistic development in the second language will take place provided the “resetting of parameters” (Saville-Troike (2006), p. 51) among the learners is attended to by the language teachers. Muriel Saville-Troike (2006) states the following with regards to “resetting of parameters” (Saville-Troike (2006), p. 51) by the learners:

Learners change the parameter setting (usually unconsciously) because to the L₂ input they receive does not match the L₁ settings they have.

(Saville-Troike (2006), p.51)

According to Muriel Saville-Troike (2006), these resetting of parameters is determined by the gravity of how much access learners have to the Universal Grammar (UG). The greater access learners have to UG, the greater the chances that “IL grammars will never deviate from structures that are allowed by the UG” (Saville-Troike (2006), p. 51). This may be viewed as the interference of the first language. However, “the resetting of parameters is available on the basis of input in the new language” (Saville-Troike (2006), p. 51), and the evidence, “positive” (Saville-Troike (2006), p. 51) or “negative” (Saville-Troike (2006), p. 51) that is provided to them in “the natural use or
formal instruction” (Saville-Troike (2006), p. 51). Evidence as stated above is understood to be along the lines of the Behaviourist school of thought of providing a response to stimuli. In line with the CLIL approach to language learning within a social context, it would be a reinforcement or/and affirmation of the linguistic expression within a social context. Thus, it is the researcher’s understanding that Interlanguage provides the space and time for learners to consciously or unconsciously acquire additional parameter settings in the process of learning a second language. The possible mismatch between L₁ settings with the input from L₂ may not entirely prove to make learning of a second language difficult, though this may seem so at the initial stages of learning, but has an advantage of its own. It enables bilingualism as well as multilingualism. Additional settings within a given context are added to the language faculty.

The proposed model within the CLIL approach, allows for additional settings to occur. One of the aims of the proposed model is allowing the knowledge (content) provided within a cultural context to be understood, learned and enhanced in discussion ‘through’ the second language and reinforcing learning of both content and linguistic items with authentic and relevant experiences.

During the period of learning, or what we may now refer to as the period of Interlanguage, conceptualization, brainstorming, organizing may be seen as a process of sharing of knowledge and experiences using the language skills of speaking. Speaking thus may now be viewed as a linguistic production where the speaker, is proficient not only with the second language, but uses the second language from a procedural knowledge point of view, so
that an entire content that is being presented, brings out the essence of the message that it carries.

Bringing out this essence of the content would require skills in speaking that would allow the listener to connect with the speaker by being able to “discern the tone of voice, loudness, excitement, gestures, facial expressions, or tempo…all those things that make a story come alive” (Harrison 2007, p.145). To allow the development of the language skill of speaking in the target language such as English, one resonates with the thoughts of Harrison (2007) when he states that:

In ‘primary oral’ cultures, people draw on an impressive arsenal of speech strategies: narrative, talk, gossip, conversation, pauses, intonation, silence, loudness, word-choice, story, and myth. They rely solely on social learning to transmit and receive everything that can be encapsulated in language. Information must also be structured for ease of memorization. There are many devices of alliteration, rhyme, and parallelism, that aid in remembering texts. In English and other large languages with literary traditions, such devices are more an art form than a daily cognitive necessity.

Harrison (2007 p. 147)

The learning of form in the second language is vital for ‘intake’ as well as expression of meaning. Form occurs at every stage of learning. The first stage begins from a low level of proficiency where the learner begins to get a
sense (a step towards learning the accurate meaning) of the use of vocabulary items, phrases, and sentences, when presented within the cultural context, in the initial stages of the discussions. The second stage is allowing variations at the syntactical, morphological, phonological, vocabulary and discourse level, to be explored in the use of vocabulary items, phrases, and sentences, when learners make presentations, within the cultural context, in controlled and guided discussions on the given content. The learners reach a third stage, which is a stage of high level of proficiency, when learners are able to make presentations creatively and accurately in the use of linguistic items, while being able to use their critical ability in applying the acquired knowledge in problem solving thus adding new thoughts and information to the existing knowledge.

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is thus an incorporation of methods that promotes the learning of a major or a minor language at various levels to suit the need, the desire, and the theme of various communities. As an approach, it focuses on the dual nature of teaching and learning where learners simultaneously learn content and language within a given context. CLIL also considers the position of the learners, giving them autonomy in learning content and language. Furthermore, CLIL opens up possibilities of inclusiveness of experiences and culture of the CLIL teachers and learners, and the communities to which they go back to from the CLIL English classrooms.