

On a continuum between content and language in CBI/CLIL-oriented settings

1. The emergence and growth of CBI/CLIL approaches

The debate on integrating content and language learning/teaching, which has been going on for more than fifty years now, has taken many routes worldwide with the view to finding efficient ways of counterbalancing content and language aspects of instruction in a wide spectrum of L2 and FL contexts. As a consequence of a high primary evaluation of immersion programmes introduced in Canada in the 1960s, in which English and French were taught as a second language through school subjects, many theoreticians and practitioners felt motivated to take an opportunity to implement similar practices in their own educational environments. Special content and language-oriented courses proved to be in need for such addressees as ethnically and linguistically diverse L2 immigrant students aiming to acquire language proficiency of L1 peers so as to prepare for their tertiary education (e.g. in the USA, Canada, Australia), parents aspiring to enrich their children L2 fluency by studying selected content subjects in the target language (e.g. in India, China and European countries), or members of the European Union communities aiming to develop multilingual and multicultural education in Europe.

The fact that a large number of varying approaches were adopted on the path to the conceptualization of content and language integration, particularly in North American context is depicted by the terms used to refer to this issue. First of all, a range of terms putting content in the first place were coined, such as: content-based instruction (CBI), content-based language teaching (CBLT), content-based language learning (CBLL), content-based second language instruction or content-based ESL instruction. The second group of terms comprised those with the primary focus on the language component, that is language and content integration, integrated language and content instruction, bilingual education, languages across the curriculum, and language for specific purposes (Snow, Met and Genesee, 1989; Brinton, Snow and Wesche, 1997; Lyster and Ballinger, 2011). The enumerated terms clearly suggest that the kind of instruction adopted is either specifically directed at content to be acquired in the target language or that language is perceived as the major goal to be achieved while coordinated with the selected content.

An important development in Europe is connected with the introduction of the concept of CLIL in the 1990s, that is Content and Language Integrated Learning, which gave an impetus for the search for more effective practices for plurilingual education recommended by the Council of Europe. Five dimensions of CLIL were derived to offer a comprehensive representation of this type of educational framework, namely, culture (CULTIX), environment (ENTIX), language (LANTIX), content (CONTIX) and learning (LEARNTIX) (Wolff, 2002; Komorowska, 2010). Over the last two decades CLIL has undoubtedly become a prominent concept among many L2 researchers, educators, and administrators responsible for shaping educational policies in Europe, promoting the belief that focus on content can ensure the simultaneous attainment of second language communicative ability (e.g. Coyle, 2007; Mehisto, Marsh and Frigols, 2008; Coyle, Hood and Marsh, 2010; Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2013). Some researchers perceive CLIL instruction as being “strongly European-oriented”, and the term itself as being generic, indicating educational situations in which an additional language is used to teach content area subjects (Wiesemes, 2009). Lyster and Ballinger (2011), the two Canadian researchers, on the other hand, see a close similarity between CLIL and well-established North American immersion programmes as both of them pursue the goal of integrating content and language instruction. The main difference between them lies in the use of the language with the status of a second or a regional language in the case of immersion programs, and the choice of a foreign language as a medium of instruction in teaching content area subjects in CLIL-oriented courses.

It also needs to be emphasized that the spread of immersion instruction throughout Canada, the many alternative versions of CBI courses offered in the USA, as well as numerous CLIL-based teaching programmes introduced in Europe led foreign language specialists to rethinking the role content should play in the process of language learning/teaching so as to make language instruction fully contextualized and more meaningful (e.g. Brinton et al., 1997; Wesche and Skehan, 2002; Wiesemes, 2009; Dakowska, 2014). As a consequence, establishing common grounds for defining the potential relationships between the approaches focusing on language form and structures and those emphasizing the primacy of processing content of selected informational materials started to be sought. One of the first ideas of finding the balance between the two options was suggested by Met (1998).

2. Content- vs. language-driven instruction – the concept of a continuum

A multitude of educational situations in which educators and practicing teachers took an attempt to adopt the principles of a CBI/CLIL approach have brought about plentiful ideas for their implementation at different levels of educational practice. As a result, some innovative procedures were incorporated into a sequence of theme-based lessons, content-based courses were offered to teach particular school subjects, as well as full bilingual programs were designed for school curricula.

An interesting way for classifying a variety of instructional models which aimed at the integration between language and content was suggested by Met (1998), who suggested putting all the models with different curricula structures on a continuum by considering the extent to which the components of language and content were intended to engage students in classroom work. The researcher thus postulated that all the educational models be defined as lying somewhere on the continuum with its extreme points being **content-driven language programs** vs. **language driven content programs**.

Content-driven language programs are those focusing on content outcomes, with content found to be of prime importance and language as secondary. Content goals of a course or curriculum are pursued by the teacher who selects the accompanying language goals, and it is the achievement on content goals that is ultimately evaluated. In language-driven content programs, on the other hand, content serves the purpose of L2 learning. It is language mastery that is focused on with content to be acquired incidentally as students learn the language as a subject. Language objectives are set out to ensure that L2 course goals are accomplished, and content serves as a source of information to be communicated on in the classroom. Students are evaluated on language skills/proficiency with no high-stakes exams administered to assess the acquisition of content (Met, 1998).

As for content-driven language programs, they cover total and partial immersion, and language-driven content programs, on the other extreme, comprise language classes based on thematic units and language classes with frequent use of content for language practice. The middle positions are taken up by subject courses and subject courses plus language instruction (Met, 1998: p. 41). The researcher points out that the proportion of teaching language and content on the content-driven continuum, as well as the amount of explicit language instruction may vary considerably; similarly teachers' decisions can differ as to the kind and amount of content to be selected to include into language driven content programs.

The concept of a continuum of courses and curricula representative of CBI orientation introduced by Met (1998) has been found helpful in classifying a vast range of instructional frameworks adopted in different educational and socio-cultural contexts by the proponents of CBI-CLIL pedagogy (e.g. Davison and Williams, 2001; Stoller, 2004; Stoller, 2008; Nordmayer, 2010; Lyster and Ballinger, 2011; Banegas, 2012). However, Met's (1998) terms 'content-driven language programs' and 'language-driven content programs' were simplified and replaced with a reduced form of the term sounding as content-driven vs. language-driven programmes. Apart from a high recognition of the explanatory power of a continuum metaphor, it has also become common to refer to CLIL as a dual-focused educational approach, which is clearly reflected in the definition provided by Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010) that sounds: "Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language" (p. 1). The significance of the interdependence between language and content area teaching has frequently been forcefully underscored. Wesche and Skehan (2002) claimed that learners participating in CBI instruction are involved in a reciprocal process in which they simultaneously learn language and content as a result of understanding and using relevant concepts by the medium of L2. Yet, a word of caution comes from Lyster (2007: 26) who claims that an adequate handling of the intricacy of the relationship between language and content demands an exclusion of the cases of incidental acquisition of language aspects, as well as of teaching grammar points in a decontextualised way.

In the last two decades of the development of CLIL pedagogy in European countries, including Poland, as well as due to launching many programmes worldwide (Japan, New Zealand, China and the USA) more interest in enhancing second/foreign language attainment by integrating it with teaching content-specific subjects has been expressed (e.g. Iluk, 2000; Wolff, 2002; Dalton-Puffer, Nikula and Smit, 2010; Komorowska, 2010; Dakowska, 2014). The overwhelming number of attempts to initiate CLIL-based programmes brought about a variety of outcomes, among others those influenced by such factors as school types, the starting age of education, the level of learners' language proficiency or the length of particular language courses, just to mention a few. In 2007 Coyle pointed out that as many as 217 types of CLIL-based programmes followed in Europe could be traced. What is more, Dalton-Puffer, Nikula and Smit (2010) noted that the majority of them operate in the curriculum as content subjects taught in a foreign language, hence they tend to belong to the category of content-driven courses.

3. CBI-CLIL – explaining its theoretical underpinnings

Whatever the origins of the ideas for integrating content and language learning and teaching were, CBI/CLIL pedagogies were generally observed to ensure effective educational practice and good learning outcomes. The results of bilingual educational instruction were found to be at least as good as those of non-bilingual teaching, even though some deficits concerning the acquisition of grammar and lexical items, as well as insufficient development of speaking skills were discerned (Naves, 2009). This gave researchers a stimulus to look more closely at the explanations of the language acquisition phenomena characteristic of the learning process in CBI/CLIL contexts. For example, the acceptance of the above-mentioned continuum between content and language-driven instruction, specifically when referring to its extreme forms of instruction clearly shows a contrast between acquiring L2 naturally through learners' immersion into the language material selected on the basis of content criteria and learning a second language with a focus on its form. In naturalistic language learning conditions learners acquire aspects of content first, and only later on when the analysis of input is introduced they may gain explicit knowledge of L2. Thus immersion learners automatise procedural knowledge of a language with no work done on declarative knowledge (Bialystok, 1994; Johnson, 1996). In formal educational conditions when language is taught as a subject, it is declarative knowledge of L2 that is restructured and automatised into procedural knowledge through practice and feedback (McLaughlin, 1997; deKyser, 2007), and only when learners have gained the command of lower levels of an L2 can they start processing content successfully.

In their attempts at explaining the success of immersion some specialists also turned to Krashen's Comprehensible Input Hypothesis and its main tenet that language develops in an incidental way by exposure to comprehensible input. The hypothesis, however, was questioned on the ground of the advances in SLA studies which showed that understanding the meaning of an utterance does not guarantee its syntactic processing indispensable in language acquisition (Gass and Selinker, 2008). While observing immersion classes and problems with the development of productive language skills, Swain (1988) developed the theory of output which claims that learners can explicitly pay attention to language forms they produce and notice them, and then reformulate their hypotheses, and modify their performance. Interaction between learners was shown to play a significant role in language acquisition processes (Ellis, 2009; Dalton-Puffer, Nikula and Smit, 2010).

After a scholarly debate on the role of cognitive phenomena of language acquisition, many L2 researchers moved towards the sociocultural approach and its basic assumption that language acquisition takes place in the social world in which language users act as members of a family, educational and ideological systems, that is participants of socializing processes (Kramsch, 1993; Dalton-Puffer, Nikula and Smit, 2010). Grabe and Stoller (1997) stated that it is the sociocultural approach that can account for the effectiveness of content and language integrated learning. Vygotsky's theory of language, with its roots in constructivist learning theory, has also been referred to as a source of explanation of knowledge acquisition as a result of engagement in social experiences within a community, that is interactions with other people, social and culture artefacts (Swain and Deters, 2007). Taking a socio-constructivist view, Lyster (2007) claimed that language functions not only as a vehicle of communication, but also as a cognitive tool used by a group of learners and the teacher who participate in the co-construction of a body of the target knowledge in cooperation with one another. For Dakowska (2014), the effectiveness of CLIL in foreign language teaching arises primarily from the fact that by being organized on the basis of subject knowledge CLIL does not separate language form from its meaning and thus preserves all the properties of verbal communication. They are: the naturalness of using discourse for comprehension and production, the authenticity of the tasks involved in reasoning, problem solving and knowledge construction, as well as focus on working out adequate disciplinary knowledge representations necessary for efficient discourse processing.

4. Some attempts at modelling content and language integration as an educational framework

One of the challenges the proponents of CBI/CLIL paradigms faced concerned formulating a set of principles for integrating language and content in such educational situations in which non-language content, basically taught through school or academic subjects, was to be combined with language work intended to help L2/FL learners overcome their language deficiencies. A natural interest proved to be the development of literacy skills which play a paramount role in dealing with a body of written materials covered in subject matter courses. Texts are perceived as a source of disciplinary knowledge and language input represented through a particular genre to be processed at the grammatical, semantic, lexical and discourse levels. As noted by Colombi and Schleppegrell (2002), written texts are indispensable for the enhancement of advanced literacy skills as they involve learners in an effective use of lexicogrammatical patterns through tasks that require conscious study of language elements.

Extending our interest beyond literacy, however, is postulated by Mohan (2001) who claims that the semantic potential of language and its social function should be defined on the basis of Halliday's functional theory of language. Language thus is interpreted as a medium of learning content/subject matter and culture, that is found capable of organizing social practice. Grammatical categories concerning classification, rules or evaluation at the level of discourse can be expressed in a form of description, time, sequence and choice in practice (Mohan, 2001).

Another contribution to finding a principled way of content/language integration came from the so-called Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach, which addressed the problem of acquiring subject knowledge by ESL learners, characterized by limited language proficiency. It was assumed that the development of ESL learners' academic language skills can be enhanced with the help of metacognitive, cognitive and socio-affective strategies (O'Malley and Chamot 1990). Although the learners were to be assessed in terms of their achievement in content learning, the development of academic language remained an equally important goal to attain. Establishing principles for CALLA-based courses has clearly been an attempt at finding an effective way of combining content and language which was to be achieved by introducing a mediating factor of strategies helpful in learning content knowledge by students making up for language deficiencies at the same time.

In order to define the relationship between content and language components in teaching Snow, Met and Genesee (1989) proposed "a conceptual framework for the integration of language and content teaching in second and foreign language classrooms" (p. 201). The basic premise of their model is the classification of language expressing content into two types: **obligatory** and **compatible language**. Language found obligatory for particular content (a text) covers structural items (nouns, verbs, rhetorical devices), functional elements (narration, information, persuasion) and strategies. Compatible language, on the other hand, draws on the relevant content so as to create context for teaching selected language points.

The concept of distinguishing between obligatory and compatible language reappeared in Gajo's (2007) CLIL model referring to L2, or even pluralistic contexts. The model assumes that in performing pedagogic tasks L2 learners process complex relationships between language knowledge, mediated through discourse opacity (metalinguistic activities), and subject knowledge, mediated through discourse density (categorization process). Knowledge coming from those two sources undergoes negotiation at the discourse level, especially with regard to information potentially controversial, biased politically or culturally, and gets integrated as an outcome of classroom interaction. The development

of language in content- language integrated processing is described by means of the two paradigms and three categories of language in each of them: (1) language in language paradigm: **content-obligatory**, **content-compatible** and **content-autonomous**, and (2) language as embedded in the negotiated target content: **content-embedded** (linguistic knowledge indispensable for communicating, establishing subject knowledge and subject paradigm), **content-useful** (indispensable for performing a task and establishing or extending knowledge), and **content-peripheral** (general links between language and subject knowledge) (Gajo, 2007: 570). It is interesting to note that Gajo's framework attempts to link the issues of content-language integration and the development of communicative competence – the key goal in foreign language instruction.

A considerable importance has been gained by Coyle's (2007) model called '4Cs' standing for content and cognition, as well as communication and culture as aspects of the content/language learning process. She also conceptualizes language-content relationship as three dimensions in language functioning: (1) **language of learning** – a particular kind of language used to aid content acquisition, (2) **language for learning** – language as a goal to be acquired by learners, as well as a way of achieving the goal (e.g. awareness-raising, strategy training), (3) **language through learning** – activating language learning and thinking processes through sociocultural contexts. Such a conception of the role of language underscores a multidimensional use of language in knowledge acquisition which characterizes educational settings where content acquisition is one of the main objectives.

The Connections Model (Bigelow, Ranney and Dahlman, 2007) assumes that it is the teacher who is responsible for integrating content with language functions primarily in the process of reading and writing (e.g. within a theme-based unit), as well as organizing the text structure by means of appropriate strategies. The teacher's decisions as to the choice of language functions and text structures to work on are to be based on learners' problems, errors, or their tendency to avoid some language aspects.

Another recent model offered to cope with language and content goals is the so-called SIOP Model. This is the model that not only addresses the problems of the implementation of a subject area curriculum but additionally recommends the use of an array of classroom techniques providing support in learning the subject-specific material, among them those connected with the use of graphic organizers or multimedia. The SIOP proponents also emphasize that working with language and content goals should contribute to the development of literacy skills, as well as to the development of a range of reading comprehension strategies helpful in L2 learning, oral practice or academic vocabulary expansion important for L2 learners (Echevarría, Vogt and Short, 2008).

Morton (2010) advocates choosing a genre-based approach which at least in its part can constitute a framework for integrating content and language learning in CLIL-oriented settings. The basic assumption of such a view is that in order to acquire subject-specific knowledge learners have to become the users of text types that serve in constructing this knowledge. Taking a genre-based approach makes it possible for teachers and their learners to construct content knowledge together by drawing on textual and linguistic characteristics of both oral and written discourse typically used in a particular content area. The researcher finds it compatible with the 4 Cs perspective on CLIL.

5. Adopting a CBI/CLIL approach: implications for classroom instruction

The confirmation of the effectiveness of the CBI/CLIL approaches as applied in numerous educational contexts all over the world has driven the attention of L2/FL specialists towards the need of providing reliable theoretical explanations of the potential success of integrated language and content instruction. On the other hand, much interest has been shown in incorporating the innovative ways of combining teaching language and content worked out on the basis of CLIL principles on the part of practicing teachers (Wiesemes, 2009). It is worth looking then at major issues that are of great significance in providing good quality research-based classroom practices.

As advocated by Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010), for many types of CLIL-based courses to be launched first a shared vision has to be provided by the teachers who then establish a range of goals to be implemented in the classroom. Subsequently, further analysis and personalization are needed so that the teachers and groups of learners are assigned their roles, and learning and teaching can be optimized in particular contextual opportunities, with the acceptance of the existing constraints. As already mentioned, Coyle, Hood and Marsh's (2010) CLIL theoretical framework, described as 4Cs, maintains that the four basic components that determine the quality of CLIL practice comprise content, cognition, communication, and culture. Even though the four notions are not labelled in the same way by other specialists in the field, they are definitely found to play a key role in understanding of the underlying principles for CLIL-based learning and teaching.

Introducing CLIL-based instruction, undoubtedly, requires careful planning and an appropriate design so that an adequate balance in the process of integrating content and language goals at all the levels be ensured. The presentation phase of content, Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010) assume, is devoted to working with knowledge, skills and understanding. As claimed by Echevarria

et al. (2008), it is the key concepts and vocabulary that have to be carefully selected and presented in the classroom in conjunction with the activity types best serving the needs and expectations of a particular group of learners. As for language objectives, they are not to be narrowed down to the teaching of the grammar of language since language is to be broadly approached as a meaning making resource. Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010: 59) describe language goals as those of “language using and learning” with an emphasis on communicative power which can be understood as “different types of language used for different purposes.” The language chosen to deal with in CBI/CLIL context can be seen as the content approached from the linguistic and pragmatic point of view. It is worth noting that in recent years numerous specialists dealing with school literacies have found it useful to analyse disciplinary texts by using of the elements of functional-systemic linguistics (e.g. Schleppegrell, Achugar and Oteiza, 2004; Fang and Schleppegrell, 2008; Morton, 2010; Martin, 2013; Macnaught, Maton, Martin and Matruglio, 2013). Another important issue associated with the integration of content and language concerns the threshold level of L2 competence learners have to reach before they are able to process particular subject-specific texts in order to expand the target knowledge; language playing the role of a vehicle for learning is to be perceived in a different way than that of language treated as a goal of an independent study (Naves, 2009; Komorowska, 2010).

In conducting a CLIL-based class teachers do not only make important decisions as to the kind of input their learners will be exposed to, but are also responsible for creating opportunities for learners to efficiently process the material they are to work on. It is teachers who determine how new concepts will be explained and demonstrated to learners so that their full comprehensibility can be ensured. What is more, the target concepts need to be explicitly linked to learners’ prior knowledge (Echevarria et al., 2008; Naves, 2009). Classroom arrangements should provide stimulating environment for students to participate in interactive activities focused on a high level of verbal communication between and among the teacher and the learners. By producing both oral and written output learners get an opportunity to enhance their thinking skills. It is of high importance that learners get engaged in enhancing their cognitive abilities by processing the target content and simultaneously making use and further developing their higher-order thinking skills (hypothesizing and problem-solving) and lower-order-thinking skills (remembering, understanding and applying new knowledge) (Coyle, Hood and Marsh, 2010: 58; Lyster and Ballinger, 2011: 283).

As already mentioned, CLIL-based teaching is characterised by setting high standards for creating conditions conducive for learners' maximum engagement in the content and language learning process owing to the teacher providing a special kind of best quality assistance and playing the role of a facilitator (Coyle, Hood and Marsh, 2010; Naves, 2009). Hence the target content and language knowledge is co-constructed in classroom conditions by learners participating actively in different forms of grouping configurations and the teacher in control of the scaffolding provided (Lyster, 2007; Echevarria et al., 2008; Naves, 2009). The concept of scaffolding has its roots in a social view of education, and it indicates providing some supporting structures to learners by the teacher as a kind of temporary assistance so as to enhance the development of new understandings, concepts, and abilities. Yet, teachers' support is expected to last only when needed by the learners who at some point gain control of their tasks themselves (Hammond, 2001). Ultimately, CBI/CLIL teachers are to help learners develop autonomous learning behaviours by assisting them temporarily in the process of learning by means of using an array of different scaffolding structures such as questions, activating prior knowledge, providing hints and feedback (Mehisto, Marsh and Frigols, 2008).

The emphasis put on developing learners' autonomy in CLIL pedagogy is connected with recognizing the value of self-directed learning of students, in particular in the case of the students using efficient learning strategies (Echevarria et al., 2008). As students following CBI/CLIL programmes may need to cope with deficiencies in speaking the TL deploying some compensatory communicative strategies can be of great help to them. One way of classifying such strategies is differentiating between conceptual strategies: analytic and holistic, and linguistic ones: transfer – language switch, translation, and morphological creativity. Empirical research has shown that CLIL learners attempt to manipulate the language code when faced with some problems with terminology use. In order to continue communicating in English they employ such conceptual strategies as: circumlocutions, paraphrases or approximations (Hüttner and Rieder-Bünemann, 2010). As CLIL-oriented teaching is to a large extent based on written materials, effective strategies for processing written texts, with clearly defined goals in mind, can play a paramount role in acquiring subject matter knowledge, especially from authentic materials. Out of a range of 'reading to learn' taxonomies offered (for further discussion see Chodkiewicz, 2014), a self-report survey of reading strategies for L2 college students proposed by Mokhtari and Shorey (2002) has proved to be a powerful tool in identifying learners' reading strategies. The researchers distinguish 3 main strategy types called global-reading, problem-solving, and support

strategies. The support strategies' are considered to be of special value for reading and learning from text, and cover notetaking, asking oneself questions, paraphrasing or highlighting.

In the case when learners' command of L2 has not reached a sufficient level of proficiency, CLIL teachers may decide to rely on some use of L1. The relationship of the two languages and their use in integrated content and language teaching is a complex issue, and it has to be carefully monitored by the teacher. On the one hand, L1 use comes naturally as L1 permanently interacts with L2 in learners' minds, as proved by psycholinguistic research findings, and it is a common language for the teacher and the learners, both of whom benefit from cross-lingual pedagogy. On the other hand, both content and language learning goals can be more successfully reached when the use of L2 becomes intensified (Ortega, 2015). That is the reason why it is required that the teacher formulates some clear principles for the use of the native and the target language in CLIL settings. Naves (2009) notes that various students' responses are expected to occur in CLIL classes, however, with the development of the learner's target language command the amount of L1 responses will be decreasing. After the period of time when receptive work on the material is emphasized, students are expected to perform cognitively demanding tasks in the TL. Echevarria et al. (2008) express the view that when necessary the main concepts can be explained with the help of L1, even with reference to an L1 content area text.

6. Concluding remarks

CBI-CLIL-based learning and teaching, regarded in recent years as representative of many current innovations and reform movements in education, needs to be looked upon in terms of its theoretical underpinnings, as well as its potential for providing grounds for successful practical solutions. Several pedagogically-oriented frameworks developed recently have attempted to suggest a rationale for the most effective integration of language and content dimensions in the educational system with a second or an additional language as a medium of instruction. CBI-CLIL programmes have undoubtedly stimulated L2/FL experts' debate on the importance of defining clearly both content and language objectives, adapting content to students' language proficiency, introducing new concepts by referring to students' background knowledge and past learning experiences, as well as explaining key concept vocabulary. CLIL classrooms have also advocated the significance of creating opportunities for strategy use in performing instructional tasks.

A number of difficulties in implementing the goals of CBI/CLIL instruction have also been pointed out, such as: lack of suitable materials for particular age groups and learners' expectations, matching contents with language structures and functions, as well as evaluating learners' progress in terms of academic development, language acquisition, and learning content. Recruiting content teachers with a good command of a foreign language can also be a problem for education authorities. Yet, as shown in the present volume foreign language teachers can be well aware of their role in the CLIL-oriented classroom, and ways of integrating language and content dimensions so that they can come up with diverse practical solutions and create ample opportunities for the best quality practice in particular classroom contexts they are a part of.

References

- Banegas, D. L. (2012). Integrating content and language in English language teaching in secondary education: Models, benefits, and challenges. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 2 (1), 11-136.
- Bialystok, E. (1994). Representation and ways of knowing: Three issues in second language acquisition. In N. Ellis (ed.) *Implicit and Explicit Language Learning of Languages*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Bigelow, M., Dahlman, A., and Ranney, S. (2006). Keeping the language focus in content-based ESL instruction through proactive curriculum-planning. *TESL Canada Journal* 24 (1), 40-58.
- Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A., and Wesche, M. B. (1997). *Content-Based Second Language Instruction*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Chodkiewicz, H. (2014). Explaining the concept of 'reading to learn': A way forward in exploring the issues of L2/FL reading competence. In H. Chodkiewicz and M. Trepczyńska (eds.) *Language Skills: Traditions, Transitions and Ways Forward* (pp. 238-255). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Colombi, M. C., and Schleppegrell, M. J. (2002). Theory and practice in the development of advanced literacy. In M. J. Schleppegrell and M.C. Colombi (eds.) *Developing Advanced Literacy in First and Second Languages: Meaning with Power* (pp. 1-19). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Coyle, D. (2007). Content and Language Integrated Learning: Towards a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 10, 543-62.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., and Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Dakowska, M. (2014). Why does CLIL work? A Psycholinguistic perspective. In M. Olpińska-Szkiełko and L. Bartelle (eds.) *Zweisprachigkeit und Bilingualer Unterricht*, (pp. 47-64). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T., and Smit, U. (2010). Charting policies, premises and research on content and language integrated learning. In S. Niemeier (ed.) *Language Use and Language Learning in CLIL Classrooms* (pp. 1-19). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Davison, C., and Williams, A. (2001). Integrating language and content: Unresolved issues. In B. Mohan, C. Leung, and C. Davison (eds.) *English as a Second Language in the Mainstream: Teaching, Learning and Identity* (pp. 51-70). Harlow, England; New York: Longman.
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M., and Short, D. (2008). *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP Model*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Ellis, R. (2009). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fang, Z., and Schleppegrell, M. J. (2008). *Reading in Secondary Content Areas: A Language Based Pedagogy*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Gajo, L. (2007). Linguistic knowledge and subject knowledge: How does bilingualism contribute to subject development?. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 10 (5), 563-581.
- Gass, S., and Selinker, L. (2008). *Second Language Acquisition. An Introductory Course*. Third Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Genesee, F., and Lindholm-Leary, K. (2013). Two case studies of content-based language education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education* 1(1), 3-33.
- Grabe, W., and Stoller F. L. (1997). Content-based instruction: Research foundations. In M. A. Snow and D. M. Brinton (eds.) *The Content-based Classroom. Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content* (pp. 5-21). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Hammond, J. (2001). *Scaffolding: Teaching and Learning in Language and Literacy Education*. Primary English Teaching Association, Marrickville, New South Wales: Australia.
- Hüttner, J., and Rieder-Bünemann, A. (2010). A cross-sectional analysis of oral narratives by children with CLIL and non-CLIL instruction. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula and U. Smit (eds.) *Language Use and Language Learning in CLIL Classrooms* (pp. 71-79). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Iluk, J. (2000). *Nauczanie bilingwalne. Modele, koncepcje, założenia metodyczne*. Katowice.
- Johnson, K. (1996). *Language Teaching and Skill Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Komorowska, H. (2010). Content and Language Integrated Learning. In H. Komorowska and L. Aleksandrowicz-Pędich (eds.) *Coping with Diversity: Language and Culture Education* (pp. 54-77). Warszawa: Academica Wydawnictwo SWPS.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lyster, R. (2007). *Content and Language Integrated Teaching: a Counterbalanced Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lyster, R., and Ballinger, S. (2011). Content-based language teaching: Convergent concerns across divergent contexts. *Language Teaching Research* 15 (3), 279–288.
- Macnaught, L., Maton, K., Martin, J. R., and Matruglio, E. (2013). Jointly constructing semantic waves: Implications for teacher training. *Linguistics and Education* 24, 50 – 63.
- Martin, J. R. (2013). Embedded literacy: Knowledge as meaning. *Linguistics and Education* 24, 50–63.
- McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of Second Language Learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., and Frigols, M. J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Oxford: Macmillan
- Met. M. (1999). *Content-Based Instruction: Defining Terms, Making Decisions*. NFLC Reports. Washington, DC: The National Foreign Language Center.
- Mohan, B. (2001). The second language as a medium of learning. In B. Mohan, C. Leung, and C. Davison (eds.) *English as a Second Language in the Mainstream: Teaching, Learning and Identity* (pp. 107-126). Harlow, England; New York: Longman.
- Mokhtari, K., and Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Developmental Education* 25 (3), 2.
- Morton, T. (2010). Using a genre-based approach to integrating content and language in CLIL. The example of secondary history. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula and U. Smit, *Language Use and Language Learning in CLIL Classrooms* (pp. 81-104). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Naves, T. (2009). Effective Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). In Y. R., de Zarobe and R. M. A. J. N. Catalan (eds.) *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (pp. 22-40). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Nordmayer, J. (2010). At the intersection of language and content. In J. Nordmayer and S. Barduhn (eds.) *Integrating Language and Content* (pp. 1-13). Alexandria, VA: TESOL Publications.

- O'Malley, J. M., and Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ortega, L. (2015). Researching CLIL and TBLT interfaces. *System* 54, 103-109.
- Snow, M. A., Met, M., and Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly* 23 (2), 201- 216.
- Schleppegrell, M. J., Achugar, M., and Oteiza, T. (2004). The grammar of history: Enhancing content-based instruction through a functional focus on language. *TESOL Quarterly* 38 (1), 67-92.
- Stoller, F. L. (2004). Content-based instruction: Perspectives on curriculum planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24, 261-283.
- Stoller, F. L. (2008). Content-Based Instruction. In N. van Densen-Scholl and N. H. Hornberger (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. 2nd Edition, vo. 4, *Second and Foreign Language Education* (pp. 59-70). Springer Science+Business Media LLC.
- Swain, M., and Deters, P. (2007). "New" mainstream SLA theory: expanded and enriched. *The Modern Language Journal* 9, 820-836.
- Wesche, M. B., and Skehan, P. (2002). Communicative, task-based, and content-based language instruction. In R. B. Kaplan (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 207-228). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wiesemes, R. (2009). Developing theories of practices in CLIL: CLIL as post-method pedagogies. In Y. R. de Zarobe and R. M. A. J. N. Catalan (eds.) *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (pp. 41-59). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Wolff, D. (2002). Zintegrowane nauczanie przedmiotów językowych i niejęzykowych w kontekście europejskim. In M. Dakowska and M. Olpińska (eds.) *Edukacja dwujęzyczna. Przedszkole, szkoła podstawowa i średnia, teraźniejszość i przyszłość* (pp. 89-127). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe IKL.

(liczba znaków ze spacjami 41 939)