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ABSTRACT

The aim of this paper*1 is to investigate the background and some of the basic assumptions and features of a newly advocated educational innovation called Content and Language Integrated Learning, CLIL for short. CLIL has been spreading for a decade or so throughout the world and it is particularly a salient trend in Southeast Asian countries such as Indonesia and Thailand. The potentials, positive and negative, of CLIL are discussed from micro and macro perspectives based on the experiences so far of the countries concerned.

BACKGROUND OF CLIL

Origin and Features

The term CLIL is of a European origin and began to be used towards the end of the 20th century to describe recent rapid developments in the teaching of subjects in a second language (L2), in most cases, English (Clegg, 2007).

The basic idea was L2-medium education, which in itself was nothing new. A similar educational practice was found in bilingual education for minority groups in the USA and Australia. Even in Japan, this idea had to be put into practice by implementing tertiary

*1 This paper is derived from a project "The Impact of CLIL on School Education: Insights from Experiences of Southeast Asian Countries" supported by a scientific research grant offered by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Sciences, from 2012 through 2014 (Category: Kiban-Kenkyu C, Project Number 24520672). This writer collected relevant information by going on a fact-finding trip to Southeast Asia in August and December 2012, and to the UK and Austria in September 2012, and to Southeast Asia again in September 2013. The argument in this paper is mainly based on a keynote address "The Recent Spread of CLIL and its Implications" this writer was invited to give at the annual Convention for Assistant Language Teachers organized by the Hyogo Prefectural Board of Education, 21 November 2012.
education through English in the first half of the Meiji Era (1868 up to 1900) understandably for want of qualified teachers and teaching materials for spreading western ideas and concepts at the dawn of modern Japan. Currently, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Science, Sports and Technology, MEXT for short, is advocating partial CLIL as one solution to raise the standard of English Language Teaching (ELT) at upper secondary school, and stipulated in the national syllabuses that ‘English be taught through English’ (MEXT, 2009). MEXT extended this idea to the teaching of other subjects and welcomed some trial innovations like ‘Math and Science taught through the medium of English where possible’ in upper secondary schools designated as ‘Super Science High Schools’ in recent years.

Why CLIL now?

The direct reply to this question is to increase students’ exposure to English because it is believed that the contact hours with the target language in an EFL situation is extremely limited, leading to an outcome lower than expected. CLIL is seen as an innovative approach to ELT. More specifically, it is seen as a solution or as a panacea to the shortage of contact time in ELT in primary schools. People seem to be frustrated with the slow progress of ELT reform everywhere in the world. No matter how hard we try, our students still cannot use English well enough, or as well as expected. So it seems that the global trend is to turn to CLIL as the last resort to improve the outcome of the ELT system in an observable way.

This was acutely felt in Japan when ‘English Activities’ were first introduced into the primary school curriculum in 2009, prior to the overall and formal enforcement in 2011. As a means to promote ELT at the primary school level in Japan as well, CLIL was thought of as a sure means of increasing contact hours at primary school. For the last few years, CLIL has been seen as the final solution to problems in ELT from primary education upwards in Southeast Asian countries. This trend is now affecting ELT in secondary and tertiary education in Japan.

What is new about CLIL?

The answer is that English CLIL is being transferred to EFL contexts, as opposed to ESL contexts. Education through L2 used to be practiced in ESL contexts, typically found in former colonized regions where the language of the former colonial powers, mostly English or French, was used as a medium of instruction in the national education systems. In short, CLIL has been the norm in ESL countries so far. But what is currently happening is bringing this particular mode of education along to EFL countries where education is basically self-sufficient with the national language, or the first language (L1) of the majority of the people in
the country concerned. To put it another way, for a country like Japan to adopt CLIL means going back to the first half of the Meiji Era, reversing the transition from higher education in L1 to that in L2.

Is CLIL spreading in EFL countries now? At the moment, it is, but it is only practiced on an experimental and ad hoc basis, in the Southeast Asian countries chosen in this paper. The main focus has been on examining the potential of CLIL for improving the learning of English in primary level education. This was clearly reflected in the CLIL PEAC (Primary East Asia Contexts) Project promoted in 2007/2008 by the British Council, involving Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand (Marsh and Hood, 2008).

VARIABLES FORMS OF CLIL

CLIL is not one method but embraces a variety of approaches to teaching a curriculum subject through the medium of L2, or English. It encompasses quite a wide range of different approaches to education. It can be described as a continuum where there are, for example, 3 forms of CLIL as shown in Table 1 below. At one end there is (1) L2-medium education (strong version) and there is (3) Content-based teaching (weak version) at the other. And there is (2) Collaborative teaching in between.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Main people involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L2-medium Education</td>
<td>Teach subjects (math, science, etc.) in L2</td>
<td>Subject teachers use L2 in teaching other subjects</td>
<td>Subject teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Teaching</td>
<td>Improve L2 ability and learn content in subjects</td>
<td>Subject teacher &amp; L2 teacher teach a class together</td>
<td>Subject teacher and language teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content-based L2 Teaching</td>
<td>Teach L2</td>
<td>L2 teacher imports subject topics into L2 lessons</td>
<td>Language teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLIL IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

CLIL was started in Europe and has been practiced mainly there, promoted and assisted by the Council of Europe. The theoretical aspects of CLIL have been studied mainly in UK universities as part of the academic enquiries in applied linguistics. For the last few years, however, CLIL has been expanding into school education of Southeast Asian countries
with the help of the British Council. ‘The Primary Innovations Project (PIP)’ (British Council, 2008) was one such effort covering several countries in Southeast Asia and was mainly concerned with ELT at the primary school level, i.e. PELT. This Project included a component which applies to education through the medium of English, and was referred to within the project as CLIL. Clegg (2007: 13) describes this transfer as follows:

In Europe, there is a lot of more recent experience in the teaching of subjects in L2 under the banner of CLIL, which is in some countries such as Germany, well-organized and accessible within teacher-education agencies. It should be said, however, that this experience has grown in a socio-economically very different context from that of countries in South-East Asia and does not transfer easily to what may be under-resourced schools in both rural and urban areas in this region. In the UK, for example, consultancy advice is available on EMMS (English medium Math and Science) in both high- and low-resource contexts across the world.

Clegg’s remarks above suggest that the transfer runs the risk of failure because CLIL is being transplanted into the soil of Asian contexts which seems to be incongruous to the original European soil (Okihara, 2012). Having visited several countries in Southeast Asia, the writer discovered that the way CLIL was perceived varied from country to country. The extent to which CLIL was practiced within the education system was also different in different countries. On the whole, however, CLIL was and still is a new thing and is being implemented only on a limited scale. To illustrate this, brief sketches follow about how CLIL is being practiced in three countries in the region, Singapore, Indonesia and Thailand.

SEAMEO Regional Language Centre (RELC), Singapore

Here, in this regional liaison Centre, CLIL has been practiced only at the tertiary level. In response to growing demand for CLIL teacher training at tertiary education level in countries like Taiwan, Vietnam, China, they offer special courses for teachers in charge of CLIL programs. Trainees this Centre receives are university teachers, or specialists in natural and social sciences, e.g., mathematics, chemistry, military science, medicine, diplomacy. Trainers this Centre employs for its CLIL courses are mostly applied linguists with expertise in teaching in an interactive way. There are obvious problems they have to face, that is, conflicts caused by the lack of expertise in each discipline on the part of a trainer.

Singapore is one of the typical ESL countries and its education in general is already
carried out using English as a medium of instruction. When it comes to developing students’ English proficiency in its mainstream education system, Singapore does not have to depend particularly on any CLIL-type innovation.

**Indonesia**

CLIL is young in Indonesia and has been one of the focuses in the government’s two plans for education reform: Strategic Plan 2005-2009 and Strategic Plan 2010-2014 (Hadisantosa, 2010).

The government policy was to start the English-medium teaching of Math and Science (EMMS) from 2008, mainly at secondary school level. The government decided to do this in a limited number of schools known as International Standard Schools (SBIs) and designated 450 schools as SBIs in 2008. These schools were expected to start formally to offer teaching of Math and Science through the medium of English from July 2008. In these schools, an English teacher’s job is to assist Math and Science teachers to teach those subjects in English, in addition to teaching English as a subject.

When this writer visited the Ministry of Education of Indonesia in 2012, the writer was introduced to some junior high school teachers of English who were helping Math and Science teachers with their preparations of teaching materials written in English and with pedagogical skills to teach those subjects in English in an interactive way.

CLIL is justified in Indonesia by the assumptions that it can develop academic and subject-related language proficiency in L2 and also that an emphasis on the explicit teaching of academic language and learning skills in both L1 and L2 can noticeably increase levels of achievement in L2-medium Math and Science (Clegg, 2007). The rationale of this policy, however, was questioned recently and there were arguments going on between proponents and critics in society at large as well as in educational circles.

**Thailand**

Thailand has a relatively long history of implementing CLIL and quite a lot of findings from which to draw insights and implications for other countries trying to introduce CLIL.

English CLIL is termed English Program (EP) and Mini English Program (MEP), and these programs are offered from primary up to senior high school, but mainly at primary school. This policy started in 2001. In EP, 4 out of the 9 core subjects (e.g., Math, Science, English, Social Science) are taught in English. In MEP, 2 out of the 9 core subjects are taught through English. There are 273 schools recognized as those offering EP or MEP programs: 44 public schools, 132 private schools, 94 international schools, and 3 others.
The purposes of CLIL-type provisions are to support the education reform promoted by the government and to use English as a medium of instruction.

1. Findings from Thai Experience

(1) Students

Reports have shown favorable characteristics of the students in the English Program. Compared to the students in the normal Thai program, students in EP have exhibited several favorable characteristics as follows (British Council 2008):

① More enthusiastic about learning, especially independent learning, and about using English in searching for news and knowledge such as reading English newspapers and English novels, searching for information on websites, etc.

② More able to adjust to different cultures after having been exposed to a variety of cultures

③ Having high-order thinking skills, confidence, and leadership

④ Average scores of students in EP are 10-20% higher. At one private school, 80% of the students in EP can communicate well in English and 75% can use English to search for knowledge.

⑤ More EP students have received awards and scholarships.

(2) Problems found in EP

① Insufficient English proficiency leading to difficulties in content learning

② Difficulty in securing qualified foreign teachers: Some do not have educational qualifications and some are just tourists and may not even be fluent in English.

③ Lack of collaboration between foreign and Thai teachers: There are several background factors for this problem. (a) Foreign teachers do not understand the global picture of the standard of Thai education and the Thai evaluation system; (b) They do not plan the lessons together with the Thai teachers of the same subject and also between subjects; (c) Teaching styles of Thai and foreign teachers are different; and besides, (d) Thai teachers focus on the development of morals. As a result, students are confused by the teaching methodology of both groups of teachers as well as by the atmosphere in the classroom.

④ Rift between EP students and Thai-medium students: This was apparently caused by the fact that the schools tend to focus their attention on EP, and as a result their two programs are run on a double standard.

⑤ Disadvantage in test taking: EP students were disadvantaged at test taking because they were not well prepared for the national tests or the university entrance examinations which were given in the Thai language.
(3) Summary of Thai CLIL

Considering all these problems and concerns, for Thailand, English-medium education may be appropriate only for some schools with good students and adequate resources, but not for most schools as yet. In addition, the recruitment of qualified teachers is a major concern for the program to be operated effectively.

POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF CLIL

There are micro-level analyses about the potential contributions of CLIL to the development of language education. There are, on the other hand, macro-level analyses in which social and educational consequences of implementing CLIL on a large-scale in a given country are addressed. Micro-level considerations are given first.

Micro Perspective

As for the potential of CLIL, there are several aspects of school education in which CLIL can act as an enabler for achieving good practice, for example, as Marsh and Hood (2008: 46-47) suggest, in learner attitudes towards the relevance of English, classroom management, attitudes of school administration, curricular alignment and development, student thinking skills, reforms of teacher education, and equality of access to English. Some are chosen for elaboration and scrutiny here.

1. Positive aspects of CLIL

There are several positive assumptions and potentials of CLIL in light of sound second language teaching and learning theories.

① The teaching of academic language as opposed to everyday language: CLIL requires the explicit teaching of academic language and learning skills (Goto 2011). The target of teaching academic and subject-related language proficiency in L2 is most suitable for ELT in school education. This is well in line with the philosophy and the overall objectives of formal school education.

② Higher order thinking resulting from learning academic language: The teaching of subjects through the medium of English can be of benefit by having teachers teach and learners learn the English language required for engaging in higher order thinking. This involves an identifiable, often subject-specific type of language, which is often not part of content-
based instruction or communicative language teaching (Marsh and Hood, 2008: 47).

The two aspects above are related to each other and together constitute a significant rationale for CLIL. Since the emergence of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the 1970s, ELT has been heavily influenced by the functional view of language and geared in the direction of emphasizing oral skills of ‘everyday language’. So the trend so far has been moving away from academic language to non-academic language, in Cummins’ terms, from Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) over to Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) (Okihara 2011). But CLIL helps reverse this trend, striking the balance between these two hypothetical entities of language.

③ Facilitation of incidental learning: CLIL can facilitate incidental learning of English, as opposed to learning with conscious efforts. The overt learning target is subject content, and therefore the instruction is focused on the content of a given subject, which students try to understand and absorb. While the students are subconsciously involved in using the second language, they learn it as an end product with relatively little ‘hard work’. This process is almost like the way one’s first language is acquired and CLIL practices just replicate this process.

④ Learner attitude towards the relevance of English: CLIL can help ensure that early learning of English does not result in negative affective attitudes. These attitudes tend to be caused by environmental factors which may make a group of pupils feel that English is a hard subject and one which is not relevant to their lives and interest (Marsh and Hood, 2008). The CLIL contents taken from what they learn in other subjects, on the other hand, have meaning and reality for students.

⑤ Collaboration across curriculum: CLIL calls for collaboration of teachers of English with those of other subjects, e.g. Math, Science, and PE, which encourages and necessitates more communications between various people in the same school. At primary level, “CLIL could be introduced, even if on a small-scale, as an active part of curriculum development where themes and topics are taught ‘across the curriculum’. This is particularly suitable for primary level education. At present, the English language often remains a distinct curricular subject, even in those cases where pupils are also learning content through English.” (Marsh and Hood, 2008: 46).
6. Cross-fertilization of content and language: CLIL can create synergy between content learning and second language learning, leading to a fusion of both.

7. Post-TENOR paradigm: CLIL can be one option for post-TENOR (Teaching English for No Obvious Reason) at early stages, bringing about meaning and motivation for students. As ELT cannot go content-free very long, ELT in school must include some form of CLIL at some stage anyway.

8. Ideal model for primary education: CLIL is most suitable and realistic at primary school level because Content-based teaching, weak version of CLIL, can be relatively easily taught by class teachers without much expertise either in content or in the second language. Even for English specialist teachers, CLIL is teachable because the content knowledge required is not highly specialized at primary school level.

2. Negative aspects of CLIL

Negative aspects like restrictions and limitations need to be looked at. Since Thailand has ample experiences in this field, there are important lessons to learn. Out of 5 problem areas pointed out in (2) Problems found in EP above, the following two are taken up for consideration here.

1. Insufficient English proficiency leading to difficulties in content learning:
   It is often the case that cross-fertilization between content and language does not work, especially if the student’s language proficiency is not high enough. This is a crucial point when trying to implement CLIL in EFL contexts. Here is a dilemma to be faced: In order to raise the current student’s English proficiency, CLIL is adopted, but the CLIL program presupposes a considerably high level of English proficiency, usually much higher than the level achievable in EFL contexts. This is exactly what is happening in Thailand. Consequently, CLIL programs are offered only to a limited number of schools with resources including qualified teachers.

2. Difficulty in securing qualified teachers:
   Securing good teachers is always a key to success in any educational innovation, and even more so when implementing CLIL programs. It is certainly a challenge for any school or for any country to recruit a cadre of such teachers. In Thailand, the
government gave up the idea of training Thai teachers of English for their English Programs, or for Mini English Programs. Instead, they decided to recruit expatriate teachers and English native speaker teachers from abroad without asking too much of their qualifications. A considerable number of such teachers turned out to be young university graduates with little teaching experience, let alone teacher’s certificates. This often caused frustration and confusion on the part of students in the classroom. Their parents then made complaints about these teachers’ poor performance in class.*2. These prior experiences illustrate how difficult it is to get someone competent enough to teach subjects through a second language even if the language they use in class is their native language.

Macro Perspective

If the introduction of CLIL into the formal education system of a particular country is seen from a macro perspective, it follows that the country has to give up, at least partially, using the national language for the education of its people. The aim of using the national language for education is to establish both a national means of communication accessible to all and a unified sense of national identity (Kaplan and Baldauf, 2005: 1020). In countries in Southeast and East Asia, CLIL virtually means English CLIL in which English is designated as the medium of instruction when teaching the school curriculum in addition to English as a subject. If this is practiced in EFL countries such as Thailand, Indonesia and Japan, it is very likely that these countries will lose or lessen the opportunity to foster national identity and culture in their young people, because the sense of national identity and cultural awareness can naturally be developed through the national language, which in most cases is the first language for the majority of people. These Asian countries all have their own national languages which are well established and widespread as the language of education, but English CLIL will take over the role of carrying academic contents over to the students, only for the reason of improving students’ proficiency of English, which is just one component of the school curriculum after all.

What is currently happening in countries in Southeast Asia is that CLIL is being introduced, at the expense of national education, for the purpose of improving the outcome of just one school subject, i.e. English as a foreign language. Therefore, the macro-level questions to be asked include: What is the impact of CLIL on the national education system

*2 Through personal communication with a Thai teacher in a private school in Bangkok
in these EFL countries? What is the consequence of introducing such an innovation for the
development of national identity of the people in each country? Overall, is CLIL cost-effective
and/or cost-beneficial for the country? To put it simply, is it worth doing?

Skepticism or concern about English dominance is expressed, though sporadically,
behind the banner of TEYL (Teaching English to Young Learner) and CLIL. In Indonesia,
for example, many primary schools in urban areas normally offer English primarily because
they are well-resourced, and for reasons that have little to do with sound theories of foreign
language learning. Despite harsh criticisms, it is unlikely that the majority of the schools,
especially the private ones, will abandon or delay the introduction of English. On the
contrary, they will use the teaching of English as a “selling point” to increase enrolment
(Renandya, 2004: 124). Indonesia is one of the rare multilingual countries that succeeded in
establishing and spreading its national language, Bahasa Indonesia, throughout the country
as a means of achieving national unity. In this country, it is said that there is always a sense
of apprehension that the widespread use of English will severely impede the development
of Bahasa Indonesia and push aside local cultures (Ibid., 129). As a precaution against the
dominance of English, or any non-national language, in education, the South-East Asian
Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) recommended that the use of non-national
language as a medium of instruction be started only from grade 4, not earlier, of primary
education (Hadisantosa, 2010: 31). Partly based on this recommendation and because of the
grave concern about the threatened status of the national language, the Indonesian Ministry
of Education decided early in 2013 not to proceed with the current policy of implementing
CLIL in their schools*3.

In conclusion, CLIL has both positive and negative potentials and, the issue at stake
is, as common sense asks, how should its positive potentials be maximized and negative
ones minimized? Provided that qualified teachers are somehow secured and that necessary
resources are made available, CLIL programs can be one option in a select few schools
where students can benefit from rich and authentic exposure to English as a second language
and also from curriculum contents taught bilingually, i.e. in English and in the national
language. It is safe to say at this stage, however, that too much expectation of, and too hasty
decision on, CLIL will result in disappointment and that there is a limit beyond which CLIL
can do harm to national education, the success of which is the most important and ultimate

*3 The writer recently heard this through personal communications with several ELT specialists in
Indonesia.
goal of any language-in-education policy.
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