

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-49281-2 — Curriculum Integrated Language Teaching
Edited by Kim Bower, Do Coyle, Russell Cross, Gary N. Chambers
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

Curriculum Integrated Language Teaching

Do your students struggle to see the point in learning a language other than English? Do you teach in an English-dominant setting? If so, this book is a 'must-read'. It offers international perspectives on Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), a revolutionary teaching approach where students study subjects, for example, physics or history, in a language that is not their own. Informed by research carried out by the authors, it addresses the issues of developing CLIL in Anglophone contexts and shows how to implement this method of language learning successfully in the reality of the classroom. Through three key themes of sustainability, pedagogy and social justice, each author explores CLIL as a means of addressing the high levels of cultural diversity and socio-economic disparity in Anglophone-dominant settings. Authored by experts in the field, it offers a set of flexible teaching tools, which serve to combine language and content, ultimately enhancing the learning experience of students.

KIM BOWER is a principal lecturer at Sheffield Hallam University and president-elect of the Association for Language Learning. She is a principal fellow of the Higher Education Academy and was awarded a national fellowship for her leadership and research in curriculum innovation in language and teacher education.

DO COYLE holds a chair in Languages Education and Classroom Pedagogy at the University of Edinburgh. She is an international expert in CLIL and has played a major role in the European movement associated with bilingual and modern language education.

RUSSELL CROSS is Associate Professor of Language and Literacy Education at the Melbourne Graduate School of Education where he leads their teaching and research initiatives in language education, including CLIL.

GARY N. CHAMBERS is Professor of Education at the University of Leeds. He has published widely on many aspects of modern foreign languages (MFL) learning and teaching.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-49281-2 — Curriculum Integrated Language Teaching
Edited by Kim Bower , Do Coyle , Russell Cross , Gary N. Chambers
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-49281-2 — Curriculum Integrated Language Teaching
Edited by Kim Bower , Do Coyle , Russell Cross , Gary N. Chambers
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

Curriculum Integrated Language Teaching

CLIL in Practice

Edited by

Kim Bower

Sheffield Hallam University

Do Coyle

University of Edinburgh

Russell Cross

University of Melbourne

Gary N. Chambers

University of Leeds



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-49281-2 — Curriculum Integrated Language Teaching
Edited by Kim Bower, Do Coyle, Russell Cross, Gary N. Chambers
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India
79 Anson Road, #06-04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108492812
DOI: 10.1017/9781108687867

© Cambridge University Press 2020

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2020

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Bower, Kim, 1961- editor. | Coyle, Do, 1952- editor. | Cross, Russell, 1976- editor. | Chambers, Gary N., 1956- editor.
Title: Curriculum integrated language teaching : CLIL in practice / edited by Kim Bower, Do Coyle, Russell Cross and Gary N. Chambers.
Description: 1st edition. | New York : Cambridge University Press, 2020. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2019058900 | ISBN 9781108492812 (hardback) | ISBN 9781108729734 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Language arts--Correlation with content subjects--English-speaking countries. | Language and languages--Study and teaching--English-speaking countries. | Education, Bilingual--English-speaking countries.
Classification: LCC P53.293 .C87 2020 | DDC 428.0071--dc23
LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2019058900>

ISBN 978-1-108-49281-2 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	page vii
<i>List of Tables</i>	viii
<i>List of Contributors</i>	ix
<i>Foreword</i>	xi
DIANE J. TEDICK	
<i>Preface</i>	xvii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xx

Part I The Educational Context for CLIL

- | | | |
|---|---|----|
| 1 | CLIL in Multilingual and English-Background Contexts:
Expanding the Potential of Content and Language
Integrated Pedagogies for Mainstream Learning | 3 |
| | KIM BOWER, RUSSELL CROSS AND DO COYLE | |
| 2 | How Can Learners Be Motivated in a Context of
Demotivation for Foreign Language Learning? | 22 |
| | KIM BOWER | |
| 3 | A Rationale for CLIL in Primary Schools | 43 |
| | PHILIP HOOD | |

Part II Current Aspects of Practice in CLIL

- | | | |
|---|--|----|
| 4 | What Pupils Say about Transition (KS2–3) and
What This Might Mean for CLIL | 63 |
| | GARY N. CHAMBERS | |
| 5 | Diversity and Transnationalism: The ‘Merged Curriculum’
Approach in Bilingual Programmes in Australia | 93 |
| | SIMONE SMALA | |

vi	<i>Contents</i>	
6	Three Schools, Three Models: Senior Leaders' Views about the Value of CLIL in Their School KIM BOWER	107
7	Plurilingualism in the Content and Language Integrated Classroom: Students' Languages as Resources in the CLIL Context MARGARET GEARON AND RUSSELL CROSS	124
Part III New Knowledge and Future Directions		
8	Lessons to Be Learned: A Professional Development Approach to Curriculum Planning in a Multilingual School in Galicia XABIER SAN ISIDRO AND DAVID LASAGABASTER	145
9	Supporting Peer Collaboration and Social Cohesion in Multilingual Classrooms: Practical Insights from Content-Based Learning Contexts GABRIELA MEIER	165
10	Exploring the Potential of a Pluriliteracies Approach DO COYLE	187
	Afterword RUSSELL CROSS, KIM BOWER, DO COYLE AND GARY N. CHAMBERS	205
	<i>Index</i>	211

Figures

1.1	The 4Cs Framework (Coyle, 2006 in Coyle, 2007a: 551)	<i>page</i> 10
1.2	The Language Triptych (Coyle, 2007a: 522)	11
2.1	A process model – investigating motivation in CLIL settings (Coyle, 2011) © University of Aberdeen	30
3.1	Building the house	50
3.2	Content and language familiarity and novelty continuum (Coyle, Hood and Marsh, 2010: 76)	52
3.3	An example of text modification	55
3.4	Text manipulation – altitude	56
3.5	Text manipulation – climate	56
4.1	Bronfenbrenner’s ecological systems theory (adaptation based on Swanson et al., 2003)	65
8.1	Curriculum development levels in Spain	149
8.2	Example of aligned curriculum development	157
8.3	Example of alignment between social science content goals, language goals and tasks	160
10.1	The Graz Group pluriliteracies model (Meyer et al., 2015)	195
10.2	Scientific processes, genres and modes (adapted from Polias, 2016)	196
10.3	Mapping knowledge pathways	197

Tables

2.1	Summary of internal and external context-dependent factors of motivation to learn (based on Williams and Burden, 1997)	<i>page 29</i>
2.2	Process motivation model for investigating language learning pedagogical approaches (Bower, 2017a, adapted from Bower, 2014; Coyle, 2011; Dörnyei, 1994; and Williams and Burden, 1997)	32
2.3	Extract from Table 2.2	34
2.4	Extract from Table 2.3	35
4.1	Summary of focal participants and data collection outline	73
6.1	Language- and school-based models of CLIL in England (adapted from Bower, 2014 and Coyle et al., 2010)	110
6.2	Summary of CLIL models, learners and interviews (pseudonyms have been used)	113
8.1	Science applied to professional activity: content, criteria and standards	153
8.2	English: content, criteria and standards	154
8.3	C for communication in the CLIL unit on habitats	156
8.4	TDI task for teachers as curriculum developers	158

Contributors

- KIM BOWER Sheffield Hallam University
GARY N. CHAMBERS University of Leeds
DO COYLE University of Edinburgh
RUSSELL CROSS University of Melbourne
MARGARET GEARON Monash University
PHILIP HOOD University of Nottingham
XABIER SAN ISIDRO Nazarbayev University
DAVID LASAGABASTER University of the Basque Country
GABRIELA MEIER University of Exeter
SIMONE SMALA University of Queensland
DIANE J. TEDICK University of Minnesota

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-49281-2 — Curriculum Integrated Language Teaching
Edited by Kim Bower , Do Coyle , Russell Cross , Gary N. Chambers
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

Foreword

Diane J. Tedick

Education in a second or ‘foreign’ language that is used as the medium of subject-matter instruction has existed for millennia (e.g. Coyle, Hood and Marsh, 2010; Swain and Johnson, 1997). Yet today’s approaches to teaching academic content through languages that are new to learners are distinct from earlier forms, in that these approaches reach a wide spectrum of learners, rather than only those from privileged backgrounds (Coyle et al., 2010), and benefit from research-informed curricular and instructional recommendations that support the concurrent teaching of content and language (e.g. Tedick and Cammarata, 2012).

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) was born in Europe in the 1990s in the context of the European Union’s vision of a multilingual Europe in which citizens are able to function in two, three or more languages (Baker and Wright, 2017). It is defined as ‘a dual-focused educational approach in which an *additional language* is used for the learning and teaching of both content *and* language’ (Coyle et al., 2010: 1, emphasis in original). Scholars have debated whether CLIL is the same as or distinct from other content-driven forms of content-based language teaching, such as language immersion or bilingual education (e.g. Cenoz, Genesee and Gorter, 2014; Dalton-Puffer et al., 2014). My goal is not to further this debate but rather to point out that, despite their unique historical origins and associated language policies and ideologies, various forms of teaching language through academic content share many of the same programme designs and pedagogical concerns and interests. Due to this, scholars working in fields related to CLIL, such as immersion and bilingual education or content-based ‘foreign’ or second language education, will be keenly interested in this book.

CLIL and other forms of content-based language teaching are enjoying a heyday internationally. These programmes are on the rise, and there are significant reasons for this increase and the widespread interest in such programmes. For example, learning language through subject-matter content is more effective than learning language on its own (e.g. Genesee, 1987; Verspoor, de Bot and Xu, 2015). Integrating content and language is more efficient, in that CLIL is a ‘two-for-one’ approach (provided, of course, that there is sufficient

pedagogical attention to both content *and* language). Integrating language and content provides an authentic purpose for using language and thus emphasizes meaningful communication. Moreover, CLIL aligns with constructivist and social-constructivist theory which emphasize holistic and interactive learning (e.g. Ball, Kelly and Clegg, 2016; Coyle et al., 2010).

Even though these reasons apply to the learning of any language, CLIL programmes have nearly become synonymous with teaching English in mainland Europe, South America, Asia and elsewhere, as pointed out by this book's editors. Dalton-Puffer et al. (2014: 215) suggest that this emphasis on English is due to 'current society-wide language ideologies that scaffold the hegemony of English'. Therefore, as the editors argue, how CLIL manifests in Anglophone, English-majority contexts have largely gone unnoticed in much of the research and discourse on CLIL. This book, with its emphasis on CLIL in Anglophone countries, is timely and significant. It is especially so in the current political climate of some Anglophone countries that have monolingual views of national identity and are being plagued by nationalist, anti-immigrant, xenophobic and racist rhetoric and policies. Being from and residing in one such Anglophone country (the United States), where I have worked in the field of immersion and bilingual education for nearly four decades (as a teacher, graduate student, researcher and teacher educator), I am acutely aware of the challenges we face in advocating for and developing bi- or multilingualism in Anglophone educational settings, for both English-speaking students and those who speak other home languages and are learning English. As the editors explain in the Preface, 'implications relating to motivation and learners' perceptions of relevance in settings where "English is enough" are considerable'. These issues are arguably more critical in the challenging political climates described earlier. In Chapter 4, Chambers mentions the need to examine the impact of Brexit on attitudes towards second language learning and states 'one might reasonably speculate ... that the impact is unlikely to be positive'. Indeed, the challenges we face regarding language education in Anglophone countries have perhaps never been more urgent. This book tackles many of those challenges head-on.

The book's editors – Bower, Coyle, Cross and Chambers – bring their extensive collective expertise to this collection. Throughout the book, the editors and other contributors explore many facets of CLIL as it manifests in Anglophone contexts, especially the United Kingdom and Australia. A common thread emerging in the book is reference to and utilization of Coyle's well-known foundational concepts: the 4Cs Framework (content, communication, cognition and culture) and the Language Triptych (language *of, for* and *through* learning), which describe the 'what' of CLIL, and seven pedagogical principles (as articulated in Chapter 1) that correspond to the 'how' of CLIL. Contributors masterfully apply these foundational concepts to their studies, theoretical discussions and descriptions of pedagogical practices.

The topics emphasized in this book resonate just as much in other Anglophone contexts, such as the United States, as they do in the contexts of United Kingdom and Australia. Among those explored are issues related to learner motivation; articulation of programmes (or transitions) between elementary, secondary and post-secondary contexts; the need to push for early language learning and trajectories that provide continuity from pre-school through secondary school and beyond; accountability climates that limit innovation with regard to language education; the desperate need for teachers who are content experts and prepared with the unique knowledge base and pedagogical skill set needed for content and language integration; and so on.

Another thread that emerges in multiple chapters in this book is that of translanguaging – or the use of two or more languages to construct meaning, shape experience and develop understanding and knowledge (e.g. Baker and Wright, 2017; García, 2009). Among others (e.g. Ballinger et al., 2017; Fortune and Tedick, 2019; Tedick and Lyster, 2020), I have been a rather vocal critic when it comes to the recommendation that translanguaging be encouraged in immersion (or other content-driven) classrooms that focus on the teaching of minority (or minoritized) languages in Anglophone communities. Like-minded colleagues and I agree with translanguaging advocates on many theoretical fronts, for example, that

- bilinguals are not two monolinguals in one;
- languages overlap and evolve over time with contact;
- bilinguals' languages are always available regardless of their use of one language or another at any given moment;
- bilingualism is an asset to be nurtured and developed in school;
- code-switching is a normal, rule-governed practice among bilinguals;
- welcoming children's home languages in the classroom is important, as doing so affirms their linguistic and cultural identities; and
- crosslinguistic connections and comparisons facilitate development of bilingualism and biliteracy (Fortune and Tedick, 2019; Tedick and Lyster, 2020).

Despite this theoretical agreement, we have questioned the wisdom behind encouraging students' use of L1 (often English) during instructional time in the non-English language in Anglophone contexts. As argued previously (and indeed in this book), the high status of English as a societal majority language and global language makes development of a second or 'foreign' language challenging for *all* learners, irrespective of their home language.

Research on second language acquisition has long established that learners need extensive input in and practice using the second or 'foreign' language if

they are to achieve high levels of proficiency in that language. Thus, encouraging student use of English in these programmes can be a slippery slope. In fact, an increasing number of recent studies on translanguaging in two-way immersion (dual language) classrooms (enrolling both Spanish L1 and English L1 speakers) in the United States have shown that students are opting to use English during instructional time in Spanish but that the reverse is not true – in other words, they are not choosing to use Spanish during instructional time in English (e.g. Garza and Arreguín-Anderson, 2018; Hamman, 2018). English is clearly the preferred language for all learners. Thus, we must be cautious about promoting translanguaging without careful consideration regarding principled, research-informed pedagogical approaches that will further students' development of the 'foreign' or second (non-English) language.

To date, there is a significant lack of empirical evidence showing that increased use of English during instructional time in the second or 'foreign' language will benefit students' L2 development (Ballinger et al., 2017; Fortune and Tedick, 2019; Tedick and Lyster, 2020). Therefore, we need more research along the lines of the Gearon and Cross study (Chapter 7) that points to specific teacher practices that allow for use of L1 (English) in ways that further students' content understandings and abilities to use the second language to express them and, additionally, reveals teacher practices that do *not* support L2 learning or content and language integration. As Gearon and Cross conclude, the key 'lies in how the teacher, as the pedagogic agent, mediates opportunities for English to be used as a strategic resource to achieve integrated goals'. Ultimately, of course, learners need to be able to function exclusively in the second language without resorting to use of English, so exploring how this transpires pedagogically is paramount.

As Anglophone contexts around the world experience a decline of students opting to study 'foreign' languages, CLIL and other approaches to content-based language instruction emerge as viable and appealing alternatives, because language development occurs in the context of learning meaningful curricular content. This elevates the role of 'foreign' language learning in schools, which is important because proficiency in languages other than English can contribute immeasurably to the development of cultural understanding, tolerance and awareness of and openness to different perspectives and worldviews. To this end, the book editors and contributors are to be congratulated for providing us with much food for thought and guidance for moving forward to strengthen CLIL in Anglophone contexts.

References

- Baker, C., & Wright, W. E. (2017). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (6th ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ball, P., Kelly, K., & Clegg, J. (2016). *Putting CLIL into practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ballinger, S., Lyster, R., Sterzuk, A., & Genesee, F. (2017). Context-appropriate cross-linguistic pedagogy: Considering the role of language status in immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 5(1), 30–57.
- Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2014). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 243–262.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Llinares, A., Lorenzo, F., & Nikula, T. (2014). “You can stand under my umbrella”: Immersion, CLIL and bilingual education – a response to Cenoz, Genesee, & Gorter (2013). *Applied Linguistics*, 35(2), 213–218.
- Fortune, T. W., & Tedick, D. J. (2019). Context matters: Translanguaging and language immersion education in the U.S. and Canada. In M. Haneda & H. Nassaji (Eds.), *Perspectives on language as action: Festschrift in honor of Merrill Swain* (pp. 27–44). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garza, E., & Arreguín-Anderson, M. G. (2018). Translanguaging: Developing scientific inquiry in a dual language classroom. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(2), 101–116.
- Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages: Studies of immersion and bilingual education*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Hamman, L. (2018). Translanguaging and positioning in two-way dual language classrooms: A case for criticality. *Language and Education*, 32(1), 21–42.
- Swain, M., & Johnson, R. K. (1997). Immersion education: A category within bilingual education. In R. K. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion education: International perspectives* (pp. 1–16). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tedick, D. J., & Cammarata, L. (2012). Content and language integration in K–12 contexts: Student outcomes, teacher practices, and stakeholder perspectives. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(S1), S28–S53.
- Tedick, D. J., & Lyster, R. (2020). *Scaffolding language development in immersion and dual language classrooms*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Verspoor, M., de Bot, K., & Xu, X. (2015). The effects of English bilingual education in the Netherlands. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 3(1), 4–27.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-49281-2 — Curriculum Integrated Language Teaching
Edited by Kim Bower , Do Coyle , Russell Cross , Gary N. Chambers
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

Preface

This book aims to address the peculiarities of language learning in predominantly Anglophone contexts. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is the focus of our attention, given its potential to meet the challenges faced by teachers of foreign languages in primary and secondary schools. CLIL involves the teaching of non-language content, such as science, through the medium of a language other than the students' native tongue. In Germany, for example, the language of CLIL instruction in geography or history is typically English; in the United Kingdom and Australia, maths or music might be taught in French or Italian.

Most European mainland countries have successfully developed CLIL as part of their national curriculum policy in the past 20 years. By comparison, the United Kingdom's and Australia's progress in CLIL lags well behind. With the spread of CLIL across Europe and South America, CLIL has come to equate increasingly with 'learning English' in non-Anglophone countries. Learning a foreign language other than English in the United Kingdom, the Antipodes or the United States is a markedly different challenge from learning English, the global language, on the European mainland, South America or the Far East, for example. The implications relating to motivation and learners' perceptions of relevance in settings where 'English is enough' are considerable. Anglophone countries, therefore, represent a challenging and unique context for CLIL as a 'new' pedagogical approach.

Contributors to the book, writing from UK, Australian and Spanish contexts, consider what CLIL means in their settings in terms of its rationale, aims and practical implementation. Drawing on literature from across the world as well as research they have carried out and practical experience, they move language education away from the problematic silos that exist within Anglophone curriculum contexts, such as 'English as an Additional Language (EAL)', 'academic curriculum subjects', and 'modern foreign languages', towards a more holistic understanding of the value and benefits of language learning as part of students' total education experience, including critical and creative thinking, first language literacy and development and intercultural awareness.

xviii *Preface*

The book aims to provide an overview of CLIL practice in primary and secondary schools in Anglophone and similar contexts. It highlights issues that teachers and school managers face as well as provides practical insights into how these are addressed.

Chapters are planned in three distinct parts:

Part I The Educational Context for CLIL

Part II Current Aspects of Practice in CLIL

Part III New Knowledge and Future Directions

Each chapter contains a critical review of up-to-date literature from across the world and insights into the context from which the author is writing as well as examples of practice and their implementation. Threads running through chapters include sustainability, social justice and pedagogies. The authors also share their thoughts on implications for future scholarship and practice in each chapter.

The first chapter of Part I serves as the foundation on which the remainder of the book is built. It provides background on the origins and development of CLIL and the rationale for its place in schools. Bower, Cross and Coyle reflect on the introduction of CLIL in Victoria, Australia, and explain key CLIL concepts such as the 4Cs Framework and the Language Triptych.

Chapter 2 is informed by research carried out in a school in England relating to how CLIL impacts on secondary school pupils' motivation. Bower investigates exploitation of the 'Process Motivation Model' (PMM) by two trainee teachers to evaluate individual characteristics of motivation, in one class where history is taught in German and in the other where science is taught in French.

With a focus on the reality of the UK primary school context, Chapter 3 addresses the issues teachers have to deal with in interdisciplinary learning. It provides a convincing case for the appropriateness of CLIL for younger learners and its capacity to provide a 'natural language experience with purpose and coherence'. Hood provides concrete, realistic, tested suggestions on how CLIL might be implemented with learners aged 5–11 in an Anglophone setting.

Part II opens with Chapter 4 on 'transition'. Chambers reports on his research with learners in the north of England and Saxony-Anhalt in Germany who are making the transition from primary to secondary school. He focuses on their foreign language learning experience and how this is impacted by transition. Chambers exploits his findings to inform thinking on the implications of transition for pupils with a background in CLIL.

In Chapter 5, Smala, writing from the Australian context, examines CLIL pedagogy in bilingual programmes. Informed by two case studies, she provides examples of formal and informal merged curricula, reflecting how cultural material might be transferred across national boundaries. Chapter 6

presents different models of CLIL and how and why school leaders adapt their curriculum to include CLIL projects, especially at a time of high-stakes inspection and accountability. High on the agenda are the motivational pay-off and benefits to learners beyond the subjects being taught. In Chapter 7, Gearon and Cross introduce the reader to two Australian teachers, one primary and one secondary. They review how the teachers introduced and reinforced language relevant to a unit on science and the humanities, respectively, teaching through CLIL pedagogy using Spanish and Italian. They provide important insights into what can be learned from plurilingual contexts and how we can understand CLIL in a multilingual world.

Part III of the book opens with Chapter 8. This chapter moves the reader to Galicia in Spain and looks at lessons that can be learned from integrated curriculum planning and implementation in a trilingual context. San Isidro and Lasagabaster report on a 2-year training–designing–implementing (TDI) approach to the professional development of language teachers and social science teachers.

In Chapter 9, Meier takes the multilingual context and examines (a) two-way immersion (TWI), (b) CLIL and (c) education in the official school languages as an additional language. In each case, she unravels the complexity of each label and moves on to review ‘learning’, ‘communication’ and the ‘social relevance of languages’. This analysis then informs the practical implications for schools.

Chapter 10 draws on many key points raised throughout the book that bring together the research focus presented in Chapter 1. Coyle demonstrates how CLIL pedagogies can be further developed to provide high-quality learning experiences from a more holistic perspective. It concludes with an exploration of how an emerging ‘ecological growth’ model based on pluriliteracies principles – pluriliteracies teaching for deeper learning (PTDL) – embeds CLIL in a reconceptualization of interdisciplinary language learning and using in all contexts.

This book has given practitioners and researchers from Anglophone countries and similar contexts a novel opportunity to share practice and provide a clear rationale for the distinctiveness of cross-curricular learning in the Anglophone and similar contexts. We feel that it makes a convincing case for the place of CLIL in schools and provides concrete, practicable guidance on how CLIL-related pedagogies might be implemented.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to all our colleagues, schools and learners who have made this book possible.