

Impact of “Content Language Integrated Learning” on English Proficiency of Students

Dr. Pydi Kavita¹, Dr. A.V.V.V.Malleswaramma², Pavan Kumar Rayavarapu³,
J.Pushpalatha⁴, Dr. B.Sanjeevi Rao⁵

¹Senior Lecturer in Applied Electronics and Instrumentation Engineering, Government Polytechnic for Women, Srikakulam, A.P., India.

²Lecturer in English, Vemuri Sundararamaiah Government Degree College, Movva, Krishna District, A.P., India.

³Asst. Professor, Dept. of English, SIR C.R.Reddy College of Engineering, Eluru, A.P., India.

⁴Asst. Professor, Dept. of English, Dhanekula Institute of Engineering and Technology, Vijayawada, Krishna District, A.P., India.

⁵Dept. of Education. Dr. B.R.Ambedkar University. Etcherla. Srikakulam, A.P., India

ABSTRACT

By failing to appropriately control for selection effects, most previous research has overestimated the effects of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) on the development of students' foreign language skills. Furthermore, the CLIL-effect on the content subject is still widely unknown. Therefore, the present study investigated skill development of 80 Indian CLIL and non-CLIL eighth-graders in English and History controlling for a wide range of student, classroom and teacher characteristics. Results of multilevel modeling confirmed that CLIL-classrooms showed greater increases in English listening comprehension but not general English skills as measured by a C-test than non-CLIL-classrooms. In History, the increases in subject knowledge over one school year were comparable despite CLIL-students' larger amount of instruction (three instead of two hours per week). The results confirm previous, differential findings for English. For the content subject, they indicate that CLIL-classrooms need to invest substantially more time to achieve comparable learning outcomes.

Keywords: classroom, education, knowledge, language, learning, outcome, school, skills

INTRODUCTION

The need for mastery of English in the future becomes a challenge for higher education institutions as one the producers for human resources in India. If the higher education institutions want to win the competition in the world, they must equip their graduates with sufficient English language skills. In addition, for students, having sufficient English skills will be very helpful in completing the tasks of college, especially in reading text books in English. To address all the above challenges, it is necessary to improve the teaching of English for non-English Study Program students by using a more appropriate design and teaching approach by placing the learners' needs as a central issue in the design of learning. The purpose of this research is to see whether project based content language integrated learning (CLIL) have significant effect on the students' oral capability. The significance of the study is that in terms of the teaching and learning English at higher institution level is only given for one semester with a load of two or three credits. The teaching of English is only a kind of repetition from the program provided at the high school level. Classes are usually big which consists of 40 to 60 students. The opportunity to practice English in the class was very limited. Therefore, the study provides opportunities for students to process comprehensible input as well to produce comprehensible output.

Project Based Learning

Project based learning works on the basis of teaching strategies that enable teachers to guide students through in-depth studies of real-world topics. A project, by definition, is an in-depth investigation of a real-world topic worthy of a student's attention and effort. The study may be carried out with an entire class or with small groups of student. Two basic approaches to education are by providing students with a high level of reading, writing, and talking tasks and providing students with a challenging problem or question that involves multiple contexts or situations. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is an approach where students learn a subject and a second language at the same time. A science course, for example, can be taught to students in English and they will not only learn about science, but they will also gain relevant vocabulary and language skills. It's important to note that CLIL is not a means of simplifying content or re-teaching something students already know in a new language. CLIL courses should truly integrate the language and content in order to be successful and success is determined when both the subject matter and language is learned. It's important to have a strategy in place when applying CLIL in your courses. One of the key things to remember is that the language and subject content are given equal weight and that it shouldn't be treated as a language class nor a subject class simply taught in a foreign language.

According to Coyle's 4Cs curriculum, a successful CLIL class should include the following four elements: Content Progression in knowledge, skills and understanding related to specific elements of a defined curriculum Communication Using language to learn whilst learning to use language Cognition Developing thinking skills which link concept formation (abstract and concrete), understanding and language. Culture Exposure to alternative perspectives and shared understandings, which deepen awareness of otherness and self. CLIL is fundamentally based on methodological principles established by research on language immersion. This kind of approach has been identified as very important by the Education Commission because: "It can provide effective opportunities for pupils to use their new language skills now, rather than learn them now for later use. It opens doors on languages for a broader range of learners, nurturing self-confidence in young learners and those who have not responded well to formal language instruction in general education. It provides exposure to the language without requiring extra time in the curriculum, which can be of particular interest in vocational settings." This approach involves learning subjects such as history, geography, managerial skills/concepts or others, through an additional language. It can be very successful in enhancing the learning of languages and other subjects, and helping children develop a positive attitude towards themselves as language learners.

In a second or advanced language learning approach, there is a consensus that language must be taught for communication purposes. Therefore, language teaching that is done in a contextual communicative must be supported continuously to achieve the purpose of language learning is for communication. Mohan even asserted that if there is a principle approach that legitimizes the promotion of language with other subjects, language teaching is the teaching of language cannot be combined with other teaching, then this principle is wrong. Mangubhai states that the teaching of languages immersion (combining language with other subjects) is one of the best learning approaches. This is supported by Genesee who suggests that the lesson of the immersion program is the merging of common subjects with language having a more positive effect than separate language learning; Students on immersion-based learning are able to display the same abilities even beyond the abilities of native-speaking children in terms of writing or speech when managed well. While Crandall asserts that the ability to use language in a special situational context cannot be accomplished without integrating the material context with language learning. In our country, the incorporation of content with language learning is very popular.

Various studies show that CLIL is very effective in improving student achievement. Dalton-Puffer's findings, Ackerl and Lasagabaster demonstrated that students taught through the CLIL program possessed better writing preference than students who were not taught by CLIL. Lasagabaster emphasizes that CLIL is believed to be able to contribute positively to the preparation for international life, improve learning motivation, improve intercultural communication skills, improve implicit and incidental learning abilities and develop all language skills, especially writing skills.

Content and Language Integrated Learning and Its Forms

In many countries (including India), universities are adapting their educational programs in accordance with the growing demand for specialists with high knowledge of the English language by developing and applying in practice various bilingual educational programs. One of the most visible and most common approaches to these programs is Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). There has been a large body of research on the efficacy of CLIL classes in terms of their impact on learners' language and subject knowledge.

CLIL is an approach that involves studying the content of a non-linguistic subject (e.g., history or geography) taught in a foreign language, and therefore learning that foreign language by studying the content of that subject. According to the Education Commission, CLIL "seeks to develop knowledge in both a non-linguistic subject and the language in which it is taught, giving the same meaning to each of them" (p. 7). This means that a distinctive feature of this approach is the setting of a double goal, namely, improving the level of competency in a foreign language as well as knowledge in a non-linguistic discipline.

Many CLIL studies have found beneficial effects on English proficiency. However, they should be interpreted with caution, as most CLIL studies do not sufficiently control selection effects and pre-existing differences between CLIL students and other students.

There is a rather contradictory picture of the efficacy of bilingual education in the development of subject knowledge. While some studies found no difference in knowledge of content and subject matter, others found benefits for bilingual students or for monolingual students.

Piesche et al. studied the influence of a bilingual and monolingual approach on the assimilation of the content of a professional discipline. The results of this study showed that monolingual students were better than bilingual ones by about a fifth of the standard deviation. This was the first time that bilingual learners had taken part in bilingual education, and Piesche et al. suggested that this was the main reason for their result. In turn, studies by Dallinger et al. found no difference between CLIL and non-CLIL students, using a history course as an example. It is worth noting, however, that the bilingual course taught history for 3 h, not 2 h (monolingual course) per week. Dallinger et al. also found positive effects from a more frequent use of English, as well as a more frequent use of a second foreign language

to introduce new terms (to improve knowledge of the professional discipline), which supported the idea of the deliberate use of multiple languages.

Multilingualism

In this study, we define multilingualism at the individual level as a person's ability to use two or more languages and "easily switch from one language to another" (p. 158). From the point of view of multilingualism, languages are considered as separate language systems, and not dialects, styles or registers within one language system. Teachers may not always be multilingual, as some native speaker teachers speak only one language, especially those who teach English. In contrast, non-native speakers are always multilingual because they teach a language that is not their first language. Thus, they are equally proficient in several languages in the sense that they have advanced abilities in at least two languages (i.e., in their first language and the language they teach), which is not always the case with native teachers.

In teaching foreign languages, it has often been assumed that one teacher teaches only one foreign language, which was the norm in schools in most countries. It was relatively rare to find people teaching two or more foreign languages in India. Research on foreign language teachers has also focused on the identity, beliefs and practices of those who teach primarily one foreign language, usually English. Recently, researchers have begun to pay increasing attention to the benefits of introducing teaching methods in language classrooms that use multilingualism as a resource, that is, multilingual teaching methods (MTP).

The growing level of super diversity has prompted some countries to change their language teaching programs in schools and universities to promote multilingualism among the younger generation and prepare them to succeed in a globalized world in which multilingualism is considered an asset. As part of these changes, there have also been attempts at the political level to encourage teachers to implement MTP.

Multilingual teaching is an educational approach that teachers can use to raise their students' awareness and understanding of linguistic diversity and encourage them to use their knowledge of other languages and language experience when learning a new language. Through this type of learning, teachers increase the motivation of students by helping them realize that they are not entirely novices, and that they already have a set of tools that they can use to learn new languages more effectively. MTPs have also been shown to improve student literacy and pragmatic knowledge, as well as overall language performance. Examples of MTPs include translation, awakening to language action, cross-language comparisons, multilingual storytelling and language diaries.

This study defines multilingualism in multilingual classrooms as the process in which multilingual teachers and students engage in complex, multiple discursive practices, including translation, to communicate in and navigate multilingual classrooms. Multilingual practices can be used in a targeted and systematic way to overcome language boundaries and to improve and maintain the language skills and multilingual competence of learners. In addition, this deliberate use of multilingualism enhances students' ability to analyze and compare different language systems, which contributes to their learning. According to García and Silvan (p. 389), multilingualism is also "part of the discursive regimes that students must perform in the 21st century," as it not only reflects the interactions of multilingual people in their daily lives, but also how an opportunity to develop their multilingual skills through translation allows students to improve their knowledge of each of their languages.

The available research on multilingualism offers educational institutions seeking to promote multilingual practices among students a limited opportunity, since the types of multilingualism studied cannot be offered to all students. Adopting the concept of multilingualism as a pedagogical resource enabling everyone to achieve multilingualism will more accurately reflect the profiles of all teachers and students in a language class. The number of studies that have used multilingualism as an educational approach is currently very limited. It is also worth noting that many studies have used a small number of participants, which affects the generalizability of the results when the goal is to understand broader trends in teacher acceptance of the MTP language in a given context.

At the same time, research on multilingualism as a pedagogical resource is practically absent in some places where the local governments are just beginning to introduce multilingual educational practices through initiatives to learn several foreign languages in schools and universities. new national curriculum for English entered into force in 2019, which promotes multilingualism in language teaching and learning. The updated curriculum now emphasizes the relevance and value of multilingualism. The learning outcomes of the new curriculum likewise highlight the development of an awareness of different languages and the use of the languages spoken by students to find similarities at different linguistic levels, from vocabulary and expressions to more complex language similarities and differences.

In addition, since multilingual users are expected to use different languages in different situations for different purposes, they may need to use all components of the communication competence; however, there is often an asymmetric development of these components, that is, they do not necessarily develop all competencies in each of these languages at the same level. Consequently, the successful study of a foreign language presupposes the ability to

correctly choose and use communication strategies from a linguistic repertoire. Appropriate language learning strategies are tools that are believed to encourage learners to take responsibility for their own learning and lead to increased language proficiency and greater self-confidence.

CONCLUSION

After analyzing the results of the experiment, we can draw conclusions about the positive experience of implementing the proposed educational model, thus confirming our hypothesis.

As a result of training according to this model, the teaching and learning of English language seem to be better. Consequently, the application of this model contributes to the study of the English language. It is worth noting that the results of the experimental group showed that LSRW Skills increased in the students. This difference in the development of LSRW Skills is explained by the fact that in the CLIL group more attention was paid to the development of communicative oral skills and group interaction. In the traditional teaching model, more emphasis was placed on writing. In further work on the educational model, it is necessary to take this into account and think over additional activities for better progress in LSRW Skills.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Ackerl, "Lexico-grammar in the essays of CLIL and non- CLIL students: Error analysis of written production," Vienna English Working Papers, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 6-12, 2007.
- [2]. Astri Hapsari., "English bilingual education: The challenge of communication and cognition aspects of content language integrated learning (CLIL) in India," UII Journal of English and Education, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 12-20, Dec 2012.
- [3]. Benseler, D.P and Schulz, RA, "Methodological trends in college foreign language instruction," The Modern Language Journal, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 88-96, 1980.
- [4]. Coyle, De., "Content and language integrated learning: Towards a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies," International Journal of bilingual education and bilingualism, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 543-562, 2007.
- [5]. Crandall, JoAnn, "Collaborate and cooperate: teacher education for integrating language and content instruction," English Teaching Forum, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 2-9, 1998. ISSN: 2089-9823 □ J Edu & Learn, Vol. 15, No. 1, February 2021: 11 – 18 18
- [6]. Dalton-Puffer, C., Outcomes and processes in content and language integrated learning (CLIL): current research from Europe. In W. Delanoy, & L. Volkmann, Future Perspectives for English Language Teaching (S. 139-157). Heidelberg: Carl Winteer, 2008.
- [7]. Dalton-Puffer, Llinares, Lorenzo, and Nikula., "You can stand under my umbrella": Immersion, CLIL and bilingual education. A response to Cenoz, Genesee & Gorter (2013)," Applied Linguistics, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 213-218, 2014.
- [8]. Fernández-Sanjurjo J, Fernández-Costales A, and Arias Blanco J., "Analysing students' content-learning in science in CLIL vs. non-CLIL programmes: empirical evidence from Spain," International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 661-674, 2019.
- [9]. Genesee, F., Integrating language and content: Lessons from immersion. McGill University. National Center For Research On Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, 1994.
- [10]. Hadley, A. O., Teaching language in context third edition. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle Thomson Learning, 2001.
- [11]. Hedrick, T. E., L. Bickman, and D. J. Rog, Applied research design: A practical guide. Sage, Newbury Park, California, USA, 1993.
- [12]. Joyce, B., Weil, M, and Calhoun, E., Models of teaching sixth edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000.
- [13]. Krashen, S. D., Second language acquisition and second language learning. New York: Pergamon, 1981.
- [14]. Krashen, S., The input hypothesis and its rivals. Implicit and explicit learning of languages. London: Academic Press, pp. 45-77, 1994.
- [15]. Lasagabaster, D., "Foreign language competence in content and language integrated courses," The Open Applied Linguistics Journal, vol. 1, pp. 31-42, 2008.
- [16]. Mohan, Bernard, Language and content. Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 1986.
- [17]. Mangubhai, Francis, "Language-in-education policies in the South Pacific. Some possibilities for consideration," Journal of Multicultural Matters, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 490-511, 2002.
- [18]. Morton, T., "Reconceptualizing and describing teachers' knowledge of language for content and language integrated learning (CLIL)," International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 275- 286, 2018.
- [19]. Robinson, P. C., ESP Today: A practitioner's guide. Hemel Hempstead. Phoenix, 1991.
- [20]. Swain, M and Lapkin, S., "Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning," Applied Linguistics, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 371-391, 1995.
- [21]. Watson, J. B. and Rayner, R., "Conditioned emotional reaction," Journal of Experimental Psychology, vol. 3, no.1, pp. 1-14, 1920.