

Vilniaus Juozo-Tallat Kelpšos konservatorija

**Negative Perspectives of Content and Language Integrated Learning
(CLIL)**

Parengė: anglų kalbos mokytoja
Ieva Gydrienė

2015
Vilnius

Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	2
1.CONCEPT OF CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING (CLIL).....	3
1.1. The Relationship of Language and Content in Language Teaching.....	3
1.2. The Origins of CLIL.....	4
1.3. The Status of Languages.....	4
2. EDUCATIONAL PERSPECTIVE.....	5
2.1. Failing in Language Sphere.....	6
2.2. Failing in Subject Sphere.....	7
2.3. Availability of CLIL Trained Teachers.....	8
2.3.1. CLIL Teacher’s Competences.....	9
2.3.2. Opposition to Language Teaching by Subject Teachers.....	11
2.3.3. The End of the Language Classroom As We Know It.....	11
2.4. Lack of Empirical CLIL Teaching Materials.....	12
2.5. Problem of Assessment.....	14
3. CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE.....	14
3.1. Threat to Mother Tongue.....	15
3.2. Threat to National Identity.....	16
4. PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE.....	17
4.1. Students’ Attitude Toward CLIL.....	18
4.2. Psychological Effect on Students’ Learning Skills.....	19
CONCLUSIONS.....	21
REFERENCE LIST.....	22

INTRODUCTION

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is the most red-hot and encouraged way of teaching languages at schools today. It is widely praised, even lauded as a superb possibility to teach students of content and language at one go. Certainly the applause is based on some apt experience, but we can not equalize languages and their relationships with the target languages according to the same criterion, as the linguistic situations in different countries largely differ. Being in the Czech Republic during my Erasmus course, I had a lecture on methodology of CLIL, where it was introduced to me as an up-and-coming project. Anyway, I remained suspicious, finding it slippery and doubtful matter to follow. The project promises to make the language acquisition more natural and easy than in traditional language class, but the fear persists that we are taking too many risks and at the extreme end of the field we may find ourselves in a pitfall. The incongruity in logics and too many conceivable perils propelled me to take on this theme.

The aim of my work is to accentuate and describe the drawbacks and risks of the project. I am going to look at the seamy side of the CLIL considering four prospects: educational, cultural and psychological.

Speaking about education, I plan to examine the influence of CLIL type provision on the acquisition of both language and content; to display the reasons for shortage and difficulties of teachers coping with CLIL. Also, the problem of assessment will be touched. On the subject of culture, I will try to reveal the threats for cultural identity and the mother tongue. And finally, I will touch a chord of a psychological impact on students: restrain in learning and development of self esteem and critical thinking.

Considering the practical use of this work I would certainly stick to my position and emphasize the necessity to speak and highlight the downsides of a CLIL's venture, in order to evaluate the risks with open eyes.

1. THE CONCEPT OF CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING (CLIL)

In the rapidly developing world competence of foreign languages, with English ahead, is becoming a particularly urgent condition for the personal development. Formerly, when the internalization was not such an inclusive phenomenon, the requirements for students were not as high as it is now. Today's modern universities propose their courses thought through English and the entering students are expected to be able to adapt and to succeed. Accordingly, the performance of a secondary school is becoming much more demanding [9].

The project which is now on the crest of the wave is widely proclaiming its efficiency and productivity, clichés of revolution in teaching and blossoming of education are amply used to promote another way towards the language mastery. However, the costs of it leads us to doubt which pair of scales weigh down – benefits or costs. If the project justifies expectations, we will ally into an even more close-knit global family, member of which will be another rider of a huge Trojan horse¹ carrying English across the world. Respectively, another family, another social class will appear, family of those without English, socially and economically deleted [9; p.9].

1.1. The Relationship of Language and Content in Language Teaching

From the very Genesis people could not subside searching for an ideal language, suitable for all the nations. Since the tragedy of Tower of Babel² happened a lot of efforts have been put to find a convenient language. The footstep humanity stepped forward is probably smaller that somebody could have expected. Eventually, the search for an ideal language evolved into the hunt for the ideal methodology of language teaching [18, p.1].

Being a polyglot became our aim, as speaking in a wider level unification of different nations and countries are impossible without knowing each other's means of communication. Looking in a narrow perspective, anyone who has an intention to expand his/hers horizon searching an internet, confronts a failure without being able to understand English. As an alternative for burdensome multilingualism, imperial languages appear – the basic tools for our common affairs [18, p.1-2]. As the globalisation marches in a rapid tempo, new

¹ “The term comes from a Greek story of the Trojan War, in which the Greeks give a giant wooden horse to their foes, the Trojans, seemingly as a peace offering. But after the Trojans drag the horse inside their city walls, Greek soldiers sneak out of the horse's hollow belly and open the city gates, allowing their compatriots to pour in and capture Troy.”

² “According to the biblical account, Babel was a city that united humanity, all speaking a single language and migrating from the east. The people decided their city should have a tower so immense that it would have "its top in the heavens." However, the Tower of Babel was not built for the worship and praise of God, but was dedicated to false man-made religion, with a motive of making a 'celebrated name' for the builders. God seeing what that people are sinning against him confused their languages and scattered the people throughout the earth.”

approaches of assimilating “imperial” language alter the old ones. The traditional approach of language teaching based on grammar and literature is being pushed away by a new one – content based teaching, where the subject has to share it’s domain with language. The decontextualized language teaching is now considered as worthless, as communication is all about context, even though each topic we are communicating about is placed somewhere in the context of life we live. Anyway, today’s theory is that “Communication is not learned through language, but rather the reverse; language is learned through communicating” [18, p.3].

1.2. The Origins of CLIL

The very first steps towards the concept of CLIL started in 1970’s Germany, when the bilingual situation in the country encouraged people to teach their children different subjects applying French language. Afterwards, this alternative developed in other countries. Particularly successful Canadian experience of applying this method influenced the growth of it in the world. Unfortunately, later it became obvious that the Canadian situation was different from f.e. European, where multilingualism is more common than a few dominating languages in one country, yet, the attempts did not ceased and as a result many new teaching forms appeared [3, p.8; 14].

The most popular language-teaching method, which since 1990 evolved into a worldwide practiced phenomenon, is CLIL. “In the context of the present survey, the acronym CLIL is used as a generic term to describe all types of provision in which a second language (a foreign, regional or minority language and/or another official state language) is used to teach certain subjects in the curriculum other than languages lessons themselves” [3, p.9].

The new project, which is so enthusiastically supported and funded by the European Union and different educational programmes, overtook schools of Europe and the world, there are almost no objections from the teachers, parents and of’ course policy makers. The bright sides are really promising: efficient lessons, implantation of smart multilingualism and intercultural understanding, preparation for study and working life, increased motivation etc., but as it happens usually for the “hits” of the period, the costs of it are overshadowed [14; 12]. While the CLIL’s venture is on the crest of the wave and did not lapse to overdue condition, the problems arising should be observed carefully and adequately struggled.

1.3. The Status of Languages

The initial idea of CLIL project is supporting multilingualism, as well as helping the minority languages to recover. However, even though CLIL includes patterns of regional or

another official language teaching combinations, the overriding numbers are of foreign language usage in the classroom [3, p.17]. While we speak about the necessity to preserve minority languages, about the linguistic equality by “letting a thousand flowers bloom”, with such measures as CLIL ahead, we also have to acknowledge that some languages brake through as much more international than the others, and our measures to block this language imperialization process, only motivates it to thrive [1].

The intersection of methods, aims and policies results in the leadership of grand languages in Europe. The scale is such, that 95 percent of European pupils are learning the most widely spoken languages, such as English, French, German, Spanish and Russian. Very influencing fact is that these languages are widely compulsory at schools. Namely the English language is obligatory in schools of 13 European countries, and is unarguably the most popular tool of communication across the world. 90 percent of students in most countries learn it and the standing of the language is constantly accruing, even in the eastern Europe, where the Russian language were overwhelming, it is being rapidly replaced by English now³ [17, p.2].

However, there are other, less popular languages than English, but also having an unfaltering basement for prospering, which is mostly the favourable geographic position. Talking about Europe leaving out of consideration the English language, the pupils of northern and eastern parts prefer German, in south the dominating is French, and in the Baltic States it is Russian. Universally the French and German languages were matching with each other for the second place on the language perch. The cause of such lingual situation in Europe is perhaps the attitude of learners, that the more popular language is the more useful it is to learn it. Another reason is the lack of teachers who could teach minor languages. People, who cherish their mother-tongue, especially if it is a “petit” language, are worried of such an ascendancy of a few languages⁴, so measures should be taken to overcome this harsh inequality [17, p.3].

2. EDUCATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Throughout the history there were two patterns of the language learning, two traditions, which we actually follow till now: “The monastery tradition” and “The market tradition” [5, p.1-2]. Both ways differed in learning situations, materials, methods and

³ “Ankščiau rusenom, o dabar anglėjam” – a Lithuanian saying- pun, the direct meaning is that “we have been smouldering before and now we are turning into coal”, the literate meaning is that “Previously we were following the Russians, now we follow the English”.

⁴ The Eurobarometer survey showed that 63 percent of people believed it necessary to protect their own languages more.

content. In the “monastery tradition” the goal was mostly the Latin language. It was learned through analyzing scientific and literary texts in Latin and interacting with thoroughly educated tutors, “the learners acquired the tools to unlock the store of the written tradition and to gain access to their intellectual and spiritual heritage” [5, p.2]. While in the “marketplace tradition” the learning was taking place while doing. Sons of tradesmen were sent abroad to learn some handicraft and to come to anchor for their steady life. While acquiring their working and trading skills they also had to learn the language spoken in the particular country. This was of course an easier way to grasp the means of communication, but these traders never perceived, or even glimpsed at the depth and beauty of the language.

Today, we are used to the goods with the labels “Two in one”, the faster, the more universal and sad to say the more primitive ways are attractive. Consequently, the policies of teaching at schools are rapidly changing towards the tradition of the “marketplace”. Of course each policy has its pros and cons, but let’s imagine that CLIL encompasses all the schools in the world, this would of course lead towards a huge crisis. “This would need massive teacher training, material development for all levels, and a new look at assessment for a start” [8, p.11]. Surely, with respective preparations and contributions there would be no so huge losses, but the question arises – will there be any valuable gains?

2.1. Failing in Language Sphere

The main point of the efficiency of CLIL is the idea of language acquisition. The supporters maintain that by paying bigger input it becomes intake, the language with all its forms and structures comes naturally, and easily, just as the mother tongue in childhood [2]. However, isn’t it a treacherous try to make the unnatural natural? In order to understand we have to compare two concepts, with the difference which isn’t subtle at all: language acquisition and language learning. Language acquisition takes place when a person is enfolded with the language and it comes in a natural way, without any special efforts, simply by communicating with parents, friends, from media etc. Conversely, language learning takes place when conscious cognitive efforts are put in order to learn and the process of learning takes place as long as the student stays in the classroom during the restricted hours, this can not be called natural. With attention to CLIL, the aims of its programme, to create a natural language acquisition in an unnatural foreign language context, where language learning is, just as it was before CLIL, the only mode to acquire the target language, sounds a bit tricky and unreliable [10].

As an aftermath of this enthusiastic idea, that foreign language will come “en route”, by communicating the curriculum of the subject, the languages are perceived as not a foreign

language (especially when we talk about English), but as a learning skill. With this in mind it loses its status of an important subject, with its refinements and depth. The language learning which used to be systematic and consistent now could be called “just in time” learning. Language learning became very general and loses its academicism, which brings harm towards deeper language development [9; 2; 5, p.12].

2.2. Failing in Subject Sphere

It is clear now that it is not so easy to gain mastery of a foreign language through CLIL, but there is the other side of the coin – the subject. Much to my regret, it would be utterly naïve to believe that the subject training in foreign language would be more beneficial than teaching in mother tongue. Student has to enlarge the efforts severely, as to perceive the content is an objective itself, not to speak about mastering it through the medium of the foreign language, so, finally, the course of the subject is being unkept due to the language problems [10]. Language should perform as an accelerator or catalyst in the learning process, not as a setback [19, p.2].

Every newly introduced vehicle has to surpass the traditional, the old one in order to be successfully applied. In the case of CLIL this added value is being interpreted as killing two birds with one stone by wrapping up the subject-specific information in a foreign language and rendering it to the student as an efficient way to acquire both. However, this “ration” given contradicts to a fact that we can learn something only through a familiar language.

“Learning process is being differentiated into three phases: perception, evocation and restitution. In other words: the content to be learned is first perceived and only then connected to images, which ultimately have to be combined into new concepts” [19, p.3]. Unfortunately the phase of evocation in CLIL classroom may remain silent, as a foreign language belongs to a foreign culture and a student can not link the alien concept with the construct of his own culture, which he would do unconsciously while learning subject content in his mother tongue [19, p.2].

Usually, the situation during the CLIL lesson develops like this: motivated and thorough students can talk a mile a minute as long as it concerns factual questions and terminology of a subject, but as soon as the facts are being depleted, and lesson tends to take a form of discussion the chorus falls silent. There is no doubt, that students always have their opinion and the venturesome would not hesitate to express it, but the problem is that a student can not operate with new foreign notions in a foreign language without a least experience, as long as a re-encoding of a foreign notion did not come in the minds of the students [19, p.3].

Moreover, the good students often avoid participating in class discussions for fear of sounding "stupid" [10]. For the meantime school students as well as non-language specialists graduating universities are so worried about their English scores (as it is an influential factor in their future employment possibilities), that they desolate the subject ambitions [9].

Moreover, some subjects of natural sciences such as Mathematics, Physics or Chemistry raise even more challenges for students. Over and above the mother tongue and the foreign language, it introduces the third language – language of the subject. Its language is rich in words that are only found in this specific field. Even though the vocabulary of exact sciences is similar across many languages, it has typical grammatical structure which takes different shapes in different languages. Mathematicians define the language of mathematics as “an arbitrary system of signs by which thinking and communication is realized”, that is why it is important to make connections between images and thoughts, their linguistic representations, just as in case of any unfamiliar language [15, p.2].

While students fail to grasp the content and relate it to the existing knowledge, teachers have to slow down the pace of the course what causes complain about tailing away from the programs. It is difficult to fit in with the subject materials in the available lesson time, not to mention the time wasted for explaining and understanding the foreign materials. Eventually, teachers feel scattered over the tasks, loosing the system they were used to follow and failing in reaching the actual learning objectives [19, p.3].

2.3. Availability of CLIL Trained Teachers

It may sound quarrelsome that in today’s English speaking world schools badly lack of English teachers. However, it is an outcome of a full-scale shift towards popular CLIL [9]. Yet, CLIL classrooms also undergo violent deficiency of well trained specialist. Reason for the shortage of CLIL teachers is an aftermath of such obstacles as a constant decrease of students wishing to study languages, university graduates look for a better paid job as language specialist are required not only at schools; lack of IT in universities; lack of teacher education programmes, limited possibilities for teacher exchange; restricted funding for proper activities, communication problems for foreign teachers etc. [4, p.9-10]

Even bigger “hunt” takes place for the specialists of other languages (not English), as except of the obstacles mentioned above which applies to them, there are other barriers such as very limited number of adequately qualified teachers in different countries and lack of teacher trainers of the “less-popular” languages. [6, p.9]

There is a very small portion of teachers who are qualified specialists for both – language and content [15, p.42]. Consequently, to struggle with the shortage and need to

improve the quality of teaching different teacher training activities and courses are being organised⁵ [15, p.3]. Still as there are obstacles in implementing these courses widely, on numerous occasions teachers are not expected to hand in the certificate or diploma [15, p.42], so their schooling quality remain dubious.

Speaking about future perspectives and hopes, some refinements are awaiting for an appropriate CLIL teacher. In any case at least these four criteria will have to be covered:

“CLIL teacher should...

- 1) be native speakers of the target language,
- 2) have completed a course or studied in the target language,
- 3) be undergoing in-service training on CLIL type provision, and
- 4) have taken a language test or examination” [3, p.45].

Surely the last three criteria are clear and natural, but what about the first one? Is this a solution of the problem and is a teacher who doesn't speak students' mother tongue is the best alternative for them? The idea is niggling, that so much efforts are required, and such questionable outcomes are out front.

2.3.1. Clil Teacher's competences

“Teacher quality is a critical factor in determining student learning”, “the recruitment and retention of good quality teachers is a key to the improvement of school systems” [7]

On the surface it seems that the only CLIL teacher's competences required are language skills and subject knowledge. However, teaching through the medium of other language necessitates to communicating the culture, attitudes, norms etc. connected to the language [16]. Proficiency in subject knowledge and the target language is surely obligatory, but even though peripheral, still very important for successful foreign language learning and development of receptive multilingualism, is teacher's ability to analyse and describe the language, knowledge of the principles of language acquisition as well as pedagogical skills [7; 4, p.7]. Regrettably very often language education policies are missing integrated treatment. For this reason preference is now given to native speakers, whereas local teachers of a foreign language are encouraged to spend an extended period in a country where that language is spoken, as well as have stated possibilities to update their training [4, p.8].

⁵ F.e. the project SOCRATES - LINGUA, Trans-language in Europe: Content and language integrated learning (countries involved Austria, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Italy, Spain, United Kingdom)

Language teachers have always been these educators who introduce wider aspect of European culture to their students: values of openness to others, tolerance of differences, willingness to communicate etc. [4, p.8] Whereas now this task lies on the language-content teacher's back. The risk surfaces that students will be deprived of this multicultural awareness in their CLIL class of the unnatural environment, alongside constant shortage of time [16]. Or just the other way about, will be over crammed with that alien awareness, excess of which causes serious cultural identity problems especially if their teacher will be a native speaker.

CLIL teacher is an agent balancing between subject-specific and language-specific acquisition objectives. He has to knit these aims in the foreign language and at the same time ensure that they are understood in mother tongue [19, p.2].

In English class the communicative competence, encompassing fluency and accuracy, is an initial objective. However, when the simple English classroom transforms into the classroom of CLIL, objectives duplicate and even contradict to each other. F.e. the main objective of mathematics teaching is to develop mathematical thinking. Generally, the essence of the lesson of mathematics is adopting ways of speaking mathematically, what means learning the language of mathematicians, which has formal and informal components [16]. In the situation of CLIL it is really hard to achieve as fundamental of science has to be understood in the mother tongue on purpose to proceed going deeper into content in future. There remains a possibility (and the only way) of switching from the target language to the mother tongue while instructing, even so, what is the good of it? Can not we remain in our traditional classes then?

Still as the aim is to master both, content and language, target language must be used. The speech of a teacher and a student usually largely differs, whereas in a CLIL lesson it is extremely obvious, as challenge for a student to operate with foreign language mathematic terms and structures swells out enormously. Therefore this should be handled very delicately, the challenge in teacher's talk must be coordinated with the age of a student, otherwise it may lead to misunderstandings, disappointment and formalism. While vice versa, if the instructions are very primitive, it harms not only upbringing of mathematical language, but also his cognitive structure of learners in general [15, p.3]. With all this obstacle course CLIL teacher should not forsake students' interest and motivation and always consider the time management [16]. Finally the responsibility and load of a teacher in a CLIL type provision is solely on the increase.

2.3.2. Opposition to the Language Teaching by Subject Teachers

As today CLIL is the most cherished and encouraged educational foster-child, governments, employers, parents and learners alike – across the Europe and the world are obsessed with English language – the major tool of instructions in CLIL and its promising idea to learn foreign language at a sweep [9]. Still and all will the teachers of chemistry, history or any other subject will master the target language (if English, then let it be) to such an extent that they could enunciate easily, without restraint, give extensive clarifications, answer unexpected questions, and the main thing – to become a language teacher of an equal value as a usual one [10]. It's natural that subject teachers are the most withstanding group against CLIL.

From the student's point of view, it is very strange and unnatural when their teacher, who is their mother tongue speaker, teaches of the world history in English, for the sake of making the unnatural natural. The one way to do it, as already mentioned before, to invite only native speakers of a target language to lecture the subjects. It's not easy though, as subject teachers are reasonably reluctant to approve, that being a native speaker of English makes one a better maths teacher, history teacher or even English teacher than a native speaker of the learner's mother tongue [10].

Not unnaturally most of the elder subject teachers are unable to teach content through language. Speaking about forthcoming generation there is some potential, but still very vague, as most universities are not yet ready to train twofold CLIL teachers [4, 10]. Subject teachers don't show interest in CLIL and very scarce numbers of them partake in re-qualification programmes. Admittedly there are not so many courses for the specifics of CLIL methodology organised, and if they are, then just few, far between and usually bursting at the seams with language specialists eager to nose out of new learning environment [6].

2.3.3. The End of the Language Classroom as We Know It

Together with approach of CLIL the status of English teacher alternates. As skills of English language are more and more considered generic, like these of basic literacy or maths, English is being taught to progressively younger pupils, at the same time the role of English specialist is being more and more marginalised, his/hers knowledge becomes substantial and less important to the way English curriculum are organised and exposed. F.e. in Finland, which is practically the birthplace of CLIL, the role of an English teacher almost disappeared, teachers had to take up CLIL, or became redundant [9].

As an alternative for double-specialised teacher, who is so much in demand and so hard to find, was introduced a "Team teaching" possibility. Two specialists: the content

teacher and the language teacher are both present during the lesson. The idea is that subject teacher tutors the content in target language, while the language teacher helps him/her with the language and class management problems. However, in practice the tendency is that subject teacher introduces the content in L1, and students respond in L1 also, as that is how easier to understand new material. Afterwards, language teacher presents the same context in L2. It is much easier for teacher's to cope with CLIL in cooperation, as together they sum total. Still and all, this alternative also carries its drawbacks, inasmuch as the amount of time consumed for explanations is much too big, the subject teachers usually do not feel the need to lecture in L2 as they have a translator by their side. Finally there is stagnation in mediation of the content in L2, as usually the usage of L2 in this kind of CLIL lesson confines to the focusing on the language itself. Eventually, nothing more is gained from this kind of lesson, except of distraction by switching from subject towards language. What is more, the threat arises, that if language teacher is more pro-active and enterprising his curriculum than the subject teacher, the balance may flip over and the result is that "rather than the L2 being the vehicle for content learning, the focus is changed around and it is the content that becomes the vehicle for language learning" [6].

Ultimately, question arises: is there any need to change conventional and certified ways of teaching? Student is being tossed and tested, teachers are forced to go ape for not to loose their jobs. Will not it be so, that we will come full circle and realize that long-time experience is more valuable and trusted than funky innovations.

2.4. Lack of Empirical CLIL Teaching Materials

CLIL type provision requires much more than the traditional language teaching. In addition to the huge demand of human resources (double trained teachers), it also necessitates of suitable teaching materials [3, p.51]. After all none of the previous textbooks can be used any more, as now they have to serve two purposes: on one hand it has to explain the content, on the other hand, it has to include materials providing proper language input for the students. This is already a challenge for material compilers, not to speak about following roadblocks, arising because of the peculiarities of each language relation to the target language.

In a present situation the burden of finding the teaching materials lies on the teacher's shoulders. This is a result of lack of time, as CLIL type provision anchors very fast, lack of finance, and lack of people in each country who would be able to design such textbooks, because they can not be applied internationally as the national curriculums must be introduced [3, p.52; 13].

For the time being, while the lack of teaching resources is global, teachers get by with teaching materials obtained abroad. However, this is not the way out, as each country has its own culturally specific realia. Accordingly, it has its own ways of introducing the concepts, practicing them, as well as the problem solving [15, p.3]. Thus, if the foreign textbook is used it should be largely adapted, as not only subjects and topics do not coincide, but also the language level is often inappropriate for learners of the same age in different countries [13].

Composing the CLIL textbooks the problem of terminology is being confronted. Terms are important part of almost every subject, from natural sciences, inclusively social subjects, to the arts and sports. Terms should be understood in both languages, L1 and L2, but some of them are difficult and sometimes simply impossible to translate [5, p.9]. Some terms are valid only in particular language (f.e. the English mathematic term “barrel” for a special type of solid; or the term “central symmetry” which is used in many European languages, but not used in English), that is why it is necessary to analyze the concepts before starting teaching [15, p.3].

Speaking about each subject separately adequate incongruities arise. Supposing during the lesson of Lithuanian History, intercourse of Lithuania and Poland would be introduced in English or any other language. It would sound very unnatural and strange, the authenticity and reliability would be misrepresented for the students. As well as the issue of the authentic historical sources: should it be deserted and forgotten? Certainly, if the topic of the lesson is “The British Empire” these can serve as a perfect teaching material, but is it worth neglecting native history? The same dilemma is reached with the social studies, when f.e. the current politics or parliamentary systems are introduced [5, p.9].

No matter how neatly the textbooks are made, there are still gaps remaining, as the content of some subjects, especially these of natural sciences, do not allow the manifestation of certain language forms. F.e. Chemistry: the lesson mainly passes executing practical experiments, and putting the observations down. Hence we may conclude that certain type of communication, such as emotive language and argumentative skills will not be acquired [5, p.9].

Another threat of CLIL is students’ disorientation. Many lacunas may appear as the methodology of CLIL conflicts with a system. The input of vocabulary, language structures, grammar is random, there is no possibility for the linguistic progression to be followed [5, p.8]. Obviously, for the compilers of the textbooks this is a great challenge in decision, how to integrate and present the materials that the benefits would be maximum, or flipping the coin over – the damage would be minimum.

2.5. Problem of Assessment

Another substantial issue in CLIL type provision is the question of assessment. In traditional language and subject classes there are clear norms of assessing defined, and yet, subjectivities in evaluation happen. How should it be coped in CLIL type provision, where the two curricula should be assessed? Should the focus be set on the language or on the content? [10] “The borders of the disciplines are blurring. In fact our “accepted practices” are always problematised, there is on-going discussion of what counts and what doesn’t... An ongoing hierarchy of knowledge hierarchies. “The Ranking Game” [18, p.4].

After all, it very often happens that a student is gifted for natural sciences, but tails away in linguistic sphere, he can not communicate the content in the target language as he is expected to do and this is how his knowledge is being disregarded, or not fully understood just because of his poor language.

On the other hand, subject in CLIL is usually considered of a prior importance. Whereas, the domain of language is being shared by all the teachers, so the shared responsibility is as a rule less relevant, while for the content knowledge each teacher is responsible separately. Naturally the content takes an upper dimension. Then, the fear arises of content evaluation, neglecting language skills, which can not be justified.

The problem blows up even more if the CLIL teacher is a native speaker of the target language and has himself/herself problems in understanding students’ mother tongue. In this situation, idea of which is widely promoted in CLIL, both – the teacher and the student are impotent to communicate the knowledge to each other. Certainly, the teacher would not be eager and would not have a right to write a good mark for the content does not knowing if a student really has the knowledge of it.

The nature of CLIL is integration of two domains, so the assessment should adequately integrate both of them brushing away the “Ranking game”, but in what conditions should it be achieved? The idea of double tests, where one part belongs to the language, another to the content tasks, was introduced [13], but can we call this integrated assessing? What about the oral accounting? After all, different formats need to be applied in order to check the whole knowledge. The inequality, subjectivity and disappointment seem to put down the roots in a CLIL classroom as long as there will be no relevant assessment criteria invented.

3. CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

CLIL is being praised for the identification with the target language culture, which enhances international understanding and tolerance. There is no need to pass any

additional readings as the perception comes naturally through participating in the lesson exhibiting the bare bones of an alien culture [10]. But does not it is the other way round – implanting foreign traditions and culture in our lives? The metaphor of the Trojan horse introduced in the very beginning for English language, forewarns about the threat of globalization causing the loss of our own culture, identity and language.

The globalisation rapidly upstages the multilingualism, the western culture is spreading in the media, internet, and now it comes with the language, at school. The notion of consumerism entrenches as a reflection of a global behaviour tending towards superficial modes of life, fast obtained base knowledge and facile victories. “The mindset orientation of Generation Y (born 1982-2001) is particularly focused on immediacy as in “learn as you use, use as you learn - not learn now, use later”. Generation C (2002-2025) will be even more influenced by early experience of integrated media, curricula and practice” [8]. The market-oriented culture is losing its value, when the society is chasing frivolous gains, strongly indulging in the foreign backgrounds, the authenticity and depth of the possessed culture is vanishing, as the culture is in people. Now we reached the halt, when the schools are being involved, the least possibility to preserve idiosyncrasy is wasted. The scale of impact on the national identity and the mother tongue of content learning through foreign language will be measured in future, when there will be no way back.

3.1. Threat to Mother Tongue

The main objective of CLIL concerning language is equipping learners with a language tool enabling them to juggle with foreign words and phrases as well as possible. It is natural that practicing foreign language a lot, influences negatively the mother tongue, just like an apprentice carpenters can not learn to use a plane or drill without some wood to work on, the same way the language learners do not work on tabula rasa, they “bed” the second language on their mother tongue, what causes the correlation and distortion of languages.

People paradoxically wish to preserve their mother tongue and at the same time they follow the popular languages, like English, German, French or Russian implanting such projects as learning content through other language at schools [1, p.3]. The protection of the mother tongue in this case is severely neglected, so maybe the linguistic heritage is being overestimated?

The observations of the English language role in United Nations and European Union were made. “In international institutions, the English language has a similar function to the Latin used in church. It is the language of the insiders and officials, allowing them to ignore national and cultural diversity. Obviously, this means that potential conflicts tend to be

concealed rather than resolved. The appeal of bilingual teaching for the foreign language teacher certainly does not lie in using language as a vehicle for subject teaching without reflection” [19, p.2].

In fact, many students studying in CLIL schools all throughout Europe notice the wastage of their native tongue. They worry of forgetting the words and expressions in their own language. They speak of a need to improve their mother tongues, to enrich the basic vocabulary and the professional language [10]. If this happens in the start of implementation of CLIL, what is waiting for them, when the project will assume a real acceleration throughout the world? Will not it be so, that we will need to bring back the lost native tongues by implanting it back through additional native language courses?

This global per equation by means of English is a threat not only to small languages of small countries, but even to such a “strong” as German or French, which are currently competing for the second place in popularity [17, p.3]. There are fears ventilated, that the devastating power of English together with CLIL may bring partial death of German language. The students are no more able to talk about issues they were introduced in CLIL classes in their mother tongue; they became so much related to the English that they abandon their native language. The authorities act adequately, as there are no more scientific publications in other language but English; all the global discussions are monitored through international language [5, p.11]. Consequently, if we are witnessing such a situation at school there will be a necessity to continue the same way in the universities, as the jump from English to the mother tongue in learning can lead to misinterpretations of the materials.

Finally, is it worth to sacrifice so many authentic tongues, for a one convenient language?

3.2. Threat to National Identity

Language and culture goes arm in arm. So, if we unclasp the language, hardly we will be able to preserve the culture. After all, the culture is in language, it is communicable heritage: traditions, history, creeds, convictions, ideologies etc. How can we retain it when school programmes offers English, or any other foreign variant, of our native legacy? As it was mentioned ahead, the history of every nation relies heavily on reading and analysing extracts from authentic historical sources. In previous history classes students were supposed to analyze these texts scrupulously and to discover the roots and roads of the homey nation. Each history book contributes to the realization of the student of the peculiarities of his own identity with the nation and culture he belongs to. Generally, history is being considered as the most important school subject for the formation of national identity [5, p.9].

So, again, the uneasiness disquiets how the identity can be transmitted through the foreign language? The tendencies may be just the opposite – the foreign culture is intruded for the students. The application of the linguistic rules and the development of communicative skills may be successful only if the dimension of socio-cultural context, in which the language has its roots, is added. Especially, when in childhood the receptivity is the highest and when the alien culture is being implanted at schools the loss of originality is unavoidable.

The cultural identity places the foundations of the nation, it reflects its roads in history, this is what makes every nation unique and every representative of it a member of a big family having not only the material heritage, but the common moral, conceptual comprehension. An example from Cold war illustrates the idea of cultural odds and disparities:

“When in its early years, the German Democratic Republic (GDR) was due to build socialist monuments, its big brother, the Soviet Union, was highly irritated. Despite the efforts of the GDR artists to create images of socialist heroes, the only reaction of their Russian comrades was complete disbelief. As it turned out, the mistake they had made was that they had remained trapped in Western iconographic traditions. So, although all the heroes had been depicted in victorious postures, they also showed signs of struggle and failure. What they represented were secularised “Men of Suffering”. Soviet heroes, by contrast, stem from the iconographic tradition of the “pantocrator”, i.e. the absolute ruler, who knows neither pain nor suffering. Accordingly, whenever a Russian Socialist spoke of “heroes”, he or she meant something quite different to what his or her East German comrade was referring to” [19, p.1].

These differences may be melted in bilingual teaching, what would be the loss not only to the particular nation, but to the world as for a selection of divergent individuals. CLIL serves as a paintbrush which muddles the colours on the palette, instead of drawing something original including all the unhoped-for undertones and shades.

4. PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

The CLIL type provision is not the way of learning chosen by students, it was enforced to them as the best methodology for language acquisition. However, the opinion of policy maker does not necessarily coincide with the opinion of a student who has to undergo the idea, and a change.

The integrated learning is not suitable for every student as the experience show students’ reluctance to continue with CLIL. The reasons for this are transparent. The language barriers result in the students’ focus only on the most important, basic information of the course. They do not do any additional readings and independent studies to deepen their

knowledge, so the outcomes are skin-deep attainment. Students feel imprisoned in their own knowledge which they can not communicate, they feel that they can do much better than their grades show. Their confidence as learners suffers a lot. What is more, many good students are afraid to speak in the CLIL lesson because of fear sounding stupid, just because of their poor language skills [10].

4.1. Students' Attitude Towards CLIL

"Thank you for the course. I wish it had been given in my own language because I know I have lost out on much information during the course, and you, the teacher, did not have the opportunity to get to know the real me, what I am able to do, what I know, what I think and who I am" [10].

This is a student's message for a teacher after having spent five days a week for eight months in a CLIL course. The girl who wrote the message is not the only one who feels this way about the CLIL studies, big numbers of students struggle with the obstacle course of the CLIL programme. Inability to combine both at once works on their confidence. They feel disappointed of their insufficient language knowledge, which erects barriers for content grasp, what severely diminishes the motivation.

Students feel neglected as CLIL is mainly the topic of the teachers, parents and policy makers. Students are not the members entitled to vote and choose, though they are really the ones who will experience the gains and losses [10]. In CLIL type provision practicing countries the tendencies are just the opposite as the authorities expect – students are not eager to take up the CLIL courses. Such subjects as physics or “text-intensive” history are difficult itself, and the foreign language demands are an extra burden to carry. The unwillingness of students to take up CLIL is especially sharp in their closing years, as they are concerned about the final marks, whereas the integrated learning usually puts on the work and knocks off the marks. “Just as education administrators interpret CLIL as two for the price of one, some learners see it exactly the other way round – working hard in two areas, that is, subject and language, for just one mark” [5, p.10-11].

The motivation of students to take up CLIL is shifting. While it is attractive as a new development the more confident and capable learners tend to take up CLIL. Still, when it will be a usual way and no more something special, the numbers of wishful, will predictably decrease. The current fallout of students wishing to continue CLIL in Canada and Germany proves the tendency which may be followed globally in future [5, p.10-11]. Having in mind the costs of implementation of CLIL, these trends should be reconsidered.

4.2. Psychological Effect on Students' Learning Skills

The main deficiency in language lesson has always been the lack of speaking practice for students. The oral language is usually the teacher's activity, which does not give much lingual knowledge for learners. What concerns CLIL, the amount of students talk shrinks even more notably. They are constrained in their inability to utter their thoughts because of the language barrier.

The severe teacher's dominance in the classroom has negative impact on students' attitudes and perceptions of learning process. While teacher is talking, students are sitting passively, which does not even mean, that they mentally participates in the lesson. The oral language is being completely neglected and what is more harmful is that "students leaving the classrooms are tend to carry the passivity over to their learning attitudes, and tend to be "disabled" in their learning abilities as well" [11]. As well as that, students cease to be able to give their opinion, to reason one or another issue, to present their own point of view.

Listening appears to be the most important skill for a teacher to have, as by listening the contribution to the student's ability to gain and search for knowledge, is the biggest. However, the CLIL discussion is usually very short and very shy. The only oral performance of a class usually is being done in chorus – a mere delivering of facts learned by heart, which can not be accepted as an appropriate speech [19, p.3]. The train of student's thoughts should be the aim of a teacher.

In the teacher – dominant CLIL classroom the fear arises that students by not coping with the language bar, will submerge in a passive learning in all the subjects. The routine of their "learning" activities will be simply listening, writing down whatever information is delivered, and doing the homework. The outcome of such learning is the basic skills of reading and writing. The critical thinking and the ability to make personal judgements and solutions will not be developed [11].

The oral development, speaking about themselves and their experiences, is especially necessary for the small children. Being taught at home by their mothers, they usually perform oral learning, thus switching from speaking to writing so abruptly may cause loathing for school and learning in general [11]. If CLIL is being implemented at the very beginning of schooling, the possibility to come through for a child as a personality in learning environment is impossible as long as he did not learn the basics of the target language, which does not come so quickly.

Classroom without CLIL is a more free-and-easy classroom, with no constrictions of a language. The mother tongue allows to a person to devote his thinking to a thought itself, to the concept, while speaking in a foreign language, critical thinking is being

severely restricted as it concentrates on the form, not the idea. Whereas the original aim of the teacher is to stimulate the thought. Here we have to weigh what is of a primary importance for us – the ability to understand the foreign language or the ability to think critically?

“It is not merely a language issue; it is also an intellectual issue which deserves serious attention from both teachers and researchers. From the perspective of language development, oral language provides a foundation for the development of other language skills... The neglect of oral language in the classroom will destroy that foundation and severely hinder the development of other aspects of language skills” [11].

CONCLUSIONS

“Content and Language Integrated Learning” (CLIL) is a real venture of our times. Being of such a great promise, at the same time it raises real risks for the national, cultural and intellectual development of the future generations. The propagated CLIL is a child of a “market tradition” in learning, which, as a rule proclaims fast-and-easy acquisition and usage without taking deeper look into the subject. The deficiencies lurk in all the spheres approached, which predicts being up to no good.

The initial slogan of CLIL is to encourage the multilingualism, but the tendency is rather the opposite – the imperial languages appear, with English in front. The need for smaller languages is minimal and the choice of the students always tends toward the more useful. With the help of bilingual teaching we are diving deeper into the globalization, abandoning our native tongues.

The educational achievements in CLIL type provision are questionable. The language acquisition through CLIL comes faster than in a traditional language class, but the knowledge of the deeper language forms and structures is being neglected. The content knowledge quality also suffers, as the language barrier allows soaking up only the core material, the very fundamentals of the subjects without exploring additional information.

The question of teaching resources is especially urgent. The integrated teaching demands of a double proficiency, so the supply of teachers drastically declines. The alternatives, such as teacher training or team teaching were introduced; however amateurish teaching brings more harm than use. What is more, the old teaching materials do not apply any more, so the need for the improvements in up-tempo is necessary.

The trepidation of loss of national identities is reasonable. Introduction of a foreign language in big amounts at the early years of schooling can severely diminish the sense of belonging to the particular nation, national heritage and traditions of which is being introduced at school much less, than the foreign culture. Furthermore, the threat to a mother tongue is even bigger, as constant usage of a foreign language results in forgetting native words and phrases, inability to express oneself in native language.

The students’ attitudes towards CLIL is often much less enthusiastic than these of their parents or teachers. Students have to cope with better burden and they often feel unappreciated enough, as the assessment issue in CLIL is rather subjective. What is more the CLIL pattern of teaching is tended to the teacher dominance what does not allow to perform orally for students. This restricts the development of students’ critical thinking, confining with the basic literacy.

REFERENCE LIST

1. Arthur van Essen “The Rise and Role of English as an International Language”, updated 2008-03-15, <http://209.85.135.104/search?q=cache:AiFwgyZxrDUJ:www.hltmag.co.uk/nov04/mart02.rtf+dominating+language+clil&hl=lt&ct=clnk&cd=9&gl=lt>
2. Dr. Glenn Ole Hellekjer “English for Occupational Purposes: The Case of Clil”, updated 2008-03-28, http://209.85.135.104/search?q=cache:7wFsEqq-ToUJ:www.cinop.nl/ezine/mvt/nb_07-13/pp_hellekjaer.ppt+language+acquisition+clil&hl=lt&ct=clnk&cd=4&gl=lt
3. Eurydice “Content and Language Integrated Learning at School in Europe”, updated 2008-03-11, http://209.85.135.104/search?q=cache:fKDg-znBXVEJ:www.eurydice.org/ressources/eurydice/pdf/0_integral/071EN.pdf+What+clil+is%3F&hl=lt&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=lt
4. “Follow-up of the Action Plan on language learning and linguistic diversity National Report Template, Country: Lithuania”, 2008-04-30, http://209.85.135.104/search?q=cache:XSDXvnG29f4J:ec.europa.eu/education/policies/lang/policy/report/lt_en.pdf+clil+teacher+obstacles&hl=lt&ct=clnk&cd=9&gl=lt
5. Friederike Klippel, “New prospects, or imminent danger? – The impact of English medium instruction on education in Germany”, updated 2008-05-13, http://209.85.135.104/search?q=cache:F489zs8pIFwJ:www.ameprc.mq.edu.au/docs/prospect_journal/volume_18_no_1/18_1_6_Klippel.pdf+Clil+threat+cultural+identity&hl=lt&ct=clnk&cd=10&gl=lt
6. <http://web.fu-berlin.de/elc/bulletin/9/en/coonan.html>, updated 2008-04-30.
7. <http://web.fu-berlin.de/elc/bulletin/9/en/craen-perez.html>, updated 2008-04-30.
8. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/guardianweekly/story/0,12674,1464367,00.html>, updated 2008-03-25.
9. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/theguardian/2005/apr/20/guardianweekly.guardianweekly11>, updated 2008-03-25.
10. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/theguardian/2005/jan/21/guardianweekly.guardianweekly1>, updated 2008-03-25.
11. <http://www.indiana.edu/~reading/ieo/digests/d107.html>, updated 2008-05-09.
12. http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/think/methodology/clil_lesson.shtml, updated 2008-03-13.
13. <http://www.xtec.es/~mherna23/presentacion/procon.htm>, updated 2008-05-13.
14. http://www2.uni-wuppertal.de/FB4/anglistik/multhaup/methods_elt/9_clil.htm#, updated 2008-03-12.

15. J. Novotna, M. Hofmannova “Clil and Mathematics Education”, updated 2008-04-24,
<http://209.85.135.104/search?q=cache:gYWII1mqB-pkJ:www.math.unipa.it/~grim/Jnovotna.PDF+clil+educational+obstacles&hl=lt&ct=clnk&cd=3&gl=lt>

16. J. Novotna, M. Hofmannova “Teacher Training for Content and Language Integrated Learning”, updated 2008-04-26,
http://209.85.135.104/search?q=cache:GgX118DguL4J:stwww.weizmann.ac.il/G-math/ICMI/Novotna_Jarmila-Hofmannova_Marie_ICMI15_prop.doc+clil+teacher&hl=lt&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=lt

17. “Multilingualism: Key facts and figures”, updated 2008-03-15,
http://209.85.135.104/search?q=cache:0GMrlx3FxeIJ:ec.europa.eu/education/policies/lang/awareness/2005/facts_en.pdf+popular+language+clil&hl=lt&ct=clnk&cd=10&gl=lt

18. Soetaert R., Bonamie B. “New Rules for the Language and Content Game”, updated 2008-03-11,
<http://209.85.135.104/search?q=cache:tndbtY76VMwJ:www.euroclil.net/inhoud/bulletins/pdf/e12.pdf+the+relationship+of+language+and+content+Clil&hl=lt&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=lt>

19. “The Added Value of Clil, Approaches and Practical Suggestions from the Perspective of Foreign Language Teaching”, updated 2008-04-20,
<http://209.85.135.104/search?q=cache:vTU7IQot1s5EJ:www.mobidic.org/doc/BI/TheoriePraxisTexte/MehrwertBilUnt/MehrwertBilUnt-UK.pdf+clil+subject+obstacles&hl=lt&ct=clnk&cd=8&gl=lt>