More than content and language: the complexity of integration in CLIL and multilingual education

Tarja Nikula, Christiane Dalton-Puffer, Ana Llinates and Francisco Lorenzo

Introduction

This volume is concerned with content and language integrated learning, CLIL. It is a form of education that has spread especially in Europe since the mid-1990s, and that draws on earlier models of bilingual education such as immersion and content-based instruction (for CLIL overviews, see Coyle et al., 2010; Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Dalton-Puffer et al., 2010b). Rather than focusing on distinctions and points of convergence between different forms of bilingual education (for discussion, see Cenoz et al., 2014; Dalton-Puffer et al., 2014; Nikula & Mård-Miettinen, 2014), this volume addresses integration as a shared concern for all forms of education that have simultaneous content and language learning objectives. It aims at highlighting the complexity of integration and to show that apart from content and language matters, an array of other factors - institutional, pedagogical, personal – also need to be considered.

Even though the above mentioned duality of content and language lies at the heart of CLIL and has been acknowledged in most studies, CLIL research to date has been mainly characterised by language learning perspectives on learners’ general language skills. That is, there has been less research on how content and language integration challenges our views of language and on the importance of language in and for content learning (but see Llinares et al., 2012). Coyle’s (2007, see also Coyle et al., 2010: 41-42) well-known conceptualisation of the four Cs, i.e. content, culture, communication and cognition, as crucial considerations in CLIL has highlighted the fact that the role of language in CLIL needs to be considered from the viewpoint of language and content to be learnt, the type of language used for learning and the cultural-contextual factors involved. However, operationalising such considerations to the more concrete level of research and educational practice still remains a challenge. Accordingly, there are calls for more principled approaches to content and language
integration (e.g. Cenoz et al., 2014; Dalton-Puffer et al., 2010; Davison & Williams, 2001; Gajo, 2007). An important step in this direction has already been taken in the volume by Llinares et al. (2012) on the roles of language in CLIL, in which they outline an approach to language that is based on systemic functional linguistics, regards form and meaning as closely intertwined, and presents lexico-grammatical choices as tightly linked to the requirements of specific academic genres and registers. The present volume continues the work on the integration of language and content in bilingual education and expands it to the levels of pedagogies, participants and practices, seeking both to contribute to the research field and to offer insights for practice. Apart from CLIL, the need for a comprehensive take on language and content integration concerns other forms of bi- and multilingual education. A more explicit orientation on the relationship between language and content in education is also increasingly important in the mainstream contexts that are becoming more and more diverse through processes of globalisation and migration (see e.g. Ahrenholz, 2010; Hélot, 2014; Little et al., 2014; Mohan et al. 2001).

When discussing the content and language relationship, Davison and Williams (2001) provide an overview of different approaches to integrated language and content teaching on a continuum from curricular focus on content teaching to curricular focus on language teaching. However, they note, referring to content and language, that the different approaches still tend to be “imprecise about how they see these entities and how they go about integrating them effectively” (2001: 63). Davison and Williams (2001: 69) therefore argue for more comprehensive theory building in order to arrive at a principled basis for content and language integration and this is a driving force for this volume: we seek to complement existing CLIL research that has largely been concerned with learning outcomes or classroom practices with a research contribution that focuses on integration and how it can be conceptualised and investigated.

Integration in education is broadly defined as ‘blending into a functioning or unified whole’ (Collins & O’Brien 2011: 241). This unity is a crucial concern, yet difficult to conceptualise and explore: in CLIL, the very phrasing ‘content and language integration’ may push us towards considering language and content as separate. In fact, as will become evident throughout this volume, focusing on integration makes it necessary to explicate what is
actually meant by ‘language’ and ‘content’. These concepts are easily taken for granted in ways that may disregard their inherent interdependency, which is described by Schleppegrell (2004: 1) as follows: “It is through language that school subjects are taught and through language that students’ understanding of concepts is displayed and evaluated in school contexts”. As the quote suggests, explication of the relationship of content and language is not only useful for research and practice in CLIL and other types of content-based instruction but for any teaching and learning context, which is why we consider digging deeper into integration as a worthy endeavour. A rationale for this book is thus to make a contribution both to CLIL research and to the problematics of the role of language in learning and teaching different school subjects more generally – a topical concern in many corners of the world for example when explicating the role of language in different curricular areas, often with reference to ‘academic language’ (see e.g. Ernst-Slivit & Mason, 2011; Valdés, 2004; Zwiers, 2008).

This volume is based on the international project ConCLIL Language and content integration: towards a conceptual framework, funded by the Academy of Finland (2011-2014). The project, based at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland, brought together team members from Finland, Austria, Spain, the UK and Canada for the shared purpose of exploring and interrogating the notion of integration in CLIL (see http://conclil.jyu.fi). The project made it possible to pool data from different countries. Although using data originally collected for different purposes involves making compromises in the exact similarity of background factors and variables, the availability of cross-border data has been crucial for allowing a more comprehensive handling of integration than would have been possible with narrower data sets. In addition to existing data, the project has also included collecting new interview data (see Skinnari & Bovellan, and Dafouz, Hüttner & Smit, this volume).

Apart from being the research focus, integration has also been an organising principle in the project. Firstly, while members, broadly speaking, share a socio-functional approach to language and language learning, they have also brought to the project different theoretical and methodological approaches ranging from socio-constructivist learning theories to systemic functional and genre approaches as readers of this volume will find. Combining research orientations has also made it possible to foster methodological and theoretical
integration, and to bring together areas that have previously rarely come together in CLIL research. Secondly, the project members represent different types of researchers: (applied) linguists, as well as general educators and subject educators who have been able to combine forces for a shared empirically-based and conceptually-oriented endeavour to explore integration as a core concern in CLIL. Thirdly, the different orientations have created opportunities for tackling integration as a truly multidimensional phenomenon but have at the same time helped identify core areas that keep emerging regardless of the perspective chosen. Consequently, this volume will illustrate the main argument resulting from the multidimensional approach of the project, namely the recognition that apart from content and language, it is necessary to extend the remit of the term integration so that it will capture issues relating to other types of ‘integration’ that any educational institution involved with CLIL or other forms of bilingual education needs to address, for example integration of different types of teacher expertise and teacher identities involved, integration as the use and merging of different languages in classroom practices, as well as the whole enterprise of integrating content and language as a meeting place for different, sometimes conflicting discourses, processes and practices.

Integration as a broader educational concern

The interconnectedness of language and knowledge building and, in more concrete terms, the apparent dependence of educational success on particular aspects of linguistic competence are not, of course, issues that have arisen for the first time in CLIL. In fact, ‘language and content’ has been on the agenda of sociologists, educationalists and linguists for a number of decades. In most cases, involvement in the topic has been fuelled by concerns regarding the obvious inequality among different groups of learners in meeting educational requirements, mastering the curricular content and attaining exam thresholds. The reason identified for this inequality was that not all learners come equipped with linguistic repertoires sufficient to navigate the established practices of institutional/formal education. In the 1970s it was above all the parameter of social class which was employed to identify at-risk groups of learners who were seen as needing support in extending their linguistic repertoire in their first language (e.g. Ammon, 1972; Bernstein, 1971, 1975; Oevermann, 1972). From the 1980s onwards the issue of class has been overridden
increasingly by the effects of mass-immigration into Western industrialised (and now post-industrial) societies (e.g. Cummins, 2000; García et al., 2006). Now it is students with migrant backgrounds who seem to be getting a bad deal in the school system on the grounds that they do not have the medium of instruction as their first language. The fact that social class still operates as a factor alongside ethnic and linguistic background is frequently ignored in public discourse as well as scholarly debates (but see Block, 2014).

A range of approaches to these issues have been developed all converging on the insight that language and content competences develop in synchrony and are, therefore, best dealt with in close combination. In the United Kingdom, the Bullock Report (1975) culminated in the recommendation that every school develop a cross-curricular language curriculum (LAC, *language across the curriculum*). This initiative was, however, largely superseded by the move for standardisation from the 1980s onwards, partly because LAC was caught in a political crossfire, attacked by the left for highlighting explicit knowledge about language and by the right for being too political with its attention to language and class (Stubbs, 2000). In North America, Content-Based Instruction developed out of an interest to support the academic language development of ESL learners but also of those learning foreign languages (e.g. Stoller, 2004; Stryker & Leaver, 1993). The strong concern with second language learners has fuelled projects like SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol), a pedagogical concept designed to help teachers to plan and implement forms of teaching that support English learners’ simultaneous learning of academic knowledge and language skills (e.g. Echevarria et al., 2009), or the new Australian curriculum, with the design of Scopes and Scales outlining the language demands that need to be addressed across the curriculum in order to support ESL learners’ school success (e.g. Polias, 2003).

Continental Europe entered these debates with a certain time-lag owing to the historically later onset of mass immigration, but in the meantime academic and educational debates have been intense in many countries. This has motivated the Council of Europe to initiate the project “Languages in Education, Languages for Education” in 2005. Even though its original aim to adapt and expand the *Common European Frame of Reference for Languages* (Council of Europe 2001) for the purposes of academic language has not been fulfilled as yet (see Thürmann & Vollmer, 2013),
the project has produced a number of valuable documents providing curriculum writers with subject-specific as well as cross-curricular notions and categories that can be worked into national curricula (e.g. Beacco, 2010; Beacco et al., 2010; Linneweber-Lammerskitten, 2012).

As regards national curricula, growing attention to the importance of language across the curriculum is reflected, for example, in the ongoing curriculum renewal work in Finland. The new core national curriculum will be launched in Finland in 2016, and greater language emphasis is reflected, for example, in multiliteracy featuring as a core factor in the broad competence areas needed in the future, and in the acknowledgment that increasing cultural diversity needs to be accompanied with a better language awareness in education. The curriculum work in Finland has no doubt been influenced by the 2006 curriculum reform in Norway, where language aims are visible in the core curriculum (The (LK06) National Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion in Primary and Secondary Education and Training) in the way each subject curriculum is expected to incorporate, in addition to its specific content requirements, five basic skills of reading, expressing oneself orally, expressing oneself in writing, developing numeracy and using digital tools (Norway, 2006). At the moment of writing, research and development also seems to be particularly intense in Germany where language and subject educators are working on a range of projects fostering cross-curricular sensitivity to language among policy makers as well as classroom teachers (e.g. Salem et al., 2013; Thürmann & Vollmer, 2010).

In sum, it can be stated that educators and educational systems realise that learning in a linguistically challenging milieu – as is the case in multilingual education – can be facilitated with careful language intervention. A widespread notion in North America is that of sheltering (see SIOP) which invokes associations of learners ‘being out in the cold’ and images of learners receiving extra nourishment so as to be able to catch up with mainstream L1 learners. By contrast, the idea that CLIL learners are specifically needy does not seem to be widespread. Rather, they are seen as mainstream, or even a particularly capable and privileged band of said mainstream. A decisive difference between CLIL and immigrant learners is the following: even though both groups study a national curriculum in their L2, the position of teachers towards said L2 is crucially different (see Martín Rojo, 2013). CLIL learners are commonly taught by content teachers who share the students’ status as non-
native speakers of the language of instruction. Consequently, they see themselves as being in the ‘same boat’ as their students, having to work through the curriculum in a language that they may use with less confidence than their L1. ‘The problem’ (if there is one) is thus ‘the language’ and it is a problem shared between teachers and students. For immigrant learners this situation rarely holds: there are few countries, if any, where significant numbers of descendants from immigrant families populate the teaching profession. The normal case is frequently for linguistically unaware teachers to place the problem entirely with the learners: if only these learners knew better German/ Spanish/ English/ Finnish (the country’s majority language) before coming to class, there would be no problem. That an adapted pedagogy might go some way to solving that problem was broadly discussed with regard to lower-class L1 learners in the 1970s but seems to have been sidelined since.

The term ‘academic language’ was quite often used in earlier literature to make a distinction between everyday language and the language of schooling. The characteristics of academic language have usually been related to its higher level of abstraction, its complexity and grammatical density as well as the specialised terms and concepts within each content area (e.g. Achugar & Carpenter, 2014; Schelppegrell, 2004). The research object for work in different traditions remains the same: to explore the interface of content schemata (as in subtraction in maths, warfare in history or upwardness in PE) and language units co-occurring with these notions at the major language levels: genres, functions and lexicogrammar. Quality of multilingual education – often seen as the ultimate rationale (e.g. Brisk, 2006) – depends critically on providing content learning with enhanced language attention. Educational quality could indeed go a long way if the language in the bilingual classroom were predictable and identifiable. We agree with Vollmer & Thürmann (2013), however, that the large majority of research on academic language has been concerned with aspects of linguistic form rather than function (the genre approach needs to be exempted from this, though). Content and language integration needs to enhance the functional aspect in bilingual education with an elaborated theory of language and language learning and with appropriate analytical tools. Some suggestions on how to counterbalance form with function will be made in this book (cf. for instance the chapters by Dalton-Puffer and Llinares & Nikula).
The different perspectives on integration

Saying that language in use always entails content is trivial in that linguistic utterances always have meaning, meaning which is realised even in a routine written genre such as a shopping list. In that sense, of course, CLIL is not special at all. Moreover, the meaning potential of linguistic utterances is not realised until language users construct meaning with them and since participants may find themselves in any number of different situations or contexts, the actualised meaning or ‘content’ they will construct from a given linguistic form can vary considerably. In other words, the sense humans make of what others and they themselves say, crucially depends on how they frame what they are experiencing.

The context and how it is framed is also a crucial consideration when discussing language and content integration in CLIL: we are dealing with educational, institutionalised contexts characterised by institutional logic whereby, certainly from secondary level onwards (but partly also at elementary level), schools are organised along cultural constructs called ‘subjects’, e.g. mathematics, history, foreign language, sports. These subjects are not natural kinds but the result of historical processes and rest on the social agreement that they serve a purpose in structuring knowledge and skills deemed societally relevant enough to be passed on to the younger generation in an organised fashion. The knowledge and skills themselves are laid down and talked about in documents called ‘curricula’, wherein those in authority also formulate goals that learners should have reached with regard to certain knowledge and skills areas by a certain stage in their educational careers. Consequently, these are the goals which teachers should be helping learners to achieve; in other words, this is what they should teach.

However, the significance of the ‘subjects’ goes further than curriculum documents and determines the daily temporal and material reality of teachers and learners. Teachers have studied to be teachers of one or more specific subjects, they are ‘history teachers, maths teachers, French teachers’, who have been socialised into the specific discourses and practices of history education, mathematics education, French language education for instance. Pupils take state examinations in specific subjects and school administrators
normally design timetables that are arranged into subjects following upon each other in a roughly hourly rhythm during the school day. For the learners these hourly slots are connected with specific people (teachers), textbooks and materials, types of activities, amounts of homework to do, degrees of ‘seriousness’ and ‘importance’ and the like. Even though teachers very much have their individual styles too, there are typical things that EFL teachers do that physics teachers do not and there are typical things sports teachers do that geography teachers do not. For all stakeholders involved the shorthand for these typical constellations of people, facts and practices (which additionally vary lingua-culturally, of course) is to say that “now it’s English/history/science” (see Hüttner et al., 2013).

This multidimensional constellation of CLIL teaching as a site where diverse institutional, educational, personal and pedagogical scripts and purposes intersect, in our view, necessitates a correspondingly multidimensional notion of integration. In this volume, we make a proposal for conceptualising this multidimensionality by identifying three perspectives on integration that will also form the basis for structuring the volume. The three perspectives have been influenced by Barwell’s (2005) suggestion that four different dimensions can be identified in research on language and content: policy and curriculum dimension, institutional dimension, classroom interactional dimension, and theoretical-methodological dimension, the latter entailing assumptions, models and theories relating to the conceptualisation of content and language in research and practice. In shorthand, the approach we suggest covers the following three perspectives on integration: the what, the who and the how.

The first perspective concerns the institutional level of planning curricula and pedagogies where decisions have to be made concerning what will be integrated and how, preferably based on well-articulated ideas about the role of language in content learning. The second perspective has to do with participants, referring in particular to their perceptions of and beliefs about integration as an influential factor in any content-based scenario. The third perspective shifts the focus to the local level of classrooms and content and language integration as a matter of in-situ practices (see also Spolsky (2004) for a similar division of language policy matters into language practices, ideology and beliefs, and management and planning). Figure 1 illustrates the three perspectives.
Figure 1 Three perspectives on integration

As the figure suggests, the three perspectives are simultaneous and interconnected rather than discrete. That is, classroom practices are of course influenced by broader curriculum and pedagogy decisions and participants’ individualised beliefs and perceptions. However, it is useful to explore content and language integration from these three perspectives because it makes it possible to approach integration in a more comprehensive manner than has to date been the case in CLIL research and highlights that language and content are involved in each perspective. Note that learning outcomes (an area that has received much emphasis in CLIL research to date, see. e.g. Ruiz de Zarobe, 2011) is not presented in the model as a distinct perspective but rather something that may be addressed both at curriculum and pedagogy planning level (e.g. how desirable integrated content and learning objectives are articulated and defined), at participant level (how an individual perceives of and/or succeeds in content and language integrated learning) and classroom practices level (how content and language integrated learning manifests itself in language use).

In the following sections, we will discuss each of these perspectives: the interface of language and content as a concern for curricular and pedagogical planning, integration as a matter of participants’ perceptions and beliefs, and integration as realised in classroom practices. In sum, we focus on what is being integrated at different levels, who the participants are and what kind of perceptions they lean on or develop, and how content and language integration takes place in the context of the classroom.
Integration as a concern for curriculum and pedagogy planning

It is obvious that an important step in the exploration of content and language integration is how it gets conceptualised at curriculum level. The importance of curricula lies in the fact that they incorporate what education authorities define as the learning matter and learning goals within the confines of particular ‘subjects’ and what, consequently, is to be taught and learned in a nation’s schools at particular grade levels. Today, curricula also make recommendations on how the subject matter should be taught, especially in order to ensure that the desired competences are built. However, education systems do differ in the extent to which they actually steer and control the implementation of their curricula: some rely on standardised national exams across the board, others rely on the idea that the use of officially approved textbooks will ensure that the curriculum is implemented in classrooms but leave assessment entirely in the hands of teachers. Additionally this may vary from subject to subject with first language (or majority language), mathematics and first foreign language being more prone to centralised control than others.

As documents, curricula contain a number of typical components: they formulate goals (what learners should know and be able to do at the end of the year/school career) and often they also say how these goals are best achieved. With regard to the specification of goals, a historical development has been taking place over a number of decades (with different onsets in different countries) that prioritises procedural over declarative knowledge: learners should not only know and remember but also be able to do. Bloom et al.’s (1956) famous Taxonomy was the landmark starting point to that and a comparative-historical analysis of curricula in most Western countries (and presumably elsewhere, too) would probably show the space given to procedural knowledge increasing with successive versions of the same curriculum. Alongside the procedural knowledge element, curricula continue to cover declarative knowledge in the form of lists and tables of topic areas, concepts, facts and issues to be covered.

CLIL and other forms of bilingual education that involve integrated language and content teaching challenge the often taken-for-granted separation between ‘language subjects’ and ‘content subjects’. An integrated curriculum has been considered an innovative alternative
to institutionalised conventional education, a shift from a *collection curriculum*, one that separates content into traditional subjects and draws on the historical canon of each discipline to delineate the borders of courses. Shifting from a *collection* to an *integrated curriculum* entails major consequences in educational organisation and praxis. Curriculum integration implies a move from mechanic to organic pedagogic practice, or put another way, from the sacred to the profane (Sadovnik, 2001: 689). Therefore, integrated classes can be seen as featuring new teaching scenarios with content teachers planning their maths or science tasks within language sensitive frameworks that include some sort of communicative practice in the second language. As a result, the linguistic nature of subjects or the subjects as represented in language are more visible in integrated practices.

These practices reflect classical theories of education holding that language criss-crosses all areas, and consequently that all disciplines have to take responsibilities in advanced language structure development (that is, *vertical discourse*, as opposed to basic streetwise and domestic language also known as *horizontal discourse*; Bernstein 1999). The original formulation included a social twist: that ultimately language and social structures run parallel. Ideologically, therefore, integration must be framed in the educational tradition of progressive democratic and inclusive education. As a result, “curriculum integration is not simply an organizational device demanding cosmetic changes or realignments in lesson plans across various subject areas. Rather it is a way of thinking about what schools are for, about the sources of curriculum and about the uses of knowledge” (Beane, 1997: 616).

Concurrent with the idea of integrated curricula is the shift in emphasis from language competence as a set of skills to a view of literacies as social practices embedded in social and political processes and structures, a change that is carried over to curriculum planning (e.g. Wyatt-Smith & Cumming, 2000). Language education, therefore, impregnates all areas and appears in curriculum design in the description of financial literacy, health literacy, digital literacy, the expression of a new turn that demands the construction of knowledge around real world competences. This interaction of disciplinary worlds renders a more accurate picture of knowledge construction. Classrooms are said to exist in a world of intersemiosis (O’Halloran, 2007). Maths, for instance, is often embodied in semiotic systems intertwined: language (first or second), visual imagery and mathematical symbolism co-occur and provide
the informational input for knowledge construction. It is out of this blending of various inputs that knowledge takes shape. In a science class: “language remained the main tool of conceptualization and classification, but it was of use only when integrated with mathematical and visual representation” (Lemke, 2002: 10).

Integration, and this will be addressed in the chapters of this book, needs to explore the interfaces of content and language and sort out both content and language units in a merged template, plan or curriculum. The fact is that even when integration does appear in official curricula, language matters in content courses have often been programmed on instinct, against no linguistic backdrop and without a proper language theory supporting them, based for the most part on the impromptu language needs that teachers identify in their students. The end result has often been, as CBI experts acknowledge, that “while research and experience indicate the advantages of a content-driven curriculum in foreign language classrooms [...] our educational bureaucracy, not interdisciplinary by nature, perpetuates the separation of language and content” (Stryker & Leaver, 1997: 7). This suggests that truly integrated curricula are indeed a rare find, and also indicates a need for well-developed, research-based conceptualisations and models as tools for practitioners to make better sense of content and language integration and the tensions between academic and everyday language (Barwell, this volume). In this volume, chapters by Dalton-Puffer, Berger, and Lorenzo and Dalton-Puffer address these issues by suggesting ways of modelling content and language integration.

For institutions and schools, the demands are many: content and language courses need to be merged in an integrated whole known by different names: integrated curriculum, school language plan or genre map (see Corson, 1999 for a classical formulation and Lorenzo, 2013 for a genre map for history CLIL courses). Countries like Germany, Sweden or Finland (Egelund, 2012) have implemented or drafted plans for integrated language education, normally resting on some functional language approaches in order to raise or sustain literacy levels. In some of this literature, genre-based models have been presented as a way forward in curriculum planning because genres incorporate language units and functions (terminology, structures and rhetorical moves) that content teachers know well. Language is better presented in genres, superordinate language units that mould knowledge as
constructed in the discipline, than with language as a battery of decontextualised skills, as a content expert can better engage in language discussion when this takes the form of genres they are acquainted with: a chronicle in history, a problem statement in economics or a fieldwork observation report in biology (e.g. Lorenzo, 2013; Morton, 2010).

Moving on from the curriculum level to the planning of classroom pedagogy such as lesson plans or assessment practices by teachers, integration demands cooperation between peers – teachers’ collaborative work ranks high on the list of educational enhancers in international reports like TALIS (OECD, 2009). When language is planned across the curriculum, teachers need at some point to put their heads together and produce a joint scheme that gives a sense of structure to the class. Integrated lesson-plans start with content units (integers in maths or track and field sports in PE), represent them in discourse events (describing an ecosystem or comparing warfare strategies) and further split them into language units of different calibre (genres, functions/notions, vocabulary, sentence-grammar units, etc.). As part of integration, every subject area plans academic tasks (lectures, field-trips, observation sheets, text-compositions, problems) which amount to communicative activities which may incorporate second language practices. The end result is a hybrid of content teaching and task-based second language teaching. Teachers select and practice language difficulties (pre-task phase) before the actual content task is done (task phase) and a final language reflection stage follows (post-task phase) (Lorenzo, 2007). The goal here is to map out the actual language sinews that activate content. This approach has proven useful for increasing language awareness in CLIL settings and has inspired templates for bilingual material development based on language description (Moore & Lorenzo, 2014).

In the context of American sheltered instruction referred to earlier, integrated lesson plans operate in two stages: a) under the name grammatical deconstruction, the language in the lesson is first focused on and b) text exploitation exercises ensue: sentence chunking, analysis of reference devices, interpretation of complex noun phrases. Research reports very positive gains in history content learning for groups taught with these literacy strategies (Schleppegrell & Oliveira, 2006). As such, this approach provides a regular systematised series of tasks that foreground language in the disciplines. The limits of this approach to date is that there is a poor mapping of the language components of the disciplines and all the
emphasis is put on making input understood. Germaine to sheltered instruction another approach based on text construction and reconstruction- the **reading to learn project**-presents promising results in language migrant education in Sweden (Acevedo, 2010).

Assessment is an integral part of the curriculum and a crucial component in every teacher’s pedagogy even if not always specified in the actual documents or explicitly defined by teachers themselves (e.g. Wewer, 2014). A practical proposal tool for integrated assessment is suggested by Llinares et al. (2012), based on CLIL teachers’ attention to the language and literacy practices through which students will demonstrate knowledge in their subjects. The desired content goals are first identified, and then the assessment tasks through which students will demonstrate the required knowledge are chosen, by giving formative (which can also be summative) scores in a content-language integrated scale. Furthermore, these authors advocate for mediation during dynamic assessment, based on classroom interactional practices that can lead to assessment for learning (see section on integration in classroom practices below). Other proposals toward integrated content and language assessment come from Massler et al. (2014) in the form of an assessment tool based on language descriptors derived from the Common European Framework of Reference (Council of Europe, 2001) and Lenz and Studer’s (2007) lingualevel model, with the description of competences in the subject content areas and the curricula of the subjects involved in their thematic categories.

*Integration as a matter for participants*

Above, language and content integration was discussed as a concern for curriculum design and for the planning of integrated pedagogy in the form of lesson-plans and plans for assessment. The latter already brought in the importance of the teachers’ role but in this section the individualised character of content and language integration will be addressed in more detail from the perspective of participant – both teacher and student – perspectives: how they experience content and language integration, what their beliefs and attitudes to it are and, also, how the CLIL experiences at the interface of language and content instruction may impact upon their (professional) roles and identities. With this, we want to emphasise that the way individuals perceive of content and language integration is an important
mediating phase between content and language integration as articulated in curricula, pedagogical plans and guidelines, on the one hand, and, as translated into pedagogical practice, on the other hand.

The role of teachers’ beliefs for their pedagogical practise is an area that has been of interest both for general educational research and for applied linguistics (for overviews, see Basturkmen, 2012; Borg, 2003) because even if there is no direct causal relationship between beliefs and action, beliefs are thought to greatly influence educational practice, (e.g. Borg, 2006; Kalaja & Barcelos, 2003). In educational research, ‘teacher cognition’ is often used as an overarching term to refer to teacher beliefs, attitudes and knowledge (e.g. Borg, 2006; Woods, 1996). Similarly, student beliefs and attitudes have been widely researched in education where teacher awareness of learners’ initial state of content-knowledge is a crucial component in influential models such as Pedagogical Content Knowledge (e.g. Park & Cheng, 2012; Shulman, 1986). Applied linguistics too has paid a good deal of attention to learner attitudes and cognitions relating to language learning (cf. Kalaja & Barcelos, 2003; Wesely, 2012 for an overview).

In CLIL and other forms of bilingual education where language and content teaching and learning objectives merge, an important consideration is how teachers conceive of such integration, i.e. how they perceive of the relationship between content and language in their professional practice. With the focus on immersion contexts and teachers’ own reflections, Cammarata and Tedick (2012: 257) argue that one of the main influences of immersion on teachers has to do with their need to “revisit and reshape their teaching identity – that is envisioning themselves not only as content teachers but language teachers as well” (which implies that teachers’ pre-immersion identities are strongly shaped by the subject they teach). They also point out how balancing language and content also involves issues related to stakeholder expectations. The struggles are partly due to the fact that immersion teachers tend to mainly perceive of themselves as content teachers as they are accountable for content matter achievement (for similar observations see Fortune et al., 2008; Tsui, 2011; Walker & Tedick, 2000). Therefore, the reshaping of teacher identity towards both content and language teaching is one often requiring considerable time, a process that could be supported, for example by teacher education.
As far as European CLIL teachers are concerned, the same balancing of content and language is a major concern, but the equation is potentially further complicated by the fact that most teachers are non-native speakers of the instructional language themselves, which may make the identity reshaping an even more complicated journey. For example, Moate (2011) reports on an interview study with primary school CLIL teachers, which revealed how CLIL may challenge teachers’ assumed expertise and identity so that they need to re-establish their sense of professional integrity. Furthermore, the fact that CLIL teacher profiles and backgrounds may differ considerably across geographical contexts is another area that requires more attention, also from the viewpoint of teachers’ identity. For example, while in Austria and Germany secondary school teachers have dual qualifications and can be both content and language experts, in Spain and Finland they are content experts. These profiles may also differ across educational levels so that primary and secondary levels of education have different emphases concerning teachers’ (foreign) language or content area expertise.

In CLIL research, the question of teacher orientation towards content and language integration has been addressed in particular by studies examining CLIL teachers’ orientation to language. Morton’s (2012) in-depth study explores CLIL teachers’ knowledge of language, or language awareness. It explicates the multi-dimensional nature of teachers’ orientation to knowledge, illustrated for example by the framework of ‘modes of knowing’ (Morton 2012: 108-111), which involves personal-public and theoretical-practical knowledge dimensions that have different emphases in different contexts. Morton (2012) investigates these different modes of in relation to three teacher perspectives of language: language as a tool for learning, language as a curriculum concern, and language as a matter of competence. As an overall conclusion, Morton (2012: 298) argues that CLIL teachers’ “language awareness in the three perspectives was largely derived from personal experience and practice, and did not generally engage with the public theories and practices”, i.e. their approach to language was not systematic and hence much L2 focus remained incidental. The conclusions by Koopman et al. (2014) are along similar lines: they explored subject teacher knowledge about language teaching in CLIL, showing that even when content teachers did display awareness of a variety of pedagogical procedures to support language teaching in their content lessons, this tended to rely on non-explicated theoretical knowledge of language
learning and development. Bovellan’s study (2014) is also concerned with CLIL teacher beliefs regarding language: she interviewed Finnish primary school CLIL teachers to explore what their discussions relating to CLIL materials revealed about their views on language and learning. One of her main observations was that a language-as-a-system view and concerns about matters of formal accuracy prevailed, rather than the integral role of language in conveying content matters. Hüttner et al. (2013) have also looked into CLIL teachers’ beliefs in a study in which they explored upper secondary level teacher and student beliefs about language learning, the effects and benefits of CLIL, and the construction of success regarding CLIL. They found that relative absence of language management combined with strong positively-oriented beliefs relating e.g. to changes in affect towards English and to increased self-confidence as foreign language users resulted in the construction of lay theories of CLIL that emphasised its success.

It is also important to take into consideration student perceptions of content and language integration as those may greatly shape their orientation to content-based teaching. So far, less research has been published on students than on teacher perceptions of content and language integration. In second language learning research more generally, however, learner orientations have received a fair amount of attention, whether under the headings of beliefs (for overviews, see Barcelos, 2003; Wenden, 1999), or learner attitudes and motivation (for overviews, see Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Gardner, 2005). Over the years, research emphases have shifted from investigating what learners believe about learning to “how beliefs develop, fluctuate and interact with actions, emotions, identities and affordances and how they are constructed within the micro and macro-political contexts of learning and teaching languages” (Barcelos & Kalaja, 2011: 282). The dynamism between fluctuating and stable aspects of learners’ mind structures as well as the importance of peers in the construction of the sense of self is also highlighted in a recent study by Skinnari (2012) on elementary school pupils’ identities as foreign language learners.

Moving closer to CLIL and language learning in contexts of content-based education, there are a number of studies conducted in immersion contexts in particular that have approached learner perspectives to language or language learning from the viewpoint of either attitudes or motivation (see e.g. Lambert, 1987; Lindholm-Leary & Ferrante, 2005; see also overview
by Block, 2011). Overall, findings have suggested that immersion helps in developing positive attitudes towards both the instructional language(s) and their speakers. However, as Wesely (2009: 281) points out, large-scale results obtained via questionnaires and surveys may even out matters in ways that undermine the importance of ‘microcontexts’, i.e. the way in which “relationships with teachers, [...] peers in the immersion program, and peers outside of the immersion program, have the potential to be both positive and negative influences on student language learning motivation”.

Turning to student-oriented research in CLIL, the bulk of it has concerned the impact of CLIL on their learning outcomes, both in the areas of language and content competence as well as L2 interactional skills. There are studies that have tapped onto student attitudes but quite often those have explored how CLIL affects student attitudes towards languages (e.g. Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009), towards foreign language learning (Merisuo-Storm, 2007), or how it may influence their levels of motivation more generally (Doiz et al., 2014) rather than focusing on student perceptions of CLIL as such. Recently, however, such research has started to emerge. Pihko (2010) and Coyle (2013) have both explored CLIL from the perspective of secondary level CLIL students’ subjective learning experiences, in the contexts of Finland, and England and Scotland, respectively. Pihko’s (2010) study suggests that even with students having an overall positive orientation to CLIL, performing with limited language skills is also perceived as affectively demanding by some, with language anxiety leading to reduced classroom activity. Coyle (2013) focused on exploring students’ understandings of successful learning in CLIL, her results suggesting that students appreciate the spontaneity of language use and learning that extends beyond the word level towards subject-related meaning construction in CLIL. A sense of achievement was also identified as a motivating force. The role of affective factors is also brought up by Hüttner et al. (2013) whose study on CLIL students and teachers in upper secondary colleges of technology suggests that CLIL success relates to students’ sense of gaining confidence and to their self-perception as more skilful users of English than students without CLIL provision.

This brief review of earlier studies suggests the importance of researching participant perceptions and beliefs about CLIL in general and points to the dearth of research focusing on participant conceptions of content and language integration in particular. These
questions will be addressed in this volume in chapters by Dafouz, Hüttner and Smit as well as by Skinnari and Bovellan.

Integration as a matter of classroom practices

We have sketched above how integration is, on the one hand, a matter of institutional policies and decisions as realised – whether explicitly or implicitly – in curricula and lesson plans, and that stakeholders’ personalised beliefs and perspectives also form a crucial consideration in integration. This section highlights the need to also look at actual classroom practices to understand how content and language integration is realised in local and situated instances of language classroom interaction, i.e. to understand the socially and performatively situated aspect of integration. In the following, we discuss the importance of exploring how teachers integrate language and content in their discourse, how students show academic knowledge through language, and how different tasks and activities lead students to approach content from different perspectives and to use varied and adequate academic and interpersonal linguistic resources. In other words, it is necessary to investigate classroom practices from all perspectives, from the moment teachers introduce new content, through to the students engaging with that content, to the type of assessment carried out, and to the actual materials that scaffold these processes (Banegas, 2012).

We pointed out in the section above that integration as the inherent interconnectedness of content and language and as something that gets realised as subject-specific academic literacies is not a novel idea. It is a crucial matter for any learner but it seems that contexts where L2 is used as the instructional tool have in particular brought to consciousness the need to attend to ‘language work’ also in content subjects. Schleppegrell and O’Halloran (2011) provide an overview of research on teaching academic language in English-speaking (mainly US) L2 settings and point out that apart from knowledge of language in their content areas and applying this knowledge in the planning stages, teachers also “need strategies for engaging students in robust ways in exploring language and content in the moment-to-moment unfolding of instruction in the classroom” (2011: 5). (See also Cummins & Man, 2007; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006; Snow & Uccelli, 2009).
In the context of bilingual education, there have been calls to carry out classroom-based research in order to understand how content and language are best learnt in integration (Cenoz et al., 2014; Leung, 2005; Llinares et al., 2012). In immersion contexts, classroom discourse research has often been motivated by language learning concerns, hence much attention has been paid to the ways in which teachers could best make language matters salient, in order to support learner awareness of morphosyntactic matters in particular (e.g. Lyster, 2007; Lyster et al., 2013), with fewer studies orienting to the learning and using of subject-specific aspects of language (but see Laplante, 2000; Pekarek Doehler & Ziegler, 2007).

In CLIL research, language and content integration as a phenomenon of classroom practices has started to attract more attention during the last few years. With the research focus on teachers, existing CLIL studies with different theoretical and methodological perspectives such as discourse analysis, conversation analysis or systemic functional linguistics (e.g. Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Llinares et al., 2012; Morton, 2012; Nikula, 2010; Smit, 2010), have offered interesting insights in this respect. For example, by focusing on aspects such as the role of different types of academic questions, the integration of content and language in teacher feedback, or the way teachers differentiate between everyday and academic talk, these studies have shown that teachers, who are L2 speakers themselves, quite rarely make subject-relevant language use a salient focus. It thus seems that teachers need to become more aware of the scaffolding strategies that can be used to support the development of students’ linguistic resources in the expression of academic content (see Llinares et al., 2012 for suggestions on how teachers can become more aware of the different roles of language in CLIL). Another important contextual matter apart from teacher linguistic backgrounds, also worthy of research attention, is the link between the use of language in the classroom and their professional background. Some studies have shown differences between CLIL teachers with only content expertise and teachers with both EFL and content expertise, regarding for example the types of questions and feedback used and their effect on student performance (Vázquez, 2010; Whittaker & Llinares, 2009). More comparative studies across geographical contexts and educational levels are necessary in order to understand the effect of teacher expertise and training on classroom practices.
With the learners in focus, the understanding of integration as an aspect of classroom practices involves paying special attention to how learners express the academic meanings required in the disciplines they are studying, how they move from oracy to literacy, and how they are able to not only express factual information and ideational meanings but also to evaluate and take a stance on the academic content that they are learning. Some studies carried out in the Spanish context have looked at CLIL students’ oral and written expression of academic meaning in social science (history and geography), focusing on how this performance is related to the requirements of the curriculum and materials used (Whittaker & Llinares, 2009) and compared this performance to that of parallel groups studying the same subjects in the L1 (Llinares & Whittaker, 2010). The findings have shown that expressing meanings in subject-appropriate manner is not an easy task for CLIL students, nor, for that matter, for students studying through L1 (for similar results, see Vollmer, 2008). In addition, longitudinal studies should be carried out that focus not only on students’ development of their foreign language competences (e.g. Ruiz de Zarobe, 2011) but also on the development of their L2 (and L1) resources to express academic meanings successfully (see Whittaker et al., 2011).

Classroom discourse is obviously a joint accomplishment by classroom participants and it is therefore also of interest to explore content and language integration as an interactional phenomenon. Studies drawing on conversation analysis in particular have shed light on the ways in which content and language are jointly negotiated in CLIL classrooms, often paying attention to the performance of specific academic discourse functions. For example, a case study by Kupetz (2011) explores how students accomplish explaining in CLIL classrooms, drawing attention to the subtle resources students deploy to construct meaning and collaboratively negotiate subject-related content as well as linguistic form with the teacher and fellow students (see also Smit, 2010). Evnitskaya (2012), focusing also on the construction of explanation in eight secondary level science lessons, takes into account both verbal and multimodal means with which explanations are co-constructed. Her findings point to great complexity and variability in how participants accomplish the action of explaining. Furthermore, an important aspect of joint meaning negotiation relates to the fact that it is often accomplished among peers. Jakonen and Morton (2013) and Jakonen (2014) have investigated interaction between peers to solve knowledge gaps concerning both
language and content, and in this volume they continue it by researching ‘language’ and ‘content’ as a concern for participants in CLIL classrooms.

Apart from CA approaches, research on CLIL classroom interaction as a site for negotiating language and content by both teachers and learners has also been conducted from discourse analytic and/or pragmatic and systemic functional perspectives, and with different focal interests (e.g. Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Llinares & Morton, 2010; Nikula, 2005, 2008). Furthermore, Llinares and Morton (2012), when investigating interaction and language learning from conversation analytic and systemic functional perspectives, call for more research combining research perspectives. In this volume, a similar point is made by Llinares and Nikula who report on a study that combines discursive pragmatics and systemic functional linguistics.

A special challenge in capturing and researching learners’ practices and learning processes with a combined focus on language and content is to achieve a comparable level of sophistication in theoretical and methodological approaches. After all, while school-level learners are socialised into different ‘subjects’, researchers are also socialised into different ‘disciplines’. That is why applied linguists normally have sophisticated conceptualisations and operationalisations of ‘language’ but rather impoverished or lay notions of ‘content’, whereas the reverse is true of subject educators. The solution lies, of course, in interdisciplinary research but relatively little such research has been done. This has to do both with the general obstacles to interdisciplinarity (e.g. Brewer, 1999) and the pecking order among scientific disciplines on which the study of language does not always rank very high. Perhaps educational realities like CLIL can serve as a catalyst in this respect: educational researchers with dual academic backgrounds might be well equipped to drive forward ‘integration’ also on the level of modelling, operationalisation and theorising. The fact that the two researchers with dual backgrounds writing in this volume (Barwell, Berger) have one foot in mathematics is probably not a coincidence: mathematics education was among the first to take a linguistic turn.

Even though not the main topic in any of the contributions in this volume, it is worth bearing in mind that assessment forms an important aspect of CLIL classrooms practices and one
where content and language considerations merge. Llinares et al. (2012) argue for dynamic assessment as a useful resource for assessment in CLIL. This type of assessment is related to the Vygotskian view of the teacher actively working with the learners and, rather than just focusing on what students know, the emphasis is on how they progress and the kind of mediation (scaffolding) that they need (see Leung, 2007). Integrated assessment also requires a combination of focus on form and focus on meaning. For instance, relevance should be given not only to formal recasts as a type of corrective feedback (Lyster, 2007) but also to functional recasts (Mohan & Beckett, 2003), which address language appropriateness (not correctness) to express academic content.

In the area of classroom practices, the use of different tasks in enhancing integration is another research area that needs to be tackled. Kong (2009) argues that attention should be given to tasks that require complex language relations derived from curricular complex relations. In these tasks, which are genre-related and, consequently, also subject-related, it is necessary to identify the stages that characterise each genre in order to grasp the complex language relations that CLIL learners and teachers need to encounter (Llinares et al., 2012; Nikula, forthcoming). A second type of tasks that require more attention in CLIL research are those that are not subject or genre-specific but form part of general teaching methodology and require students to address language and academic content in different ways: role-plays, presentations, group-work sessions (see Llinares & Dalton-Puffer, forthcoming).

With regard to how languages are integrated in the CLIL classroom, the fact that CLIL teachers are mainly non-native speakers of the target language means that their multilingual competences are more or less guaranteed. Rather than a drawback, CLIL teachers’ non-nativeness and the use of both L1 and L2 can contribute to enriching students’ content and language engagement in the classroom. For example, the positive role of translanguaging in bilingual classrooms has been demonstrated in different studies mostly focused on immigrant learners (e.g. Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Cummins, 2008). These studies have argued for the interdependence of knowledge and skills across languages. In some CLIL contexts, like Spain, translanguaging in CLIL can be enhanced thanks to the collaboration between main teachers (non-native speakers) and language assistants (often native speakers) in classroom-situated activities (Dafouz & Hibler, 2013; Lorenzo et al., 2010;
Méndez & Pavón, 2012). Although some of these studies have already indicated the potential advantages of using two languages in the classroom, more studies should be carried out at the micro-level, focusing on concrete situated practices and activities, in order to understand the principled purpose of using the L1 and/or the L2 in the CLIL classroom, as well as the affordances that translanguaging creates for student participation and engagement in classroom activities. This is a question tackled in the chapter by Moore and Nikula in this volume.

Introducing the chapters

The volume consists of three parts, which are framed by the present introductory chapter and by a concluding overview chapter by Tom Morton and Constant Leung. Each part corresponds to the perspectives on integration introduced above. As was pointed out, we see connections between the perspectives rather than treating them as clearly demarcated entities. However, the three-way division of the volume is helpful in showing the chapters’ main entry point and contribution to the discussion on integration.

Part 1: Curriculum and pedagogy planning

The chapters in this part relate to the ‘curriculum and pedagogical planning’ part of the model. They offer valuable tools for conceptualising and modelling content and language relationship in ways that have genuine applicability for CLIL and other forms of bilingual education programmes, both as regards their curriculum design and pedagogical planning, and can help these programmes become clearer about their aims and objectives. In the first chapter, Christiane Dalton-Puffer approaches integration through a transdisciplinary construct of cognitive discourse functions, grounded in both educational and linguistic thinking, and links subject-specific cognitive learning goals with the linguistic representations they receive in classroom interaction. The aim of the construct is to conceptually order and reduce the multitude of academic language functions that are circulating in curricula and specialist literature alike, and to offer researchers and teacher educators a principled heuristic tool with which to access cognitive discourse functions and thus enhance their visibility and teachability. The chapter by Francisco Lorenzo and Christiane Dalton-Puffer is also concerned with modelling the interconnectedness of language and subject competence,
with special focus on subject history. Drawing on the construct of historical literacy, the authors, firstly, outline a three-tier model of historical knowledge structures and show how these correlate with predictable units at different language levels: lexicogrammar, functions and genres. Secondly, they approach historical literacy as a developing trait, characterising the linguistic performance of learners in history courses in a second language both in the written and spoken mode. The third chapter by Angela Berger is concerned with bilingual mathematics teaching and reports, based on think-aloud protocols, on learners solving arithmetic word problems to model the specific nature of the interplay between mathematics and language, including the questions of how English as a foreign language influences mathematical thinking. The chapter describes the ensuing Integrated Language and Mathematics Model (ILMM), which represents a significant step in characterising the nature of the interaction between mathematics and language during the process of solving second language word problems and is thus an important contribution to the discussion on the nature of content and language integration in this volume. To conclude the first part, Richard Barwell examines the possibilities offered by Bakhtin’s theory of language to serve as an alternative approach to such conceptualisations of language that tend to be implicitly based on a ‘replacement’ model of learning in which learners’ informal, everyday, idiosyncratic language practices are gradually replaced by formal, standardised content-area registers. Drawing on such key notions in Bakhtin’s theory as heteroglossia and centrifugal and centripetal forces, Barwell discusses how these ideas lead to a view of integration as expansion (rather than replacement) of language repertoires, highlighting the tensions that arise between these forces as the requirements of institutionally recognised forms of content language and learners’ diverse language practices meet.

Part 2: Participants

This part contains the two chapters in the volume that have participant perspectives on CLIL as their starting point; both are concerned with teachers. The chapter by Emma Dafouz, Julia Hüttner and Ute Smit investigates university teachers’ beliefs on teaching and learning in English medium education in multilingual university settings (EMEMUS) to tap into their conceptualisations of content and language integration. Drawing on recently developed ROAD-MAPPING framework of the core dimensions in EMEMUS, (Dafouz & Smit, 2014), the study analyses university teachers’ interviews conducted in Austria, Finland, Spain and the
UK. Their findings suggest that teacher beliefs are shaped contextually and that integration of language and content is constructed on a continuum from ‘similarity’ to ‘difference’ when compared with long-standing monolingual education through the national language, these ‘similar’ or ‘different’ beliefs being contingent on perceived agency in teaching and learning, the institutions’ form of internationalisation, and considerations of acculturation to university in general and the teachers’ academic disciplines more particularly. The chapter by Kristiina Skinnari and Eveliina Bovellan is concerned with CLIL teacher beliefs about integration and about its effects on their professional roles. The study is based on secondary level CLIL teacher interviews conducted in Austria, Finland and Spain; the teachers interviewed were either science or history teachers. Their findings suggest that even if teachers acknowledge the connection between language and content and consider attempts to separate them artificial, they still often struggle in trying to understand the dual role of language and content in CLIL and its impact on their teaching. This concerns the role of language in particular, with teachers having different understandings of what language is, how it should be taught and by whom.

Part 3: Practices

In this part of the book, attention is turned to integration as a matter of in-situ instances of language use and interaction in CLIL classroom contexts. The chapter by Tom Morton and Teppo Jakonen explores the ways in which learners discover, and work on, their own ‘knowledge gaps’ around matters of linguistic form and meaning. Their analysis depicts in detail the linguistic, embodied and artefactual resources that learners deploy during interaction to resolve these gaps and how they achieve intersubjectivity when doing so. Their findings illustrate how a micro-interactional approach can throw light on ‘cognitive’ constructs such as focus on form and languaging, and they also offer suggestions on how such an approach could be further developed in the contexts of bilingual education. In their chapter, Ana Llinares and Tarja Nikula examine the use of evaluative language in CLIL classrooms. Evaluation in classrooms is easily associated with teachers evaluating and assessing student performance. However, learning how to evaluate subject-related information and to use evaluative resources to establish social relations are important skills for students as well. Using data from different European contexts and combining systemic functional and discourse-pragmatic orientations, the study explores resources of evaluation.
used for knowledge construction and for participation in the social context of CLIL classrooms. Their findings show that the use of evaluative language is affected by the discourse context and its interactional patterns but that cultural differences may also be at play, relating both to geographical localities and to different subject-cultures. Pat Moore and Tarja Nikula close this section by approaching integration as a matter of language choice and merger. They use the notion translanguaging to highlight that interaction in CLIL classrooms is also about meaningful engagement in multilingual practices. The findings, based on classroom data from different European contexts, indicate two main categories of translanguaging. When content-oriented, translanguaging is explicitly oriented to and used to scaffold meaning negotiation in the teaching and learning of content. When socially oriented, translanguaging is unmarked in the unfolding talk, with participants orienting primarily to the flow of interaction. Overall, the findings suggest that multilingual practices are dynamic and functional, and contribute both to content learning and the maintenance of interactive flow but also that they are highly context dependent.

To wrap up, Tom Morton and Constant Leung offer a synthesis of the volume based on each preceding chapter’s view of language competence, image or model of language learning and explicit or implicit pedagogical approach. Drawing on Berstein’s (2000) work on pedagogic discourse, they introduce a four-part framework consisting of two intersecting axes: higher to lower disciplinary orientation in approach to language competence and higher or lower visibility in approach to language pedagogy, and argue that different positions in the framework result in tensions between what can be broadly described as centripetal or centrifugal tendencies in approaches to integration. Their contribution also shows the usefulness of ongoing dialogue on integration which will, no doubt, reveal further interfaces and convergences. We hope that the present volume can offer useful insights for this process.