Zoraida Horrillo Godino

zhorrillo@gmail.com

A Case Study of Cross-Curricular Dialogue as a Part of Teacher Education in the CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) Approach.

Academic biography

Zoraida Horrillo Godino completed a BA degree in English Philology, an MA in Teacher Education and an MA in Research on the Pedagogy of Language and Literature. She worked as a researcher for the Open University of Catalonia (OUC) and for the Autonomous University of Barcelona (UAB). She also worked as an in-service teacher educator on the CLIL approach at the Institute of Educational Sciences of the UAB and as a Teacher of English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) at Catalan primary and secondary schools. She is currently working as a TEFL at a school for learners with especial educational needs; and she is carrying out research on teacher education.

Abstract

This study is part of a large project on teacher education in the CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) approach to teaching in Spanish secondary-education schools. The study departs from the assumptions that the professionals working on interdisciplinary environments such as CLIL education require an informed appreciation of the perspective of a complementary discipline — either a linguistic or content one (Newell in Chettiparamb 2007: 45) and that cross-curricular dialogue is a tool for obtaining information about what makes it difficult for professionals from different teaching praxes and epistemological traditions to reach agreements about what language and what content to teach and how to integrate these when planning CLIL activities (Escobar Urmeneta 2008).

The study explores the professional perspective an expert in the Pedagogy of History offered to an expert in the Pedagogy of English as a Foreign Language. The main results of the analysis are the reconstruction of the former's model for teaching History and his conception of the role of discourse in the Pedagogy of History. These are the basis for identifying potential points for discussion between an expert in the Pedagogy of History and an expert in the Pedagogy of Foreign Languages who have to engage in a process of cross-curricular collaboration to develop CLIL teaching sequences.

Key words: CLIL, teacher education, cross-curricular collaboration, epistemological tradition, content-obligatory language.

Introduction

Numerous recent studies provide evidence that the use of the CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) approach to teaching/learning in the European context can promote a higher degree of sophistication of a wide range of learners' knowledge, skills and competences related to both a second or foreign language and a school content subject, such as Mathematics, History or Music (e.g.: Hütner and Rieder-Bünemann 2007; Linares and Whitaker 2007; Lyster 2007; Mariotti 2006; Stohler 2006).

The European Union supports innovative teaching practices like the CLIL approach because providing a multilingual education to its population has always been regarded as crucial in the planning of the successful democratic construction of the EU itself from a multicultural and multilingual reality (Vollmer 2006). Consequently, the CLIL approach is already part of the mainstream school provision at the primary and secondary levels in the great majority of the country members of the EU (Eurydice 2006). However, the use of the approach is not widespread (ibid 2006) because of its novelty. Most teachers have not yet acquired the teaching competencies and abilities that are peculiar to CLIL. They have been unable to do so because, broadly speaking, suitable Teacher Education (TED) in CLIL is not offered in a systematic fashion to student-teachers or in-service teachers (Eurydice 2006, Escobar Urmeneta forthcoming).

Providing TED in CLIL is necessary because European teachers usually become specialists in a single epistemological and pedagogical area. To illustrate this, Mathematics teachers know only Mathematics and have the skills to teach Mathematics only in the usual language of instruction of the institution at which they work. In contrast, CLIL teachers are characterised by 'the ability to teach one or more subjects in the curriculum in a language other than the usual language of instruction

and thereby teach that language itself. Such teachers are thus specialists in two respects' (Eurydice 2006: 41).[1]

The large competitive and collaborative research project 2006ARIE10011 and its continuation, 2007ARIE00011, funded by the Catalan Agency of Management of University and Research Grants (AGAUR), are a response to the need to offer TED in CLIL for inclusive secondary-education classes. An initial hypothesis of these projects is that the collaboration between experts in the pedagogy of second or foreign languages and experts in other subjects, such as Mathematics or History, can create an environment favourable to TED in CLIL (Escobar Urmeneta 2008). A finding related to this hypothesis is that teachers participating in the projects found it difficult to collaborate with their colleagues specialized in other subjects to create CLIL teaching materials because they had dissonant conceptions of what to teach in CLIL classes and how to do so (ibid 2008).

As a part of the above-mentioned collaborative research projects, this study aims to contribute to explore what makes it difficult for secondary-education teachers with different pedagogical and epistemological backgrounds to dialogue and reach agreements. The study focuses on exploring what an expert in the pedagogy of History makes relevant when engaged in a conversation with an expert in English as a Foreign Language.

Theoretical Framework

<u>The Integration of Content and Language Learning/Teaching</u>

'Language is the major medium of instruction and learning' (Mohan 1985: 1), because most subjects or 'some subjects (as school subjects at least) are actually constructed through little else but oral encounters called lessons' (Dalton-Puffer 2007: 7). Therefore, school subjects are language classes, though the label *language classes* has been traditionally restricted to the classes in

which a first language (L1) or second or foreign one (L2) is both the designated subject and the content of the interaction (Dalton-Puffer 2007). The subjects to which the label *language classes* is not attached, are usually known as *content subjects*. To illustrate this, learning Science, i.e. learning a content subject, involves learning the differences between the language students use in the street and the one used by scientists to explain the facts and phenomena of the natural world (Pujol 2003). Since there is a variety of language intrinsically linked to Science, there must be as many linguistic varieties used at school as subjects.

A CLIL subject is the result of the integration of the instruction of an L2 with a content subject. Since the L2 in a CLIL subject is associated to a given content subject, the language necessary to construct the lessons of the CLIL subject is a subject-specific variety of the L2. A case in point is the integration of English as a Foreign Language with Science. The language necessary to carry out Science lessons in English is a Science-specific variety of English.

Despite the L2 in CLIL instruction is subject-specific, the linguistic objectives of this instruction tend to remain unspecified (Dalton-Puffer 2007). Gajo (2007) posits a typology of language knowledge based on classroom interaction. He postulates that discourse is an interface between the language paradigm and the content paradigm. Three categories of language can be identified while considering the negotiation of linguistic knowledge from the language paradigm:

> *Content-obligatory language*: linguistic knowledge necessary to the communication of subject knowledge and to the normal pursuit of classroom activities;
>
> *Content-compatible language*: negotiable linguistic knowledge related to the communication of a particular item of subject knowledge but not indispensable to the fulfilment of the task in question

(NB: the contrast between these two types of knowledge was originally suggested by Snow et al. 1989);

Content-autonomous language: linguistic knowledge where negotiation has the communication of subject knowledge as a starting point but in which the language paradigm is given priority (the didactic task is a linguistic task and not a subject task); a sequence of language class seems to be *inserted* (but not really integrated) into the NLS [content subject] class (Gajo 2007: 570).

Three more categories are identified when taking into account the content paradigm:

Content-embedded language: linguistic knowledge necessary not only to the communication of subject knowledge, but also to its very establishment; this type of knowledge is relevant in the framework of the subject paradigm;

Content-useful language: while not indispensable to the fulfilment of the didactic task, this type of linguistic knowledge contributes to fixing and extending the subject knowledge;

Content-peripheral language: although not directly relevant to the task in question, this type of linguistic knowledge enhances general links between language and subject (ibid: 570).

Gajo (2007) enriches the definition of his typology by using the concepts of *communication* and *authentification*. The development of communicative competence implies the acquisition of the linguistic knowledge needed to convey the subject content. That is, communication goes from the language paradigm to the content paradigm through the discourse interface. Authentification goes in the reverse direction. The authentification of the language means improving the process of putting subject knowledge into discourse.

TED in the CLIL Approach

The integration of L2 and content in a subject syllabus calls for the reconceptualization of the roles of the language teacher and the content teacher. They need to collaborate in order to establish a list of content-obligatory and content-compatible language elements (Snow, Met and Genesee 1989; Gajo 2007). The content teacher assesses which language is essential or obligatory for talking about the subject matter, whereas the language teacher knows how to teach the pertinent language skills. Content-compatible language objectives also derive from the ongoing assessment of students' needs and progress through the L2 curriculum (Snow, Met and Genesee 1989). Therefore, the language teacher and the content teacher maintain their own original priorities, though their areas of responsibility are expanded (ibid 1989).

In order to be able to collaborate, language teachers and content teachers firstly have to understand one another. They require an informed appreciation of the perspective of their complementary discipline — either the linguistic or content one, though they need 'not expertise in the full range of concepts, theories and methods' (Newell in Chettiparamb 2007: 45). However, few secondary-education teachers in Spain have this informed appreciation of the other's area of expertise. Unlike primary-education teachers, secondary-education teachers lack an overall understanding of all the subjects in the curriculum and a solid pedagogical base (Perez-Vidal 2002; Escobar Urmeneta 2009). In the area of foreign languages, the pedagogical-communicative competencies in the target language of teachers specializing in a content subject usually are not sophisticated enough to deliver CLIL instruction (Escobar Urmeneta 2009). All this causes secondary-education teachers to experience difficulties to reach agreements on what to teach in CLIL classes and how to do so when engaged in cross-curricular collaboration (Escobar Urmeneta 2008).

When difficulties to reach agreements arise, cross-curricular dialogue becomes a procedure to gain information about exactly what causes the difficulties (Escobar Urmeneta 2008: 18). This information is obtained through a process of acquisition of a basic understanding of the other's professional needs, interests and methods (Horrillo Godino 2008a&b). It is through this basic understanding of the other that teachers from different traditions can establish an effective cross-curricular dialogue or *exchange* (Petit and Pallares 2008). Progressing through exchange stages is rather complex because gradually gaining a vantage point on the other's professional mentality is part of the process of exchange itself. Therefore, acquiring the *multilateral cooperation strategies*[2] to gain this vantage point and to engage in a process of exchange turns out to be a crucial part of the CLIL teacher education (Horrillo Godino 2008a).

The Context of the Research

This study focuses on the initial steps of cross-curricular dialogue between Leon[3] and the researcher. Leon was an expert in the pedagogy of History, in which the researcher was an absolute novice.

Leon and the researcher held an interview about a teaching sequence of History in English for Catalan students aged 17-19 taking *Bachillerato* (post-obligatory secondary education). The sequence had been accepted as English language activities by other experts in EFL.

The teaching sequence had been designed by an English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) student enrolled in a pre-service teacher education master[4]. She was unacquainted with the pedagogy of History, like the researcher. The latter used the sequence to obtain feedback for the student-teacher, which involved eliciting Leon's professional standpoint. The fact that both the author of the teaching sequence and the researcher were absolute novices in Leon's field of expertise prevented Leon from obviating the most basic and crucial aspects of his discipline during the interview.

The Research Objective and Question

The objective of this study is to explore Leon's professional mentality as emerged through the interaction with the researcher. The associated research question is *According to Leon, what does a History teacher aim at for* Bachillerato *students? What does Leon consider it necessary to do to create a teaching sequence of History in English for* Bachillerato? *What does he think a History teacher should not do to create this kind of sequences?*

Methodological Framework

The interpretative framework used for this study departs from both the sociocultural approach to cognition (Lantolf 2006; Mercer 2004; Mondada and Pekarek-Doehler 2004; Zuengler and Miller 2006) and the ethnomethodological approach to social interaction (Garfinkel 2001; Mondada and Pekarek-Doehler 2004; Jefferson 1992a&b). Both approaches can be applied because they 'converge in insisting on the central role of contextually embedded communicative processes in the accomplishment of human actions and identities as well as of social facts' (Mondada and Pekarek-Doehler 2004: 504).

This study draws the notion of *situated learning* from the sociocultural approach. This notion captures the view that learning is rooted in learners' participation in particular social practices and continuous adaptation to the temporal and local circumstances and activities that constitute talk-in-interaction (Mondada and Pekarek-Doehler 2004: 501). From ethnomethodology, the study draws Conversation Analysis (CA) as a tool to analyse data. CA studies the organization of social action, particularly those social actions that are located in the everyday discursive practices of members of society (Psathas 1995: 2). These members provide for one

another inference-rich linguistic material for achieving intelligibility in a local context and in a coordinated on-going basis (Jefferson 1992a&b).

CA is used to interpret the data studied, including an interview. Ethnomethodologists consider that it is in members' free-flowing interaction where the keys for interpretation of talk-in-interaction can be found (Silverman 1993), since social meaning and the context of the interaction are (re)created on an on-going basis during the interaction itself. They argue that interviews are not naturally occurring interaction because they have been previously structured or semi-structured by the researcher. However, interviews can be a useful tool for ethnomethodological study provided that the process of research is described (Nussbaum and Unamuno 2006). That is, the configuration of the research field, i.e. the language(s) used by the researcher, the researcher's identity and actions, the tool, the protocol, the setting, the recorder and so on; create reality by interacting with the informants (Nussbaum and Unamuno 2006; Unamuno and Nussbaum 2004).

Apart from CA and sociocultural constructs, content analysis is also used in this study. Content analysis allows for the interpretation of the content of data through a systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns (Hsieh and Shannon 2005). The type of content analysis used is Qualitative Conventional Content Analysis (QCCA), in which researchers do not use preconceived categories, but they allow categories and names for categories 'to flow from the data' (ibid: 1279). This inductive process involves adopting informants' point of view, i.e. the emic view (Duranti 1997), which is also the view adopted for CA.

Data

Informants

The informants are Leon, an expert in the pedagogy of History, and the researcher, an expert in the pedagogy of EFL. They both volunteered to participate in the research.

The Corpus

The data available for study are multimodal; and they consist of the items in Table 1, overleaf.

The first item in Table 1, the interview, is the main set of data for this study, while the rest of items are auxiliary data used to triangulate it. The interview, and the teaching sequence structuring it, are authentic data because the interview was aimed to provide feedback on the historical content of the CLIL sequence. Therefore, the interview would have taken place even if it had not been recorded and studied.

Data Gathering, Processing and Analysing

The interview between Leon and the researcher was audio recorded. Next, it was transcribed and analysed by using CA and QCCA. The latter was also applied to the rest of the data. The audio recorder was considered an extension of the researcher during the analysis.

After undertaking CA and QCCA, the language Leon talks about was classified under Gajo's (2007) categories of language knowledge to gain a deeper understanding of the language he proposes. The emic view adopted during the previous stages of analysis seems to be abandoned in using Gajo's categories. However, the emic view is maintained because the way Leon perceives different items of language influences the final classification of those items under categories of language knowledge.

Analysis

Although the interview was analysed turn of speaking by turn of speaking as Leon and the researcher's jointly constructed sequence of meanings; space does not permit a complete reproduction of the analysis. For this reason, only the most relevant points for answering the research question of what History teachers should (not) do to create a teaching sequence of History for *Bachillerato* will be dealt with below.

<u>A Model to Teach Complex Historical Explanations</u>

Leon begins to provide his feedback on the teaching sequence on Nazi concentration camps during Second World War for *Bachillerato* students by ongoingly constructing a model to teach complex historical explanations. This model has three components: skills, contents and linguistic tools. Every component has subcomponents, which have to be made explicit when planning a teaching sequence.

The Skills Component

This component consists of skills *at the conceptual level* ('a nivel conceptual', t.[5] 69), *at the procedural level* ('a nivel procedimental', t. 69) and *at the attitudinal level* ('a nivel, no sé, de de actitudinales', t. 69). Leon lists the most frequently used skills in his field. The conceptual skills he mentions are *to know* ('conocer', t. 69) and *to analyse* ('analizar', t. 69). The procedural skills mentioned are *to classify* ('clasificar', t. 69), *to relate* ('relacionar', t. 69) and *to deduce* ('deducir', t. 69). The attitudinal skills are *to argue* ('argumentar', t. 69)*, to appraise* ('enjuiciar', t. 69) and *to take a stand* ('posicionarse', t. 69).

Type of Data	Content	Use
Conversational data	• Interview between Leon and the researcher	• To discover the most fundamental and basic aspects of Leon's professional standpoint.
Written Document 1	• Field notes about Leon's feedback.	• To check whether they enrich the conversational data.
Written Document 2	• CLIL teaching sequence on Nazi concentration and extermination camps in Second World War. • The sequence was annotated by Leon.	• The interview was semi-structured by this sequence. • During the process of analysis, the sequence was used to check to what Leon referred in the interview. • Leon's notes were also studied to check whether they could add detail to the oral information he provided.
Written Document 3	• An abstract written by Leon. • The researcher added questions about some concepts appearing also in the interview. • Leon subsequently added the answers.	• To solve doubts about the contents of the interview that did not surface until the researcher read the abstract.
Written Document 4	• E-mail exchanges between the researcher and Leon.	• To solve doubts about the contents of the interview that did not surface until the data were being analysed.

Table 1: Types of Data, their Content and Use.

Leon's list of frequently used skills does not contain *to contextualize*, *to explain*, or *to narrate*, even though he makes use of these terms when instructing the researcher on how to teach history. To illustrate this, he refers to *contextualize* as part of what students have to do to succeed in creating historical explanations (t. 156). This illustration is, in turn, a piece of evidence that *to explain* is a composite skill, as Leon makes explicit in Fragment 1:

Fragment 1:

> Explicar y aprender a explicar es una habilidad histórica que consiste en ordenar, jerarquizar y secuenciar personajes, conceptos que tienda a resolver un "¿por qué?" (Document 4: 1)
> *To explain and to learn to explain is a historical skill that consists in placing characters and concepts in an order, a hierarchy and a sequence to solve a 'why?' (Document 4:1)*

Inserting concepts and characters in a temporal sequence is a basic operation to yield a narration. However, Leon displays resistance to use the term *to narrate*. Instead, he prefers using the expressions *to determine the causes* and *to understand the causes* ('determinar las causas o comprender las causas', Document 4: 2) because both fiction and true events can be narrated, as he states in Fragment 2.

Fragment 2:

> La diferencia [entre la Historia y la Literatura] es la cuestión de la verdad (la ficción no es verdad y la historia sí). (Document 3: 1)
> *The difference [between History and Literature] is the issue of truth (fiction is not true and history is). (Document 3:1)*

A verisimilar fictional narration is more important than truth for an expert in Literature, while the notion of truth is crucial for an expert in History. Thus, Leon avoids using the term *to narrate* owing to a practice deeply influenced from his epistemological tradition.

The Contents Component

The content component has seven subcomponents. The first consists of two kinds of *temporal relationships*, *chronological* and *historical* ('relaciones de temporalidad cronológica e histórica', t. 59). During the interview, the researcher does not inquire about the difference between the two relationships because she takes the word *chronological* to be a synonym of *historical*. Doubts about the correctness of her interpretation emerged after the preliminary analysis of the data. She checked her interpretation against the information Leon provided in Document 3.

Fragment 3:

> Las relaciones temporales pueden tener más de un sentido histórico (por ejemplo: los aztecas relacionaban el pasado y el presente desde un sentido circular — el tiempo se repite —. Occidente en cambio le da un sentido lineal y ascendente) (Document 3: 1)
> *Temporal relationships can have more than one sense in historical terms (for example: the Aztecs linked the past and the present in a circular way — time repeats itself-. Contrastingly, the Western world conceives it as a lineal and uprising sense) (Document 3: 1)*

Therefore, there is a difference between chronological relationships and historical ones for an expert in the pedagogy of History.

The second subcomponent consists of *historical characters* ('personajes históricos', t. 86) such as Hitler (t. 126) and Columbus (t. 100). The third consists of *concepts* ('conceptos', t. 126) such as *Nazism* (t. 128) and *Fascism* (t. 130). The fourth consists of quasi-characters, which are

Fragment 4[6]:

> **88[7]. Leon:** […] la Iglesia/ el Estado/ el Ejército/ que funcionan como personajes dentro del texto/ pero que son

conceptos\ como el Estado\ (.) el Estado hizo qué\(.) la Monarquía hizo tal cosa\(.)[…]

***88[7]. Leon:** [...] the Church/ the State/ the Army/ that function as characters within the text/ but they are concepts\ such as the State\(.) the State did what\(.) the Monarchy did that thing\(.) [...]*

The fifth subcomponent consists of *consequences* ('consecuencias', t. 59). The sixth consists of *purposes* ('intenciones', t. 59). The last subcomponent consists of causes.

To obtain a complex explanation, the causes must be multiple. Besides, they have to be linked to quasi-characters' purposes rather than to characters ('vinculas o desplazas la intencionalidad del personaje a cuasipersonaje', t. 88). If a single cause is provided or if the purposes are linked to a historical character instead of quasi-characters, the resulting explanation is not complex but simple and naïve ('ingenuo', t. 96). He verbalizes the underlying simple explanation in the teaching sequence in the following fragment; and he compares it to an explanation of the discovery of America:

Fragment 5:

96. Leon: […] el modelo de explicación aquí es ingenuo\(.) es simple\(.) porque todo sucede a causa de lo malos que eran los nazis\(.)
***96. Leon:** […] the model of explanation here is naïve\(.) it's simple\(.) because everything happens because the Nazis were evil\(.)*

97. Researcher: °uh/ uhm\(.)°
***97. Researcher:** °uh/ uhm\(.)°*

98. Leon: o les pue_ deducir eso\(.)
***98. Leon:** or you can deduce that\(.)*

99. Researcher: sí\(.)
***99. Researcher:** yes (.)*

100. Leon: que son modelos de explicación simple\(.) porqué se descubrió América/ porque Colón así lo quiso\(.) y no: […]
***100. Leon:** they are simple models of explanation\(.) why was America discovered/ because Columbus wanted it that way\(.) and no: […]*

The well-known explanation of the discovery of America in Fragment 5 contains a single cause linked to a historical character instead of a quasi-character. Leon compares this explanation to the tacit explanation in the teaching sequence in order to further illustrate what is not a complex historical explanation. An example of a complex historical explanation of the discovery of America is provided below.

The Linguistic Tools Component

Leon mentions three types of *linguistic tools* ('herramientas lingüísticas', t.80, t.84, t.86) to be specified in a teaching sequence on History. A first type is the language used to causalize: *as a result of*, *due to* ('a raíz de, causa de', t. 92). The second is language to *use intertextuality* ('el uso de la intertextualidad', t. 92), e.g.: *I believe that, according to that person* ('yo creo que, de acuerdo a tal persona', t. 92). The last type is the tense, mode and aspect of verbs in the jargon of an expert in (the pedagogy of) language and literature. Since Leon lacks this jargon, he describes these features through opposition of the forms of the verbs *occur* and *happen*. He includes this grammatical specification because students are better able to *communicate them [historical contents] with exactitude when they refer to occurred-was occurring, happened-was happening* ('comunicarlos [los contenidos históricos] a la hora de referirse con exactitud a pasó-pasaba, sucedió-sucedía, t. 92). That is, he includes grammar within linguistic tools to the extent that it can help students to convey more accurate meanings.

The linguistic tools proposed by Leon can be classified according to Gajo's (2007) typology of language

knowledge in order to gain a better understanding of their role in the creation and understanding of complex historical explanations. When regarded as tools for content communication, they appear as part of Gajo's language paradigm. Within this paradigm, they are content-obligatory language because they are necessary to produce explanations and to the normal development of classroom activities. The first type, verbal grammar, can be argued to be content-compatible language because there are other linguistic resources to express nuances of temporal information. However, it is classified as content-obligatory language here owing to the fact that Leon believes it is part of the language students need to learn to convey certain chronological information in historical discourse.

Linguistic tools and language in historical discourse in general can also be looked at from Gajo's (2007) content paradigm, which is attempted in the next section.

Complex Historical Explanations in Discourse

Leon contrasts the simple explanation *Columbus discovered America* with the complex explanation he builds in t. 100-102. The explanation is the underlined text in Fragment 6. Excepting the *notice this* with which Leon asks the researcher to pay attention to the complexity of the ensuing chunk of discourse, the words without underlining are *concept*, and *quasi-character*.

Fragment 6:

> **100. Leon:** […] fíjate\ un proceso de expansión europea\ concepto\ concepto\
> 100. Leon: *[…] notice this\ an European expansionist process\ concept\ concept*

> **101. Researcher:** ᵒsí\(.)ᵒ
> **101. Researcher:** *ᵒyes\(.)ᵒ*

> **102. Leon:** que incidió en que muchas monarquías/ portuguesa y española\ concepto/ concepto\ cuasipersonaje/

cuasipersonaje\ invirtieran mucho dinero/ por (.) debido a que habían rutas e: en el Medio Oriente que estaban cerradas porque los turcos habían invadido/ concepto/ concepto/ concepto\(.) por tanto/ muchos navegantes/ como Enrique el Navegante\ Portugal\ descubrió nananananá/ y dentro este contexto (.) Colón descubrió América\(.) […]

102. Leon: that caused that many monarchies/ the Portuguese and the Spanish ones\ concept/ concept\ quasi-character/ quasi-character\ invested a lot of money/ for (.) owing to the fact that there were routes in the Middle East that were closed because the Turks had invaded/ concept/ concept/ concept\ (.) therefore/ many sailors/ such as Enrique el Navegante\ Portugal\ discovered nananananananana/ and within this context (.) Columbus discovered America\(.) […]

Leon juxtaposes the word *concept* to *expansionist process* and *European* in t. 100 and to *Spanish [Monarchy]*, *Portuguese [Monarchy]*, *routes in the Middle East*, *the Turks* and *invaded* in t. 102. He also juxtaposes the label *quasi-character* to *Spanish Monarchy* and *Portuguese Monarchy* because he has defined quasi-characters as concepts in t. 88 (see Fragment 3 above). The adjacency in speech of *concept* and *quasi-character* to all these phrases suggests that Leon classifies the latter under the former. Hence, *concept* and *quasi-character* are posited as meta-narrative terms in the multi-layered piece of discourse in t. 100-102.

The fact that *concept* and *quasi-character* — subcomponents of the model for complex historical explanations — stand for *expansionist process*, *European*, *Spanish [Monarchy]*, *Portuguese [Monarchy]*, *routes in the Middle East*, *the Turks* and *[the Turks] invaded* means that these expressions are an inextricable part of the complex historical explanation of the discovery of America. Therefore, they are content-

embedded language in Gajo's (2007) content paradigm. The linguistic tools in t. 102, such as *because* ('porque') and *owing to [the fact] that* ('debido a que'), are also content-embedded language because they convey the nature of the relationship between concepts. For instance, *because* conveys the causal relationship between the configuration of concepts *[closed] routes in the Middle East* and *the Turks invaded*.

When content-embedded language is taken out of the underlined layer of discourse in Fragment 6, there is virtually nothing left in this layer. This is evidence that the conceptual tissue in the historical discourse is very dense— at least in the discourse displayed for *Bachillerato* students. This dense display of content-embedded language is the cause of Leon's deep concern about the instructions in the sequence for assigning the reading of a historical text:

Fragment 7:

> Ask students not to worry about the meaning of every word, but to concentrate in the general meaning of the text (Document 2: 4)

Trying to obtain a general meaning of a text without checking the meaning of new words in a dictionary is a reading strategy widely approved of by experts in the pedagogy of EFL, though it may not work for historical texts because some of these words, according to Leon, *can invest the text with meaning, because they are concepts* ('pueden crear sentido al texto, porque son conceptos', t. 116). He even circles the words *general meaning* and writes the following note next to the circle:

Fragment 8:

> ¿Pueden dar sentido si no conocen la palabra? (Document 2: 4)
> *Can [the students] make sense [of the text] if they don't know the word?*

What compounds the inadequacy of the instructions above is that the activities the students are asked to do after the reading are not aimed to facilitate the acquisition of vocabulary conveying concepts, but they deal with *small vocabulary* (t. 148):

Fragment 9:

> **148. Leon:** puede ser interesante (he coughs) trabajar e: aparte de_ de_ de_ de_ de_ el vocabulario pequeño con conceptos\(1) ^{o}como: como: e:ste: nazismo:/ marxismo:/ a:^{o} conceptos de estos que permitan/ de una u otra manera\ tener más elementos para hacer explicaciones más complejas\(.) ^{o}no sé si:^{o}
>
> **148. Leon:** *it can be interesting (he coughs) to work e: apart from_ from_ from_ from_ from the small vocabulary with concepts\(1) ^{o} such a:s a:s thi:s Nazism/ Marxism/ a:^{o} concepts like these which somehow enable students to have more elements to do more complex explanations \(.) ^{o}I don't know whether^{o}*

What Leon names *small vocabulary* is the set of words rejected, cellar, prevent, assignment, to herd, hollow, set aside, manpower and corpse (Document 1: 5), which corresponds to the set of words that experts in EFL foresaw as challenging in a text about how the Jews arriving at a camp were divided into prisoners for forced labour and prisoners for the gas chamber and how the latter were gassed and their bodies disposed of. Unlike concepts, these words cannot enable students to do more complex explanations (t. 148). Thus they cannot be content-embedded language, but still they are connected to the topic of the text and to the general topic of the sequence, for which reason students can enhance the general links between language and the subject knowledge by becoming acquainted with them. Consequently, they can be classified as content-peripheral language within Gajo's (2007) content paradigm. When looking from the centre of the content paradigm, as Leon does; what is on the periphery looks small.

Discourse as the Ultimate Target

Leon verbalizes what he believes to be the core task of a History teacher thus:

Fragment 10:

> **150. Leon:** en historia enseñamos a que la gente aprenda a explicar (.) el pasado\ y aprenda a comprenderlo\(.) pero explicar se hace lingüísticamente\(.) si no sabe explicarlo lingüísticamente/ habrá que enseñar a escribir sobre el pasado\ no/
>
> **150. Leon:** *in history we teach people to learn to explain (.) the past\ and to learn to understand it\(.) but explaining is done in a linguistic way\(.) if he can't explain it linguistically/ one must teach to write about the past\ mustn't one/*

Therefore, a History teacher's ultimate goal is to teach how to create and understand complex historical explanations. The fact that Leon produces the expression *to teach to write about the past* is a piece of evidence that the traditional form of discourse in the discipline of History is written language. Another piece of evidence is that he is surprised at the description of the expected types of interaction between the teacher and the students and among the students during oral activities in the teaching sequence, which EFL teachers customarily do:

Fragment 11:

> **34. Leon:** […] sobre todo me llamó la atención °que se describiera el tipo de° interacción\(.) […]
>
> **34. Leon:** *[…] what I found more striking was that the type of interaction was described […]*

Despite his surprise, Leon does not reject the idea of introducing oral interaction in the History classroom. He does not only qualify as *superb* ('superbién', t. 36) the activities in which students have to carry out oral activities in group. Besides, when asked to outline his own version of the teaching sequence, Leon would keep an hour-long oral info-swap task, though he would modify its contents. One of his main modifications would be providing linguistic tools to model the quality of the line of argument to be developed by the students and adding the instruction 'argue in the following manner' ('argumenta así', t. 329). Therefore, he would provide a subject-specific model of discourse.

Summary

Leon considers that teachers designing (CLIL) History sequences should aim to teach their students to produce and understand complex historical explanations. In order to achieve this, (CLIL) teachers should model a type of discourse containing temporal information, characters, quasi-characters, consequences, multiple causes linked to the quasi-characters' purposes, and linguistic tools. They should design activities and instructions focusing on the language that is indispensable to establish historical knowledge (content-embedded language) and that is necessary to the communication of it and to the ordinary pursuit of classroom activities (content-obligatory language). The traditionally targeted form of this subject-specific discourse seems to be written discourse.

Concluding Remarks

The preliminary study of the interaction between an expert in the pedagogy of History and an expert in the pedagogy of a foreign language does not only reveal that the History teacher's core task is to teach subject-specific discourse and that one of the ways to achieve this is using a model consisting in skills, contents and linguistic tools. It also enables the researcher to identify points of discussion among these kinds of experts when they have to dialogue to create CLIL teaching sequences.

A first point for discussion between the expert in the pedagogy of History and the expert in the pedagogy of a foreign language is the language they use to communicate with each other. They may display resistance to borrow terminology from the field of expertise of the other because of their practice and their epistemological tradition, as Leon is biased against the term *to narrate*. Moreover, they may use the same linguistic form to convey different meanings. Lack of awareness of this difference may cause misunderstanding, as when the researcher thought that Leon used *chronological relationships* and *historical relationships* as synonyms. Therefore, the two kinds of experts need to become acquainted with the other's professional jargon to prevent lack of understanding as a cause of disagreement.

A second point for discussion is how to deal with different types of language in the CLIL sequence. While content-embedded language from Gajo's (2007) content paradigm and content-obligatory language from his language paradigm are obtained with the specifications coming from the content subject, content-compatible language derives from the foreign language curriculum (Snow, Met and Genesee 1989; Gajo 2007), for which reason Leon does not deal with it. *Small vocabulary* could also derive from the foreign language curriculum. The expert in the content subject and the one in the language subject need to reach an agreement on the status of *small vocabulary* and the way this and content-compatible language are going to be treated in the CLIL sequence. That is, flexibility on the part of experts coming from distanced epistemological traditions is indispensable if a CLIL programme is to succeed (Escobar Urmeneta 2009).

A last point of discussion among the expert in the pedagogy of History and the expert in the pedagogy of a foreign language is how to incorporate oral discourse into the CLIL History class. The implementation of a learner-centred curriculum calls for the participation of students in oral tasks as well. This implies that the tradition in the pedagogy of History and the epistemological background affecting it need to be modified, as reaching agreements on terminology and the treatment of the different types of language also involve fusing the practices and identities of the two kinds of experts to become experts in CLIL education.

Acknowledgements

Notes

1. Only Germany, Austria, Norway and Hungary among the country members of the European Union claim that their teachers generally study two subjects (Eurydice 2006: 41). If these specialize in a *content subject*, such as Mathematics, Music or History, plus a *second or foreign language subject*; they are competent in the two types of subject integrated in CLIL instruction. However, only Hungary requires certified evidence of specialization in a content subject and a language subject to qualify as a CLIL teacher (ibid: 41).

2. The term *multilateral cooperation strategies* is the author's own translation of the term *estrategias de cooperación multibanda* as used by Escobar Urmeneta (2009).

3. The informants are referred to with pseudonyms in this paper.

4. Read Escobar Urmeneta (forthcoming) for details about the master programme.

5. The abbreviation *t.* stands for *turn of speaking* in this paper.

6. Many turns by Leon are long chunks of speech about more than one topic. For practical reasons, only relevant parts of his turns have been reproduced in this paper. The symbol […] shows where a part of a turn is omitted.

7. Long quotations from the interview, which are not inserted within paragraphs, contain transcription conventions. See the annex to read the legend of these conventions.

References

Atkinson, J.M. & Heritage, J., (eds.) (1984) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chettiparamb, A. (2007) *Interdisciplinarity: a Literature review*. [Online] www.heacademy.ac.uk/ourwork/networks/itlg.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007) *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Duranti, A. (1997) Ethnographic methods. In Duranti, A., *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Escobar Urmeneta, C. (forthcoming). Pre-service CLIL teacher-education in Catalonia. expert and novice practitioners teaching and reflecting together. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & D. Lagasabaster, (eds.) (forthcoming). *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*. United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Escobar Urmeneta, C. (2009) Cuando la lengua de la escuela es diferente de la lengua familiar. Tema del mes: Enseñar en inglés. *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, 395: 46-50.

Escobar Urmeneta, C., coord. (2008) *Memòria Científica del projecte 'Formular un model de formació professionalitzadora adreçada al professorat d'aules de semiimmersió (FOPP-SI)'*. AGAUR. 2006ARIE 10011. [Online] http://pagines.uab.cat/cristinaescobar/.

Eurydice (2006) *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe*. [Online] http://www.eurydice.org/ressources/eurydice/pdf/0_integral/071EN.pdf.

Gajo, L. (2007) Linguistic knowledge and subject knowledge: how does bilingualism contribute to subject development? *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10 (5): 563-581.

Garfinkel, H. (2001) *Ethnomethodology's Program*. London: Bowman & Little field.

Jefferson, G., (ed.) (1992a) *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford UK and Cambridge USA: Blackwell, vol 1.

Jefferson, G., (ed.) (1992b) *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford UK and Cambridge USA: Blackwell, vol 2.

Horrillo Godino, Z. (2008a) *Initial Steps in the Co-construction of a Space of Dialogue Between an Expert in Foreign Language Pedagogy and an Expert in Social Science Pedagogy. A Case Study*. Unpublished MA dissertation, UAB.

Horrillo Godino, Z. (2008b) *Two Teachers in the Classroom: Teaching Maths in English*. Unpublished document presented at TESOL-Spain convention 2008.

Hsieh, H. & Shannon, S.E. (2005) Three approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15 (9): 1277-1288.

Hüttner, J. & Rieder-Bünemann, A. (2007) The effect of CLIL instruction on children's narrative competence. *View[s]*, 15 (3): 41 - 46. [Online] http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/Views_0703.pdf.

Lantolf, J.P. (2006) Sociocultural theory and L2. *SSLA*, 28: 67-109.

Linares, A. & Whitaker, R. (2007) Talking and writing in a Foreign Language in CLIL contexts: a linguistic analysis of secondary school learners of geography and history. *Revista española de lingüística aplicada,* Monographic 1: 83-91.

Lyster, R. (2007) *Learning and teaching languages through content. A counterbalanced approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mariotti, C. (2006) Negotiated interactions and repair patterns in CLIL settings. *View[s]*, 15 (3): 33-40. [Online] http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/views15_3_clil_special.pdf.

Mercer, N. (2004) Sociocultural discourse analysis: analysing classroom talk as a social mode of thinking. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(2): 137-168.

Mohan, B.A. (1985) *Language and Content*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Mondada, L. &. Pekarek-Doehler, S. (2004) Second language acquisition as situated practice: task accomplishment in the French second language

classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4): 501–518.

Nussbaum, L. & Unamuno, V. (eds.) (2006) *Usos i Competències Multilingües Entre Escolars d'Origen Immigrant*. Bellaterra: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Perez-Vidal, C. (2002) Spain. In M. Grenfell (ed.), *Modern Languages Across the Curriculum*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Petit, C. & Pallarès, O. (2008) 1+1= 1, una nova aritmètica pedagògica. In *II Trobada sobre Semiiimersió: la col·laboració entre dos experts a l'aula SI*. Bellaterra: Facultat de Ciències de l'Educació and Institut de Ciències de l'Educació.

Psathas, G. (1995) *Conversation Analysis. The Study of Talk-in-Interaction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Pujol, R.M. (2003) Una ciencia que enseñe a "hablar". In R.M. Pujol, *Didáctica de las Ciencias en la Educación Primaria*. Madrid: Síntesis.

Silverman, D. (1993) *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*. London: Sage.

Snow, M.A.; Met, M. & F. Genesse (1989) A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23 (2): 201-209.

Stohler, U. (2006) The acquisition of knowledge in bilingual learning: an empirical study on the role of language in context learning, in *View[s]*, 15 (3): 41 - 46. [Online] http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/views15_3_clil_special.pdf.

Unamuno, V. & Nussbaum, L. (2004) L'entrevista com a pràctica social i com a espai de construcció d'identitats. In *Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis*. First International conference on CDA, Valencia.

Vollmer, H. (2006) *Towards a Common European Instrument for Language(s) of Education. Preliminary Study: Languages of Education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe- Language Policy Division. [online] http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/LE_Conf06_Report_May07_EN.doc.

Zuengler, J. & Miller, E.R. (2006) Cognitive and sociocultural perspectives: two parallel SLA worlds? *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1): 37-38.

Annex

Transcription conventions proposed by Gail Jefferson (Atkinson and Heritage 1984)

TONAL SEQUENCES	SYLLABIC LENGTHENING
Descending \	:
Ascending /	
Maintenance _	INTENSITY
	PIANO
PAUSES	ºtextº
Short (.)	
Long (number of seconds)	TRANSCRIBER'S COMMENTS
	(comment)
TRANSLATION	
Text	