The Cultural Element in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Programmes

© Hugo BAETENS BEARDSMORE

International Conference: Sociocultural competence and language learning in multilingual settings, V.U.B. 18-19.9.2014
Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, Paleis der Academiën

Introduction

In their foundation book on CLIL Coyle et al. (2010) discuss models of CLIL at whatever level of schooling, or in whatever context, as composed of four variables, known as the four C's, namely, *Content, Communication* (i.e. language), *Cognition* (i.e. learning) and *Culture*. Although the first three of these C's are well developed in this excellent book, the fourth C, Culture, is handled in less depth. In one of the most comprehensive recent books on bilingual education (Garcia, 2009) very little mention is made of the cultural element in the models discussed.

In this article I will focus on the cultural part of the four C's as a supplement to the detailed presentation of arguments on the other three major aspects of any CLIL programme.

Under contextual variables in CLIL the following is given for culture (Coyle et al, 2010, 17):

- " Building intercultural knowledge, understanding and tolerance, e.g. module of psychology on causes of ethnic prejudice.
- Developing intercultural communication skills, e.g. student collaboration on joint projects across nations.
- Learning about specific neighbouring countries/regions and/or minority groups, e.g. 'school hopping', which engages students and teachers in border regions in sharing resources and curricular objectives.
- Introducing a wider cultural context, e.g. comparative studies involving video links of internet communications."

At primary level, for example, the authors illustrate from a theme-based, short module, which may be useful in educational contexts where learners have little authentic access to languages and cultures beyond their own (Coyle et al, 2010, 19). The example is given of partnership between two classes in Rwanda and the UK where schools exchange pictures, artefacts, letters and videos on a joint eco-project

using French. In the illustrations of models used in secondary education (Coyle et al. 20-23) there is no specific mention of the cultural element in the types proposed, though this could be presumed as present in the nature of activities engaged in. There is no specific mention of culture in the illustrations of models of what might occur in tertiary education (Coyle et al. 23-26).

In the further development of what CLIL is all about Coyle et al. go into great depth, both at the theoretical and the practical level, of what is involved in the notions of Content, Cognition and Communication, and devote two pages to the cultural element in their discussion of cultural awareness and intercultural understanding (Coyle et al. 39-40).

Any debate on culture is hampered by the lack of clear and accepted definitions of what culture entails. Without wishing to enter into the polemics surrounding definitions it is perhaps helpful to examine the concept from a perspective that is useful to the task in hand. In this case we are looking at an educational model that involves "a dual-focused form of instruction where attention is given both to the language and the content" (Coyle et al. 2010, 3), and where the language goal is to "learn as you use, and use as you learn…[which]…differs from the older experience of learn now for use later" (Coyle et al, 2010, 10).

Traditional second language learning often contains conscious efforts at raising cultural awareness of the target language as forming part and parcel of the language acquisition process, and may take on many forms. In those parts of a CLIL programme that focus not on the language but on the content matter to be acquired it is not self-evident where the cultural element finds its place. To clarify this we require some definition of culture that suits the driving element behind the programme, namely the non-linguistic subject matter being acquired.

Some definitions of culture

Defining culture is difficult, whereas defining aspects of culture is easier. In fact, most ordinary people give aspects of a culture when they talk about it, but often fail to grasp the essential essence of what their own or another culture may represent. Culture is a web of meaning of great complexity, which is simplified when a community presents itself to the outside world. Such simplification accounts for stereotypes.

Stereotypes influence the way information is processed about the members of groups (i.e. more favourable information is remembered about in-groups and more unfavourable information tends to be remembered about out-groups, though there are exceptions).

Stereotypes create expectancies about other people and the holders of stereotypes often search for information and behaviour in others that will confirm those expectancies (Corson, D. 1995). One of the goals of CLIL programmes is to overcome stereotypes by using content-matter subjects to reveal how natural and how unbiased it can be to work through a specific learning topic through a different language than one's own without necessarily questioning the wider cultural element that lies behind the topic being handled.

The idea that learning content-matter through a second language can overcome cultural discrepancies can be illustrated from an intriguing case reported from Peru by Duverger (2005). Concerned by the number of adolescent poor girls who unwittingly become pregnant, a group of Peruvian teachers attempted to overcome the embarrassment and taboo against sex education by trying out an interdisciplinary approach to the topic and handling it through the medium of French, i.e. a form of CLIL. This apparently enabled the class to talk about genitalia, boy-girl relationships, fecundation, pregnancy, etc. with a certain objectivity that avoided the mental

blockages inculcated by the family, social or religious environment. The use of a foreign language helped attain the objectivity necessary to access knowledge.

When 350 teachers were asked to respond to the question, "What does culture mean to you?" their answers grouped under three categories. (Robinson, 1985.)

Figure 1. Categories of culture.

a) Behaviour	**b) Ideas**	**c) Products**
Language Customs Habits Foods	Beliefs Values Institutions	Literature Folklore Art Music Artefacts

Those who refer to culture in terms of customs, behaviours and products reflect a notion of culture as observable phenomena, but which may or may not exclude many significant aspects of a people's culture. On the other hand, those who give illustrations of ideas or beliefs are giving a cognitive definition which reflects a notion of culture as not observable, as something which is internal, but which can be explicitly described.

Gonzalez (1983) distinguishes between:

a) **Surface culture**:

The products of artistic endeavour, achievements of intellectual and artistic genius, deeds of heroic valour, concepts of lofty spirit, and various modes of significant thought, genteel living and racial vigour.

b) **Deep Culture:**

Thoughts, beliefs, actions, concerns, hopes and worries, personal values, minor varieties and half serious superstitions, subtle gradations of interpersonal relationships as expressed in actions and words, the day-by-day details of life as it is lived. Religion also falls into this category of deep culture, and in Muslim societies may be the most decisive feature that determines an entire life view.

> “Culture does not consist of things, people, behaviour or emotions. It is the forms of things that people have in their mind, their models for perceiving, relating and otherwise interpreting them.” (Geertz 1975, 89)

One of the more widely accepted definitions of culture is as follows.

> "Culture is an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate and develop their knowledge about and attitudes towards life." (Goodenough 1964, 36)

Yet the most powerful definition of a society’s culture is the one most difficult to pin down, consisting as it does, of many aspects of life which are not made explicit.

> "A society's culture consists of whatever one has to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to its members, and to do so in any role that they accept for themselves. **Culture is what everybody knows**." (Goodenough 1964, 36)

This last idea, that culture is what everybody knows, is at the origin of misunderstandings between peoples, mis-representations of other groups, breakdowns in perception and communication. Since most Europeans know very little about the Arab world for example, its history, its geography, its diversity, except through partial and often incomplete information on certain products, certain ideas and certain behaviours, this leads to stereotypes, based on western interpretations of “what everybody knows”, or our cultural filters. The same is true for the role of religion as a determining force in culture. For Muslim societies, the culture is what everybody knows, takes for granted and acts upon, whereas for people of other religions who do not share this culture they can only note the behaviour, ideas and products that strike as different, ending up as stereotypes.

Culture, then, is:

- Shared and negotiated knowledge
- A historically transmitted pattern embodied in symbols
- Symbolically expressed in artefacts, norms, codes, tacit understanding
- A social relationship, mutual action
- Notions of what is significant
- "Constitutive rules", i.e. agreement on shared meanings.

(Goodenough, 1964)

Skutnabb-Kangas (1987), modified by Baetens Beardsmore (1993), combining the different approaches referred to above, define **cultural competence** as containing 4 components:

Knowledge: a cognitive component. This refers to knowledge about the relevant culture, including its language, history, traditions, institutions, religion, etc.

Feelings: an affective component. This refers to feelings and attitudes towards a culture, identification with the culture, and for believers religion is obviously an important element that determines feelings.

Behaviour: this refers to the capacity to act in culturally appropriate ways.

Metacultural Awareness: refers to knowledge about, feelings towards and behaviour in different cultures and is thought to be difficult for monolinguals to attain.

If we accept that most learners in initial stages have extremely limited knowledge (i.e. the cognitive component) about the target language in a CLIL programme, then it is clear that this limited knowledge may easily lead to stereotypes. But even the few who have more information are unlikely to share the feelings (i.e. the affective component) about the culture of the language that those who grew up in it might have. The result can often be a behavioural problem, or inability to act in a culturally appropriate way. **Cultural incompetenc**e (i.e. a lack of metacultural awareness) then either leads to rejection and withdrawal from contacts, or else the forming of stereotypes and superiority complexes based on the home cultural competence.

The place of culture in CLIL programmes

CLIL programmes can be effective by deflecting primary attention from the language element of the course, if desired, and concentrating on the content element, except in the parallel L2 lessons that usually accompany the CLIL component, at least in secondary programmes. It is perhaps useful to look at the cultural element in both of these.

Culture in the L2 lesson

In those lessons that concentrate on language acquisition teachers may carry out the traditional progression from simple to complex structures, from relatively concrete to relatively abstract vocabulary, from straightforward communicative language to more subtle registers of language usage as the programme proceeds. In these lessons they will at times incidentally, at times consciously, draw attention to cultural elements inherent to the language being taught. They are also likely to attempt to inculcate the cognitive, affective and behavioural elements that Skutnabb-Kangas refers to and may

well draw attention to metacultural aspects by comparing L1 constellations with those of the L2 being acquired. In so doing learners are hopefully brought to overcome stereotyping.

In efficient CLIL programmes, where there are often parallel but separate L2 lessons, there is usually some coordination between the content-matter teaching and the purely language lesson in the programme. There may be good coordination between the needs of the content matter subject in terms of specific lexical needs, frequently used structures and certain usage conventions required for the non-linguistic subject matter. But the language teacher may decide to compensate for what cannot be handled in the content-matter subject, particularly in terms of target language culture, by doing what has always occurred in traditional language lessons, and handling aspects of the literature, the history, the behaviour patterns of the target language community, or what Gonzalez refers to as surface culture. But the aim in the traditional language lesson is also to raise awareness of what Gonzalez calls deep culture, and which Coyle et al (2010, 40, citing Byram, (1977) refer to as the cultural impact of CLIL, by developing learners' intercultural understanding. Coyle (2009) elsewhere goes into some depth in the development of “intercultural learning” in CLIL programmes, which seems to coincide with Sktunabb-Kangas' classification of metacultural awareness. And all this is legitimate, both in CLIL programmes and traditional language lessons.

Van Ek & Trim (1990) for the Council of Europe draw the link between language and culture in second language learners by suggesting that learners should become familiar with expressing the following according to the appropriate cultural norms.

I) Universal experience

1. Everyday life, e.g. working hours, leisure activities, holidays.
2. Living conditions and living standards.
3. Interpersonal relationships, e.g. formality, informality.
4. Major values and attitudes, e.g. traditions, politics.

II) Social conventions and rituals

a) Non-linguistic

1. Body language
2. Visiting rituals
3. Eating rituals

b) Linguistic

1. Politeness conventions
2. How to avoid being dogmatic
3. Correcting someone
4. Avoiding displeasing the interlocutor

5. Discovering or expressing attitudes
6. Obtaining compliance
7. Requesting
8. Offering, inviting

III) Social roles

1. stranger/stranger
2. friend/friend

IV) Psychological roles

1. neutrality
2. equality
3. sympathy
4. antipathy.

The above list raises the question of just how much of all this can be handled in the second language lesson and whether it should be handled implicitly or explicitly. It is also difficult to see how many of the above features could be incorporated into the content matter lessons without losing sight of the main goals, which is to acquire the subject matter.

Culture in the content-matter lesson

In this part of the programme, and which is the driving force behind CLIL models, culture is a more subtle feature that may or may not be on the level of consciousness of the practitioners. No teaching or learning operates in a vacuum. Within the wider culture of the society in which the school operates there are sub-cultures imposed by the nature of the participants and activities being conducted, some more ritualistic than others. A wedding ceremony represents a sub-culture where people say and do things in an orchestrated pattern of behaviour that involves language. Other examples of sub-cultures are youth culture, pop culture, SMS text culture, etc.

The CLIL classroom sub-culture

A classroom represents a sub-culture where there are certain implicit rules about who directs speech acts (usually the teacher), who controls turn-taking, as in the traditional "Question, response, feedback" routine of classroom behaviour, who interrupts the flow of discourse (teachers interrupt pupils, learners rarely interrupt teachers), who directs activities.

CLIL programmes place great stress on providing opportunities for less ritualistic turn-taking by encouraging pupils to work in peers or small groups, to collectively solve content-matter tasks in hand and to feel less inhibited in trying out the target language without the constant supervision of the teacher, or the deadening effects of

display questions, where a pupil responds in front of the whole class to a request for display of knowledge by the teacher. This increases the opportunity for self-initiated output that Swain (1985) refers to as necessary for acquisition of the target language.

Although peer interaction is possible in traditional language lessons, it is more difficult to contextualise. Asking learners to role-play in imaginary real-life situations in the target language is not very realistic and is limited in outcomes. Discussing literary texts in the target language often requires sophisticated language skills that pupils may not have to hand.

On the other hand, the use of authentic materials, for example in a biology class, where text, illustrations and objects are readily available, can provide a solid contextual basis for peer interaction on the solution of the biology task. Hence a CLIL class has a slightly different sub-culture pattern as far as pupil-led interaction is concerned, and which is felt to increase the exposure and opportunity for language usage. Swain (1996) noted how only 14% of children's utterances were longer than a clause when the lesson was teacher-fronted and that in grade 6 of Canadian immersion classes 44% of pupil turns were one or two words in length. Peer interaction in CLIL lessons tends to augment the production of connected discourse when not dominated by teacher-fronted activities. It also increases the pupil's "right to error" in attempting to use the target language, which is essential in language development, be it the first or the second language, otherwise there is no way of knowing what ground still needs to be covered to attain target-like proficiency. Since learners are not concentrating on the language, but on the content matter discipline, they tend to try out their linguistic knowledge more spontaneously.

The above points have been confirmed in a comparison between learners in CLIL classes and mainstream foreign language learners in Spain by Moore (2011). CLIL learners were found to provide more mutual interactive, linguistic and affective support and demonstrated greater engagement through both more and more extended cooperative constructions. There is evidently a CLIL classroom sub-culture of cooperative interaction that enhances target language expression.

The sub-culture of the discipline

It is the use of authentic content-matter material that provides another element of sub-culture present in a CLIL lesson. Whatever the content-matter subject being taught through an L2 there is a sub-culture inherent to the domain of activity or discipline, whether the domain be biology, mathematics, geography, etc., each of which has to be learned and applied, just as what happens if the subject is being learnt through the L1. By sub-culture is meant the pattern of approach for interpretation and acquisition of the discipline, and is slightly different from the purely linguistic features inherent to the domain of activity

All scientific disciplines, like those in the humanities, have register features which determine what type of language is necessary to the task in hand. Serra (2004) calls these "discourse practices". In English the passive voice of the verb is far more prevalent than in ordinary language usage, and is indeed often obligatory in certain cases of scientific presentation. Examples of the type; "the weight is measured by means of the formula X….; the product to be analysed is weighed to the precise amount…; the bunsen burner should be placed so as to heat the substance…." This raises the question as to how often the verb "to weigh" occurs in a traditional language lesson and whether it would occur in the passive voice in any natural and repeated sequence, let alone the specific content-matter lexis. Hence the sub-culture inherent to the content-matter lesson provides natural and recursive stimuli for the acquisition of the appropriate language, once the models have been encountered. Coyle et al (2010, 59) point out that the language of science requires an analysis of the linguistic genre, the type of discourse and language which is embedded in different content subjects and that this entails systematic analysis at the planning stages. Not doing this can cause problems, as when in my visits to primary schools in one country I noticed that the mathematics lessons regularly used passive structures in problem-solving questions but the passive voice as a linguistic structure was not handled till three years later in the curriculum of the target language programme.

This reveals what Coyle et al. (2010, 43) point out;

"In the CLIL classroom it is unlikely that the language level of the learners will be the same as their cognitive level".

Coyle et al (2010, 94) give a concrete example of how a piece of authentic material from an encyclopaedia for history can be revised to make the language more accessible, while maintaining the appropriate cognitive level of the content.

But even if one is aware of the specific register constraints or discourse strategies inherent to a domain of linguistic activity teachers must be aware of certain pitfalls that may occur. It is often thought that using authentic materials implies having text-books that have been produced in the target language culture. This may cause problems on two counts. A teacher of geography through the medium of French in Hamburg noted that it was impossible to use French-produced geography textbooks in Germany for two reasons. The first was that the language of the French text-books was far beyond the capacities of the learners, even though the content was pitched at the correct level for the age group being taught. Consequently, more simplified language was required than that of the original text-book in order to achieve the educative goal of teaching the appropriate level of geography (Drexel-Andrieu, 1993).

But more serious in the Hamburg example was the fact that the French text-book did not cover the geography syllabus that was required in the northern German syllabus. For example, the French text-book talked about the ports of Toulon, Le Havre and Marseille, about French estuaries, the Mediterranean, etc., but said nothing about Hamburg, Bremen or Kiel, or about the Baltic. This is an element of surface culture alluded to earlier that was discrepant for the curriculum required in the CLIL lesson.

To overcome such problems, the Luxembourg authorities (where trilingual education for the entire school population has been in place since 1913, cf. Lebrun & Baetens Beardsmore, 1993) produce all their own, indigenously prepared materials for primary education and for parts of lower secondary education in the three languages of the curriculum, Luxemburgish, German and French, which ensures their anchoring in the Luxembourg school and wider culture. The schools import foreign materials for more advanced needs in upper secondary education, where it is assumed language will no longer provide a barrier. But even here subtle differences in the sub-culture inherent to a particular discipline have been noted. A biology teacher who taught through German in lower secondary and through French in upper secondary streams pointed out that there were few inherently different approaches to biology between French and German curricula, whereas Anglo-Saxon curricula, unlike the continental counterparts, were far more influenced by Darwinism, which of course would affect the approach to the syllabus.

Geiger-Jaillet et al. (2011, 114-115) make clear reference to the problems inherent to transforming the “objects of knowledge” (e.g. historical concepts, social sciences) into “teaching goals” when there are different educational cultures and traditions behind foreign materials. They illustrate from the cultural differences (terms used by Geiger-Jaillet et al.) behind the very conceptualisation of domains or disciplines. In Germany and Switzerland history and geography represent two distinct school disciplines, whereas in France they are coalesced. The school programmes, and the way they are broken down or grouped, differ from country to country. This implies that the authentic materials represented by foreign imported textbooks cannot just be transferred for use in a different national syllabus context.

Even a subject like mathematics might have a hidden cultural agenda behind the way it is handled in schools working through a CLIL programme. Mathematics is considered a good content-matter subject for CLIL programmes because of the restricted and recursive nature of the language used, the strong support of language-free communication through formulae and diagrammatic presentation and the highly structured development of argumentation along patterns inherent to a mathematics syllabus. However, a bilingual primary school in Paris working through French and English discovered problems when it tried to coalesce the Anglo-Saxon and French syllabuses. It was found that the way the basic mathematical concepts were handled in the two systems was highly divergent and that it could not be assumed that

mathematics meant just doing the same thing in another language. This discrepancy was noted in a secondary school in Strasbourg, on the Franco-German border, where learners were exchanged across the border for part of their secondary programme. Those involved were all considered good, both at languages and general subjects, and were not expected to have problems in crossing the Rhine to continue part of their education in the other language. However, the French teachers of mathematics discovered that their German guest pupils were having great difficulty with the maths programme, even though they had been considered good in mathematics back home in Germany. Finally it was discovered that the mathematical tradition in German schools (i.e. the sub-culture of German mathematics) was very different from that followed in France, even though the major concepts and principles were equivalent if not equal.

The above reflect what Pepin (1997) noted in the following:

"In England, teachers focussed on training pupils on mathematical concepts or skills and devoted much time to the practice (sometimes routine) procedures…… In France, teachers focussed on developing mathematical thinking which included exploring, developing and understanding concepts, and mathematical reasoning…. the main objective in a German mathematics classroom was to discuss mathematical content (Pepin 1997:131)".

Geiger-Jaillet et al (2011, 115) give a synthesis of further examples of the differences in the cultural traditions inherent to the teaching of mathematics in bilingual schooling, based on studies produced in German (Frey, 2006) and French (Rolli, 2006).

A comparative analysis of eight text-books produced in Germany and in France for the teaching of earth and life sciences (Jazbec 2008, in Geiger-Jaillet et al. 2011, 123-124) revealed fundamental differences in the conceptualisation of didactic goals and techniques, as well as the presentation, layout and handling of their content. Such differences may present teachers in CLIL programmes with problems of reconciling the sub-cultural discrepancies with the national teaching tradition they are accustomed to or are expected to follow.

The problems faced in the teaching of mathematics in a CLIL programme reveal Goodenough's analysis of what makes up culture, in this case the sub-culture of the discipline of mathematics. The goal is to teach the "shared and negotiated knowledge" peculiar to the specific discipline but such knowledge may not be shared across the different language communities involved. The mathematical traditions of each language community are "historically transmitted patterns embodied in symbols" that do not coalesce easily. Teachers are confronted with different types of "tacit understanding" inherent to the discipline that they might not be aware of. According

to the traditions of the mathematical sub-culture there are different notions of "what is significant", depending on each mathematics language community. In order to teach mathematics teachers have to inculcate "agreement on shared meanings".

History is often considered as a good content-matter subject for a CLIL programme, but it has advantages and drawbacks. On the one hand it contains a heavy cultural element and fits the definitions provided by Goodenough in that it covers "an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols…", allows one to understand the other language community's identity and to compare this with one's own marks of identity, thereby enhancing metacultural awareness. On the other hand, the language of history is often highly complex, contains a specific lexis that is not prevalent in everyday life and often subsumes some knowledge of the cultural background, which is implicit but not explicit. This is why teachers of history often have to develop the background to a historical topic and which is not self-evident from a particular text being studied. It is sometimes considered wiser to use history in more advanced levels of CLIL programmes precisely because of the inherent difficulties in coping with this heavily cultural laden subject.

Serra (2004) illustrates an example of a history lesson in the Val d'Aosta region of Italy which differs from other CLIL type programmes in that the two languages of the school, Italian and French, both come into play in a highly structured fashion and where code-switching is prevalent. It also illustrates an integration of the four C's that Coyle et al. (2010) plead for as fundamental to a successful outcome. The example given is based on units where pupils in a lower secondary school class find historical sources for the topic of "witches" in the historic castles of the region, and where the Italian L1 history teacher works in collaboration with the French L2 language teacher.

Different objectives form the basis of this unit of activity: pedagogic – to stimulate cognitive competence (observation, selection, classification, etc.), linguistic – (working through L1 and L2 on different types of texts with different lexical levels), content – to acquire factual information (both historical and linguistic in both languages), conceptual (forming scientific concepts).

CLIL at the tertiary level

At the tertiary level the weight of the cultural element embedded in a discipline may be much heavier. Students of history in Belgian universities are expected to be able to consult original sources in different languages, Dutch, French, German, English, Spanish, given the complex linguistic make-up of Belgian history. In a course entitled "Explanation of historical texts in…" followed by the name of the language selected, much time has to be devoted to embedding the particular text in its cultural and historical context which is not necessarily apparent in the text itself. The Act of Union with Wales or The Act for the Dissolution of the Greater Monasteries, even when presented in modern spelling and punctuation, cannot be understood without

extensive insights into the cultural background of the times. In a course of "Terminology of the Anglo-Saxon media" destined for students in communication sciences the decoding of the specific register of headlines, or "headlinese", often required great cultural background knowledge in order to extract any meaning. The popular press proves far more difficult than the highbrow press because of the assumptions that readers of such papers are well informed of the cultural background and can decode eye-catching headlines with amusement and ease. "Paki bashing in Leicester" is a totally opaque headline to a foreigner not aware of the racial violence against migrants of Pakistani origin in Leicester and there are more extreme examples of such linguistic and cultural opacity in the American press. The headline "Why is Aunty anti?" would be impossible to decode unless one was aware that in the United Kingdom the B.B.C. is affectionately know as "Auntie", yet a native-speaker in Britain would have no problems, because of cultural knowledge or "what everybody knows".

Conclusion

Coyle et al. (2010, 64 and 77) give suggestions as to how the cultural element can be integrated into a CLIL programme by inviting teachers to examine the cultural implications for the development of a particular topic. They particularly mention links between schools where there is a focus on the partner school language, by the use of video links. When pupils make exchanges there can be surprising reactions of a positive type, which reflect the increased motivation to use the target language, as often witnessed in all CLIL programmes. In a video link exchange between a lower secondary school class in Belgium and a partner in England, working through French and English as target languages, the English pupils indicated their surprise at the number of paper bins present in the Belgian classroom compared with their own, including small ones on the groups of tables, known as "*poubelles de table*". This led to dialogue between the pupils of a type that would probably never have been instigated by teachers, and was a sign of genuine interest on an authentic topic. What the English pupils had noted was an artefact element of school culture in Belgium and the reaction showed a raising of metacultural awareness.

To conclude, Coyle (2009) states that:

"The 4Cs Framework suggests that effective CLIL requires progression in knowledge, skills and understanding of the content; engagement in associated cognitive processing such as thinking skills which impact on learning; interaction in the communicative context, developing appropriate language knowledge and skills; and a deepening intercultural understanding which permeates all 'Cs' and is integral to learning through the positioning of self and 'otherness' based on attitudes and values."

If Goodenough's statement that "culture is what everybody knows" is valid this implies that in CLIL lessons the aim is to get learners to the appropriate cognitive level of what "everybody knows" or should know in the content matter sub-culture, history, biology, mathematics, geography, etc. This can be achieved by focussing on the cognitive and observable features of the sub-culture of the discipline in question, so as to produce "agreement on shared meanings". In preparing CLIL lessons it is wise to devote thought not only to the culture implicit in the use of the target language, but also the sub-culture embodied in the specific discipline.

Bibliography

Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1993 Response to questions on European integration, in *Europes: els intel.lectuals i la questió europea*, Acta, Fundació per a les idees i les arts, 26-33 (Catalan), 128-135 (Spanish), 234-241 (English), 334-341 (French), 439-447 (German).

Byram, M.1997 *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

Corson, D. 1995 Qualities of teaching in a multiethnic school, in Garcia, O. & Baker, C. (eds), *Policy and Practice in Bilingual Education: Extending the Foundations*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

Coyle, D. 2009 Promoting cultural diversity through intercultural under-standing, in Carrio-Pastor, M. (ed.) *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Cultural Diversity, Linguistic Insights 92*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt, 105-124.

Coyle, D., Hood, P. & Marsh, D. 2010 *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Drexel-Andrieu, N. 1993 Bilingual geography: A teacher's perspective, in Baetens Beardsmore, H. (ed.) *European Models of Bilingual Education*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 173-182.

Duverger,J. 2005 *L'enseignement en classe bilingue*, Hachete, Paris.

Frey, S. 2006 Mathematikenunterricht im französischen Zug an der deutsch-franzözische Grundschule Stuttgart Sillenbuch, in Schlemminger, G. (éd.) *Aspekte bilingualen Lehrens und Lernen – Schwerpunkt Grundschule,* Baltmannsweiler, Schneider Verlag Hohengehren, 169-189.

Garcia, O 2009 *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*, Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell.

Geertz, 1975 *The Interpretation of Cultures*, London, Hutchinson

Geiger-Jaillet, A., Schlemminger, G. & Le Pape Racine, C. 2011 *Enseigner une discipline dans une autre langue: méthodolgie et pratiques professionnelles,* Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang.

Goodenough, W. 1964 Cultural anthropology and linguistics, in Hymes, D. (ed.) *Language in Culture and Society*, New York, Harper and Row, 36ff.

Gonzalez, F. 1983 Reinforcing culture in three bilingual education programs, in Escobedo, T. (ed.) *Early Childhood Bilingual Education: a Hispanic Perspective*, Teachers College, Columbia University, 93-104.

Jazbec, S. 2008 Biologieunterricht in Deutschland und Frankreich. Ein Schulbuchvergleich in Hinblick auf die Eignung für den bilingualen Unterricht in der Realschule, *Cahier du bilinguisme – Werkhefte zum bilingualen Lehren und Lernen,* 3-60.

Lebrun, N. & Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1993 Trilingual education in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, in Baetens Beardsmore, H. (ed.), *European Models of Bilingual Education*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 101-120.

Moore, P. 2011 Collaborative interaction in turn-taking: a comparative study of European bilingual (CLIL) and mainstream (MS) foreign language learners in early secondary education, in *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14/4, 513-530.

Pepin, B 1997 The influence of national cultural traditions on pedagogy classroom practice in England, France and Germany in Leach, J and Moon, B (eds) *Learners and Pedagogy* London: Open University Press.

Robinson, G 1985 *Cross-cultural Understanding: Processes and Approaches for Foreign Language, English as a Second Language and Bilingual Educators*, Pergamon, Oxford.

Rolli, G. 2006 *Quelles structures linguistiques allemandes au service de quelles mathématiques?,* Strasbourg, Université Marc Bloch, Mémoire de Master.

Serra, C. 2004 Construire des savoirs disciplinaires et linguistiques dans l'enseignement bilingue» in Mondada, L. & Pekarek Doehler S. (eds), *Plurilinguisme, Mehrsprachigkeit, Plurilingualism. Festschrift pour Georges Lüdi.* Francke Verlag, Tübingen and Basel, 147-156.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1987 *Are the Finns in Sweden an Ethnic Minority - Finnish Parents Talk about Finland and Sweden,* Roskilde University Centre, Institute VI, Roskilde, Denmark.

Swain, M. 1985 Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development, in Gass, S. & Madden, C. (eds) *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, Newbury House, Cambridge, MA, 23-53.

Swain, M. 1996 Discovering successful second language teaching strategies and practices: From program evaluation to classroom experimentation, in *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 17, 2-4, 89-104.

Van Ek, J. & Trim. J. 1991 *Threshold Level 1990*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe Press.
N° of words: 6255