

RESEARCH CONTEXT

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)

- Dual-focused educational approach: content & language (Dalton-Puffer 2011)
- Integration of the different roles of language: “*language of, for and through learning*” (Coyle, Hood & Marsh 2010)
- Bi- and multilingualism seen as a cultural, economic and social asset (Coyle, Hood & Marsh 2010)
- European language policy: ‘1 + 2 languages’ motto for each citizen
- CLIL seen as a key method for foreign/second language learning in the EU: “*major contribution to make the Union’s language learning goals*” (Commission of the European Communities 2003:9)

The Belgian context

- Bi-/ multilingual workers needed on the job market (Mettewie & Van Mensel 2009)
- Language learning often seen as problematic (Janssens 2008, Ginsburgh & Weber 2006)
- Polarisation of the two main linguistic communities (Dutch- and French-speakers) for economic, social and political reasons
 - ➔ Linguistic, educational, socio-economic and socio-cultural issues at stake
- Different implementations of CLIL due to separate educational systems

Part of Belgium		Official CLIL since	CLIL schools Primary/Secondary		CLIL pupils Primary/Secondary		
French-speaking part	Wallonia + Brussels	1998	157	125	11 858	20 324	(1)
	Flanders	2014	/	41	/	1760	(2)
Dutch-speaking part	Brussels (STIMOB)	2001	10	2	?	?	(3)

(1) Federation Wallonia-Brussels (school year 2014-2015) and Chopey-Paquot 2015 (school year 2013-2014)

(2) Flemish Ministry of Education (school year 2015-2016) and Flemish Ministry of Education (school year 2014-2015)

(3) Scholengroep Brussels (school year 2013-2014)

BROADER RESEARCH PROJECT (French-speaking Belgium) ‘Assessing CLIL’

Goals

Compare **processes** and **products** of language learning between **CLIL** and **non-CLIL** learners:

- what are the differences, if any;
- for which **linguistic** aspects;
- according to which **cognitive**, **socio-affective** and **instructional** factors?

+ focus on and contrast between one official state language (*Dutch*) and one high prestige foreign language (*English*)

Methodology

- Multidisciplinary: cognitive, socio-affective, linguistic
- Longitudinal: 5 waves of data collection during 2 school years
- Comparative: CLIL/non-CLIL, English/Dutch
- Sample: over 900 pupils



	CLIL Dutch	CLIL English	Non-CLIL Dutch	Non-CLIL English
Primary (age 10-12)	176	103	70	105
Secondary (age 16-18)	141	104	117	118

Research team

- 4 PhD-researchers: A. Bulon, A. De Smet, I. Hendrikx, M. Simonis
- 1 post-doctoral researcher: L. Van Mensel
- 6 academics: P. Hilgsmann, L. Mettwie, F. Meunier, K. Van Goethem, B. Galand, A. Szmalec

PHRASEOLOGICAL APPROACH

Theoretical framework

- Notion of form-meaning pairing is fundamental in language acquisition as it facilitates language storage, access and retrieval (Wray 2002, Ellis & Cadierno 2009, Ellis 2013, Hoffmann & Trousdale 2013)
- Language is phraseological (Sinclair’s *idiom principle* 1991, Wray 2002, Gray & Biber 2015, Moon 2015, Heid 2015, Colson 2015) -> empirical validation from corpus linguistics
- Different categories of phrasemes:

Referential
collocations, idioms, compounds, ...

Textual
complex prepositions, linking adverbials, ...

Communicative
speech act formulae, attitudinal formulae, commonplaces, ...

- Phraseological competence is at the centre of linguistic competence in both first and second language acquisition (Siepmann 2008)
 - ➔ Essential component of native-like fluency (Handl 2015, Granger & Meunier 2015)
- Principles of language patterning are best acquired through implicit learning by unconsciously meeting multi-word sequences repeatedly in context (Kirsner 1994 and Ellis 1994 as cited in Kennedy 2015)
- Exposure to target language input is a prerequisite for successful language acquisition (Wible 2015), but is not sufficient
 - ➔ Need for pushed output, focus on forms/functions and interaction between those
- Corpus-based analyses of the phraseological competence of foreign learners (e.g. Bahns 1997, Cobb 2003, De Cock 2003, Granger 1998, Howarth 1996, Nesselhauf 2005, Paquot 2015, Siepmann 2005a as cited in Siepmann 2015) show that:
 - learners use fewer phrases more often;
 - they have lexical “teddy bears” for particular pragmatic functions;
 - they have a disproportionate preference for one-word markers over multi-word ones fulfilling similar pragmatic functions;
 - some collocational errors can be traced back to overgeneralization in the L2 or to L1 influence

Hypothesis

CLIL settings offer more target-like and input-rich environments than traditional settings



CLIL pupils are expected to produce a language output that is more phraseological (and native-like) than that of non-CLIL pupils

Methodology and data collected so far

- Subjects: CLIL pupils in the 5th and 6th year of secondary education coming from 9 schools in French-speaking Belgium
- + 2 control groups (non-CLIL pupils and natives in English and Dutch from the same group age)

Quantitative data	
Corpus-based data	Questionnaires
• Lime Survey • 846 written productions (e-mails) • Topics: Party and Holiday • 2 texts/student: 1 in French and 1 in Dutch or English • Timed productions & no access to dictionaries or other reference tools	• Language background and use • School trajectories • Contact situation • Language attitudes and motivation

Current analysis

- Global complexity measures: word/sentence counts and length, type/token ratio, noun/verb, adjective/adverb indices, age of acquisition for content words, readability, N-Grams and lexical bundles
- Coh-Metrix

Contact

Amélie Bulon (PhD researcher, Université Catholique de Louvain) : amelie.bulon@uclouvain.be

References

- Colson, J.P. (2015). Cross-linguistic phraseological studies: An overview. In: F. Meunier & S. Granger (eds.), *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, 191-206. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Chopey-Paquet, M. (2015). *Investigating teacher partnerships for CLIL: Developing a model for subject-content and language teacher pedagogic collaboration towards integration*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen and Université de Namur.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: from practice to principles? *Annual Review of applied linguistics*, 31, 182-204.
- Ellis, N. (2013). Construction Grammar and Second Language Acquisition. In: T. Hoffmann & G. Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, 365-378. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, N. & Cadierno, T. (2009). Constructing a Second Language. Introduction to the Special Section. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 7, 111-139.
- European Commission. (2003). Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity: An action plan 2004-2006, 1-29. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/doc/official/keydoc/actlang/act_lang_en.pdf
- Ginsburgh, V. & Weber, S. (2006). La dynamique des langues en Belgique. *Regards économiques*, 42, 1-10.
- Granger, S. & Meunier, F. (2015). Phraseology in language learning and teaching: Where to from here? In: F. Meunier & S. Granger (eds.), *Phraseology in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*, 247-252. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gray, B. & Biber D. (2015). Phraseology. In: D. Biber & R. Reppen (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of English Corpus Linguistics*, 125-145. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Handl, S. (2015). Essential collocations for learners of English: The role of collocational direction and weight. In: F. Meunier & S. Granger (eds.), *Phraseology in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*, 43-66. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Heid, U. (2015). Computational phraseology: An overview. In: F. Meunier & S. Granger (eds.), *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, 337-360. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hoffmann, T. & Trousdale, G. (Eds.). (2013). *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Janssens, R. (2008). Taalgebruik in Brussel en de plaats van het Nederlands. Enkele recente bevindingen. *Brussels Studies*, 13, 1-15.
- Kennedy, G. (2015). Phraseology and language pedagogy: Semantic preference associated with English verbs in the British National Corpus. In: F. Meunier & S. Granger (eds.), *Phraseology in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*, 21-42. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mettewie, L., & Van Mensel, L. (2009). Multilingualism at all costs: Language use and language needs in business in Brussels. *Sociolinguistica*, 23, 131-149.
- Moon, R. (2015). Dictionaries and collocation. In: F. Meunier & S. Granger (eds.), *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, 313-336. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Siepmann, D. (2008). *Phraseology in learners' dictionaries: What, where and how. Phraseology in Language Learning and Teaching*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 185-202.

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wible, D. (2015). Multiword expressions and the digital turn. In: F. Meunier & S. Granger (eds.), *Phraseology in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*, 163-184. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.