



Revisiting the Content-Based Instruction in Language Teaching in relation with CLIL: Implementation and Outcome

Abdul Karim

School of Educational Studies Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800, Penang, Malaysia

E-mail: ka15_edu131@student.usm.my

Mohammad Mosiur Rahman (Corresponding author)

School of Languages, Literacy and Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800, Penang, Malaysia

E-mail: mmr15_pbt003@student.usm.my

Received: 12-08-2016

Accepted: 30-10-2016

Advance Access Published: November 2016

Published: 10-12-2016

doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.7p.254

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.7p.254>

Abstract

The present article has reviewed literature on Content-Based Instruction (CBI) along with the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in Language Teaching based on the recent development in the field. This includes the learning principle, factors responsible for the successful implementation of CBI/CLIL, their prospect and outcome. The paper is written based on secondary data from different articles providing exploratory account of contexts observed, paying attention to the views and practices of participants, and review papers on previous studies. The goal is to understand the aspects of CBI, its relation with CLIL, success and shortcoming resulted from the implementation in language teaching.

Keywords: Overview, Content-Based Instruction (CBI), Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), Immersion

1. Introduction

The mastery of the learners in Second Language (L2) becomes high when the conditions applied during the First Language (L1) acquisition appear in the second language (L2) acquisition: that is, when the emphasis is given on meaning rather than on form; when the language input is above the competence of the student; and when there is ample opportunity for students to get access to the meaningful use of that language in a relatively stress-less atmosphere (Krashen 1985a; 1985b; Savignon 1983; Snow 1993; Wesche 1993). Thus, with the intention to attain the mastery of the students in English as a Second or Foreign Language by not solely focusing on the language itself, instead emphasizing the content of the subject matters, which students learn as parts of their academic journey, and which ultimately result in the English proficiency of the students as the course materials are developed in English, Content-based Instruction (CBI) emerged in the mid-1970s recommended by British governmental commission, which suggested two skills-reading (receptive) and writing (productive)- must be given emphasis during the development of curriculum. It was the result of the 'Language across the curriculum' movement during that time (Larsen & Freeman, 2000).

2. Research Problem

Existing literature has been found to be divided and indulged the discussion among the terms CBI, CLIL and Immersion and its implication on language teaching (Cenoz & Zarobe, 2015; Chamot & O'Malley, 1994; Ruiz de Zarobe, 2008). Therefore, it has become obligatory to incorporate a conceptual analysis to distinct these terms or draw any relation that is predominantly established in the available literature (see Greere & Räsänen, 2008; Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010; Tedick & Wesely, 2015). CBI/CLIL/Immersion needs to be analysed contextually before the adaptation in a different context or program since, potential impact of integration can lead various pedagogical impediment, which found to be a barrier in the implication among the literature and consequently, the learning of language (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Fortune, Tedick, & Walker, 2008; Tedick & Wesely 2015). Therefore, based on a categorical analysis of literature on the factors that influence CBI/CLIL/immersion, according to researchers e.g. Cenoz & Zarobe (2014); Gallagher and Leahy (2014); March, Hau, & Kong (2000); Bulter, (2005); Morris & Tarone (2003), is a predetermining factors of integration and impact the language teaching. However, in accordance to the problem stated, the specific aim of the article are following:

1. To investigate, whether CBI, CLIL and Immersion are distinct or identical, or not.
2. To explore what is the suitable context to implement CBI, in relation to the principle of CBI.
3. To apprehend the potential impact of CBI in the language teaching and learning, in association to implication barriers of CBI.

3. Methodology

In order to answer the research questions of the present study, an extensive amount of literature has been reviewed and explained. To the review of the related literature, a systematic search has been adopted by using the topic and keywords

e.g. CBI, CLIL, Immersion, Bilingual education etc. Searches for peer reviewed articles were conducted in ERIC (EBSCO or CSA), Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA) and Google Scholar of years year between (2000- 2016) to find out recent and as many numbers of literature as possible related to the topic and keywords. Collected data were analysed under each heading and sub headings. All data that are collected from different secondary sources are acknowledged accordingly in text and in the reference list.

2. What is CBI?

CBI is defined as “the concurrent teaching of academic subject matter and second language skills” (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 2003, p. 2). It provides authentic, meaningful academic contexts aiming at developing both the language skill and subject-knowledge of the learners. In addition to CBI, some authors perceive that it also aims at improving the repertoire necessitated in the field of learning (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994). Butler (2005) elucidated that CBI facilitates learners in the process of negotiating meaning and practicing the productive language skills, which will help them to focus on forms as well as meaning. This is marked as “comprehensible input”, which is recommended as being an indispensable issue of CBI (Swain, 1985, 1993). CBI facilitates Cognitively-demanding tasks that, according to Cummins (1992), aid learners in attaining Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), which leads the learners to the overall academic success. The incorporated cognitive skills and learning strategies into CBI are also corroborated by a number of cognitive and educational theories in principle (Butler, 2005). He added that teachers use a wide range of instructional strategies that entail visual aids, conceptual maps, and analogies by which they purportedly generate meaningful and organized information. As a result, students can successfully enrich their knowledge by adding the new one to the prior one (e.g. Anderson, 1990; Armbruster, 1996). CBI, by providing learners with cognitively challenging content materials and tasks, privileges the students in a way that they can develop self-esteem and critical thought process. In a word, CBI, intrinsically like Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), with corroboration from a number of theories belongs to different academic aspects, with a view to boosting integrated development of learners required to achieve language proficiency and content knowledge.

2.1 CBI and Immersion

Highly influenced by Immersion Education is the content-based instruction, and Immersion Education implies the type of foreign language instruction, which theorizes that the medium of regular school curriculum is the foreign language (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Cenoz & Zarobe (2015) define immersion as type of CBI, and it is one of the familiar L2-medium programs. According to them it was introduced in 1960, Canada intending to assist the bulk of the language learners. So far, two types of immersion programs are designed - One-way immersion (OWI) and two-way immersion (TWI). OWI, as mentioned by Tedick & Wesely (2015), is designed for L1 speakers, and TWI is developed for learners who have heterogeneity in terms of language in the classroom.

2.2 CBI and CLIL, are they Different or Same?

To be the member of the global family, in the first hand, it is important to adapt the International Language (English) in the curriculum. For last 20-25 years, it evident that, worldwide universities have been experiencing the growing necessity to be internationalized, which is resulted from getting access to English language by using it as the medium of instruction, and this scenery prone to take place mostly in non-English speaking countries (Coleman, 2006; Ljosland, 2005). Some approaches are associated with emphasizing on both content and language in an integrated way, and usually get carried out by subject specialists or team teaching (Greere & Räsänen, 2008). CLIL is one of them. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), which has flourished in Europe since the 1990s as Dalton-Puffer (2007) reported, has been dubbed as “an educational approach where [content] subjects [.] are taught through the medium of a foreign language” to the learners belong to all educational levels (Dalton-Puffer, Nikula, & Smit, 2010, p. 1). The action of CBI is often regarded as Content and Language integrated learning because learners’ primary focus is the content and secondary target is the mastery of the language. Occasionally, some controversies arise regarding whether CBI and CLIL are same or different. CBI is used mostly in North American setting (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989) and practice of CLIL is found in Europe (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010; Ruiz de Zarobe & Jiménez Catalán, 2009).

Ground studies on CBI/CLIL programs all over the world, discussed by Cenoz (2014), look at the similarities and differences between the programs generated from their definition. She criticizes the idea of dubbing CLIL as a unique approach. Cenoz leads the discussion focusing on an example in a school in the Basque Country where the languages of instruction are Basque, Spanish and English, and where the learners are linguistically heterogeneous. No monolithic variation regarding the properties like languages of instruction, the language, societal and educational aims and the typical type of children taking part in these program exists between CBI/CLIL, according to her analyses; therefore, it is to be claimed that if variation occurs circumstantially, it is accidental. Learning the subject matters through medium of second or additional language is considered as Content-based Instruction (CBI) or Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) (Cenoz & Zarobe, 2014). Coyle, Hood & Marsh (2010) opine, CLIL is an educational approach where teaching and learning of both content and language are accomplished using an additional language, and it explicates that in the classroom focus is not only on the content, and not only on the language. Accumulation of both is prevailed in the classroom. In addition, some authors identified both terms synonymous (Ruiz de Zarobe, 2008, p. 61 footnote). In fine, it the bottom line can be drawn in this way that CBI and CLIL, in respect to their setting, aim and objective, contents, and implementation, are same.

3. CBI Contexts

Typically CBI is implemented in English programs, bilingual programs, foreign language programs, heritage language programs, and other programs across grade levels (Butler, 2005). Some programs focus on learners' language development (language-driven approaches) while others emphasize largely on aiding students to acquire the content knowledge by providing different types of cognitive and linguistic corroboration (content-driven approaches) (Met, 1998). Cenoz & Zarobe (2014) categorizes the pedagogical situations where CBI/CLIL is practiced as the following:

- A. Where the local languages are not used institutionally. This is due to the minor users and/or the lower status of the language. Speakers of Quechua in Peru or Nahuatl in Mexico are the worth example belong to this setting.
- B. Situation where spoken languages are not part of the curriculum of the host country. To mobilize socially people use these languages, and in these cases home languages are dissimilar to that of the host one. In particular, children comprised to this situation are Turkish speaking people living in Netherlands or Germany.
- C. This is typically English as a home language situation. Intending to get excellence in the language skill some subjects are taught through the local minority languages. Example lies on the English–Spanish dual immersion programs in the USA.
- D. This situation includes contexts where English is learned as a Foreign Language such as Austria or Sweden and in bilingual regions in areas where English is taught as a third language. Usually, languages of majority or minority people are used at school. That to attain a good job requires the excellence in the English language backs the institutions to teach some subjects in English.

Gallagher and Leahy (2014) refer situation B and C as 'immersion by default' and 'immersion by design' respectively. Situation in which schoolchildren have no access to their L1 at school and are taught in other languages such as English in the case of immigrant students in the UK and Ireland, German in Germany or English in the USA is marked as 'immersion by default'. 'Immersion by design', they indicate, implies that the school as a place to improve bi/multilingualism and that there is assistance for learners intending to language learning. This is applicable for situation D. Situation A, as Paran 2013 expounds, devised due to lack of choice, which is a common phenomenon in the educational systems in Africa, Asia and South America. It is worth mentioning that in such contexts native language is different from the academic language.

4. Principle of CBI

CBI intends primarily to the contents practiced in the classroom, and trivializes the active role of the teachers. Krahnke (1987) stated that little or no individual endeavor is given from the teachers' part to teach the language only, rather subject matter or course contents are to be taught in the target language.

Richards & Rodgers (2001) pointed out that one of the core principles of CBI is that, successful learning of second language takes place once it is learned during the acquisition of information, rather than triggering solely on the mastery of the language itself. The main focus on this regard is the content, which Brinton et al. & Wesche (1989) identified as 'point of departure' or 'organizing principle' the course. According to them, students' effective learning of language is determined by presenting it in the course materials in a meaningful and contextualized form with the secondary focus on the language itself while primary objective is to acquire the information from the contents. In the formal academic journey, second language proficiency is highly achieved when the goal is to gain the expertise of the content instead of the language (Scott 1974; Collier 1989; Grandin 1993; Wesche 1993). To assure the expected achievements in second or foreign language learning, as Richards and Rodgers (2001) suggested, learners learn language better once they find learning materials interesting, useful, and direct to reach the goal. Selection of the content should be done with the credibility. Advocates of CBI are with the view that, to make learning worthy the syllabus should consider the eventual uses will the learners make of the target language. Learners' 'morale' and as a consequence effective learning will be promoted if the informational contents (subject matters) are relevant. CBI tends to bring students under the umbrella of learning of the second or foreign language with success by establishing certain features those make learning feasible for them. As D'Anglejan & Tucker (1975) pointed, task is influential on the learning of second language, and it leads to the effective acquisition of learning once it is associated with communicating with someone regarding any relevant issue, which appears attractive to the students. In a word, selection of the content has a pivotal role to play in CBI because it determines the attitude, aptitude and motivation of the students towards learning, and promises the desired attainment at the end of the session.

4.1 Influential factors for CBI to be succeeded

Comprised factors affect the effectiveness of CBI are - lack of in-depth content knowledge (March, Hau, & Kong, 2000), insufficient attainment in L2 (Langman, 2003; Pica, 2002), increased anxiety for both teachers and students (Ryding & Stowasser, 1997), and the substantial investment of time and energy by both teachers and students that CBI requires (Stryker, 1997). The successful implementation of CBI seems to be determined by a number of factors including: (a) context and curriculum, (b) Characteristics of teachers, (c) Characteristics of learners, and (d) ample resources (Butler, 2005). In what follows, I will explicate these factors.

4.2 Context and Curriculum

The setting in which CBI gets implemented can be different depending on educational and social contexts, the role of students' L1 and the target language (TL) within the given society along with the support from both academy and community for language education (Butler, 2005). Accordingly, he added, variation takes place in terms of students' and teachers' needs, goals and expectation from CBI. Usually, CBI curricula vary when balancing the focus between

language and content. Different emphases in curricula influence the kind of syllabi, activities, and materials used in CBI, as well as assigning the role of pupils and the teachers in such education (Davison & Williams, 2001). This elicits that no isolated or pre-fixed stuffs (syllabi, material and notion of practicing those) exists in CBI. What to be followed is decided only after being cognizant about the particular aim or goal of the program.

4.3 Characteristics of the Teachers

In terms of language proficiency, generally two types of teachers conduct CBI programs – native and non-native speaking teachers of the target language. It has been seen that some CBI programs are taught by language teachers and content teachers lead the other ones. Successful implementation of CBI requires positive interaction between teachers and students. Without this, there is a greater possibility of the program being failed. Morris & Tarone (2003) stressed on the development of a meaningful and effective relationship between teachers and learners in second language acquisition while some identified indications that students in mainstream classes in ESL contexts impute a higher status to the content teachers than those of the language (e.g., Creese, 2002). Teamwork is perceived as the key determinants for successful CBI implementation, but Gilzow & Branaman (2000) found that assuring cooperation between language teachers and content teachers in a difficult task to accomplish. According to Leung (2001), different goals towards which two types of CBI teachers are heading to causes this complicacy. Several studies on CBI programs hypothesize some qualities of the teachers that lead to an effective implementation of CBI. Below are such ones:

- (i) Teachers' good command in English or the target language, which means not only are the teachers able to explain things but also have to perform it with proficiency;
- (ii) Teachers have to have wider idea about the content they are teaching in the class;
- (iii) Teachers' instructional strategies, which include strategies regarding the content and instruction;
- (iv) Teachers' expectation for student achievement as part of their attitude (Butler, 2005).

However, it is noteworthy that the actual relationship between the aforementioned qualities and students' performance is not well defined. But is true that teachers with these quality can boost teaching and learning in the classroom and robust in the adverse setting.

4.4 Teachers' Role

Stryker & Leaver (1993) cited in Richards & Rodgers (2001) elucidated that mentors in CBI is more than just efficient language teachers; they must have the in-depth knowledge about the subject matter and the ability to bring out knowledge from students. They suggest some required qualities of the teachers which lead the program meeting the success. Below is the list of those:

1. Teachers should have the ability bring the change of direction if needed.
2. They should have the ability to implement group work and team-building techniques.
3. They should have the ability to organize jigsaw reading arrangements.
4. They should have the ability to provide prior knowledge about particular topics and language skills required for learner success.
5. They should help students to form coping strategies.
6. They should execute the process approach in writing.
7. They should use the appropriate error correction techniques.
8. They should help students in developing and maintaining high level of enthusiasm.

These integrated skills of teachers determine the success of CBI/CLIL programs. The most these skills would be acquired by the teachers, more the probabilities of the successful implementation of CBI program.

4.5 Characteristics of the Students

Like teachers students also vary in terms of following facts:

- (i) Proficiency in the target language;
- (ii) Schemata about the content being discussed in the class;
- (iii) Learning strategies and styles they are familiar with;
- (iv) Age and level cognitive development; and
- (v) Aptitude, motivation and anxiety level (Butler, 2005).

Some people claim that content-based program is comparatively feasible for the learners belong to advance level than those of novice. Klee and Tedick (1997) admitted the fact that, students with low proficiency, in their college level content-based foreign language immersion program, compare to Intermediate-High ACTFL, went through "extreme frustration" (p. 155), performed poorly, found it difficult to survive and left the program. However, this scenario does not connote that CBI does not entail students at the beginning-level of language (Stryker & Leaver, 1997), rather meaning that they are unwilling to perform well if language proficiency, prior knowledge, degree of development. and learning styles do not comply to the curriculum and instruction provided in CBI program having dubiousness (Butler, 2005). Thus, the curriculum and classroom instruction should be presented in a way that students with versatile characteristics can easily extract what they are supposed to do, and head towards that.

4.6 Learners' role

“Learning by doing” underpins CBI (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). This, according to them, presupposes the active role of the students to be performed in several phases. They also stated that not only should the learners get them ready psychologically but also mentally for CBI. One of the goals of CBI, as discussed by Richards & Rodgers (2001), is to establish learners' autonomy. Stryker & Leaver (1993) elicited the reason behind this by stating that autonomy leads the learners to be cognizant about their own learning process so that they can authorize their own learning. In addition, CBI students are expected to corroborate each other in the classroom (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). They also believe that learners should interact passionately in the classroom and should interpret input. They should maintain the patience to tolerate the uncertain things usually take place during learning and seek diversified interpretations presented by their peers. Learners are not assumed to act only like the typical ones. Instead, unlike other approaches, students are bestowed the authority in choosing learning contents. This motivates learners in the prolonged journey of education and directs them to reach their goal.

4.7 Resource Availability

Resources are other determinants that facilitate effective implementation of CBI. In an educational program, teachers, learners, materials and classroom equipments etc. are exclusively considered as resources. Butler (2005) identified some important resources that include: (a) a good collaboration among teachers, administrative staff, parents and community, (b) allocation of required time and money, and (c) readiness for text book and other kind of materials. A number of studies conducted in CBI setting emphasize the importance of academic collaboration and corroboration, and both financial and human assistance for the program (Gilzow & Branaman, 2000; Stryker & Leaver, 1997). Butler (2005) admitted the fact that it is not always possible to prepare authentic materials that meet both the linguistic and cognitive needs of the learners and their interest. Hardly in EFL contexts, do the materials provide ease to the learners. This is because of importing textbooks that have rare match to the local curricula or national education policy. Students are far too unfamiliar to such kind of authentic ones. What is effective in this regard as Sternfeld (1997) suggested, as part of readiness teachers can ask students to go through the background of a given text in L1.

5. Potential impact of CBI/CLIL

Studies have been conducted to know the potential outcome of CBI or CLIL. But it is noteworthy that, such investigations mostly took place in contexts where CLIL is practiced. Studies conducted in the context of USA and CANADA are mainly product oriented and notify that maximum students enrolling in immersion programs are learning several school subjects through the medium of L2, which results in achieving a greater degree of command in the second language at no cost to proficiency in the L1 or academic knowledge (Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013; Tedick & Wesely, 2015). The principle of CBI connotes that students should be given input through their target language with greater priority on content itself rather than the language. By settling this in the pedagogy CBI facilitate meaningful learning of both information and language. Baker (2011) stated, the more exposure to L2 is provided, the more mastery in learning takes place, and same scenario is found every part in the world where it is practiced. However, it is to be considered that students taking part in CLIL classrooms do not attain the mastery of L1 to use it in productive skills. The fact admitted regarding this is that students belong to these programs achieve a good command in the receptive skills but encounter problems with grammatical accuracy and sociolinguistic competence when writing and speaking (Tedick & Wesely 2015). After having an exploration on several studies Cenoz & Zarobe (2015) state that mastery over the second or additional language is the outcome while the learning of content and development of the first language occurs simultaneously. In one of their papers namely “A review of research on content-based foreign/second language education in US K-12 contexts”, Tedic & Wesely (2015) unearth the results of a specific type of CBI: immersion programs in primary and secondary schools in the USA. Focusing both on one-way immersion designated for English L1 speakers and two-way immersion emerged to serve the purposes of heterogeneous classes where both English L1 and English L2 students are participating, they found that students belong to both groups are succeeded in academic subjects. Not only this, as they demonstrate, students of immersion programs also improve their cross-cultural competence. Most studies on the outcome of immersion programs in Canada and USA accord these results. Another admitted fact is that students enrolling in secondary and tertiary education such as CLIL are optimistic regarding such learning experience (Aguilar & Rodriguez, 2012; Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2014; Llinares & Dafouz, 2010; Lorenzo et al., 2010). This is due to diversification in terms of choosing materials for teaching as during the selection of the topics the academicians prioritize the interest of the learners. Other research evidence, students accentuate the reality that compare to the other approaches of teaching CBI, in particular, induce teachers to organize teaching stuffs with greater care so that those can lead the learners to manage desired proficiency, and this kind of effort from teachers' part is very unlikely in other approaches of teaching (Aguilar & Rodriguez, 2012; Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2014; Llinares & Dafouz, 2010; Lorenzo et al., 2010). Thus students are seen enthusiastic in learning to reach the edge of expertise that are destined for. As Doiz et al. (2014) fortifies the fact that challenges thrown by CLIL please the students to a greater extent. This catalyzes the aptitude and morale of the learners to penetrate contents associated with difficulty. She exemplifies that, in terms of writing, students initially experience difficulty, and thus they do not like it but when they manage to produce plenty of writing, such achievement makes them feel proud and pleased. That CLIL tend to offer another privileges are the activities that necessitate the engagement of the students, and students are kind of partial to tasks where they can interact and collaborate actively, and to serve this purpose entail less use of textbooks (Coyle, 2013; Doiz et al., 2014). So teachers, as mentioned earlier, have to work hard for designing materials to facilitate effective classroom activities. Many studies reveal the fact that

CLIL is effective for foreign or second language learning. The investigations conducted in Europe expose that in terms of foreign language development CLIL offers outstanding results (Dalton-Puffer, 2011; de Graaff, Koopman, Anikina, & Westhoff, 2007; Lasagabaster, 2008, 2011; Lorenzo et al., 2010). In addition, research conducted in Spanish context has delivered the similar indication of success by generating the information that CLIL students preponderate their non-CLIL peers when they are compared to each other regarding language expertise and measures. In terms of the measurement of academic achievement administered in English, several studies reported that proper application of US one-way language immersion (OWI) and two-way language immersion (TWI) programs indicates that students participated in these programs perform better than their non-immersion peers (Downs-Reid, 2000; Essama, 2007; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006; Padilla, Fan, Xu, & Silva, 2013; Thomas, Collier, & Collier, 2011). CLIL students, in particular, seem to do intensively well in listening and speaking skills, and organization skills as Naves & Victori (2010); Lasagabaster & de Zarobe (2010) asserted, vocabulary acquisition (Feixas, Cod_o, Couso, Espinet, & Masats, 2009; Marquez, 2007; Catal_an & de Zarobe, 2009), and word association (Moreno, 2009). Furthermore, successful implementation of CLIL results in the achievement of positive cognitive gains such as the improvement in the students' L1, as contained in cross-sectional and longitudinal studies by Lorenzo et al. (2010). Duration of the course has an influence on determining the positive outcome of CLIL. Lasagabaster & Doiz (2016) endorse, learners' achievement of certain skills are connected to the extension period of time allocated to them. The observation done by Ramirez-Vergudo, Alonso and Vinas cited in Linares & Dafouz (2010) explicates that teachers belong to the primary level provided 40% time to listening, 26% in speaking, 18% in reading and 16% in writing. Coyle (2013) strengthens this by arguing for, adequate time allocation to develop skill such as writing is a prerequisite, and therefore its implication assures students' performance being highly improved. Although duration of CLIL is one of the determining factors of the success of CLIL, certainly, it is not certified by the researchers, in fact, according to them, the role of duration to gain positive results is questionable. Apprehended by Aguilar & Rodriguez (2012) is the ambiguity whether extended exposure or CLIL solely benefits the learners, but they perceive that the expansion of the exposure is partly facilitating the success. In her one of the hypotheses, Cenoz (2013) drew that if learners are facilitated with plenty of EFL classes, they would be likely to attain almost equal development as their peers in CLIL. According to her, the barrier is that schools lack sufficient time to spend on learning English as an individual subject; therefore, to foster learning schools can introduce contents on English and teaching them by following CLIL approach. Based on the proposition by Dornyei and Ushioda (2011) implies the fact that the way learners perceive themselves and others and the way they evaluate their achievement in a specific L2 learning context will have a momentous influence on foreign language learning. This statement is made regarding learning foreign language learning contexts. However, Lasagabaster & Doiz (2016) are of the view that this scheme can be applied to CLIL classes. The distinctive studies on students' self perception reports have illustrated that learners of primary and tertiary level hold similar perceptions about their progression of both the receptive and productive skills and language area (Lasagabaster, 2014). Students of all levels, in particular, have registered their rank of their progression where vocabulary topped the rank, and pronunciation, speaking, reading, writing, grammar owned their position consecutively in the rank as Dafouz, Nunez, Sancho, & Foran (2007) mentioned for the results of tertiary level, and Ramirez-Vergudo, Alonso, and Vinas (in Linares & Dafouz, 2010) for primary education. CLIL facilitate some additional advantages for which learners are so gravitated to this. By assuring those advantages, in a large scale, CLIL flourish learning. The increase in the learners' self-confidence and a decrease in the reticence to get more exposure to the language are such advantages as noted by Dalton-Puffer et al. (2009, p. 21). CLIL privileges students to express their learning experience, and it is to be noted that being cognizant about learners' opinion can be an asset Lasagabaster & Doiz (2016).

5.1 Shortcoming of CBI/CLIL

Although a bunch of advantages to foster learning lies on CBI/CLIL, neither of them are not free from some shortcomings. The goal of such programs is to develop mastery of the content, which is correlated to attaining the mastery of the language. But when it comes to the reality, it shows the reverse scenario. It is found in practice that apart from triggering on certain terminology pedagogically, CLIL may have ambiguity in targeting at language learning goals (Dalton-Puffer, 2011). CLIL does not have overt emphasis on teaching grammar. This happens because of several identical factors. For the first, as Fortaner (2010) mentioned, teachers in CLIL suffer from short of potential training, which is a prerequisite of the successful implementation of any educational program. Teachers hold the perception that by attending classes conducted in English, learners will have the command in foreign language naturally (van der Walt, 2013). Secondly, complicity is associated with the selecting procedures of course content. Lorenzo, Casal, & Moore (2010) identified, lack of doable materials is responsible in this respect. Finally, according to Huttner (2013), the deployed activities of the teachers and students are creating hindrance, and stakeholders such as researchers and policy-makers are not made cognizant about these. In addition to these, the conventional thought of both teachers and students plays an unconstructive role for not having a pragmatic teaching and learning of grammar. Coyle (2013) stated that students' goal is to get the exposure of the language regardless of accuracy. Carrying the same perception in their mind, teachers are less likely to discuss grammatical rules in the classroom. So grammar, core of a language, is not addressed properly in the CLIL/CBI classrooms. It is also elicited that in CLIL classrooms speaking and writing are widely emphasized; perhaps, this is one of the reasons for students not being engaged to learning grammar. The downside of CLIL, as Dalton-Puffer et al. (2009, p. 24) figured out, is that students criticize the notion of focusing solely on speaking and reading in CLIL classes with writing being perceived as less important, despite the magnitude they feel associated with being skilled in writing to serve professional purposes such as writing reports, memorandum etc.

5.2 Instructional problems in CLIL/CBI

Teachers determine the successful implementation of any educational program and can often compensate for the low-quality contents (Richards, 2003). Required is intensive training to be proficient mentor. Teaching approach like CLIL/CBI or immersion programs necessitates potential teachers. Freeman (1998) revealed that in US immersion programs, it is difficult to recruit efficient bilingual teachers who have the expertise to teach language and content simultaneously. For most of the US immersion teachers, pre-service preparation or in-house training intended to language and content integration is not as beneficial. Some studies are conducted to uncover insight of how immersion teachers compensate content and language instruction Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Fortune, Tedick, & Walker, 2008), and how the typical Foreign Language teachers perceive CBI and what is their preparation for the classroom. That the reflection of the teaching expertise, Stryker & Leaver had considered highly required for mentors, had been relegated in the classrooms. Teachers did not follow the process approaches to flourish students' writing skills. Besides, they were unlikely to correct the students' error. As being mentioned, teachers emphasize fluency over accuracy. Learners felt the need of learning grammar and being the master over writing. But teachers failed to initiate changes of direction. Teachers have to make students accustomed to the challenges by providing them some strategic platforms. However, lack of this derailed students. Dalton-Puffer et al. (2009) reported that a decline in the learners' attendance in the classroom might have derived from the fear of English. The plausibly depicted problems arose from different contexts were due to the dubiousness from the instructors' part resulted from not being well-trained and aware of their responsibilities. Cammarata and Tedick (2012), in a phenomenological study, stated the fact that a big challenge encountered by both OWI and TWI immersion teachers lies on the balancing of language and content. That teachers fight strongly to be both the language and content instructor and experience ambiguity regarding which features to present in the classroom. This puzzle is intrinsic when the teachers are about to integrate content and language; thus researchers suggest to arrange in-house training for the teachers on how to integrate language and content to overcome that hurdle. In addition, it is to be illuminated that these are the areas of opportunities, which after being attained assure the successful implementation of CBI/CLIL.

Whatever tagline do the programs contain, CBI/CLIL got introduced to serve a great purpose to the students who are about to learn second and foreign language. Either of these offers learner-centered classroom. Handy teachers can highly participate to assure the programs' success by taking part in preparing feasible materials for learners to lead them meaningfully get access to these.

6. Recommendation and Conclusion

The recent research in the field of Second Language Education has been flourishing, so does the CBI/CLIL and its implication in language teaching. However, the development also leaving gap in the research and practice of the field (Rahman & Pandian, 2016). According to Rahman and Pandian (2016) sufficient support and assistance e.g. professional development, opportunity for classroom or action research, more research oriented in-service training of the teachers' should be given to the teachers from the educational institution and the government. Teachers' should have their liberty to take decision for the sake of better teaching and learning, allowing them to take part in the selection of the contents, and provide payments within stipulated time period, all kinds of support should be given to the instructors. These will help to develop the morale of the teachers. Butler (2005) illuminated that, not only do the content teachers require a good command in English but also need a greater degree of knowledge about language improvement and usage. He added that they have to be cognizant about learners' proficiency level and language learning strategies. Similarly, he mentioned, language teachers intending to use CBI must be ornamented with the content knowledge to facilitate learning. However, such qualified teachers are absent in many East Asian EFL contexts. Teacher education program can solve this problem. CBI/CLIL oriented programs should be monitored by the related authorities. Multidimensional problems may arise while implementing this. The execution of skilled monitoring can facilitate the useful learning in CBI programs. Nevertheless, it helps to identify the problems, which by taking initiatives can easily be solved. Problem may arise from not understanding the instruction given by the teacher clearly or students' of interest to learn or teachers' lack of knowledge regarding the content or irrelevance between the goal and practiced content. These can lead to the inhibition of motivation and aptitude of the learners. The most controversy results from the accumulation of content and language. Butler (2005) elucidated that although it is difficult to distinguish language and content, some evaluations should be done to understand whether lack of language ability or lack of prior knowledge is responsible for students' low performance. In addition, CBI classes are conducted in the target language. But students in EFL setting lack necessitated command to deal with content, and they are likely to use L1 to understand the content. It is a matter of concern as the primary focus of the curriculum here is to attain mastery over foreign language. The monitoring should also focus on whether teachers fail to encourage or motivate students to learn things using foreign language along with language itself or teachers themselves lack the required command in English. The materials and tasks prepared for classroom practice should also be scrutinized to check whether they suit the students' interest. If any problem from any phase is sorted out, the authority can initiate to solve the problem. Not only this, such monitoring can help thrive the programs in future.

Reference

- Aguilar, M., & Rodríguez, R. (2012). Lecturer and student perceptions on CLIL at a Spanish university. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(2), 183-197.
- Anderson, J. R. (1990). *Cognitive psychology and its implications*. WH Freeman/Times Books/Henry Holt & Co.
- Armbruster, B. B. (1986). Schema theory and the design of content-area textbooks. *Educational Psychologist*, 21(4), 253-267.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (Vol. 79). Multilingual matters.
- Brinton, D. M., M. A. Snow, & M. B. Wesche. (1989). *Content-based Second Language Instruction*. New York: Newbury House.
- Brinton, D., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*.
- Bruton, A. (2011). Is CLIL so beneficial, or just selective? Re-evaluating some of the research. *System*, 39(4), 523-532.
- Catalán, R. M. J., & De Zarobe, Y. R. (2009). The receptive vocabulary of EFL learners in two instructional contexts: CLIL versus non-CLIL instruction. *Content and language integrated learning: Evidence from research in Europe*, 81-92.
- Cammarata, L., & Tedick, D. J. (2012). Balancing content and language in instruction: The experience of immersion teachers. *The Modern Language Journal*, 96(2), 251-269.
- Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language teaching*, 39(01), 1-14.
- Cammarata, L. (2010). Foreign language teachers' struggle to learn content-based instruction. *L2 Journal*, 2(1).
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Caldas, S. J., & Boudreaux, N. (1999). Poverty, Race, and Foreign Language Immersion: Predictors of Math and English Language Arts Performance. *Learning Languages*, 5(1), 4-15.
- Cenoz, J. (2013). Discussion: Towards an educational perspective in CLIL language policy and pedagogical practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 389-394.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 356-369.
- Coyle, D. (2013). Listening to learners: an investigation into 'successful learning' across CLIL contexts. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 244-266.
- Creese, A. (2002). The discursive construction of power in teacher partnerships: Language and subject specialists in mainstream schools. *Tesol Quarterly*, 36(4), 597-616.
- Cummins, J. (1992). Language proficiency, bilingualism, and academic achievement. In P. Richard-Amato & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *The multicultural classroom: Readings for content-area teachers* (pp. 16-26). New York: Longman.
- Collier, V. P. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL quarterly*, 23(3), 509-531.
- Davison, C., & Williams, A. (2001). Integrating language and content: Unresolved issues. *English as a second language in the mainstream: Teaching, learning and identity*, 51-70.
- Dafouz, E., Núñez, B., Sancho, C., & Foran, D. (2007). Integrating CLIL at the tertiary level: teachers' and students' reactions. *Diverse Contexts-converging goals. CLIL in Europe. Frankfurt: Peter Lang*, 91-101.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms* (Vol. 20). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles?. *Annual Review of applied linguistics*, 31, 182-204.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T., & Smit, U. (2010). Charting policies, premises and research on content and language integrated learning. *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*, 7, 1-19.
- D'Anglejan, A., & Tucker, G. R. (1975). THE ACQUISITION OF COMPLEX ENGLISH STRUCTURES BY ADULT LEARNERS1. *Language Learning*, 25(2), 281-296.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Hüttner, J., Schindelegger, V., & Smit, U. (2009). Technology-geeks speak out: What students think about vocational CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(2), 17-26.
- De Graaff, R., Jan Koopman, G., Anikina, Y., & Westhoff, G. (2007). An observation tool for effective L2 pedagogy in content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 603-624.
- De Zarobe, Y. R. (2013). CLIL implementation: From policy-makers to individual initiatives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 231-243.

- De Zarobe, Y. R., & Cataln, R. M. A. J. N. (Eds.). (2009). *Content and language integrated learning: Evidence from research in Europe* (Vol. 41). Multilingual Matters.
- De Zarobe, Y. R., & Lasagabaster, D. (Eds.). (2010). *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (Eds.). (2014). *Motivation and Foreign Language Learning: From Theory to Practice*.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Downs-Reid, D. (2000). Using English achievement data to promote immersion education. *The ACIE Newsletter*, 3(2), 1-4.
- Essama, L., & Schools, P. G. C. P. (2007). Total immersion programs: Assessment data demonstrate achievement in reading and math. *The ACIE Newsletter*, 11, 1-8.
- Espinosa, S. M. (2009). Young learners' L2 word association responses in two different learning contexts. *Content and language integrated learning: Evidence from research in Europe*, 93-111.
- Fortune, T. W., Tedick, D. J., & Walker, C. L. (2008). Integrated language and content teaching: Insights from the immersion classroom. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 66, 71.
- Feixas, M., Codó, E., Couso, D., Espinet, M., & Masats, D. (2009). Enseñar en inglés en la universidad: Reflexiones del alumnado y el profesorado en torno a dos experiencias AICLE [Teaching English at the university: Student and teacher reflections on two CLIL experiences]. *Investigar desde un contexto educativo innovador*, 137-153.
- Fortanet-Gómez, I. (2010). Training CLIL teachers for the university. *CLIL in Spain: Implementations, Results and Teacher Training*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 257-276.
- Gallagher, F., & Leahy, A. (2014). The feel good factor: comparing immersion by design and immersion by default models. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 27(1), 58-71.
- Gilzow, D. F., & Branaman, L. E. (2000). *Lessons Learned: Model Early Foreign Language Programs*. Professional Practice Series. Delta Systems Company Inc., 1400 Miller Parkway, McHenry, IL 60050-7030; 800-323-8270; <http://www.delta-sytems.com>.
- Grandin, J. (1993). The University of Rhode Island International Engineering Program. In M. Krueger and F. Ryan (eds.), *Language and Content*. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath. 57-79.
- Genesee, F., & Lindholm-Leary, K. (2013). Two case studies of content-based language education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(1), 3-33.
- Greere, A., & Räsänen, A. (2008). Report on the LANQUA Subproject on Content and Language Integrated Learning: Redefining CLIL—Towards Multilingual Competence. *Recuperado de http://www.lanqua.eu/files/Year1Report_CLIL_ForUpload_WithoutAppendices_0.pdf*.
- Hüttner, J., Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). The power of beliefs: lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 267-284.
- Haj-Broussard, M. (2002). Perceptions, Interactions and Immersion: A Cross-Comparative Case Study of African-American Students' Experiences in a French Immersion Context and a Regular Education Context.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Addison-Wesley Longman Ltd.
- Krahnke, K. (1987). *Approaches to Syllabus Design for Foreign Language Teaching*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Klee, C. A., & Tedick, D. J. (1997). The undergraduate foreign language immersion program in Spanish at the University of Minnesota. *Content-based instruction in foreign language education: Models and methods*, 141-173.
- Kong, S. (2012). Content-Based Instruction: What Can We Learn from Content-Trained Teachers' and Language-Trained Teachers' Pedagogies?(Enhanced). *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66(Supplement 1), S233-S267.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 89-112.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2008). Foreign language competence in content and language integrated courses. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 1(1).
- Lasagabaster, D. (2011). English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), 3-18.
- Llinares, A., & Dafouz, E. (2010). Content and language integrated programs in the Madrid region: Overview and research findings. *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 95-113.
- Llinares, A., Morton, T., & Whittaker, R. (2012). *The roles of language in CLIL*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lorenzo, F., Casal, S., & Moore, P. (2010). The effects of content and language integrated learning in European education: Key findings from the Andalusian bilingual sections evaluation project. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 418-

442.

Lorenzo, F., Casal, S., & Moore, P. (2010). The effects of content and language integrated learning in European education: Key findings from the Andalusian bilingual sections evaluation project. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 418-442.

Lorenzo, F., Casal, S., & Moore, P. (2010). The effects of content and language integrated learning in European education: Key findings from the Andalusian bilingual sections evaluation project. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 418-442.

Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach* (Vol. 18). John Benjamins Publishing.

Ljosland, R. (2005, September). Norway's misunderstanding of the Bologna process: when internationalisation becomes Anglicisation. In *conference Bi-and Multilingual Universities: Challenges and Future Prospects*. Helsinki University (Vol. 13).

Leung, C. (2001). Evaluation of content-language learning in the mainstream classroom. In B. Mohan, C. Leung, & C. Davison (Eds.), *English as a second language in the mainstream: Teaching learning and identity* (pp. 177-198). New York: Longman.

Llinares, A., & Dafouz, E. (2010). Content and language integrated programs in the Madrid region: Overview and research findings. *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 95-113.

Lasagabaster, D. (2014). Chapter eight: Content versus language teacher: How are CLIL students affected? *Utrecht Studies in Language and Communication*, 28, 123.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Borsato, G. (2006). Academic achievement. In F. Genesee, K. J. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners* (pp. 176-222). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Langman, J. (2003). The Effects of ESL-trained content-area teachers: reducing middle school students to incidental language learners.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Block, N. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low SES/Hispanic dual language schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(1), 43-60.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education* (Vol. 28). Multilingual Matters.

Met, M. (1998). Curriculum decision-making in content-based language teaching. *Multilingual Matters*, 35-63.

Marsh, H., Hau, K. T., & Kong, C. K. (2000). Late immersion and language of instruction in Hong Kong high schools: Achievement growth in language and nonlanguage subjects. *Harvard Educational Review*, 70(3), 302-347.

Martin-Beltrán, M. (2014). "What do you want to say?" How adolescents use translanguaging to expand learning opportunities. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8(3), 208-230.

Morris, F. A., & Tarone, E. E. (2003). Retracted: Impact of Classroom Dynamics on the Effectiveness of Recasts in Second Language Acquisition. *Language Learning*, 53(2), 325-368.

Navés, T., & Victori, M. (2010). CLIL in Catalonia: An overview of research studies. *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training*, 30-54. New York, NY: Newbury House.

Paran, A. (2013). Content and language integrated learning: Panacea or policy borrowing myth?. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(2), 317-342.

Pessoa, S., Hendry, H., Donato, R., Tucker, G. R., & Lee, H. (2007). Content-based instruction in the foreign language classroom: A discourse perspective. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(1), 102-121.

Padilla, A. M., Fan, L., Xu, X., & Silva, D. (2013). A Mandarin/English two-way immersion program: Language proficiency and academic achievement. *Foreign Language Annals*, 46(4), 661-679.

Pica, T. (2002). Subject-matter content: How does it assist the interactional and linguistic needs of classroom language learners?. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(1), 1-19.

Rahman, M. M., & Pandian, A. (2016). The Gap between Research and Practice in the Field of SLA: The Rationale behind It and Bridging the Gap. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(3), 162-172.

Richards, J. (2003). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1987). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2008). CLIL and foreign language learning: A longitudinal study in the Basque Country. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(1), 60-73.

Ryding, K., & Stowasser, B. (1997). Text development for content-based instruction in Arabic. In S. B. Stryker & B. L. Leaver (Eds.), *Content-based instruction in foreign language education* (pp. 107-118). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. *Input in second language acquisition*, 15, 165-179.
- Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *Canadian modern language review*, 50(1), 158-164.
- Stryker, S. B., & Leaver, B. L. (1997). Content-based instruction: Some lessons and implications. *Content-based instruction in foreign language education: Models and methods*, 285-312.
- Sternfeld, S. R. (1997). Caterpillars into Butterflies: Content-based instruction in a first year Italian course. *Content-based instruction in foreign language education: Models and methods*, 56-77.
- Stryker, S. B. (1997). The Mexico experiment at the Foreign Service Institute. *Content-based instruction in foreign language education: Models and methods*, 177-202.
- Scott, S. (1974). A note on the relationship between English proficiency, years of language study and medium of instruction. *Language Learning*, 24, 99-104
- Tedick, D. J., & Wesely, P. M. (2015). A review of research on content-based foreign/second language education in US K-12 contexts. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(1), 25-40.
- Thomas, W., Collier, V., & Collier, K. (2011). *English learners in North Carolina, 2010*. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. Retrieved from http://esl.ncwiseowl.org/resources/dual_language/
- Van der Walt, C. (2013). *Multilingual higher education: Beyond English medium orientations* (Vol. 91). Multilingual Matters.
- Vázquez, G. (2007). Models of CLIL: An evaluation of its status drawing on the German experience. A critical report on the limits of reality and perspectives. *Revista española de lingüística aplicada*, (1), 95-112.
- Wegner, A. (2012). Seeing the bigger picture: What students and teachers think about CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(4), 29-35.
- Wesche, M. (1993). Discipline-based approaches to language study: Research issues and outcomes. In M. Krueger and F. Ryan (eds.), *Language and Content*. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath. 80-95.