

## Book Review

*Sotiria Pappa, University of Jyväskylä*

*Sylvén, L. K. (2019). Investigating Content and Language Integrated Learning. Insights from Swedish High Schools. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters. ISBN-13: 978-1-78892-241-8 (hbk), ISBN-13: 978-1-78892-240-1 (pbk)*

This edited volume presents a three-year research project on Content and Language Integration in Swedish Schools (CLISS). CLISS particularly focused on sciences and economics programs in upper secondary schools (Grades 10-12; 245 participants), which intend to prepare students for higher education. Divided into five sections, the book explores the language, rather than content, side of CLIL. The volume starts with background information concerning CLISS and CLIL in Sweden. The following four sections of the book concern assessment and motivation (Chapters 4-5); English vocabulary, reading comprehension and exposure to English (Chapters 6-9); students' L1 proficiency and development through CLIL (Chapters 10-13); and students' and teachers' views and experiences in CLIL (Chapters 14-16). The volume concludes with an epilogue by the editor, which discusses issues raised by the project findings and makes suggestions for future research and CLIL implementation.

In Chapter 1, Liss Kerstin Sylvén first describes the education system, CLIL and English in Sweden, before presenting an overview of CLISS. Following this introductory chapter, BethAnne Paulsrud presents the scope and extent of CLIL in Sweden in more detail. After succinctly presenting the findings of the 1999 and 2000 Swedish National Agency for Education's (Agency) reports, the author reports on the 2012 CLISS survey. The latter survey foregrounds the CLISS studies by mapping the current situation of CLIL in Swedish upper secondary schools and comparing it to the previous Agency reports. The author argues this comparison gave rise to three issues, namely the seeming increase in Partial or Occasional CLIL, the focus on English at the expense of other foreign languages, and school personnel's lack of understanding of the concept of CLIL. With the Agency's latest report reflecting the 2012 CLISS results, the author stresses the importance of a standard, commonly accepted definition and practice of CLIL.

Further foregrounding the CLISS project, Britt-Marie Apelgren presents results from a 2011 questionnaire study focusing on some of the important student background factors during the CLISS participants' first term. The author argues that exposure to languages, learning other languages, and extramural English may advance language skills and proficiency. However, these factors in conjunction with the benefits and language skills students perceive positively

---

Corresponding author's email: [sotiria.s.pappa@jyu.fi](mailto:sotiria.s.pappa@jyu.fi)

ISSN: 1457-9863

Publisher: Centre for Applied Language Studies

University of Jyväskylä

© 2019: The authors

<http://apples.jyu.fi>

<http://dx.doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201905092525>

may not necessarily translate into high academic and language performance. Moreover, she argues that the parents' educational background is influential regarding choosing CLIL classes, thus supporting the notion of CLIL as selective of students with a stronger academic and socio-economic background.

In Chapter 4, Helena Reierstam and Liss Kerstin Sylvén present a study on upper secondary school teachers' attitudes to assessment. The authors draw on data from interviews, questionnaires and teachers' written assessment design, and focus on teachers of biology, history and English as a foreign language (EFL). Arguing for assessment as an integral part of education (see also Gablasova, 2014), the chapter reports on whether course content and language assessment practices differ depending on the language of instruction. The authors stress the importance of creating a CLIL curriculum with a specific agenda for target language learning outcomes, training teachers in CLIL methodology, and shifting to a view of language as a carrier of subject-specific content.

The following chapter by Amy S. Thompson and Liss Kerstin Sylvén presents a longitudinal study on motivation. Examining CLIL and non-CLIL students, the study investigates whether motivation changed over time and whether boys or girls showed significant change in motivation in the three years of the study (see also Kobayashi, 2002; Lasagabaster, 2011; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009; Meece, Glienke, & Burg, 2006). The authors explain their results and argue that students who choose CLIL classes show higher motivation and more dynamicity in their motivational profile than their non-CLIL counterparts. They conclude with suggestions for research on motivation in relation to foreign languages other than English and longitudinal research in contexts where exposure to English is limited.

Chapter 6 touches on the topic of students' proficiency and progress in English receptive vocabulary (see also Admiraal, Westhoff, & de Bot, 2006; Ruiz de Zarobe & Jiménez Catalán, 2009). Understanding receptive vocabulary to include the dimensions of form, meaning and use in speech and/or writing dimensions, Liss Kerstin Sylvén and Sölve Ohlander discuss receptive vocabulary in light of commonly used tests and CLIL learning contexts. Based on data from a twice-administered Vocabulary Levels Test and statistical analysis, this study highlights the need for more challenging teaching and learning in CLIL, but also attention to more difficult frequency levels and academically-oriented vocabulary for CLIL and non-CLIL students alike. The authors argue the importance of longitudinal studies that provide baseline data on students' proficiency levels prior to CLIL classes in order to avoid an overly positive picture of CLIL.

The comparison between CLIL and non-CLIL students continues in Chapter 7, in which Eva Olsson and Liss Kerstin Sylvén examine the impact CLIL may have on the development of their productive English vocabulary, i.e. writing proficiency (see also Dalton-Puffer, Nikula, & Smit, 2010; Olsson, 2015). This study draws on writing assignments on topics related to the natural and social sciences, focusing on general features (text length, word length, variation of vocabulary) as well as general and academic productive vocabulary. The reported results suggest that, although CLIL students were at an advantage in the beginning of the study, their use of academic vocabulary had not increased more than that of their non-CLIL peers after three years. The authors discuss this unexpected finding and argue that CLIL students should be challenged more in their productive language use, while subject content instruction should focus more explicitly on vocabulary.

Liss Kerstin Sylvén and Sölve Ohlander contribute to the two previous chapters by examining CLIL and non-CLIL students' reading comprehension (e.g., Alderson, 2000). Using tests from the Swedish Scholastic Assessment Test, the authors argue that CLIL in general is beneficial when exposure to written English is extensive, while EFL classes may also contribute to non-CLIL students' progress in reading comprehension. Yet, CLIL students reached higher levels than non-CLIL ones. The chapter concludes with suggestions for instruction and research.

Chapter 9 addresses exposure to the target language outside the school context, i.e. extramural English (EE) (e.g., Reinders, 2012). Positioning her study among literature on the effect of EE on L2/FL learners, Liss Kerstin Sylvén statistically analyzes empirical data from a twice-administered language diary and examines six categories: reading, speaking, writing, listening, digital gaming and other. Given CLIL participants' significant exposure to EE, the author argues for its importance, especially for general vocabulary, and suggests CLIL and EFL teachers include students' EE activities in the classroom, while continuing to support students' academic language proficiency.

Shifting the focus to Swedish as the language with reduced curriculum time, Chapter 10 compares CLIL and non-CLIL students' appropriation of a general academic vocabulary of Swedish. Per Holmberg presents two studies, which used the Swedish Academic World List and ideational grammatical metaphors respectively to distinguish Swedish general academic vocabulary in students' texts from the same corpus. He, then, compares and discusses the results of these studies, suggesting CLIL models aim at integrating content and language with multilingualism, rather than solely one target language, in mind.

Chapter 11 focuses on linguistic correctness. Maria Lim Falk draws on students' written exploratory-type assignments and uses error analysis to examine orthography, grammar, phraseology, word choice, semantics and stylistics. The chapter discusses linguistic correctness as part of literacy in the Swedish curriculum and the development of L1 in CLIL as a topic little researched. Against this background, the study and its results are reported, concluding with an argument for supporting academic language competence and other aspects of the L1 in order to advance bilingual proficiency through CLIL.

Chapter 12 concentrates on academic language proficiency in Swedish. The study presented by Sophie Johansson and Elisabeth Ohlsson uses corpus linguistic methods and lexical profiling to look at 520 CLIL and non-CLIL students' texts over a three-year period. In addition to reporting on the statistical analysis of the two student groups, the chapter presents a qualitative analysis of two students' texts. The authors conclude that no increase in student groups' characteristics features in their writing was observed and stress the importance of language in subject-related tasks.

Chapter 13 continues with a discussion on Swedish receptive vocabulary, focusing particularly on L2 Swedish students in CLIL classes. Inger Lindberg and Sophie Johansson draw on the field of L2 vocabulary development and use three vocabulary tests to assess students' receptive lexical knowledge. The vocabulary data is explored in relation to language background (L1/L2 Swedish), CLIL or non-CLIL instruction, parents' educational background and gender. Based on the findings, the authors conclude that English CLIL in conjunction with relevant instruction in L2 Swedish may offer L2 Swedish students a more favorable and equitable learning environment than Swedish-medium programs.

In Chapter 14, Tore Otterup examines four multilingual students' reasons for choosing English-medium instruction, their perception of school and education, and their future plans. The results from the questionnaire, participant observations, and interviews are discussed in light of power relations in the classroom and English as a language with high symbolic capital. The author argues that the sample may represent a privileged group and the results indicate that students increasingly get more opportunities to be agentic through choosing English-mediated instruction.

Chapter 15 takes an ecological perspective in investigating the student perspective (e.g., Dalton-Puffer, 2007). Based on a semi-structured interview with eleven Grade 10 students, BethAnne Paulsrud's descriptive study concentrates on the role of English in students' early experiences of the CLIL program and their expectations from it. The author discusses CLIL students' secure identity as English speakers and problematizes the pervasive presence of English in terms of affordances and CLIL education in the Swedish context. Moreover, she questions the necessity of English-medium CLIL and suggests the introduction of other languages.

In Chapter 16, Ylva Sandberg investigates the teacher perspective (see also Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010; Gitsaki & Alexiou, 2015), looking at motivations for language use and teaching CLIL classes. The study is founded on thematically analyzed data from semi-structured interviews with four biology and four history teachers. First, the findings are discussed in light of linguistic, communicative and content aspects of languaging and, second, in relation to CLIL teaching literacy, a concept put forth by the author. The author argues that CLIL may lead to professional development and that school leadership should support an exchange of expertise between teachers of content- and language-based school subjects.

The novelty of this volume mainly lies on the participants and context of the study, but also on the research foci and combined perspectives. The studies focus on three schools, following both CLIL and non-CLIL students throughout their high school years. In addition, the project the authors report holistically takes into account various aspects of language learning as well as motivation and assessment. While issues of motivation and assessment in CLIL have been addressed elsewhere (e.g., Lasagabaster, Doiz, & Sierra, 2014; Quartapelle, 2012), such a longitudinal and focused approach has been absent from CLIL literature. Moreover, combining student and teacher perspectives from the same CLIL programs is new compared to other edited volumes which include various CLIL stakeholders' perspectives that are usually not related to each other (e.g., Kalaja, Barcelos, Aro, & Ruohotie-Lyhty, 2016). From the student population, the multilingual students are also represented, an area that is under-researched (cf. Dalton-Puffer, 2007), and issues of identity are addressed (see also Norton, 2013). Further contribution is derived from the wider context of the studies, a European country in which exposure to extramural English is high, students are considered proficient in English as an L2, and teachers are not trained in CLIL. Such a context affords interesting conditions for examining the linguistic competences in L1 and L2 through CLIL, but also question the extent to which CLIL per se is to credit for such competences in L2.

Providing an up-to-date picture of CLIL in Sweden, the studies comprising this volume serve as a reminder that CLIL programs need to be problematized. The presence, status and role of English in Sweden are prominent, which may question the need for English as the language medium in CLIL and argue for multilingualism

involving languages other than merely English. Indeed, this may hold true for many other European countries where English proficiency is a highly desired skill in higher education and the professional world, making English the medium of instruction in CLIL programs (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009), sometimes at the expense of other languages (Bruton, 2013). Moreover, the volume highlights the need for attention to academic L1 and L2 proficiency and content-specific vocabulary development. The attention to more language-aware and language-sensitive CLIL teaching is only recently being addressed in schooling. For instance, this is something the recent Finnish curriculum has acknowledged (FNBE, 2014), although its nation-wide effects on CLIL and regular teaching have yet to be explored. While one can understand the focus on science-related and economics classes, it would have been interesting to see how other curricular subjects contribute to L2 development through CLIL. Moreover, this volume is language-oriented, but if CLIL is to be understood as a mutually supportive integration of content and language (Coyle et al., 2010), future CLIL research could take a content perspective alongside a language perspective. The present studies may serve as inspiration for further studies in this regard. Finally, the volume stresses the importance of groundwork in the form of framework and policies for CLIL implementation, and transparent assessment guidelines, CLIL training and collaboration for more uniform or successful teaching practices. This may hold true for any educational initiative, yet it is even more pertinent to CLIL in and beyond Sweden, as it has so far been enthusiastic, albeit idiosyncratic, in its implementation by teacher communities. For these reasons, the volume is topical and a recommended read for researchers, policy-makers and teacher educators in CLIL.

## References

- Admiraal, W., Westhoff, G., & de Bot, K. (2006). Evaluation of bilingual secondary education in the Netherlands: Students' language proficiency in English. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 12*(1), 75–93.
- Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruton, A. (2013). CLIL: Some reasons why...and why not. *System, 41*(3), 587–597.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T., & Smit, U. (Eds.) (2010). *Language Use and Language Learning in CLL Classrooms*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- FNBE [Finnish National Board of Education]. (2014). *Core curriculum for basic education 2014*. Retrieved from [https://www.oph.fi/english/curricula\\_and\\_qualifications/basic\\_education/curricula\\_2014](https://www.oph.fi/english/curricula_and_qualifications/basic_education/curricula_2014)
- Gablasova, D. (2014). Issues in the assessment of bilingually educated students: Expressing subject knowledge through L1 and L2. *The Language Learning Journal, 42*(2), 151–164.
- Gitsaki, C., & Alexiou, T. (2015). *Current Issues in Second/Foreign Language Teaching and Teacher Development: Research and Practice*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.
- Kalaja, P., Barcelos, A. M. F., Aro, M., & Ruohotie-Lyhty, M. (2016). *Beliefs, Agency and Identity in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kobayashi, Y. (2002). The role of gender in foreign language learning attitudes: Japanese female students' attitudes towards English learning. *Gender and Education, 14*(2), 181–197.

- Lasagabaster, D. (2011). English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), 3–18.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2009). Language attitudes in CLIL and traditional EFL classes. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(2), 3–17.
- Lasagabaster, D., Doiz, A., & Sierra, J. M. (2014). *Motivation and Foreign Language Learning: From Theory to Practice*. Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins.
- Meece, J. L., Glienke, B. B., & Burg, S. (2006). Gender and motivation. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(5), 351–373.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and Language Learning: Extending the conversation* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Olsson, E. (2015). Progress in English academic vocabulary use in writing among CLIL and non-CLIL students in Sweden. *Moderna spårk*, 2, 51–74. Retrieved from [ojs.ub.gu.se/ojs/index.php/modernasprak/article/download/3261/2820](http://ojs.ub.gu.se/ojs/index.php/modernasprak/article/download/3261/2820)
- Reinders, H. (2012). *Digital Games in Language Learning and Teaching*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., & Jiménez Catalán, R. M. (2009). *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Quartapelle, F. (Ed.) (2012). *Assessment and Evaluation in CLIL*. European Commission-Lifelong Learning Programmes. Retrieved from <http://aeclil.altervista.org/Sito/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/AECLIL-Assessment-and-evaluation-in-CLIL.pdf>