Three Forms of Bilingual Education Immersion, Dual Language and CLIL

Damaris Castro-García

THREE FORMS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION IMMERSION, DUAL LANGUAGE AND CLIL

THREE FORMS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION IMMERSION, DUAL LANGUAGE AND CLIL

Damaris Castro-García

EDICIONES
ESCUELA DE LITERATURA
Y CIENCIAS DEL LENGUAJE

Índice

Preface

Although bilingualism has been an intrinsic part of humankind for centuries, even today it is an intriguing topic for both specialists and non-specialists in this field. Researchers try to find answers to the different phenomena intervening in bilingual and multilingual contacts and in bilingual education with the intention of discovering patterns and specific characteristics of the human language faculty. Non-professionals in the field, on the other hand, marvel at children, teenagers or adults who can use different languages in their linguistic repertoire to deal with everyday situations, seemingly with little effort. Interestingly, many of the world's bilingual speakers have developed this skill through the acquisition of a second language, and often within the context of formal education.

In today's society, globalization and its demand for fast-paced communication lead to continuous contact with people of different language groups. As a result of these demands, bilingualism has become more of a conscious endeavor in countries such as Costa Rica, where monolingualism used to be the norm. In addition, given that society is increasingly oriented towards business and services, more and more people must be bilingual to satisfy the needs of multinational corporations. At a time when higher levels of proficiency in many foreign languages are required in Costa Rica, attention must be directed toward improving programs of foreign language instruction. To address that challenge, three different experiences have been described and analyzed here: the Immersion programs developed in Canada, the Dual Language programs found in the U.S., and the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) movement developing in Europe. The characteristics provided by this analysis could serve as insightful input to inspire second language teaching practices in Costa Rica. It is evident that parents are striving to find educational opportunities to provide functional bilingualism for the younger generations.

The main challenge for bilingual education in Costa Rica is that it is seen, to a very large extent even today, through the lens of foreign language teaching where language is taught primarily as a subject, rather than used as a medium of instruction. It is hoped that this review of the directions taken in various parts of the world will serve to enhance the solutions required to face the challenges implied by the need for professionals who can use foreign languages effectively in many different fields. A greater familiarity with the results achieved by these programs can also provide a broader basis for the decisions which must be made in the future regarding the design of innovative programs for foreign language instruction. From the perspective of language attainment, the Costa Rican context does not yet enjoy the benefits that well-established Canadian Immersion programs, Dual Education, and CLIL could bring to the

process of bilingualism. The analysis and implementation of practices such as those described here can eventually yield the results that we are all seeking. We will begin by discussing the case of Immersion Programs in Canada. The second section will discuss the development of Dual Language Programs. The third case that will be discussed is that of the current CLIL movement in Europe. It is our hope that this analysis will serve to inspire fruitful changes in the years ahead.

Damaris Castro-García[1]

November 2017

---

[1] Damaris Castro García is a tenured professor at Universidad Nacional (Costa Rica), where she has worked since 2003. She has taught Grammar, Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition, and has participated in several research projects. She is currently pursuing doctoral studies at the Universidad de Salamanca in Spain. This text is based on part of a much broader investigation for her doctoral dissertation.

Immersion Programs
The Case of Canada

This section describes various aspects of French immersion education in Canada. First, a brief outline is provided of the socio-political background where the programs originated. Then, information about the goals and main defining features that identify Canadian immersion programs is presented. Information is also provided regarding the Association of Canadian Parents for French, a unique organization that has played a key role in these programs. A description of the structure of immersion programs is followed by a review of findings grouped into three different subsections addressing common benefits associated with immersion education, challenges faced by immersion education and other findings that have derived from research in these programs.

1 Background

It is well known that the Canadian immersion programs have enjoyed long-term, international recognition for their success in the implementation of second language teaching programs. Ever since French immersion programs were established in the 1960s, Canada has served as a referent for teachers and researchers interested in bilingualism developing place in a variety of immersion programs. As Baker (2011) posits, the original parents' experiment to have a group of 26 kindergarteners immersed in a French program in St. Lambert, Montreal, in 1965, gave birth to an ongoing language learning practice that has produced excellent results in a framework of immersion bilingual education. The origin of the French immersion movement in Quebec, rather than in Canada as a whole, can be better understood considering that each province or territory is in charge of its own education, and that there is no the figure of a federal ministry of education in its legislation.

The socio-political Canadian context is a driving force for the creation and implementation of immersion programs there. Canada is divided into 10 provinces and 3 territories. French holds majority language status in Québec, a historical French settlement since the 1600s. Despite its minority language status, French remains strongly present, to a greater extent in a sizeable number of speakers in Ontario and to a lesser extent in New Brunswick. In the rest of the provinces, French is a minority language. Quebecois are known for their interest in preserving and maintaining the French language. Baker (2011) argues that, in Canada, bilingualism, through second language acquisition, serves to lessen conflict and seeks harmony between language

groups while creating a more integrated society. He also notes that speaking a second language gives all citizens access to careers, higher education, jobs, travel, communication and information. For Baker, bilingualism in Canada has become key to jobs in the local government or civil service, to work as a teacher or in the mass media.

In Canada, French is present in different spheres: from their multilingual parliament, which serves as a sign of prestige and value toward the language, to local stores and households. The interest of Quebecois in strengthening the language is reflected on the different activities carried out to promote the use of the French language. Baker (2011) sees it reflected in activities such as voluntary language classes, complementary schools, vacation classes or Sunday schools, in which communities and families seek opportunities to promote the use of the language. Baker (2011) also points out that it is common for bilinguals to avoid speaking the majority language in offices and shops when they feel that the majority language threatens their minority language.

Furthermore, Baker (2011) also insists that immersion education should be viewed beyond educational terms as it involves a political, social and cultural ideology. For him, immersion education represents a movement toward a different kind of society rather than just a different type of bilingualism. For Baker (2011), "[b]y promoting bilingualism in English speakers, immersion education in Canada may support French language communities, increase the opportunities for Francophones outside from Québec and help promote bilingualism in the public sector…" (p. 271). With this social context in mind, we can begin the analysis of immersion programs in Canada.

According to Roy and Galiev (2011), French immersion programs appeared as a response to an overt interest of Quebec citizens to exert a greater economic and political control over their province. Gibson and Roy (2015), on the other hand, note that in 1963 the Canadian government appointed the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism to analyze a series of challenges regarding unequal distribution of English and French speakers. This commission recommended protecting and supporting minority communities and their languages. Work at the governmental and commission levels continued for several years. Following recommendations made by that commission, the Parliament passed the first Official Languages Act in 1969. Subsequently, the government funded and promoted French instruction for French speaking citizens and French-as-Second-Language instruction for the majority groups. Along with the governmental interest in a more even distribution of speakers of French and English in the region, parents were also concerned about their children's future and the new requirements that their changing society imposed on their offspring. Gibson and Roy (2015) note that the socio-political and cultural chaos inspired a group of parents to search for instructional methods to provide their children with the command of French that they required. With the help of specialists from McGill

University in Montreal, those active parents convinced the district to approve an experimental plan recognized today as French Immersion Programs. This initial experiment is now well known for its evident success in which students reap the benefits of proficient second language acquisition while maintaining an adequate level of English. The well-researched basis of the experiment, and the strong parental, socio-political and institutional support contributed to the advantages accrued from these programs. They, in turn, have also given way to continued research, some of which will be discussed below.

2 Goals and Defining Features

We could argue that a general goal that could be identified from reading about Canadian Immersion programs is that it seeks to attain bilingualism in French while still developing appropriate levels of proficiency in English. Although this may account for the bigger picture, several other details should be considered, as objectives clearly go beyond bilingualism. In this vein, Baker (2011) maintains that the original goal of French immersion programs was clearly identifiable. The program aimed at children becoming bilingual and bicultural while still enjoying the benefits offered by their curriculum. To achieve this, the so-called "experiment" had clear objectives: First, children would have to be literate in French; that is, read, write, as well as speak in the language; second, they would attain standard curriculum levels in all areas (including the English language); and third, they would learn to value both English-speaking and French-speaking Canadian traditions.

Bingham Wesche (2002) states that early French immersion originally predicated three basic assumptions: 1) Incidental, daily exposure to a language in a natural context results in children's innate acquisition of language and that this ability diminishes as age progresses; 2) frequent, varied and prolonged exposure to the language is necessary for learners to become fluent; and 3) language exposure and engagement ought to be made available through activities that are interesting for learners, in a natural rather than formal instructional setting. These activities were supposed to aim at facilitating language comprehension and obtaining production from students. Bingham Wesche (2002) views these features as basic elements of immersion education today. They reflected in early school starting ages. He adds that they are also seen in initial instruction through French (often taught by native speakers) that is progressively reduced in hours to incorporate English instruction; and in the use of French to teach curriculum including varied topics of interest for students.

Furthermore, different authors have reviewed fundamental features of the programs relating to the Canadian context where immersion takes place. Many of the characteristics considered are shared across the different analyses. Bingham Wesche (2002) describes contextual features of the original immersion program at St Lambert, and that have prevailed across many other

immersion programs in Canada. They have come to be considered crucial to the success of immersion programs. They include the following:

1) Students in the program were *speakers of the majority language*. As such, French represented an additional language and English continued to be developed as they were exposed to it at home and in the community.

2) All the students shared a similar language proficiency in French, so they all identified with one other, sharing motivation and interest in learning.

3) As an optional program, the students joined it voluntarily, thus contributing to enhance their motivation. Motivation was also boosted because both students and parents had a positive attitude toward language learning.

4) There was strong social support toward the learning of both languages. Parents, community, and society valued the language learning process.

5) The languages and their respective communities had several aspects in common. The two languages involved were typologically related, sharing cognates and features of the writing system. At the community level, people had similar cultures and beliefs, daily routines and holidays.

6) Local political control in charge of funding issues and decision-making allowed for parental involvement that, in turn, endorsed constant innovation.

7) Immersion teachers were native speakers with extensive experience curriculum-wise and who also were willing to teach in French.

8) A wealth of authentic material, pedagogical and otherwise, was available for students and teachers.

For Bingham Wesche (2002), these conditions laid the foundation for success in early immersion programs, and Swain and Lapkin (2005) bring us to a more contemporary analysis of Canadian immersion features. The current linguistic and ethnographic diversity of Canada ought to be considered when analyzing the features that those programs should have. Acknowledgement of the changing sociopolitical context of Canada and the constant increase in the diversity of its population lead to the need for a change in the pedagogy identifying immersion programs. For that purpose, Swain and Lapkin reviewed the above list of eight characteristics of the Canadian immersion programs published in Swain and Johnson (1997), and analyzed whether the items on this list required adjustments to fulfill the current demands of Canadian society.

1) Swain and Lapkin (2005) argue that, given the largely diverse linguistic background of students, French, originally the "second language," should be referred to as the "immersion language." This is justified by the significant presence of students whose first language is not English, as was once the case, but one of many possible languages.

2) The second feature contemplates that the curriculum of the immersion students is the same as the curriculum of *core* students; for these authors this feature remains unchanged.

3) Third, they call for evident support for the students' first languages, and argue that in Swain & Johnson (1997), there was already a demand for the L1 to be part of the curriculum. Swain & Lapkin (2005) continue to stress the importance of L1 presence in the curriculum, ttaking into account the various linguistic backgrounds represented in schools today. They suggest the use of dual-immersion practices to take advantage of language varieties in the classroom. Other authors have also underlined the importance of L1 in immersion programs. Cummins et al. (2005) emphasized that "pre-existing knowledge for English language learners is encoded in their home languages. Consequently, educators should explicitly teach in a way that fosters transfer of concepts and skills from the student's home language to English" (p. 38). Cummins et al. (2005) acknowledge the challenge that this represents in Canadian classrooms where over 20 different L1 languages can interact within one school, and describe the benefits of dual language texts to minimize this situation in such varied language environments. For Cummins et al. (2005), dual language textbooks allow for the use of students' L1.

4) The original fourth feature in the review presented by Swain and Lapkin's (2005) remains unchanged. This feature, a defining one for the authors, calls for "additive bilingualism" for students in immersion programs.

5) Their fifth feature also remains the same except for the substitution of the term L2 by "immersion language," This refers to the notion that the immersion language is mostly restricted to classroom use.

6) The sixth feature maintains the same idea; that is, students in immersion programs share a similar linguistic background in regard to the "immersion language," in this case French. Despite the variety in the students' language background, they all share a limited knowledge of French.

7) Teachers are bilingual (French/English). The authors mention the rarity of programs having multilingual instructors (who know languages other than English and French). This is even more significant if the diverse students' background is to be accounted for by these teachers.

8) The culture of the classroom must address the L1 cultures of all the individual cultures represented in it, not just the L1 culture, as originally called for in Swain & Johnson (1997). There is an imminent need to acknowledge not only the variety of linguistic backgrounds, but also the multiple cultural forms that accompany them. Cummins et al. (2005) argue that this situation can also be overcome through the implementation of "identity texts." Thus, "instruction communicates respect for students' languages and cultures and encourages students to engage with literacy and invest their identities in the learning process" (p. 42).

In sum, the results of this revised version of the eight characteristics of immersion programs seek to integrate the vast linguistic and ethnic diversity

in such a way that both first languages and cultures, in all their forms, become part of today's immersion programs.

Along the same lines, Baker (2011) also maintains that even today particular elements identify the undeniable success of Canadian immersion programs. He also describes eight identifiable, key features that have traditionally defined immersion programs. He notes that these programs aim at bilingualism in two languages that are majority languages of recognized prestige (French and English). Second, students are not required to enroll in them, but do so voluntarily. Third, children can use their first language (English) in beginning stages and during out-of-class activities. Keeping in mind the ideas put forward by Swain and Lapkin (2005) and by Cummins et al. (2005), we understand that this is far more complicated now, due to the large numbers of cultures and L1s that are part of today's classrooms. Fourth, teachers are fully bilingual (even if students do not perceive that from the beginning), and this contributes to high quality language exposure and modeling. Fifth, classroom work concentrates on significant, real communication, through which students must convey daily needs. This allows students to create associations between their learning and authentic language use in everyday situations. Sixth, because students share a similar linguistic background when they begin, it contributes to their self-esteem and motivation. Seventh, the curriculum in these programs is the same as that developed by "mainstream 'core' students"; this serves as a guarantee for equality at the social level. Finally, immersion represents a societal, political, or even economic as well as educational movement. There are many participants in immersion programs; parental involvement in particular keeps the community well informed and active in the education process.

The lists developed by Bingham Wesche (2002), Swain and Lapkin (2005), and Baker (2011) regarding Canadian immersion programs coincide in certain elements they consider essential, in some cases with slight changes in their wording. They include the following areas:

The lists provide descriptions of the programs as dealing with additive bilingualism. Baker (2011) describes bilingualism in two majority languages, relating it to additive bilingualism. He suggests avoiding the term "immersion," which could carry a subtractive meaning, and suggests using the term "submersion" instead.

All descriptions refer to the possibility of L1 use. For Baker, L1 is permitted up to the first year and a half, while Swain and Lapkin (2005) discuss offering students "overt support in all home languages." Bingham Wesche (2002) suggests L1 support at home and in the community.

All descriptions mention teachers being (competent) bilinguals, and/or ideally multilingual.

In all cases, reference is made to students with a similar background in the "immersion language." Bingham Wesche (2002) terms it "instructional language," Swain and Lapkin (2005) refer to it as "immersion language," and Baker continues to call it "second language."

Baker (2011) and Swain and Lapkin (2005) also agree on the idea of students in immersion programs developing the same curriculum as students in "core" programs. Bingham Wesche (2002) points out three features that are not included by either Baker or Swain and Lapkin: linguistic and social features common to the languages and communities, local political and administrative control over immersion programs, and the availability of authentic materials for immersion students. On the other hand, three features set apart Swain and Lapkin's (2005) and Baker's (2011) lists of key features. Baker (2011) emphasizes the optionality of the immersion programs, also mentioned by Bingham Wesche (2002), the importance of meaningful communication in class and the social (also in Bingham Wesche), political, economic and educational aspects of the "immersion initiative." Conversely, Swain & Lapkin (2005) stress the importance of the "immersion language" being the language used for instruction. They point to the fact it may be the L3 for some students. These authors also refer to the confinement of the immersion language to the classroom; this can be related to Baker's (2011) third feature that describes students' liberty to use other languages outside the class. Lastly, Swain & Lapkin (2005) strongly emphasize the need to acknowledge the home cultures of all students.

All of the sources mentioned above delimit a number of very important key features that identify Canadian immersion programs and that are essential in the evident achievements of the program. Despite some differences, the agreement in identifying defining features of immersion programs points to the validity and strength of these features and to the fundamental role they play in consolidating and garnering favor for immersion education in Canada.

Additionally, Cummins (2014a) further highlights certain features that were first identified in Canadian "immersion programs" and that have also contributed to the continued success of these programs; they are not included in the above characterizations. The fact that some of these characteristics have become core principles of models such as CLIL demonstrates how valuable they are. This value has been made evident due to the permanent examination that these programs have undergone, which Cummins (2014a) also describes:

> The Canadian French immersion programs, however, were the first to specify some of the instructional strategies (now generally referred to as "scaffolding") that are necessary to ensure that students comprehend the meaning of what is being communicated by the teacher. These strategies include the use of concrete demonstrations, visuals, and verbal paraphrases. Also, within French immersion programs, reformulation in French of what students say in English is always possible because virtually all teachers are reasonably fluent in English… French immersion programs were the first bilingual programs to be subjected to intensive long-term research evaluation, although some large-scale research had been undertaken in other contexts prior to the Canadian experience… (p. 4–5)

This brief review shows some of the fundamental goals and features that identify Canadian Immersion programs. Other programs elsewhere have tried to replicate the results of Canadian programs. Given the sound accomplishments associated with this model, this is only understandable. As seen below, another key feature in these programs is parental involvement.

3 CANADIAN PARENTS FOR FRENCH (CPF)

Parents have played a much more prominent role in Canadian Immersion programs than in any other educational movement. Just as when the French immersion programs originated, parents today who send their children to these programs do so with the intention of providing their offspring with as many advantages as they can. For Roy (2008), "[m]ost parents who continue to send their children to French immersion programs do so because French is one of the official languages in Canada and because it provides their children with future opportunities: cognitive, social, and economical" (p. 397). Parental involvement has played a critical role in Canada. These parents' efforts are reflected in constant commitment of the association of Canadian Parents for French (CPF) to strengthen the use of French language. For Gibson and Roy (2015), CPF can be described as "… a grassroots, non-profit association established to promote French-second language learning in Canada …[their] efforts have contributed to the advancement of Canada's official language policy" (p. 218). A closer analysis of the work done by this association serves as an example of how shareholders can make a difference when it comes to seeking, implementing and maintaining fruitful educational programs in any given community.

According to Gibson and Roy (2015), the association was originally formed in 1977 as a result of an initiative by the first Commissioner of Official Languages, Keith Spicer, who brought together representative parents with a leading role in the promotion of French across the country. Their mission was to report back to stakeholders in each of their regions. At Spicer's request, these parents participated in a conference where the parents themselves, researchers, specialists, language consultants and other interested parties came up with a series of recommendations for the government, ranging from curricular issues to cultural reinforcement in French communities; from teacher and staff training to students exchanges and funding. One of their key recommendations was the creation of a national parents' association. By October 1977, the association had clear objectives, an executive committee, and a strong structure with representatives at the national, provincial or territorial, and community level. Gibson and Roy (2015) list three main objectives endorsed by the, then, newly created association. Namely,

1. to assist in ensuring that each Canadian child have the opportunity to acquire as great a knowledge of French language and culture as he or she is willing and able to attain;

2. to promote the best possible types of French language learning opportunities;

3. to establish and maintain effective communication between interested parents and educational and government authorities concerned with the provision of French language learning opportunities (CPF, 1978, p. 1). (p. 224)

Gibson and Roy (2015) argue that CPF efforts have focused, through the years, mainly on three fronts. First, they have ensured permanent distribution of key information among the different participants and the general public interested in immersion education. Second, they have advocated for French as a Second Language programs that are effective and that satisfy the students' needs. Third, they have promoted a wide variety of activities outside the classroom to enhance the knowledge that students acquire in the classroom setting. Gibson and Roy (2015) offer multiple examples of how the CPF has traditionally achieved these duties. In terms of distribution of information, the CPF association is very concerned with providing quality information to other parents and to their communities. With this intention, they have developed a *Handbook for Parents*, distributed all over the country, with information about French second language instruction. Moreover, they offer diverse publications directed to reducing feelings of weakness or anxiety of parents and students in immersion programs. They also produce materials for students; i.e., booklets, videos, surveys, activity books, collections of good practices and others. Finally, they have launched several multimedia campaigns to inform the population in general about Canadian immersion education practices.

Their second main aim, advocacy for effective programs, is mirrored in their constant search for funding for FSL programs. Whenever one of the funding agreements expires, CPF joins forces to present facts and make recommendations that reflect any new priorities and adjustments required in immersion programs. Second, CPF has made evident the need to offer opportunities for students to continue developing language skills at the postsecondary level. They support permanent teacher training as well. They have worked publishing newsletters, organizing conferences and publishing articles on this topic, thus attracting a great deal of attention to the issue of teacher training. Third, they have held many conferences on the topic of attrition in immersion programs. Fourth, they have shown great resistance to opponents of bilingualism and immersion programs in particular. Through cooperation with researchers and educators, they are skilled at presenting evidence that disqualifies their opponents' criticism. Fifth, they are in constant contact with decision-makers and have willingly presented reports at the governmental or provincial level to argue in favor of immersion education. They have also offered multiple consultations and symposia on the subject.

Regarding their third focus of work, extracurricular activities promoted by the CPF, Gibson and Roy (2015) offer numerous examples. These activities include summer sessions for students in immersion programs offered at the local or provincial level, or family camping weeks where school-age participants are involved in French related activities. They arrange public speaking competitions and "speak-offs," events where participating students come from core French, French Immersion, or French as First Language groups. They have implemented national contests in partnerships with sponsor organizations, and promoted competitions, dances, carnivals, field trips, parties and youth conferences among many other activities.

Finally, Gibson and Roy (2015) point out a number of future challenges that the association faces. These have to do with greater inclusion of academically challenged students, appropriate provisions for students with varied linguistic backgrounds, adequate life-long measurement and assessment of language proficiency, dealing with a shortage of teachers for core-French and French-immersion in some regions, and developing a more articulated educational policy that reflects research findings and that serves as a directing guide for school boards, and postsecondary programs that develop FSL proficiency. While these challenges vary depending on the region, many areas would benefit from the appropriate solutions.

It can be concluded that the role of parents and stakeholders in language education is fundamental to ensure success. CPF serves as an excellent example of how a grassroots organization can be heard and can find the ways to fulfill the needs of a community or an entire country. The achievements of CPF are summarized by Gibson and Roy (2015):

> The most obvious impact of the efforts undertaken by the grassroots members of Canadian Parents for French is the spread of the French immersion option from a limited number of major centers in 1977 to hundreds of communities large and small in every province and territory except Nunavut, and from a program mainly available at the elementary level to variations on the immersion approach from preschool through postsecondary (p. 231).

4 Program Structure

In Canadian language programs, great variety can be found in its institutions and its language programs. Lazaruk (2007, p. 607) mentions the following types of bilingual programs. The first is *Core French*, the most common type of program offering students "a basic level of proficiency in French." It starts at some point between kindergarten and grade 5, with 20 to 40 minutes of instruction per day, with the intention of developing students' language and cultural skills. The second is *French Immersion*, in which French is used as the language of instruction, more than just as the subject of the class. These

are probably the programs that have been studied the most and are the focus of the present section. Third, *Extended French* is a type of program available only in a few provinces. It adds a couple of core subjects taught in French to the French Language Arts courses from grade 4 to secondary school. Finally, *Intensive French* is described as the newest type of program in which students spend 70% of the day learning the French language in a FSL program that focuses on language use and offers "an intensive period of French instruction covering half a school year, usually in grade 5 or 6."

Swain and Lapkin (1989) provide a description of the basic distinction between the most common immersion programs: early vs. late immersion. The program that has been studied the most is the early total immersion program. They describe it simply as: "'early' because it begins with the beginning of school, 'total' because *all* instruction for the first few years is in French" (p. 151) (emphasis in original). The other option, "late immersion," is described by Swain and Lapkin (1989) as follows:

> It is called "late" because it begins at about grade six, seven, or eight. In-struction in French may consume all class time or be as little as fifty percent of it. Prior to entering the program, students will have had daily periods of French as a second language ("core" FSL classes) for at least a year. Following the program, which may be for one or more years, students are again usually able to take several subjects per year in French if they so choose (p. 151).

Besides the age of students when entering the programs, further characteristics contribute to the differences among various programs; much variation is also found within immersion education. Swain (2000b), concentrates on what the programs have in common rather than describing their distinctive features. She notes that although Canadian French immersion programs take on several forms, the element that they share is that students receive subjects such as history in French, and adds that at least 50 percent of the school day students use French while they are still learning the language. Genesse and Jared (2008) describe how, originally, children in this type of language program initiated their literacy and academic instruction in their second language, French, before learning to read and write in English. Students were instructed in French from kindergarten to grade 2, when they started to be partly instructed in English as well. Makropoulos (2009) maintains that since the 1980s different types of immersion programs have become available:

> Early French-immersion (EFI) programs begin at the onset of elementa-ry school and provide equal instruction time in both official languages after initially exposing students to more French. Middle French-immersion (MFI) programs are sometimes offered from the onset of grades 4 and 5 to students from regular English programs. Late French-immersion (LFI) programs are offered at the intermediate level (grades 7 and 8), and provide up to 75% of the instruction time in French. Students from EFI, MFI, and LFI programs can en-

roll in secondary French-immersion programs that are typically offered from grade 9–12 (ages 14–17) in Canada (p. 318).

Moreover, Baker (2011) refers to the different types of "immersion bilingual education" which can be classified by *age* and *time*. According to the students' age, *early immersion* is for students in "kindergarten" or the "infant stage"; *delayed or middle immersion* describes settings where children start around ages nine or ten; and *late immersion* refers to programs that start the level of at secondary school. On the other hand, based on the amount of time devoted to French instruction in second language immersion programs, *total immersion* starts with 100% immersion in the second language and then during periods of two or three years it can be reduced progressively until it gets to 50% at the end of junior schooling. It is *partial immersion* when it offers, from the beginning, around 50% immersion during both "infant and junior schooling" (p. 239).

According to Cummins (2014b), in Canada, "[c]ore FSL programs typically teach French for 30–40 min each day. Starting grades vary from province to province, and within provinces school boards typically have some discretion regarding the starting grade level" (p. 2). He points out that over 90% of the student population follows this option and insists on the need to turn to more successful forms of bilingual programs such as immersion programs.

It has been seen that variation is a common aspect of immersion education. The studies reviewed below provide additional informtion about diverse types of immersion programs.

5 RESEARCH FINDINGS

5.1 ADVANTAGES

As a result of the success and rapid spread of immersion programs throughout Canada, these programs received quite a bit of attention from researchers, educators, and specialists who have devoted a lot of time carrying out investigation in immersion classrooms. This research focus has led to an enormous number of studies over more than five decades of immersion education. Commenting on the first studies carried out on immersion programs during the 1960s, Lambert (1981) asserts:

> To our surprise, our bilingual youngsters in Montreal scored significantly higher than did carefully matched monolinguals on both verbal and nonverbal measures of intelligence (...). Furthermore, their pattern of test results indicated that they, relative to monolinguals, had developed a more diversified structure of intelligence and more flexibility in thought, those very features of cognition that very likely determine the depth and breadth of language competence (p. 10).

Findings such as those of Lambert have been replicated in numerous studies, as reviewed by Genesse and Jared (2008). Evidence from research on the results of Canadian immersion education will be discussed below.

Swain and Lapkin (1989) present two main findings in their paper. First, they show that older students (enrolled in late immersion) can be as successful as younger ones (early immersion students) in learning particular properties of the language, and that older learners can be more effective, time-wise, than younger learners in doing so. They point to the fact that older learner's advantages are more evident in literacy skills (reading and writing) while younger learners perform better in listening and speaking tasks. The latter exhibit boosted confidence and lower degrees of anxiety. Swain and Lapkin (1989) attribute the older students' advantages in reading and writing to the implementation of visual, linguistic and cognitive strategies that they use in their L1 and to the cognitive maturity that allows them to process information on the basis of their L1 experience. The second argument presented by Swain and Lapkin (1989) has to do with methodology. They insist on integrating grammar and content during instruction: "… grammar should not be taught in isolation from content. But then, neither should content be taught without regard to the language involved. A carefully planned *integration* of language and content, however, holds considerable promise" (p. 153) (emphasis in original). This notion has been echoed by other authors and is the basis of teaching methodologies such as Content Language Integrated Learning. As research continues, greater support is being given to the adequate integration of grammar and content.

Swain (2000b) describes the contributions of French immersion education to Applied Linguistics (AL) and Second Language Acquisition (SLA). In reference to AL, she identifies three main contributions. The first is the awareness derived from French immersion programs toward acknowledging minority and majority groups, and within them, the influence that the social conditions of these groups exert on the outcomes of immersion classrooms. While French immersion acknowledges these societal conditions, it also shows how both groups can benefit from the model. For Swain (2000), the second contribution is related to the idea that "the contributions of disciplinary knowledge and related research paradigms to applied linguistics have been amply demonstrated in the FI research literature" (p. 200). Fields such as education, linguistics or sociolinguistics have found a space for academic practice through experimental, observational or ethnographic studies that have shed light on the method and results of immersion education, all the while strengthening each of the fields in the process. Third, immersion education has affected numerous subfields of AL (e.g., education, language policy, second language pedagogy) in a more straightforward fashion, providing analyses and growth to the different fields.

Regarding specific contributions to SLA, Swain (2000b) lists the following six main areas: First, studies on French immersion have been the greatest contributors to a new, enhanced view of the role of *output in SLA*. She highlights the role of output (and not just input) in the process of language learning, as seen in her "Output Hypothesis." Second, FI has also provided much analysis and evidence toward the types and uses of *negative feedback* in SLA. Swain (2000b) refers to negotiation of form as an ideal type of feedback that allows students reevaluate their output and come up with ways of repairing their production. Third, the notion of *focus on form in relation to SLA* is linked to the previous ideas or output and negative feedback. Swain (2000b) claims "there is value in focusing on language form through the use of pre-planned curriculum materials in the context of content-based language learning" (p. 205). Fourth, for Swain the contributions in connection with the *role of L1 and SLA* have shown that the L1 is used, in immersion settings, mainly with three purposes: to advance in the completion of tasks, to talk about the L2, and to create and maintain interpersonal contacts in the class. Fifth, on the issue of *age and SLA*, studies suggest that there is a difference in the cognitive abilities that younger and older students put into practice, and that older learners may be more efficient than younger learners in the development of literacy skills. Finally, regarding *language testing and SLA*, Swain explains that studies show a disparity between what the tests measure and what students have actually learned. She recommends that, as researchers, "if we are to measure the learning that occurs as a result of the research "treatment," … [we should] tailor our tests to what happens during that treatment" (p. 206). In summary, Swain (2000b) has identified contributions that have favored and strengthened the development of SLA as a science. She adds that the "controlled" environment in which French immersion programs develop, serves as an ideal setting for research to take place. This is reflected in the amount of research that has been produced in this context.

Along these lines, Bingham Wesche (2002) maintains that the benefits of French immersion programs can be separated into three large categories: language skills, academic achievement, and language attitudes. First, in terms of French language skills, immersion students enrolled in early, middle, or late programs, exhibit a better functional command of the French language than students enrolled in core French classes. Within-group comparison also shows that students in early immersion programs have a better command of French than students in middle immersion and these, in turn, perform better than students in late immersion programs. Second, regarding academic achievement, assessment in math, science, and social studies has shown no detrimental effects of immersion in general achievement in English. Assessment in French seems to lag a little behind in early levels. The same occurs with late immersion students who have a limited French language background and who show initial, temporary, lower scores. Despite successful results in all types

of programs, early immersion programs maintain important advantages when compared to all other programs. The third area of advantages comes in terms of language attitudes. The very positive attitudes reported by current and past immersion students supplements the learning experience and are very likely responsible for high levels of motivation and involvement.

Bingham Wesche (2002) also highlights that the immersion experience has consistently resulted in certain outcomes, such as the advantages related to early starting immersion programs. Children that begin the program with a well-defined L1 (that progressively continues developing) benefit the most from immersion programs offering a robust communicative emphasis. Second, intensive instruction in immersion serves better purposes than reduced instruction that is extended in time. Even brief programs offering very intensive instruction have proven to be more beneficial than long programs with limited instruction. Third, meaningful content learning is very significant as it represents a key vehicle for learning. Language learning through content instruction leads to ample communicative opportunities with peers and, possibly, native speakers of the language. It also offers opportunities for language analysis, feedback, communicative production and enhanced accuracy. For Bingham Wesche (2002), these characteristics in combination with the appropriate contextual factors, result in multiple benefits for immersion students.

Bialystok, Peets and Moreno (2014) set out to determine how much L2 instructional experience was necessary before benefits in metalinguistic awareness and executive control appeared in emerging bilingual children in immersion settings. On the premises that bilingualism accelerates the development of metalinguistic awareness, the authors studied how many years of immersion education were required to reach these metalinguistic benefits. Bialystok et al. (2014) found that 2 years of instruction were enough for immersion students to outperform non-immersion students in several tasks, regardless of low proficiency levels in the immersion language. They also found that the metalinguistic advantages increase after 5 years of instruction, although not to the level of bilingual children.

In describing their findings, Bialystok et al. (2014) claim that immersion participants in the study outperformed non-immersion students on a morphology task (Wug Test). Immersion and non-immersion students originally performed equally in a grammaticality, sentence-judgment task, although more years in the program resulted in better performance for immersion students. Finally, for verbal fluency tasks, at a younger age receptive vocabulary levels were the same for both groups of students while productive vocabulary was higher for non-immersion students. As immersion children got older, they performed equivalently to monolingual students. The authors determined that students who had a more organized semantic system and a larger vocabulary are able to come up with more words in these tasks

and that, regardless of the program, students produce more words as they grow older. Bialystok et al. (2014) conclude that more experience in language use results in greater benefits and more similarity to the pattern found in bilingual students. As experience modifies ability, the role of immersion classrooms becomes essential in helping children become bilingual as they enjoy more of the benefits brought about by bilingualism.

Jim Cummins has invested most of his professional career in analyzing several aspects of French Immersion; Cummins (2014a) comments:

> The overall outcomes of French immersion programs can be summarized as follows (see Baker, 2011; Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013):
> – Students acquire reasonably good receptive skills (listening and reading) in French but their productive skills (speaking and writing) are limited with respect to grammatical accuracy and range of vocabulary.
> – Teaching through L2 entails no adverse effects on L1 literacy....
> – In early immersion programs (starting in Kindergarten, age 5), students are able to develop functional decoding skills in French despite the fact that their French proficiency in the early grades is very limited.
> – Immersion appears appropriate for a wide variety of students... (p. 6–7).

Cummins (2014a) adds that these results indicate that there is still room for improvement. He addresses the need to analyze common pedagogical assumptions and use research evidence to implement instructional strategies leading to even better results. Cummins (2014b) summarized years of research in the following passage:

> A common finding from L2 immersion programs across a variety of contexts is that students gain a reasonable level of fluency and literacy in L2 at no apparent cost to their academic skills in the socially dominant language. In the Canadian French immersion context, students catch up in most aspects of English standardized test performance within a year of the introduction of formal English language arts. With respect to French skills, students' receptive skills in French are better developed (in relation to native speaker norms) than are their expressive skills. By the end of elementary school (grade 6, age 12) students are close to the level of native speakers in understanding and reading of formal French (assessed by standardized tests)… (p. 3).

In a different study, Lappin-Fortin (2014) presents interesting findings involving *French immersion students, core French students* and what she terms *core French plus students*, to refer to those who have participated in some form of immersion experience either in Quebec or France. Her results show that French immersion students express themselves with more ease than core French students do. Also, core French plus students did better in terms of sentence length than the core French students. However, her findings show that French immersion students do not outperform core French students in terms of accuracy and even more interestingly, that the core French plus group is more successful regarding total word counts and accuracy than either of the other groups. This last group outperforms both the French immersion students

and the core French group in accuracy in simple sentence construction and one other variable under study: verb + infinitive use. She maintains that core French plus students possess greater knowledge of grammatical rules and verb morphology and they use these rules accurately. The author attributes these differences to possibly higher motivational factors. These findings highlight the importance of participating in authentic immersion experiences as it evidences greater advantages for students who have enjoyed this experience over students who have followed French immersion and core French classes without spending time immersed in a French-speaking culture.

Mady (2015) analyses the achievement results of sixth-grade, Canadian born English/French bilingual, Canadian born multilingual, and immigrant multilingual students enrolled in immersion programs in the province of Ontario (an English-dominant region) of Canada. Mady found that the immigrant group outperformed the Canadian born English/French bilingual group and the Canadian born multilingual group in French speaking, reading and writing; integrative motivation and in oral willingness to communicate. The results were also significant in favor of the immigrant group for instrumental motivation when compared to the Canadian born bilingual group. For Mady (2015), these results are a clear indication of the advantage that immigrant students have in comparison with the other multilingual groups, despite the challenges to gain access to immersion education that this population faces. Mady (2015) maintains that the results of her study evidence the great effort that immigrant groups make to adapt to the Canadian community and its demands. They show that immigrants are not to blame for lower numbers of official language bilinguals in Canada, and come as a good response to politicians who require high levels of language proficiency to admit immigrants.

In addition, Hipfner-Boucher, Pasquarella, Chen and Deacon (2016) investigated how French/English cognate awareness developed in immersion children and how this development related to reading comprehension. Their findings show that the immersion children exhibited awareness of cognate relations as early as first grade and that the development of this ability progressively develops through the first years of elementary school. Hipfner-Boucher et al. argue that cognate awareness is critical for lexical quality because it results in a much richer vocabulary in students and thus supports reading comprehension. They claim that their findings also substantiate the idea of cognate awareness as a metacognitive ability as it shows knowledge of words beyond their individual meaning. Furthermore, they found that this awareness of French/English cognate relations contributes positively to French reading comprehension (and could be used as a predictor) both for students whose L1 is English and for those who have a different L1. This is an indication, they maintain, of the contribution of cognate awareness to reading comprehension even in cases where etymological connection does not include the students L1. Finally, Hipfner-Boucher et al. (2016) call for an early, explicit

teaching of cognates in immersion education and for consideration of cognate awareness development as an additional metalinguistic skill in that context.

5.2 Challenges of Immersion Education

While the amount of benefits of immersion programs outnumbers its limitations, the years that have gone by since the initial stages of Canadian immersion education have allowed for a very conscientious, in-depth analysis of the process. As a result, many ideas have been brought forward, some of which concentrate on problematic issues whereas others focus on possible solutions for shortcomings. Some of the challenges have to do with core features of the model while others are a result of more current linguistic and social demands of the participants in the learning process. Makropoulos (2009), for example, argues that the present times offer more pressing issues. She maintains that stakeholders are aware of the changes in political priorities and the budget cuts affecting immersion programs, and how they have repercussions on access to these programs.

Cummins (2007, Cummins 2014a, b) points to the need to revise basic instructional practices that have become permanent assumptions in immersion programs. He insists that these presuppositions are inconsistent with current theoretical findings and contradict evidence from areas such as Applied Linguistics and Cognitive Psychology. The first erroneous assumption deals with the instructional use assigned to the TL and the avoidance of use of the L1 as a resource in the classroom. For Cummins (2007), while evidence supports the idea of extensive communicative TL language practice in the class, it also substantiates the cognitive usefulness of the L1 in the classroom. He also notes that students' prior linguistic and experiential knowledge can contribute to L2 advancement, and that only by resorting to L1 experience can prior knowledge be made available to learners. Cummins (2014a) argues that L1 and L2 academic skills are interconnected and that this is a resource that all students have equal access to, regardless of their linguistic backgrounds because "[t]he interdependence principle applies to languages that are linguistically distant from each other as well as to languages that have common roots" (p. 7).

The second assumption requiring revision is the idea that translation between L1 and L2 is not allowed in the immersion classroom. For Cummins (2007), translation is a powerful tool in the classroom and it requires adequate guidance to allow students to access and deal with language information as efficiently as possible. For Cummins (2007), engaging students in writing projects could render translation a clear strength in the classroom, and he also mentions products such as "identity texts," developed by students in their two languages. Furthermore, Cummins (2014a) argues: "In the context of L2 immersion programs, translation in the instructional process has been regarded as highly counter-productive because students would likely 'tune out' input in their weaker language, knowing that translation into their L1

was on its way" (10). For reasons such as this, he insists, very little attention has been devoted to developing strategies that instruct students on how to transfer information across languages through translation. Cummins (2007, 2014a, b) maintains that, rather than avoiding translation, teachers should provide students with strategies to use translation as a powerful tool in their second language acquisition process. Besides translation, we should not lose sight, however, of the importance of input and output in L2. The use of L1 as resource in the classroom should not interfere with the development of L2. Cummins (2014a) argues: "[i]t is certainly important within immersion programs to create largely separate spaces for each language. Extensive input (and ideally output) in the target language and active engagement with the language are prerequisites for acquisition" (p. 17).

The third assumption reviewed by Cummins (2007, 2014a, b) is that requiring strict separation of languages in the classroom, or what he calls the "two solitudes assumption." He also notes that this idea is counterintuitive because students would naturally tend to make constant cross-linguistic connections. Cummins calls for a dynamic view of multilingualism instead: one that acknowledges the difference in the mental structures of monolinguals and bilinguals. For Cummins, if teachers instructed students to identify similarities and differences between their languages and guided them to develop strategies that entailed coordination across languages, students could learn the languages more efficiently. Cummins (2007, 2014b) also claims that rigorous separation of languages impedes activities such as directed teaching focused on French/English cognate relations, creation and distribution of multimedia language books, or projects such as sister exchange classes, all of which could contribute greatly to language development. Cummins (2007) concludes by pleading for a view of L1 as a tool to achieve superior L2 proficiency that can be achieved if the correct instructional strategies are implemented. Furthermore, Cummins (2014b) invites educators to make use of coordinated planning that could help them integrate objectives that are common to English and French. We can imagine how this joint learning of contents would strengthen the knowledge of features shared by both languages while also facilitating students' comprehension and use of the languages.

Authors such as Howe (2014) argue that Canadian teacher education has traditionally provided pre-service teachers with a varied array of tools, and that characteristics such as "effective leadership, multiculturalism, racial tolerance and global citizenship education, as well as comprehensive curriculum, teaching and learning, all figure prominently in teacher education" (p. 589). He maintains that multicultural teacher development has been a constant in Canadian teacher development. Although this may be the case, ideas such as those put forth by Cummins (2014a, b) certainly open the discussion for more and better ways to improve Canadian immersion programs from the perspectives of teacher training.

Furthermore, Makropoulos (2009) addresses the issue of class inequalities in school choices when certain parents lead the decision-making process to select schools, especially in the context of late French immersion (LFI). She stresses the importance of offering options for bilingual education to older students, who may not have had that opportunity previously and who may not find this opportunity elsewhere. Makropoulos (2009) discusses the claims of students from immigrant and working-class families who did not enroll in early immersion programs either due to their parents' lack of knowledge and information about these programs or to the parents' pressures of working life. The study shows that these students later enrolled in LFI programs due to teachers' recommendations and their own personal interests. Makropoulos (2009) contends that middle-class family students actively tried to join the programs and showed a very clear interest in acquiring communication skills in French that could eventually provide them with economic advantages. Moreover, for Makropoulos (2009), working class families were far more concerned with employability issues, concentrating mostly on finding a way to join the labor market.

Makropoulos (2009) also points to a distinction between different groups of students in late immersion education. First, there are students belonging to a middle-class group, whose parents are English-speaking individuals and who receive encouragement from these parents to pursue LFI education. Parents' involvement in this group sometimes includes enrolling their children in the programs even when students are not necessarily interested. On the other hand, there are students whose parents are immigrants or English-speaking, working-class Canadian and who rely mostly on processes initiated by teachers' recommendations for students' enrollment in FI programs. The students in this group also show a clear, personal interest in joining the programs. A third group is formed by descendants of at least one Francophone parent, who join FI programs due to their parents' initiative, with an interest in maintaining their families' French language skills. This study describes how social class and family background play a determining role in the reasons for enrolling in LFI programs and about parents' and students' roles. We could take this study as an invitation to look for fair procedures enabling all students to have a clear option for immersion education regardless of their social groups.

In another study, Makropoulos (2010) explores the subjects of students' interest in FI programs and their connection with aspects such as class, culture and race. He found that students who had shown themselves to be engaged had related the immersion curriculum with their language abilities and needs. These students claim that the French skills acquired in secondary immersion classes provided them with the ability to succeed at the level required for university work. A distinction is made in that study between students with or without a Francophone parent. Engaged students with no Francophone parent claimed to face difficulty dealing with the linguistic demands in classes taught

in French (their second or third language). Conversely, engaged students coming from Francophone families had no trouble with linguistic demands since they relied on their previous linguistic background.

On the other hand, disengaged students in Markopoulos' (2010) analysis claimed that what the curriculum offered to them was not related to their abilities and interests. Regardless of the students' achievements in language and content or how well they were doing in the program, they believed that the immersion program was not worth investing their time in. For disengaged students, one possible contributing factor identified by the author is whether students had a Francophone parent or not. As was also the case in Makropoulos (2009), the existence of a French linguistic background facilitated or hindered the processing of challenging linguistic information. For students with no Francophone parent, managing challenging linguistic information could serve as an additional factor for disengagement. This study shows how students' attitudes are shaped by how they see their own realities and needs related to linguistic and academic situations. The school and students' personal experiences contribute to their perception and attitudes toward the immersion program they were enrolled in. These findings represent a challenge for immersion programs in offering a type of language program that keeps students engaged for as long as possible.

Roy and Galiev (2011) describe the challenges immersion students encounter to be recognized as bilinguals, despite the social and cognitive benefits associated with bilingualism in immersion contexts. The authors maintain that discourse on bilingualism shapes how students and others around them perceive their own language competencies. They add that in the Canadian francophone society it is believed that bilingualism is the competent use of English and French where code-switching and transfer are not present. The authors determined that while early immersion students are enrolled in the program by their parents, late immersion students make this choice alone because they see the need to know the country's two official languages. Students and parents who choose immersion do so because it offers cognitive advantages to learn subsequent languages, it creates better opportunities at the job and societal level, and lastly because they could learn the country's official languages. Both parents and students recognize that the language levels they reach might not correspond to their needs and that they might not suffice to compete for certain jobs. The immersion students do not consider themselves fully bilingual or having an adequate level of French, even after a number of years in the program.

Moreover, Roy and Galiev (2011) refer to the notion of what characteristics determine the appropriate variety of French and competency as a Francophone as contributing factors for students' self-evaluation of language proficiency. In this sense, teachers' decisions in the classroom, and their overt disqualification of certain language varieties, are said to have a strong effect on students'

subsequent evaluations of themselves. The authors noted that Canadians see immersion students either as true bilinguals or as bilinguals who are not francophones. Canadians associate code-switching with a lack of language proficiency, despite the fact that theory dictates the opposite. Moreover, sociocultural knowledge is also considered a distinctive feature of bilingualism by which French-speaking learners of English are more likely to be defined as bilinguals than English-speaking learners of French are, simply because the former may have broader sociocultural knowledge. The authors note that immersion education in Canada reflects the social and ideological perceptions of different actors in the society. Who is bilingual and what identifies a person as such is shaped by the social and ideological characteristics deemed official in that society. Roy and Galiev (2011) conclude that French immersion education does not simply entail becoming a French-English bilingual, but "French immersion education is about gaining cultural, linguistic, and social wealth and dominance in Canadian society and elsewhere and about becoming competitive in the bilingual job market" (p. 371). It can thus be seen that in society where native speakers define who is bilingual and also represent the standard against which learners are measured, immersion students face a tough challenge in speaking both English and French well.

Cummins (2014b) draws attention to the lack of coherence that characterizes the policies that regulate Canadian language teaching, and adds that this incoherence results from the independent and largely disconnected provincial jurisdiction that creates different policies and provisions. Cummins (2014b) thus calls for a change in FSL policies because of what he considers to be a critical failure of Core French as a Second Language (FSL) programs across Canada. He insists that the Core FSL program, despite the participation of over 90% of students in FSL programs in Canada, continues to result in constant, disappointing failure. He discusses three areas of interest that have been analyzed in greater depth in recent years. First, he describes the issue of English and French instruction for newcomers. Cummins notes the lack of training and preparation at pre-service or professional development stages for teachers working in primary and secondary levels. He insists that teachers need to excel not only in knowledge of their subject of expertise but also in dealing with students who are learning the language while also learning the content through that language in their classrooms. Cummins proposes this be done following two cost-effective solutions: 1) Schools could specify the type of knowledge and abilities that they expect in the professionals to be hired, so that they can be sure that they have the linguistic and content knowledge needed for the new immersion classrooms; 2) intra-school criteria should be developed to require specific qualifications of school professional. This would ensure that schools with a diverse population would have professors and administrative staff with formal or proven knowledge of educational practices in environments with varied linguistic or cultural representations.

The second issue addressed in Cummins (2014b) is the apathetic attitude of the government toward promoting and implementing bilingual programs for heritage languages: "Canadian provinces have shown little interest in imaginative approaches to heritage language education" (p. 6). The third issue has to do with the practice of denying bilingual opportunities to deaf children. He criticizes the common practice of Audio Verbal Therapists who forbid patients with cochlear implants to receive American Sign Language input or instruction. Cummins maintains that this practice denies this population the opportunity to be bilingual and stops them from engaging in real communicative practices while condemning them to spend time learning to decode speech instead. For Cummins, these three practices show how assumptions that are not substantiated on evidence can determine common policies and practices.

Cobb (2015), likewise, taps into the sensitive issue of availability of Canadian French Immersion programs for special education students; this becomes even more complicated when the inclusion of parents in the children's educational process is not seen as beneficial or even necessary:

> Support for students with special needs varies in intensity and delivery, and may unfold as an alternative program, modifications to curriculum expectations, and/or accommodations to classroom environment, instructional delivery, and/or assessment… Access to support has remained a persistent issue for students with a variety of needs, including those who are gifted, as well as those with attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder (AD/HD) and attention deficit disorder (ADD). (p. 171)

Cobb argues that support for the gifted is recognized as a type of special education only in Ontario, but not in the rest of Canada. Moreover, ADD, AD and HD are still under revision to determine whether these should be recognized as special education. Cobb points out that although children in Ontario could access bilingual education, this is not recognized as a right. Thus, fighting for access to these programs becomes even more difficult for special education students. In addition to these difficulties, Cobb draws attention toward the lack of support for special education children and their families. He notes that adequate support is crucial during the second language acquisition process for any student in general, and for special education students, including gifted students who often face underachievement and frustration as a result of different experiences in the classroom, such as facing insufficient challenge. Cobb insists that attention and support are necessary for special students and could be provided through prompt referral for assessment and by monitoring those waiting to be assessed.

Along with the accessibility issue, Cobb (2015) also discusses that of exclusion that takes place when students are relocated in different learning programs that restrict their learning opportunities. The process can also exclude parents if they are not welcomed as part of the decision-making process.

Cobb recommends ways to minimize exclusion in immersion programs: 1. the development of inclusive processes where students are referred for assessment under supervision of both parents and teachers; 2. mentoring and professional development of teachers in identifying and providing support to special needs students; and 3. developing an awareness of inclusion and conflict resolution techniques in immersion teachers to foster more productive relations with parents. For Cobb (2015), addressing the issues of accessibility and exclusion could guarantee a more equal education for children, especially in immersion programs, and lower attrition rates that are prominently higher for children and adolescents with learning disabilities.

Finally, Roy and Schafer (2015) explore the role of reading in French immersion programs, and how it is commonly assumed to be a language skill rather than a social practice, thus largely limiting reading to curricular requirements rather than associating it with leisure. They add that this issue becomes more complicated when immersion students' reading abilities, and the cultural competence required, are measured against those of native speakers. Students may be asked to read native-like texts set in unfamiliar political and social contexts. The authors argue that cultural references and uses of French or Quebecois varieties unknown to students make texts more difficult for students and may discourage them from appreciating these texts. According to these authors, strong ideologies held by teachers and society in general are imposed on students who end up accepting and reproducing them. Expectations of native speaker-like competence and cultural knowledge can be harmful for students. Roy and Schafer (2015) call for a broader view of literacy (especially in bilingual programs) that would go beyond simply acquiring decoding and encoding skills:

> If we look at literacy practices, learning to read and write does not only mean that students need to read the words, acquire more vocabulary, understand different varieties of French and succeed during tests. It also means that literacy practices are co-created in many ways by the people inside and outside of the community (p. 532).

They invite immersion instructors to teach reading, not only to excel in formal testing, but also to be able to use reading to explore ideologies related to the language and culture.

While the number of challenges that immersion education faces may seem extensive, they should be taken only as a sign of a reflective, critical attitude on the part of researchers genuinely interested in continuing to improve the process of immersion education. This process of reflection is supported by over 50 years of experience and a steady growth in the number of students and programs. Features such as the research and analysis derived from immersion have guaranteed the undeniable success associated with these programs.

5.3 Other Findings

Bourgoin (2014) explores the predictive effects that L1 literacy has for intra- and inter-language predictions of reading skill abilities. With the premise that reading skills represent a critical determinant of academic success, she insists that the lack of consolidation of reading skills is even more detrimental for students at risk for reading problems and that these difficulties are greater for students with literacy limitations who are learning a L2. She adds that these limitations could be eradicated through adequate targeted instruction; hence, the need for timely identification and intervention. Bourgoin (2014) claims that phonological awareness (especially recognizing the first sound of a word) and alphabetical knowledge in early L1 literacy skills are significant predictors of L2 reading. Similar findings are claimed regarding L2 phonological awareness, and alphabetical knowledge and reading in the L2. These effects could be identified even in very early stages of French immersion. Bourgoin notes that special consideration should be given to the idea of using these initial literacy predictors to identify individual differences very early in the immersion process so that students can benefit from well-developed reading skills. Bourgoin (2014) stresses the possibility of an early identification of students at risk for reading difficulties in L2 by administering appropriate tests either before they start learning the L2 or once they have started.

Cummins (2014b) provides a detailed list of activities that can be used to ensure the acknowledgement of linguistically diverse populations and their languages in the second language classroom and in the school itself. These activities are being implemented across Canada by both educators and researchers. He terms these practices *teaching through an English as an additional language (EAL) lens* and *teaching through a multilingual lens*, and mentions simple activities to increase the presence of the students' languages at school and in the classroom. Some include presentations of one new word by a different student each day; learning and using simple greetings in the different languages of the classrooms, welcoming students by greeting them in diverse languages; addressing participants in those languages at school assemblies, and displaying students' work around the school.

Cummins (2014b) also lists activities to motivate students to use their L1 to develop reading skills, do research or take notes during class. These activities could provide access to students' background knowledge and further it by accessing information in their L1 via Internet or other sources. For Cummins, the use of L1 could ease comprehension and facilitate transfer of information between languages. Students could be encouraged to use L1 when planning projects to be presented in the class language. They could also read, tell stories or ask parents to tell them stories in the L1. School libraries should give them access to L1 dual language books. Teachers and principals could invite community members to class to read or tell stories. Students could research current topics using their L1 and then discuss these topics from the perspective of their L1 culture or ideology. Cummins (2014b) argues that teachers and

schools could make use of technology to raise awareness regarding language, geography or intercultural realities. *Google Translate* can be used to develop rough drafts of papers that can later be revised by more advanced speakers of the language. *Google Earth* can provide a closer look at specific regions and lead to discussions about other countries and comparisons of those countries to the Canadian reality. Finally, students can be part of *Dual Language Project Work* that could be distributed online, or could even be carried out in cooperation with other schools via web.

Similarly, Lyster and Tedick (2014) propose three ways to enhance students' metalinguistic awareness in immersion pedagogy. First, a stronger *focus on form* allows awareness and practice activities targeting form either implicitly or explicitly. This would enable students to increase accuracy and academic literacy, and higher levels of oral and written proficiency. Second, a focus on *interaction and corrective feedback* between teachers and students. For Lyster and Tedick (2014), this interaction offers multiple possibilities for language development through questioning and scaffolding which eventually lead students to greater engagement with language and content material. Through corrective feedback, teachers could also draw students' attention to language forms to improve accuracy. Third, strengthening *cross-lingual pedagogy and teacher collaboration* could reinforce greater vocabulary development and facilitate the use of L1 as a cognitive tool for L2 learning. These ideas are similar to those discussed by Cummins (2007, 2014a, b). Lyster and Tedick (2014) emphasize the power that teachers, as ultimate decision makers, have in directing students toward successful language learning outcomes. For these authors, strengthening metalinguistic awareness could contribute to the improvement of grammatical accuracy, lexical variety and sociolinguistic competence in immersion education students.

6 Concluding Remarks

The movement that began as an experiment for just over 20 students has served as a beacon for teaching practices for more than five decades. Although still evolving as a social and educational movement, Canadian French immersion programs have served as a referent for educational practices around the world. With minor modifications, the original objectives, teaching practices and pedagogy still seek and reach the desired goals of second language skills. The accomplishments of these programs, thus, continue to inspire second language models like those of the following sections.

Dual Language Education
The Case of the U.S.

Here we explore the characteristics of Dual Language Education. After presenting background information, we discuss some of the distinguishing features of the model, and key factors identified as determining elements of success across different programs. Both positive effects and problematic issues associated with the model will be brought forward. Finally, we present what different authors consider to be pressing issues for future research.

1 Background Information

A review of the development of Dual Language Education (DLE) in the U.S. reveals that it is a subject of permanent discussion and politically-charged modification (see Baker, 2011, for a historical review of bilingual education in the U.S.). In the literature on DLE, various names are used to refer to this teaching model: *Dual Language Education, two-way bilingual education, bilingual immersion education, two-way immersion education, developmental bilingual education* (Freeman, 2000), *dual immersion education, enrichment education* (Torres-Guzmán, Kleyn, Morales-Rodríguez & Han, 2005), and *dual language enrichment education* (Parkes, 2008). Although DLE is frequently associated with the United States, this type of program also exists today in Macedonia, China, and the South Pacific (Baker, 2011); and Canada, Israel, Ireland and Germany (de Jong, 2014). The research discussed below, however, is centered on the conditions, characteristics, and evolution of these programs in the U.S.

Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary, and Rogers (2007) define DLE as "any program that provides literacy and content instruction to all students through two languages and that promotes bilingualism and biliteracy, grade-level academic achievement, and multicultural competence for all students" (p. 1). According to Baker (2011), DLE began in Dade County, Florida in the United Stated in 1963. He describes how parents from the Cuban community in the area, with the hope of eventually returning to Cuba, were interested in their children conserving Spanish proficiency while also being able to function in the English-speaking society where they live. For Baker (2011), since the dual language program began to be implemented, English-speaking children from middle-class parents were enrolled in it, showing interest from parents in foreign language instruction. As the phenomenon evolved in the U.S., it continued to mix students from majority and minority groups across the country. When DLE programs were first implemented, they were seen as

an option that would use the experience gained in the immersion programs in Canada while possibly reaping greater benefits due to the presence of native speakers of both languages in the classroom (Valdés, 2013), something the Canadian programs did not always enjoy.

Valdés (2013) also mentions that DLE appeared to be promising from several perspectives. It offered instruction in the first language to students from Mexican minority groups, and it brought together majority and minority students, to help diminish the historical segregation toward the minority group. These promising characteristics that initially described DLE education have only been strengthened throughout time. Baker (2011, p. 231) maintains: "Dual Language education attempts to effect social, cultural, economic or political change, particularly in strengthening the weak, empowering the powerless, and working for peace and humanity in the midst of conflict and terror." It can be deduced from these ideas that DLE programs are identified with a strong sense of social changes seeking equality. Parkes (2008) insists that both children and parents in this model differ substantially from participants in any other kind of model. Palmer, Martínez, Mateus, and Henderson, (2014, p. 762) consider that implementation of DLE programs that foster social integration represent a triggering element for a change in school demographics where more "white native English-speaking students" enroll in DLE programs such as the one they describe in their study.

Both in its origins linked to Cuban immigrants, and in its historical development often linked to Mexican immigrants, Spanish has dominated the landscape of DLE, as the most frequent counterpart language to English. More recently languages such as Korean, Mandarin and French (Tedick, 2014) are also part of this landscape. The presence of minority and majority populations is often referred to in descriptions of DLE, because this is at the core of the model. For Lindholm-Leary (2012), a DLE program combines English Language Learner students that share one of the minority languages in the area and native English-speaking children in a single educational setting to receive academic instruction through both languages. These features establish the context for an enriched setting where two groups of students with constrasting backgrounds and histories enjoy high quality education in an environment that promotes equal opportunities for both populations. For Torres-Guzmán, Kleyn, Morales-Rodríguez, and Han (2005), these rich characteristics of the population in dual language programs "can translate concerns about language development and cultural pluralism into an equitable linguistic and cultural education for all students…" (p. 472).

More recently, a new form of the DLE model has been gaining popularity in the United States. This is called the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). Polat and Cepik (2016) describe SIOP as a planning tool that offers a framework-type guide that helps instructors to deliver, assess, and evaluate those "instructional practices that can help ELLs [English Language

Learners] attain English proficiency and achieve academically in content areas" (817). According to Daniel and Conlin (2015), this approach integrates language support into the English content classes rather than offering support in the weaker language outside class. For Daniel and Conlin (2015):

> The goal of the SIOP model is to prepare teachers in helping ELLs to navigate the dual challenges of learning subject-area skills and content and learning language through building students' background knowledge, making content comprehensible, and attending to other key components of sheltered instruction. (p. 171)

Daniel and Conlin (2015), citing Echeverria et al. (2008), list the main components of SIOP as the following: content and language objectives are reflected in meaningful activities and material; students' background knowledge is built on the basis of prior knowledge and vocabulary growth; comprehensible input is provided; scaffold techniques and learning strategies play a key role in the classroom; students' interaction is encouraged; clear application of content and language knowledge is crucial; well-paced instruction and student engagement are necessary; and vocabulary and content review sessions, as well as student comprehension assessment are also essential. In general, we find that the model attempts to provide full access to knowledge for all students in the classroom. This is carried out in a context that corresponds to the basic ideals of dual education, as described below.

For SIOP, while some argue that there seem to be challenges to overcome in the interpretation of the approach (Daniel and Conlin, 2015), or in the implementation of "theoretical and operational foundations" (Polat and Cepik, 2016), evidence shows that improvement is possible and is already taking place, at least at the level of teachers' attitude toward students in this kind of program (Song, 2016). SIOP, as a newer addition to Dual Language Education, serves as evidence that the model continues to evolve.

Considering the background information presented, we move now to analyze further characteristics and basic tenets that have served as cornerstones for DLE as it has developed.

2. GOALS AND CHARACTERISTICS

One of the highly distinguishing features of DLE programs is that it targets students from two different segments of the society or specific community where it is implemented. These participants also have two different language backgrounds. On the one hand, the program also engages learners from language minority groups (i.e., Spanish, Korean) who typically represent minority populations in the area. On the other hand, it enrolls students from the majority language (i.e., English) who tend to embody the dominant social group and dominant language in the area. Both groups of students

are integrated into a classroom where they receive literacy and content area instruction through both of their languages. Additionally, for de Jong (2014), a DLE program "distinguishes itself by enrolling native or fluent speakers of each of the two languages in the program and by emphasizing the benefits of social and academic integration of diverse student populations…" (p. 241). The social benefits of DLE education tend to be highlighted for this model. Furthermore, for Tedick (2014, p. 160), an equally distributed student body in the educational setting is ideal to stimulate "meaningful student interaction between the two groups of learners, provides exposure to peer 'native' language models, and promotes positive intergroup relations (de Jong & Howard, 2003)." This contact with ideal language speakers that serve as language models also favors DLE programs when compared with alternative methods of bilingual education.

Baker (2011) has provided a detailed description of what Dual Language bilingual schools may offer to their students:

> The *mission* of Dual Language bilingual schools may also be couched in terms such as "equality of educational opportunity for children from different language backgrounds," "child-centered education building on the child's existing language competence," "a positive self-image for each child, "a community dedicated to the integration of all its children," "enrichment not compensatory education," "a family-like experience to produce multicultural children," and "supporting bilingual proficiency not limited English proficiency."
>
> The mission of all Dual Language schools (compared with mainstreaming) is to produce *bilingual, biliterate and multicultural children*. Language minority students are expected to become literate in their native language as well as in the majority language. At the same time, majority language students should make "age-relevant" progress in their first language and in all content areas of the curriculum. (p. 225)

While the benefits mentioned above are likely to be present in dual language settings, some appear more frequently. The DLE model pursues specific, clearly identified objectives. Across the literature, three major goals are considered essential in DLE, once it brings children together from two language backgrounds. First, it enables students to obtain quality academic knowledge in both languages. Second, children can become bilingual and biliterate as they advance. Third, it promotes cross-cultural understanding and positive attitudes that fight racism and foster social change while developing multicultural appreciation (Freeman (2000), Torres-Guzmán et al., (2005), Parkes (2008), Lindholm-Leary (2012)). These goals—the first two in particular—represent a historical breakthrough for students from minority groups, who have traditionally been at a disadvantage but are now receiving highly prestigious instruction in DLE programs.

Certain common characteristics serve as a basis to describe dual language programs. First, DLE promotes strict language separation, what Baker (2011, p. 226) calls "language separation and compartmentalization." This implies

a strict division of language use depending on different factors. Baker (2011) describes the language division according to time; the model alternates languages between lessons, days, weeks or semesters. Attention should be directed to distributing the time so that students are equally exposed to each language and can achieve the set goals in each. When alternating languages, care should be given to a balanced distribution and a precisely timed switch over to the other language. These options are possible as long as a clear-cut boundary is drawn between the two languages.

Second, language separation, as implemented by bilingual teacher is also required. Bilingual teachers are expected to use the language that students can identify with them by avoiding a switch between languages. It is believed that this motivates students to respond to the teachers according to the language they commonly use. In the event of a shortage of bilingual teachers, teachers could be paired. In this case a Spanish-speaking teacher and an English-speaking teacher would use their respective language when teaching their subject (i.e., Science, Art) to the same class. Mixing languages is to be avoided; and switching languages within a lesson, especially with bilingual teachers, is deemed detrimental for students.

Third, language separation by content curriculum takes place when certain subjects are taught in specific languages. A possible alternative is "language day" patterns in which given days of the week are associated with a given language (i.e., Spanish on Mondays, and English is used on Tuesdays). While this alternative does not fix a language to a subject, it leads to a rotation of all the subjects in relation to the language, ensuring exposure to a great variety of language forms across different subjects. The language day usually alternates from one week to another, so that specific subjects are not always taught in the same language. This language separation can also be done by assigning a given language to a particular subject (i.e., social studies in Spanish, mathematics in English). Nowadays, some flexibility regarding these language boundaries is expected and called for by several authors. Baker (2011, p. 229) criticizes DLE when it enforces a very strict language separation, characterizing it as "dated, difficult and unreasonable." Palmer et al. (2014, p. 759) condemns this "monolingual notion of bilingualism." They insist that this strong language separation "is founded upon the outdated notion of languages as separate systems, and bilingualism as dual monolingualism" (p. 759). As discussed elsewhere, well-supported theories favor cross-linguistic transfer of information; namely, Cummins' Common Underlying Proficiency (1980, 1986, 2008) and Interdependence Hypothesis (1979, 1986, 2000, 2005). Considering these theories and the existence of a base of cognitive and academic knowledge underlying academic performance, which is evident through transfer of proficiency from L1 to L2, such a strict separation of languages is uncalled for and may even be detrimental for students.

Another time-based language division is also found in DLE. Two models are common across the U.S.: the 50:50 and the 90:10 models. For de Jong (2014, p. 242), "[b]oth models can be effective when they are well-implemented...." These two models are described by Baker (2011) as follows:

> The two main models in the US are 50:50 and 90:10. In the 90:10 model, 90 % of the instruction is in the minority language in the kindergarten and 1st grade, with 10% to develop English oral language proficiency and pre-literacy skills. Over the remaining elementary grades this ratio changes to 50:50 (e.g., by the 4th to 6th grade). Students often begin formal English reading in the 3rd grade. But from the 1st grade, they are exposed to English literacy more informally.
>
> In the 50:50 model, a 50%-50% balance in use of languages is attempted in both early and later grades. Variations between 90:10 and 50:50 are possible where the minority language will be given more time (60%, 75%, 80%), especially in the first two or three years. In the middle and later years of schooling, there is sometimes a preference for a 50%-50% balance, or occasionally more accent on the majority language. (p. 227)

Lindholm-Leary (2012) acknowledges these two possibilities for models and argues that, besides this distribution of languages used for instruction, another major difference of DLE lies in the language used to teach reading. Lindholm-Leary (2012) explains that, in the 90:10 model, reading is first taught in "the partner language" (i.e., Spanish, Korean) for both native speakers of this language and English-speaking youngsters. For the 50:50 model there is much more variation. While in some schools children learn to read first in their primary language (Spanish and English respectively), at other schools students develop reading skills in both languages simultaneously. Authors like Castro, Paéz, Dickinson, and Frede (2011) identify reading as a basis for academic success, thus the importance of a close follow-up on the reading process in DLE. Castro et al. defend the critical connection between phonemic awareness and decoding skills, key elements to support oral language proficiency, which is, in turn, the basis for subsequent reading ability. Castro et al. (2011) also characterize the process of language and literacy development in dual language learning as one that "involves the integration of component skills (e.g., sound-symbol awareness, grammatical knowledge, vocabulary knowledge), as well as more elusive sociocultural variables. Bilingual learners can and do develop second language literacy while acquiring second language oral proficiency" (p. 16).

One more distinctive feature of DLE has to do with the extent of the program in each school setting. That is, whether the program is a "strand" (or stream) program or if it is a "whole-school" program, the former appears to be a much more common—according to the literature—than the latter. Torres-Guzmán et al. (2005) describe school-wide implementation of DLE as rare, as most of the schools in their study implemented strand-DLE. Palmer (2010) describes a strand program as one that

> … is situated in an English-language mainstream public school much as a transitional bilingual education program might be, with one classroom out of two or three at every grade level dedicated to Spanish–English dual-language instruction, and the other classes conducted entirely in English. (p. 95)

The previous citation raises a delicate issue by comparing DLE with transitional programs, known to aim at preparing students to become part of mainstream groups, while often sacrificing their L1. This is clearly an idea that works opposite to the purpose of DLE. Moreover, on the subject of strand vs. whole school programs, de Jong (2014), for example, attributes this "design issue" of strand *versus* whole school implementation as having important effects on the outcomes of the program in general. In her study, only 97 out of 441 programs were school-wide programs. For de Jong, the overall environment of the school may affect the mission and organization of the program as well as the relationships of the different programs within the school. Further rationale is provided by Hernández (2015), who argues "[t]he most common programs exist as TWBI [Two Way Bilingual Immersion] strands within English-medium public schools, while others may offer a school wide approach" (p. 102–103). As can be gathered here, the issue of the extent of the program in a given setting is another distinguishing feature of DLE.

Certain sensitive issues that may exert more influence on DLE than on other sorts of bilingual programs have also been identified. Freeman (2000), for example, points to context as a very influential factor in DLE when she claims "the particular structural, sociolinguistic, and ideological context in which the dual-language program is situated influences how this bilingual program functions on the local level and challenges the dichotomous thinking that characterizes most discussion of bilingual education." (p. 202–203). She describes how students' socio-economic background is not always limited to the typical dichotomy of majority vs. minority population; or how the variety of levels of proficiency changes from one program-site to the next. According to Freeman, features such as these give context a more prominent role in DLE when compared to other types of bilingual education programs.

Furthermore, Torres-Guzmán et al. (2005) direct attention to the decision-making parties involved in processes affecting DLE programs and how the way these individuals value the student members of the speech communities in the program may be reflected on the programs offered for this very population. The issue of value and perception of students is critical in this type of education, considering that minority groups, often representing segregated groups, are a fundamental part of the program.

Additional information is provided by Parkes (2008) about the characteristics of the parents participating in these programs. Parkes (2008) set out to determine the type of families that select DLE programs and the reasons behind this decision in the Southwest of the U.S. He determined that, from the families participating in the study, the majority use Spanish

with their children (54.6%) while the second group communicates with them mainly in English (45.4%). Also, 34.2% of the parents are Spanish dominant, 24.7% are English dominant, and 40.5% are bilingual parents. Regarding the educational level of parents, 50% have a high school education while 32.1% have undergraduate and 17.9% graduate degrees. These results evince interesting parallels between bilingual or Spanish-speaking caretakers and an evidently limited higher education experience. Second, in terms of objectives; Parkes' results show that the parents' main reason for choosing this model is that they want their children to speak, read and write in two languages. Other reasons include a desire for their children to succeed in globalized societies, and at the primary school level, for them to relate comfortably with different people. In this study, all parents (Spanish-speaking, English-speaking and bilingual parents) expressed a strong interest in their offspring becoming bilingual and biliterate. For Parkes (2008), the distinctiveness of family characteristics and the particular expectations they have on DLE programs deserve special attention when designing this type of program. Based on this study, we can conclude that the make-up of the family and community in the program, as in other DLE programs, is very different. These characteristics affect the programs and their outcomes.

3. Key Factors for Successful Programs

Lindholm-Leary (2005) (see also Howard et al., 2007) identified a list of key factors that are consistently found in Dual Language educational settings and associated with successful outcomes in these programs. She argues that these features identify effective language programs, in general, and dual language programs, in particular. Lindholm-Leary further insists that each of these eight factors, as key elements determining the singularity of each program, should be analyzed through the optic of the context in which each program is situated. She maintains: "[u]nderstanding these features can help young programs mature and more experienced programs develop into a program that promotes more successful outcomes in students" (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p. 44). These factors are described in depth in Lindholm-Leary (2005) and will be briefly summarized here.

3.1. Assessment and Accountability

The idea of assessment is consistent with the notion that all students who participate in DLE should reach a high standard of education. It follows that assessment is essential to measure the progress in students' performance and the achievement of the objectives of the different programs, mainly dual language programs. According to assessment results, programs, teachers, students and other actors involved in the process would be held accountable for their performance. Lindholm-Leary (2005) argues: "[d]ual

language programs require the use of multiple measures in both languages to assess students' progress toward meeting bilingual and biliteracy goals along with the curricular and content-related goals" (p. 10). She adds that the data collected through assessment should undergo scientific analysis for these results to provide accountability and allow for improvement. She also recognizes that assessment and accountability should portray a number of essential features. It should be consistent and systematic; monitor program effectiveness; be aligned with true standards; be geared toward the goals of bilingualism, biliteracy and multiculturalism; have multiple measures in both languages; and be scientifically interpreted. The results that can be derived from these data should report on students' progress, track students' progress over time, aim at staff advancement and be distributed among stakeholders for subsequent analysis. Assessment and accountability are thus seen as valuable tools that can effectively inform about the progress of a program as well as appropriately mark the way toward improvement in any given setting.

3.2. Curriculum

Lindholm-Leary (2005) claims that both the features of curriculum itself as well as those of the planning that goes into curriculum are crucial for the design and implementation of a program. Curriculum should correspond to the criteria and assessment in the program. It should challenge students; this could be attained through activities that demand higher order thinking skills from students, such as those described in Bloom's Taxonomy. It should also integrate technology, and its topics must be meaningful and interconnected. Moreover, it ought to correspond with an "enriched" type of program, with a long-term effect on students. The idea of bilingualism, biliteracy and multilingualism must be reflected throughout the core features of the curriculum. Finally, it should be a reflection of the students' cultural values and their characteristics. As of the planning related to curriculum, this should involve vertical and horizontal correspondence across its components. It ought to take into account materials that are varied in genre and presentation (such as video, print, and audio, referred to elsewhere as *multimodal* materials); and just like the rest of the curriculum, these should support students' goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and multiculturalism.

3.3 Instructional Practices

Lindholm-Leary (2005) enumerates a long list of important features belonging to this strand, and adds: "good instruction is even more complicated in dual language programs because of the added goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and multicultural competence, and the constant need to integrate and balance the needs of the student groups" (p. 14). The features that describe this factor focus on the qualities that instruction should have in the program in general, as well as on the ones that describe input in the classroom. For

Lindholm-Leary, the program should target a wide variety of learning styles and proficiency levels. It should foster positive interactions and genuine dialogue between students' peers and between professors and students of the different social groups that interact in this setting. The instructional practices should also promote cooperative learning where group work shows shared, common objectives; and individual work seeks social equity and accountability while both aim for bilingualism. In terms of language input, instructional practices should include "sheltered techniques" (visuals, modeling, various presentation strategies) that allow negotiation of meaning. They should be challenging, plentiful, interesting and relevant. Students should be offered controlled as well as flexible tasks that aim at highly proficient oral skills. Moreover, program activities should address all students' needs equally; and although students are integrated for most of the instruction time, classes will be given in only one language at a time. Here is where planning meets reality. Instructional practices are the contact point between planning (at macro and micro levels) and students in the classroom come together in the process.

3.4 Staff Quality

In addition to instructional practices, Lindholm-Leary (2005) contends that well-qualified teachers are another chief component of a successful program. Instructors should be certified, excel at their curriculum subject and be familiar with the features of the type of model they are immersed in. They need to possess good techniques for classroom management and instruction, and have experience with the characteristics of their educational setting and their students' backgrounds. They should possess bilingual teaching credentials and be savvy on language acquisition's best practices. Teachers are also expected to be native speakers or show native-like proficiency in the language of instruction, being bilingual and fully biliterate. Lindholm-Leary (2005) warns that the latter feature should never be the sole reason for a teacher to be part of a program, as "one cannot assume that because a teacher has a bilingual credential that s/he has current knowledge, understands, or supports the dual language program" (p. 21). This type of language proficiency is required to ensure "cognitively stimulating instruction," but is not, by any means, the only distinctive feature of teachers in dual programs. Monolingual English-speaking teachers are often part of DLE programs as well. These teachers should have the ability to understand "non-English" language coming from students, especially at initial levels of the program, with the purpose of meeting the students' needs from the beginning.

3.5. Professional Development

This factor refers not only to teachers, but to other members of personnel as well. Training for administrators and teachers should come from various fronts. Personnel should be knowledgeable in dual language models, their

tenets and distinctive features. They need to be familiar with theories that deal with bilingualism and second language development, as well as biliteracy. They should also know how to deal with content subjects that contain and reflect the basic goals of bilingualism, biliteracy and multiculturalism of the model. Moreover, training in equity matters is also crucial to promote high achievement expectations, especially in the group that represents the minority or disadvantaged population. It is essential to keep in mind that "[a] long with the training of teachers, training of staff is an important component of a successful program. An effective program cannot have office staff who only speak English if a significant number of parents do not speak English" (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p. 24). Given that often parents' first contact with the program through administrative channels, parents must have a way to communicate and learn about the program if they are not fluent in English. We can see the value of this factor as it demonstrates that if all members of a program are targeting a similar objective, they all should be equally involved in pursuing it. A program would be perceived as stronger if the public can recognize that they represent a united front in the school.

3.6 Program Structure

For Lindholm-Leary (2005), the features that conform this factor are divided into five segments. First, a strong program fosters a clear view of the DLE model and sets the goals so that these permeate all activities in the school. The program structure exhibits a clear focus on bilingualism, biliteracy and multiculturalism that is evident through high achievement expectations projected onto students. Second, students, parents and teachers are treated equally. They enjoy a safe, organized environment that facilitates learning inside an active community interested in the process of dual language learning. Participants in the process also enjoy the resources and professional support that encourage additive bilingualism as an outcome of the process. Third, leadership comes from the school principal, the program coordinator and the team in charge of managing the model at the local level. This means that there is permanent communication with the central administration, in charge of tracking the development, planning and coordination of any given program. These leaders also supervise staff unity, collegiality and development as well as the funding of the program. Fourth, the language educational model supports second language development, theory and research based on bilingualism. A fruitful program structure fosters appropriate instructional and classroom practices and commits to these Dual Language educational practices. Finally, Lindholm-Leary (2005) says that an ongoing planning program should be focused on developing the basic goals of dual education. This is to be reflected in all areas of the curriculum. From these ideas we conclude that a permanent planning program supports the practices that guarantee proficiency levels across all linguistic areas. Different actors are involved in the design and

implementation of a good program structure; active communication and support seem to be key to obtain the desired outcomes.

3.7 Family and Community Involvement

According to Lindholm-Leary (2005), dual language education programs ensure family and community involvement through the program itself and through liaison parents. From the perspective of the program, it implements several activities that warrant home/school connections that create a welcoming environment for parents. DLE programs posit great value on bilingualism, biliteracy and multilingualism. This is also reflected in practices such as making announcements and posting signs in the languages that are part of the program and in the hiring of staff speaking the non-English language. As to the liaison parents, these are bilingual speakers who maintain contact with parents from both language groups, organize parent-training sessions, know about theoretical issues of dual language programs and contribute to other parent-related issues when required. The key is parent involvement because "[w]hen parents are involved, they often develop a sense of efficacy that communicates itself to children with positive academic consequences" (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p. 40), which of course translates into beneficial consequences in the program itself. We can assume that, given that the mere existence of the program reflects the needs and interests of the community, this factor is of capital importance for an effective program to take place and for the program's subsequent accomplishments.

3.8. Support (Resources)

The impact that support can have on a program can make a significant difference in the effects that a program can have. Lindholm-Leary (2005) maintains "[t]he support a school receives influences its funding, materials, teacher training, program model, planning, parent involvement—and thus ultimately student achievement" (p. 42). Support that guarantees a successful program comes from various sources, at various levels. First, at the administrative level, support comes primarily from the school district and the local Board of Education. This source of support is essential for funding allocation and structural as well as functional guidance for the program. A second source of support is from the community and the school administrative authorities. They need to show a welcoming attitude and perception toward bilingualism, in general, and dual programs, in particular. Without their support, programs are not likely to last for long, that is, if they start at all. The third source of support lies at the school level. The principal plays a key role in integrating every member of the school as an active participant in the program. Making sure that the staff aptly understands and supports the model, finding and allocating the resources that the program needs to function accordingly, and creating a thriving atmosphere at the school setting are some of the roles of

the school's principal. He also needs to ensure acceptance of the program and the personnel that implements it, and he make an effort to provide materials that lead to the attainment of the goals and objectives. Finally, the last source of support is located at the family level. Family support is essential as a source of critical advocacy that helps keep the program in the school, even when the program may seem inadequate for other stakeholders or authorities in the area. Once more, we are reminded that the interest in dual language learning stems mainly from the families.

While acknowledging the undeniable singularity of each program and the effect that context and language specific features have on determining the distinctive features of any given DLE program, Lindholm-Leary (2005) characterizes successful programs from a basis of academic research in the area. The elements described above summarize decades of experience with successful DLE programs and serve as a guide that ensures future positive attainment of programs if these are implemented correctly.

4 ALLEGED BENEFITS OF DLE

Many positive characteristics have been attributed to DLE programs. Here we present several studies that refer to benefits associated with DLE. Freeman (2000) refers to the positive social effect that this type of education can have, because DLE challenges the traditional view of monolingualism by which minority language students were expected to learn English and become part of mainstream education to receive high quality education. He also argues that by promoting minority language learning at school, DLE raises the status of the minority languages that are part of these programs and questions "the legitimacy of monolingualism in Standard English as the unquestioned norm for students in mainstream U.S. schools" (p. 207). Torres-Guzmán et al. (2005, p. 455) further credit this model as "socially worthy" given that it directly promotes a more "inclusive" society that fosters bilingualism as well as diversity among its members. For Torres-Guzmán et al., it challenges traditional constraints assigned to the social status of minority groups while broadening the possibilities of "equity and inclusion" of these individuals as valued members of the social group.

A number of academic studies have evidenced the effects that DLE has on students. Lindholm-Leary and Block (2010), for example, contend:

> Hispanic students participating in dual language programs in predominant- ly Hispanic/low SES schools achieve at similar or higher levels compared to their mainstream peers in tests of English. In addition, students achieve above grade level in assessments in Spanish. (p. 43)

These authors further maintain that, in their study, both groups of students (Spanish dominant and English proficient) appear to exhibit advantageous results in areas such as language arts and mathematics. Not only are these

students performing well in English, but they are also excelling on Spanish tests. Lindholm-Leary and Block conclude that this evidence points to the idea that DLE programs are a contributing factor to closing the academic performance gap between Hispanic and non-Hispanic groups, even in segregated settings.

Furthermore, Lindholm-Leary (2012) offers a summary of findings from different studies where she enumerates the following benefits of DLE. First, DLE students show equal or above grade performance on English standardized tests on reading and mathematics. Second, when compared to peers across state, they show similar scores at around grade 5-7 or earlier. Third, achievement gaps between English language learners and their (English-only class) English native-speaking counterparts disappear at around 5th grade. Fourth, when measured in the partner language, DLE students obtain equal or above grade levels in reading and mathematics. These findings apply to groups whose counterpart language is Spanish, Chinese and Korean; the same type of results can be found at secondary levels. In addition, Lindholm-Leary shows that students attain high levels of proficiency in both languages; students who are English language learners are found proficient on state tests; and these results are extensive to populations coming from "different types of communities (urban, suburban, rural) or socio-economic backgrounds (high, medium, low income communities); and with students of different ethnic, linguistic, socio-economic, and special education needs" (Lindholm-Leary, 2012, p. 258). Marian, Shook, and Shroeder (2013) also argue that DLE brings many benefits to educational programs. Marian et al. (2013, p. 182) found that both minority and majority language students "show improved math and reading performance on standardized tests in English" while they also "stand to gain proficiency in both languages of instruction." They identify the latter as a desirable qualification in today's globalized society.

On a different note, Ruiz (2012) offers examples of how the "high expectation curricula" of DLE is an effective practice that promotes a "high level of interaction, authentic communicative contexts, a focus on comprehensible input and output, primacy of students' background knowledge, and early introduction of print…" (p. 153–154). Ruiz (2012) insists that dual English language learners in the U.S., particularly those of minority language groups, have an array of features (derived from their life experiences) setting them apart from monolingual English students; thus, they should not be compared to the latter. For Ruiz, when faced with the task of learning English while also performing accordingly in content areas, dual language learners need and do learn at a faster pace and demonstrate superior gains within a limited number of years, and thus succeed in the process. Ruiz (2012) concludes that this is achieved through enriched programs that implement high expectation curriculum; one of these programs is DLE, which provides "instruction

tailored to the unique resources and needs that English Learners bring to our classrooms" (p. 159).

Palmer et al. (2014), based on a close analysis of successful dual language teachers, describe certain types of behavior that, they found, favor a translanguaging pedagogy, that, in turn, supports authentic bilingualism. First, the effective teachers in their study served as models of dynamic bilingualism. These teachers implemented language practices that supported language and content learning in students. Second, regardless of the language competencies of students, efficient teachers treated students as competent bilinguals since initial stages of their language process. By treating students as bilingual speakers who are academically competent, these teachers reassured bilingual competency development in students. Third, effective teachers enthusiastically acknowledged and emphasized students' metalinguistic remarks associated with cognates, grammar, and structure, for example. By so doing, they assigned value to the students' knowledge and allowed this knowledge to become part of the growth in understanding of both English and Spanish, in the classroom. This strategy once again supports Cummins' theories (1986, 2005, 2009) on L1 transfer of knowledge into L2 on the basis that there is a Common Underlying Proficiency functioning interdependently to support the development of both languages. Palmer et al. (2014) conclude that these practices evince how teachers are crucial in allocating a key role to students as bilingual resources in the classroom. They insist that these practices promote and develop strong bilingual personalities that strengthen dual language practices. As this excerpt illustrates, good end results in a program are due to a combined source of efforts, one of which is the key role of teachers in the classroom, as contended by Lindholm-Leary (2005).

Lindholm-Leary and Genesse (2014) present the following results that tap into effects of various forms of bilingual education; special emphasis is given to the outcome of DLE programs. First, students enrolled in bilingual programs attain the same or better results than students enrolled in mainstream programs. Second, majority students (i.e., the largest group of students regardless of their L1) develop regular levels of proficiency in the L1 and advanced levels of proficiency in their L2, L3 or L4. Third, students in two-way immersion and developmental bilingual education programs, while becoming highly proficient in their L1, are also likely to be highly proficient in the dominant language at a rate similar to that of their counterparts (students in mainstream programs). Fourth, students from various, ethnic, socio-economic, and learning-challenged groups enrolled in bilingual programs benefit (academically and in terms of L1) equally or more than students in mainstream programs. Fifth, while intensive exposure to the dominant language does not translate into higher proficiency and achievement in that language for minority of majority students, intensive exposure to the minority language results in higher levels of proficiency for both groups of students.

Finally, in general, there is a positive connection between bilingualism and academic achievement for minority and majority language students.

In a similar vein, de Jong (2014) also provides a summary of outcomes that are frequently associated with two-way immersion programs. She maintains that the 90:10 model programs appear to be more beneficial to develop Spanish (oral) language abilities. Second, she argues that students in two-way immersion programs perform just as well or better on English tests than students enrolled in mainstream plans. Third, involvement in two-way immersion programs that start at the elementary level exert a long-term, positive impact that can be traced even to secondary school. Fourth, students with low socio-economic status, African-American students and students with special needs perform equally or significantly outperform non-DLE groups.

The studies reviewed show some of the results that have been found after analyzing the effects of dual language programs. Some ongoing research confirms the results mentioned above and seeks solutions for the problems identified, a selection of which are discussed in the following section.

5 Challenges of DLE

As is also the case with other types of bilingual education, DLE has a number of issues that represent future challenges for the model. For instance, Torres-Guzmán et al. (2005) bring up a critical issue that may have devastating effects on the very core principles of DLE and thus on its main objectives; namely, the erroneous allotment of time in language distribution. In the sample studied by Torres-Guzmán et al. (2005), they found that:

> … there is a widespread belief that a 90-10 model is implemented as 90% instructional time in English and 10% in the LOTE [Language Other Than English]. In other words, teachers do not know the basic tenets of dual-language programming and are making decisions about medium of instruction in ignorance of what they ought to be doing under the dual-language label. (p. 467)

While teachers are partly responsible for this problem, Torres-Guzmán et al. assign greater responsibility to district, program and administrative parties in charge of creating, labeling and implementing the programs. These actors should set the basis and constantly assess the programs in their area. It was also found that many programs labeled as "dual programs" were actually second language and heritage enrichment programs. This situation, Torres-Guzmán et al. (2005) sustain, may limit the future development and permanence of dual programs. The authors also observed that a few teachers (in programs with a stronger presence of the minority language) exhibit a better understanding of the foundations of the model. This calls for better teacher preparation, as a way to achieve the proper implementation of the model.

Palmer (2010) raises issues of segregation and even racism (in the form of personnel's attitude) present in the dual language program in her study. She describes situations where African American students and their parents have faced negative comments concerning the students' suitability for the program from school personnel. She claims that social workers in that institution are said to discourage African American students from dual programs based on their alleged inability to learn languages. This fact fosters exclusion of this population from such programs while promoting racism and creating an inequitable learning environment. Certain teachers in this setting argue that the program does, in fact, exclude students that are in need of the program, Latino students included. She argues that the situation contributes greatly to behavioral problems in the classroom, leaving students with a clear lack of motivation toward learning in general. Palmer concludes that for DLE to succeed, the interaction of race and power variables in each school must receive utmost care so that racism and inequities are eradicated from the learning environment.

Further rationale is given by Paciotto and Delaney-Barmann (2012), who point to the challenges raised by sociocultural and economic factors in rural areas. In particular, they put forward the issue of human resources and teacher availability in these regions. They illustrate this situation as follows: "[b]ecause of the lack of financial resources and ELL education knowledge, and geographic isolation, rural districts have to 'adapt' the preexistent human resources to fit the needs of changing demographic contexts" (p. 20). Personnel go through a learning process; they face a lack of effectiveness, and experience trial and error practices mostly based on their own motivation and personal interest towards their student population. Paciotto and Delaney Barmann (2012) show how a lack of state support results in a shortage of prepared teachers and administrators, the impossibility of language policy implementation, and a concentration of bilingual teachers where the focus of the migratory group is located. These features, they claim, are all very commonly found in underfunded rural areas. We can see how pressing the issue of qualified teachers is in these rural areas. The situation probably adds this difficulty to others that are commonly found in these contexts, such as school funding or teaching material limitations.

Feinauer and Howard (2014) draw attention to the problem of the lack of accountability established in connection to the "third goal" (cross-cultural competence of dual language programs) and they also offer ways to solve this problem. They contend that, when compared to the other goals of academic achievement and language and literacy, cross-cultural competence has received limited attention and is apparently seen as a less important objective. These authors argue that to develop intercultural understanding and cross-cultural abilities, students need a strong feel of their own cultural distinctiveness. They maintain that this issue may be addressed by being knowledgeable about how

the notion of student identity would help understand the students' progress in cross-cultural competence. Feinauer and Howard (2014) further assert that knowledge of students' cultural identity development may be approached from different perspectives. First, a developmental perspective can show how the program shapes the students' identity through time. Monitoring whether the program offers opportunities for students to explore their identities over time could do this; the fact that DLE programs are usually long-term programs also facilitates implementation of this type of techniques. Second, identity formation may be explored through a sociocultural perspective. Since linguistic interactions have a powerful effect on how we perceive the world and ourselves, these interactions play a fundamental role in explaining identity formation in this sociocultural sphere. If we consider that minority and majority students in DLE programs enjoy different opportunities (language- and education-wise) than students in mainstream settings, we could predict that they are also faced with different identity choices. Finally, a post-structural perspective views identity as a dynamic, changing phenomenon in which language plays the role of defining and delimiting identity. In the context of DLE, students' choice of language, students' positioning of themselves and the positions assigned to them by others may serve as a reflection of students' identity. The authors conclude by insisting on the need for students to develop a strong self-identity as a basis for subsequent attainment of cross-cultural competence.

Furthermore, de Jong (2014) points to the idea that the traditional focus on a dichotomous group as representative of student population in DLE no longer suffices and that it leaves out representatives of populations such as students who are already bilingual, students with special needs or the African-American students enrolled in dual education in urban U.S. She also draws attention to organizational issues of DLE; in particular, the fact that most of the programs in her study, 97 out of 441 (p. 248), operate as strand programs rather than whole-school programs. She insists that strong leadership is required to transform ways of thinking and perception as well as to turn strand programs into school-wide programs that support the goals of dual language learning.

Hernández (2015) addresses another sensitive issue of what she labels two-way bilingual immersion; that is, the challenges of student-student interaction and teachers' practices in these settings. She draws attention to the power struggle that takes place in the classroom due to the known perception of English as the language of power in the U.S. English, and she adds, that internationally it is linked to:

> … status, power, and wealth, largely due to its status as a global language in science, technology, medicine, entertainment, sports, and so on … the status of language in TWBI [Two-Way Bilingual Instruction] settings may be influenced by Spanish- and English-speaking students desiring to conform to the dominant language that is associated with prestige and power in U.S. schools and communities. (Hernández, 2015, p. 106)

If attention is given to the ideas associated with the prestige of the English language briefly referred to above, and to the varied linguistic and stratified society in which these interactions are taking place, these findings (Hernández, 2015) are not surprising. She discovered that state and district assessment measures endorse English as the language of prestige and value. She found that both Spanish- and English-speaking children prefer to resort to English during their interaction in the classroom, delegating Spanish to an inferior position. She further determined that English-speaking students, who also do most of the talking, generally lead small-group interactions in the classroom. Furthermore, Hernández (2015) concluded that whenever the language of interaction was Spanish, English-speaking youngsters would switch to English during these interactions and Spanish-speaking children would conform to this practice. According to Hernández, teachers frequently reported challenges with students' interaction, particularly when those in the dominant group refused to work with students of minority populations. Teachers also acknowledged certain leniency toward the use of English. Hernández attributes this, possibly, to teachers' awareness of general policies favoring English as the prestige language and to the difficulty of the Spanish material. Hernández makes a plea for ways to encourage Spanish speakers to participate more actively in small group interaction, and to develop non-threatening activities that can empower this population and result in better sociolinguistic skills that would, in turn, lead to a greater use of Spanish in the classroom. There is also a marked need for district and state support of the tenets of dual language practices. Hernández (2015) concludes by emphasizing the necessity of strengthening the status of Spanish as the minority language in this scenario. We can see how this plea is justified; this idea alone would have clear effects on the other issues raised in this study.

6 Future Research

As a phenomenon that is alive and evolving, DLE serves as a source for future studies. Several authors have brought forward ideas that can nourish new research. Castro et al. (2011) argue that further analyses are needed in areas such as language development of English language learners in pre-school; and influence of English immersion programs on children's L1 development and native language development and literacy. Marian et al. (2013) call for studies covering cognitive functioning in areas other than reading and math; and studies exploring the connections between the academic knowledge gained and its transfer to other languages and non-academic contexts. Moreover, de Jong (2014) calls for future longitudinal research that could provide information on contrastive ways of learning for students from different populations; studies on graduation rates, course placement, higher education and career choices of students; and studies on racial, ethnic and linguistic

multiplicity as well as on the impact that they have on dual language programs design and operation. Lindholm-Leary and Genesse (2014) posit many areas in which research could serve to clarify unsettled issues. First, from a methodological standpoint, they say, instructional time patterns at each school setting must be defined more clearly. Programs should be defined in terms of length and instructional practices to allow for more accessible means of comparison across programs. Second, regarding assessment, instruments that measure students' achievement (in language and non-language areas) need to be created to have access to more reliable, valid information, especially regarding minority students. Third, studies that explore results of students in Chinese and other Asian languages are necessary. Fourth, further research is required to explore outcomes of students with special needs in dual language programs. Fifth, these authors call for research to determine the features that identify high-quality programs and the impact that other types of programs have on students. These examples show how DLE has a long-lasting projection toward a very active future.

7 Concluding Remarks

The history of DLE programs illustrate that the development of the model has not been easy, as the model has been evolving in a "racialized context" (Palmer, 2010, p. 110), immersed in a "political context of opposition to bilingual education" (Torres-Guzmán et al., 2005, p. 455). The model, nevertheless, continues to grow, not only in the U.S. but in other regions as well. It has branched out to forms such as SIOP mentioned above. The evidence shows that when implemented correctly, DLE can yield beneficial results for its population. As such, this model "holds promise for replacing segregated, assimilationist, and academically ineffective education in schools with many Spanish-speaking ELLs" (Paciotto & Delany-Barmann, 2012, p. 19). It is with these ideas of growth and change that we await the results of what the future years of design and implementation of DLE programs will bring in the U.S. and in other areas of the world.

The CLIL Phenomenon in Europe

This section addresses the *Content and Language Integrated Learning* (CLIL) movement in Europe, describing how the model originated and outlining the political, educational and grass-root interests behind its origins. A series of definitions are presented with the intention of illustrating the different perspectives that have informed the model. Different key concepts serving as bases for the model are discussed: the Four Cs Framework (Content, Cognition, Communication and Culture); the Triptych Approach (Language *of, for* and *through* learning); and the scaffolding practices that best identify the model. A description of the benefits associated with the model is also provided. This is followed by a characterization of CLIL in contrast to Content-Based and Immersion instruction. Finally, future challenges that have been identified regarding the model are presented as further potential lines of study.

1 Origins of CLIL

Marsh (2012) provides a detailed historical description of the steps that led to the establishment and implementation of CLIL in Europe. From the 1958 European Economic Community Council regulation of official status languages within the European Union (although at that moment CLIL was not known as such) to the 2011 European Commission Working Papers that describe CLIL as a key element in education, different participants have set the basis for CLIL's ongoing role and growth today. The process has involved actors at the supra-national level, namely the European Parliament (EP), the European Commission (E. Comm.), the European Council (EC), and the Education Council. Relying on their hierarchical position, they have developed resolutions, recommended initiatives, produced declarations and created objectives resulting in the creation and application of CLIL practices in the Member States of the European Union (EU). According to Marsh (2012), The Maastricht Treaty (1992), another supranational initiative, serves as referent for the focus on education, training and languages that has served as a basis for CLIL. The Eurydice Network, has helped to provide detailed reports on how CLIL operates and is implemented, based on data from the participant states. Working groups, such as the Group of Intellectuals for Intercultural Dialogue, have contributed proposals to support the CLIL process and Civil Platforms, such as the Civil Society Platform on Multilingualism, which have come up with recommendations to help promote multilingualism in the EU. These participants paved the way for national and supra-national resolutions, regulations and proposals that have resulted in what CLIL stands for today.

Additionally, at the supranational level, Marsh (2012) mentions programs that have provided support. The LINGUA program (EC, 1989) sought implementation of an improved quality of language learning, initiating the search for a more suitable teaching model. The LEONARDO DA VINCI program (EC and EP, 1994) appeared as an action program to reinforce vocational training, particularly in language teaching and learning. The SOCRATES program (EP, 1995) encouraged forms of mobility and linguistic development through exchanges in the European region, while the CULTURE 2000 program (EP and EC) sought to preserve Europe's cultural heritage, emphasizing the teaching and learning of its languages. Finally, two important documents should be mentioned, given their impact on this process: the White Paper (E. Comm., 1995) and the Green Paper (E. Comm., 1996). The former's plea for an early start of foreign language teaching and learning as well as for greater flexibility and improvement in education facilitated the development of innovative approaches such as CLIL. This paper also refers to the 1 + 2 principle, by which EU citizens are called to be proficient in their mother tongue and at least two other languages of the community. Moreover, the latter's insistence on learning at least two more community languages to have access to opportunities at the occupational and personal level in the EU context also reinforced the idea presented in the White Paper and thus fostered the implementation of CLIL-like practices. It can be deduced from the brief description above that many participants have contributed to the creation and implementation of CLIL, and that while the process seems to have started at the top (institutional) level of society, there has been much opportunity for participation at the parental and school level, and more importantly that the entire process responds to the need for language instruction in society.

The CLIL movement finally appeared in Europe in 1994 (Marsh, Maljers & Hartiala, 2001). According to Marsh (2012), the pre-existing concept of *Content and Language Integrated Classrooms* (CLIC) (1993) was transformed by several stakeholders into *Content and Language Integrated Learning* (CLIL) with the purpose of designating and assigning much-deserved importance to the methodology rather than to the context introduced in the original concept. Dalton-Puffer (2008) insists that the driving forces behind the implementation of CLIL practices in Europe came from very two distant focal points: local grass-roots (teachers, parents, specific institutions, and communities) and top-down policies implemented in the EU like those above. The middle-level groups regulating local education policies were left to find a way to mediate between the rather disconnected focal sources.

2 Definition of the Model

CLIL literature presents many definitions that help construct an idea of the key features that constitute the model. These definitions vary in terms

of the emphasis they give to certain features of the model. Some concentrate more on the "skeleton" of the concept (its general structure or strongest characteristics). Others try to depict a more real image of the concept or even its implications in classroom dynamics, or others offer a hint at the political tones that may influence the model in some contexts. Some of these definitions will be presented now. An early description by Coyle (2006) combines the first two emphases more commonly present in definitions across the literature. Some of CLIL's general features and certain possible classroom functions result in a fairly complete definition put forward by Coyle:

> CLIL is a lifelong concept that embraces all sectors of education from primary to adults, from a few hours per week to intensive modules lasting several months. It may involve project work, examination courses, drama, puppets, chemistry practicals and mathematical investigations. In short, CLIL is flexible and dynamic, where topics and subjects—foreign languages and non-language subjects—are integrated in some kind of mutually beneficial way so as to provide value-added educational outcomes for the widest possible range of learners. (2006, p. 3)

While Coyle's definition does not provide specific details of the implementation of CLIL, it does give a general idea of the levels at which the model could be implemented, the form it could take in a classroom, the flexibility it offers for topics, activities, the types of students it addresses.

Not all definitions highlight the same features of the model; many concentrate on delineating the general structure of CLIL and thus offer only a broad idea of the term, as illustrated in the following examples:

> The term CLIL … functions as an umbrella not only for a wide array of educational practices but also for an even wider array of terms tied to specific lingua-cultural, national, educational and disciplinary traditions…. the term has acquired some characteristics of a brand-name, complete with the symbolic capital of positive ascriptions: innovative, modern, effective, efficient and forward-looking…[the intention being that] 'CLIL' retains its open nature as an umbrella term for many realities of non-language content teaching through an additional language. (Dalton-Puffer, Nikula & Smit, 2010a, p. 3)

> CLIL, understood as an approach that integrates language and content, co-exists with a plethora of terms that range from the bilingual integration of language and curricular subjects, to content-based language teaching, theme-based language teaching, or content-enhanced teaching. (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2010, p. 367–368)

> [A]n umbrella term broadly covering the central part of [the] continuum between content-driven and language-driven teaching approaches. (Juan-Garau & Salazar-Noguera, 2015b, p. 3)

These definitions describe the general scope of CLIL without really providing specifics on how it comes into play in an educational setting.

This broad way of describing the model—through expressions such as "an umbrella term for many realities," "coexists with a plethora of terms," "[t]he CLIL 'generic umbrella' includes many variants," "an umbrella term broadly covering,"—allows for many interpretations and provides many possibilities that they could define as CLIL practices. Other definitions focus on more practical aspects of the model inside the classroom context concentrating on the function given to the second, foreign or additional language, depending on the definition, and also on the role this language is to play in CLIL. They appear to have the intention of guiding practitioners (to different extents and at different levels) on the implementation of this CLIL subject-specific language in the classroom. The following are some examples of this type of definition:

> Content and language integrated learning – the use of an L2 in the teaching of non-language subjects –… (Dalton-Puffer, 2008, p. 1)

> CLIL is a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning of both content and language. (Mehisto, Marsh & Frigols, 2008, p. 9)

> The term 'Content and Language Integrated Learning' (CLIL) was adopted in 1994 (Marsh, Maljers & Hartiala, 2001) within the European context to describe and further design good practice as achieved in different types of school environments where teaching and learning take place in an additional language…CLIL is an educational approach in which various language-supportive methodologies are used which lead to a dual-focused form of instruction where attention is given both to the language and the content. (Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010, p. 3)

> Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) can be described as an educational approach where subjects such as geography or biology are taught through the medium of a foreign language, typically to students participating in some form of mainstream education at primary, secondary but also tertiary level. (Dalton-Puffer et al., 2010a, p. 1)

> An inclusive term, particularly used in Europe, for bilingual or multilingual education in which a second or later language is used for learning subject content, and where both language learning and content learning occur simultaneously with an emphasis on their integration. (Baker, 2014, p. 235)

> CLIL is a teaching approach in which an additional language is used for the teaching and learning of subjects with a dual focus on language and content. (Heras & Lasagabaster, 2015, p. 71)

All of the definitions in the latter group aim at establishing a clear distinction between the role of the second, foreign or additional language in the CLIL setting in contrast to the traditional role assigned to this language in conventional, mainstream classroom contexts. These definitions revolve around a sole function for the additional language, describing it as used for

content teaching and learning or in non-language subjects. In sum, this means that the second, foreign or additional language is used as a means, not as the end purpose in the classroom and it is definitely not seen (at least when it is working as the CLIL language) as the subject of the class. Finally, other definitions try to convey that socio-political function that the CLIL model serves within the EU. Given the historical, social or political region where CLIL is implemented, CLIL may also serve as a bridge in multilingual territories to create spaces for trilingual regions.

The definition presented by Lorenzo, Casal & Moore (2009) hints at this function that also applies to CLIL as "an umbrella term embracing all scenarios and whatever combination of regional, heritage, minority, immigrant and/or foreign languages they involve; providing for a highly diversified language curriculum" (p. 419). CLIL represents a very strong teaching force in European countries, and it is now beginning to be considered in the educational contexts of South America as well. See Curtis (2012) in reference to Colombia, and Banegas (2016) for Argentina, for example. Since its origins, it has sought to find the best way to form bilingual citizens who can deal with the linguistic requirements of globalization. When the CLIL proposal first appeared, Europe was looking for a way to respond to the demands of our modern society to educate bilinguals who would be prepared to interact with citizens from diverse linguistic backgrounds. This process still continues today. Certain characteristics of CLIL permeate the different definitions listed above. The word *variation* condenses essential features that are part of CLIL. Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010a) discuss this variation in relation to how CLIL is implemented in terms of *length* (short or long) or *intensity* (low, medium or high) including the combinations that can be derived from these.

From these definitions, we can note that CLIL caters to a varied age groups with various numbers of hours, it provides opportunities for different types of learners, and it allows for the use of diverse practices and methodologies. Mehisto et al. (2008) insist that CLIL is a flexible approach offering a new perspective which has tried to synthesize and put into practice the knowledge gained through many years of experience in approaches such as immersion, bilingual education or multilingual education. Juan Garau and Salazar Noguera (2015a) add practices such as *Content Based Language Teaching* and *Content Based Instruction*.

Another frequent feature is the notion of the "dual" focus served by CLIL, as Coyle et al. (2010, p. 35) state: "it is not a question of whether to focus on meaning or form, but rather that it is fundamental to address both." Appropriate CLIL practices seek a balance between content learning and language learning in a way that these would benefit from one another while at the same time avoiding any possible detrimental effects caused by CLIL implementation; i.e., when CLILC was first implemented, many were concerned with students not learning the content of the class. For those familiar with CLIL, there is

no debate on whether a class should concentrate on language itself or on its specific content; a clear balance should guide both. In sum, CLIL is "an umbrella" that protects many methodologies, activities, practices and realities be these personal, political, social or cultural; and according to Dalton et al. (2010a, p. 3), it also embraces "cultural, national, educational and disciplinary traditions." All of these underlie the constant reference to flexibility and variability in the definitions above.

Along these same lines, a word of caution is necessary. Variability and flexibility were mentioned above as imminent descriptors for CLIL, and although they are indeed appropriate, those features should still be treated with care. Coyle (2007) already warned:

> Given the diversity, I would argue that such a flexible inclusive approach to CLIL is both a strength and potential weakness. The strength of CLIL focuses on integrating content and language learning in varied, dynamic and relevant learning environments built on "bottom-up" initiatives as well as "top-down" policy. Its potential weakness lies in the interpretation of this "flexibility" unless it is embedded in a robust contextualized framework with clear aims and projected outcomes. (p. 546)

To prevent vague interpretations and misconceptions when applied, Coyle (1999) discussed the 4Cs framework and its principles. Definitions such as that of Lorenzo et al. (2009), presented above, should be interpreted with care.

3 The Four Cs Framework in CLIL

Coyle (1999) developed the 4Cs Framework to represent the intertwined connection existing between *content, cognition, communication* and *cultural awareness* in CLIL-like practices. For Coyle (1999), "it is through **progression** in the knowledge, skills, and understanding of the content, by **engagement** in associated cognitive processing, **interaction** in the communicative context, and a deepening awareness and positioning of cultural self and otherness, that learning takes place" (emphasis in original, p. 53). Originally the framework tried to guide teachers and planners toward "effective teaching and learning in content classrooms" (Coyle, 1999, p. 46), and it became one very important cornerstone in CLIL. Today it is still used as a planning framework to help teachers ensure an appropriate balance of the 4C elements in every class. According to Coyle (2006):

> Teachers, learners, trainers and researchers are collectively exploring the interrelationship between subject matter (content), the language of and for learning (communication), the thinking integral to high quality learning (cognition) and the global citizenship agenda (culture) which constitute four Cs… From this perspective, CLIL involves learning to use language appropriately whilst using language to learn effectively. (p. 9)

Along these lines, the framework clearly represents a key strength in acceptable CLIL practices given that it serves different aims in the classroom. If we consider that the framework can guarantee that in CLIL classrooms students can learn content and language while communicating effectively with their peers and developing cultural sensitivity and awareness, then the importance of following the principles underlying the 4Cs framework are undeniable. Furthermore, Coyle et al. (2010) contend that this contextualization of the 4C Framework, reflected in careful planning and showing the evident integration of the 4C elements in the teaching and learning process, is what distinguishes CLIL from other approaches or other forms of bilingual education. Coyle et al. (2010, p. 12) argue that "CLIL is not simply education *in* an additional language, it is education *through* an additional language."

4. THE LANGUAGE TRIPTYCH APPROACH

This latter quote takes us to another important CLIL principle put forward by Coyle (2006, 2007), known as the *triptych approach*, where the different types of communication and interaction that students implement in a CLIL classroom must be viewed differently if they are to be compared with those of a regular foreign language classroom. Coyle (2006, p. 10) wrote: "if the content determines the language needed in CLIL, then language **of** learning, **for** learning and **through** learning is a more relevant analytical approach to determining the language to be taught in CLIL classrooms…" (emphasis in original). These characteristics of language in CLIL classrooms may affect the structure of the curriculum because the linguistic needs of the students are different in CLIL contexts. Students require grammar forms and structures enabling them to discuss and interact with peers in ways that are not in vogue in regular foreign language classrooms and that do not necessarily follow the same order as that found in those classrooms. Coyle (2007) describes the CLIL classroom language as follows:

> Language *of* learning is based on an analysis of the language needed for learners to access basic concepts and skills relating to the subject theme or topic…. an analysis of the language needed to scaffold content learning will lead to a complementary approach to learning progression… Language *for* learning focuses on the kind of language which all learners need in order to operate in a foreign language using environment. It foregrounds metacognition and learning how to learn….Language *through* learning is predicated on the sociocultural tenet that learning cannot take place without active involvement of language and thinking… (p. 553–554)

Coyle et al. (2010) later expand on this idea by saying that the language *of* learning is that language required to have access to the information discussed in class. The language *for* learning is the language required to function in the second language, to discuss ideas or interact with other learners, for

example. Finally, the language *through* learning is that needed to carry out active involvement in the language itself and for analyzing both content and language and for *higher order thinking*, by which, according to Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom, (1956), Anderson and Krathwohl (2001)), students engage in cognitive processes that allow them to use knowledge more dynamically. This vision of language is not limited to how students make use of it inside the classroom, as is usually the case in traditional, foreign language classrooms. It goes beyond the classroom limits by allowing students to take this language with them outside the classroom, as they get involved in thinking practices that may encompass analyzing concepts and elaborating on ideas even after the class is over. This last function of language in CLIL-like views widens the scope of the use of language that takes place in a traditional foreign language classroom in which, if any, the language *of* learning and the language *for* learning are sought and used. This stepping away from curricular grammatical progression may demand more careful planning on the part of the professors as they must be ready to anticipate students' linguistic demands and to provide the language forms that students may need to function in different subjects in the CLIL classroom. This is where the idea of *scaffolding* becomes absolutely necessary.

5. Scaffolding: A Key Element in CLIL

Scaffolding techniques and scaffolding language embody another key feature of CLIL. Given that students face more linguistic and content-related challenges in this type of educational context, scaffolding becomes a key player in the classroom. CLIL teachers, therefore, must facilitate access to students to either the new language or new content that students are receiving in class. In these settings, it is the teacher's role to create a connection between what students know and the new information they are receiving. According to Baker (2011), who defines scaffolding following the ideas of *zone of proximal development* put forward by Vygotsky (1962) and Bruner (1983), scaffolding can be described as the type of language present in a teacher-student, cooperative-classroom relation where "the teacher supports the student by a careful pitching of comprehensible language… This is achieved by the teacher moving from the present level of understanding to a further level that is within the child's capability" (Baker 2011, p. 294–295).

Meyer (2010) also describes multiple benefits brought about by scaffolding techniques. Besides the evident access to classroom material, balanced scaffolding provides students with access to different types of input. It can be regulated or reduced as students' language levels advance, it enables students to carry out tasks in the classroom, it supports classroom production by helping students verbalize their ideas, and it enables weaker-language students to benefit more from the class. Overall, he concludes, scaffolding

enhances students' proficiency in cognitive academic language. According to Meyer (2010, p. 14), "[t]o successfully deal with multi-modal input, students need to have a wide variety of study skills at their disposal which makes the scaffolding of language and learning a key component of successful CLIL teaching."

Moreover, having access to language and learning techniques that implement scaffolding allows CLIL students to activate metacognition and engage in more advanced, critical thinking (Coyle et al., 2010). For Marsh (2012), academic language deserves particular attention in CLIL settings as it should be made part of the lesson through scaffolding to ensure that the learning outcomes are the best possibly expected. Harvey, Tihinen, Määttä, and Uusiautti (2013) argue that scaffolding has a special relation to the cognition principle of CLIL. For these authors, scaffolding allows students to engage in more elaborate thinking, which would eventually give students access to deep levels of analysis and understanding that would translate into cognitive rewards. Being such a critical component of a CLIL setting, scaffolding should be given very careful attention, especially if we consider that there are usually multiple language levels in a classroom and they all deserve to be acknowledged. If CLIL practices really aim at providing all students with equal access opportunities to learn the foreign language, teachers should pay special heed to students with lower linguistic proficiency so that they receive the language they need through scaffolding techniques that would enable them not to miss out on learning. As Harrop (2012) puts it, weaker learners may be put in a vulnerable position if scaffolding does not meet their needs. It can be deduced from the discussion above that CLIL attempts to do quite the opposite, and several studies, such as those of Dalton-Puffer (2008, 2011) discussed below, present evidence of the benefits that CLIL brings to the process.

6. ALLEGED BENEFITS OF CLIL

Here reference is made to some of the evidence that has been gathered in connection to the beneficial effects of CLIL. Multiple benefits have been linked to CLIL practices; they range from a more fluent use of the language to stronger vocabulary, from higher levels of motivation to intercultural awareness. Coyle (2006) contends that if qualitative class time is spent in a foreign language, this would result in increased linguistic competence (see also Marsh 2012, Juan Garau & Salazar Noguera 2015a). For Coyle (2006, p. 6), CLIL offers students the opportunity to engage in "problem-solving, risk-taking, confidence building, communication skills, extending vocabulary, self-expression and spontaneous talk…" through the combination of content and language learning. She argues that the teachers and learners' sense of belonging to a learning community is just one of the outstanding outcomes of CLIL.

Dalton-Puffer (2008) refers to several benefits identified in CLIL: CLIL students equate or even outperform non-CLIL students' results on content tests; they are more persistent to get tasks completed and are not as easily frustrated, thus developing stronger procedural competence; and their communicative competence also evinces their higher levels of L2 learning. She also notes that the naturalness of the classroom and its reduced focus on form allow students to enjoy a more relaxed learning environment. This author insists that while some language areas seem to be unaffected by CLIL instruction (i.e., syntax, writing, informal/non-technical language, pronunciation and pragmatics), receptive skills, morphology, risk taking, vocabulary (especially for technical and semi-technical terms when addressed explicitly (see also Dalton-Puffer, 2008), creativity and fluency quantity are greatly benefited (see Baetens Beardsmore, 2008, in reference to the latter). In a later study, Dalton-Puffer (2011) stresses that CLIL students' strategic competence enhances them to convey content notions accurately, even at early stages of the process and despite possible limited linguistic resources.

Furthermore, this author identifies two advantages of CLIL educational settings: "the didactic nature of the interaction and the cultural familiarity with the domain of use and its rules." (Dalton-Puffer, 2011, p. 195) This predefined, pre-planned language learning, which seems to be disguised in a content-learning class that takes place in the students' L1 culture, is what for Dalton-Puffer results in students building their very own, confident use of the language and a clear appropriation of it. For Dalton-Puffer (2011, p. 196), this is the "most striking outcome of CLIL programs." CLIL students whose language-learning aptitude and interest are average have been known to benefit from CLIL-like practices as well. This is not commonly found in a traditional language classroom. If we consider the above principles of CLIL, this last concept reinforces the CLIL quality of serving a wider range of types of learners.

Lasagabaster (2008) also insists that CLIL programs

> …help prepare students for internationalization…, boost the affective dimension…, help improve specific language terminology…, enhance students' intercultural communicative competence…, foster implicit and incidental learning…, trigger high levels of communication among teachers and learners…, [and] is also believed to improve overall language competence in the target language, in particular oral skills. (Lasagabaster, 2008, p. 31)

He adds that L2 usage boosts motivation in all students while creating a facilitative atmosphere to help students advance at their own pace. In his research, Lasagabaster (2008) shows that CLIL groups outscored non-CLIL peers in all areas tested (i.e., grammar, listening, speaking, writing and overall competence). He also found that lower level CLIL-students surpassed non-CLIL students from upper school levels in overall foreign language

competence. Finally, when analyzing sociocultural students' status, he found that CLIL exerts the same beneficial effect on students regardless of the parents' sociocultural status. In a more recent study, Heras and Lasagabaster (2015) further investigated motivation between CLIL and non-CLIL students and found that in their study, although CLIL students obtained higher scores on the tests, the differences were not significant. They analyzed the results for gender groups and found that although female students exhibited higher means, the differences were not significant either. Non-significant results were also found for their vocabulary tests and gender groups. Although the results of this study seem to contradict findings of other studies, the authors attribute these differences to sample size and degree of intensity of the CLIL program.

Along the same line of benefits described by other authors, Lorenzo et al. (2009) also provide evidence for CLIL learners outperforming non-CLIL counterparts and showing greater gains than monolingual students. Lorenzo et al. (2009, p. 427) elaborate on the benefits discussed by Dalton-Puffer (2008) analyzed above, and extend these benefits to "structural variety and pragmatic efficiency, hence encompassing language growth at lexico-grammatical and discourse levels." These authors describe later-start learners' competence as comparable to that of early-start students, and they also point to CLIL as a facilitator for cohesion between schools as well as a generator of greater inter-departmental collaboration. Lorenzo et al. (2009) also find benefits from the fact that each one of the intervening teachers in a given CLIL classroom focuses on a particular area of language specialization, and this results in students having access to a wealth of language learning possibilities.

Coyle et al. (2010) insist that CLIL stimulates linguistic competence, cognitive flexibility (see also Juan Garau & Salazar Noguera, 2015b), and intercultural awareness, while offering learners of various ages an opportunity for language learning which builds on a complementary experience where language learning and subsequent language acquisition develop through content learning. Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010a) also refer to high-quality language use taking place in CLIL classrooms. This language allows students to interact more actively through the use of discourse-pragmatic strategies serving a wide range of functions in more challenging discussions than those present in traditional language classrooms (see also Harvey et al., 2013 for a reference to cooperative action and student activation in the classroom). Dalton-Puffer, Nikula and Smit (2010b) again direct attention to the interactional ground facilitated in CLIL, where the communicative intentions present clearly distance themselves from those of other learning settings. They argue that the lexical and morpho-syntactical resources that students develop are evident in complex structures in students' written production, and show greater pragmatic awareness.

Maillat (2010) affirms that CLIL promotes acquisition in an environment favoring a lowered affective filter, and also finds evidence for pragmatic strength

in CLIL. Maillat (2010) suggests that the facilitative, low affective-filter, low-anxiety (see also Harrop, 2012, for the latter) environment that fosters L2 use in CLIL gives rise to a *mask effect* that "liberates" the spoken production of students, who feel that the use of the L2 as a medium of instruction and not as a subject itself provides them with a setting that is less constrained by the emphasis on form typical of other learning situations. Overall, for Maillat (2010), CLIL provides the pragmatic strategies that enhance oral production and hence language learning. Furthermore, Lorenzo and Moore (2010) point out that the symbiosis between language use and content goals is evident in students who can handle academic content in spite of limited language development. Lorenzo and Moore (2010, p. 30) argue that this is possible through the idea of *notion,* which "can be represented in different language forms (with different degrees of success) at different competence levels." We can link this idea to the scaffolding practices discussed above which play a fundamental role in CLIL. Given the adequate scaffolding language and techniques in the classroom, students can access the information they need to obtain the cognitive knowledge that is sought.

Marsh (2012) insists that CLIL offers a series of benefits that range from learning of both language and content to serving political policies and goals moving through social, cultural, professional, economic and psychological benefits carried by bilingualism. He lends special importance to the fact that CLIL provides linguistic opportunities for a much larger number of individuals than the previously existing options due to its presence in mainstream education. Harrop (2012) also refers to this possibility of accessing content and cognitive knowledge and creativity for students that are not necessarily at the top of the class while they also enjoy the benefits of enhanced cultural awareness that allows them to learn more about themselves and others. Nicolay and Poncelet (2013), studying 5-year-olds in a Belgium CLIL context, describe the importance of phonological awareness in the learning and the development of vocabulary. They conclude that as vocabulary develops, students refine their phonological awareness, which is then used to represent novel, unfamiliar sounds, and which, in turn, results in learning new words. Nicolay and Poncelet (2013) also identify phonological awareness in L1 as a possible predictor of vocabulary learning variance in L2, especially in connection with productive vocabulary. To conclude this brief summary of the numerous benefits of CLIL-like instruction, it is also important to point out that researchers also talk about equal access to internationalization for all students (Pérez-Vidal, 2015), deeper, more intense cognitive processing (Prieto-Arranz, Rallo-Fabra, Calafat-Ripoll & Catrain-González, 2015), an increase in students' active participation with peers (Nikula, 2010), and a clear difference in long-term development of "written complexity, accuracy, and fluency in writing," in relation to non-CLIL learners (Gené-Gil, Juan-Garau, Salazar-Noguera & Salazar-Noguera, 2015, p. 145). Like any developing

process, limitations and deficiencies have also been identified as part of the CLIL model development (see 8 below).

7. Delineating Differences (CLIL: Neither Content-Based nor Immersion-Oriented)

Some authors have lent importance to establishing a distinction between CLIL and other educational models particularly *content based teaching* and *immersion programs*. Coyle (2006, p. 2) insists that "[w]hilst CLIL shares certain aspects of learning and teaching with these, in essence, it operates along a continuum of the foreign language and the non-language content without specifying the importance of one over another." Lasagabaster and Sierra (2010) discuss the difference between CLIL and immersion programs and identify seven key differences:

1. The language of instruction in CLIL does not coincide with the language spoken in the community.
2. CLIL teachers are usually not native speakers of the language used for instruction.
3. The starting age at CLIL is usually around secondary school age. This creates a clear difference in terms of the amount of exposure for students participating in CLIL and Canadian immersion programs, for instance.
4. The teaching materials used in CLIL settings are usually adapted for the particular settings as opposed to those directed to teach native speakers in immersion settings.
5. The language objective of CLIL does not aim for native-like proficiency, as often occurs in immersion programs.
6. Immigrant students rarely participate in CLIL programs (particularly in the Spanish context described by these authors); most often they enroll in immersion programs.
7. Given the relatively new age of CLIL, the amount of research in the field does not yet compare to that existing in connection to immersion settings.

Regarding immersion programs such as those of Canada, Dalton-Puffer (2008) also argues that whereas CLIL teaches another prestigious language and the initiative is derived partly from parental support housed inside the mainstream education sector, it differs from Canadian education programs in that the language is not official in the countries where CLIL is taught, nor are the teachers native speakers of the language. Dalton-Puffer and Smit (2013, p. 546) also offer the following reflection:

• CLIL is about using a foreign language or a lingua franca, not a second language. Students will encounter the language of instruction mainly in the classroom…, The dominant CLIL language is English, reflecting the fact that a com-

mand of English as an additional language is increasingly regarded as a key literacy feature world-wide.

- CLIL is usually implemented once learners have already acquired literacy skills in their mother tongue. CLIL teachers are normally non-native speakers of the target language and are typically content rather than foreign-language specialists.
- CLIL lessons are usually timetabled as content lessons (biology, music, geography, mechanical engineering etc.) while the target language normally continues as a subject in its own right in the shape of foreign language lessons taught by language specialists.

In short, CLIL can be seen as a foreign language enrichment measure packaged into content teaching, whereas Dalton-Puffer (2008) notes that *Content Based Instruction* (CBI), aims to develop second language skills "through the teaching of curricular content that is not typical of language classes per se…; such programs have commonly been developed in situations where education systems have to cope with large numbers of immigrant speakers who have yet to learn the official language of instruction in the system" (p. 2). Along these same lines, Gabillon and Rodica (2015) state that CBI's original purpose was two-fold: It provided extra support to tertiary students in the language used as the medium of instruction, and it prepared immigrant pupils to move on to mainstream education. When comparing the initial concepts of CBI to those of CLIL, it is clear that a sharp differentiation between the two is necessary.

8. CLIL's Future Challenges

To conclude this brief reference to CLIL, it is important to recall concerns raised by researchers regarding this model. Although some shortcomings have been mentioned and references to limitations have arisen since CLIL first started developing, criticism toward CLIL practices has become a much more evident in recent years. For instance, Bruton (2011) raises very serious concerns in relation to the impolementation of CLIL, its results, and related research: "There is every reason to believe some students may be prejudiced by CLIL, and that not only academic, but also institutional, interests may be taking precedence over some students' interests in the state educational sector" (p. 523). He questions research on CLIL, saying that there are biased results responding to researchers' interest; that these studies are limited and questionable; that CLIL groups are already more proficient or motivated before they become part of the CLIL process and that this fact alone yields quantitative and qualitative results that do not necessarily support CLIL approaches in the end. All along, he insists that there is insufficient control of intervening variables (i.e., number of hours, additional English classes, existing initial differences, lack of pretests, socio-economic differences, methodology

and type of instruction, among others), which may be influencing results commonly associated with beneficial CLIL effects.

Bruton (2013, 2015) adds that there is a lack of evidence of real benefits with CLIL, and that "if there are any possible CLIL successes they are probably attributable to selective measures and contrived supportive conditions" (p. 119). Bruton (2013) questions CLIL from different perspectives, from its novelty to its effectiveness in language development, and to its teachers' motivation. Bruton (2013) insists that the current, constant concentration on CLIL takes attention away from the many non-CLIL students and/or the problematic situation of FL teaching in mainstream education in the Spanish context, one that does not involve CLIL practices. He concludes that political, educational and parental factors come together to facilitate the adoption of CLIL practices, and he calls for redirecting attention toward the less-favored groups in the educational stream. Although several concerns have surfaced since the initial implementation of CLIL, the issues raised by Bruton are still worthy of careful attention. While Hütner and Smit (2014) have challenged and clarified some of the assumptions presented by Bruton (2011, 2013, 2015) (particularly in the sense of CLIL complementing, not replacing, FL teaching and in explaining the known variability of CLIL), not all of his ideas have received detailed attention. Important consideration should be given to Hüttner and Smit's (2014) call for contemplation and analysis of national, regional or institutional language policies. These language policies can foster appropriate CLIL implementation and its subsequent beneficial results.

Pérez-Cañado (2016) also refers to this upsurge in criticism toward CLIL. She acknowledges that after a period of cheerful enthusiasm toward CLIL and its results, a more critical analysis is surfacing now. Pérez-Cañado (2016) identifies three main challenges surrounding CLIL, namely its characterization, its implementation and its research. Regarding the difficulty of pinning down the limits of CLIL, Pérez-Cañado (2016) suggests that the pedagogical and research community can find a common ground that recognizes the variety of programs encompassed within CLIL as well as the multiple results and effects that these multilingual programs yield for this community to benefit from them. As for the implementation of CLIL, Pérez-Cañado (2016) argues that this could be achieved through targeting program diversity and ensuring equal access to content and languages for all students, regardless of their personal differences. Finally, in terms of research, Pérez-Cañado (2016, p. 18) calls for basic tenets of "unbiased, balanced and methodologically sound research" to provide us with accurate information regarding CLIL. According to Pérez-Cañado, these ideas may serve to enable CLIL to produce the results that the present society requires.

Other concerns have appeared in different studies in the last ten years. Lorenzo et al. (2009) find the integration of content and language a current challenge for CLIL practitioners. These authors also speak of the need for more

research on the status of technical, content related, productive and receptive vocabulary; as well as for more longitudinal studies including gender variables. Lorenzo and Moore (2010) point out that while the teachers' variation in how they approach the use of language in the classroom can be beneficial for students, these teachers' views can be expanded to offer even more benefits to learners. Dalton-Puffer (2011) calls for more clear-cut goals and objectives for the model; see also Gabillon & Rodica (2015) concerning insufficient professional knowledge. She argues that although more conceptualization, guiding frameworks and material have been developed, more commitment from national education systems in Europe is still required. Meyer (2010) mentions the need for guidance on how to develop quality materials to implement the 4Cs framework. Dalton-Puffer (2011) asks to direct attention to language forms and usages requiring improvement, such as the use of the null subject, negation, suppletives, more relevant subject-based language, and better ability in describing subject specific concepts.

Marsh (2012) describes the challenge faced by teachers in matching the age of the students (and language competence) with the cognitive demands of the model, a fact made evident by the knowledge and skill heterogeneity of CLIL classrooms. He also points to the need to increase higher order thinking skills in the classrooms. Harrop (2012) is initially concerned with the possible disadvantageous position of weaker language students in the classroom, which may be worsened if appropriate measures are not taken. She emphasizes that due to the additional difficulties present in a CLIL setting, overachievement will inevitably be limited, bringing with it greater skepticism and less interest in CLIL programs. Harrop (2012) also refers to theoretical and methodological deficiencies of CLIL that can be observed in the model favoring some skills over others. She concludes by analyzing the costly demands of the model in relation to both financial and human resources for its execution. Dalton-Puffer and Smit (2013) also point to the need for attention to managerial issues in CLIL contexts. They make a compelling case for more research in CLIL, to give continuity to earlier research and make action-research an active component of CLIL programs. They focus on seven lines of research in relation to the examination of goals, investigation of perceived success, examination of stakeholders' views of CLIL with relation to various languages, investigation of actual presence and use of the five language skills in the classroom, investigation of academic language function of CLIL in the classroom, investigation of CLIL and non-CLIL pedagogies' similarities and differences, and the investigation of explicit language teaching in CLIL settings.

More recently, Fernández-Sanjurjo, J., Fernández-Costales, A., & Arias Blanco, J. M. (2017) have reported on a study that evaluates science skills in students enrolled in CLIL and non-CLIL programs. In their report involving primary students, they discuss two important findings: (1) Non-CLIL students statistically outperform their CLIL counterparts on competence in science

in their L1.; and (2) When considering socio-economic status, students with high or medium status obtain similar scores and show no statistically significant differences. However, students with a lower socio-economic status obtain scores statistically significantly lower than those of group formed by the high and middle status students. These results deserve attention because they contradict one of the main tenets of CLIL, or at least they suggest a disadvantageous position for CLIL students regarding content learning. Further studies in this area are deemed extremely important.

As can be concluded from the above paragraphs, and as is certainly the case in any movement that is alive and evolving, there is evident room for improvement in CLIL practices; more importantly, many stakeholders are already working on this. They are interested in continuing to reap the benefits from CLIL, while researchers are actively seeking results and possible solutions for the problems they identify. There is vast evidence of the benefits derived from CLIL when the model is correctly implemented, but only time will show how CLIL will continue to evolve. This process will secure the position that the model already enjoys as a referent in the language education arena.

References

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives.* New York, NY: Longman.

Baetens Beardsmore, H. (2008). Multilingualism, cognition and creativity. *International CLIL Research Journal*, *1*(1), 4–19.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2014). *A parents' and teachers' guide to bilingualism* (4th ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Banegas, D. L. (2016). Teachers develop CLIL materials in Argentina: A workshop experience. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, *9*(1), 17–36. doi:10.5294/laclil.2016.9.1.2

Bialystok, E., Peets, K. F., & Moreno, S. (2014). Producing bilinguals through immersion education: Development of metalinguistic awareness. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *35*, 177–191. doi:10.1017/S0142716412000288

Bingham Wesche, M. (2002). Early French immersion: How has the original Canadian model stood the test of time? In P. Burmeister, T. Piske, & A. Rohde (Eds.). *An integrated view of language development. Papers in honor of Henning Wode* (pp. 357–379). Wissenschaftlicher: Trier.

Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives* (Vol. 1: Cognitive domain). New York, NY: McKay.

Bourgoin, R. (2014). The predictive effects of L1 and L2 early literacy indicators on reading in French immersion. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes*, *70*(3), 355–380. doi:10.3138/cmlr.2346.

Bruner, J. (1983). *Child's talk: Learning to use language*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Bruton, A. (2011). Is CLIL so beneficial, or just selective? Re-evaluating some of the research. *System*, *39*, 523–532. doi:10.1016/j.system.2011.08.002

Bruton, A. (2013). CLIL: Some of the reasons why and why not. *System*, *41*, 587–597. doi:10.1016/j.system.2013.07.001

Bruton, A. (2015). CLIL: Detail matters in the whole picture. More than a reply to J. Hüttner and U. Smit (2014). *System*, *53*, 119–128. doi:10.1016/j.system.2015.07.005

Castro, D. C., Páez, M. M., Dickinson, D. K., & Frede, E. (2011). Promoting language and literacy in young dual language learners: Research, practice, and policy. *Child Development Perspectives*, *5*(1), 15–21. doi:10.1111/j.1750-8606.2010. 00142.x

Cobb, C. (2015). Is French immersion a special education loophole? And does it intensify issues of accessibility and exclusion? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *18*(2), 170–187. doi:10.1080/13670050.2014.887052

Coyle, D. (1999). Supporting students in content and language integrated learning contexts: Planning for effective classrooms. In J. Masih (Ed.), *Learning through a foreign language: Models, methods and outcomes* (pp. 46–69). London, UK: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

Coyle, D. (2006). Content and language integrated learning: Motivating learners and teachers. *Scottish Languages Review*, *13*, 1–18.

Coyle, D. (2007). Content and language integrated learning: Towards a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *10*(5), 543–562. doi:10.2167/beb459.0

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and language integrated learning.* Edinburgh, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, *49*(2), 222–251. doi:10.3102/00346543049002222

Cummins, J. (1980). The construct of language proficiency in bilingual education. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Current issues in bilingual education* (pp. 81–103). Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, *56*(1), 18–36. doi:10.17763/haer.56.1.b327234461607787

Cummins, J. (2000). Interdependence of first and second-language proficiency in bilingual children. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp. 70–89). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511620652

Cummins, J. (2005). Teaching for cross-language transfer in dual language education: Possibilities and pitfalls. In *TESOL symposium on dual language education: Teaching and learning two languages in the EFL setting.* Istanbul, Turkey.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(2), 221–240.

Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. In B. Street & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol. 2: Literacy, pp. 71–83). New York, NY: Springer Science and Business Media. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-02252-9_6

Cummins, J. (2014a). Rethinking pedagogical assumptions in Canadian French immersion programs. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *2*(1), 3–22. doi:10.1075/jicb.2.1.01cum

Cummins, J. (2014b). To what extent are Canadian second language policies evidence-based? Reflections on the intersections of research and policy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *5*, 1–10. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00358

Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Chow, P., Cohen, S., Giampapa, F., Leoni, L., & Sastri, P. (2005). Affirming identity in multilingual classrooms. *Educational Leadership*, *63*(1), 38–43.

Curtis, A. (2012). Colombian teachers' questions about CLIL: What can teachers' questions tell us? (Part II). *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, *5*(2), 1–12. doi:10.5294/laclil.2012.5.2.6

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2008). Outcomes and processes in content and language integrated learning (CLIL): Current research from Europe. In W. Delanoy & L. Volkmann (Eds.), *Future perspectives for English language teaching* (pp. 1–19). Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content and language integrated learning: From practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 182–204. doi:10.3726/978-3-0351-0171-3

Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T., & Smit, U. (2010a). Charting policies, premises and research on content and language integrated learning. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL Classrooms* (pp. 1–18). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/aals.7.01dal

Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T., & Smit, U. (2010b). Language use and language learning in CLIL: Current findings and contentious issues. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 279–291). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/aals.7.14dal

Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). Content and language integrated learning: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, *46*(4), 545–559. doi:10.1017/s0261444813000256

Daniel, S. M., & Conlin, L. (2015). Shifting attention back to students within the sheltered instruction observation protocol. *TESOL Quarterly*, *49*(1), 169–187. doi:10.1002/tesq.213

de Jong, E. J. (2014). Program design and two-way immersion programs. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *2*(2), 241–256. doi:10.1075/jicb.2.2.06jon

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2008). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson. doi:10.5617/adno.1092

Feinauer, E., & Howard, E. R. (2014). Attending to the third goal: Cross-cultural competence and identity development in two-way immersion programs. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *2*(2), 257–272. doi:10.1075/jicb.2.2.07fei

Fernández-Sanjurjo, J., Fernández-Costales, A., & Arias-Blanco, J. M. (2017). Analysing students' content-learning in science in CLIL vs. non-CLIL programmes: Empirical evidence from Spain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. doi:10.1080/13670050.2017.1294142

Freeman, R. (2000). Contextual challenges to dual-language education: A case study of a developing middle school program. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *31*(2), 202–229. doi:10.1525/aeq.2000.31.2.202

Gabillon, Z., & Rodica, A. (2015). Content and language integrated learning: In search of a coherent conceptual framework. In *Official Conference Proceedings* (pp. 311–324). Brighton: The International Academic Forum (IAFOR).

Gené-Gil, M., Juan-Garau, M., & Salazar-Noguera, J. (2015). Writing development under CLIL provision. In M. Juan-Garau & J. Salazar-Noguera (Eds.), *Content-based language learning in multilingual environments* (pp. 139–161). New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-11496-5_9

Genesee, F., & Jared, D. (2008). Literacy development in early French immersion programs. *Canadian Psychology*, *49*(2), 140–147. doi:10.1037/0708-5591.49.2.140

Gibson, J., & Roy, S. (2015). Canadian parents for French: How a grassroots organization has contributed to the advancement of Canada's official languages policy. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *3*(2), 218–240. doi:10.1075/jicb.3.2.03gib

Harrop, E. (2012). Content and language integrated learning (CLIL): Limitations and possibilities. *Encuentros*, *21*, 57–70.

Harvey, T., Tihinen, T., Määttä, K., & Uusiautti, S. (2013). Content and language integrated learning in practice: Comparison of three cases. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *2*(2), 86–98.

Heras, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2015). The impact of CLIL on affective factors and vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, *19*(1), 70–88. doi:10.1177/1362168814541736

Hernández, A. M. (2015). Language status in two-way bilingual immersion: The dynamics between English and Spanish in peer interaction. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *3*(1), 102–126. doi:10.1075/jicb.3.1.05her

Hipfner-Boucher, K., Pasquarella, A., Chen, X., & Deacon, S. H. (2016). Cognate awareness in French immersion students: Contributions to grade 2 reading comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *20*(5), 389–400. doi:10.1080/10888438.2016.1213265

Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Rogers, D. (2007). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Howe, E. R. (2014). A narrative of teacher education in Canada: Multiculturalism, technology, bridging theory and practice. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *40*(5), 588–599. doi:10.1080/02607476.2014.956540

Hüttner, J., & Smit, U. (2014). CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning): The bigger picture. A response to: A. Bruton. 2013. CLIL: Some of the reasons why... and why not. *System*, *41* (2013): 587-597. *System*, *44*, (2014): 160–167. doi:10.1016/j.system.2014.03.001.

Juan-Garau, M., & Salazar-Noguera, J. (Eds.). (2015a). *Content-based language learning in multilingual educational environments.* New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-11496-5

Juan-Garau, M., & Salazar-Noguera, J. (2015b). Introduction: The relevance of CLIL education in achieving multilingualism on the global stage. In M. Juan-Garau & J. Salazar-Noguera (Eds.), *Content-based language learning in multilingual environments* (pp. 1–10). Springer International Publishing Switzerland. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-11496-5_1

Lambert, W. E. (1981). Bilingualism and language acquisition. *Annals, New York Academy of Sciences*, 9–22. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.1981.tb41993.x

Lappin-Fortin, K. (2014). Comparing written competency in core French and French immersion graduates. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *17*(2), 91–112.

Lasagabaster, D. (2008). Foreign language competence in content and language integrated courses. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, *1*, 30–41. doi:10.2174/1874913500801010030

Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2010). Immersion and CLIL in English: More differences than similarities. *ELT Journal*, *64*(4), 367–375. doi:10.1093/elt/ccp082

Lazaruk, W. A. (2007). Linguistic, academic, and cognitive benefits of French immersion. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *63*(5), 605–628. doi:10.3138/cmlr.63.5.605

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2005). *Review of research and best practices on effective features of dual language education programs.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2012). Success and challenges in dual language education, theory into practice. *Theory into Practice*, *51*(4), 256–262. doi:10.1080/00405841.2012.726053

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. doi:10.1080/13670050902777546

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Genesee, F. (2014). Student outcomes in one-way, two-way, and indigenous language immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *2*(2), 165–180. doi:10.1075/jicb.2.2.01lin

Lorenzo, F., Casal, S., & Moore, P. (2009). 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. doi:10.1093/applin/amp041

Lorenzo, F., & Moore, P. (2010). On the natural emergence of language structures in CLIL: Towards a theory of European educational bilingualism. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 23–38). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/aals.7.02lor

Lyster, R., & Tedick, D. J. (2014). Research perspectives on immersion pedagogy: Looking back and looking forward. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *2*(2), 210–224. doi:10.1075/jicb.2.2.04lys

Mady, C. (2015). Immigrants outperform Canadian-born groups in French immersion: Examining factors that influence their achievement. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *12*(3), 298–311. doi:10.1080/14790718.2014.967252

Maillat, D. (2010). The pragmatics of L2 in CLIL. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 29–58). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/aals.7.03mai

Makropoulos, J. (2009). Gaining access to late French-immersion programs: Class-based perspectives of Canadian students in an Ottawa high school. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *32*(3), 317–330. doi:10.1080/15235880903378941

Makropoulos, J. (2010). Students' attitudes to the secondary French immersion curriculum in a Canadian context. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *23*(1), 1–13. doi:10.1080/07908310903494525

Marian, V., Shook, A., & Schroeder, S. R. (2013). Bilingual two-way immersion programs benefit academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *36*, 167–186. doi:10.1080/15235882.2013.818075

Marsh, D. (2012). *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): A development trajectory.* Córdoba: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Córdoba.

Marsh, D., Maljers, A., & Hartiala, A.-K. (2001). *Profiling European CLIL classrooms: Languages open doors.* The Netherlands, Finland: University of Jyväskylä, Finland & European Platform for Dutch Education.

Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. J. (2008). *Uncovering CLILl: Content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education*. Oxford: McMillan Education.

Meyer, O. (2010). Towards quality-CLIL: Successful planning and teaching strategies. *Pulso*, *33*, 11–29.

Nicolay, A. C., & Poncelet, M. (2013). Cognitive abilities underlying second-language vocabulary acquisition in an early second-language immersion education context: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *115*, 655–671. doi:10.1016/j.jecp.2013.04.002

Nikula, T. (2010). Effects of CLIL on a teacher's classroom language use. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 105–123). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Paciotto, C., & Delany-Barmann, G. (2012). Minority language education reform from the bottom: two-way immersion education for new immigrant populations in the United States. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46*, 17–21. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.059

Palmer, D. (2010). Race, power, and equity in a multiethnic urban elementary school with a dual-language "strand" program. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *41*(1), 94–114. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1492.2010.01069.x

Palmer, D. K., Martínez, M. A., Mateus, S. G., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *98*(3), 757–772. doi:10.1111/modl.12121

Parkes, J. (2008). Who chooses dual language education for their children and why. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *11*(6), 635–660. doi:10.1080/13670050802149267

Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2016). From the CLIL craze to the CLIL conundrum: Addressing the current CLIL controversy. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, *9*(1), 9–31. doi:10.5565/rev/jtl3.667

Pérez-Vidal, C. (2015). Languages for all in education: CLIL and ICLHE at the crossroads of multilingualism, mobility and internationalization. In M. Juan-Garau & J. Salazar-Noguera (Eds.), *Content-based language learning in multilingual environments* (pp. 31–50). New York, NY: Springer International. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-11496-5_3

Polat, N., & Cepik, S. (2016). An exploratory factor analysis of the sheltered instruction observation protocol as an evaluation tool to measure teaching effectiveness. *TESOL Quarterly*, *50*(4), 817–843. doi:10.1002/tesq.248

Prieto-Arranz, J. I., Rallo-Fabra, L., Calafat-Ripoll, C., & Catrain-González, M. (2015). Testing progress of receptive skills in CLIL and non-CLIL contexts. In M. Juan-Garau & J. Salazar-Noguera (Eds.), *Content-based language learning in multilingual environments* (pp. 123–137). New York, NY: Springer International. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-11496-5_8

Roy, S. (2008). French immersion studies: From second-language acquisition (SLA) to social issues. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *54*(4), 396–406.

Roy, S., & Galiev, A. (2011). Discourses on bilingualism in Canadian French immersion programs. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *67*(3), 351–376. doi:10.3138/cmlr.67.3.351

Roy, S., & Schafer, P. C. (2015). Reading as a skill or as a social practice in French immersion? *Language and Education*, *29*(6), 527–544. doi:10.1080/09500782.2015.1059435.

Ruiz, N. (2012). It's different with second language learners: Learning from 40 years of experience. In C. Dudley-Marling & S. Michaels (Eds.), *High expectation curricula: Helping all students succeed with powerful learning* (pp. 145–161).

Song, K. H. (2016). Systematic professional development training and its impact on teachers' attitudes toward ELLs: SIOP and guided coaching. *TESOL Journal*, *7*(4), 767–799. doi:10.1002/tesj.240

Swain, M. (2000b). French immersion research in Canada: Recent contributions to SLA and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *20*, 199–212. doi:10.1017/s0267190500200123

Swain, M., & Johnson, R. K. (1997). Immersion education: A category within bilingual education. In R. K. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.). *Immersion education: International perspectives* (pp. 1–16). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/cbo9781139524667.003

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1989). Canadian immersion and adult second language teaching: What's the connection? *The Modern Language Journal*, *73*(ii), 151–159. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1989.tb02537.x

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2005). The evolving sociopolitical context of immersion education in Canada: Some implications for program development. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *15*(2), 169–186. doi:10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00086.x

Tedick, D. J. (2014). Language immersion education. A research agenda for 2015 and beyond. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *2*(2), 155–164. doi:10.1075/jicb.2.2.00int

Torres-Guzmán, M. E., Kleyn, T., Morales-Rodríguez, S., & Han, A. (2005). Self-designated dual-language programs: Is there a gap between labeling and implementation? *Bilingual Research Journal*, *29*(2), 453–474. doi:10.1080/15235882.2005.10162844

Valdés, G. (2013). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language minority students. In C. A. Klee, A. Lynch, & E. Tarone (Eds.). *Research and practice in immersion education: Looking back and looking ahead* (pp. 15–38). Minneapolis, MN: Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota. doi:10.17763/haer.67.3.n5q175qp86120948

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cuando se requieren en Costa Rica más altos niveles de competencia en idiomas extranjeros, la atención debe dirigirse al desarrollo de los programas de enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras. En esta entrega de *Cilampa*, se describen tres distintas experiencias: los programas canadienses de inmersión; el modelo dual para la enseñanza de idiomas, conocido como *Dual Language Education* en EEUU; y el movimiento europeo Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas Extranjeras (AICLE).

When higher levels of proficiency in foreign languages are required in Costa Rica, attention must be directed toward improving programs of foreign language instruction. In this issue of *Cilampa*, three different experiences have been described: the Immersion programs developed in Canada, the Dual Language programs found in the U.S., and the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) movement developing in Europe.

DAMARIS CASTRO-GARCÍA
Profesora de la Universidad Nacional de Costa Rica desde 2003. Ha impartido cursos de Gramática, Lingüística y Adquisición de Segundas Lenguas, y participado en diversos programas de investigación. Actualmente cursa estudios doctorales en la Universidad de Salamanca en España.

Professor, Universidad Nacional (Costa Rica), since 2003. She has taught Grammar, Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition, and has participated in diverse research projects. She is currently pursuing doctoral studies at the Universidad de Salamanca in Spain.