

Publicato in: Coonan, C.M., (a cura di), 2008, *CLIL e l'apprendimento delle lingue*, Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina, Venezia.

DEVELOPING A PERFORMANCE TEST FOR ITALIAN CLIL TEACHER CERTIFICATION: EXAMINING CLIL TEACHER LANGUAGE

GERALDINE LUDBROOK

Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy

Abstract

As the provision of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is moving increasingly into mainstream education, the call for certified qualification of CLIL teachers is growing. A project is being developed at the University of Venice to design a test to certify both the L2 competence of CLIL teachers and their knowledge of CLIL methodology. For the purposes of the pilot test, it will focus on the teaching of science through English.

As CLIL is not easily understood as a construct, making the measurement of ability complex, there are many directions for research within this context, which include examining how the interplay of general foreign language proficiency, subject-specific language, the language of classroom interaction, and code-switching contribute to the construction of CLIL science classroom discourse, in addition to the issue of what minimum L2 language proficiency is required of the CLIL teacher to effectively handle the methodology needed to implement this approach. This paper will discuss the methods used to investigate the target language use through the qualitative analysis of data from several different sources. The methodological issues will be discussed in a separate paper in this volume (cf. Serragiotto).

Parole chiave: *valutazione CLIL, certificazione CLIL docenti*

1. Content and Language Integrated Learning

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is an educational approach that has evolved in Europe from the new needs for multilingualism set out by the Council of Europe. The approach has been rapidly introduced into mainstream education throughout Europe, yet many issues remain unaddressed. Despite the key role the CLIL teacher plays in implementing the approach, there have been no attempts to standardize CLIL teacher training.

Only eleven European countries currently offer specific pre-service training for teachers intending to work within the CLIL approach: Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Spain, France, Lithuania, Austria, Poland, Finland, Sweden and England. Nonetheless, the recent report commissioned by the European Commission on professional training for European language teachers recommends that all foreign language teachers should receive pre-service training in the methodologies and strategies for teaching another subject through the medium of a foreign language even if they do not intend to specialise in the area. Various reasons are given for the recommendation: this training improves the language teacher's language competence; it encourages a more comprehensive use of the target language in their non-CLIL classes; it gives teachers ways of raising social, cultural and value issues in their foreign language teaching; and the CLIL approach encourages co-operation with colleagues from different disciplines (Kelly, Grenfell, 2004:76).

In-service training in the CLIL approach has been introduced in a few countries: in France, additional certification of competence has been required for teachers of a non-language subject teaching in a foreign language since 2003. Germany, too, has introduced additional teacher qualifications for bilingual teaching in some states (Eurydice Education Unit 2006:43-44).

However, even though the CLIL teacher cannot be simply considered a content teacher with additional language skills, in many countries where additional qualifications are required to teach within the CLIL approach, these generally focus on the content teacher's knowledge of the target language. Most education authorities adopt four main criteria for the recruitment of CLIL teachers. Besides training in their content subject, the teacher should:

- be a mother-tongue speaker of the target language;
- have studied in the target language;
- have followed in-service training in CLIL methodology;
- have acquired some certification of their knowledge of the target language (Eurydice European Unit, 2006, figure 4.3).

Yet, even though it is recognised that CLIL teachers require a good command of the foreign language in which they intend to deliver their subject, there is little agreement between experts as to what the minimum proficiency necessary for effective application of the CLIL approach might be. Marsh, for example, claims that teachers “do not need to have native or near-native competence in the target language for all forms of delivery, although naturally they need a high level of fluency” (Marsh, 2002:11). A different view is put forward by Smith (2005) who argues that native speaker skills are a necessary prerequisite for effective and flexible CLIL teaching.

Education authorities throughout Europe have different standards for CLIL teacher foreign language proficiency: the Dutch education authorities recommend at least a B2 level of the CEFR, in Poland and Hungary a B2-C1 level is required, whilst in Finland the Ministry for Education proposes a C2 level of proficiency (Eurydice Education Unit, 2006:43). Nevertheless, the call for a more defined level of target language proficiency of CLIL teachers is increasing. As Takala states: “One crucial aspect of CLIL should also be spelled out: how good should CLIL teachers’ proficiency in the language of instruction be and how could that level be reliably checked?” (Takala, 2002).

In 1999, education reform in Italy paved the way for a more widespread introduction of the CLIL approach in mainstream education. State schools were given greater autonomy to introduce and develop different forms teaching that more closely met the needs of their students. Amongst these was the possibility to teach content subjects in a foreign language. Another innovation was the introduction of more

flexible forms of teaching, in particular the concept of teaching modules, which may be of variable length, from a few hours to several months, and may have a cross-curricular nature (cf. Coonan, 2002:43-44). The focus on flexible language instruction was further reinforced by *Progetto Lingue 2000*, a project of the Italian Ministry for Education to improve the quality of foreign language teaching in the state school system (MPI, 2000).

Since the early 1990s, Italian education authorities have organised projects for CLIL teacher development. In the Veneto region, for example, the University of Venice has run training courses in CLIL methodology for in-service teachers in collaboration with regional education authorities since 2002, and is working to introduce the training of pre-service teachers (Coonan, 2004). In addition, pan-European CLIL projects, under the Socrates scheme, have funded teacher mobility programmes for language and subject teachers alike, to improve their language skills or to follow CLIL teacher training courses abroad (Coonan, 2002:107-108).

There are some content teachers who teach CLIL on their own; however, in Italy CLIL is mainly provided through a teaching team of subject and foreign language teachers. In the Italian CLIL classroom, the teaching partnership seems to be characterised by features of the complementary/ supportive teaching team, defined by Maroney (1995) as one in which “one teacher is responsible for teaching the content to the students, while the other teacher takes charge of providing follow-up activities on related topics or on study skills”. In some cases, the collaboration takes place before the lesson and the content teacher manages the lesson on his/her own. More commonly, in addition to shared preparation, both teachers are always present in the classroom at the same time (see the examples reported in Coonan, 2004).

As CLIL moves increasingly into mainstream education in Italy, the need for specialised training and qualification of CLIL teachers is becoming more evident. A project is being developed at the University of Venice to certify the methodological knowledge and foreign language proficiency of teachers intending to implement the CLIL approach in the Italian education system. The pilot test will be focussed on the science classroom, the most common subject taught within the CLIL approach; for the purposes of the initial study, the foreign language used will be English, although it is planned to extend the test to

other languages to meet the multilingual needs of Italian CLIL.

The methodological section of the certification project will be dealt with in a written exam form (cf. Serragiotto in this volume). This paper will focus on the issues involved in the development of a performance language test to assess the foreign language competence of the Italian CLIL teacher.

2. Performance language testing

Performance language testing has become increasingly popular in recent years, especially for the assessment of language proficiency for specific purposes in professional contexts. There exist, for example, tests assessing the English of air traffic controllers, the Japanese of tour guides, and the Italian of primary school teachers. For a review of these and similar tests, see Douglas (2000).

Performance language testing generally tends to follow two main schools of thought. In the first, the test performance is the means by which a language sample is elicited so as to allow evaluation of second language proficiency. Test tasks may resemble or simulate real-world tasks, but the real focus of the test is the underlying knowledge and ability that is revealed in the performance. The performance is thus the “vehicle of assessment” (Messick, 1994:14). The construct of the test is generally based on an explicit theory of language and language use, such as the models of communicative language ability developed by Bachman (1990), Bachman, Palmer (1996), and Canale, Swain (1980).

The second theory is the task-based approach to performance testing in which the fulfilment of the test-task is the ‘target of assessment’, and the second language is the ‘medium’ of the performance (Messick, 1994:14). The test tasks simulate or replicate real-world tasks and the criteria used for evaluation of task fulfilment are based on real-world criteria. In its most pragmatic form, this approach may make no recourse to theoretical models of language use in the definition of the test construct, relying instead on a close analysis of the target language use.

Bachman (2002) proposes a form of test development which takes into consideration both approaches of performance testing: attempting to define task characteristics on the basis of both the analysis of the target language use domain and either an existing framework or a frame-

work developed ad hoc for the test. The framework may be rooted in a theoretical model, or based on a course syllabus, or defined from a needs analysis of the target language use domain.

There are clear advantages to be gained from performance language testing. One is the issue of authenticity. If the candidate is required to perform tasks taken from the target language context and domain, then there is a much higher likelihood that the language produced in the performance will be closer to the language used in the real-world context. Background and topic knowledge, too, are often included in the construct of performance tests for specific purposes, in which test content and test methods stem from an analysis of a specific use situation or context, capitalizing on special purpose abilities on the grounds that “context-based tests may provide more useful information than general-purpose tests when the goal is to make situation-specific judgments about subjects’ communicative language ability” (Douglas, 1997:18).

Defining an appropriate *a priori* construct for a performance language test for Italian CLIL teachers, and considering the test tasks to be designed, will therefore require a careful analysis of the target language use domain. The next section of this paper will examine the methods used to collect and analyse the target language used in an Italian CLIL science classroom, drawing on a small case study recently carried out in an Italian secondary school.

3. The case study: establishing methodological tools

A qualitative approach was adopted in the case study of Italian CLIL teacher language, incorporating different methods of data collection to build up as rich a picture as possible of the CLIL learning and teaching environment.

3.1 CLIL classroom observation schedule

CLIL classroom observation was the principle source of data. To aid this exploratory phase, an observation checklist was chosen as a framework for the observation. Often used to provide a sampling frame

to classroom observation (see, for example, Montgomery, 2002) this instrument has also been used for both *a priori* and *a posteriori* analysis of output in speaking test tasks (O'Sullivan, Weir, Saville, 2002).

In the preliminary stages of the development of a similar tool for Italian CLIL classrooms, two checklists devised for classroom observation of non-native English speaking teachers were examined. De Graaff, Koopman, Anikina, Westhoffer (2007) report on the development of an observation tool based on principles from second language pedagogy. The checklist covers several aspects of CLIL methodology: focus on form, focus on meaning and different kinds of scaffolding. It does not, however, look at the fields of general language proficiency, subject-specific language or classroom management, as the specific aim of the study by De Graaff *et al.*, is to detect effective CLIL pedagogy.

Closer to the aims of the Italian testing project, albeit in a non-European context, Elder (1993) illustrates an observation schedule developed "to assess the English language proficiency of non-native speaker graduates training as secondary mathematics and science teachers" in Australian schools (Elder, 1993:235). The schedule contains features of both language and language-related behaviour based on the literature of classroom communication, considered crucial for effective teacher performance and revised to include only those features which were found "to discriminate among non-native speaker teachers" (*ibid*: 237). The schedule was produced for use by teachers of mathematics and science, so was formulated to be meaningful to non-language experts and designed to be used during a 15-minute observation of teacher performance.

As Elder's 1993 schedule contained some of the main categories of language features considered relevant to the Italian CLIL context, it was decided to use this as a starting point for the CLIL classroom observations. In order to tailor the schedule to focus more precisely on the foreign language needs of the Italian CLIL teacher, a group of Italian experts in CLIL methodology, teacher trainers, CLIL teacher trainers, and trainee teacher supervisors were asked to indicate what aspects of the original schedule they considered to be important features of the Italian CLIL classroom. Their evaluations were then incorporated into a revised version of the schedule. An additional section was added to the schedule, which took into consideration code-switching, intended here as any kind of alternation between L1 and L2, not specifically switch-

ing, borrowing or mixing. Although L2-only interaction is encouraged, the effective use of L1 is an important feature in CLIL classroom discourse (cf., for example, the studies by Butzkamm, 1998 and Nikula, 2005 on code-switching practices in CLIL classrooms). The two descriptors added concerned the teacher's effective use of L1/L2 code switching and the teacher's encouragement of effective code-switching by the students. The CLIL observation schedule used in this case study can be found in the Appendix.

3.2 Content and EFL teacher interviews

Carrying out a pre-observation interview with the content teacher to be observed is a means of establishing a collaborative relationship, as well as being a rapid way of gathering important background information about the learners: their estimated language level, their general experience of CLIL learning, and information about the organisation of the specific CLIL course being observed. The real focus of interest, however, in this study is establishing the teacher's level of L2 proficiency as accurately as possible. In the pilot study, a semi-structured interview – as described by Cohen et al (2000:146) – was used. The teacher was asked for self-assessment of his own level using the Common European Framework self-assessment grids (see Council of Europe, 2001, tables 2 and 3:26-29). In addition the teacher was asked to assess his foreign language proficiency using the DIALANG diagnostic language tests. This was then backed up by a portfolio of the teacher's studies, certifications, study periods abroad and other use of the L2.

An interview with the EFL teacher team-teaching with the content teacher was also carried out to explore the role of the FL teacher in the CLIL classroom, to identify what difficulties had been encountered, and to record any additional insights the language expert might contribute to the picture of the language competences required of the subject teacher in the CLIL classroom.

3.3 Group interviews

Coonan (2007) has conducted considerable research on the 'insider' view of the CLIL classroom, working with subject and language teacher teams implementing the approach in Italian classrooms, to record their perceptions of the CLIL classroom. Her results show that,

due to a high degree of teacher awareness, useful information can be gleaned from CLIL teachers' experience in the classroom. Group interview with both foreign language and content subject teachers implementing the CLIL approach in the Italian secondary school in question was organised to discuss the specific questions of CLIL teachers' language needs and levels of proficiency.

3.4 Other data sources

In addition to teacher interviews and classroom observation, various teaching materials used in the CLIL module were examined: handouts prepared by the content teacher and used by the EFL teacher to prepare students for the CLIL module, and the tasks set for students during the module. The end-of-module test was also looked at.

4. The case study

The school chosen for the case study was a technical secondary school¹ that trains students for employment in the sectors of trade, tourism and surveying, offering experimental courses in IT, foreign trade correspondence and tourism. It was chosen as the context for the case study because English-language CLIL in the science classroom has been implemented here for several years, generally in the first two years of secondary school with students aged 14-16.

The class observed was made up of 20 students aged 15: four boys and 16 girls. The students had already received science instruction in CLIL the previous year with the same teachers and were therefore familiar with the procedures and classroom rules regarding the use of English, as well as with pair and group work activities.

The science teacher observed was a strong advocate of the CLIL approach and had been instrumental in introducing it into the school. He had completed a CLIL training course offered by the University of Venice and was involved in a research project involving CLIL teachers in Italy. He used Internet resources to provide material for his CLIL module, including MIT videos of science lessons. He evaluated his level of language proficiency within the B1 level for all skills, with the exception of reading comprehension, which he evaluated as B2. The

¹ Istituto Tecnico Statale per il Commercio, il Turismo e per Geometri Girardi, Cittadella (PD).

DIALANG test instead revealed that in reading, grammar and vocabulary, his results were at the C1 level, whereas his listening comprehension score was slightly lower at the B2 level. He also provided useful insights into his own language needs, expressing confidence in his teacher-fronted lessons, but finding difficulty in unplanned interaction, in retrieving the unpredictable lexis that he might require during the lesson to respond to student requests for information.

The teacher also outlined the structure of the CLIL module planned. It was to last 18-20 hours and would be delivered in the last five weeks of the school year. The students would first be made familiar with some of the vocabulary to be used by the EFL teacher in the English lessons. Then a series of four lessons would be held in the physics laboratory. In these teacher-fronted lessons, the content teacher would carry out demonstrations and experiments related to the theme of the module. The next four lessons would be group work held in the multimedia laboratory. The students would work in pairs; each pair would be given a task that involved retrieving information from the internet. The students would then prepare a PowerPoint presentation of the completed task. The module would also be evaluated with a written test which would be marked by both science and EFL teacher, giving two separate marks. Any comments on the test would be written by both teachers in English.

A total of four CLIL lessons were observed. Two lessons were held in the physics laboratory and involved the science teacher explaining a process and illustrating it through a series of practical demonstrations on the topic of Electrostatics. These lessons were science teacher-fronted activities, while the EFL teacher stood at the whiteboard providing written support (for example, irregular verbs, specialist lexis) and occasionally intervening orally.

The other two lessons observed were held in the multimedia laboratory. In these lessons, the students worked in pairs retrieving information from the Internet to respond to a series of questions they had been assigned while the teachers monitored and assisted them. The research was to be presented orally by the students at the end of the module with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation they had prepared.

The CLIL classroom observation schedule was used during the observation. When possible, examples of language features (exemplify-

ing, for instance, or monitoring) were noted. In addition, all board work by both teachers was recorded. The initial analysis of the observation schedule seems to indicate that it is a useful tool in the observation of the CLIL science teacher's performance. Most of the descriptors seem relevant and capture salient moments of the classroom interaction.

More CLIL classroom observations of other content teachers will permit some further fine-tuning of the schedule. Two aspects in particular will have to be ascertained. Much of the classroom management observed was carried out by the EFL teacher, and further observations will be needed to verify whether this division of tasks by the EFL and content teachers is common to other teaching teams or whether it was specific to this particular pair. This will help inform decisions made as to whether the four categories of language features should have the same weight within the CLIL teacher's test performance. In addition, the descriptors seemed to capture the use of L1/L2 code-switching in the lessons observed. If further observations confirm that the different ways in which Italian is used by the content teacher are systematic to CLIL science classrooms, the descriptors might be articulated to take this into consideration. However, the general impression was that the schedule is a valid one for the Italian CLIL classroom.

The interview with the EFL teacher also provided interesting data. She had team-taught CLIL with the content teacher, and another science teacher at the school, for two years. She saw her role as providing language support to the content teacher in the classroom, anticipating students' difficulties as she was familiar with their language skills and knowledge. The teacher confirmed that during the CLIL module, all the EFL lessons were used for preparation of the CLIL science lessons, especially of the lexis the students would need. With regard to the content teacher's language needs, the EFL teacher confirmed the science teacher's own perception of his limitations as lying in the shift from working within his subject to other registers, such as class management.

The group interview with the team of EFL and content teachers working within the CLIL approach revealed additional consensus on the language needs of the content teacher. They all agreed that native speaker level of proficiency is not a goal for either CLIL teachers or learners, however they strongly felt that the content teacher should achieve a level of language independence that would permit the EFL teacher to concentrate on the students' language development. Lexical

flexibility that allowed the use of strategies such as reformulating and recasting was considered very important, more so than grammatical accuracy. The general view was that while teacher errors that did not impede student comprehension were not serious, systematic errors were not acceptable. The content teacher's language containing some language errors was seen as being useful to encourage learners to see error correction as a positive part of language learning. More than grammatical precision, the teachers regarded accuracy of pronunciation and intonation as being of greater importance as the aim of the CLIL module was effective communication.

Analysis was also carried out of the various documents used in the CLIL module: handouts prepared by the content teacher, and the tasks set for students during the module. The end-of-module test was also examined. The test combined multiple choice and true/false items with open questions. The paper was marked by both teachers and separate grades were given for content and language. Comments and corrections were written by both teachers in English. The language was generally correct, although it was not possible to identify exactly what each teacher had contributed.

5. Conclusions and further research

The case study has provided researchers with useful data. An initial analysis of the data collected using the CLIL classroom observation schedule seems to indicate that it is a valid tool for examining the CLIL science teacher's performance. Most of the descriptors seem relevant and capture salient moments of the classroom interaction. The teacher interviews also made useful information available, both regarding the content teacher's language needs and the level of proficiency required.

The case study also provided insight into the tasks that might be designed for the performance test, operationalizing the construct. The teacher needs to be able to prepare and deliver teacher-focussed presentation of subject-specific material, with the aid of practical demonstrations, board work, and written handouts; to set up and monitor pair and group work task-based activities, interacting with the students on issues regarding both content and language; to evaluate student performance, both oral presentation of group work tasks and written test production. Establishing the nature of the test tasks and defining the task characteristics will require careful consideration of what degree of authenticity

and interactivity is desired and can be achieved in a performance test simulating a classroom situation.

In future research, validation of the checklist will continue with repeated observations of CLIL classrooms and through focus group discussions with other teachers using the CLIL approach in Italy aimed at further clarifying and refining the checklist. This framework drawn from the target language use domain will form the basis for the construct underlying the test, and guide the construct-based scoring criteria used for performance evaluation.

The issue of establishing an appropriate minimum level of L2 proficiency of the Italian CLIL teacher is a judgment-based decision that will be based on performance data from trialling of the test tasks. Experts will have to be consulted to try to reach consensus on what minimum level is acceptable. This will require extensive discussion of the language model to be used, and precise definitions of issues such as fluency, accuracy, and intelligibility in the CLIL context will have to be established.

Although there are no specific tests of CLIL teacher language, there are several training courses available in different countries. A review of the L2 language proficiency required for these courses may provide a useful source of information. Certifications of training for in- and pre-service CLIL teachers are now being offered by several UK institutions. The University of Nottingham, for example, have a Certificate in Content and Language which deals with the principles of the teaching of content subjects through a foreign language, strategies for the CLIL classroom and material design. Language requirements for entry to the course, besides “a good first degree with at least second class honours”, are 6.5 IELTS, with at least 6.0 in each element, or the TOEFL equivalent, corresponding to the C1 level of the CEFR²

Other European institutions are also offering similar courses in CLIL teacher training. The *Paedagogische Hochschule Niederrhein* offers a Master of Arts in Content and Language Integrated Learning. Although the working language of the course is English, two modules are delivered in the country of the target language in order to support both language skills and intercultural awareness. Participants

² http://www.cambridgeesol.org/annual_review2007/section09.html

are expected to reach a language level of C1 (part 1) and C2 (part 2) in the target language.

To date, the only attempt at a standardised international qualification for CLIL teachers has recently been developed by Cambridge ESOL, which has added a CLIL module to its Teaching Knowledge Test. Presented at the recent ALTE conference in Cambridge (April 2008) it aims to test

knowledge about content teaching in a target language and the learning, thinking and language skills which are developed across different curriculum subjects; knowledge of how to plan lessons as well as knowledge of activities and resources used to support a CLIL approach; knowledge of lesson delivery and how assessment is carried out in CLIL contexts.

The test is aimed at pre- or in-service teachers and international candidates teaching at primary, secondary and tertiary level. The language of the test is English and a CEFR B1 level (or IELTS Band 4) of English is recommended for test takers, as well as familiarity with specialist lexis relating to CLIL³.

The review of these CLIL qualifications illustrates how educational institutions and international testing bodies are addressing the issue of CLIL teacher qualification. It also provides useful information on the levels of L2 proficiency required for entry to courses or recommended for test takers.

An additional aspect to be addressed is that performance on language tests is typically judged with reference to a native speaker ideal. Some scholars have, however, challenged the concept that the native speaker is an appropriate model of English for language testing, and teaching, outside Kachru's (1990) 'Inner Circle (see the work by Brown, Lumley, 1998; Elder, Davies, 2006; Han, Singh, 2007; House, 2002; Jenkins, 2006; Pickering, 2006; Taylor, 2006; Seidlhofer *et al*,

³ <http://www.cambridgeesol.org/exams/teaching-awards/clil.html>.

2006). CLIL would seem to be a clear example of English used as a Lingua Franca in the classroom, albeit between non-native speakers sharing the same first language. A discussion of the issues involved in terms of CLIL teacher performance will be a necessary stage in the complex process of setting benchmarks for the test.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Pierandrea Pelà and Cristiana Marchi, as well as the other CLIL teachers at Istituto Tecnico Statale per il Commercio, il Turismo e per Geometri Girardi, Cittadella, for their kind collaboration.

Bibliographic references

Bachman L F, 2002, "Some reflections on task-based language performance assessment", in *Language Testing*, 19, 4.

Bachman L F, 1990, *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Bachman L F, Palmer A S, 1996, *Language Testing in Practice*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Brown A, Lumley T, 1998, "Linguistic and cultural norms in language testing: a case study", in *Melbourne Papers in Language Testing*, 7, 1.

Butzkamm W, 1998, "Code-switching in a bilingual history lesson: the mother tongue as a conversational lubricant", in *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1, 2.

Canale M, Swain M, 1980, "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing", in *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1.

Coonan C M, 2007, "Insider views of the CLIL class through teacher self-observation and introspection", in *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10, 5.

Coonan C M, 2004, *CLIL: un nuovo ambiente di apprendimento*, Venice, Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina.

Coonan C M, 2002, *La lingua straniera veicolare*, Torino, UTET Libreria.

Council of Europe , 2001, *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

De Graaff R, Koopman G J, Anikina Y, Westhoff G, 2007, “An observation tool for effective L2 pedagogy in content and language integrated learning (CLIL)”, in *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10, 5.

Douglas D, 1997, *Testing Speaking Ability in Academic Contexts-Theoretical Considerations*. Princeton, NJ., TOEFL Monograph Series 9, ETS.

Douglas D, 2000, *Assessing Languages for Specific Purposes*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Elder C, 1994, “Performance testing as a benchmark for LOTE teacher education”, in *Melbourne Papers in Language Testing*, 3, 1.

Elder C, Davies A, 2006, “Assessing English as a Lingua Franca”, in *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26.

House J, 2002, “Developing pragmatic competence in English as a lingua franca”, in Knapp K, Meierkord C, (eds.), *Lingua franca communication*, Frankfurt, Lang.

Jenkins J, 2006, “The spread of EIL: A testing time for testers”, in *ELT Journal*, 60, 1.

Kachru B, 1990, “World Englishes and applied linguistics”, in *World Englishes*, 9, 1.

Marsh D, 2002, (ed.), *CLIL/EMILE. The European Dimension*, UniCOM Finland, University of Jyväskylä, Continuing Education Centre.

Messick S, 1994, “The interplay of evidence and consequences in the validation of performance assessments”, in *Educational Researcher*, 23, 2.

Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, 2000, *Progetto Lingue 2000*, Gruppo Lingue Straniere, Rome, MPI.

Montgomery D, 2002, *Helping Teachers Develop through Classroom Observation*, 2nd ed, London, David Fulton Publishers.

Nikula T, 2005, "English as an object and tool of study in classrooms: Interactional effects and pragmatic implication", in *Linguistics and Education*, 16, 1.

O'Sullivan B, Weir C J, Saville N, 2002, "Using observation checklists to validate speaking-test tasks", in *Language Testing*, 19, 1.

Pickering L, 2006, "Current research on intelligibility in English as a lingua franca", in *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26.

Seidelhofer B, Breiteneder A, Pitzl M-L, 2006, "English as a Lingua Franca in Europe: Challenges for applied linguistics", in *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26.

Takala S, 2002, "Positioning CLIL in the Wider Context", in Marsh D, (ed.), *CLIL/EMILE. The European Dimension*, Finland, University of Jyväskylä, UniCOM Continuing Education Centre.

Taylor L, 2006, "The changing landscape of English: implications for language assessment", in *ELT Journal*, 60, 1.

Web references

Coonan C M, La formazione avanzata a livello universitario dei docenti CLIL in Italia. 2004, retrieved 17.5.2006: www.gold.indire.it/nazionale/content/index.php?action=read_cnt&id_cnt=5967

Eurydice European Unit, *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe*, 2006, retrieved 28.05.2006: www.eurydice.org/portal/page/portal/Eurydice/showPresentation?pubid=070EN

Han J, Singh M, "World English speaking (WES) student-teachers' experiences of schools: curriculum issues, transnational mobility and the Bologna Process", in *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*,

2007, 4, 1, retrieved 13.05.2008.
<http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci>

Kelly M., Grenfell M., 2004, *European Profile for Language Teacher Education – A Frame of Reference*, University of Southampton, Southampton: <http://www.lang.soton.ac.uk/profile>

Maroney S, *Team Teaching*, 1995, retrieved 12.02.2008.
www.wiu.edu/users/mfsam1/TeamTchg.html

Smith K, “Is this the end of the language class?”, in *Guardian Weekly*, January 21, 2005, retrieved 11.11.2006: education.guardian.co.uk/tefl/teaching/story/0,15085,1394830,00.html

Further reading

Brinton D M, Snow M A, Wesche M B, 1989 *Content-based Second Language Instruction*, Mass, Heinle & Heinle.

Brumfit C J, 1984, *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching: The Roles of Fluency and Accuracy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Chambers F, 1997, “What do we mean by fluency?”, in *System*, 25.

Crystal D, 1987, *The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Elder C, 2001, “Assessing the language proficiency of teachers: are there any border controls?”, in *Language Testing*, 18, 2.

Elder C, 1993, “How do subject specialists construe classroom language proficiency?”, in *Language Testing*, 10, 3.

Marsh D, 1994, “Bilingual Education and Content and Language Integrated Learning”, International Association for Cross-cultural Communication, Language Teaching in the Member States of the European Union (Lingua), Paris, University of Sorbonne.

McNamara T, 1996, *Measuring Second Language Performance*, Harlow, Longman.

Serragiotto G, 2003, *CLIL: apprendere assieme una lingua e contenuti non linguistici*, Welland Ontario, Guerra.

Van Avermaet P, Colpin M, Van Gorp K, Bogaert N, Van Den Branden K, 2006, "The role of the teacher in task-based language", in Van Den Branden K, (ed.), *Task-Based Language Education*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

APPENDIX

CLIL classroom observation schedule

1. General language proficiency

Intelligibility of expression

- 1.1 pronounces words/sounds clearly;
- 1.2 utters sentences clearly, with suitable rhythm and intonation;
- 1.3 stresses important words/ideas;
- 1.4 clearly marks transition from one idea/lesson stage to the next, using words such as *so, now, right*;
- 1.5 uses appropriate facial expressions, gestures, body movement.

Fluency and flexibility of expression

- 1.6 speaks at a speed appropriate to the level of the class;
- 1.7 speaks fluently, without too much uncertainty;
- 1.8 can express ideas in different ways: rephrasing, elaborating, summarizing, exemplifying.

Accuracy of expression

- 1.9 grammar of spoken and written language is generally accurate;
- 1.10 uses correct spelling and punctuation in board-work.

Planning, monitoring and repair

- 1.11 plans what is to be said and the means to say it, exploiting any resources available;
- 1.12 uses circumlocution and paraphrase to cover gaps in vocabulary and structure;
- 1.13 backtracks when a difficulty is encountered and reformulates;
- 1.14 corrects own slips and errors if s/he becomes aware of them or if they have led to misunderstandings.

2. Using subject-specific language

- 2.1 demonstrates knowledge of subject specific terms;

- 2.2 pronounces specialist terms clearly;
- 2.3 uses specialist terms judiciously, writing on board when necessary;
- 2.4 makes clear the connection between ideas, stressing link words *if, since, in order*;
- 2.5 explains concepts and processes in ways appropriate to the level of the class, using simple language and familiar/concrete examples;
- 2.6 explains diagrams, models, graphs clearly;
- 2.7 links new information to the students' previous knowledge.

3. Using the language of classroom interaction

- 3.1 poses questions to check understanding of previously learnt material/new information;
- 3.2 grades questions appropriately for the level of the class and the learning task: simpler to more complex; closed/open;
- 3.3 responds appropriately to students' questions, requests for assistance;
- 3.4 deals effectively with wrong answers, non-response, using scaffolding techniques such as requests for clarification and recasts;
- 3.5 gives clear instructions for activities;
- 3.6 makes effective use of teaching materials.

4. Using L1 and L2

- 4.1 makes effective use of L1/L2 code-switching, clarifying rules with students;
- 4.2 encourages students' effective use of L1/L2 code-switching.